

---

HELSINKI – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up Session Part 2  
Thursday, June 30, 2016 – 13:30 to 15:00 EEST  
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. So now we have our last session. Alan Greenberg is not here. He asked us, Leon and me, to chair this session. We have two items on this session.

The first one is about the At-Large review. Yesterday the working party met here in Aurora room. We have here to the two Chairs of the working party about the review of At-Large, and I will give them the floor to give us the situation today.

Holly or Cheryl?

HOLLY RAICHE: Start with me. Yesterday, we had a lovely lunch and a lovely discussion. We had where we're up to in the review, for those of you who weren't there, and that's not many of you. In the process, we have progressed to the point where we have, I will say, an independent examiner. In fact, it's a team. There are four of them. There's Team Tom, Nick, and Rosa, and they've split up along geographic lines as to who and what areas they're responsible for.

---

*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.*

---

They have been talking to a lot of us. A lot of us have been talking to them. Sometimes we've worked in groups and sometimes singly. They've gathered a lot of information, and yesterday's lunch was yet another opportunity for them to hear from people, to ask questions and listen.

In terms of where we are in the process, as I say, we're really up to the independent examiners having been selected, onboard, and starting to talk to us. Everybody has their contact details, and if they don't, they're on the website. Am I right? If not, get ahold of Ariel.

They are very interested to hear from anybody. They will, from here, go back into their own little huddle and exchange the sorts of views they all have gathered about us and come up with a survey, which they're hoping that all of us or as many of us as possible will respond to. The questions in the survey are going to be based on the information that they've gathered to date. They're looking for our responses, and that will be the basis for an initial draft report. Now, the draft report will be run past the At-Large review working party for comments, questions, and corrections, whatever.

The other opportunity that will be presented to talk to that team will be, by the way, in Hyderabad. By that time, there should be the draft report and some feedback. They will, by the end of the

---

year – that’s the schedule – have come up with a final report and recommendations. As I keep saying to myself and everyone, that’s when the fun starts because, from there, it’s a matter of implementing the recommendations. Rinalia was very clear about Board expectations on the recommendations, which are that they are simply to be recommendations about what can be implemented for the range of improvements that will happen.

So we have one more opportunity to see the four-people review team, but at any time, they’re happy to hear from any of you. In the meantime, expect a survey. I think, Cheryl, before Hyderabad it [will] be. Before Hyderabad, there will be a survey that we hope as many of you as possible will fill out to assist them in coming up with a draft report.

Did you get the feeling that the draft report would be ready by Hyderabad or not? Maybe not. I’m just not sure. At any time, by the way, they want to hear from you. They will be trying to attend, not necessarily in person, meetings, and they’re certainly open to the possibility of a range of teleconferences or Skype chats or whatever. So there’s plenty of opportunity for further communication if you would like to.

That’s where we’re up to. Cheryl, would you like to add some more?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. I'm always happy to embellish just a little bit, so I'll take the opportunity to embellish now, even though I'm off-screen because of where the camera is. I'll come over here. Here I am. Hello. I'm over here. Right.

The matter Holly just mentioned about you all filling out the survey is very important, but what I'd like to suggest is it's equally important for you all to pass that link of the survey on to others. If we can spread this survey further out into your At-Large Structures – so as regional leaders, make sure all your At-Large Structures get hold of this survey. Just check that they've got it. We would like to hear from as many of their individual members as can be motivated.

One of the things that some people may feel is that, at the end of that survey process, they may not have been asked a question which is on a matter that they feel is important. That's okay because the external reviewer is more than happy to accept written documentation or statements. So you may find that your At-Large Structures might say, "Oh, but they didn't ask us about this. And what about that?" That's an opportunity for you as regional leadership to gather those opinions together and put a one-pager and send it through on behalf of this particular geographic region, "This is a few things we thought you might be interested considering as well."

---

As I said to so many of you yesterday, this is not a threat exercise. This is an exercise in helping us build a better model. So embrace and engage this with a positive-ness. Now, that doesn't mean that you can't see, "Historically, this, this, and this has not been the best way I think it could work." That's fine. But just don't dwell on history or, indeed, ancient history. Also share with the examiner, especially if you are interviewed, some of what your thinking is on how things could be done efficiently, effectively, and in a way that goes all the way towards making us as inclusive as possible.

With that, I guess we should open for any questions.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Seun, you have a question?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. Thank you, Cheryl and Holly. Just two questions. Those of us who happen to have been interviewed in [inaudible] are we also expected to fill the survey? Secondly, the survey, is it open for comments on what the fields are, and can we actually contribute to it? Thank you?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Seun. We have not seen the survey. It's not our survey. It's the external examiner's survey. I would suggest that you shouldn't assume that there will be commenting opportunities, but there may be because surveys often form a different type of data collection exercise than what you, for example, would do in an interview. So there might be very specific metrics or data points that they're interested in accumulating, and you need to answer those. There may be an opportunity for any other comments, and that's fine. If that's the case, that's a good opportunity. But it doesn't mean you can't use the opportunity to put it through the region.

Should you be engaged in both – in other words, should you be a survey participant as well as interview participant – absolutely, because the interviews that may have happened with you already or will happen in the near future are an anecdotal exercise. They're in some ways almost a scoping exercise for issues that enough of us bring to the surface that they may then wish dig deeper and more specifically on.

In a later interview, you might get a callback interview. That's okay, too. Or, actually in the survey.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Cheryl.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to add to that, they really want to hear from you. To repeat what Cheryl said, the survey will ask a range of questions because they're gathering data to give credibility, meaning, and depth, whatever, to outcomes. They need the data. But then anything else that you want to say, just put in an e-mail, for goodness sake, or Skype them, or whatever. They really want to hear from you.

