

SAN JUAN – ALAC & Regional Leaders: Work Session, Part 7  
Monday, March 12, 2018 – 12:15 to 13:15 AST  
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

**ANNOUNCER:** This is the ICANN 61 ALAC & Regional Leaders Work Session, Part 7, on the 12<sup>th</sup> of March 2018 from 12:15 to 1:15 PM in room 102 ABC.

**CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:** Ladies and gentleman, this is a working lunch meeting, which means please do feel free to continue to get your lunch, but also feel free to get on to work. We are here for the purpose of an informal interaction and I hope Frank and Philip’s conversation between the ALAC Review Working Party and the ALAC Leadership including RALO leaders.

Let me remind you that the ALAC Review Working Party is a regionally balanced group, which has been “managing” to “deal with” the process of our second review, internal organizational review. And I don’t need to go over the bitter and twisted history of some of that and its outcomes.

Suffice it to say, we’re delighted to have both Khaleed and our ever beloved Leon informally here with us today. We not, of course, that they do hold a rather important position in the

---

***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.***

---

Organizational Effectiveness Committee and the future of what happens with the implementation planning for any recommendations and implementables out of the second round of ALAC review.

To that end, we also want to note that the ALAC At-Large, in other words the whole of the ALAC, is and has been part of the discussion and the working party list, even though the working party itself is a set of appointments to per region and additional ALAC representatives.

I'm going to filibuster a tiny bit longer while Alan gets ready, because I'm nice like that, and I'm going to ask you to quietly take your seats. We're not going to do a set of round robins. This is an informal but highly instructive, we trust, conversation and its now over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm now using our new official notification that people should take their seats and stop private conversations as soon as possible. It's amazing how well that works compared to just talking.

Certainly, welcome to [Leanna] [inaudible]. At-Large has one board member, but that doesn't mean we don't have more than one board member who came out of At-Large and [Khaled] is

---

one of those. Careful. That could be called captured and we want to make sure we don't allude to that, even if it might be true.

I noted that – I went back to the mailing list that we used for the working party and I believe it was created on something like March 5, 2015. So, we are now entering our fourth year. I also note that under the original organizational review bylaw, these reviews have to be done every three years.

So, in parallel with doing this, we should be starting a new one, at least under the old rules. I hope that's taken as a joke.

This has been a long process. I don't think any of us want to recount some of the recent history. But, at this point, I think there is a sense of urgency among all parties to figure out a way forward and get this doing.

The purpose of these reviews is to look at issues within an AC and SO and hopefully address them.

The review did identify a number of issues, some of which we believe are not worthy of significant work and some of which definitely are.

What we need is a way to go forward to actually start the work of implementation. Some of us are a bit tired of writing documents that only yield other documents.

---

At this point, from my understanding, the OEC needs something that will clearly say what is going to be done and be able to make a recommendation to the board to adopt it.

I hope what we are talking about presenting to the OEC – and most of you I believe have seen a draft of that – is a document that relates the issues to what we think we can do, and that is what the last OEC did ask for as an overall methodology going forward.

I guess what I'd like out of this meeting is do we have a level of comfort from the two OEC and board members here that this is a viable way forward and we should put more effort into finishing it, or do we do something else?

I did state at a meeting of AC/SO chairs and Göran on Friday that my personal fallback plan if this doesn't work is to stall until I'm no longer chair and leave it to someone else to worry about, but I hope that's not the case and I would really like to see while I am still chair us starting a substantive implementation of whatever it is we're going to implement.

I guess I'd like to turn it over to either Leon or Khaled to give us a little bit of feedback and guidance as to how we move forward.  
Thank you.

---

KHALED KOUBAA: He's really clever.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl and I can keep on talking.

KHALED KOUBAA: He's really clever. He wants to eat. First of all, Alan, thank you so much because that's really an honor for me to be part of the At-Large and my background is the ALS of Tunisia, AFRALO. That was my background, my first family, my Internet family, so thank you for that.

After saying that, let me just make sure that I am personally here on my capacity as board member and not as a chair of the OEC. I will be more interested to hear from you and I heard your concern and I completely acknowledge them. I can assure you that we are taking into consideration those concerns. My personal belief and my personal decision, the OEC will probably have one last discussion internally about any draft that will be provided to the OEC and then give the right recommendation to the board to move on.

