COPENHAGEN – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 6
Sunday, March 12, 2017 – 11:00 to 12:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I am one of the co-Chairs of the At-Large Review Team along with Holly. Holly has asked me to get started. I do want to apologize for any of the remote participants that we are starting just a tad later than the advertised time. We have no intention, however, of finishing any later than the advertised time and if we can get our work done early, you can all get 10 or 15 minutes of your lives back and that would be a good thing, too.
	When you make an intervention in today's session, please remember that this is a recorded session and we have interpretation into French, Spanish, Chinese, and of course English if your native tongue is not English. Therefore, you start with, as I did, "Hello. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record." So even though I would say, "Over to you, Aziz," Aziz will then say, "My name is Aziz," and that gives a punctuation point for the record, for the transcript, and for those who are having their voices interpreted.

You'll also note I have started to slow down slightly because that is also something that will assist the interpretation and the accuracy of the interpretation. So, if you can, speak as slowly and as clearly as you can and, if you can, identify yourself at the beginning of each of your interventions.

This is an interactive session. We don't have a roving mic, but I know that the magic will happen because I'm waving my hand and the team at the back of the room are incredible. We'll even put a mic up at the mic stand, so do not feel that if you are not at the table you do not have a voice. You can just stand at that mic and we will note you and your intervention can go on the record.

We have all the members of the ITEMS team here today. If you do not know them, I will ask them now to very briefly introduce themselves. They don't have a presentation. I just checked. And the purpose there is, we want to go through their recommendations in this draft report and have a fearless, frank, and friendly interchange to help all of us – as in the At-Large community, the ALAC, and its Leadership – better understand where we have any form of confusion or concerns with some of the recommendations.

That said, we want to say to ITEMS up front, the majority of everything you've said in terms of recommendations and implementables, we agree with and in many cases we believe

we're already on that pathway. So this is not a doom, gloom, and despair exercise. Far from it. But let's try and remember the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and I'll remind people about that if needs be.

We do have a clock running. Well, we don't have it running yet, but we can run the clock. What I would suggest we do is we don't limit the timing of interventions unless we find people are coming back for a second and a third intervention on a single topic. We will then run a clock, and we will run a clock down if needs be to a one minute or 30 second for subsequent interventions.

Please remember this is just a point in the process. What ITEMS is able to do now by attending this meeting and conducting the public meeting that they will be running later on is getting continued feedback from us and the wider ICANN community. So this is still part of the developmental process. It is not the end of the game yet.

So with that, who's going to start off. Tom, you?

TOM MACKENZIE: My name is Tom Mackenzie, and I'm part of the ITEMS Review Team.

ROSA DELGADO: Good morning. My name is Rosa Delgado. Thank you.

NICK THORNE: I'm Nick Thorne, the gentleman.

TIM MCGINNIS: My name is Tim McGinnis. I'm also part of the ITEMS Review Team.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I like the fact that he let Rosa go first. Never miss the opportunity to start out how you intend to conduct the rest of the meeting, which is with great politeness and aplomb. So thank you, Nick.

First of all, is there anybody here who has a particular problem with how Holly and I have outlined this agenda? Fairly free-flowing, looking at not just the concerns but all of the recommendations, and having an interactive discussion with ITEMS. If everyone's happy with that agenda, good. We'll take that agenda as read. Holly, did you want to start off now?

HOLLY RAICHE: The first thing I did was cut myself off. I think that's terrific. The thing that has attracted most attention would be the Empowered Membership Model, but what I would like to do is,

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

Tom, have you got say five minutes to start? What I would like is say five or 10 minutes just on the Empowered Membership Model from you because that has been the focus of most of the comments that we have made. Hearing from you an understanding of what it is and how it works may actually assist the discussion. I have in front of me a list of all of the recommendations, so we can move from there once we've cleared up that understanding of your proposed model. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: Thank you very much, Holly.

We're getting towards the end of this review process which will officially be completed in about a months' time unless we need to extend the deadline by a couple of weeks or so. But just before we start, we would really like to say that this has been a challenging, intellectually very stimulating, and very interesting exercise over the past year. We understand that as external reviewers we have made suggestions that may have seemed difficult to swallow for some members of your community, but we are very appreciative of the way in which you have provided feedback and we hope that we have done you service by taking sufficiently into account your reactions to certain aspects of what we have proposed.

We are, as I say, approaching the end of the process. In December, we submitted to you a very first draft, and the members of the Review Working Party had about a month to provide an initial round of feedback which they did by the 6th of January. We then worked our draft quite substantially and resubmitted on the 31st of January a second draft and we are now in the public comment period and we understand, we have been following, the way in which you are working very hard on collecting and bringing together all your public comments.

Just briefly on the EMM – we are actually going to divide up the way in which we present the different aspects of our report.

HOLLY RAICHE: It will be short. Trust me.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes. Okay.

Very quickly, one of the big, overarching feedback feelings that we got from the people that we have spoken to throughout this review process is that there really is no question anywhere in the ICANN system – especially within At-Large obviously but in the entire ICANN system – that At-Large plays a very important role in representing the interests of end users of the Internet. That role is one which, to answer what the Bylaws requires us to look

into which is the purpose of the At-Large community, there is no question in our minds that this community has a very important purpose which needs to be upheld and maintained in the years ahead. So that is plain and clear.

What we had, while there were many questions that were raised. was the way in which that mission is achieved. How do you achieve that mission of representing end user interests within ICANN? It's an incredibly challenging task, we understand. And we fully appreciate that some of you have dedicated the best parts of the past 15 years to achieving that goal. The extent to which that goal has been achieved is up for debate, let's say. There are people who believe that you are in a significantly better situation today than you were eight years ago. Okay. Fair enough. But there are many people who think that more could be done, somehow some things could be changed, to ensure that that objective is better met.

We mentioned this before, but we ran three hypotheses when trying to figure out what it was that was possibly blocking At-Large. The first was that – it's simply mission related – is that the mission of ICANN is so technical and so narrow that you're only ever going to find a very small cadre of people around the world who are qualified to take part in these discussions. And so that immediately limits the size of your population or membership, if you like, that's ever likely to participate in these events. That's

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

an entirely possible hypothesis – your membership base is just naturally small.

The second hypothesis was that your community has been dogged by people, power, and politics – that it's conceivable that the leadership positions within your community have been occupied by certain individuals who have been unwilling or unable to allow for proper succession planning. It's a possibility and we looked into that as you will have seen in our report.

The third hypothesis is an organizational hypothesis. That's to say that you've got the people, you've got the mission, but you haven't for whatever reasons been able to build around yourselves an organization, a structure, that allows for ordinary end users to quickly and effectively get engaged in the policy advice processes or the outreach and engagement processes which you are missioned to do. So it's an organizational problem possibly that you have.

As I've mentioned in earlier discussions with you, we actually felt that it was a part of all these hypotheses needed to be considered, and so we think it's a bit of all these possible hypotheses.

So what was the result of all this? Well the result was a set of recommendations which we are glad to hear that in many cases you are thinking along the same lines and in fact that you're

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

already working in that direction. That to us is absolutely welcome news, and so fantastic.

The big recommendation, if you like, is this EMM model, and Tim is going to give you more specific details of that model. But very basically, what this model is about is about creating a uniform mechanism across all regions which will allow individual end users to become quickly involved in either the outreach and engagement or the policy advice making processes that you do on a regular basis.

