
COPENHAGEN – At-Large Review Working Party meeting
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 – 11:00 to 12:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning. This is the At-Large Review Working Party meeting, March 14, 11:00 A.M.

HOLLY RAICHE: Folks, we're already a bit late, and we've got a lot to get through. Can we start this meeting very soon, please? If you'll all take your seats, as many of you as can attend.

Okay. Thank you. Some ground rules here. Where we are up to in the process: we are now looking at a draft of our response. This is the ALAC response – it is not the RALO response – to the review. We are looking at Maureen's draft. She used as the basis for the draft Alan's draft. It was revised basically on the instruction of everybody around this table. It is a much tighter document and I think raises most of the issues. So that's the document we'll be working with.

Now, if anything has been left out, if anything has been left unsaid that you think should be said, you really have from now until Wednesday evening to say something. Where we're going

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.

from here: we're going to take away all the comments made today on Maureen's draft. Tomorrow, as you are aware, there is an open session with ITEMS talking about this review. At least some of us will be there taking notes. Any points that are made can be incorporated into our final draft.

The expectation is that we will have a pretty much final draft by Wednesday evening. That's not saying it's completely perfect, but it's saying that all the elements should be there.

Where we are up to now is just the final gathering of everybody's thoughts. I first of all have to thank everybody. First of all, I was really pleased with all the people who have responded through the various methods, whether it's an e-mail or Skype or on the Google Docs or on the wiki or whatever. I was very pleased with the number of people and the thought that was put into it.

I would like to personally thank Alan for getting all of those thoughts down on paper because that was a huge job. I'd also like to thank Maureen because of getting through and refining it to something that is a little bit more compact without losing much. As I said, I invite everybody around this table, if we left something out, to raise your hand now.

The work today is just on Maureen's draft, and that will be put up on the screen. We are working with Olivier. Olivier is finalizing the other response to the review, which is the RALO response.

It's important that that's finalized and that we work with Olivier to make sure that we're not actually saying contradictory things. I don't think we are. I've had a look at the comments. So far they've been very useful. They've taken a more RALO-centric – as they should – viewpoint. That's fine and that's actually important because a lot of the recommendations had to do with structure, and the RALOs had to speak for that structure.

Before I go any further, I think we will have on the screen Maureen's version. Is this true? Thank you, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sorry. It's coming in one moment. I'm loading it now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we get it distributed? Not all of us can read on the screen.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's also been sent by e-mail to everybody. Is that right, Ariel?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] momentarily.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I just wanted a confirmation that was happening. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Ariel had my firm instructions to do that, and she's such an efficient person that it's been done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cut the crap. Let's get on with it.

HOLLY RAICHE: I would like to just pass on a really interesting comment made to me by Tom last night at the gala when I started to talk about the different characteristics and priorities of the RALOs and why it might be difficult to have a uniform set of rules for At-Large membership. He said to me, which I guess surprised me or maybe it shouldn't have, that, when he realized the different ways in which the RALOs operate, "Well, in that case, the EMM model won't work."

After I picked myself up off the floor and smiled sweetly at him and said, “That’s a very interesting observation,” I thought I would pass that on. I think that one of the things that we now need to put into the draft is to stress the different ways in which the RALOs work, thus making it very difficult to have uniform rules. That’s just my suggestion and my little passing on from whatever.

Cheryl, with your suggestion, how would you like to proceed? My suggestion is we just go statement by statement. If people want to add anything, they can.

But first, Tijani, I’ve got two things to watch. I’ve got hands up here and hands up there. Because this is how everyone can participate, I will try to keep my eye on both.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I will help with the list. Don’t worry about that. And this is traditional in the face-to-face meetings. [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Holly. I would like to also give some information. I spoke with Bob, and he told me that they will fix it or something

like this. He already is convinced that there is something to be done on what they provided. So I think that they are now more and more convinced that things are not like they are thinking. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I also had some interactions with some of the members of ITEMS yesterday. I think it's better to interact with them when we there is wine or beer. I think that makes things more interesting. There were good discussions. We finally had to smile on the long-run.

I think this probably should have happened earlier. Maybe we missed it or they missed it, either of the two. Maybe we should have had this opportunity to interact with them, but I think they probably missed that opportunity and lost it. But it's not too late. I'm glad that some of the interactions were positive. They had some understanding in some of the things that were shared with them. I won't go into specifics. That's just a summary.

For this review, I just want to get a clarification on the document that was just shared now that was submitted by Maureen. Thank you, Maureen, for the updates. I want to confirm: is that the

same document that Alan had in Google Docs? What is this one about? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, if you'd care to respond to that, please, and then we'll go to Aziz.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Seun, the document was actually the result of the instruction that I was given by Holly.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: And me.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And Cheryl, after the discussion with the rest of the ALAC at a meeting on whatever day it was.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think it was Monday.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Monday. So this is the edited drafted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, just before we go to you, Aziz, the review team and the leadership of the ALAC have felt that there was a benefit in having an editorial process go through this meeting while we have the opportunity to do a face-to-face. In that editorial team are obviously the primary authors, sitting upon my left and right hand side, of the document to date, but also fresh eyes as well. We have Olivier. I believe Glenn is invited. John Laprise is invited. Sarah is doing a great job, specifically focusing on executive summary development. And Maureen, who actually is an editor, is helping us ensure that it's as readable as possible, along with Leon, who does know how to put forth an argument and win it in court. So it's a next iteration. It's not a final iteration by any means.

If I may, Holly, the purpose of today's exercise is to identify if this is the direction that we should be heading in. If not, why not? If there are, for example, particular slabs of information supporting documentation and material that have been cut from this current iteration for the purposes of making it, for example, a shorter document, if that was desirable – I personally think it is – is there another way beyond the primary body of this document of making sure those things are captured and accessible to the Board and the decision makers later on?

So we can also discuss today if you feel there is something missing, if you feel there is an approach that should be taken,

and if you feel there is material, such as you mentioned, which I would argue should not go in this report – it should be annexed to this report – let’s work out what type of material it is. Are we just hyperlinking? Are we doing whatever? So that’s what we’re trying to do. You’re helping us, as the review team, polish this into an almost-finally-faceted document. Your editorial team will meet on Wednesday night, Thursday morning, and Friday – not sure when, but at some point – to come up with a near-final-final proof, and that proof will come back to you all again. So just as long as we’re clear on the purposes of our exercises here.

We have Aziz, and then we have Alan. I don’t see anyone else at this stage.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Two things. The comments until tomorrow morning, you said – we’re going to meet with the African community, and we’re going to have the final comments on Wednesday evening. So please take that into account. Tijani and Seun did talk to ITEMS members, and I talked to Tom as well. I’ll tell you what I said. I tried to convince him. In the ‘90s, in the beginning of ISOC, a British told me a story. He used to have his dog on an ISOC mailing list. His dog was in fact talking about the evolution of ISOC. That dog on the mailing list had a lot of

fans because he was always right. Of course, it's the master who was talking, but he had inscribed the dog on the mailing list.

I told that story to [Tim] regarding the empowered member who could be active. We might have some dogs as empowered members.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm delighted to know that none of the ITEMS team managed to have any time to enjoy themselves last night because it seems to me like they must have gone from one to the other of us. I can assure you I had one of them in the bar to well after midnight as well. Poor darn people. Must be exhausted today.

