

---

HYDERABAD – At-Large Review Working Party  
Thursday, November 03, 2016 – 12:15 to 13:45 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

HOLLY RAICHE:

...organizational reviews, what the Board has asked us to do. We're then going to talk a bit about the background of the ALAC Review and in specifically, and Cheryl's going to talk to this, the 2008 Review which was of ALAC, but not of RALOs and the ALAC...

...from the survey responses really split into four things that emerged from those responses about the mission and purpose of ALAC itself as well as the RALOs and the ALSes. Our relationship between us and that At-Large community and the RALOs, I should put that in a different order, but also then our relationship with ICANN generally.

And, finally, issues about accountancy and transparency. So I've come up with some draft recommendations and then some discussion because they're still looking for input as to what you're saying. And we're going to just look at some timelines. So let me start with—

---

*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.*

---

Do you want to just talk about the mission, the Board [seeing] the job or do you want me to? What the Board says about reviews and what we're... Actually, [inaudible] just about—

Could that slide be moved up, please? Thank you. [Larissa]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll take it. I'll take it.

LARS HOFFMANN: This is Lars Hoffman, ICANN staff. This is just some text from the current Bylaws to give you another view why the reviews within ICANN, what the mandate is. Basically, the idea is that reviews should look at the continuous role of the organization and the review within the wider ICANN ecosystem. And they should look at what impact and the implementation status of previous reviews. So to what extent have the recommendation of the last At-Large review been implemented.

And then obviously accountability and transparency issues, especially, with the new Bylaws coming into remit for the reviews and that's also part of the subject areas that items... or is looking at. And then, specifically, for this At-Large review, obviously the role of the RALOs and the ALSes as opposed to the ALAC is also a big focus simply because those weren't part of the first review as Cheryl will certainly point out later. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

What this next slide is about and you can read it on the slide pack, is there are some lessons that have been learned—

We're just going to check here on... so I can read this to you.

Okay. As you will be aware there have been other reviews there what's called the Organizational Reviews, which are about us, about ccNSO, about ALAC, about Supporting Organizations, except GAC, and there are some specific issues which is what Alan just covered. There are some issues that have arisen from the range of reviews. [Larissa] has already spoken to this working group about these, but just to remind you just some lessons. The first is that the community attention and buy-in is really critical and as we have to hear from all of you and we have to have all of you think about what is important to you, to us, and to ALAC.

Next, it's about operational effectiveness. How operationally effective is ALAC and are the structures underneath. Because that is certainly an issue for this set of reviews. There are some standard policies and procedures and guidelines, and I'm going to go through what this working party has to do once we have the items report. Because for us in the working party, in fact, the work is just about to begin within a couple of months.

---

Project management. I'm supposed to be disciplined, so are the rest of you. Implementation and success is difficult to assess and I think that's fair. The implementation plans must contain some required elements. We are going to have to be looking at, in terms of implementation – this is something that Nick told me this morning and I think it's really interesting – we have to think about what it is we're trying to fix before we have an implementation plan on what to fix and how to fix it. So this is going to require some interesting thoughts from all of us.

And then support for data-driven and measurable outcomes. It's going to be on, first of all, the ITEMS Team to make some suggestions and then it's going to be on us to do it. Okay. Ariel, next slide, please.

And I'm going to hand over to Cheryl. Because Cheryl was the top dog when it came to the 2008 Review, which was the first review, we're on the second. Cheryl, over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Holly. Yes, I had the dubious honor of being the Chair... well, the honor wasn't dubious because I was the Chair, but it was dubious because it was the first time that the At-Large Advisory Committee had been reviewed. And it was, indeed, a very much differently designed process than we find ourselves going through now.

---

However, there were a few key points in terms of the ability to measure and make recommendations based on an external independent review of our organizational effectiveness. To this, it is important to realize that the review of the At-Large Advisory Committee in 2008 was specifically and primarily focused on the At-Large Advisory Committee. Yes, it did look at Regional At-Large Organizations. Yes, it did look at At-Large Structures, but only in terms of how that multi-layer or three-layer flow worked from an At-Large Advisory Committee perspective. The focus was on the fitness of the ALAC to serve its purpose.

So, I'm going to take you through very briefly what was implemented. It was 13 areas for improvement. And I'm not sure how many pages, but I think it's something in the... well, it wasn't triple digits, but it was certainly more like 45 than it was 14 of recommendations, most of which have been completed. And I will take you through those briefly in some detail now. But what I want to make very clear – and this is important for the work party to recognize – those areas for improvement were a subset and specific construct from a Board Review Working Party that took a much larger set of recommendations from the independent reviewer.

So if you look at the independent reviewer's work you will find, in some cases, significantly different recommendations. They were digested, paired down and recommitted to a similar, but

---

significantly different in a few points number of areas for improvement. And that in itself is a very, very different system. So we're not looking at as much of a top-down process as we were back then in 2008.