That's point one – it's easy and rapid engagement for individual end users. However – and this is an important point – before we came to this particular conclusion, we took into account and we read up on past experiments that have been tried within At-Large to get end users involved, and we have deliberately tried to avoid all of the pitfalls that the community has faced in the past. By that, I mean that opening up and too quickly empowering end users – the experiment that you had in the early 2000s which was not a particularly positive experiment.

So what we have done – and Tim will go into more details – is that we have tried to create a system which recognizes the power of the ALSes and what they are doing on the ground today and maintaining that, but it also gives ordinary end users a quick

access but does not give them the kind of voting power, if you like, that they had in the very early days of ICANN.

What we have simply written into our model is that end users who can prove to you the community that they are active – and that's a very important part of our model – active members will over a period of time be recognized for their contributions and be, if you like, empowered with a vote to take part in elections or to volunteer as rapporteurs.

I shall stop there then and I can hand over to Tim, if you like, to provide a few more details regarding the EMM.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just before that, we do have a hand raised from Siva, so if we could take Siva then go to Tom then come back to you Seun perhaps, and Tijani? Use the AC room. That I can see. It's in front of me. If not, I will keep looking around. But Siva has had his hand up since the beginning so please go ahead, very briefly.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN METHUSAMY: My name is Sivasubramanian. I'm from ISOC India and [it's in the] At-Large. I was one of the respondents to your survey. I sat with you, I think, in Helsinki or Hyderabad for about 45 minutes. And I talked quite a lot, but in the end you ended up recording it on a survey answering questions. And I noticed that

part of what I conveyed was not so well captured in the way you recorded it or it did not fit into the survey format of questions. And so essentially I'm not only talking about my response. I'm just asking you a question about the design of the survey and the way the response is collected and understood by all respondents.

Based on my experience, based on what I observe, the intent that I conveyed or the crux of the idea that I conveyed, as I could see, was not captured in the survey or in the way you recorded it. That was one point that I wanted to observe.

And I just want to say I respect you and the other consultant. I want to ask you if there was any preconceived notion or any predetermination on your part that At-Large is not good or the At-Large Structures are not effective. Did you have any such preconceived notions that reflected in your report?

Ultimately At-Large has a very, very crucial role and it takes time to build up this organization and it's doing very well for the past 15 years despite its setbacks and it should be allowed to be strengthened rather than weakened in any manner. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you don't mind me intervening, Siva. They're very important questions and one of which – the beginning one I think – the

analysis and justification of the mechanisms for the survey, etc., I think is a very deep conversation and one that I've asked Tom if his team could take on notice. Not to just bring back to you, but I think that's something that would be worthwhile exploring but not in the confines of today and today's report. Very important question, but I'm going to ask ITEMS to take that on notice if you don't mind because it's something that I'm sure you're not alone in wondering about.

If I have the order correct, the order would be Tijani, Seun, and then Alan. But tell me if I've got that order out of order.

[ALAN GREENBERG]: Good enough.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good enough? Okay. Can we go to the rest of ITEMS' presentation on this first though?

[HOLLY RAICHE]: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're happy to hold? Okay. Back to you guys – Tim.

TIM MCGINNIS: I don't really have a presentation here. I'm happy to field questions, as we all are. But I actually would like to give you two minutes on my thinking over the last few weeks.

I was fortunate enough to attend the APRICOT meeting, and after that I had six days and instead of flying to the United States and then back to Europe I decided to stay in Vietnam. I was floating in the ocean one day looking up at the blue sky, and it struck me that what we've done with the Empowered Membership Model is to give you back 19 years. We've taken you back sort of on a reset back to the original notion of what ICANN was supposed to be, where end users were making policy.

So what we've done with the EMM is taken all the internal focus that – we heard from universal agreement from all of our interviews and survey respondents was that you're far too focused on internal processes – and we've turned you outward to look at and engage in the actual policy making processes so that At-Large (the Advisory Committee, the ALAC itself) has early knowledge of what's going on in the other ACs and SOs and there's a two-way street of communication between At-Large and the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

We've refocused you we hope in the EMM, and that is one of the parts, as it were, one of the functional aspects of the

Empowered Membership Model, is [to] refocus you externally and provide communications for early policy intervention which hopefully will lead to less work overall.

I was thinking the other night, what if you only did two pieces of policy advice per year, or three? If you got early intervention and you got rapporteurs telling these working groups what At-Large thinks early on and they would take that on board, there'd be far less work for you to do, far fewer things for you to have to comment on either in public comment periods or providing advice to the Board. So hopefully that will make your workload significantly lighter.

I think that's about all I had for my thoughts on that over the last few weeks. If you want to ask specific questions, I'd be happy to entertain them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on the queue – and I think we're ready to go to the queue now unless Nick or Rosa want to make an intervention on that. And thank you, Tim. I think it's important for us to help – you've helped us, certainly, me, understand the intent and the rationale. And I think if we can establish some of that more during this meeting on recommendations which we find ourselves questioning, that would be a very productive thing

indeed. So let's see if we can make that [inaudible]. So thanks, Tim. That was very useful.

So we have Tijani, then Seun, then Alan, then I believe then Aziz, then Olivier, and okay so, Humberto, were you beforehand? Humberto? You'll be before or after? After and then Humberto. Okay. Let's go.

Tijani. Two minutes and we're going to run a clock. No alarm. Run the clock.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. [Bob], I would like to give you a piece of information. In AFRALO we didn't yet implement the individual membership in AFRALO. But it is under its way and I think by the end of the year we will have it.

And despite of that, we have people in our community who are not part of any ALS and who are very active. I don't know if Etienne is here because he is in Copenhagen. He was here yesterday. Etienne was one of those, and Etienne even got the approval of AFRALO to have the funding by the CROPP to go to an event in Africa and he is not member of any ALS. And we don't have the individual membership implemented in AFRALO.

So in AFRALO at least, any member, any individual member, any individual user, can participate. He is participating in all our

monthly calls. He is active. He participates. He discusses. And he even got funded to go to an event. Unfortunately the event – it was Africa – the event was cancelled so he didn't make it but he got the approval.

This is a piece of information tell you that this is implemented already. We already have anyone, any end user, who wants to participate, who wants to be involved, they can do so. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. Thank you for the introduction. Just along the line of what has been mentioned by Tijani, I just wanted to throw a question to you too.

During the process of developing the report, to what extent do you consider our views? If we say, "Okay, this particular data, perhaps [we] need to have a second look at it." To what extent do you consider it as – [be] honest – to what extent do you consider it as being not an issue of conflict of interest in this case? Because I think if we are giving you information, the attitude, how you react to the information, would also determine what the interpretation of the information would be on your side.

So how do you interpret or how do you receive the data the information would give to you? Because obviously [inaudible] observe that the information we give to you are not reflected in the report itself. So do you consider it as being us trying to defend ourselves, or you just feel that what we're giving does not work and we are the ones being reviewed hence we are not in the right place to give you any information that would be useful for you?

The other thing is, Tom, you mentioned something relating to end users proving to someone before they get [a leadership position]. So who is the person [that you have to] prove to? Because we are starting with EMM flat. That means that there is no leader [and coach]. So who are we going to prove to before we start having leaders? Is it to the Board? Is it to [other] SOs or ACs or something? I think we need to be very clear with the structure as well. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: Tim might want to answer the question about who ALMs are going to be reporting to. But regarding the – just very quickly – in the 20 seconds regarding about whether we're taking your opinions into account, that is the basis of our work really as independent reviewers. We have to take on board all peoples' points of view. We do believe that we did that.