Anyway, all that aside, we are well aware of when material is coming in. While I said we're leaving Thursday morning, tomorrow – Wednesday – we don't meet until 8:30 P.M. So it's very much at the end of the day. There will be plenty of time for the material to come in.

Alan, and then, Seun, you're back in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. As an aside following Aziz, those of us who were attendance at WSIS 2 in Tunisia may or may not be aware that one of the delegations had someone who was blind and had a

seeing-eye dog. The dog ended up being registered as a formal member because he did need an ID card to get on the bus.

I saw an early version of this – or maybe the same version; I don't know – sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's not [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It doesn't matter. It's either the same or a different version. I did do a redline comparison. From my perspective, there are a number of critical areas of things that have been deleted. I will be mentioning them as we go along.

One of the concerns I have is that some of the [inaudible] things in that report were not really aimed at the consultants. If the consultants don't end up changing them, it's important to demonstrate that we had said these things in preparation for the next step.

Again, I don't care whether they're pointed to, annexed, or something, but there are a whole bunch of things that I think are critical to the discussion that need to be somewhere in the documentary evidence. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, what you said there is exactly what I'm hoping for. I believe Holly agrees. The aim of today's game is to work out where that documentary evidence goes and in what format to make sure that we're producing the bulk of what we need now, even though there will be another version after this public comment phase; that there shouldn't be a great deal of modification to what we need to prepare. We've got a good foundation to take us right through to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. That's where the documentary evidence you're referring to is so important.

Yes, Alan, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, if they make all the changes we ask for, our stuff to the OEC is going to really easy. But we do have to cover Plan B.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I always like contingency planning. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. Thank you to the folks reviewing the document. I have to be honest. I'm not sure I'll be able to read the document in details – this current one – and I want to just

ask a basic question. On the document on the Google Docs which we have been developing since three weeks or one month ago, which Alan put up, I want to confirm: was it lifted in totality? Was it lifted entirely into this and then other stuff was added to it? Or have some things been removed?

Because if some things have been removed, then it means that one has to read this entire document from the beginning to the end. One can read it, but reading it to identify those things may really, really take much more time. So I want to confirm that before [to determine] if I won't be attending any meetings. I'll just go hide somewhere and start reading. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan will answer that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was lifted from the last version that was frozen. There were a couple of small changes made after it but not significant. There have been significant things deleted and a lot rewritten as we've gone along the way, at least from Maureen's editing, based on the version I got and created a redline for. So, yes, there have been deletions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're behind the eight-ball here on time. We know that. The people who need to vote on this final version, for want of a better word, or come to a consensus on this final version to go in on time – many of you will be traveling. So we're trying to make it available as early as possible for your reading pleasure on the airplanes you're going to get on as well.

Yeah, we're very aware that the deadline is bucked right up against the end of this meeting. So we'll do whatever we can to make sure that the reading of the final is easy enough. Out of today's conversation, we'll hopefully ensure that all the necessary documentary evidence has a home. What that home is we also need to discuss and decide today. I'd like to get beyond process and into that if possible.

Sebastien, I made sure that there's a microphone there. Obviously I saw your waving of your name, but for anyone else in the audience, just stand there and we will recognize you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Thank you, Cheryl. You partly answered my question. This is the working group meeting that is doing a great job. If you don't have the time to follow, if you're not as passionate, you need to concentrate and work once the final version is published by the end of the week, as you said. Is there another time where we should intervene? What is the

participation of the people who do not participate? I did a search on a high level. When could it be useful for us to participate and intervene?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, I'd like to think that those who are the ALAC and regional leads are the highly engaged and active participants. However, with the timing we have, which is compressed and unfortunate, we must remind everybody, as we did in our APRALO meeting this morning, Holly, that, if you have a significant opinion that needs to be expressed differently from what is in this end document by the end of the week, then you still have time and should be putting in a personal response to the public comments.

I'm hoping I have time to put in my personal response to the public comments. I'd encourage any or all of you to do the same. They're not mutually exclusive. So the train may leave the station, but there's another way to get to the destination.

Holly, shall we get some actual documentation up and gone through? Let's go for it. Over to you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Now, do people have the scrolling rights to this document?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alberto has a small intervention. If you just go to Alberto briefly, please, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: I'll speak in Spanish. Just very briefly, in LACRALO we have decided that the report we sent to Olivier we'll publish on behalf of LACRALO in the public comment as well. But there will be a heading that is actually different from what we have already sent, and there will be a few words that have been changed. That's all.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Okay. Now, I think we need to go through this – I want to say line by line.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, no. Please.

HOLLY RAICHE: But that would kill us all and we'd make no progress. The time we are aiming for is an hour – let's see. It's 11:15. We are out of

here at 12:45. So we don't have a lot of time. This is the opportunity, in fact, where you've all got to have a reasonable level of comfort as to what's here. As Cheryl said, if you think there are things that are missing that might go in an annex or somehow be incorporated, we need to talk about it now.

We start off with – I'm scrolling my – can we go up to the introduction on the screen? People have scroll rights. If you're on the Adobe Connect, you've got scroll rights. It's much easier to see on your own computer than it is on this. But it's up there for anyone.

Okay. Now, I'm not going to read this out, but are people comfortable with this introduction? I'm going to give you all about three minutes to read it if you haven't already. See if this is a fair summary. A lot of people just only read the summary. If that's all they read, are they going to get what they need to know? I'll just give you two minutes. Five minutes. Three minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Counting down to one and zero, by the sound of it. While you're doing that, let me remind you, yes, this the introduction. Before this, there will be an, in its purest form, executive summary. We're not trying to be all things in the executive summary, so the

following piece, the introduction, is important. Quite often people will not read much further than that.

I recognize you, Olivier. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Besides breaking things here, I hate to hear silence, so I might as well fill it quickly. I note in the introduction that you've got the table, which is actually really the executive summary. Will that move over to the executive summary at that point?

HOLLY RAICHE: If you read the full document, it is a response to the recommendations. That's what the table is about. There are other sections in there which are not about the recommendations which are basically a response to what you've said which you didn't make any recommendations about. So there are other things that would have to be covered. But, yes, that chart maybe belongs in the summary, along with reference to the other parts of the response that are not covered by the recommendations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Olivier. And I'm looking to see if there's any indication that people want to start talking. I have Javier – sorry, I just about died; that [inaudible] almost cost me my life then. Javier, please.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you. Just comments on the text. First, a question, and it has to do with something that Sebastien brought up right now: the meeting with the Board. In the beginning, in line 25 – sorry. It's talking about ALAC, and then on 28 it says, "ALAC serves as the primary organizational home for the Internet end users." So is ALAC the home?

Okay. So it's At-Large.

The other thing is that, in line 39, it's a just a typo or an omission. It says, "reviews recommendation." I guess it should "reviews recommendations to varying."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Plural.

HOLLY RAICHE: What line are we on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 39.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Remember, ladies and gentlemen, the reason the numbers are on the side is for you to do exactly what you have just done. Draw our attention to anything by line. Those numbers will disappear later on.

I also think we should remember that there was an important point made by Chris Disspain in today's meeting as well, and that is to make sure that we look at the identification and problem statements that we can take out of the review. So we may need to think about a clear recognition of some of those.

They're woven through the document – don't get me wrong; it may be a table, it may be a paragraph; I don't know – but we need to probably make sure that is relatively high in the document.