Next slide, please. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

While we're waiting, I was just going to make a comment. The design of the last review was not we would do an external view and then the Board would have a committee. The design was an external review that was supposed to be implemented the level of dissatisfaction with the review caused the Board Committee to be created.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. And I think also there wasn't... recognizing that we were the second of these organizational... this is still not working team. So if we could get the next... oh, I'm sorry, mine is caught up. Thank you.

Just on Alan's point, we also need to recognize that as only the second organizational review ever undertaken by ICANN. And the GNSO Review had not gone into even its implementation phase when we started the role of the Board Committee. And

---

what it should be doing was, I think, less crystalized than it was in later times.

These were the areas for recommendation. We had the ICANN Bylaw noting in particular the Board member, which was our current Seat 15. In fact, the independent reviewers recommended two Board seats. The implementation recommendation was for uno, one Board seat. We did look also at the ALS/RALO/ALAC structure and from that point of view a number of key sub-recommendations were made. It was deemed at the time that the tripartite model was fit for purpose.

It was also recognized that we would need to look at the next layer, which is what we're doing now with the regional organizations and the At-Large Structures in our following reviews. But out of that we had a number of recommendations that were made for ALSes and Regional At-Large Organizations.

One very important one was the education and engagement planning. Our involvement globally and strategic in operational plans. Some very important work on cost modeling and there remember we were in a very different situation in terms of how any or our requests for external if extraordinary expenditure were ever managed. Public comment periods was of significance. We had a situation where we had public comment periods that were simply not working for our tripartite model.

---

There was not enough time to have input come in through the RALOs.

Translation processes were relatively new and very important to us, particularly with our Regional At-Large Organizations. We had ourselves established as the home of individual internet users and that did actually require a Bylaw change. We had specific discussions about inputs from consumer representatives. Efforts were made, although not very extraordinarily well completed. And we looked at specific policy advice mechanisms which, of course, are the ones you are operating in today. Next slide, please.

The complete and ongoing ones are listed there. The ones that you will see are really much the ongoing work of our community that goes on with the various beginning [guidance]. The outreach and in-reach roles of the Regional At-Large Organizations. Non-performance, most of the RALOs are still working through those issues and ALAC is as well. The concept of skills development, of course, our capacity building program which we now run thanks to Tijani and his team's work has made a big difference there. And the matter of equal treatment for ALAC and other funded communities for accommodations is not an issue now, but was a huge issue then.

Next, and I believe, last slide before I hand back to Holly.



---

The watching brief ones continue on, but major ICANN work since has been done. So this was in the days where translation services and translation policy was not a formulated policy as we now know it is and it's an integral part of ICANN. GNSO Outreach, consumer representatives, a number of issues in the nexus between GNSO and ourselves have been solved for the more positive in terms of how working groups and interactions go on. That is actually less of an issue now than it was back then.

Our policy development processes, I think, are robust in model, but not in actual performance. So we probably need to simply use our perfectly good model more effectively. And we also need to look at the fact that the concept of GNSO PDP incorporation for not just ALAC, but ICANN wide is a very different thing now than it was back then.

And I believe, Holly, that's it's from me.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thanks, Cheryl. Ariel, can we have the next slide, please? Could we skip this slide and I want to go to the next one, if I could. The only reason I have put up on the slides the GNSO Review and you don't even need to read the words, the GNSO has gone through the same process we're going through, but one of the things that they point out in the very first set of recommendations is about their need to actually effectively work with the rest of us. And, in

---

fact, if we've got a focus of this review, it's probably the opposite. How do we work together? And how do we work with the rest of ICANN. Next slide, thanks.

This review is about... and these are the words that have been used by the Board, ITEMS was selected as the independent examiner. They are to conduct an independent review of the At-Large community. And note this is the At-Large community. This isn't just ALAC, this is At-Large, which is a different and much bigger group. They are to look specifically at the improvements resulting from what you have just heard. And, specifically, the components of the community. That's more than just ALAC. As Cheryl said, it's about RALOs, it's about At-Large Structures and how we all work together. So that's what we're doing now. Next slide.

And these are the milestones. Now, we're sort of going up the hill if you could see. We are at the second meeting where we have ITEMS. They are at the stage of presenting to us preliminary findings and they're expecting us to come back with comments and discussion. That's your job. There will be a draft final report. We will be asked to look at it to comment on it. And there will be a final report that will go to the Board. Next slide, please.

You can't read this, but please read this [when] in the presentation. Once the ITEMS Team Report has gone to the

---

Board, then the fun begins. You think you had it easy now, well, you have seen nothing yet. If the Board accepts the recommendations, then we have to have an Implementation Team. We have to work out an implementation plan that the Board is going to approve and then we have to implement it. And that's all of you. And that's probably a lot more of you. But right now, is really the beginning of the work for ALAC, for RALOs and At-Large. And that's if you look at these steps carefully you realize that's exactly what lies ahead for us.