But then as a team we had to decide on what our own editorial line of thinking was. And so that's how we ended up with our recommendations and the particular line of argument which you have seen in our report. But we have certainly taken everybody's point of view into account. And At-Large, I would say, is one of those communities where people have very stark differences of opinion on what's a preferable way forward within the community itself. There's a lot of differences of opinion.

So we had that to contend with and then we had our own line to come up with. And Tim – there is a second part to that question which is how ALMs would – who are they going to be reporting to if this model is going to be implemented as soon as this model is implemented.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Tom. So if I understand the question correctly, it's who will ALMs report to. Well, if they are a rapporteur to a working group, then they report to ALAC who are the democratically elected decisional participants, if you will. The people there are the deciders. So in terms of reporting to, they give information to ALAC to help the ALAC make decisions.

On Wednesday we'll be running a workshop where the question asked by John Laprise on the mailing list a few weeks ago is, imagine what the EMM would look like. We're going to put that

into practice. And I believe that will be in this room. Is that correct, Holly? Heidi maybe?

So we will be running a workshop in here and we will be actually moving you around the room showing you how the Empowered Membership Model is meant to work. So that will be Wednesday.

But I think you mean something else when you say, "Who do they report to?" Is that correct, Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much, [Tim]. Actually my question is, for instance you mentioned rapporteurs. Who makes them rapporteurs? You mentioned they would be reporting to ALAC. In your report, ALAC does not exist. It's a new thing because we have 15 member ALAC right now. But now you're saying there's going to be 10 member ALAC. That means that we're going to be having this set of new stuff. So my point is, who is going to be the deciding decision maker in this line of structure? Because on the long run it seems that we're going to be making arbitrary or subjective appointments without actually recognizing that these people are volunteers and they actually may not do anything in six months and they may do a lot of things in one month. So we need to recognize that. That's just my point, but I look forward to the workshop of moving around the room Wednesday. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that gives you probably a little extra ideas of where you should be taking some of us in the workshop. There are still some more understandings to be made clear. I think if you ask five people around this room you'd probably get four different sets of understandings, maybe even five different sets of understandings – six perhaps if you ask me because I keep changing my mind on things.

I think that gives you a sort of a leveler on where you might be needing to pitch, and this is from the invested community. Your Wednesday session will have rank and file and my great Aunt Mary, should she be walking past on the day. So that's going to be another challenge which I trust you'll be able to meet.

Our list to now is as follows: we now have Alan and Holly's hand blocking everything I wrote – Alan, Aziz, then we –

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Olivier.

HOLLY RAICHE: Humberto.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Would you like to just say it, Holly, instead of me echoing you?

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry. I can read my writing. Olivier, Humberto, Alberto, and Siva.

Actually, Tim, if you want to respond, and then we're on to Alan.

TIMM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Holly. I think there is still a significant amount of misunderstanding of the model, and that's perhaps due to the way we wrote it up. But we're still having a 15 member ALAC. We are in many ways cementing the status quo in place. We are not making significant changes to the structure. You've still got people representing larger groups of people as you do currently with your At-Large Structure. You've still got a 15 member RALO, 10 of whom are elected, five of whom are chosen by the NomCom. So that doesn't change. You've still got the ALAC as the body making decisions and giving advice to the Board.

So the basic structure remains. It's just, I think that maybe it was Alberto commented on the list about a week ago or maybe it was Carlton, it's the function that's changing. We are, as I said before, refocusing you. The idea, the suggestion, is get involved

in actual policy making, spend a lot less time discussing things amongst yourself because you've sort of built a little fortress, At-Large, and you spend a lot of time in your own little fort, and that has led to probably some mistrust by other communities, other SOs and ACs, about you and you about them, and it's all unnecessary frankly. And I think that if you look at the model in terms of what you have now, you will recognize that the basic structure is still the same. It's just that, as I said, it is what you do that changes significantly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, team. And staff, when I said use timers, I mean use timers. I don't care whether it is me talking, Tim talking, Tom talking, Nick talking, pop up the reminder. We don't need to do an alarm, but we do need a two-minute reminder, otherwise we don't get through everything.

Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A whole bunch of points. I'll be very brief. Number one, for the workshop, some of us will not be there because of conflicts, including Seun because there's an Auctions Proceeds CCWG that we have to attend.

A number of points – Tom started off with the statement, "Some people think we've made progress, but some people think there's more to be done." Those are not exclusive. Please, I find that deeply offensive because I happen to believe both of those. So saying it is them versus us is not appropriate.

The concept of voting is interesting. Recognize we have some RALOs which virtually never vote. So the vote ain't worth a lot in some of those cases.

You talk about the substantive part of our work being PCs and advice to the Board. We rarely give advice to the Board. We've done maybe two in the last two years, okay? We do respond to PCs – a modest number of them – and a decreasing number. But that's not our main work. Our main work is influencing the discussions as they're ongoing. When we have to put a strong comment into a PC or, heaven help us, advice to the Board, we've failed. Now some PCs aren't to do with ongoing public comments, but for those that are, it's really a failure not a success.

Again, Tom started off saying there's a limited number of people, but many times in Tim's intervention, in your report where you talk about the Summits will not scale to the large number of people [being] involved, you can't have it both ways.

Either we're going to attract a huge number of people or there is a very limited scope.

If I may finish, please.

I'll stop there. There are more points, but you say we don't understand your model and many of us perhaps don't. But I think there's still a really great misunderstanding of the business we're in, and by talking about our job being advice to the Board is completely misunderstanding the business we're in and where we spend our time. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tim, if you don't mind I'm going to ask if I can get a few extra questions collected and then ITEMS can respond to a couple of things. I suspect some of the matters people have put their hands up for may cluster together and you may be able to respond at that time.

Alan, we will put you back on the bottom of the queue because I know you have more to raise, and we are now going to close the queue after Alan revisits it.

Next we have Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm going to speak in French. First a question to Tom. Thank you for your presentation and for your excellent work you made. I don't think that we all – the RALO, the ALAC members – didn't understand very well what you're proposing. I think – and believe me – that some people have really well read your report and understood what you said in the report.

I wasn't to ask a question to Tom. What is what you call an Empowered Member? There are very well defined criteria? I'm among the people who participated in 2003 in [Tunis]. I was invited as Civil Society representative to think about the ALAC implementation. Roberto Gaetano was also there, and we spoke about the ALAC base, and the ALAC base was the [representativity] of the persons who already had a kind of work made locally for their communities at the local level. So we thought, automatically, we thought about organization that we called ALS later on and it was better [than] to have a person somewhere in the world who [he's inscripted] on the mailing list, who [made things] for his country or his community but we never know what [he has done].

So I think this changing is not very good. Maybe I didn't understand it well, but I'm among the one who are skeptical about that because the [basis], the [aim] of ALAC was the [representativity] of persons who already are representing or already have credibility in their own community. And I think that

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

it's very important to represent a community, an association, or some people who are working on human development. And this is my question. I'd like to understand that because it was our problem. I know that Holly is going to say that I have to finish here, so I'm finishing here. But in AFRALO we have some individual questions to ask. Okay, I'm finished.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Aziz, that's sort of a universal symbol for "time."