So they want to hear from you from the survey for a range of statistical reasons, but they want to hear anything else you have to say. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Any other remarks or questions?

I can give you my feedback if you want. I had a very good impression about those people, at least three of them, those who approached me. It happens that they are all men. I am sorry for that. Perhaps there is a problem of language with Rosa. But what I can tell you is that they are really willing to do a very good job. From the human point of view, they are excellent. Three of them are excellent.

Also, I will have a meeting now with one of them at 3:00 because, after our discussion yesterday, he wanted to have more

---

information. I think, as much information as we give them, they will be able to make a better job, make a better survey. I hope that the result will be really interesting and really in the interest of At-Large in general. I hope – and I said this several times – that the review goes deeply in the ALSes because it is there. Before we did the ALAC review. Now we need it to be an At-Large review.

Any other remark? Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Tijani. Just a question. I had my interview yesterday. Is it [illegal] if I talk a little bit about this interview? Or is this...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Go right ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's no one here.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. It was quite a good discussion of one-and-half hours, and it was also forward-looking. I was looking to Tom Mackenzie, who's responsible for Europe. His final question was, "So how would you solve that problem?" The problem we had discussed just before that was that, of course, we have to renew our ALAC



---

community again and again – and just being about the ALAC, not necessarily the At-Large – but on the other hand, keep the knowledgeable people who’ve served that community for such a long while.

I said, “Yes. It’s difficult to want both renewal and knowledge transfer on the other hand.” Then there was an idea that just came in my mind. Maybe if you find the idea worse, well, maybe you can recommend that as well. I said, “People like Olivier, Cheryl, and Alan in the future, who have been Chair and served that community, are well-connected.”

Cheryl, I think you’ve had trouble to get travel support because you don’t have any official role to play anymore. I suggested that maybe we can ask for an official role or official position to be an advisor or consultant to this community, just to keep those people who served and are well-connected further and stay connected to this community.

I think Cheryl would be a wonderful example because Olivier is still in the position and receives travel support. Let’s see what happens when Alan at some point is not our Chair anymore. It would be really a loss to lose – I could even think of other people; Evan Leibovitch or whomever.

So this was my proposal, and if you think that could be a good one, because obviously the review was taken very serious last

---

time. The result was we got an At-Large Director on the Board. So if this review is taken seriously in the same manner, then we might be successful getting a second director, and maybe even further position to strengthen this community and to keep the knowledge. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sandra. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. Thank you on behalf of Alan and I and others. Not losing the knowledge, trust, and connections we have is important, but we also need to have an active role while we're here. We shouldn't just be stage decorations. I think that mentoring that I hope I'm doing vaguely successfully with a few people around this table is an example of what sort of use you should be making of us. Not the only example, but an example.

I wanted to just bring up the point with regards to the second director. As Chris Disspain said, it's a very different world now than it was then. So how we do this is important. I wouldn't take the approach of the, "We were told it should be two and it only turned out one. Boo-hoo," approach. I would take an approach that says, "We've had proof of concept. We've seen an increase in the importance and impact of the At-Large Advisory

---

Committee and the At-Large community, ICANN-wide.” We’ve gone from where we had to fight and argue to be included in an equitable way in certain policy development processes and cross-community activities to where it would be unthinkable for the letters A-L-A-C not to be included in these things.

A lot has happened in this time, and of course, we’ve actually had success with the members that we have sent to sit in Seat 15 on the Board. We heard compliments for our current sitting member as well today, just to affirm all of that.

So now is a different time. We should actually present it as an opportunity to leverage on that current position, and a second director would be a way of taking us to the next level of influence and greater efficiencies. So go for it, team, but try to avoid the boo-hoos, “We didn’t get to in the past,” and focus on how much more we are recognizable and recognized as an integral part of what happens ICANN-wide.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Any other remarks about the At-Large review? We still have some [minutes].

Okay. If there is no other comments, no other questions, I will hand it over to Leon – excuse me. Wolf. Wolf, go ahead.

---

WOLF LUDWIG:

Sorry to step in. I will have, as Sandra interview yesterday, I will have it in half-an-hour. I was reflecting already on what I really want or need to say. I will come back to what you argued yesterday, Tijani.

I'm quite unsatisfied with the eight years I served as the Chair. I tried to do my best, but the results are quite mediocre. We didn't succeed to really increase the number of ALSes. We had to decertify, and we are now on the same level we were four years ago. We are far away from reaching anything like our ideal, what would be one member per European country. According to the Council of Europe standards, it's 47. So it was 37. Okay. And ten of them are in Germany alone.

Even more difficult than outreach, which was always understood as a leadership task – not many members participated in the efforts. How to keep them involved, which was in-reach, is much, much more difficult than anything else. The attendance rate at our monthly calls is pretty low. It's always the same bunch of usual suspects we have at our calls who are reliable. EURALO's representation at ALAC At-Large Working Groups is quite low, as well.

So we have a group of highly committed people with limited capacities. There's always a question of burnout to a certain extent. We really have to continue and work hard, and that's

---

what I'm trying to do and discuss with Olivier, how to better get our members involved. The in-reach is a consistent problem, and just counting new ALSes for me never would be, even if it's still a goal for outreach. But the question is, how do we reasonably keep them involved? This is major challenge, in my opinion, and I have no real solution for this. I'm still asking myself what we have to do to make it better. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Let's hope that the review will give us some solutions for how to make our ALSes more involved, more engaged.