In terms, Olivier, of the list, the table we have in the current introduction, going up per se into the executive summary, I may become difficult to convince that that is a perfect idea. I think

one should reference the table. Otherwise, executive summaries end up as long as the documents.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is this a subtle way of saying I need to buy you a drink?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can try. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two things. The table I find somewhat problematic because it attempts to summarize our relatively long answers in one or two words in the third column. It may well give the wrong answer because often people don't read past that. So I would not try to summarize the long answers in a couple of words there, to be quite candid. That's number one.

Number two, in the introduction that Holly originally wrote, I had submitted some changes. Some of them are small, and I haven't tried to figure out if they're there or not. But there was one very substantive one. John Laprise, on one of our lists, asked the question – I think it was the subject of a small task or something like that; I don't remember exactly – of, "What would ALAC and At-Large look like if we simply implemented all of the changes?"

I thought that was an inspired question. I answered it on the list, and there were a number of people who basically said, “That’s really important. We need to include it in the group.” I won’t read the whole thing here, but it comes down to saying what a number of other people have said.

Let me try to find the summary of the words. “If we implement all of this, which is going to imply heavily overworked people, people in tasks that they can’t do, it would essentially, to be dramatic about it, destroy At-Large as an effective component of ICANN and roll back all the work we’ve done in being able to influence the direction of policy and other things within ICANN.”

I think, if we believe that – as I said, I got a fair number of positive comments and no negative comments on it – I think we need to say it. Yeah, it’s a strong statement, but I think it’s important.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did you have more.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that’s it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. First of all, I'd like to agree with Alan. This should be the last part of our answer because this will conclude and show what the harm is that we can have if we implement these kind of recommendations.

I raised my hand not to say that but to agree with Cheryl about putting the evaluation at the beginning, at the higher position of the report, especially because the Board, as Rinalia said, decided that, for the upcoming reviews, it would led in two parts: evaluation and recommendation. And the recommendation would be done by the community. So only the evaluation will be done by the reviewer.

So this is something that we have to take into account and put in our report so that the Board, when they see that, will see that we agree or disagree on what the evaluation was. For the recommendation, it's another issue. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani said, “Put it at the end.” I hope he meant the end of the introduction. If we put it at the end of the 20-page document, no one will ever see it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: At the end of the executive summary.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just replying to Alan, when I did the chart, at first it was just for myself, and it was shorthand. Then when I thought about a summary, I thought it would actually be useful to have something upfront to actually demonstrate that a lot of what is being recommended in fact we agree with, either wholly or in part.

So the words there were almost my shorthand to myself. I think we have to decide if we want to put the whole of the text in, which can be very long, or if we just eliminate the text all together, which is then confusing. I just didn’t know what to do. Maybe we think about that one. But it was just my shorthand to myself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think, once we finish with the text, we need to add up how many we're accepting unilaterally and partially and rejecting and put that summary in. But trying to describe the substance in a couple of words I think is going to end up causing more – that's my opinion. I don't feel strongly about it. But that's the way I think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seun, followed by Olivier and Satish.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. I'm trying to figure out who pronounced my name, so I'm trying to just – never mind.

I just wanted to bring attention to the ALAC definition thing because I just quickly ran through the bylaw now and saw that ALAC is actually in the bylaw as the home. Even though we understand that that is not the practice, the reality is that At-Large is, I think we may need to word it in a way that it's not inconsistent with what the bylaw says. So I just want to note that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm looking again at the introduction and the executive summary that will be put together. I've heard earlier that you mentioned that the table might not be suitable for the executive summary. Do we have to perhaps focus and see whether we would have it on there or not? I do notice that the introduction at the moment doesn't read like an introduction. It reads more like an executive summary. I would have thought that an introduction would probably just say what is in this paper.

I note that I wasn't aware when reading this overall that it had so many different component parts. I can see here the different sections – recommendations, recommendations made through omission, EMM implementation guidelines, methodology, non-recommendations suggestions, analysis of prior review recommendations, travel issues, and volunteer turnover.

That's a very complete statement, so the introduction might wish to just say a few words about where one would find what in there, rather than dig into the issues. Of course, the executive summary would have the issues itself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Trust your editorial team, but Holly wishes to defend the position regardless. Go on, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I was just about to say that I am not about to defend the whole thing. I was about to say that we have one hour. Instead of trying to wordsmith, I want people to go through and see if there's something of substance that troubles you. Wordsmithing has been done very well by Maureen, and she's going to have lots of help.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wait. [inaudible] wordsmithing?

HOLLY RAICHE: There's plenty wordsmithing. After everything is wordsmithed, your plane ride home better be very long because you're going to, if you have anything really objectionable, object. But can we please move onto the text?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's my job to threaten people, Holly. Don't get into my space. Okay. You look after your reputation, okay?

HOLLY RAICHE: It's been solid.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Don't try to match my nasty one. Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Cheryl. First of all, I agree that we should not be wordsmithing this document right now. The priority should be for the larger issues.

Secondly, I'd like to point out that, if go on the track of what would happen if we implemented these recommendations, we would not only break At-Large, but we'll also break parts of ICANN. In particular, some of the policy processes today are not scalable. If you have 5,000 coming in and giving public comments, the public comment process is not being managed by an algorithm, which is going to simply do the data processing. It is individuals who have to go through every one of them. It's going to break the whole ICANN process as well, not only within ALAC. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To someone like Alan and others around the table who sit on the parts of the working groups that do that laborious role, I hear what you're saying and couldn't agree more.

Just before we move on – I would like to see some more cards or hands up because we do want to look at substance now – let's agree, if you would, on the following. Obviously there's going to

an i that's needs dotting or a t that needs crossing or a pluralization or a misword that needs picking up. Can any and all of those things just be put to an e-mail? As far as I'm concerned, I don't care whether it goes to the leadership team list – that'll do – or it gets to staff and they'll get it to us. I think we just need a single point of collecting all of those “Line 44 should be this” and “Line 177 should be that.”

As long as we have it in our possession, before 20:15 tomorrow UTC – what's that? Well, 8:15 in the evening tomorrow – then I'm sure that the editorial team will be able to bring those in. Yes, you will then have another opportunity to polish up again. But please note those privately. Get them to us.

Now let's go, preferably by section and line number, to matters of substance. I think, Kaili, you got your hand up before Seun. Regardless, Seun, you've had a couple of interventions, so if you don't mind, I'll go to Kaili.

KAILI KAN:

Thank you, Cheryl. I'm not sure yet if my comments will fit in with the lines or if they're more in general.

I'm just saying we had a very good meeting with the Board. There are two top-line issues that we have concern about. One is

about the review, obviously. The second is about the effectiveness of our At-Large/ALAC/ALSes.

One thing we just mentioned was about the bylaws. I believe that the bylaws did not focus on what it should be focused on because. We are here to represent the end users' interest. Therefore, our grassroots organizations – ALSes – should have a criteria; that they do the same, that they represent the end users' interest and defend them or represent them and demonstrate that. That should be the fundamental criteria for admitting an ALS. That will form the foundation for the RALOs, as well as ALAC.

So that is one thing that probably needs to be revised in the bylaws. I don't know yet if this should be mentioned in our response or not, but that's one thing I see.

Another thing is that, just in the meeting, I was about to come up with a counter question. We are being asked whom we represent. We say we represent the end users' interest. My question is: whom does ICANN represent?