My personal belief is that I also would like to see the At-Large review move and go to a situation that the At-Large would be happy with and the community will be happy with because we

---

want to make sure that the review is something that answers, first of all, the need of the community before everything else.

I will not be able to answer any question honestly. I would love to hear from you, from every member of the ALAC and At-Large leadership. We have discussed this in the past with Alan, everyone, and we are pretty comfortable with the situation where we are now.

So, I will just say that we will be discussing very soon, the upcoming meeting of the OEC, and we will for sure have a decision made by that time.

I don't know if Leon would like to ...

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, everyone. It's good to be back home. Thank you. It's good to have lunch at home. What else could I ask for?

I think it's been clear that we're here in our personal capacity and not even in our board member capacity, but rather as friends sitting here.

First of all, I would like to congratulate and commend those who have been working so hard in building the different documents that have been worked upon and that are now, informally at

---

least, submitted to some members of the OEC and I hope that it will soon be formally submitted for the OEC to review and actually make some decisions on it.

I am aware. I've been talking to many of you and I am aware that we have time pressure, and most of all, I am very happy to see that there is this urgency to actually begin implementing the different ... The plan that has been built by the At-Large Review Working Party in order to improve the way to do things here in the ALAC and of course the larger At-Large community.

So, I am very thankful to you, Alan, Cheryl, Holly, Maureen, everyone that has actually been very active in this.

As Khaled said, I think the most fruitful thing we can do today is to listen to you and to continue to understand your concerns. I am not a stranger to those concerns because I've been part of this and it's really fresh in my mind and in my skin still.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The scars haven't healed, have they?

LEON SANCHEZ: No, not at all. The wounds are fresh still. On a personal note, I really liked the way you framed the issues and how you mapped

---

them to very concrete actions that I think actually can deal with the issues that have been risen by the review.

I would like to of course welcome any comments and questions that you might have so that we can continue to have these dynamics, this inertia, this dialogue on how we can bring this review to the best possible and how we can actually make improvements to the At-Large community for the benefit of end users. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. On the point of view on whose behalf are you here, although I had no illusions when I became chair of ALAC, it would have quickly reinforced me that I am not in power to speak on behalf of ALAC unless ALAC has made a decision. I can give opinions on where I think it might go, but even that's a rather risky thing to do.

I just came from a discussion on GDPR where we have not made a decision. I hope I did that right. I fully understand you're not here on behalf of either of them and are not speaking on behalf, but you are two individuals who have some insight as to how these groups might think and that is what we were looking for.

One more clarification. This document, I thank Leon for saying it's roughly in the right area. This document was not written as



---

an implementation plan. It's not a list of things we're going to do. It's at the level that I believe the ICANN board should be involved in, and yes we will have to flush it out, but we're deliberately trying to keep it sparse and not promise to do things until the people who are going to have to implement it actually decide what it is they can do in a reasonable timeframe.

You said you would like to have a decision from the OEC the next time they meet. Can you tell us when that is so we have a target? When do we have to get this final document? Because what we have here is a draft. I don't know how much it will change. This certainly is going to have to be some preambles before. We can't just toss a table at you. Well, we could, but I'm not sure that's wise.

So, what timeframe are you looking at for your next OEC meeting, so we can know whether we can make that and what our target is?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Normally, the next OEC meeting will be during the next board workshop in beginning of May. End of April we will have something at least for the OEC to look at it before the meeting.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: So, we're talking about third week in April at the very latest. That's a target I think we can work to. We'll turn the floor open to anyone who has any comments or thoughts. I did ask Cheryl if she wanted to comment and she said, no, we'll just open it up, but of course Cheryl is one of the people that put her hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In fact, I may just begin and perhaps start to get your digestive juices slowed and your thinking one started.

Just to make sure both Khaled and Leon are very clear on where the ALAC Review Working Party and the ALAC and regional leaders are with this draft.

This draft, whilst the kernel of editors and drafters out of the Review Working Party – and Leon escaped this, but he knows exactly ... We haven't actually found anyone brave enough to replace you, Leon, which worries me greatly.