So with that, I'm going to hand over to the head of the ITEMS Team and we are going to talk about the results of the survey. I think while that slides getting up... And, by the way, I have Nick's watch so that I can keep a very firm hand on Tom. What we found in terms of the four themes that I outlined and then you've all got a chance to talk. I hope you all do. I hope there's loads of questions and loads of comments. Over to you, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Thank you, Holly. Yeah, I'm a bit worried about the fact that you're holding Nick's Rolex watch as a kind of ransom because that's going to put me in a lot of pressure to get through this as quickly as possible.

Just a word or two of clarification, what we are not doing with this presentation is presenting anything resembling

---

recommendations or preliminary recommendations. We are at a sort of midway point through our review. We're not quite at a midway point, but we're getting there, through our review process. And what we have started to see are patterns that are emerging of what people are saying to us, what the survey results appear to be showing. So this is very much, I'm sort of enveloping my language, if you like, in the conditional. We are presenting what appears to be emerging out of the findings.

So, thank you for these words of introduction which I think have already helped us, Cheryl, Holly, Lars, and you Alan, have answered some of the questions which we, ourselves, would have like to ask the community as a result of this presentation. We also, just as a word of introduction, want to make clear that this is a session in which we want you to provide us with input on what we are going to tell you and where you think that things have already been done in the past. Certain reforms have been tried successfully, unsuccessfully. So we want you to give us a sort of push back on some of the things that we're going to say and engage in a kind of constructive dialog for the remainder of the session. So. I'm going to kick straight into the presentation. So if we can go to the next slide.

This, following your schedule, is what we have been doing with interviews. You can't see there's a sort of an outline of a global map there, but this is just to show you that as part of the review,

---

as we said that we would, we have participated in one ICANN Meeting in Helsinki and this ICANN Meeting now in Hyderabad.

In addition, we have also gone out to reach the members of the At-Large Community when and where they meet at key non-ICANN meetings around the world. So the very first one was the African Internet Summit in Gaborone, which my colleague, Tim, at the end of the table attended. I attended the EuroDIG Meeting in Brussels in June. And Rosa at the very end of the table attended the LACNIC Meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica. She was nearly sent to San Juan, California. I kid you not, ICANN Travel bought her a ticket to San Jose, California. And then, finally, we've got another meeting which is after this meeting which is going to be taking place in Jalisco, Mexico which is the IGF Meeting. So that's just to say that that's the five global regions. One meeting per global region to engage with the community at those key places. Next slide.

So, in addition, to the face-to-face interviews in which we've done about 100, we've been conducting a global survey. A survey which, hopefully, all of you have responded to. It's an ongoing survey and it's been targeted at various respondent types within At-Large, within the broader ICANN ecosystem and even beyond. And so what you cannot perhaps very clearly see on this slide is that by far the largest chunk of respondents to our survey is the At-Large community itself. The small red

---

section at the bottom is ICANN staff. We then have a section of people who are Internet end-users who have maybe had a connection with At-Large in the past, who know about At-Large and don't want to take part in At-Large processes. There's a whole community of people out there with an interest in these issues who we've also targeted. And, finally, up at the top there are the representatives of the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees within ICANN. So that's the sort of distribution, if you like, of respondents to our survey. Next slide, please.

Now this, just very quickly, is the distribution of responses from the different parts of the world. Now, a clarification and, it's an important clarification, as you know, as I have just said, we've targeted all kinds of different respondents from staff, etc. This chart only concerns respondents in the At-Large community. So that's to say people who've self-identified themselves at the beginning of the survey, these are the regions of the world that they come from. So you see that there's a very even distribution of responses from the different parts, except, perhaps Europe, which I'm ashamed to say, is the section that I'm responsible for and which is the smallest part of the chart down at the bottom, which is currently at 12.6 percent, which we hope we can boost up to a similar proportion before the end of this meeting. Next slide.

---

Now, this is just simply a typology of the results of the ALSes that have responded to our survey. And so what you see there – and it was an interesting sort of confirmation of what we had already read about – was that a vast majority of the ALSes, of the representatives of ALSes who are responding are members of ISOC Chapters. The At-Large community is made up of 50% of At-Large Chapters. And then the other sections you can read there, academic organizations, computer clubs, etc., national NGOs. But represent relatively small proportions of that community.

Just as a very quick word, these are statistics which we're presenting, this is a very high level representation of the results we have received. What we are going to do later is to burrow down, is to drill down into these results to show you what's going on at a regional level in a much more precise way. Next slide, please.

So, now, we have said that we were going to just during this meeting give you four big areas of where there are sort of issues that we've seen coming out of the conversations that we've been having and the survey results.

So the first one is clearly to do with the mission and purpose of At-Large. Now, the first thing to say here... Yes?

---

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to ask you an obvious question, but it's a clarification. We talk about ALAC and At-Large and sometimes it's done interchangeably. Could I insist that if you're talking about the larger community, which I think you are, it's the At-Large community rather than ALAC, okay. It's just something everybody should keep in their mind. If we're talking At-Large, we're talking about ALAC, RALOs, ALSes, okay.