Well, during my work the CCT-RT, I talked about how ICANN should play the role as a regulator. It was not that very well-received, I would say. However, one thing that I see is that the independence, from the U.S. government, of ICANN seemed to be overlooked because before ICANN was overseen by the U.S.

government. The U.S. government – no question – is supposed to represent the public interest as an elected government. However, in that sense, ICANN can focus on the DNS, registry, and registrars and do its own work because that part of the responsibility was taken care of by the overseer. Now we're independent.

So we see a lot of work that we carry on; for example, price caps. As an example, all of the approval procedures of the new gTLDs, etc., etc., etc., are typically what a regulator does. Then this regulator is to represent the public interest – in other words, the end users' interests – which is defined as ALAC's responsibility.

So that brings a conflict. From historical inheritance, ICANN, as I see it, is backboned by registries and registrars. Should that continue to be the case if ICANN is positioned to be a regulator for most?

In that sense, the business interest of the DNS industry should be the target of regulation, not to be within the decision-making processes of regulations. That is obviously what turned the whole thing upside-down within ICANN.

I'm just going through the simple logic. However, we'll then carry on. How do we move forward? I don't know. I'm just raising a question. How do we at ALAC see this issue? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Kaili. I don't want to use the words "it's out of scope" because it's not for us. But it is for what we're doing in this meeting. I think it's a very useful conversation to have, but I'm going to be avoiding it in this particular fora.

KAILI KAN: Fully understood.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. What do we got? 45 minutes left in the session today. Let's see if we can be as focused as possible on substantive issues out of this piece of work.

Holly, did your hand up before Seun?

HOLLY RAICHE: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Okay. So Seun and then – oh. Not Holly. Not at all. Over to you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just a quick one. Is there a reason why we're not using Google Docs as another option?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seun, I had people in each ear then. Would you please repeat that, please? Because I would like to hear what you were saying.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. I was asking: is there any reason why we are not using Google Docs as an option to contribute edits to the document?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In fact, a lot of the work was started out in Google Docs. There is no problem with doing that. However, we are getting to the point where we should be locking things off, not opening them up, for general commentary and edits. We also need to recognize that, as the owner of the current Google Doc, unless Alan invites specific people as contributors, that hasn't happened as yet. We can do it, probably. But do we need to? I'm not sure. But there's no reason that we do or don't use Google Docs. But remember, we can't just use Google Docs because not everyone can utilize that particular tool.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, the current Google Doc, at this point, is obsolete. So making comments there will not be particularly useful. If we choose to, this Word document could be reimported into Google Docs and we could use that for the next two or three days. That's not my call, but it certainly could be done. Once we do that, we will clearly open it up to whoever we should open it up to. The current one is not the relevant one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Alan, Holly was having apoplexia just with the concept of putting the current editorial documentation out for more general “note here, comment there,” and I can understand that position. There are plenty of ways for people to contribute, but let's try to get most of those contributions to us by whatever means possible before 8:15 tomorrow evening. Certainly, with the polishing, we can do a locked-off document and say, “This is the version that is now going to be put into Google Docs and Word,” if that's what you all want us to do. Then your last polish could be done by that.

But again, time is against us. I don't know whether each of you have the time to do that with a Google Doc of 28 pages going on.

ALAN GREENBERG: To cut it short, after this meeting, I will take this Word document and do a comparison to the base that it was started on and distribute that redline or the quasi-redline to everyone so they can see the changes and perhaps focus their attention on those things, rather than try to read the whole document over from scratch.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which of course goes back to your earlier point. Now, I'm not seeing any more cards up. I would like to think I should see more cards up. I had both Alan and Tijani, one in each ear, saying, "Do you want to start the timer?" Well, at the moment, I guess I can. That'll be good because we'll be finished by ten past 12:00, not 12:45, because I'm not seeing input here.

HOLLY RAICHE: All I can say is that this is fantastic because it means that actually we've now got Maureen's document and everybody's happy with it. Nobody has got any problems with it. So you can all walk away and we can just take it in from there. If I'm wrong, then you cards should be up. If I'm right, we can finish the meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we were going to go recommendation by recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's exactly what she said.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I haven't heard the first one being called.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, that's because everybody keeps intervening.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is exactly what Holly said we would do. So the cards went up and then the cards went down. Holly, put up those recommendations if that's what you were doing.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's what I was trying to do. We just got a little bit – okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Page reference for staff to scroll to, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Let me, first of all, find it in my document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Line 85.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Line 85.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ladies and gentlemen, that's line 85. My Adobe Connect has crashed at the moment.

HOLLY RAICHE: You can look at mine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So 85. You need to scroll the other direction for the screen.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right. Okay. We are now at Recommendation 1. I'll read the recommendation. I'll let you read the response. If you're happy with the response – because I actually recognize a lot of it anyway from earlier versions – “At-Large members from each region should be encouraged – and where possible, funded – to participate in Internet governance policy-related conferences and events in their region and to use these events as opportunities proactively to raise awareness among end users of

the At-Large and the opportunities to engage in ICANN-related activities.”

Now, can I make one comment about this? This is not controversial. The response is, “That’s fantastic. We do it anyway. Nice you should say so because there have been barriers put in place in terms of either funding or a misunderstanding of our role to do this.” To me, this is a very welcome statement. We not only agree; we do it.

If anybody has anything to add, then put your hand up and in some way indicate you want to – otherwise, we can just move right on to Recommendation 2.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we just note that Alan had his hand up to begin with. Over to you, Alan. It may not be anti-what-you’ve-said, but let’s hear what you want.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much for letting me say what I want.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would like to think you should.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think, in this answer, we have fallen into the morass of the review team and are being far too prescriptive with far too much detail. The reference to “a delegation of two or three RALO leaders are effective,” which I think is, one, RALO-specific, is not a level, I don’t think, we need to go into. It goes into a bit too much detail. “CROPP only has five slots.” I think very much we need to say, “We don’t have enough funding to do this properly,” and not go into the details. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I trust that’s noted and nobody has a counterpoint to that. My screen is still black in front of me. Can I have the next line referenced for the next recommendation, please, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: 108. I’ll read it. “Recommendation 2: At-Large should be more judicious in selecting the amount of advice it seeks to offer, focusing upon quality rather than quantity.”

Our response, in summary: “We support this recommendation as well. There is a chart that Alan has done which actually demonstrates the fact that, over time, we have been judicious in what we choose to respond to.”

If people can read the response and indicate whether they are happy with that response, we can move right along. I will give you a bit of time.

Alan, you want to say something about the recommendation?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not quite ready yet [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may then, while you're all reading, Glenn, I note you're having to leave to do your ubiquitous duty of photography. But you did have a point in the chat earlier. Did you wish to speak to that before you left?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No. It was basically the sidebar in the document [itself], but I understand that you're looking for e-mails. For each section, I'm doing comments on each recommendation. Which e-mail address do you want me to send it to?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we actually ask one of the staff just to receive this to stop the mania? Whom? Heidi?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Send it to staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just send it to the At-Large staff. One of them will work it out.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And could I suggest we have a subject line that just says “At-Large Review”? Then we’ll all know.

HOLLY RAICHE: “At-Large Review Comments.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can make as many letters as you want, as long as the first of them spell out “At-Large Review.”

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In the editing of this one, there were two things lost. One is important and the other one, if we want to take it out, the chart needs to be changed.