Anyway, whilst we are very familiar with it because this is a document that's been churned amongst us, the ALAC and the regional leaders and the rest of the working party have not had this particular table framework for very long at all and they have in fact only had one opportunity during yesterday – I believe it was yesterday, it feels like a blur sometimes. I think it was in the

---

last 36 hours at least – to have any sort of informational interaction and Q&A with us as well.

So, whilst, as Alan said, we're not envisaging enormous changes, there may be text changes, there may be – certainly, as Alan said, it needs to be sandwiched between preamble and some explanation. It needs to be made very clear that the title is somewhat just slightly misleading because, as an implementation proposal, it is vastly inadequate. This is a bridging document to assist the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, provide the ICANN board with sufficient detail that should they wish to resolve that we do go ahead and plan and implement a number of things to remediate or modify or rectify issues raised in an independent review and the following process, that they have enough to look at and understand that we have mapped – can use that word now, Alan? Am I allowed to use mapped again now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good. We have mapped the issues identified with a form of response. So, with that as a preamble, we've got John. Over to you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: No. We're going to me first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, we're having Alan first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yesterday was the first time we had a minor opportunity to discuss this. The document has been distributed to the ALAC and the working party several weeks ago with the exception of two people who are [inaudible] two new people who were omitted from the list accidentally.

I will say I added the title on the fly I think on the plane over here, so the title was indeed not well thought-out. That being said, most of the information there is not new. It was extracted from our previous responses, and in fact, from the mapping that MSSl did with some rewording. There's one or two new ideas in there because the world has changed since we started this process six months ago or started the answering process six months ago.

With that, John is the first. Go ahead.

---

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you and thank you for coming and seeing us today. I have a question that's sort of process related. Early on in the review process, I had a look at the original survey instrument. Cheryl asked me to take a look at it. I did. There were many issues with it ... Issues that, as a scholar myself, I had grave concerns about the research at that point in time.

Going forward, how do I voice those concerns in an effective way to have a positive effect by simply editing a survey? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to take that, John. Look, how to do this politely? Well, I'll be damned. I won't.

It's not our job to rectify poorly performed performances of the past from people who we have no control over at all. We did our job and you were a vital part of that job, by offering clear expertise and guidance firmly rooted in the experience and specific work of our part of the ICANN Organization. What was done with that is not actually our fault, and certainly not our problem to solve.

What some future ICANN MSI member or a person from a subcommittee of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee or the board may wish to do if they're looking at future structure,

---

that's an entirely different question. They know where we live. I'm pretty sure they can contact us.

It's nice for us to offer to do remediation, but it's really not our job to do remediation.

That said, however, you know very well because you've been part of it, we took an awful lot of time responding at each point of the process.

I personally don't feel that our collective voice has been inadequately heard. I think the ridiculous amount of human hours that has gone into responding to this is a sad testimony to a system that needs radical reform, and if they would like to get onto you, me, or anyone else to help them do a better job next time, that would be welcome.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Just to be clear, the OEC in October asked for a mapping between the issues raised and the ALAC At-Large proposals. The word recommendation from the items review was not mentioned in that sentence.

So, let us not focus on how this could have been done better, but what we have to do now to go forward. Who do we have? Guess we can go back to our lunch then.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that’s sorted. It is probably wise because I’m noticing in the Adobe Connect room that there are people who would like to at least do a high points and holidays of the document. If we just go through it and just note some of the features in each, that does two things.

It allows those who need a second reading to refresh themselves on the points to have that now, and it also puts to the record of our informal meeting what we’re talking about, for frame of reference. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you were asking me to do that and I’ll be glad to. I said we won’t use the word recommendation, but I will here. The At-Large Review Report had 16 recommendations and with each of them they had an issue, and the issue is what we’re focusing on, not their proposed solution.

The first issue was that we should worry about quality not quantity in terms of our advice and other comments. Our brief response is we already do. We can demonstrate with statistics that we have carefully been doing that. We do acknowledge the website did not reflect that well. It did not reflect the

---

differentiation between comments and advice, for instance, very well and we are working to fix that problem.

Number two was a statement that we have significant difficulty getting people other than those who are in this room, and sometimes even those in this room, to actively participate in the policy commenting process and participate in policy development processes. That is definitely an issue. It was an issue that was presented to the reviewers and it was an issue that at the time started the review we were already starting to address.