Is there any other comments or questions? If there is not, I'll hand it over to Leon to address the next item. Go ahead, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Tijani. Our next agenda item is the review on ICANN 56. Well, as you know, this is the first meeting of its kind. We've already talked a little bit about the feedback that each of us have on this new meeting structure, with Göran and Steve Crocker. I think that, now that they're not watching us, we can actually say the truth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You mean you've [inaudible]?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Of course, now the floor is open for comments and for feedback and to brainstorm about how we could do a better use of our time on our next meetings.

While we were planning this meeting with Gisella and Alan and Beran, it was quite challenging because we didn't know actually how it was going to turn out and how to evolve. We were waiting for other constituencies and other cross-constituency events to actually be put in place so that we could allocate the different slots for the working sessions for the ALAC and the different working group and RALOs that met here.

So I think that that's been quite a lesson for us in the planning aspect, but I will surely like to listen to others and receive that feedback so that we can better plan. Of course, there's been feedback on the planning in previous meetings. We've heard that we need some time to go from one place to another. We need coffee breaks. We need not to start at 6:00 AM, of course. Whatever feedback you can provide us will help us plan a better meeting next time.

So the floor is open, and I see Holly's tent card up. Holly?

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

To repeat what I've said in front of Göran and Steve, I've found it really positive to have cross-community stuff. One of the issues that I suppose we all face, that I face certainly, is to contribute to the GNSO policy, which is what we're supposed to be about and one of the things we're supposed to be doing, if you're not part of something, it's really hard to find a way in. If we're going to have the people participating in policy development, which I think would be a nice thing, a vital thing, you need a way in.

So being able to sit in on what's going on in particular area, figuring what the issues are, figuring out if it interests you, and learning a little bit of the language really helps. It means people suddenly discover, "Oh, that is something I might be interested in I can contribute to." So it's being able to leave this space for people to be able to find out what the rest of ICANN is doing.

In fact, the one thing I miss about having more days is that probably half my time in an ICANN meeting is going to other meetings, finding out what those issues are, what's important for me to think about or bring to people's attention, and to develop the kind of "We should be involved in the work of ICANN." This has been a really helpful way to do it to introduce people to what the rest of ICANN is doing and find out what's interesting and then put their hands up and be involved. Thanks.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Holly. What I think that we can take out of what Holly just told us is that we're breaking the silos that we were used to working in. Right? So this is a positive thing, and we should definitely foster to continue working this way.

I have a queue, and I have Tijani, Vanda, Sebastien, and then Jimmy. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Leon. I am happy that we are making use for the first time of this Meeting B format. I used to be a member of the Strategy Working Group, together with Sebastien, Sandra, Satish, and two other people from At-Large. The intention of this Meeting Be was to have the work done, first, and second, to have some outreach. I think that this format is more or less what we planned for, except that we are in Helsinki and the outreach in Helsinki in a holiday period, it was a problem.

There was two parts for the work done. Our work I will call intra, and the cross-community inter. So for the intra, it's more or less good. But for the inter, for the cross-community, I am not saying that there is not a lot of our community here participating in the cross-community sessions. Yet the cross community sessions are part of the meeting. So we are here for both, and I hope that in the future it will be better because, otherwise, there is something to do.



---

There is some problems for this meeting. For example, having two parallel working sessions at 8:00 in the morning makes it difficult to have more than three people in the room when you start. So it was really disappointing for everyone because we are here to work. At the end, if you work at three or at five, it is not effective at all. In Hyderabad, it will be worse because the path from the hotel to the convention center seems that it would take one hour.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It is?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It seems. That's what I heard from the meeting staff. So – okay. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. It's not one hour. They're saying about 30 minutes between hotels. But please remember that we've got the session this afternoon from 5:00-6:30, which is a debrief of Meeting B. Also, there will be a little overview of Hyderabad, ICANN 57. So there will be challenges in India, and we will be looking into them, not only from an At-Large perspective, but we'll also be looking into them in working with the Meetings Team on the most efficient way, and also building the agendas to allow for

---

the travel time in between. It is going to be a challenging meeting. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Gisella, for the update. My information was wrong. But, still, 20 minutes? Here we have 5 minutes. 20 minutes is an amount of time in the morning. If we can solve those problems, I am really happy with this format, and I think we were productive. We worked very good. There is some things to improve, but in general, I think it is a good format.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Tijani. Next in the queue I have Vanda. Vanda, please take the floor.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, thank you. I have a suggestion for the improvement of this meeting. I'm happy with the idea of cross-community work, but I feel that this time we had some lack of time to participate really with others. It was a very difficult time to go around and get together with the people and really attend other meetings because there was a lot of parallel issues.

I guess I feel like I'm losing something. Yeah, that's my feeling. I'm just hoping for the – I'm losing something because there was

---

not much time to do so. So the suggestion to expand the time for the cross-community meetings. The goal, like Holly said, more deeply inside the teams, the ideas, because there is not much time to talk. It's time just to listen. You need the time to listen, and you need time to express opinions and share ideas because you can even change your opinion if you listen more people are talking about. So it's quite important.

My main suggestion is to try to think about the whole meetings, not only B, all the other meetings, and to have more sessions, and more deep sessions, on cross-community. So that's my suggestion. For the B model, I believe we need more time. I believe that the shortness of thing makes this feeling of losing. You came so far, and you are losing the opportunity to do so. It's making people a little frustrated. Maybe we need more time in the model, that I believe is a good model. But more time and more deep discussions on that. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Vanda. So I guess the challenge is to maybe have less topics per cross-community session so that they can be more focused and that we can go deeper into each of the subjects.

