
BUENOS AIRES – At-Large Review Working Party
Sunday, June 20, 2015 – 12:15 to 13:15
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

LARISA GURNICK:

...meeting, there was a public session on reviews, and by the way, there is a similar session on reviews coming up on Wednesday. So I hope many of you can participate in that. But certainly, the message that we heard from the community, with seven reviews that are scheduled to take place in 2015, and that's both bylaws, mandated reviews such as the one we're talking about here, as well as the AOC mandated reviews, which is WHOIS, SSR, and consumer choice, consumer trust, and our competition review.

It's quite a heavy review load. So based on the feedback from the community that we collected in Singapore, there has been a proposal that was posted in the middle of May, that suggests a different time table for reviews. And specifically, as it impacts this review, a slower ramp up to conduct a review, and that's what Holly was referencing.

So this is out for public comment at the moment, and we had already discussed that we would certainly urge all of you to submit a response to the public comment. But in effect, the elements, the slower start to the At-Large review that's being proposed, that's out for public comment, already incorporated in the timeframes that we're looking at here, and appreciate the support for the more reasonable, slower schedule. Next slide please.

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.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sébastien, you have a question?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I have a comment.

I understand that we have a lot to do, and I understand you already discussed the issue of the schedule, but as we are asking for transparency, accountability, to the Board in the IANA stewardship transition and the accountability work done, we need to be at the same level as soon as possible.

And the fact that we postponed all of that to be done in 2017. That means that it will, even not apply before the next election to the Board member, leaves me a little bit in trouble, because I really think we need to... We are too early the last review, but if we do it too late this time, it will not be [inaudible]. We have a lot of things to clean in our relationship with the ALS, in the working of the RALOs.

And it must be done as soon as possible. My other comment is that I hope somewhere, I apologize, I didn't dive into detail of this presentation. That the relationship between our organizations and others within the ICANN overall system is very well taken into account to see how we can improve it, change it, or add things, because it's another point where we need to do better. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Sébastien. I think, happily put, everybody put their hands if they would like to actually start the review right now. So I think the

reason why the timeline is what it is, is that the people who are going to be involved, there is absolutely no bandwidth that they have. This is a much more realistic timeframe, and it's the one that people are perhaps more comfortable with.

The second one I will take as a question. What we are looking for is input into the sorts of questions that should be asked, and that clearly our relationship with other areas within ICANN, it's quite a legitimate question. And we can make a note of that. Eduardo, you have your hand up.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes. This is Eduardo for the record. I have a question, you know, we are in the middle of this IANA stewardship. Everybody is working on that. Everybody is focusing on that. How will that effect this? Especially we have an accountability group making changes to the bylaws at one point in time. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Any proposals that will come out from the transition work, and specifically the accountability work, will certainly be integrated into the work that's been defined by the bylaws as they stand right now. So, obviously, we're aligning our process and our plans for upcoming reviews, to recognize the possibility that there may be some changes, based on the proposals that are currently being circulated.

It does not appear that there will be any changes to the organizational reviews, which are currently mandated by the bylaws, but certainly as

that process comes to closure and we have more certainty about what the final outcome will be. It will all be integrated with the plans. But because of the current commitment to perform these reviews, we're moving forward based on the bylaws, as they stand at this particular moment, but being prepared to make changes should we need to do that.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Could I add something there? I think for this review, this is much more focusing on our accountability to, if you will, our organizations or the various ALSs we represent. The representation and the accountability of the ALSs to a RALO structure, and the RALO structure's accountability to ALAC.

So, if you will, it's a very internal to the whole ALAC concept as to how we're accountable to each other. Now that feeds into the whole accountability issue of the ICANN structure, but this is our focus on what we think we're doing and whether we think we're doing very well, and what we might do better.