[AZIZ HILALI]:   In my country [just to until] –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Until then we'll come up with – we'll work out something. What we might also do one day is get a clock which means you can look at the table and talk and not have to look at the screen and talk, which is not natural in this set-up. Perhaps staff might think about that because it would be nice and the same could be said for public forums. They have the clocks in places that people aren't focusing. But we might fix that as well.

Can I ask, Olivier, having heard the last two questions, will your question cluster with that? It will? In which case I want to take your question then I want to go back to ITEMS for responses on

that set of three interventions. Then we have another three interventions to deal with before we go back to Alan. So we sort of split up our time. I've got it. It's fine. Okay.[Aseal], all yours.

He said it would match.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Did you call my name? I heard [Aseal].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I just thought I was renamed some other name I didn't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm summoning a demon – it's Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. It's just actually a very short comment, and I'm going to not be emotional about it. I wasn't going to intervene first but when I heard Tim McGinnis tell us about bringing At-Large back to its roots 19 years ago, I fell off my seat. I was there at the time. I recall that it was a blood bath. I consciously refused to take part in any ICANN discussion until 2008 because of the blood bath at the time. It was not

welcoming to any newcomers. There were just a bunch of – beep. It just has the flavor of, "Let's make our country great again" – this inaccurate notion that things were better in the past and I'm really sorry, I don't subscribe to it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Whoa! Okay. Who's going to take that? Tim? Tom?

TIM MCGINNIS: I'll take that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go, Tim.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Olivier. I guess to answer Alan's questions, we have never suggested in our report that we would have hordes and hordes of people. I think that's a misunderstanding. We are expecting a modest increase. In fact, we're expecting the people who are in this room and are listening and who currently participate in At-Large to participate as ALMs. Whether they are working with their current ALS and that ALS becomes an ALM or whether they choose to work as individual ALMs, that's up to them. It's just [going to be a] modest increase. I'm guessing 10%, but that's just my random guess – a 10% growth at least initially.

So it's going to be crucial for the current users to participate, I think.

And the second question, I guess our – and maybe an answer to Seun's question about what was our bias – is maybe that the individual end user is the unit of policy making, and we didn't have any preconceived notions that there needed to be a vetted entity that was well-known and working in their communities to participate in Internet policy making.

The third question is, for Olivier, that wasn't the point of the EMM, but it was just a realization that just came to me in the last week that, "Boy, this is what we've done. We've turned them back to the original role," without the blood-bathy aspects, I may add. We cut out all the blood-bathy stuff but left all the good stuff, we hope.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think Tom wants to react as well to that, but we also need to continue moving it on. So reset of the clock. Over to you, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE: Aziz, you asked a very specific question about the ALSes, and I think Nick has actually got some more information which he can give you about this transition, if you like, or this switch to a focus on more individual end users. And I think for one thing, is that

we acknowledge that there is a credibility and that in certain regions of the world and as far as certain ALSes are concerned, there has definitely been some very good work that has been carried out by those ALSes on the grass roots kind of work. And that needs to be maintained. And we believe that we have maintained. That particular aspect of the EMM could even be slightly involved between now and the end of the review process.

But the reason why the switch we felt to individual members was important was because we really sensed that, for one thing, the fact that [it's] non-uniform around the world and that it's one set of rules in Africa, a different set of rules in Asia, that really means to say that it's de facto a non-level playing field for end users around the world. If you're an end user in Asia it's relatively one set of rules and it's another set of rules elsewhere. That seems to be, for one thing, problematic and we would like to have just one set of rules for everyone – one set of simple rules for getting engaged.

And then, as I say, we'll go into the details during the workshop, but it's a simple mechanism for end users to wake up – for a scholar at the University of Berlin – to say, "Hey, wait a minute. This is an issue that I want to take part in," and at the next ICANN meeting in three weeks' time he can participate, get involved in working groups, and quickly become, if it turns out that he's an

interesting and worthy potential member of the community, become what we have described as a rapporteur.

NICK THORNE: Thanks, Cheryl. I shall be very brief, and please forgive me if it sounds rather punchy in that we have thought through a number of the questions which have been asked. We've also talked to many, many, people around this table. Most of our recommendations come from the survey, from interviews, and from conversations, we've had. We haven't been able to take on all of your views, but most of the ideas in our report come from other people and from objective inputs. I think it's time we reminded all of us of that. But that means that some of you, of course, didn't get on the right side of the argument, so your views weren't represented in the report.

On the issue of how the ALM will work, anybody can be an ALM. The ALM candidate will ask his RALO for a package of information of what he can do and how he can contribute. Yes, there will need to be a transition – Seun, your point. We can't just suddenly change everything overnight. There will need to be RALO people who can hand out information and accept ALMs. The ALM can then decide to what degree they want to become involved in the work of ICANN. I say that in the broadest sense. It will be for ALAC to decide, probably on an annual basis, how

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

many rapporteurs they need to represent ALAC views and to pull in information from the major working groups operating around the ICANN system.

Who will be eligible to be a rapporteur? Individuals will need to demonstrate their willingness to make actual contributions over a period of time. We don't want to get into micromanagement, but we will give you some ideas on the sort of objective criteria which could be monitored by staff. Staff would then, simply collecting statistics according to objective criteria, report to the group we have named the "Council of Elders" – which is essentially term-limited members of ALAC – and it will be for them to decide who will be eligible to A) get a vote and B) be a rapporteur.

The rapporteur tends to come first because if the rapporteur has demonstrated their ability to make a reasonable contribution, they will then, as it were, graduate to being a voting member.

I'm going to stop there. We'll walk you through all of this at the workshop on Wednesday. I hope as many of you as possible will come. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Nick. And just to remind you all where we are in the queue and what we're trying to do with our time management

today, we have three remaining cards up. Thank you, Aziz. I was going to ask you about that. We are going to be looking first at Humberto then Alberto, then over to a short intervention from Siva and Sarah, and then come back to Alan. And I don't want it to be any later than quarter past the hour when that happens. So at quarter past the hour, we should be handing back to ITEMS for them to respond to your interventions. So please be as concise as you possibly can.

In the remaining half hour we have some other recommendations to look at. Over to you, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I'm going to speak in Spanish.

I will be very brief. That's why I took some notes, and I will try to express my concerns as briefly as possible.

My concerns are in regards to the report. From the LACRALO Chair perspective, I would like to thank ITEMS because you have allowed us to activate the LACRALO members' activity. You should see the amount of comments that we are receiving right now. All expectations have been achieved, and this report has re-activated the participation of many LACRALO members who have never turned up in the meetings.

EN

We also have a working group within LACRALO to provide feedback for a declaration that Chairs are preparing. So everything that is being criticized here, this resulted in a working group to provide feedback for this report.

I'm a little bit concerned mainly about one of the presumptions about the fact of having 15 ALAC members and to eliminate two ALAC members according to the model that we have right now. We will be using the Chair and Secretary to be part of the ALAC.

I'm sorry, I'm reading the web page. Sorry, I'm reading the page – page 66 of the report – this is "Composition of ALAC" – the 15 ALAC members. Sorry for that. Do you have the report? Do you have the page there?

What I wanted to say is this because I'm wasting my time right now. What I wanted to say is that the President, the Chair, and the Secretary, that will be ALAC members will be so overloaded with work that they won't be able to comply with their obligations in the RALOs. So what will happen with the monthly meetings? Are they going to be eliminated? Are we going to modify the MoUs? What happens with geographical representation? Many members come from Argentina and from Brazil. Are they going to be creating a new RALO because they will be the ones having the voting rights?