Another possible suggestion would be to actually know the different subjects that are going to be discussed in these cross-

---

community sessions well in advance so that, when we get to the cross-community session, we already have done some research and are able to better drive the discussion. So, yeah, I think that's feedback that maybe the Meetings Team will be able to address.

Next in the queue I have Sebastien Bachollet.

**SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** Thank you very much. Tijani talked about three members of the working group. The two others was Eduardo, and then the last one, Sylvia, to name the five from At-Large.

I think, if I want to improve what we were doing here, I will say we as At-Large need to concentrate more on policy issues and less on organizational issues. Saying that, we need to have, either before or after – it depends on if we can prepare online before or not – but it would be useful to have a discussion among us about the topics that will be discussed at the cross-community sessions so that we can bring some element of our discussion. If we have a discussion after, we can plan on what we heard, we can share it, and we can plan the work ahead.

I really think that this [loop] needs to be organization in a better way. Yes, I guess one of the problems with the organization this time was that items for the cross-community session came very

---

late, and then it was very difficult. But I would say, if we have in mind that our time here must be policy and not organizational issues, it will be a good improvement.

Saying that, we may need also to discuss among us which topics we would like to have at the cross-community level to be taken into account. I was quite struck that it was essentially something coming from the GNSO, with a lot of talks and not enough discussion. I have another improvement, it's to have a webinar before with the presentation of what is at stake, and then to have the possibility to have discussion within the room here. Getting a lecture, as we are here, I guess we lose time and money. All that needs to be improved. There were some good things done, but we can do better. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. I guess you are right in different [inaudible]. I guess the reason for the cross-community sessions being mainly about GNSO issues is that, of course, policies are made by supporting organizations. But you are right that we definitely should be able to propose subjects of discussions to be had in these cross-community sessions, because while of course those who are doing policy are the supporting organizations, that doesn't mean that we are not

---

able to actually put some subjects on the table so they're also discussed from the policy point of view.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I definitely agree with you, Leon, but if we take what was [just] told in the previous meeting, saying how we can focus on the end user and consumer, it could be one topic to be discussed cross-community-wide. Even if it's not to become a PDP, it's policy. Don't be afraid from the fact that we do policy too, even if we don't do PDP.

LEON SANCHEZ: I agree. Thank you, Sebastien. Next in the queue I have Jimmy Schulz. Jimmy?

JIMMY SCHULZ: Could you please turn on the timer? Could you please turn on the timer? I want two minutes.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Two.

JIMMY SCHULZ: Thanks. To make it short, I like this meeting format very much. We got rid of the time-wasting things, like opening ceremonies

---

and other time-consuming things. What I liked is that we've got more things done in less time because we stopped repeatedly repeating what we've already repeated in front a lot of others the whole day, saying everything twice or three or four times.

I really like that the Board was coming to us and not we had to go there. They stayed, and they listened, and it was discussion and not just a show, as we had before. I really liked that. It's a new style. They showed, really, respect to our work, which I really [admired].

I liked the idea of every-night receptions because this is one of the best – well, important – parts to get to talk to others you don't see the whole day. From my perspective, I had more time to see other constituencies, other events, than the last time. I was able attend some tech meeting and other meetings because we did have more time because we got rid of most of the things we don't have to do.

One thing that the Board already said that I'd like is the open-mic session at the end. I think that's one thing we should think of. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Jimmy. I think we would all agree with you that the change of format of interaction between the Board

---

and the At-Large community is a very positive thing, and we should definitely continue to act that way.

Next I had Maureen, but I don't see your tent card up anymore. Do you still want to say something, or should we go to Alan? Okay. Alan is next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just a number of observations, and some of them were alluded to already. The format we're using for what we're now calling cross-community groups was a last-minute change and was different from the original plans, which were described as inter-community discussions.

As a result, the bilateral-type meetings that some people feel are necessary ended up having to be squeezed in, if they could happen at all, and they typically happened over lunch or something like that, and usually under somewhat awkward circumstances. Certainly with the GAC, we found we just didn't have a room that was big enough for everyone. So I think that's a loss, and I think we need to think about it.

I agree with Sebastien that the cross-community works ended up being very much GNSO. Now, for us, in many cases that's fine. We have a great interest in it. But there's other parts of our community that have no interest in it. And to say that there is



---

just one cross-community work and you can't schedule something against it essentially says you're giving people the afternoon off or whatever, if indeed they don't have any interest and you can't schedule against it. So I think we need to be more flexible and make sure that people's times are being used productively. Not everybody is going to have an interest in the next round of gTLDs, no matter how much some people think it's the important thing.

The cross-community working groups, where, if you did have an interest, worked I think far better than some people were predicting. Still somewhat limited and not giving everyone an opportunity to speak, but there's a limit to just how much time is involved. Again, maybe having two competing subjects in different areas at the same time might relieve some of that.

Overall, it's been interesting. I've met with a number of people, some of whom said this is the hardest meeting they've ever had, and I'm one of those. This was a really rough meeting for me. Other people say, "Gee, everyone is mellow and laid back. What a nice, relaxing meeting." So it's clearly meant different things to different people, and I think somehow we have to cross those boundaries. Thank you.

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. I'm definitely on the side of those saying that this was a far more relaxed meeting. At least from the CCWG point of view, it was very relaxed. Believe me. So I love it.

I think you said something really important in regard to the cross-community sessions. How do we manage to foster breaking the silos and go work with others in other communities whilst being able to retain people working in the meeting? So flexibility might be something that we need to think about for next year's policy forum.

Next in the queue I have Tim.