And part of what we're asking is the sorts of questions we should be asking ourselves as to how we think we should be performing, and what we should be performing. That will fit into, if you will, an ICANN that, yes, will be restructured, and that sense of accountability. But I think this is all part of that sort of accountability. You've got your hand up? Yeah, of course.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

This is Eduardo again. So, I'm not... So are we going to be doing, starting in July, is to look at the previous... Hello? Yeah. At the previous assessment, I will say, and see if what work, what didn't work. Is that the first thing we're going to do? And after that, what is next? I just need some clarification. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Sure. The first step is to conduct the self-assessment, which means looking at the outcomes from the prior review, and seeing that those improvements get made, and that they serve the purpose that was intended. So that's the self-assessment. Parallel to that will be thinking through the elements of the review, the mechanics of the review, the methodology of the review, to make sure that it's applicable to this organization.

And I'll give you a good example. We already know that making sure that things, surveys, and interview questions are translated into several languages is much more relevant and important to this group, than perhaps to another group. So that's something that we have to plan for, allow for. That's a skill set that we need to make sure that we bring to the table in whoever the independent examiner is.

We have to make plans for that. So it's identifying those factors and elements, early on, before we go out with a RFP, so that the proposals come back that are fully aligned with the kind of work that we're expecting the independent examiner to do. So that kind of work will continue through October. Then we expect to begin the competitive process in November, and engage the independent examiner by

March, and then the independent examination will start in April 2016, and last for about 9 to 12 months, at which point the independent examiner will issue their final report, and of course, there will be many, many, many interim points in time, where there will be discussions of their initial findings.

There will be a draft report that will be posted for public comment. And all of that will culminate in the final report that would be issued somewhere around the December 2016 timeframe. I hope that that clarified for you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

This is Eduardo. Yes, it does clarify. So in a practical manner, is this the previous review, is that already published somewhere that we can start looking at it, or is it something that's going to happen in July?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yes, in fact what has happened, probably months ago, we have, Ariel pointed out, there is a link to all of the information that we have about this review, but also a link that is to all of the documents from the previous review. So that's been available for some time.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

This is Heidi. Just to add, so we have Ariel for the fantastic job, we have an overall workspace that shows first the previous review, 2008 to 2012, and then the current review. So now what we have also done is we, and it's also in your chat, in the AC room, is this page, where we

have this ALAC and At-Large improvements from the previous review, the final report. It has 13 recommendations, we've now broken that down, as you can see up on the screen here, and we've added the table with one additional column that talks about the effectiveness.

So we have one title or one column on the status, most of, the vast majority are complete. There are just a few that are ongoing. But we've also decided to add another to the far right, a column that talks about the effectiveness of each of those recommendations, and then supporting documents. And that's what this working party will need to do in the following weeks. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

And Eduardo, before you put your hand up, I think we have to agree on what we mean by effectiveness, how we're going to rate that and so forth. I think we've all got, in our heads, what that might mean. I'm not sure what is in one head is in another head, and so we'll need some discussion about effectiveness.

But all the background is there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you. One thing that would be interesting to add is, result of the summit, number two, because a lot of discussion within the summit was to announce the relationship between the ALS, the RALOs, and the ALAC, and the rest of the world. And then it would be useful to add them, not to reinvent what was already discussed by, during the summit and with some document done at that time. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's a good suggestion. Thank you. There are some movement, on the left of my...

ALAN GREENBERG: It's movement that's almost invisible from the chair's position, as you well understand. But now you understand firsthand. A couple of comments. In response to Sébastien's earlier comments, the... There is a public comment out right now on should we delay reviews?

We are either fortunate or unfortunate that we were in the midst of starting one when the public comments started. So we have sort of benefited from it. If the end result says, no we shouldn't have delayed anything at all, well we're in an embarrassing position, sorry we did.

But that remains to be seen. The second thing I'll comment is, Sébastien is very correct. We have problems with ALSs and effectiveness, and I personally, if to the extent I have any authority, and so far today, it proves I have none, at least in running meetings, we're going to do our best to try to start tackling that before the review, and not wait for a review.