This is a chart of the number of things that we submitted something on, a comment on. Some percentage of those were “You did a good job. Thanks for doing all that work,” which were not substantive and did not take a large amount of time and we just felt were socially proper. I didn’t want to have me or staff take the time to read through all of those, so there was a statement pointing out that some of these were non-substantive.

If we want to omit that statement, then we need to go back and actually count how many substantive ones there are. Because it lowers the numbers and they’re pushing for lower numbers.

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Either way, either staff has to go through and do a substantive review where we add back the statement – the second one is a comment that a very small fraction of these are actually advice to the Board. We’ve given two or three in the last two years. I believe, again, since they are very confused on what we do and think we only do advice to the Board, it is really crucial to point out that this is how many statements we’ve

made, not the number of advice to the Board. We need to emphasize that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Noted. I've been noting down. Have you been noting as well, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Mm-hmm.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Two people have noted that.

ALAN GREENBERG: They're also in comments I had sent to you and Maureen.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's all right. Okay. Recommendation –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Before you move on, you have a Alberto.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you'd like to let me help you do the queue.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just leave the mic open. Leave it in front of you. I can project to get to it. Don't worry. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: I believe that ITEMS didn't tell us what the metrics were to make a difference between the important things, the substantial things, the short-term or the long-term. So I believe that this response is correct: we have no metrics. Otherwise, we should be making them up. So perhaps we can leave the numbers, and that's it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent point. Thank you very much. I've made a note of that. Okay. We're on Recommendation 3.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Line number, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Line #124. We might even get there. “At-Large should encourage greater direct participation by At-Large members (ALMs) in ICANN working groups by adopting our proposed Empowered Membership Model.”

Now, to my mind, this is really the critical response. This is where I think, in the Australian term, the rubber hits the road. We won’t go any further than that.

Now, would everybody please read this? I’ll give you a minute or two. Because this the critical wish. This is one of the very few recommendations where in fact where we have real problems.

Now, Sebastien already has his hand up. Do you want to come to the mic, please?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. For the ease of the meeting, I will do it in English, if you accept that I do it in English.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, no. Do it in French.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. It’s bringing me two questions. The first one is that, if I understood it well, there are two documents that will go out. This one is for ALAC purposes, and the other is for RALO

purposes. Therefore, I am not sure that we need to dig into details about the RALO level in this answer. But that means also that you may need, at the beginning of the document, to acknowledge that there will be two documents, that we are just digging into one part because the other part is taken care of by the one that concerns the RALO leaders.

My other suggestion – I’m sorry to be late at the beginning – is that, when you start with ALAC, first write “ALAC” in full and, second, put a definition of ALAC at the beginning of this document. We saw today that even the people who must know have some trouble between ALAC and At-Large. Then we need to say it again and again.

My third point: we may want to take the recommendation and split it in two parts; one, the ones who say “participating in At-Large” [or “members” or “participants.”] We can say “Yes, we are doing it. We can improve it. We want to do it.” The second part is about their model. But their model is just one recommendation. I will say we don’t care about this recommendation because we disagree or whatever.

So there are two points in this recommendation. Unfortunately, it’s done in one sentence. We may wish to split this recommendation in two parts. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: All very good points. Thank you. I think it's very good right up front in the intro to differentiate between the At-Large community, At-Large – spell them out. So, yes, of course. I think it makes a fair point. Certainly in the response that is there, we do distinguish between participation and rejecting the model. We sort of say, "Well, yeah, we do, but don't follow the model."

You weren't here at the beginning, Sebastien. What we did say is that we'll be working with Olivier. They're developing a RALO response. When that's ready, what we will be doing is actually sitting down and looking at both documents. So it depends very much on what the RALOs are going to say. When we have a chance to look at that, we come back here and say, "Do we need to say everything?" We have to say something because this is an ALAC response, but we may not have to say a lot if the RALO response says it. So I think that's a point we just have to take on board. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Also, Sebastien, we need to recognize that there is a style guide that was created by ICANN. I'd like to encourage us to follow that style guide, which actually does tell you things like when you should have things fully spelled out to begin with. So I think we'll also use that as part of our polishing repertoire. Thank you for reminding us.

The other thing we may consider, of course, is the use of a glossary, which means that, when we refer to a word in a document, there is a definition appended to the document that makes it clear what we mean by it.

I have Tijani, and then I have Satish. Tijani – and then Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. I don't think it is interesting to give as much detail about the individual members in our current organization. I think that it is good to say that it is already implemented in three RALOs and that it is on its way for the two other RALOs. We can say also that each RALO is implementing it according to their rule of procedure, to say that they are not all the same. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Maureen, you're fresh on the list or is that a right to reply?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

[inaudible] list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

On the list? Thank you. Noted. Okay. Next we have Satish, and then we have Alan, and then we'll be going to Maureen.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Cheryl. I would support what Tijani has said. On line 131, there is a statement that says, “APRALO organizes its individual members into a regional ALS.” The process is not fully done, so I’d rather take it out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I’ve got quite a number of things because there were a lot of changes made on this. The very first one is a small point. It says, “In fact, two current ALAC members are individual, unaffiliated members.” I think that’s rather moot. Traditionally, almost all NomCom appointees have not belonged to an ALS to start with. I happen to be an unusual creature in that, right now, I’m a RALO-appointed person who’s an individual member. But that’s a detail that happens to be true today.

The second one is that there was a question raised – I don’t know exactly where it fits in the current one – pointing out that they give no explanation as to why, with the Empowered Model, suddenly more people will show up. There’s a lack of connection. Why will they suddenly come? I think that needs to be asked.

The third is that there is a reference to – if someone can find it – how the ALAC sees potential for an objective of enhanced participation through further investment by ICANN. I really don't think we want to be asking for more money in this context. So the reference to "We need more investment if we're going to succeed" I think is a losing argument.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Agreed].

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a section that mentions NextGen and the Fellowship as important. As it reads right now, it reads as if that is our only source of new people. They're a source of really good people, but it's not the only source. It reads as if that's the only place we get people from. I think that needs to be more generalized. Yes, those paths are important, but they're not unique.

Almost lastly, there's a paragraph that reads, "The ALAC believes ALS membership should remain because it is an At-Large link the grassroots. In the local context, ALSes are recognized as established organizations, and in some cases, older than ICANN," blah, blah, blah. That completely ignores the initiative that we're now starting that ALSes, we hope, by reaching to the members, will be a source of people who will actually be active.

So it's not only the work they do on the ground; it's the fact that they are a targeted source of people we can communicate with and we can hopefully get some of them involved. Again, I think that's an important issue we want to make because it meshes with our solution to what their addressing.

Sorry. I didn't realize this was the format we're going to be working on, so it's a little harder for me.

There's a reference to RALOs being consensus-driven. Some of our RALOs are very consensus-driven. Some of them are very vote-driven. This fits very well for APRALO, which very rarely votes. It doesn't fit as well for the current incarnation of NARALO or LACRALO, which virtually always votes. So it needs to be made sure it's not RALO-specific.

I believe lastly that there is reference that we – “does not guarantee that we represent 4.5 billion end users.” The number I think is currently 3.5, and we never claimed to represent it. So it shouldn't say that in this section. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now, by the way, all of these were already sent. So you have [them] documented.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And you're also on the editing team. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I've taken onboard the references about the RALOs. Now, when I was putting this together, of course Olivier's first version of the RALO response came through. There was some really interesting stuff in there, which I felt should be incorporated in because they actually talked about the membership model. But I take onboard that there are some instances where being too specific isn't relevant. We can actually remove that sort of thing, but I think, when we're talking about the membership model itself, there should be some sort of comparison included in there, probably on a lesser scale]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We've got the speaking list as it is at the moment. I have Alberto and then Tijani and Annette. Let me recognize one of our former Chairs of the ALAC. Great to have you back in the room. Did you wish to speak to this matter, or are you just trying to get a better [view] on the screen?