TOM MACKENZIE: Thank you, Holly. And yes, absolutely. The distinction between ALAC and At-Large is one of the main things that has been in the backs of our minds. The main issues, if you like, the distinctions that we have realized is of sort of key importance when carrying out a review like this. And if you don't mind, if I can just sort of return a little comment. In your slides just earlier, you said, ALAC Review 2016. This is not the ALAC Review 2016, this is the review of the At-Large community in 2016, which is a very different exercise altogether. And but, anyway, back to what we were saying.

So the mission of the At-Large community, and we realize that his At-Large community is the community that is described in the ICANN Bylaws. There is no disagreement among the people that we have spoken to of the importance of the mission of At-Large. This is an important mission and it's a mission that needs



---

to be defended. There is no question about that among all respondent categories. That is a result that has come out loud and clear. However, and there is a however, there are many questions about the mandate and the accountability of At-Large leadership we've put. Now, that might sound like a threatening kind of statement to make, but it's not. That's not the intention.

The only thing that we are highlighting here is that there is a difficulty when there has been an apparent difficulty in creating an organization which effectively does that thing of representing end-user interests in ICANN processes. It's an incredibly noble and worthy mission, but one which we are very much aware is a difficult one to achieve. So there are questions coming from all sections of our respondents and people we've been talking to about exactly who is mandating the ALAC. Next slide.

The last point my colleague is... Can I just go back one?

HOLLY RAICHE: No.

TOM MACKENZIE: No. Okay. All right, then. I won't. Relations of ALAC, At-Large, and the RALO. So this is obviously a big issue again. And we have seen that what has happened since the last review is that the At-Large community has evolved. It has grown considerably, but

---

there are lots of issues that people are coming back at us with. These are membership issues, who are members, how have they become members, what, on who's clock? The list could go on. There are many people raising questions about exactly how the criteria that he used and whether they're used in a uniformed way across all the different regions. So there's inconsistent criteria among the RALOs for ALS recruitment. There's a need for more effective sharing of best practices. So there seems to be a perception of an uneven treatment of potential members of At-Large in different parts of the world.

And then, of course, there's this big question which is the relative performance of ALSes. So we carried out in the early stages of this review our own kind of exercise to get a self-assessment from the RALOs of the performance of ALSes and the results were, well, you know, less than let's say brilliant. There was quite a high incidence of inactivity among the At-Large community.

Finally, we have structural issues and so there are questions that are being raised about a static leadership, the fact that there's a slow turnover of people in leadership positions and what can be done about that. Next slide.

This is just one result, we're not going to have very many of these. It's just a result which was to the question, in the current

population of ALS is the current population of ALS truly representative of global end-user opinion. This to clarify was a question that was asked to all respondent categories and what you can see there is, yes, absolutely. It's a rather small slither of that response. The next one is, yes, absolutely. And so the total of those two represents little more than 40, 45%. So you do have a majority of people saying that, no, it is not an organization which in its current form is truly representative of end-user opinion. Next slide.

Now, this is a set of questions that was mainly asked to ICANN, the representatives of the other SOs and ACs, the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees within ICANN. So this whole issue of whether the balance of the At-Large community is satisfactory within the ICANN multi-stakeholder system. Is the balance right? It's too earlier for us to pronounce to make any kind of pronouncements about what the results are. But it's very clear that there was a very polarized opinion about this, which goes from people feeling that it's totally insignificant and not nearly important enough to those who are on the contrary believe that it's far too interfering with other constituents within ICANN. So it's a good balance. It's a very polarized opinion. It's not one about which we today have our own opinion. Next slide.

Outreach and Engagement. Again, a very important issue. And what here we have been interested to observe is that there are

---

many, many comments, 50% of survey respondents commented on this issue. And it's on the two-way function of this At-Large community. As a mechanism for outreach, a sort of top-down function and engagement which I a bottom-up function. Engagement in the policy-making processes within ICANN. It seems to us that At-Large has these two functions, but it is again an issue about which there is a very divided opinion. Some believing that it should be exclusively a mechanism, a vehicle for participation in policy-making processes. Other that the community should be much more proactive in outreach activities. So, again, this is an area that we are going to have to explore a lot before we start making anything resembling specific recommendations.

On this point, there is also an interesting issue that lots of people have highlighted which is the coordination among different ICANN departments, the Policy department and the Outreach and Engagement department who all have a budget for outreach activities and the level to which these departments are coordinating effectively with ALSes and the RALOs to ensure that resources, people, time are being used in the most optimal way. There are several quite severe sort of questions about the way that that level of coordination is happening.

And, finally, on this issue there are many comments on the quality versus quantity of ALSes. So is it worth having this

---

community? Is it worth making all this noise about having a community of 250 or whatever it is ALSes, if only 50% of them are in effect are participating actively? And isn't it more important to focus on the quality of these ALSes? Next slide.

So this is the review timeline. In fact, I think this is pretty much redundant — it's a reminder of what, Holly, you were saying just now. So this is what our contract says. And this is what we have been able to tick off so far. So we've done all that and the ticks don't really sort of matter, but what matters to you now is when we submit our draft report for the Review Working Party consideration. And that is going to happen on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December, that's we have just under a month, about a month to prepare that draft report and submit it to you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

He left one date out and that is the 9<sup>th</sup> of November and it is to say for all of you who still want to contribute and, in fact, we hope people still contribute. There is still time to contribute, do another survey, put in input, whatever. Because the door is open for a little bit longer.