The review may prove that what we're doing is wrong, or that we didn't do it effectively, but I don't think there is any intent to wait for the review before we start doing that, and lastly I'll point out that we've been joined by the chair of the structural improvements committee, which I understand is being renamed.

Well I said it is being renamed, will be renamed, but I understand that you are currently the chair, and just to acknowledge that because I don't think we've ever had a formal announcement in At-Large, and certainly not in a public meeting, that in her... In the beginning of her first term, she was appointed chair of one of the important committees, subcommittees of the Board, so I would like to acknowledge that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That said, let's keep going.

LARISA GURNICK: Next slide please. Process improvements. We already talked about these things. They're all implicit in the plans that we're proposing and sharing with you all here, and these are coming out as lessons learned from the recently conducted and still going, in process, GNSO review.

As well as some of the implementation work that's being done on ATRT 2 recommendations. All that experience and all of those lessons learned are being brought to bear to make this review process easier, more effective. So we already talked about the planning phase, the importance of spending more time up front to make sure that the scope of work and the deliverables, and the self-assessment, and that all of those elements are really clear.

We expect that will, while it might seem like the start is slower and we're delaying the actual review, the time that an examiner is being brought in, I'm quite confident that it will make for a more productive

review, because when the party that will be engaged actually gets started, a lot of the leg work, a lot of the clarity will already would have been done, and the work would have already been done by this team, and it will make for a much smoother and productive process.

The whole concept of the review working party, this group, you all being a part of the process and serving in this liaison capacity that's so important, has worked out really well for the GNSO review. And there is some discussion now about considering how this concept could possibly be extended, into the implementation phase. And that is still something that's under discussion.

And that early and continuous engagement between the working party and people that truly understand the organization that's being reviewed, and the engagement with the independent examiner, is really intended to make sure that the independent examiner, however very knowledgeable or not so knowledgeable that may be about how ICANN works, that they have continuous feedback, and they don't veer too far off course by the fact that they may not have a deep or accurate understanding of how things work.

So that also has proven to be very valuable in other reviews. And of course, we already know that in order for the review to really yield the kinds of results that would be productive for ongoing improvement. It's absolutely critical that we get the participation from the community, that we get answers, feedback, survey results, that are broad and diverse because without that, the review really doesn't work as the important accountability mechanism that it is.

Next slide please.

So we wanted to review what we're calling the preparatory questions. So these are not survey questions. These are really questions for you to think about. The answers to these questions will have an impact on the RFP, and on the scope of work, and on the requirements and the deliverables that we will expect from the independent examiner.

For example, starting with the first item, who should be considered as a relevant responder in order to make sure that we properly evaluate the operation of At-Large? To Sébastien's point, you can see that the fourth bullet item that's listed as other ICANN structures and groups, and that's really intended to make sure that we collect appropriate information to make sure that the interaction between the At-Large organization and other ICANN structures has been identified.

Those interactions that are important. The dependencies that are critical have been identified, so we can have a proactive and well planned effort to make sure that the outreach and the data collection includes the right structures and groups. Next question would be, if we are developing the survey tool, imagine it's an online survey of some sort, and if in fact, we agree that all of those groups of people ought to be targeted with the survey questions, should the questions be different?

The argument for different questions recognizes the fact that some people will answer questions from a very deep and extensive base of experience, of working within the At-Large organization. While others,

such as newcomers or people that are on the periphery of the ICANN organizations, may not have the depth of experience.

So asking them questions that have to do with the mechanics of how things work within At-Large, may not necessarily produce the right results, because if people are not aware of how things work, asking them if that's effective or not, may not be the best line of questioning. So perhaps there will be other sets of questions that we would think to ask those groups, newcomers and others, about what they find important or effective about the way they interact, or maybe about the way that they're being represented by the At-Large community.