ANNETTE MUEHLBERG: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So on the next recommendation, I've got you lined up. You'll be first cab off the rank, I promise.

Briefly, and now, staff, please run the two-minute timer. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you for being the only one with the two-minute clock. I think ITEMS really didn't read our bylaws, especially the LACRALO bylaws. Individual users in LACRALO are included. They have no right to a voice, but they have the right to vote. They have actually worked internally in working groups. Within those working groups, they do have a right to vote because this is the opinion that they are taking.

Now, with respect to the experience, I asked yesterday that the experience in this model – well, the answer that we got from ITEMS is that it's the same experience that the Empowered Community had adopted, so there is no model with experience.

Finally, NextGen as a source. Remember that the meeting in our region was suspended and we didn't get any NextGen for several

years, actually. So NextGen is only for the [region] as opposed to the Fellowship program. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Tijani. He gets a two-minute clock, too. It's all right.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. I think that the lack of connection between the evaluation and the recommendation should be highlighted in the executive summary as a general remark. Then, each time we find it in any recommendation, we have to highlight it also.

My second remark: I have been advised to avoid the periphery of At-Large because it seems that, in English, it is not a good utilization of the word. Since I am not a good English speaker, I'll give you the information, and if you find it like this, yes, please change it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Maureen, I'm assuming your card is back down and you're not back in the queue?

Okay. Then I'll go back to Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Recommendation 3 has some words that say, “The only place where perhaps EMM has been proposed.” I have a concern with adding any formal support on that recommendation, especially on the table, which says [it] partly. I don’t know how we’re going to do it, but I think Recommendation 3 was clearly talking about EMM. I think we should just be against it straight off, as much as possible. I don’t think we need to assume that they were referring to individual membership, even though that’s what they’re doing. I think they are proposing EMM in Recommendation 3. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Can I respond to that? If you go back to Sebastien’s recommendation that we split a question, in this case we can actually deal with this separately. We can deal with the actual recommendation about individual membership and then say, “However, talking about this in the context of EMM, we think X,” and just make that a little bit clearer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Briefly, I don’t remember if anywhere in the response we should say how far we are in accepting individual members. Most RALOs

accept them, and some are about to accept them. Or that's what I've gathered. Some of them are pretty close. So just add a little one-line timeline saying, "We're there. We have decided this and it's in the process of being implemented in two RALOs." Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We'll discuss that further. We need to move on to Recommendation 4 now. That I believe, if my eyes don't deceive me – whoa, don't take it away – was line 172, which has just gone off screen.

HOLLY RAICHE: Should I read it anyway for you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think you may as well, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: "Recommendation 4: At-Large support staff should be more actively involved in ALM engagement in policy work for the ALAC drafting position papers and other related work."

My first response to that, before anybody says anything else is that seems to be about three things rolled up in one. It talks about ALM engagement. Well, if you take that component out,

it's about ALS support staff actively involved in drafting papers and other policy work. I think we have to take that separately from the membership model and deal with that separately.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I welcome Annette to the table. Over to you, Annette.

ANNETTE MUEHLBERG: Well, it's a great pleasure to be here this time because it's actually the tenth anniversary of the RALOs. We put a lot of work in in 2006 and 2007 to make this possible. We actually drafted bylaws in 2006 and made RALOs run and real in 2007. So it is a funny thing to be at the review team meeting right now.

I don't want to molest you with all the experiences, but there is one thing we asked for ten years ago, and I think it's still crucial. What do RALOs and ALSes and ALAC need? We always have this issue of language and translation. We always get the answer: "It's too expensive." What we can do and could do is get a little help. We have some criteria at ALAC and also at the regional level that is really of interest to us.

Then we want to write a little paper. Normally, at first we don't have the time, we don't have the language, to really do it right and properly in English, and we need some experts. We ask for what we want to have written and what the position is about,

but we need an expert who has some knowledge about the ICANN world and the IT world and the technical world and so on. This person, who is able to write, we should be able to pay in a very transparent way with a very small budget.

I think this makes sense. We did that approach. We started that in 2006 and 2007, and suddenly it got lost. Instead of that, we got more and more staff we didn't ask for. As a trade unionist, I'm always for staff and not against staff, for the record. But staff is really expensive. To have just a little budget of 6,000 euros a year for the possibility to really write a paper which really reflects your positions and not ICANN policy positions written by staff I think is crucial to really understand what people want. So if you really want to have the advice of end users in the end to the Board, I think this would be helpful.

In short, less staff and a very small, very transparent budget. I think, apart from that, that staff helps in drafting these is very good. So this is not against staff. It is just the proportion of where you put the money. Give a little authority to the local and to the ALAC to really write down their position in the way they want to. Thanks.

[MAUREEN HILYARD]:

Thanks. I will take over the microphone to say that, in fact, if you were watching the meeting with the Board and ALAC, some of

the things were put to the CEO. He just said, “Put this in your budget item.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The other thing is that, these days – and in fact, from about 2011-ish certainly and arguably even 2009-ish; but ’11 definitely – we have become now, I would suggest, one of the largest users of ICANN’s language services. We actually do have a lot of ability to get local language things changed into English language if that’s needed.

However, these enablers are going to be more important if a EMM happened to be the case. So thank you for your intervention. Holly has made notes on that.

Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I was thinking – oh, I’m going to speak in Spanish. The thing is – and it doesn’t really have any connection with this point – I want to clarify something that Alberto said because it is important in terms of how it will be drafted in the document.

In the case of LACRALO, nowhere do the bylaws consecrate individual members. However, because there is silence, we have interpreted that they can be involved with no right to vote. In the

mediation process that we are conducting right now, the proposal that we have is that it should be expressly stated within the reform that we think we should do. That's the situation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, but is there a reason we cannot move to Recommendation 5 now?

No? Go ahead then, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: “Recommendation 5: At-Large should redouble efforts to contribute to meetings between ICANN’s senior staff and executives, ISOC and other international organizations, to engage in joint strategic planning for cooperative outreach.”

I find that a wonderful suggestion. We’re never invited. I think that’s what Alan said. Please have a one-minute read. If you’re unhappy, put your hand up. If you’re not unhappy – okay, Alan. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go for it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I want to let other people actually spend a minute or two [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Vanda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Holly suggested a minute. We don't have a minute to spare, Holly. We just need to move on. Alan, with a two-minute clock – I don't care whether we have an alarm. I just care that we have a two-minute clock. And then Vanda, and then Javier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Two small points, or what I hope are small points. First, there is reference to a number of APSTAR and then some AP acronyms. If we're going to use acronyms, we really have to define them and not presume people know what they are. I would prefer to not have RALO-specific stuff in this kind of section. Simply say, "Many RALOs do things." I don't think we need to list each of the MOUs that we have.