TOM MACKENZIE:

That's right. In fact, we'll show you the links to that in just a second. So we have the draft report, which we're going to be

---

sending you on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December. We do have a question about what happens between the 5<sup>th</sup> of December and the 6<sup>th</sup> of January when we submit... well, there's a Christmas holiday for a start. But there's also a draft report for public comment which we need to submit. But, how can we submit... I mean, we're obviously going to submit that draft for public comment, but we will need to have taken into account any comments that the Review Working Party has submitted to us.

And so we need to have an extra sort of line in there as to when you're going to provide us with your feedback on our draft report. So the 6<sup>th</sup> of January is the public comment report. The final report for discussion is the 15<sup>th</sup> of March. This is actually just contractually what we've signed up to. We then have a final report on the 14<sup>th</sup> of January. And, finally, the presentation of final report to the Board which is on the 20<sup>th</sup> of June next year. And that's when you then take over with your own internal processes for evaluating our report. But that's where then out of the picture after the 20<sup>th</sup> of June.

So, finally, our very final slide is, I think, oh yes. Now, we have two questions to you. We have lot of questions really, but we have two main questions which is that we would like to be sure that we have in our possession. And that it has been brought to our knowledge and attention all of the ongoing review processes and things that are going on in various parts of the At-Large

---

community. Because we are aware in all of the sort of global regions that there are sort of other kinds of review processes going on. There also a whole process going on in regard to the ATLAS recommendations and the reevaluation of ALS criteria. All this information we sometimes come across it, but we would rather that the community brings it to us in a very sort of proactive way so that we don't miss anything. We don't want to face a situation where we get to the end of the report and we're suddenly told that there was some sort of parallel process going on regarding some aspect of the community.

The second thing is, yes, in fact, you may have already provided an answer to this question which was that we wondered whether it's within the scope of this review, to provide recommendations that might have implications on ICANN Bylaws. And, I think you mentioned... I think Cheryl mentioned that was a possibility. Or at least it was an outcome of the previous review process that there was an update to Bylaws. So that's, well, perhaps an answer to that question. We will have other questions but, perhaps we can ask—

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to stop you there.

---

TOM MACKENZIE: Our final thing is just the link to the survey.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, I'm not.

TOM MACKENZIE: There you go.

HOLLY RAICHE: There is a link to the survey and it is on the home page and I checked. A couple things there is an action item, nobody's getting a Christmas holiday if you're in the working party because, in fact, there is a missing date and it does fall within the Christmas break. But that's an action item for the working party that I'm sure will be picked up.

The other would be something for, I think, the Leadership Team to have a look through to answer your second question. So I think there are a couple of action items on us.

The next thing I'd like to do is just ask the rest of the team is you've got anything you want to add before we open the floor, because we've already got Tijani and Seun.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have nothing to add.



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. The survey will be closed by the end of the ICANN meeting, that's the whole thing. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: [Inaudible] anyway. What I would like to do is I went to the floor and we've got two hands up and we've got Tijani, you had your hand up first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I'm a little bit concerned about at least two of your [inaudible]. The first one showed that the survey responses came from more than 50% of people outside At-Large. The second one was the [inaudible] where you show from where the ALSes come. When you say a few part from end-users, do you mean that those are jobless people? Because you have academia, you have technical people, etc. But all are end-users. So this distinction... this, if you want categorization, I don't think it is very relevant, because it is misleading. When I see it I understand that our ALSes are not end-users. Very few of them are end-users.

HOLLY RAICHE: Let Tom answer that, thanks.

---

TOM MACKENZIE:

This category of end-users is, in fact, a category of people who have... we've already looked into who they are exactly. And for the most part, the vast majority of the people in that orange, yellow section that you're concerned about, they are people who are participating in IGF Meetings who have actually quite considerable knowledge of the Internet government issues and At-Large. And some of them, a reasonable number of them are people who were in At-Large in the past and who are no longer. Or people who know perfectly about what At-Large does and who have no intention of ever joining At-Large because they don't believe that At-Large stands for the values and principles which they stand for.

So there are people who have a very... some of them have a hostile view of At-Large, but we felt that if this pie chart was simply a sort of a big blue section of people within At-Large and that was sort of it, that we would be giving you a very partial view of what is actually going on.

And the other thing, just to sort of reassure you is that these... as far as the questionnaire because I think it's important that you should understand how the questionnaire functions. As you know we had a multi-layered questionnaire and so these people

---

had to qualify their level of understanding of the At-Large community.