This model is based on the fact that all users are experts. So I'm just providing my point of view according to what I have read. I belong to the academia. I am understanding and interpreting the text. From my perspective, the model will deepen the representation issues that we have with [least] developing countries. I have many more suggestions but I will stop here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Alberto, go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO: I will try not to be emotional. I will speak about facts. Our ALSes, we organize regional, international, and national, and local events. We have agreements with governments, organizations, we receive invitations to participate in different events at a local, international, and regional level. When it comes to end users, we give them, for example, e-books, we deliver face-to-face courses and radio and TV courses.

There is only one ALS with more than [1,900] Fellows and more than 50,000 Fellows virtually speaking. There is another ALS with 800 members and we have more than [9,000] votes. This means that only eight members reach more than 90,000 members

because they are voting on Internet issues, on technology issues, they are also voting on the consumer defense on Internet.

So my question would be, how many individual members will be required to do what these ALSes do? How would you consider diversity in this case? Because if we modify everything that is being modified, how diversity will be considered? Because we are respecting that in ICANN. Thank you.

Sorry, there is one more question. What is the exact accurate experience that you have? What is your experience when it comes to the model that you are proposing?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Siva, you have a very short intervention please. Go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN METHUSAMY: I'm always asked to be very brief. I'll take two minutes, okay.

The [central to your] report was the criticism about the power structure. What [will be] your criticism? [Such] a power structure [worked]. It was needed. But for such a power structure, At-Large would have ceased to exist. That is one of the very important points and I think Tim could understand that.

Secondly, you talked about empowering individuals as opposed to empowering individuals [inaudible] led to the problem of capture. The new process of selecting a rapporteur and then empowering selected members could also be [gamed] if someone wants to capture At-Large. But what gives me the relief is that Nick [Thomas] was talking about a certain type of oversight, and if that oversight was very well thought of, then all my comments could be dropped. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sarah, go ahead please.

SARAH KIDEN: I have a few comments. I want to start with leadership positions. There's a comment you made about leadership positions and people not wanting succession. I think that's a total misunderstanding. From the outside that's how it looks, but I'm an example of succession and ALAC leadership has been very helpful in trying to get us up to speed.

The other thing is I'm still trying to understand the difference between the new proposed model and the current model, but I look forward to the session on Wednesday. I hope I'll learn a lot. But why was it believed that the current At-Large Structures do not allow end users to participate in policy development?

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

And then there was a comment about getting the same set of rules across the board. I think it's impossible. We deal with so many issues. We have different problems. For example, an ALS in North America may not have access problems hindering their participation, but in Africa I have a problem of access hindering my participation. So I think it's difficult to get the same set of rules across the board. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent point, Sarah. And I'd like to note that is a perfect example of succession. We've seen Sarah take regional leadership positions and we trust will be stepping up to other leadership positions in a very fast track. And yes, I guess it is because she does the work. But she's being nurtured, if not more than encouraged. Tijani, that's the way I would describe your working with Sarah is doing. He's working very hard to replace himself and to find other Sarahs – not necessarily of her excellent gender which, of course, for gender equity would be my preference – but it may not be obvious succession planning but I think the people who are moving through the ranks are finding it very fast track, probably almost too fast at times.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Plus one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going now back to Alan, then I want to go to your responses to that set of questions, and we do want to leave some minutes for other issues because we have really only just touched the Membership Model. It was a biggie. It needs to be dealt with.

Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And I'll talk as quickly as I dare with the interpreters.

Number one, you quoted a lot of what you were told. There are a number of instances demonstrably where you either misunderstood or believed someone who was very poorly informed. We can talk offline. If you want specific instances I can give them to you.

In terms of rules across the board, the ICANN Bylaws on the At-Large and ALAC very explicitly say we must tailor the rules based on the regional [need] differences. So, yes, the Bylaws could be changed but it was factored in then.

The fact that we have been working on some of these problems – these problems were not unknown to us and we've been working on them for well over a year, and that was not

mentioned anywhere in the report – I think gives the impression that there's a certain slant that we were just oblivious to these things, and I think that left a very bad taste in some peoples' minds.

The fact that you are calling this the "Empowered Membership," "Empowered" is a very hot word in ICANN right now and we have mentioned a number of times that this will wave red flags at other parts of the community. And again, we strongly advise, you want to keep the model, fine, but change the name because otherwise it is going to be a real problem because of the Empowered Community and the abilities that that truly Empowered Community has.

Lastly, you're talking about perhaps 10% growth. Again, I'll remind you that in various places in the report including the section on Summits, you say because you're expecting such large growth that that concept will not scale, and it certainly would scale with a 10% growth, that we need a single story. If all we're expecting is 10% growth, you're suggesting a rather large number of changes, which I don't think are warranted given the modest growth you're looking for. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Can I ask Leon who snuck his hand up, is it necessary for you to go now or do you need to be first in the queue after ITEMS responds to these questions?

LEON SANCHEZ: I can be first in the queue after.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You may be the first among many then, Leon. Back to you, ITEMS.

TOM MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. That was lots of questions there. Perhaps I could start with the concerns that were expressed by Humberto and Alberto in Latin America. We have had the privilege – thanks to Rosa – for really a very detailed reporting, if you like, of the situation in Latin America, and we do understand that there are many very active ALSes who are doing incredible work on the ground. And that is a dynamic which should certainly be maintained and encouraged, and we do hope and trust that the EMM will build on that incredible dynamic which to a certain extent you have put in place.

What Alberto, you followed up by saying, was that you had concerns about the multiplying effect of allowing individual end

users to become members. And so you mentioned ALSes which have tens of thousands of members or hundreds of members and the effect that that might have if all of those people suddenly become members. The answer to that is – what I'll just say to that point, if your concern is about the numbers of people, we do not expect for a…

UNIDENTIFIED MALE/FEMALE: [Inaudible].

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. That was not your point? Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alberto, please make that point clear for us please now.

ALBERTO SOTO: I was only asking how many users – I have no problem with the incorporation of new users – but what I mean is, how many users would we need to be incorporated so that we replace what we are doing with ALSes as a form of multiplication? It would be an exponential multiplication. How many users do we need? That is, your model says they would be multiplied, and so we are multiplying them by 100 or by 1,000. That's the issue. What experience is there in this model? That is a concrete question.

TOM MACKENZI: The question correctly is –

ROSA DELGADO: Can I answer that?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, sure.

ROSA DELGADO: Yes, hello. I will try to answer that question, but also I would like to congratulate the region. I think they've been working very hard, and I see that from all the comments. But I think with this model we [don't try] to eliminate the ALSes. The ALSes will continue to be ALS. The difference will be that the representative of the ALS will become the representative also the individual – the ALM. The rest of the work done by ALSes doesn't need to be replaced or doesn't need to be [inaudible] so I think I am correct that the ALSes will continue. The problem is you know they have to live together, and that's the reason I think we shouldn't try to analyze in the way that the ALSes will disappear. They will not disappear from the model.

Regarding the role of the RALO, I think the RALOs will have a different [prevailing] model and in this new model and

especially because the main issue will be the outreach and engagement of users. And of course there will be [coming two hats]. I think that will be, as Humberto mentioned, [we'll] have the problem.