The second one is that, if we are going to have anything specific, I suggest we reinstate or rewrite a paragraph at the end which summarizes that we have a great interest in joint activities and

we think it's a great thing, and that, with cooperation and funding and whatever notwithstanding, we agree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I actually have Heidi next, then Vanda, then Humberto, then Maureen.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Cheryl. We could add that At-Large staff was already in touch with our counterparts in ISOC. I think we could probably increase that. So I think this is probably in progress.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just a short one. Remember that, since they mention the strategic plan, that RALOs and groups like LACRLO and AFRALO have strategic plans, and the plans have good results. So a little mention there would maybe help.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Humberto – Javier. What is my problem with you today, my dear man? I do apologize. Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: As we say in Spanish, “No [inaudible].” You translate it. I’m fine to be after Alberto.

On line 183, just for clarification purposes, in the way it’s drafted it says, “ISOC (and other international organizations).” Just for clarity, maybe we should clarify that ISOC is not an international organization, per se, in the sense of IGO. So maybe it’s, “ISOC (and international organizations).” So it’s not an “other.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That’s their bad language, not ours.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Oh, that’s right. My bad.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But thank you. We all agree that that’s –

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: So let’s correct them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We couldn’t possibly do that. I have Maureen and then I have Sebastien.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Cheryl. In this particular instance, I think that the issue is that, at a RALO level, for example, or even an ALAC level, we're not being invited to the formal meetings that ICANN has. I think in this particular instance what I was actually trying to say is that, although it isn't happening at the high level, at the grassroots level, RALOs are actually getting out there and making their own context. I think it's in that context that I've actually included and made sure that it's noted that it's actually at the grassroots level that people are actually making those [valuable contacts].

As you say, it's part of our strategic plan that each of the RALOs has to actually get out there and do the outreach.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. We'll work more on that then. Sebastien, and then Olivier, and – oh, you do want to have another? Okay. After Sebastien, it goes to you then, Olivier.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I want to be sure that it's clear what it is in this sentence. What is important here is not “international.” It's ISTAR. ISTAR is a short list of organizations. It's the root server system. It's IETF. It's the W3C. It's the Internet Society. It is –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: RIRs.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: RIRs. And that's it, full stop. Yes, I don't like the name "international." We are not an international organization. Neither of them are an international organization. It's bad writing. But what is important is ISTAR.

I would say that, if we are willing to start to have discussions with ISOC, then we will unbalance At-Large and the role of ALAC in this. ISOC is just one part of the ALSes. If we give more power, more of a role – I am an ISOC member and it's with this hat that I talk also – I don't think it's a fair statement.

At the level of the RALOs, there are a lot of things going on with the RIRs. We may wish to have something with the W3C, with the IETF, but what is important is that it's done at the right level. I am not sure that we are the right level. If we want to compete with the Board of ICANN to meet with the Board of ISOC, we will lose our time and our – it's not useful, I guess. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted, Sebastien. Thank you very much. You had a tiny intervention. Please go ahead.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: No. Sebastien clarified for me that there's a meaning to ISTAR. So if it's a term of art, it's a term of art.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is. Olivier, and then Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. You might have all forgotten this, but in 2014, there was a meeting of the Director for At-Large, the ALAC Chair at the time – me, effectively – and the Director of Chapters for ISOC. We derived nine action points from that. It has to be somewhere in our wikis because it was published. Heidi is pointing to where it is. Okay. We got the nine action points.

First, webinar introduction to At-Large and ISOC. This would include speakers from At-Large and ISOC and ALS chapters. There's a whole number of other things. I'll put them in the chat so you can read them. I'm not going to read through the whole lot.

But we haven't followed up on this, so in a way, the ball is rolling, but it's not being controlled.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: E-mail.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What we will note to do is to reference that material as part of the documentary support evidence.

I've got Alan and then I'll go back to Annette, and then we need to move to our next recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. As noted in the ALAC response, not approved by ALAC but not disputed by ALAC, to the SO/AC accountability sub-team of the accountability Work Stream 2, the ALAC is not particularly subject to capture because people are appointed from around the world.

Our one, single vulnerability, however is the large number of ISOC chapters. Should ISOC ever be in a position to control those chapters, or for that matter, should the chapters actually start talking to each other and working together, we have a very significant capture problem. Pushing that we should work closer with ISOC and get more cooperation and coordination with ISOC is almost saying, "Let's see if we can figure out a good capture scenario for the ALAC." I'd be very, very cautious about this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. As one of the co-rapporteurs for that particular work track within Work Stream 2, I just want to remind you that, [for] the mandate for Work Stream 2 looking at the accountability for the support organizations and advisory committees, the best practice modeling we were asked to come up with was specifically to be looked at through the lens off minimizing the risk of capture.

Annette?

ANNETTE MUEHLBERG: Thank you to Sebastien and to Alan for clarifying the role of ISOC for the records and history. Because of the fact that ISOC is financed largely by business, in Europe we put in our regional bylaws in the beginning – we stopped that for certain reasons – in the beginning we did not have ISOCs join the RALOs because of that; there was a conflict of interest there.

So to push that I think is a mistake. We now have many ISOCs as ALSes, but I think for clarification and transparency and understanding, it's good to publish, to really write, what Sebastien had said so that everyone understands what this ISTAR means.

In the answer, we should add that these are certainly important organizations but not the only important organizations and that,

especially on the regional level, there are other organizations and other meetings which are at least as important. So we should really clarify that this is like an incest activity arrangement, and it's the opposite of outreach and regional activities. So I think we should clarify that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As Alan said, it's like a recipe for capture, but apart from anything else, there's lots of opportunity for capture coming out of this report. That's just one of them.

Can I draw us to a close on this recommendation and move to the next? And may I tell you that, as the timing is writ, we only have three more minutes?

It appears to me that we are not going to get through all of these recommendations. However, the next one is one that deserves a face-to-face interaction. If I may stretch our friendship with the fabulous interpretation team and take no more than five to ten minutes on this next recommendation and then encourage, as we said earlier, for you to go through and give us feedback on the rest, which I think in many cases we actually agree with, that's the way forward.

Does anybody object to that? Alan, don't object to it, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, thank heavens. Good.

ALAN GREENBERG: Get ready.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: She's poised. Over to you, Holly, for the next rec.

HOLLY RAICHE: Actually, there are two. One is "Recommendation 6: Selection of Seat 15 of the ICANN Board." Now, I can't imagine that anybody thinks that we should not have a process and that we should actually make the final recommendation ourselves.

Is there anybody who thinks that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: Because that's what we're saying.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Which recommendation are we on?

HOLLY RAICHE: We're at 6. The other one that is contentious is the evolution of our working groups. Those are the two that I can see are going to cause the most heartache, and we'd like to hear from everybody in the next five to ten minutes. Beyond that, I'm just going to have a quick skim, but I think those are the two biggies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Over to you, Alan. Then we have Harold.

Okay. It's a point of order, I believe, from Sebastien. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I really feel that this part of the discussion may be held even if the election is over without the candidate on this. You need to leave the others to talk about that. It's the reason why, if it's the last ten minutes, I will leave the room. I am sure that the others will give a good statement. I think I would like to add that all the candidates, all the people who put in their name – not just the two who are on the slide – should not discuss this issue. That's it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So noted, Sebastien. Is it the will of the room that we declare this to be conflicted territory? If anyone believes that it is conflicted territory and anybody, I suppose, who has put themselves forward in the recent election and selection process should not be engaged in the conversation, make yourself known if you believe that is the case.