And so there were three categories within this. There was a lot of understanding of At-Large, a medium and a low, basically. And the people with the low understanding were rooted right through the questionnaire very quickly and, basically, they were only answering questions like saying, “Is the website good?” And that kind of thing. So they are not influencing or altering any of the data that concerns elections or those kinds of things which only a relatively sort of informed respondent could answer.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Could I make a suggestion that maybe in the report itself you, at least, clarify a little bit of the question. Because if that’s a question that Tijani has, it’s probably a question that others would have. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you very much. One of the just observations chats that has ISOC on it, has two similar colors, you may want to change the color for one of them in order for it to be understandable.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Okay.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: The other thing, on slide six you mentioned something in relation to representation. Yeah, you said 4.3%. So this representing end-user, is it in terms of the purpose of At-Large or in terms of geographic representation. Is it in terms of representing the goal or the objective of At-Large or in terms of representing – having geographic representation of end-users? I'd like to get some clarification on that.

And then the last comment, Slide 11H. You mentioned that the final report will be issued and posted where? And is that for public comment again or what? Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: So in answer to your question about colors, actually you can read that chart just simply by... if you start at the top of the list of the key to the colors and you just sort of go around, it just goes around the pie chart, if you see what I mean. If you just start at the top, which is the ISOC color, the blue color. And then if you just read that list down, then you can just go around your pie chart like that. But those kinds of editorial... we're going to sort that out for the report obviously.

Now, for your second point is regarding the 4.3 of respondents who think that the current population of ALSes really represents

---

end-users, that's purpose of At-Large. So At-Large has this mission to effectively represent the interest of end-users in ICANN policy-making processes. And there was only a very small proportion of respondents, I believe, that that was actually the case. So we do get responses like that.

But, I think it's very important regarding your point and Tijani, your point, is that statistics are notoriously slippery things which you can use in all kinds of different ways. We are perfectly aware of the slippery nature of statistics and we're not going to use them as some kind of weapon or in some kind of manipulative way to make one point in a sort of stronger way than another. As we sort carry forward and we go for it in the review process, we're going to bring out and reveal a much more sort of nuanced picture of what is being said or has been said in the review. And in something that we simply cannot do in a sort of 10-minute presentation here.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's okay, Alan?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just a follow-up.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:                      Sorry, I thought that was a new question.

SEUN OJEDEJI:                      No. Just a follow-up. But my major concern for this particular statistics. I mean, this 4% is that if about 50% of At-Large actually fill the survey and this report is saying 4% says they don't think the purposes of At-Large has been met. I mean, it's a significant concern that I have. And I think we need to watch... watch these things so that it does not create a misinterpretation of what it actually is. I mean, 50% that knows, that have paths of At-Large filled survey. And overall, 4% think the purpose is achieved. That is a lot of... I mean, it simply means only 4% of the ALSes or less than that actually are in support of what At-Large is doing [inaudible] readiness, I'm sorry.

TOM MACKENZIE:                      I think that your reaction is the right reaction. I mean, this can be a slightly worrying thing to observe. If we'd had time, if we had had all day to talk to you, we can also bring out and show you and many encouraging survey findings or statistical findings as well, which is saying that meetings are getting better, that outreach is improving. There are lots of things that are positive signs. We maybe have sort of worried you by giving one of these particularly sort of worrying signs. It's just one bit of opinion. But, as I say, we've got all week to discuss and to get your

---

pushback on these kinds of results and our report, of course, will be a much more nuanced picture.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Alan's next and then after Alan, Tijani, Dev, Olivier, and Tim and Cheryl. We have a lot, so would people please keep their questions short. And you've got to keep your answers short.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm going to make it easy on answers. I don't want any answers. Just a couple of comments and we can have interchanges later should you choose.

There was a question on the survey on what is the purpose of At-Large or something phrased like that. There were 10, 8, or 9 different options. From my perspective all of them were valid. We do all of that to some extent. So I'm not quite sure how you judge since only one answer was allowed per person, which one they picked. And if the 4.7 or whatever 4.9 came out of that number, that may well explain why it was so small. Not representing the opinions of end-users, I think you almost have to say for those end-users that have opinions. When At-Large started we said, it was said we represent the end-users, all 3, 4 billion of them. We've changed the wording because we know we don't represent the users themselves. But we're trying to

---

guess what's best for them and that depends on how good we're doing.

You're using the term engagement differently than we do. You said engagement is bottom-up. In fact, we use the term engagement as a top-down to try to get these people involved. Engagement is not them feeding things back to us, we use the term engagement as trying to get them to participate more in our processes. So they're both top-down processes from that perspective. Just note you're doing a draft before you're going to the IGF which is interesting.

I'll note the survey pointed to the Westlake Report, not the report that was implemented and that may end up with some skewed results in that particular questions. For instance, as the most blatant example, the Westlake Report said, "Keep the ALAC liaison on the Board, do not having voting Board members." The final report said, "Two voting Board members, please." And then the Board implemented one. So they were quite different in some cases. Whether the Bylaws will be implicated, almost everything the Bylaws say about At-Large is not quite accurate anymore. So I'm hoping that we will use this as the opportunity to fix all of that. So, yes, they better change. And, yes, we're doing things that the Review Team should know about and hopefully it will know about them.



---

And lastly, your statement of whether they viewed themselves as well-informed, a self-assessment of how well-informed they are is not necessarily an accurate number.