We haven't set up all the details still of the model, so I think we need to really continue working on this situation and I think it's more or less what I can say. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tim, go ahead.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Cheryl. The other question – you had two questions – was about geography. There's no change to the geography that we're proposing. You are still LACRALO, and you said that there will be voting. You had a question about that. In the EMM, voting is based on activity. So we're not saying, "Well, you have 90,000 members. You get 90,000 individuals." We have based voting on those At-Large members – and maybe Nick is going to say a few words about voting – those active At-Large members are the ones who are enfranchised.

Nick, do you want to expound on that?

NICK THORNE: I'm repeating myself, I think. But let me try and deal with a couple of issues. Nobody is trying to get rid of ALSes. You already have different sized ALSes. Some consist of one or two members. Some consist of nearly 2,000. So both of those ALSes have a similar weight of vote in the existing system. Under the EMM – and again, I'll repeat myself quickly – any individual can become an ALM. It will be based upon the participation performance of that individual, and that will be monitored by [Siva] by some grown-ups, namely the COE – the Council of Elders. It will be on the basis of their participation that they will gain #1) eligibility to be appointed rapporteur and #2) to get a vote in essentially elections for their RALO.

I've limited myself to some very specific issues. I hope that's helpful. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You have a right of reply and follow-up, [Alberto].

[ALBERTO SOTO]: I think you did not get the point. I'm going to give you an example because we definitely agree with that. We've always believed that the person who needs to take a position is a person who has been participating actively, and we fully agree with that 100%. But what we want to say is that in the case of

our RALO, there is a country like Argentina that has thousands of RALOs – maybe not thousands, but it has many more than the rest of the countries in the region, so nine – and this means they have nine individual votes already versus Bolivia that has only one. So if all the individual members in Argentina agree, they can take the positions with the system that you are proposing. That's all I wanted to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] mull it over and give it due consideration, I'm sure.

Olivier, go ahead. [Two minutes].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Sorry for jumping on this, but I think the question is – and you've been [turning] around it – but the question is, is the weight of a vote from an individual the same as the weight of a vote of an At-Large Structure that has 10,000 members? If it is, then I find that to be a bit odd.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nick, go on.

NICK THORNE: The straight answer is yes, and as I just tried to explain, we already have a situation where you have different sized ALSes,

each with a single vote. They are not given weight according to their size.

Olivier, I entirely agree that this cannot be perfect. It isn't. But we see no way around the option of bringing this back down to the basic of an individual. If you have an ALS with 1,100 members, those members can choose to be represented by one individual or they can – all 800 of them or whatever – say, "I want to be an ALM," and they will be judged upon their contributions and their performance to see whether or not they are eligible to vote.

Again, I hope that's been clear. I've tried to keep it short.

TOM MACKENZIE: The only thing I would add to that was that generally speaking, we've assumed that ALSes are mainly involved in outreach and engagement kinds of activities, grass roots kinds of activity, in the different regions and that in our model in any case, what [we are] ALMs – the individuals – they are mainly, but not exclusively, but mainly people, individuals, from all sections of society who feel that they have some contribution to make more in the policy. So it's more in the bottom-up kind of side of your work. So there is definitely a top-down and a bottom-up side to what you're doing. The ALSes is more groundwork. The ALMs are more in the kind of bottom-up policy development work. And we have

really, the emphasis that we have tried to put on the ALMs – or the individuals – is to really make it, is to simplify, the way in which they can get involved.

What we have seen is that in the current system there is a fairly complex set of rules for becoming – you don't necessarily have to become a member of an ALS – but it's strongly encouraged. The home page of the At-Large organization says that you have to become a member of an ALS. If you don't have an ALS locally, you can create one, but there's a nine-step, incredibly complex and time-consuming process to create your own ALS. We're getting rid of all that.

We're saying to individuals, "Get involved. If it turns out that you are a potentially valuable member of the community, you will quite quickly realize that there are opportunities to become, if you like, 'empowered' by becoming a rapporteur and progressing in that way." But it makes it a lot easier for individuals.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alan, can I ask you – and I know you're standing up now – is your hand still up?

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. So I can ignore you. Excellent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do like ignoring Alan wherever possible.

Those of you around the table, will simply put up with the fact that I'm now being kind and considerate, as shocking as that may be. Jabera, can you now please make your intervention? And what I've also discussed with Holly – Holly and I agree – we're just going to run this topic to the end of the session now and we will take questions in addition to this directly to Holly and I. We will consolidate them and we'll make sure they get to ITEMS.

Okay, so let's run with this topic because it's obviously important. Questions on other topics we will collect – e-mail staff, e-mail Holly and I. We'll manage it.

Jabera, please. Over to you.

EN

MATOGORO JABERA: I have followed the discussion that's going on, and I found time to go through the report and I would like to read one of the comments. "Newcomers find it difficult to get involved. Global awareness regarding the organization is poor, and it would appear that Internet end users do not properly understand the role played by At-Large in defending their interests."

I think the comment I could make is that the team could have a point, but the issue is that we need to check the current model, how can it be improved? Because even if we have the Empowered Member Model, if there is [inaudible] awareness among the end user, then it will not make sense. The issue is that, how do we increase the end user awareness [inaudible] within the community?

Because, for example, I'm the lecturer from the university. You find most of the students, most of the faculties, are not aware of the At-Large and of the activity that's being done. So changing the name, it does not make sense, but increasing the awareness [inaudible] within the communities, then it will bring up more members.

For example, I'm also very recently selected to represent the [RSSAC] in the Security, Stability, and the Resilience Review Team. But you find even most of the end users they are not aware on how the security is being affected within the Internet.

ICANN 58 COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

So the awareness [inaudible] it can be taken as an [inaudible], but changing the name of the model it may not make that much difference. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Appreciate that from, can I just say, a relative newcomer? That's important to note because you have an equal voice in these rooms. It really is very important.

Can I ask, now we seem to be taking a little more time on this topic, if we can go through and check our speaking list because I need to make sure ITEMS have enough time to respond? So let's not load up the questions too many, otherwise we won't get to hear the responses. And that's very, very, important. Don't worry about it, Holly.

At the moment – I'm going back to my promise to let Leon be the first among many. He's a patient man, thank heavens. We have Leon, we have Tijani, we have Maureen, I do not believe we have Seun, I believe he's put his hand down, and we are going to go to Yrjö, and then back to Alan.

Okay, but I do see Yrjö.

Hello. Who are you waving about?

HOLLY RAICHE: [Is it] online?

[HEIDI ULLRICH]:   No. I want to get in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright. I suppose we can let Heidi have a talk. We'll think about that, Heidi. We'll see how we go.

Leon, to you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl. My question is very short. How does the ITEMS team see that disbanding the current working groups of the At-Large community will help better represent the users' interests? I say this because in working groups is where the users coordinate and have an articulated vision to the different topics that are being discussed on the ICANN-wide community.

So if we tear these working groups apart – I also wanted to point that having working groups within the At-Large community does not exclude At-Large participants to actually have an active role within the ICANN-wide working groups. So they are not exclusive. It's not an either/or. They are complementing.

To me, when you say that you want to dismantle these working groups, would mean to effectively silence the community of At-Large users because then you won't be able to have a coordinated and an articulated view from the At-Large community to then be taken up to the different working groups ICANN-wide-wise.