Go ahead, please, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Cheryl. I do believe that it would be healthier to not be in the room discussing this so that everyone else can discuss it very openly. But my remark was not going to be about this process but about the working groups. Just a quick note, if I may disrupt a little bit this point, I spoke to one of the reviewers and he told me that we misunderstood what's written in the report.

So I kindly asked him to fine-tune the recommendation so that we don't misunderstand what's written there. His point was to say, "Okay. So you have been reviewing whether you disband or resume the different working groups that you have on your roster. So far, you have been refusing to actually disband many working groups that have been in pause for a long time."

I told him, “Just tell us that. Don’t tell us to not have working groups. Tell us to refresh in any case the working groups that we have, and we can then continue the discussion.”

So that’s my point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Leon. Indeed, that’s a point that was made to me by the reviewers as well: that the suggestion was – I have your point of order – in fact to take a clean slate and a new look at what working groups we do need. I do believe that it will be rewritten regardless of our response in that light.

Your point of order, Tijani? Because then I do need to go to Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Yes. I don’t want to raise my name because I don’t think it is a conflict of interest or not. I want to say to Sebastien and Leon that we are not discussing the current process. It is about having our own process or making the NomCom and the random draw do it in our place.

So where is the conflict? Where? I don’t see it.

LEON SANCHEZ: If I may just follow up, I agree with you, Tijani. I don’t think there’s any conflicts since the process is now over. However, I

think that having at least myself in this room could maybe restrain someone from openly speaking and from feeling comfortable about discussing the issue. That's why I want to provide everyone with the most open forum to actually discuss this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Leon. I want to note that that means two of the three people who put expressions of interest in for this are leaving the room. I'm now going to go to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Number one, I agree with Tijani. I do not believe there is any conflict because we're talking about how a future process might be done, where we may be candidates or not. But that notwithstanding, the comment I am going to make is completely irrelevant to that whole discussion. So I do not plan to leave. I do plan to stay. If that restrains someone else from saying something, I'll leave for when you want to say it. I'll block my ears, but I don't plan to leave for the discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Well, this is known as Australia as a dog's breakfast. Harold, over to you.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm going to speak Spanish. Very briefly, let me just say that this recommendation has a conceptual contradiction because it recognizes that, as a community, At-Large has skills in the bottom-up model to make policies, to make proposals, to make corrections, and to make reviews, but we do not really have a capacity to vote.

So, conceptually, what are we saying then? Basically this is what it is. Are they removing our possibility to vote? Is that what they're doing?

Just that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: [We are supposed to be talking about the report, not the concept.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alan, specific to this recommendation, please make your points.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There was a comment that was at the end that was omitted, and I believe it is critical. As Tim McGinnis made very clear in his talk, and the paper makes slightly less clear, this is an

attempt to roll back the change in 2002 enacted by the Board to change how At-Large votes, as it were. I do not believe it is within the scope of a review of At-Large to attempt to even partially roll back a Board decision at that time. Maybe one day we should have voting of everyone and their dog for the Director or whatever, but it's not within scope of this review to undo a Board action, and a very, very strong Board action. I believe we need to say that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. This is one of those that I doubt will have any wings or support beyond the writers of the paper. Seun and then Alberto.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I want to agree with the fact that I also don't see any conflict of interest in this whole thing. I'm even surprised that has been said.

Anyway, on the recommendation itself, I find it interesting. We were here talking about the possibility of implementing one part of the previous review, which recommended two seats for the Board. Last year we were talking about it to the Board and I remember Chris Disspain was even saying, "Why was it not added in the first place?" Now we're getting a review that is even

saying, “Okay. This time around, that single seat you have let’s take from you and give to NomCom to do the selection.” It’s just interesting.

It also loses the fact that there’s a community and there is the NomCom side of things. If we’re going to have this, then we should just have the NomCom do all the Board selections across all the SOs an ACs. That would make things even out.

In my own opinion, we have appropriately responded to this, and I think this is sufficient. I don’t even know why we need to respond with these details. However, I hope that will be enough to educate them on how much process we go through before we even elect that single Board member and let them see how transparent it is. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Seun. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Right now, I agree with Leon with respect to Seat 15. Now, with respect to the answer – and actually, all the answers to these recommendations – I suggest that we respond with just how the recommendation is and not consider what ITEMS has not said.

Yesterday, for example, in the first draft, we made some observations. These observations were not really taken into account. So if we now are saying that you might modify something, I think we should not consider that either. We should simply answer based on what's in the recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Just to point out that I see no conflict in this item of conflict.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, thank you for bringing the circle to a complete close. Is there anyone who wishes to take any more discussion – oh, sorry. I do apologize. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. It's only to say that I find the text sufficiently strong to answer this recommendation. I don't want it to be changed. I find it very good as written. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's delightful to have that sort of comment come in. Thank you. I think stridency is good occasionally. Just as we are about to

close, I know that Alberto's card is up, but I doubt that he wants to speak because he's not even there. I'm going to Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thank you. While we say that we strongly object to the recommendation and that a random selection is not an acceptable way, we are not saying what is really being violated here. Is it the autonomy of At-Large? Is it the independence? I think it'll strengthen it if you say what is really being violated rather than saying we don't like this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can answer that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, it's noted. I'm not sure we need to answer it, but go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: The title of this Director's slot is that the Director Selected by At-Large. To have At-Large have no part in that process makes no sense.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To say the least. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Also, all is said in the paragraph. It is said that we are not represented anymore. It is not us who are selecting our Director, so this is not fair. At-Large is not considered in this case.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: [I think we've only got] 45 minutes for lunch, and then we've got to be [back here].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly is hungry, so apparently we're finishing now. Well, that settles that, ladies and gentlemen. Holly is tired and hungry. She's leaving. Does anyone, while she's walking out the door – that is only partially joke, by the way, because she just said, "I've only got 45 minutes for lunch." Poor you. You have all my sympathy.

Is there anyone who wishes to go back to discuss the work group matter any further? Because I thought we fairly much agreed with the understanding of what we were supposed to have.

I have two on the list. I'd prefer to only have two on the list, but if you insist on putting your cards up, do so now.

Alan and then Tijani and Seun, who may or may not decide to leave his card up for whatever reason.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Two things. I'll be very brief. There was again a statement there that pointed out that work groups are the method that ICANN uses throughout its organization to discuss, make decisions, and come to closure on things. That's the essence of the multi-stakeholder model. I think that statement needs to be made.

Number two, there was a list of the types of work groups we have, and identifying them into three categories. It's completely irrelevant for the review team. They don't give it something. But it's critical if this recommendation is not substantively changed for the next pass, so it needs to be captured. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

So that's one of those documentary evidence situations. Tijani? And can I ask why you all put your cards back down again? Is it just to trick me? Go on, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I think that an e-mail should be sent immediately to all the ALAC members – perhaps some are not here – to explain to them that they have until today at 8:00 in the evening to make comments. It is very important that they make their comments because it would be their last moment to do it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've seen staff take that as action item already, so that will definitely –

[MAUREEN HILYARD]: [inaudible] got to stop.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Really? If only I've run a meeting before I might know that.

[MAUREEN HILYARD]: Heidi just told me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I know, I know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, all of you, including you, Heidi. Seun, thank you for taking your card down. We have now completed the amount of

time we have for this activity today. If you want to know what the next steps are, listen over again to what Tijani just said.

Goodbye, one and all, and put your hands together for our long-suffering interpreters. IT guys, we love you as well, but we don't thank you until the end of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]