Unfortunately, with the IANA transition and accountability, priorities changed. But, our plan at this point still is to, number one, focus on getting people – and I’m not differentiating between individual, unaffiliated members, or people who are parts of ALSes, to getting people to understand what we’re doing and capture some small number of them.

As I pointed out, we have about 240 ALSes, if we could get one person from one out of every three ALSes to be really active, that’s an additional 80 workers. I don’t know if we can manage a lot more than that.

Our target is a number of different outreach and engagement mechanisms so that we can make sure that we reach people



---

who might be interested in the rather arcane things we do and engage them. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Just on that point, I think it's important that we also recognize that just sitting around this table, not our extended family but this table right now, I count nine people actively engaged in GNSO policy development and three that are passionately involved with the ccNSO processes. So, I wouldn't call that underrepresented from a group of 15 ALAC member appointees and five RALOs who could perhaps reasonably suggest they have a leadership of two or three each. So, yeah, let's pop this into perspective, shall we? I think we're doing not too shabby. Shall we do better? Should we take it out to the [inaudible] communities? Absolutely. But, we are not poor performers and I would put those stats up against constituencies within the homes of those support organization policy development processes any damn day of the week.

That said ... Was Cheryl getting grumpy? Yes. That was an aside. That said, I also am very aware because of my role with the GNSO Council that right now the considerations in the Council are how we can rationalize the ridiculously large number of members and participants coming into their precious PDP processes and slowing it down with all of this opinion and input.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: So, we'll just stop participating and help solve their problem for them. That's really easy.

Our challenge always has been how do we engage and get involved with the people who don't have the privilege of showing up at meetings and understanding what ICANN really is? To some extent, that is a problem that is going to be with us forever because it was built into the DNA of the architecture of At-Large that was given to us.

Short of trying to change that completely, and basically telling all of At-Large today, "Go away, we're starting from scratch," we have to try to make it work.

Anyway, that's our attempt and we believe we will be moderately successful if we're given the proper resource to do this and resources will be an issue. Thank you.

[LEON SANCHEZ]: Thanks, Alan and Cheryl. I think that one more thing that we could do is to be more loud about what the At-Large community is doing in the different processes that you are contributing to because I know for a fact that there is a lot of At-Large people contributing a lot of work and a lot of hours and a lot of pain, etc., to PDP processes all over the ICANN ecosystem.

---

But, maybe what we're failing to do is to create awareness on this work that we are delivering to the wider community.

I think that not only we need to go, as you both said, but we also need to be better at communicating and telling everyone outside the At-Large community what we are actually doing because that will actually make the At-Large work not to say self-sustainable because that's not the right word, but actually demonstrate that we as end users ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Demonstrable effect.

[LEON SANCHEZ]: Exactly. As end users, we are adding a ton or tons of value to the ICANN ecosystem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: To add to that, I think it's a little bit hard to demonstrate completely because you can count up the number of people in a working group. That doesn't necessarily reflect. You can count on the sort of conversations that are here. That's hard to document.

---

If you're looking at how much time we have as volunteers, it's limited anyway. I think I'd rather spend the time in contributing.

In terms of metrics, we've tried metrics and it's a later point that will come up. We have to think of ways I think to quantify what we do without detracting from the limited amount of time we have.

I do take a deep breath and go hard to quantify. We can try. We can try with metrics. I'm pretty sure that I think we'd rather spend our time contributing and I'm sure there are other ways we can strengthen that, but measuring is going to be a bit of a challenge and obviously has been.

[LEON SANCHEZ]:

Just to clarify, metrics can be a part of being more loud about what we're doing, but there are also other ways of actually creating awareness of what we are doing within the ICANN ecosystem. I'd also rather be contributing and using our time in feeding into the PDP process rather than creating a process to measure that.

HOLLY RAICHE:

A process to measure the process of contributing to the process.

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

Just a personal thought and follow-up with what Cheryl said about the participation. I think personally the technology is better when it is visible for the end user. It's important for us to think about participation from an expertise side. We need more experts. We need more new blood with expertise, not new blood without expertise.