So that was my question: how do you see this increasing the representation that the At-Large community is supposed to reflect or to feed into the different working groups ICANN-wide?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. ITEMS are chafing at the bit to respond, so let's get a response at this point. Go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE: Thank you, Leon. We realized that this was going to be a recommendation that would elicit quite strong reactions, and sure enough it did. The reason why we did this was because, first of all, there was an observation that a lot of time was being spent, a lot of volunteer time was being spent, on these working groups. And we wanted to find a way, a measure, which was perhaps a dramatic, a radical, measure, but which would force the community to abandon a lot of what we perceived as an inward-looking mechanism and oblige the community to be

exclusively focused on the Cross Community Working Groups and other ICANN working groups.

Then, because we do understand that the community has – there are linguistic communities. There are all sorts of things – but to organize themselves in a more ad hoc way if you have kind of splinter groups or side groups that want to address issues, but really there was a feeling that the reasonably structured internal working group mechanism could be done away with.

We appreciate this kind of criticism of that recommendation, and we will continue to be taking into account these kinds of views.

LEON SANCHEZ: [May I] make a quick follow-up, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes [inaudible].

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you – just 10 seconds. So would it be fair to say that maybe the recommendation should read that we should strive to make our working groups more efficient rather than disbanding them?

TOM MACKENZIE: That's one possible – No, actually the recommendation is that you should put a complete freeze on the creation of working groups. Tim and I had another discussion this morning with a prominent member of the At-Large community whose name we shall not divulge in the name of the Chatham House Rule, but there was a suggestion during that conversation that there has been a proliferation of working groups. It's not that the idea for the creation was a bad idea in the first place. It was a legitimate idea. But as far as we understand, the original idea was to have maybe one or two working groups, the purpose of which was to onboard people into At-Large – to provide them with a landing pad to learn about and get up to speed with the issues that are being dealt with within At-Large.

As we've shown in our report, that initial idea of having just one or two working groups has clearly gone haywire because there are at least 20 – I can't remember the exact figure – what are listed as "active" working groups, many of which are not doing much work at all. They have a very low level of activity. And we've questioned whether all this proliferation of working groups has been a good thing for At-Large, and so we think you should really go right back and that's hence the drastic nature of our recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So noted. Did you want to speak specific to this, Tijani? Okay, so then Tijani and then Maureen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I have to leave…I have to…thank you very much.

First of all, Nick, you said that everything in the report come from the input you got from the interviews. I understand that and the problem is not from the inputs, it is from the conclusion you draw from inputs.

I disagree with Tom when he says that if something is true in Asia, it is not true in Africa. He see that as a problematic issue. I see it as enrichment and we need it. Diversity is our – we are diverse and we need to consider the diversity. If you change the organization into individual members, this will make a big problem of diversity because who are the individuals who are involved? You can see ICANN here. Most of them come from the North. Because in the South they have problem of connectivity, they have problem of means to participate, and the ALSes ensure that. The ALSes are bodies that have a status in their countries, so they are already established and they [can] afford to participate. Individuals may not have the same ability to do.

Also, individual members will lead to capture. If I was in [industrial] for example, if I was a registry, I will try to make a lot of people from my community subscribe and become members of At-Large so that because now At-Large have one voice in the Empowered Community in ICANN. So that they can ensure that the voice of At-Large can vote for them since the individual members can come from anywhere. There is no – how can you ensure that the individual member is At-Large, is an end user? Everyone is an end user. Everyone. Even if I am a registry, I am an end user also. This is another problem.

The last point is about the rapporteurs. You said that an ALS may become an ALM. Very fine. So an ALS cannot be a rapporteur. An ALS is not a person. An ALS will not have any vote in the future because it cannot be a rapporteur. It's not a person. It's an entity. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ladies and gentlemen, we have five minutes left, six speakers listed, and at this stage ITEMS would actually like to respond to a few things.

So much for the time management being successful. I'm going to ask for a one-minute clock. I'm going to suggest that we collect the six speakers' inputs with one-minute clock, and I'm going to ask the indulgence of ITEMS to then take a little bit of extra time

HOLLY RAICHE: Maureen's off the list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So if Maureen's off the list, she can put her card down and that leaves five people. Seun, over to you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Since we are short of time, I would just like to say, ITEMS, we will be responding to the report. Please this time around look at them. Look at our responses and react to them. [See them] as honest responses, and please treat them as such and let us have an input/impact on your report. I'd like to start with that.

I also would like to note that I'm speaking here solely as At-Large, not as any other hat that I may wear, especially the numbers community, especially consider that ITEMS is doing a report for numbers for the NRO.

One last point, Nick, I just want to say that you said all your report is based on the feedback you've gotten from us or from

ICANN|58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

any other person, but I hate to say that I would like to ask for who said what. But again, I don't think most of the comment or your report is reflective of what the majority of us in At-Large said during the interview. Because I'm surprised. I'm concerned about that. I'm not saying you should display who said what, but again, it's not reflective of it. And when we ask ourselves informally, "Did you say this? Did you say that?" Nobody said - they said they didn't. It's a serious concern and I wonder why. So maybe [it's At-Large that's having] the problem or maybe it's just ITEMS that is not telling us what data they are using. I'm sorry about that, but [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We have run out of time, thank heavens, Seun.

Alan, can I ask, would you care to be the last speaker in the queue?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't care.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'd like you to be because you've probably got a couple summation points. So if I can go to Yrjö, and then I'll be going to Alberto. So Yrjö, please.

YRJO LANSIPURO: ALSes are an asset to the ICANN – an asset – not something that to get rid of because they are all, or mostly all, established organizations in their own context and they have influence. And since they are affiliated with ICANN, we can assume that in the local context, in the multistakeholder national context, they are friends of ICANN. They put in a good word for ICANN in those debates that influence the national standpoint represented in GAC and elsewhere, and ITU, and so on and so forth. So please remember that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Next we have Olivier, and then we'll be coming back to Alberto.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I have a question for Tom. One of the missions of the ALAC is to provide consensus advice, to bring consensus in the community to come up with a single point of view that reflects the consensus to whatever process it is that it is commenting on. Without working groups, how is it going to be able to do that? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, I know you're keen but hold that pen [and] the paper and we'll come back to it.

Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Following with the working groups, working groups are created due to needs, not due to quantity. We cannot say that we need to have one or two working groups. Up to now, most of us have agreed on the fact that we have problems and that we have to fix those problems in the working groups. So this means to optimize working groups.

Tom said that he spoke with one member and that this recommendation will be kept perhaps, so my question is, are you going to proceed with all recommendations? Is there any majority explaining this? I'm going to say something that I didn't want to say. I said that this was already done but with this, this is something that is already done. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rosa and Nick can go for it for however they like, but for no more than 10 minutes.

Alan?

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Regarding what Alberto just said, I really don't want answers from ITEMS here. I want them to go away and think and talk about it and not make an on-the-fly commitment.

A couple of issues – there have been issues with our website: how we talk about members, how we list policy issues, how we list working groups. We have said from the very beginning this is a new website, there are significant problems still with it. So we thank you very much for identifying where our website does not make sense or does not match what we say, but usually that's because the website is in error not because we're lying to you. So that's a big difference.

We want consistency in your report please. I already mentioned the issue of the increase in number of people versus statements that it can't scale.