HOLLY RAICHE: Before you do that, Tim has actually got a couple of answers on the statistics. So before we hear any more questions, Tim?

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Holly. So, yeah, it is a troubling statistic and we've put it up there just to let you know what your colleagues felt about performance. But that was the answer to 4.3% think that you are doing a very effective job in fulfilling your mission and 35.2% you're doing a somewhat effective job. So total with nearly 40% very effective or somewhat effective.

And in terms of the balance question that Tijani had, two-thirds of our respondents are either end-users or involved in At-Large. And of those involved in At-Large, two-thirds of those respondents are in the leadership position in ALS or RALO or in ALAC. So the balance has shifted more toward At-Large and end-users than it was when we gave you a report in Helsinki.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Tim. I'm going to go to Dev next, because you haven't spoken at all.

DEVANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. I'm sorry for being late, I was engaged in another session. So one comment that I have regarding the survey was that I thought it didn't really speak to the engagement of the At-Large community as it pertains to working groups because we say we want the At-Large community to be involved. And what does that mean? There are three activities: policy advice, organization building, and actual being liaisons and Cross-Community Working Groups and Supporting Organization, etc. But what I find and I think is a trend that perhaps needs to be looked at very closely is to how the At-Large Community in working groups are valued within the ALAC and RALO leadership.

We have Policy Working Groups and we have Organizational Working Groups. And what I'm seeing happening is, one, we asked people to volunteer for these groups. They produce work. Relatively it's not really looked at by the RALO leadership. And I don't know if the ALAC itself even looks at it. I mean, several working groups do monthly reports. I'd be very interested to find out who actually reads them. So, I mean, volunteers are being disincentivised to actually participate in working groups. They're ignored by RALO leaderships. They're not acknowledged by the

---

RALO. Why then should they get involved. And so, that's my comment in terms of I thought the At-Large survey didn't really cover that aspect. Why are people not engaged in the working groups and so forth.

TOM MACKENZIE: Nick has got an answer to that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Nick?

NICK THORNE: Forgive my voice. Dev, thank you. Dev raised this issue with me earlier in the week and he's quite right. We did not adequately cover the question of working groups in the survey. I don't imagine it's the only thing that we didn't adequately cover. But Dev's points are, I think, valid and strong. He's very kindly given us some bullet points to set out clearly what his views are. We'll be talking to people about this during the week. We'll be taking other views.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Dev. Thank you, Nick. Olivier, you haven't spoken, but you had your hand up.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. And, in fact, I'd put my card down because I think Tim partly answered the question on this shocking 4.3% of respondents. I think I calculated that that would mean eight people said that they were satisfied. So who around the table have said they were not satisfied and what the hell are you doing about it, is my question, because it's you that you're criticizing. So, that's all. But, I guess, the question was worded in a specific way which is slightly different. We are very twitchy about saying, you know, we cannot represent end-users but representing the interests of the end-users. And I think it's somehow misunderstood as well by those people that are answering the survey, so it's tough. I could say it's impossible to represent 3 billion people, except if we get \$3 billion and we pay them each \$1 for responding.

HOLLY RAICHE: Is that a request for money?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll have to speak to Xavier about this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Tim, response?

---

TIM MCGINNIS: I fully agree that it is an impossible task to try and represent end-users. I think that the eight people who said you were doing a very effective job truly felt that way. And the rest who said somewhat effective were also being honest. It is just not in the realm of possibility to represent end-users fully or completely without getting 4 billion voices heard somehow.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Tijani, did you have another comment?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Holly. The figures of the survey is something. Their interpretation is another thing.

When in Helsinki, Sandra said that we have to weigh the answers according to the source of those answers. I disagreed with her there. But now, I say, yes, yes, yes, we need to make the weighting because when I see that very large part of the survey was done by people who are not At-Large, I understand that we have comments like, “We don’t represent anything, etc. etc.” Because there are people in this community, in the community of ICANN that think that end-users don’t have any place in ICANN. ICANN is about names and numbers and end-users they are useless. So it’s normal that those people can tell you everything about At-Large. So now I want this survey to be

---

constructive. Yes, we need the point of view of the others so that we know what other people think about us. But also we have to make the right weighting, so that we have the right results. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: And you that eight think that we're just terrific. I think that's great. Do we have any other comments, because I would point out—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much for your comment. In fact, I think it shouldn't be a worry to have that many answers or respondents from outside the At-Large. We actually... they didn't fill it at all the form, the survey, but they gave good ideas and I think to follow the perception the people have outside is very important. And I think it was very good they answered. They have interest in answering and I think that we shouldn't forget it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you. Wafa?

WAFDA DAHMANI: Just a little comment. For this question about do you think that At-Large is [inaudible] the end-user. It would have been

---

interesting if you asked them why do you think this? The comments would be very interesting. It would have been. It's done, so.

HOLLY RAICHE: Gentleman behind? While we're waiting, Tim give your response.