There is no need for us to have four billion Internet users involved within ICANN. It's even impossible for us to manage. But, we need for sure new membership in the At-Large community.

At the same time, we need also to preserve the expertise that have been gained by the experts that we have around the table here today and the family of the At-Large.

So, there is a certain balance. We need to find it. It's probably difficult to find that balance, but it's not really important for us to focus only on having new members, new members, new members. It's probably the expertise which is more important than the membership number.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly?

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Following up directly, one thing that APRALO has done, and I think other RALOs have done as well, is a mentoring program. In fact, you're talking about a transfer of knowledge. That's what we've done in the limited way we've just started. It's something where we have to do to—

ALAN GREENBERG: This session officially ends in an hour. I'm sorry, in 15 minutes. So, if we want to go through this, we're going to have to go back to it a little bit. We'll talk about participation again when we come to one of the later items. I think it'll also answer some of the issues you raise.

Can we go on to number three, please? Number three, the issue is staff resources are disproportionately focused on administration and not policy. We accept the fact that they are very significantly focused on administration and helping us run meetings and keeping everything greased. We do not feel it's disproportionate. Although we are using and will increase the use of staff to help right documents, we are not creating 50-200 page documents like the GNSO does. We're not writing major policy where we need authors to manage and oversee a major drafting process. We believe we are using it appropriately now. We will be requesting support in a number of other areas, particularly in relation to number two and contacting people

---

and putting things in words that are understandable, but we do not believe that it is disproportionate at all, but there are staffing implications that we will be looking at in the detail [inaudible]. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Of course, what we're looking at here is the inability to discern the vast difference and importance to us between something labeled as administration and what actually happens, which is facilitation. So, the facilitatory value to the communities is simply not measured or recognized in this, but I think that's something in our implementation we will recognize and make sure is clearly delineated. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Number four was we should abolish the ALT and return the decision-making powers back to the ALAC. Our answer simply is the ALT does not make decisions. It never has. It doesn't, according to our rules; and it doesn't, according to process.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a quickie.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: It is advisory to the chair and this chair values that. The next chair may not.

Number five. Uneven contribution of At-Large to a coordinated ICANN strategy in outreach and engagement. Missed opportunities for coordination with other constituencies and ICANN staff.

I'm not sure ICANN has a coordinated outreach and engagement for individual users. Interestingly enough, my recollection is – and I can't quite read that from here, I'm afraid – is that the recommendations ... The issue said we don't coordinate with staff. The recommendation, which we're not supposed to be talking about, said we don't coordinate with outside bodies like ISOC. So, the two were not connected at all.

Our response is to the extent that the mission of ICANN allows and additional funding is available, we do work with other people. And to the extent that anyone within ICANN, including GSE, wants to work with us, we do. And GSE is actually the only internal part of ICANN that we meet with at every meeting and give them significant time just because of those synergies. So, we believe in fact we're doing that to the best extent we can and we will continue.

Maureen, go ahead.



---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Just following on from that, I would like just like to add that – and I would say this with many of us – when we’re organizing events, they generally include other organizations. That’s the whole point. We endeavor to go to those events where we know we can actually work cooperatively and collaboratively with other organizations, iSTAR organizations.

Also, the collaboration that’s even taking place at this event, at this meeting, where we had the NCUC ALAC joint even which was well attended, this is really what the community wants. And we’re doing it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we’ll continue to do it. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can’t see the fourth column here, but I believe it says we’ll continue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ongoing.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Ongoing, thank you. Next one, number six. The election processes are excessively complex and have been open to allegations of unfairness.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. Somebody doesn't....

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. Some of our election processes, specifically the one process associated with the board member selection is complex compared to what anyone in ICANN does. It is not that different from the NomCom, but it was developed through a bottom-up process. The only place they mentioned allegations of unfairness is in that issue and it wasn't clear what that was in relation to, so it's hard to answer it.

We believe that something developed by the community is appropriate. If the community chooses to change it, that is also appropriate and it will evolve as it does after every one of the selections we've done so far – and we've done three of them – we go back and tweak the rules because we discover something that needs minor adjustment.

If there's ever a desire in the community by general consensus to change it radically, then that will happen. But, that's where the [inaudible] should come.