With regard to working groups, you say abolish working groups, but then you say we should start using social media more. We should find new messaging tools. We should do more outreach. Those are working groups. I guess we should appoint a social media king, and they can do the work for us. Working groups are how ICANN does its job, period. We're spending a lot of time working. You should see how many hours the GNSO spends in working groups compared to council meetings. There's a factor

of 100 or 1,000. That is where the work is done that is where we should be spending our time. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just before we go to ITEMS, I've had a plea and I'm feeling extraordinarily generous. Another 60-second intervention please. Go ahead.

AIDA NOBLIA: I am quite new in ICANN. I don't want to repeat any comments. I would like to thank ITEMS because you have been very [inaudible] with all your comments. We see [what you see] but you have received information and according to your methodology that is the perception that you had. And now what you are receiving here is a new or a different perception from another group, and this should be complementary or supplementary to your work.

So as not to repeat other comments, from my modest point of view I believe there is a problem in terms of a structure, but at least a problem with the functioning of the At-Large Structure. You have both point of view so you should solve this and analyze the situation, but more than the ALS structure and the RALO structure this has to do with the working, the functioning, of the structure. We have to improve the functioning of the structure.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

So how can we improve the functions without changing the structure? Well, by means of training, by means of outreach, and by means of accountability.

I think these are the three main points to be taken into account in order to improve the functioning of the structure. Of course, we thank you for your input, but we have been working on that as well.

Another comment – this issue of the mentors and the individual participation, this already exists. This caught my attention because we are now undergoing a situation in which we are promoting, brainstorming, we are promoting working groups. And of course I do understand that you want to provide us with solutions. We are proposing solutions, individual solutions, but we are on [an era] when we are talking about collective work.

I don't want to take more time, and thank you for your work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And thank you for raising some very important points. I know ITEMS will appreciate that.

I'm going to, I assume, go to you, Tim because you were keen to respond to a couple of things. But I – yes, Holly. Go ahead, Javier, very briefly.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Just quickly, recently we had really interesting cross community conversations in the Leadership Program, and one thing that came through really clearly is that I felt a consensus in the community that people agree that structures are good in ICANN and that what needs to be done in ICANN is optimization of current processes. And I felt that really, really, strongly. People are tired of moving stuff around after the Transition. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That was lovely and brief. What I was going to ask – and assuming, Tim, I am still going to you next unless someone waves at me from the team to say no – if you could consider what you need to respond to now and what you might want to wish to make sure you feature in your Wednesday work because you've probably got a few ideas of, "Oh, we need to go deeper into that," not just for us but for the communities. So make some smart choices and use as few minutes as possible. Over to you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Cheryl. I just wanted to address the two most egregious comments. Tijani suggested that, how can ALSes be rapporteurs since they're not human beings? That's silly. An ALS

could decide to be an ALM with one person as their point person, as is the current status quo. That's how you work now. And that At-Large Member can simply be a rapporteur. There seems to be willfulness in misunderstanding amongst some on the Review Working Party that I hope we work through on Wednesday.

To Siva's point of capture, the capture's not at all possible. We designed it to be capture-proof. Can't do it. Tried 100 ways. Just not possible.

So we have a number of other questions. I've come to the right set of questions from Alberto's 90,000 members can still be reached – [that was] your question – the exact same way they're reached now. There's no change to diversity. And you asked the question what experience is there with the Empowered Membership Model? Well, there is, I guess, the same amount of experience as with the Empowered Community that has recently been adopted.

I think those are the main points. Leon had a very good question, so one more – how does disbanding working groups better represent users' interests? Well, it doesn't better represent users' interests. What it does is it gets you to refocus on the things that are mentioned in the Bylaws.

So there's near universal agreement that At-Large spends too much time on internal processes and far too many internal

working groups: 95% of people we surveyed in interviews told us that. So we said, "Oh, well, how do we fix that?" The common sense way is the most direct approach. So Recommendation #7 – and Nick might want to expand on this – "At-Large should abandon existing internal working groups and discourage their creation in the future as they are a distraction from the actual policy advice role of At-Large."

So the rationale is in the recommendation. Nick, did you want to add something?

NICK THORNE: Thanks. I'd like to deal with three things, the third having just come from Tim.

On working groups, our concern and the concern of many of our interlocutors was that in its current working methods ALAC and At-Large in general spends too much time on internal procedural issues. And a lot of those working groups have been set up to deal with internal procedural issues. We will look closely at the wording of our recommendation, but as Tim just read it out, it says, "Do away with what you've got at the moment and discourage their creation in the future."

That might be too much diplomatic language and it was probably me who wrote it given my background. But what that

means is, you do away with what you've got at the moment and you only recreate the minimum. At least that's how I would interpret it. But we will look again and if it needs to be made clearer, we'll do that.

The two other things – Yrjö, I think my friend you may have come a little bit later to the conversation and that I did explain earlier on in response to a question that we have no intention at all of in any way doing away with the current ALS structures. We still have to write our recommendations on outreach on the downstream side where ALSes are so important and so much of the good work is done. We will let you have those recommendations in the last version of our report, but broadly we want to make things better, and we'll be recommending that the ICANN community gets together in a more effective fashion and includes At-Large in that process in the policy making process and in making it happen in a sort of corporate, ICANN way rather than in the rather bitty way in which it's happening at the moment. But we do recognize the importance of the contribution made by ALSes.

My final point, Seun, my friend. Everything that comes out of this room is taken seriously, and of course it's regarded as an honest reaction. There is no question of our being cynical in the way in which we have reacted to any reaction from anyone that we've

spoken to, listened to, or had a beer with – the latter only applies to me, of course.

But I have to say to you that life is such that we heard lots of things which you probably wouldn't like. And the same applies to most people around this table. There will always be something you didn't like that somebody else was saying. That's why you have objective, external, reviewers because sometimes herding the cats gets a bit too difficult. I'm sorry to use very basic language, but what I'm saying to you is that we didn't put anything in our report which we hadn't heard. And the things that went into our report have mostly been heard pretty often. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tom, 60 seconds on summation.

TOM MACKENZIE: Oh, 60 seconds, alright then. Just really to confirm what Nick has just said. People do speak a lot more freely when we're on a one-to-one than you probably are between yourselves. And so we heard probably stronger views than you are accustomed to hearing just among yourselves. So that might explain partly your objection to some of the things that we wrote in the report.

I don't really want to add much more, apart from just a thank you for this meeting and to say that we are going to be around all this week to continue to engage and exchange with you regarding these objections you have to certain aspects of the model that we've proposed.

I'd really just like to finish just by putting to you how different would a meeting like this look in an EMM type of scenario? And actually what you would have is that you would have the 15 members of the ALAC would all be here and those people would probably be the same people, in the early stages of the EMM at least, that you are seeing today. But the one new thing, the new faces that you would probably see, are the people who start to move up through the process. And those are these ALMs who have been actively engaged in working group activity within ICANN for at least three months and who volunteered to become what we have described as a rapporteur and who get travel support to attend ICANN meetings.

So you suddenly get a fresh load of faces. You get at least 10 faces probably that are new faces turning up to your meetings that are supported with travel funding. And we've sort of integrated that into the model.

So we really do believe that we have – I'll stop with that – we have a model which gives support to your existing community

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

but while bringing in fresh new faces on a regular basis. Thank you very much. We remain at your disposal to carry on the discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I ask you ladies and gentlemen to put your hands together to show our thanks to the ITEMS team, and what we know is a tough job. But keep your applause going and if you're like me because I need to be upstanding for our unbelievably patient interpretation team.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are nothing without you and you have a well-deserved break overdue. Thank you, thank you, and good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]