TIM DENTON:

I wish to second the opinions expressed by Jimmy Schulz. I've found that the absence of ceremony and the smaller sizes actually led to, I think, a quieter atmosphere of deliberation and a greater ability to attend to our business. There is something important in the feel of this meeting, which reminds me of ARIN and other meetings, where I believe policy is discussed and things get done. There's been a reduction of the three-ring circus aspect of ICANN's frequently bloated self-importance of banging drums about how wonderful they all are. With the elimination, I think, some of the open meetings, there's been an ability to get down to our business in a more quiet and studious way.

---

I think that's about it, but whatever we're doing, I'd like to see more this of because it seems to be productive of results. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Tim. Last on the queue I have Bastiaan.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you, Leon. I cannot for myself as a relative newcomer say it has been a very relaxing meeting. It's been very overwhelming. I have to first of all congratulate and be very grateful towards my mentor, who's been guiding me through the process. That has been most helpful.

As a newcomer, with regard to the meeting format, I cannot really compare it to what it used to be like, but it has been really helpful for me, on the one hand, to actually delve in and dive into what's happening in the At-Large community. That was really great. It still is great. We're not there yet.

But I have to be honest there, and I don't know exactly what the intent was. I would personally would have liked to see a bit more actual policy work being discussed here. Now, I don't know exactly how people from At-Large are involved in that. I don't know if that's maybe in line with what Sebastien referred to. There was a lot of focus on the organizational aspects in certain

---

discussions as well. It's probably very important, but I would have liked to see, maybe for me to learn more of it, exactly how certain people from the At-Large community are involved in policy-making.

But again, I thought it was really worthwhile to learn from what's happening here, and then, obviously, in the afternoon sessions, to see how other stakeholders are involved with the actual policy-making process. So that was really, really helpful, and I think it gave me a couple of pointers to see where I can actually become involved in the future. So I will be sharing that with you guys later.

Also, someone also made the point that it did end up sometimes quite high-level in the cross-community sessions, so they were not always as focused as I would have liked them to be. I don't know if that was the idea or not. Sometimes it just felt like, "What is the sense in the room?" which can be good, but it would have been nice for me also if there was a bit more focused and specific.

But, again, great show. I'm happy to get rid of the ceremonies and all the blah-blah associated with that. So for me, it was definitely a good one. Thank you.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Bastiaan. You're definitely welcome to our community, to our family, because we're a family. Well, you got a great mentor for sure. So take advantage of that.

Next in the queue I have Daniel and then Alan. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. One thing is, this being my second ICANN meeting after Marrakesh, that I happen to be part of the RDS Working Group. Coming from here on the second day, the arrangement was really great because we had the CCWG, and then after the CCWG, the next day, [they] gave more little discussions.

Now, getting [buried] into that room, we're locked up. Heads up. Coffee was there, which was really nice, yeah, to refresh. But the energy that we used in the meeting – I think what cut across was really so, so, so much that we're doing so much within a small period of time. This is the networking abilities, [unlike] if I'm to compare to Marrakesh, was also good. But in Marrakesh you had to move to and fro within a small thing. Yeah. I think I like the meeting. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Daniel. Next in the queue I have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm addressing the subject of schedule. This meeting, first of all, was a very challenging meeting because the rules and regulations were changing as we spoke, so we probably put more effort into it. But at the same time, it was also, I believe, the most inclusive meeting, in terms of involving other people and – well, at least asking other people to contribute to the agenda. So what is on the agenda is largely what was suggested.

Policy at this meeting is an interesting question. We have spent an immense amount of time over the last two years on the IANA transition and accountability neither of which, I point out, are policy. As a result, a lot of policy things around ICANN were deferred. So we had a major effort on proxies and proxy registrations that was finished now. It's now before the Board or maybe has been approved by the Board. The other ones on RDS, on WHOIS, on New gTLDs are basically just kicking off, so there wasn't an awful lot to discuss in a plenary.

So there was to some extent a dearth of actual policy issues at our level or at a time frame that we were ready for them. But that one notwithstanding, if someone had suggested that we really need to discuss something, it probably would have made its way onto the agenda. But it didn't. Yes, some things were

---

kicked off, both policy and administrative – or certainly administrative, maybe policy – that we simply didn't have time for.

But it really should be a community-driven effort, and if you think there's something that should be discussed in Hyderabad, say so.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. I see no one else on the table – oh, I'm sorry. I'm really sorry, Seun. I didn't see your tent card. Please, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to pose a question, or perhaps it's a comment. We were supposed to have a session yesterday, which was cancelled. I don't know why it was cancelled. I'm not sure it was announced prior to it being cancelled because I thought there was going to be a session, actually.

So I just wanted to make a suggestion. Of course, I'm not [questioning] the fact that it was cancelled, but I think that we should avoid cancelling our sessions. Even if it means that we need to put in another agenda item in it, just because this particular meeting is very, very focused, it's not something that

---

can just say, “Let me go to another session that is running elsewhere,” especially if I really want to focus on At-Large.

So for me, yesterday it was just like, “Maybe I should be going to my room.” Even if we’re going to cancel this session, maybe towards the end of the meeting, we could cancel. But I think should we maximize all our sessions, even if we’re discussing something different. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Seun. I think Alan wants to respond to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. That meeting was cancelled because of a major conflict. It was supposed to have been cancelled, cancelled, cancelled. Unfortunately, it stayed in the central ICANN agenda. So it should not have shown up anywhere. We tried to reschedule it against another community meeting, and although we had scheduled that one against a community meeting, by the time we cancelled that one, we were told our room was blocked out, it can’t be used. As I said, the rules changed as we went along. By the time we cancelled that one, we were told we can’t reschedule against another community one where the ALAC had



---

moderately little interest because of what I could consider an arbitrary rule.