---

And, of course, again, in relation to recommendations, the concept of allowing anyone in the world to apply and then we select one randomly, perhaps whoever wants that outcome should look at the list of some of the people who have applied in the past. They are public. Do we really want a random selection?

Next number. Olivier, please go ahead, briefly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. In fact, it's interesting to see that we regularly have this criticism of saying the election process is too complex because some still think that the election process that was the initial At-Large elections worldwide where everybody had a vote to put people directly on the board and which ended up in a bit of a shambles should be the process that we should be using. Of course, there's some reticence certainly in this group because of the historical significance of the results that we got back then and the way that this was gamed.

So, I think that we're in a just middle position, but there will always be people who will want more and some less. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Number seven. Excessive amounts of community time are spent on process and procedure at the expense of policy development.

---

What we don't say in the comment or in our response is if you look at the GNSO Council, the first GNSO review said the GNSO should not be setting policy. It should be managing the process.

Although we are not – At-Large is not a policy development organization, the At-Large Advisory Committee is very much managing the process to make sure At-Large works. It is not unreasonable we spend a fair amount of time in these meetings when we have a chance to decide how things go if we spend some of our time on administration.

That being said, we acknowledge the fact, again, our web presence and Wiki presence did not reflect the reality and the reviewers chose to believe not what we said, but what was written on the web. That is being corrected and we will no longer list 30 defunct committees as if they are active, which was unfortunately the case.

Next, number eight. Social media and Internet based tools should be used more effectively and at minimal cost. Now, that was an interesting value judgment that was put in an issue to continuously survey and channel end user input into ICANN decision-making. It's not at all clear that continuously serving people ... Sorry, is at minimal cost. People who are in that business seem to think it's an expensive business.

---

That being said, we are using social media. We have a working group that regularly, and to the extent that ICANN actually has a policy on how it uses social media, we'd be delighted to work together with ICANN staff on that.

Next, need for increased At-Large awareness and staff training regarding social media. That is basically the same item and we're not going to go into it a lot more. We have always had some staff members to the extent they were available to us working on social media.

Number 10, there are a multitude of communication channels at At-Large and we should restrict it to one. Essentially saying we should get rid of our Wiki, get rid of our mailing lists, and use some other tool.

We use exactly the same tools that are used throughout ICANN. We do not have the right to unilaterally tell ICANN IT what to support and we are continually, through our Technology Taskforce, looking at the possibility of new tools that will help.

That being said, we have a wide community that is subject to very different constraints. Some legal constraints as to what tools they can even access and very much bandwidth and cost of bandwidth.

---

Next one. Stop holding ATLAS meetings and start holding general assemblies. We did point out we do hold general assemblies and we believe that keeping people only in the silos of their region does not, in the long term, support what we're trying to do and we have to occasionally have some level of cross-pollination. And of course that's always going to be subject to funding.

Next, 12. ALAC input to a coordinated ICANN outreach program it [sub-optimal]. Number one, it's not clear we have a coordinated ICANN outreach program. Number two, it's the same as number five. We do it to the extent possible and the extent practical, given volunteers, resources, and money.

We have Olivier who wants to comment. Go ahead, Olivier, very briefly please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. It is worth noting that the RALOs coordinate extensively with their regional vice president and have an outreach strategy on a regional basis. However, as you very well noted – and I think that would be welcome – is the fact that we are not given unlimited funding for doing this, and of course outreach does require funding. So, it's well-understood that we're doing as much as we can provided where the funding is at present. Thank you.

---

[KHALED KOUBAA]: Just to note that the very previous session was the LAC Space.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Next one, systematic RALO participation at regional events. Same answer. We do it to the extent we can and limited by ICANN's mission.

Ricardo, we're already out of time right now, so if you have an intervention ... Okay, thank you.

14, need for an innovative approach to funding or revitalized At-Large. I would be delighted, but their suggestion to use [auction] funds is not going to fly. And number two, we probably could go out and find sponsors. I believe we have no choice but to use ICANN funds. That was an interesting thing. They could not understand why we weren't appreciating their generosity, but so be it.