Any questions here before I move on to the next slide?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I was going to point out, on the right hand side, there are perhaps more detailed wording of what you were saying, and I think we probably need to add the question about the languages in which the questions are put, aside from the... We have six languages, should we have others?

So if people could also think about that as an additional question, that would be good. And Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I have a question. This is Eduardo. So for example, newcomers, you know, when we're doing this review, are we also thinking about how effective is the organization in outreach, for example? Is that one of

the things that we want to know? Or are we strictly speaking about how we do the process, you know, within the organization?

LARISA GURNICK: Participation and engagement is very much a key part of the review. So the answer would be absolutely, yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo again. So the reason I'm asking is that, we're not looking here only how we do things, step by step, in terms of process, but we're looking at the whole organization in terms of how to reach and had to do with, not only operational things.

Like, you know, if we ever want to assess the operation At-Large, really you're talking about operation and effectiveness of the whole organization. Thankyou.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, you're absolutely right. It's the, how effective is the organization at accomplishing its mission? So it's operational effectiveness as it also connects with the purpose of why the organization is here, in which case, the participation and engagement and being able to bring into the organization people on a continuous basis, and make sure that they understand and have the access to information and knowledge from them to become more participatory, and involved is very much part of the review.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Madame Chair, Olivier speaking. And I have a question with regards to the, actually not a question, a suggestion with regards to the timeline. Earlier in the slide deck there was a timeline which showed that the consultation would take place between, I think it was, July and October.

And is it July and October? We could go back a couple of...

To conduct self-assessment, and that was July to October 2015. And I believe the self-assessment includes going out to our communities and asking the questions to our communities. And so, the question number six on the right hand screen, which you can actually scroll through, and what months and periods would not be ideal to conduct the survey or interviews? And how long should the survey remain open?

I would suggest that the months of July and August be blacklisted as in Europe, in particular, the month of August you're not going to find anyone indoors, or even close to an Internet access point. So we need to keep that into account. And I would imagine, when one says conduct self-assessment, does that include the analysis of the self-assessment? Or is that just the surveying?

LARISA GURNICK: Olivier, just to clarify, it's not that yet. Self-assessment is just this group reflecting on whether the review recommendations, how the recommendations that came out of the last review, have been implemented. So it's truly in preparation for the review. The surveys,

the broad based outreach to the community, with survey questions and interviews, would not begin until April of next year.

And we already marked down the July August would be difficult times. But it would be shortly after April, depending on how quickly everything moves once the independent examiner is engaged, that that outreach to the At-Large community, and other structures, would take place through very organized survey and set of interviews.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Thank you for this clarification. And perhaps in order to avoid ambiguity in the future, we could actually put preliminary, that these are all preliminaries, because I can certainly... Well, I was confused by that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. We can do that. Eduardo.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, next slide. Okay. Some other questions to think about. Besides the kinds of things that we already have identified, ICANN announcements, blogs, teleconferences, email blasts and social media, are there some specific things that we can start planning ahead, as means to communicate out that surveys are available to be completed, and this is all in anticipation of this process beginning, as I said, in April of next year.

What are some of the existing communication channels and what does that calendar look like, that we can start leveraging to get the word out, to make sure that people participate and provide responses? And based on some pre-planning conversations that we had yesterday with Holly, Cheryl, and Alan, we already identified a couple of ideas that I included in the parenthesis of how to use regional meetings and other meetings that are outside of the ICANN meeting structure, that might be useful to get the word out.

And in that case, we would be really reaching out to people that wouldn't necessarily be a part of ICANN meetings and the process that we're engaged in here, so that we can get diverse points of view. Another topic to think about, what would be the appropriate targets for completed surveys, based on the relevant populations?

And certainly one of our expectations from the independent examiner is that they bring their professional expertise and knowledge, what constitutes a sufficient sample size and such? So we're not trying to step into that role, but it would be very helpful to understand the expectant size of the relevant populations that we're trying to reach, so that we can make some plans for how long a survey ought to be left open. So to give people a chance to respond.