Lastly, we did however redeploy all of the subjects from that one into other meetings because at the same time the discussion with the Fellows changed from an introduction to, “These are experienced people who will participate in the discussion,” we redistributed all the subjects. None of the subjects got lost, got left off, as it was. We would have actually added something to the schedule and would have had a few more subjects we had to drop altogether, except for the rule saying we couldn’t do it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. I have two people in the queue. I have Cheryl, and then Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I was going to have a quick onto his.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. So a quick follow-up to his? Please, go ahead.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Seun, I think there also was a problem between the ICANN app. It was a technology glitch between the ICANN app and the scheduler. If you had done the scheduling on the website, when Alan cancelled, it disappeared from the website and disappeared at all. But because it was still on the app and that wasn't updated, that was a problem. So this glitch is something more we'll discuss in the Technology Task Force to make sure that the two things are connected and what gets cancelled on one gets cancelled on the other.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Judith. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm glad to know that there was a mismatch with the technologies as well because that just is another issue that we can make better much more quickly. But what's important is to recognize that this was not a meeting that was cancelled on the fly; far from it. This was cancelled in advance of us all getting on planes to even come here. But it still appeared, depending on how we choose to look at our calendaring for this event.

But of course, the staff has told us time and time again to check the wiki that they have control over, that even if something is

---

cancelled on the fly, that's your most up-to-date and accurate lead on where you can be when.

So it's a good learning. It's certainly something, but I just don't want to let anyone in the room wonder why something was cancelled late in the day; far from it. It was well and truly cancelled in advance. But we've been always been told, check your wiki because that's almost real-time updates of change.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Heidi, I believe that you want to say something.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Leon. Yeah. Just two comments. I think, speaking for staff, perhaps I speak on their behalf of my team. Perhaps going forward, and not just for Meeting B, the agendas could be slightly changed to not just be what the item is and who's speaking, but also to include the aims of the objectives, another column for deliverables, output, and follow-up. So perhaps that's something that we could consider going forward.

For the next meeting, policy forum, perhaps there could be something like what At-Large did for the last two summits, where they had prep teams formed to discuss the policy topics. So perhaps we could have the ALAC and the RALO Chairs and

---

Secretaries form sessions prior to actually arriving in Johannesburg and talk about what the items are and what possible At-Large input could be. That could then be discussed maybe in the morning sessions for the afternoon sessions. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Heidi. Is there anyone else who wants to make a comment or provide feedback on this new ICANN meeting structure?

Okay. Could you please say your name?

NARINE KHACHATYAN:

Narine Khachatyan, ALS representative. I'm a Fellow, also, part of the Fellowship Program. I would just like to take this occasion, first of all, to thank my mentor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

I just wanted to mention and just repeat that one of the main issues we have been discussing among Fellows and these others has been related to appropriate stakeholder representation, as well as the inclusion of underrepresented groups. Since is the purpose of finding then common ground of various organization represent and advocate for various interests, and sometimes representatives there wear many hats. There shouldn't be more

---

efforts made to engage people who are just from underrepresented groups and communities.

I have also suggested this when I was answering the questionnaire the day before yesterday, in order to just not to miss the important voices of parts of the public who are usually unable to make their voices heard.

The second point which I would like to comment about policy discussions during those At-Large gatherings. Truly speaking, I think that I don't share that opinion that more policy should be discussed here because I think that this is a channel enabling people to participate better in working groups, in PDP processes. I myself consider this place like we are discussing how to help people to come here or deliver opinions which are maybe not heard. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

No, thank you. Thank you. Last in the queue, I have Seun Ojedeji. We've reached the top of the allocated time for this item, so I would kindly ask you to be concrete.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Time? [inaudible] I'm just coming back to make a few suggestions. At-Large normally covers beyond names, right? Occasionally may be good to us, so put an item that actually

---

updates [inaudible] community, and even the IETF community. So if we can actually also invite them to occasionally come and give us updates as well, it may be a good thing to consider.

Secondly, I see that Cheryl did something about mentorship. I'm seeing that classes [inaudible]. I really don't know how that weighs on her. I think it's maybe good to also see if we can have more veterans, as they call them, who can actually serve as a pool so that it's not just one person we [are giving up].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm not sure I got that. Okay. Those are my two comments. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Seun. Okay. Seeing no one else willing to provide any more feedback, Alan, would you like to continue with chairing the session?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, what is the next item?

---

LEON SANCHEZ: The next item is decision-making, and we are going to discuss whether we ratify the statement on the revisions to ICANN’s expected standards of behaviors.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’ll allow you to continue in that role, and I’ll take over after you’re finished.

LEON SANCHEZ: Good. Tijani, would you like to – okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, if you could continue for the motion on the standards of behavior, and I’ll take the chair back when we finish that and go onto the Rules of Procedure.

LEON SANCHEZ: Excellent. Thank you very much, Alan. Our next agenda item is the decision to be taken on whether the ALAC wishes to ratify the statement for the revision to ICANN’s expected standards of behaviors.

This is an issue that of course is very important to our community. We have a document that states the expected standards of behaviors for all ICANN meetings, both virtual and face-to-face. But recently, it has come to the attention of the

---

community that these standards of behavior need enhancements, and they can be improved. So moving forward on this subject, there is of course a proposal to enhance these standards of behaviors.

The ALAC undertook the task of actually drafting a statement on how we see these new enhancements and what we would expect from this review. The draft was circulated in time so that you could actually have a look at it. We are stating five points, which, if you like, I could read through so we are clear on what we are actually putting on the table for ratification.