15, need to reinforce impact of outreach and engagement's activities. Again, there was not a real link between what they were talking about and what the issue said. But, what they ended up saying is we should document all possible funding opportunities for travel in a single place. Our comment to that is replicating information from multiple places and then having it out of date is not productive. We do agree that we should point

---

to it all in one place. I've also said we must document exactly how much money and who gets it. That, to a large extent ....

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It's done for some events. We do it to the dollar for ICANN meetings. For other events, ICANN's policy is it's not available and the only time anyone has ever asked or required a document disclosure request to get it. That's largely ICANN policy.

That being said, if At-Large is subject to such scrutiny, everyone else should be too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got about ten minutes. I think it's enough time to allow for a round of questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Last one is absence of consistent performance metrics. We agree. It is something we have worked on sporadically. It got shelved during the IANA transition and accountability efforts because the same people who were working on metrics were working on that and it was a matter of priorities.



---

That being said, how do you track real performance, real activity, as opposed to just someone has an auto-dialer connect to a meeting and then plays World of Warfare while the meeting is going on. You can't quite do that.

So, we are struggling with how to do it, but we agree to the extent that we can come up with some level of metrics to measure individual performance, we should be doing it and that is part of the implementation, should we ever get to implementation of this review. And that is number 16.

Cheryl tells me even though we've run out of time, we have ten more minutes and I should open the floor, first of all to Khaled or Leon and anyone else. Go ahead.

KHALED KOUBAA:

Thank you, Alan. We appreciate you give us this level of details about the issues. Just let me explain a little bit our expectations from the board perspective.

Our expectation will be to have a document that would allow the OEC to give recommendation to the board at the next meeting, as I said, in May. This recommendation in fact needs to be ... From the OEC perspective, we need to give the board a recommendation that are capable to be measured. So, we will

---

expect that we have some sort of evaluation and monitoring of the implementation.

Also, it's very important from the board perspective that we take into consideration the financial element of any implementation effort. As you know, the budget is now ... It's an important decision, element in every single decision at the board level. So, this is something that we will expect and we look forward to receive from you the document. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think all of that is understood. Certainly, we would as part of our implementation be giving regular reports to whoever chooses to read it. Much of it will be a yes it's done, no it isn't done. So, it's an easy metric. Some of it will actually be metrics of measuring numbers. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to mention something not specific about this, but my impression of how the result of these recommendations. I don't know if you're the right channel or not, but whoever – I don't know how or how these companies that do these reviews are selected.

When we look at these recommendations, we all saw that they did not do enough background research into how ICANN works

---

because sending recommendations that we have to start from scratch doesn't make any sense to us. I mean, to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Khaled, and then I realize I didn't answer your comment on budget. I'll come back once you've finished. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Very quickly, I will go through the idea of what we are now talking into in the OEC. The idea is that we are learning a lot from the reviews, the At-Large reviews, the others. We are learning so much, something new, something we are experiencing after the new bylaws.

But, there is other element which we are talking about as well which is the reason why we have reviews. The reason why we have the reviews is something that we all agree on as a community. We also say this is a theory of change, that we all agree on it. What is this theory of change? What's written explicitly in the article number four in the bylaw? It says through independent review we will improve accountability and transparency. This is the theory of change.

But, as every theory of change, it needs to be scientifically proven by impact assessment and by measurement.

---

Unfortunately, this has not been done at all. So, this is what the OEC is looking for. We will probably have ... We will wait for the first round of reviews to finish so we will be able to have data and we will use that data within an external consultancy company that uses the different methodology of impact assessment that the World Bank used, that the IFC used, the different big organizations use for big programs.

And instead of going forward with correcting the reviews, let's have a step back and answer the first question, which we all need to. Are we having impact from those reviews or not?

I'm not sure that there is an answer yet. Myself, I will not be able to give any answer. But, I'm sure that the scientific methodology of measuring an impact will provide us with an answer.

Then, it's up to the community to decide how to move on. It's either we keep the reviews, correct them, streamline them, find a better way to do them or probably find another way to do the accountability and transparency. There are thousands and millions of ways to improve accountability and transparency.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I must admit I have to disagree with you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't.

ALAN GREENBERG: You said we don't know if there's been any impact. I look at the term impact as what happens when a car traveling at a high speed hits a brick wall. There has been an impact. I thought what we were looking for is a positive impact.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's true, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are looking for positive impact, not just impact. The amount of work that has been put into this work so far is impact, but not one we really wanted.