If we're talking about a group of 50 people, that's one thing. If we're talking about a group of thousands of people that are distributed, obviously that brings more complexity, and requires more time.

Next slide please.

Another set of questions having to do with the interviews. Who would be the key individuals within the At-Large organization that should be identified for the one on one interviews with the independent examiner? Already we know that our starting point will be the leadership team, and we're generally looking to have them conduct somewhere in the order of 20 interviews.

The face to face, or one on one interviews, not necessarily face to face, but one on one interviews, will be conducted as a supplementary data collection method, because we expect somewhere on the order of hundreds of people to respond to the online survey, and that will be the primary method of collecting diverse and broad information.

And interviews will support that effort and help the independent examiner get clarifications, and fill in the blanks, through one on one engagement with certain people.

Another question that would help us plan ahead, what periods, months, and this is one that I believe Olivier had picked up on, what are the periods that would not be ideal? So we already know that the summer months would be problematic, and I guess we're looking for any other heads up of times that are particularly challenging so we can plan ahead.

Next slide please.

Questions about how long should the survey remain open. To a large extent, that's really driven by what's the population and we're trying to reach, and where are they and how do we reach them? We certainly

want to make sure that the survey stays open long enough to give people a chance to participate, recognizing that conducting the survey is just the beginning of the process, then the data has to be compiled by the independent examiner, analyzed, validated.

So we want to keep the surveys open, sufficiently long to give people a chance to participate, but at the same time we recognize that that process cannot last for very extended time, because then that will really push the review duration out. And then finally, list any significant developments that have impacted, or will impact the organization since the last review. The starting point for the independent examiners, will be to look at the last review, to look at the recommendations that came out of that review, to look at the preliminary self-assessment conducted by this group, but then it's also to think about what has changed since the last review.

And the last review as in 2008, so a lot of time has gone by. So certainly there are all sorts of developments that have happened since then, that have an impact on how this organization conducts its work and possibly its effectiveness.

Holly, do you want to add...

HOLLY RAICHE:

I was just going to point out what we will be doing is using a lot of social media as well, to get out to people. And, by the way, if any of you think that you are not going to be responding to the survey, you're wrong. You will. But we need to listen to others. And I noticed, for

example, who should be surveyed. Yes, I certainly think in the ALAC context and in the RALO context and in the At-Large context, I would also think through maybe we need to think about, who we deal with in terms of other parts of ALAC or outside.

If we're looking at our mission statement, which is about outreach, maybe we need to think about who we're supposed to be outreaching to, and whether we have been, in terms of achieving our mission. So think a little bit more broadly in terms of not only of the questions asked, but if you look at our mission statement about outreach, how do we actually establish that we have, and that we've done so effectively?

So with that, that's you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. Go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. I would say that we have to answer, we have to answer the survey.

This is Alberto Soto speaking. I'm going to complete the survey, otherwise they will kill me. But in order to be able to answer, I would like not to give a personal response, but to talk this over with my region. So I should be given time so as to gather the information from my region, and answer the response not on my own behalf, but on behalf of my region. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

...from July through October, because what we are doing is putting the questions here for everyone to think about, but then the expectation is not only will you answer the survey, but you will be going back into your groups, talking about these questions, coming up with additional questions we haven't through about it.

And I think that Sébastien's suggestion, gone through the documents, what have we done in terms of our own reviews, or other things that are relevant. So that in that, in the preparation period, which is July to October, that you will start already to talk to your own organizations, what is it that we should be asking of ourselves?

And that's going to be part of the preliminary work, so that, in fact, when it comes to the time when we are looking at procuring the independent examiner, we'll have a much better feel for what questions we need to know, what is it that particular individual or organization needstoknow.

So absolutely, yes you have to answer, but yes you actually have to talk to your own constituents.

Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I was going to comment about what Alberto said. You know, that he can consult with the organization, but I think if we're going to ask the question, we should ask it to everyone, not only consultation only by

the, you know, we should get information from the actual ALSs, individual ones. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'll answer, but then also Larisa. When we're talking about the preliminary questions, we are talking about, getting a feel for the independent examiner. So this is not actually the survey itself, but it is the groundwork. So the extent to which, in fact, part of the question is, who is it that the independent examiner should be examining?

And we are the ones who are probably best placed to come up with those responses. We're not doing the actual review, we're adding our expertise, we're giving our expertise, so that there is a really solid platform of information, upon which the independent examiner can move forward to provide that review. So yes, thorough answer, but it's not the actual examination itself. Go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

So I have another question. So once the independent review does what that person will do, I think the result is that there will be some recommendations out of that review, and then we will engage in some kind of discussion about the recommendation to make sure that that makes sense, for all working on this. Is that correct? Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

If I may clarify. The preliminary self-assessment, is really intended to be done by perhaps this review working party, and maybe, you know,

several others. But the community, the broader community, the ALSs, the RALOs, and all of the individuals that are part of the broader organization, will have an opportunity to provide their feedback, through the structured surveys that will be conducted, once the independent examiner starts the review.

So they will absolutely have a chance to provide their point of view, and this is the reason why the independent examiner will consider the input from the preliminary self-assessment that's done by this group, but they will not stop at that. They will continue and reach out to the broader group to collect all of that information.

So I would say at this point, the effort was envisioned as really targeted to this working group, with the understanding that everybody will have an opportunity to do it once the independent examiner launches their survey.

And to your second question, once they start, once the independent examiner, having considered all of this information, begins to formulate their observations, and findings, which will ultimately lead to recommendations, this group, the review working party, will be very, very much hands on, A) to correct anything that isn't accurate; B) to provide additional information, maybe when things weren't clear to make sure that the independent examiner has the appropriate understanding, and I would say; C) also is to flag anything that just isn't feasible, or prudent, or expected to really help with whatever the observation is.

So there will be extensive opportunity to flag these kinds of things, even before the draft report is formulated, which will then again, go out for public comment, which will give everybody, not just within the At-Large organization, but public At-Large, general broader public, to offer their points of view. Much as the GNSO draft report, by the way, is out for public comment right now, and I will invite all of you to take a look at that, and provide your feedback.

We're really eager for feedback on that review, and we expect that At-Large review will be in that place, in about a year and a few months' time, where the GNSO review is today, looking to get that broad feedback that will move that report into a final report.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Where we need to go now is next steps, in terms of what we've got to do, because we know we have the July to October window. Sébastien?

We've got... Is this the next step? We're talking about next steps from here, but do you have something to say before that?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I will try to do something between the two, but I just wanted to be sure that you all know that when I was a member of the structural improvements committee within the Board, I request and I am still requesting, that we stop the review by silos, and we get a review, a whole holistic review of the organization.

Last time it was done in 2002. And we are now a long time after that, without a vision, a global vision of the organization. And that's, it was never accepted. Now it's not the time, but I wanted you to know that it's my deep point of view for what we need for this organization. Now we can't do that, and we start with the GNSO, now with the ALAC, and I guess the NomCom will come soon.

We have to do the review of all of the silos. What I would like very much is that we, as an organization, we take into account a question about the broader line. Where we fit today, and is our border still the right one? If now, what we can do, how we can do, what could change, because if we don't do that, everybody will stay in this small house, or small silo, and it will not help to have a systematic view of the organization.

I hope that review, the CCWG will say something on that. And maybe the ATLT three or four or five, will be able to undertake some kind of this work, but since I don't see when it will happen, I wanted to raise this issue here with you. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. I think, given that... I think that one of the next steps has to be, Ariel, in terms of where we go, the next steps are for the self-assessment, the questions. We're looking for questions.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. We should review inside before, you know, like make all the assessments, what we are doing now when this kind of work that we should do from July until October, or something like that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Exactly, exactly. What we will do, probably, is the work space that Ariel has put up, has plenty of space for us, for all of the background information, and make sure that people can contribute to part of the Wiki. I will also suggest that as the next step, the next RALO calls in July or August, if there are people still not on holidays, start to provide the kind of self-assessment questions and so forth, that we have been asking for.