We received comments, and those comments were also take into account for finalizing the draft that you see on your screen, on the right-side of the screen for those in the room, and of course on the left side of the screen for those in the Adobe Connect room.

This statement reads as follows – yes, Tim?

TIM DENTON: If the print is large enough, perhaps we could just read it ourselves?

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm sorry?



---

TIM DENTON: If the print is large enough, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might just read it ourselves?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It doesn't have any interpretation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

TIM DENTON: Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yeah, we need to actually read it out loud because we have interpretation –

TIM DENTON: Let's just do it as inefficiently as possible then. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Let's do it fast and nice. So this is the final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC, on the ALAC statement on revisions to the ICANN expected standards of behaviors.

---

“The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the revisions to the ICANN expected standards of behaviors, and hereby submits the following as a formal statement to the Board.

“First, the ALAC recognizes the need to review the ICANN expected standards of behaviors as a continued effort to address the evolving needs in our community.

“Second, the ALAC is supportive of the proposed revision to the ICANN expected standards of behaviors as it is our belief that said provision will help to improve areas of coexistence between the many participants in ICANN meetings, thus fostering diversity and strengthening our community’s richness.

“Third, the ALAC believes the ICANN expected standards of behaviors much be augmented by providing clear information about how violations to the expected standards of behaviors will be addressed and who is to address said violations.

“Fourth, the ALAC also suggests to include clear information on how and where to report any transgression to the expected standards of behaviors.

“Fifth, the ALAC also recommends that, once the expected standards of behaviors review is finalized, ICANN undertakes a socialization campaign on this issue, especially at face-to-face

---

gatherings, which many include, but not necessarily be limited to, handouts, posters, publicly available and viable material, and/or some outreach activities, as well as some form of acknowledgement by participants that they have read, understood, and agreed to comply with these standards.

“The ALAC is confident that this revision to the ICANN expected standards of behaviors will favor a better interaction between community members at ICANN meetings, while providing a clear process to report any violations.”

So this is the final draft. I would like to open the floor for any comments, and then I will of course raise the motion for ratification.

Are there any comments on this final draft? Okay. Having no comments, I will now like to put on the table the motion to ratify this statement.

Anyone want to second the motion?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tim.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Tim is seconding the motion. I believe Seun is seconding the motion as well.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

LEON SANCHEZ: Good. So now I think we're calling a vote on ratification for the final statement on the revisions to the ICANN expected standards of behaviors.

Those for ratifying this statement, could you please raise your tent cards?

Staff, could you please count the votes and tell us what the result is?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: More than 100%.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 110%.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: We have 15 out of 15 ALAC members voting yes.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. This statement is ratified. With that, I would like to turn this session back to the Chair of the ALAC, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I've spent the last half hour revising the motion to amend the Rules of Procedure and sent it to staff and then discovered I send them a blank file because somehow the whole thing got erased before I said "Save." So I think the best laid plans of whatever – you have a motion?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sure do. I'll put it [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: The version on my computer is blank now. Maybe I better see if it's the one I think it is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I guess it got –

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess it was somehow erased after I sent it. I don't quite understand how that could have happened, but it doesn't matter. I don't have to finish rewriting it again now.

The motions reads – by the way, for my records, could you please send me a copy of the file I sent you?

“Whereas the At-Large Advisory Committee is currently operating under Rules of Procedure, ROP, approved on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of April, 2013, and which went into effect on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of October, 2013, whereas a number of changes to these Rules of Procedure have been recommended and distributed the ALAC on the 6<sup>th</sup> of June, 2016, whereas the ALAC met during ICANN 56 and proposed a number of changes to those revised Rules of Procedure related to Section 19, whereas during its meetings, the ALAC had insufficient time to fully address the proposed changes to Sections 2 through 16. Therefore, the ALAC adopts the revised Rules of Procedure as distributed on the 6<sup>th</sup> of June related to Section 19 as amended during the ALAC meetings at ICANN 56.”

---

The original motion was seconded by Maureen. Does Maureen accept this revision?

Maureen accepts the revision. Is there any discussion of the motion? I'd like to call the motion – yes, Tim?

TIM DENTON: Do you have a seconder? Do you need one?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have a seconder, and the seconder has accepted the revised motion.

Seeing no one who would like to discuss it, I'd like to call. Are there any abstentions?

Kaili abstains. You'll be given an opportunity at the end of this process to explain it, should you wish.

Is there anyone who votes no?

Can we see a show of hands and/or cards for those who vote yes? The number better be 13.

So we have 13 – you can lower your hands – in favor. The names will be recorded in the records. We have one abstention, and we have one person not voting. We were –

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: One person who has chosen not to participate in this vote. The revision of the Rules of Procedure require a super-majority, two-thirds of the ALAC. We have that. The revised Rules of Procedure have been adopted, effective immediately. Thank you.

For the record, I will be putting out another motion shortly for the sections we didn't get a chance to look at. They're not going to be changed at this point from what's already been distributed. Please take a look at them and be prepared to discuss them at the next ALAC meeting. Preferably, if you have any concerns, raise them before the meeting so they can be addressed at the meeting. Preferably, we don't want to spend the whole meeting on Rules of Procedure.

Cheryl cannot see why not. If I put my video camera on my screen when I'm running the meeting, you could see why not.

We have five more minutes before the next part of this agenda. I'll take the opportunity to say, is there anything else that anyone would like to address?

I do have one issue which I will allow people to comment on – not allow; ask people to comment on. I'm meeting with the CEO for a very short meeting in a few minutes, and if there's anything



---

that you think should be raised with him that was not raised during our discussion already that needs to be focused on, I would be glad to mention it.