LEON SANCHEZ: I guess what Khaled wants to say ...

ALAN GREENBERG: We knew what he was saying.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yeah, but I mean it's true. We need to find out whether that impact is being positive or negative. To that end, I think that this

---

recommendation 16 or the issue mapped as number 16 is key to this, developing metrics so that we are able to appropriately measure by whatever means we decide, by whatever method we decide. Developing this will be key into actually allowing us to measure the impact and the value that the At-Large community is building to the ICANN ecosystem.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We are having a hard time, have had a hard time, developing the metrics for performance of individuals. We have lots of metrics. One of the metrics we didn't have time to talk about today is we have demonstrable metrics to show we bring lots of new people into At-Large. Our real problem is we don't retain them. We have hard numbers, real facts and graphs that will demonstrate that. So, it's not as if we don't have any metrics at all. We have lots of metrics. We don't have ones on a certain aspect, which happens to be a critical one.

In terms of budget, when we envisioned the timeline for this, we believed we would have a motion, action of the board, in time to both submit additional budget requests for this coming year and to make a comment in the draft operational plan and budget. We have missed both of those.

So, to the extent there's going to be budget needed to do any of this implementation, and during the implementation phase the

---

first part of planning it is going to be estimating what are the implications in terms of staff or other costs. We will have to do that through an ad hoc process for this current year or defer the implementation and hopefully build it into the various budget instruments we have going forward.

We are not going to be in a position to put budget costs on this document at this time because we haven't done that level of detailed planning.

We had Kaili. Sorry, did you want to respond to that?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Just to say that I think the costing of whatever we are going to implement should be costed by final staff and then we'll move forward [by that].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any implementation we propose is going to be contingent on available resources, both volunteers, staff, and dollars. It's clear. Kaili, and then I have to wrap up.

KAILI KAN:

Yeah, just very quick. I am very disappointed about the selection of items as the independent party and I would suggest that we

---

review next time how that party or agency to be selected. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Kaili and [inaudible] for your comments on this. I'm not only listening to you, but I am feeling your pain. Believe me, there have been very strong comments about it and I will continue to be very firm about how this moves forward so that we continue to act in the best interest of the organization and community.

ALAN GREENBERG: Khaled?

KHALED KOUBAA: My final wish is let's not personalize problems. It's not about items. It's not about persons. It's about process and a way how to do things. Point taken. As said by Leon, we feel the pain but it's not only about persons.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, we've had a lot of organizational reviews in ICANN. A lot of them have not gone well in terms of actually producing effective results.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] reviews.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The details, however, are different and we need to learn something from them going forward. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to say I wanted to just really thank everybody for I think informal and I think quite productive time we've had here today. I know it's hard to get time in everyone's agenda, not the least of which Alan literally left stage while the rest of the presenters he was in panel with were still speaking. Thank you for squeezing this into your schedule. It really is valuable. Olivier, it is your meeting that we're running into. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I was just wondering what the next steps were on timeline as well. Since we have the chair of the OEC, maybe he could enlighten us as to where we're going from here.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that was addressed. They are having a meeting at the retreat in May. Our target is to get a document to them prior to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to remind, that is the major action item out of this. We need to have this raring and ready to go with bells and whistles all on it wrapped up in a bow third week of April, so let's get to work on that, and thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: One quick question. If we get you a document and the OEC considers it at that retreat, is there any chance it will go to the board at that retreat or be deferred to the next meeting? The answer to be yes, no, or we don't know. So, the answer is no.

LEON SANCHEZ: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, we will not have an answer from the board until at least probably the June ...

---

LEON SANCHEZ: 62.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please clear your tables quickly, promptly. There is another meeting starting right now. Can I also make sure we thank our fabulous interpretation staff and the technical team? As ever, we will be almost mute in my case without you.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I personally ask John Laprise and Glenn McKnight to come talk to me for five minutes?

[LEON SANCHEZ]: I want to announce tomorrow the celebration of NARALO at noon. We're celebrating our 11<sup>th</sup> year and it's going to be fun. Make sure you [inaudible] tomorrow.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, everyone. It's been a pleasure to be back home.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**