Now I expect that we can send out something to the working group members, as a reminder to say some time should be set aside, so that the questions that were up there, can start to get some answers, and so that we can feed back to you, all of the input. I would expect that the input from all of you, will come in the next two months.

So that October, you've got quite a good basis of preparatory work. What are the next steps should we be involved in?

LARISA GURNICK: So to recap next steps. I would suggest that it would definitely be very helpful for you to take a look at the summary, at the summary tables that Ariel and Heidi have provided, which reflect what the recommendations were. I think perhaps, for those that are not

familiar with what those outcomes and the recommendations were, it would be helpful to revisit that.

As well as to really think about it from your individual points of view, whether those improvements have been effective. As Holly suggested, it would probably be also very useful to come up with a definition of what's effective, and how to, you know, to determine whether something has been effective. And I know we also talked about another aspect of effectiveness which has to do with a cost benefit analysis.

Cost being time spent on implementation, not necessarily hard costs, but effort, energy invested. So these are some of the things to think about. And so that's one track. And we need feedback on all of this to be wrapped up by middle of September. And then the other track is providing answers to the specific questions that Ariel has also flagged. And we'll certainly, staff will follow up to make sure that these two things are very, very clear, and so that you understand exactly what we're asking for.

And I would say that another important next step would be for you to think about providing a response into the public comment period that's only open for another week or so, that closes on July 2nd, to Sébastien's point about the holistic review. That's the public comment proposal that's really asking for feedback on those kinds of issues.

And to date, partly because everybody is so busy with transition work, we haven't gotten much response and feedback. But there will be a

public session on Wednesday, where all of this will be discussed. And anything that has to do with the effectiveness of reviews, as an important accountability mechanism, particularly given the time that we are living right now with the transition, that kind of feedback would be very, very helpful through the public comment process that's open through July 2nd. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah [inaudible], and then Eduardo, were you putting your hand up again? Okay.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. I suggest we have a couple of action items put on here, so that we are reminded that we have to do these things. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Trust me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] Park. And I, first to thank you to Larisa to explain very sort of like a detailed explanation of how we are going to conduct this review. But I also wanted to echo what Sébastien was saying about this holistic review. So rather than just kind of like giving opportunity to the public at large, for public, the you know, the chance to make public comment, I wondering whether we can give more engagement with those, the different stakeholder groups?

Like we can take advantage of this leadership positions, like SO, AC group of people. How they perceive At-Large, because as we all know, the At-Large structure itself. We are going through a lot of, how can I say? The experiment. And we, ourselves, many times, have to prove who we are, what kind of roles we are providing, which is very different from GAC, for example, which is very different from the GNSO.

We have to kind of like approve ourselves, and I think in that sense, we have done, very great work. In the previous review process, to improve ourselves. But now we have to engage with other groups, how they really view ourselves. What kind of expectations they really have from At-Large? That would be more important in that sense. So rather than just giving a chance for them to make public comment, I would like to encourage them to be part of respondents, together with At-Large community like us.

So we can really understand the other sort of like views from other stakeholders.

HOLLY RAICHE:

[Inaudible], that's one of the things that should be, we're asking for people to contribute to questions as well as organizations. So, take the opportunity to put those words down and say, part of the preliminary work should be identifying the areas outside of ALAC, that should be part of the....

I mean, I would expect that you would be reflecting those comments back into what the preliminary material that would be handed onto Larisa. But yes, exactly. That's the sort of material we're looking for. Thank you.

And I think we're out of time, but could we thank Larisa for her time. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you all. I appreciate the attention this morning.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]