Number two, the ALT is meeting with Steve Crocker tomorrow. As many of you know, these have generally been open meetings that are held the day after ICANN; Friday morning, typically. This time, we were, to be blunt, not allowed to hold a meeting in that kind of format. There are no facilities available, no remote facilities, no transcription, no anything. And we were basically told the ALT could have breakfast if we wanted to. And that is what we're doing. But should there be anything you think we should be raising with Steve Crocker that hasn't been already been mentioned here, please speak to one of the ALT members.

Yes?

GARTH BRUEN: Alan, can you identify the ALT members so people know who to talk to?

ALAN GREENBERG: Surely. North America, me. Holly from Asia-Pacific. LACRALO, Leon. Sandra, EURALO. And I've missed somebody.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani. See? I can't see you. Tijani from AFRALO. Given that, I will take one 30-second break to consult with staff, and then we'll have the final item of our agenda.

Okay. Sorry for the interlude. The next item is described as Chair's announcement. If any of you have been at any of our meetings before, you know that means that it's time for a party, except this time we have no party. But the Chair will say a couple of words, which could go along with a party, should we have had one. But this is a B Meeting, stripped down. No parties. At least not during our meeting.

Just a couple of comments. Number one, I'd like to congratulate on behalf of all of us Seun and Sebastien, who – I'm not sure he's around. Seun was recently [inaudible] elected to the AFRNIC Board of Directors, and Sebastien to the AFNIC Board, representing users. I think the two of you need to find different names for your organizations. Differing only by one letter is confusing. Okay.

I'd like to make a personal thanks. Sandra has been on the ALAC for almost six years now and spent a large amount of that time tirelessly working on the ICANN Academy, and I think done a

---

great service to ICANN in general. Her arm was twisted this year to put her onto the leadership team, somewhat against her will. She gave the proviso that, yes, she could do it, but she probably couldn't come to the June meeting because there were too many other things in the same time frame. She's here.

But that's not what I'm talking about, Sandra. We have a major thing that happened at this meeting, or just prior to it. We appointed a GAC liaison. It's something we've been talking about for a long time, and Sandra is the one who took the lead on that, orchestrated it, and made sure it actually happened. I thank you for that, because if it had been left to me, it may not have happened at this time, and I think it's a really important milestone for ALAC. Thank you.

On a positive note, you might have heard 200 – I was going to say 2,000 – ALSes. That's a real milestone. We're not only going to have 200 ALSes in the near future; we're going to have 200 ALSes that work, that actually contribute and are part of our overall environment. So I'm looking forward. I'm glad we've reached the number, and we're –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It should be higher. We're at 201.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: We're at 201 now. Okay. And a couple of our RALOs are saying we're going to get rid of a few as quickly as we can. So it's going to hover around 200 for a little while. That's fine. But I look forward to actually empowering all of them, and that's good.

Sebastien is back. Sebastien is back. Sebastien, were you in the room when you were mentioned?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: You were congratulated for your recent reappointment to the AFNIC Board.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we suggested [inaudible] AFNIC Board, we need a little bit better diversity, in names if not in people.

Lastly, as some of you may have noticed, Ron Sherwood, who has been our very faithful liaison from the ccNSO, is not at this meeting. He is ill – very ill – and I'd like to convey on all of our behalves our best wishes.

---

That's all I have, folks. Is there nothing that we need to formally raise?

Then I would like to thank our staff, who are continually pushed by me and others for completely unreasonable demands and come through.

To the technical staff, who again – we thank technical staff after every meeting. For many meetings, it was a nice thing to do. But there were innumerable problems with remote participation, with audio-visual, with microphones not working, with not being able to hear things. For the last several years, we have not had virtually any of those problems. They have perfected this down to an art or a science – I don't know which – so thank you all. It's really great.

Lastly, we have our stalwart interpreters, who continually put up with our speaking too quickly – and I'll say that slowly – to our using innumerable buzzwords and technical terms, which, every time I listen to a translation or an interpretation, they do flawlessly. And of course, to our continual running over of meetings and letting us keep doing it anyway. So thank you all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

And forgetting to say our names.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yeah. See, I forgot a critical part. I forgot to say my name when I started speaking, and we all forget to say our names. Usually they make up for it. Thank you.

Gisella has one more that I must have forgotten. No? Go for it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Just before anyone thinks they can leave – and we’ve said how important the cross-community sessions are. The cross-community sessions are this afternoon at 3:15 to 4:45 in Hall A. We have the first one, the workload scheduling and management, but more importantly for what we’ve discussed just previously in this session, from 5:00 to 6:30, we’ve got the ICANN 56 wrap-up and planning ahead for ICANN 57.

So I highly suggest that anyone who has any points that they wish to convey to the Meetings Team and ICANN senior executives to come to that session and to voice any concerns or even positive feedback. Coming from a customer services point of view, positive and negative feedback is always very useful.

Then we finish this session at 6:30 with the closing cocktail, which is in the Piazza area, which will allow you to say bye-bye to everyone, and see you all in Hyderabad. So we look forward to seeing you later. Thank you.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:       Where is the Piazza area?

GISELLA GRUBER:            Sorry. The Piazza area is where the other cocktail was, where the breakfast was, where the opening – I don't know what we're allowed to call it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Just a reminder. Excuse me. Excuse me. RALO Chairs have another meeting at 3:00.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:       No. 4:00.

ALAN GREENBERG:            4:00. 4:00? I believe it is in Level 2, Room 16, which is shown as Number 8 on the map, just to confuse you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**