TIM MCGINNIS: Sure. I can respond to Wafa quickly. The comments are very interesting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I guess I'm audible now. By now as I have understood that the At-Large community should be involving more ALSes around, and as you can see from this table that a meeting is happening here in India. And most of the people from the ALSes in India. They are here and they don't have any sort of presentation at this place. So now, and that's my concern. I mean, at this point of time ICANN has around eight or nine ALSes in India. And there are very few people from those ALSes here at the At-Large meeting. So either there's an issue with the information dissemination or there is a problem with communication. There has been no communication to the At-Large communities or ALSes in India. Because it's happening and the venue is here in India and there must be more representation of those ALSes at

---

this meeting right now. But I couldn't see any people from India at this meeting. I mean, from the ALSes, particularly [inaudible] of India. That's an ALS for India and I don't see people around, you know.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sure we've taken that onboard and I know we did do some outreach efforts there and I don't know what's happened. So I think that's something that; A, we need to take on board. And, B, the Review Team needs to take onboard.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I mean, it needs to be addressed whether there was an issue in communication. Why the ALSes or the RALOs they are not actively submitting the information to the end-users.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Alan and then Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: On a regular basis we bring people from an ALS to our ICANN meetings, we're only funded for that limited extent. This was not a meeting to which we were funded to bring people from ALSes. So they are welcome to come. Information was sent out to all the ALSes that the meeting will be held, but we're not in the



---

position to fund them or to force them to provide their own funding. So that's just one of the concerns we have on a regular basis.

HOLLY RAICHE: And Cheryl. Cheryl has not had her turn Olivier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Two things. Cheryl is happy to bring up her process point as the last point. But just in response to that last intervention, of course, we do have a regional list and I'm wondering whether our regional's list is as widely read as it needs to be. And that's something we certainly need to look at when we're coming up with possible solutions to some of these issues. But I'd also be very keen to see who is going to attend from local community in our capacity building lunchtime sessions. Because this is a Newcomer's Day and it's a little bit earlier. But I'll come back last because it's a process point.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank, Holly. Three Indian At-Large Structures organized the Indian School of Internet Governance in the past three days. It

---

was attended by 30 people and I understand that the majority of those 30 people are attending this very meeting. This morning there were between 6 to 12 representatives from these At-Large Structures that I have seen walking around. Alas, for this meeting they were told that they could not have their food here so they went to get food in the other place. I have spoken to a couple of them. So they are around but, unfortunately, not for this specific session. It's just one of these weird things.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Mona?

MONA SAVARD: Thank you. I have a question. But I'd like to say first, that this shouldn't affect the credibility of the survey. Now, seeing the questions some of which ask is a bit confusing in terms of what you expect to have as a reply. In general terms, I'd say these questions demand a deep knowledge of our system. So do those who replied really know the system? Do they really know what At-Large can do and what it cannot do?

And then, I have another question. Could you really say how we can see the impact of ICANN as an administration, as an entity and how they manage At-Large? Can you really see what their impact and their management of At-Large is based on the

---

survey? Because At-Large is supposed to defend the interests of end-users. But ICANN does not have the same mission. ICANN has a different mission, so can you see that here? Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE:

I'll reply in French, given that your question was asked in French. Regarding the question on the requirements we have and what we ask the respondents to the survey, I'll say, yes. There's a certain requirement, a certain knowledge required. And, that is, the limit that we face when we carry out this sort of service. But our review of At-Large is not limited to this survey. This survey is but one tool. We've also got the tool of surveys of interviews. We have one-hour interviews with participants and there we discuss different subjects. And then there's also a third access which is the research. We have a team that works on research regarding these different aspects.

So we use different tools in order to counterbalance these results that could not be entirely accurate in the survey. So we are completely aware of the limits that this exercise implies, that the surveys implies. But going back to the comments made here by Dev, who was saying the survey did perhaps not cover some questions. Was that it? Was it you? What was it? Yes, on working groups, that's it.

---

And that is precisely because the community of people who are off today is on the procedures, on the management of working groups is relatively limited. And so it would have been very likely that we would have had answers that were not entirely accurate. So in order to deal with the subject which is of the utmost importance, it is not the subject that's going to give us an answer, it's whether the people who undergo the interview and the people who respond to those questions in the interview that are going to answer to us.

HOLLY RAICHE:

We're out of time. And we will remind people that you've got until the rest of this meeting to get ahold of any of the four who... put your hands up Rosa, Tim, Tom, Nick. And if you have not done the survey, do it. The working party will be hard at work in terms of looking at the draft report, it's a job for all of us.

But I would like to thank the team. I'd like to start with thanking the Chair, Tom. But, Nick, Tim, and Rosa, thank you very much. And a reminder to everybody which is only the beginning of the review and, we're out of time. We're, in fact, over time. Nick, do you want your watch back?

NICK THORNE:

Yes, please. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. Can somebody turn half a dozen lights off.? Can staff note an action item for us to discuss suitable amount of time in the week of Copenhagen for what is the timeline on the 15<sup>th</sup> of March? Thank you. Because a 45-minute lunch session is not going to cut it.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**