
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 15th of May, 2019, at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Marita Moll, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, David Mackey, Gordon Chillcott, Haroun Cherif, Herb Wayne, Holly Raiche, Joanna Kulesza, John Laprise, Jonathan Zuck, Jose Lebron, Maureen Hilyard, Yrjo Lansipuro, and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

We currently don't have anybody on the Spanish channel, and we have received apologies from Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede and Lilian Ivette De Luque.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogan, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Our interpreters for today are Marina and Paula.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so that the interpreters may identify you on the other language channels.

Thank you, and with this I turn it over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, and welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. We've got today a short section on the EPDP Phase 2. Then after that we'll look at two current statements being

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.

drafted. One is the evolving ICANN multi-stakeholder model. That's probably likely to be taking most of our time. And the other one, with a much later public comment closing date, is the process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews. After that, we'll have Jonathan Zuck and Sebastien Bachollet discussing the ICANN 65 policy workshop and talking points. Finally, Any Other Business. I noted for the Any Other Business we've got this CPWG sub-group regarding the NomCom review implementation – an update on this. That's due on the 19th of June.

Is there any other Other Business to be added to this? Or any amendment, in fact?

I see that Alan says he has nothing to report on the EDPD because there was no report last week. So that section will go pretty fast, I hope.

I'm not seeing any additional business being added to the agenda, so the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen. We can move to the action items from last week, with the one remaining action item for John Laprise: to request that Evin Erdogan put up a link to the multi-stakeholderism slide deck on the Social Media At-Large and distribute to all the RALOs. I haven't seen that come up on the RALO mailing lists. Is this in process?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Hi, Olivier. We're scheduling a Social Media Working Group call. I think it's this next [Monday]. I'll confirm that, but it's within the next few days. It will be shared on that list. So, even though it was noted as an AI from a CPWG call, it's really more related to Social Media and At-Large. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great. Thank very much for this, Evin. Are there any comments or questions on any of those action items?

No? Okay. Let's then move on to the next part of the agenda. That's the Expedited PDP Phase 2 update with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. You have 20 minutes for this. I'm not sure who wishes to speak first.

I know that Alan has nothing to report, so perhaps, Hadia Elminiawi, would you have any summary or any point that you'd like to bring to the attention of the Consolidated Policy Working Group?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Not really. As Alan mentioned, our meeting is still to happen tomorrow. We are going to discuss the draft proposal of our working message. The staff also posted some worksheets for Work Stream 2 topics. The worksheets deal with the topics like legal versus natural, city field, data retention, potential OCTO purpose, feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized e-mail address, and accredited privacy and proxy. So there is nothing much to report. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. Alan, any update on your side?

Perhaps Alan Greenberg is unable to speak on this topic. Okay – oh. Are there any question on this topic? I see Jonathan Zuck has put his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I just have a quick question for Hadia and Alan that doesn't need to be answered this moment but something to think about, which is that one of the things that we're going to try to do in Marrakech is start the meeting with a group discussion of the other meetings that are going on during this ICANN policy meeting and making assignments of people to attend those meetings and raise particular issues at them. I'm wondering whether or not there's an EPDP meeting in Marrakech that it would be worthwhile to have one or two people from the At-Large attend and raise their hand and bring up a point.

So you may not know to the answer to this question, but if that would be useful, I just wanted to get your sense of that because that's one of the things we're going to be trying to do at the meeting. Thanks, Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: To the best of my knowledge, as of the last discussion I was a part of, there are no public meetings on the EPDP in Marrakech. There will be a number of working sessions, but there's no opportunity for other people to raise their hand in those. So certainly other people are welcome to attend, but there is no participation. The last I heard.

There was discussion of a high-interest topic meeting. Last I heard, the general consensus was not enough will have happened before

Marrakech to allow us to put on a useful high-interest session. So my understanding is I'm not participating in the group that is formally scheduling the meeting, but all indications were that there probably would not be a public meeting of the EPDP.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I've also read that there's a real pushback from the GNSO on having a high-interest topic relating to the EPDP, as in not a public meeting of the EPDP but actually an ICANN-wide discussion about the EPDP. That was on the mailing list of the SO/AC chairs and the group that's putting this together.

Alan, you've got something else to add?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I don't think it was pushback saying we don't want to talk to the public. I think it was pushback saying there's not likely to be to report on and have a subset of meeting on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, the way I interpreted the message was, at such an early stage, it was not a good idea to have a discussion on this. Anyway, these are just details, but it's unlikely as a result that we'll have a topic on the EPDP in Marrakech.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, you used the term “pushback,” as if they said, “Oh, no. We don’t want to meet with the public. I think the motivation is different, so I’m not sure the word “pushback” connotes the right meaning. That’s the only reason I was commenting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Any other thoughts on that?

I’m not seeing anybody else putting their hand up, so thanks very much for this update. We look forward to next week, as you will have had an EPDP call by then. I gather there is not very much for us to let you know about or tell you in advance, so we’ll just have to wait and see how this Work Stream 2 or Phase 2 part start it’s work.

Now let’s go to the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. Starting with recently ratified by the ALAC, the comment on proposed renewal of the .asia registry agreement was adopted by the ALAC, and the executive summary is on the agenda, as well as on the executive summaries page. There are currently no public comments for decision. So the main focus of this call are the two current statements that are being developed, the first being evolving ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model, which closes on the 4th of June, and the second being process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews, which closes on the 15th of July.

I believe Marita Moll has a presentation on the multi-stakeholder public comment. Over to you, Marita. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you very much. Can we have the presentation up on the screen – oh, wow. That was fast. That’s not the first slide. Yeah. All right. Hi, everybody. Great to make it today. Abdulkarim isn’t here. I don’t know if Judith is here. That’s our four-person team, so I’m the one doing it today. I have put together a slightly different kind of presentation that Greg did. I took everything that he did and condensed it for you. There were 21 issues on the original list, and I condensed those into four larger issues that I think, one way or another, encompass everything. There are different ways you can split these things up, but I’ll show you how I thought we could do it because, somehow or another, I don’t see that we want to actually respond to all 21 issues or 15 issues individually. I think it’s more effective to say, “This is a group of issues that are related, and this is how we think they could be better handled.”

Number 2 slide, please. I’ve categorized them into these four issues: structural, process, participation – that is the people; who they are, and how they’re working – and intergroup relations. I’m seeing it as a quadrant. The issues are related. I’m not any good at actually producing something that’s visual on this, but I’ll think about how it could be done. So just think about four different issues, one in each quadrant, and then all the lines that connect them.

Let’s go with the next slide. Under the category of structural, I’ve placed these particular ones, which you saw last week. If you want to look at

this and go back to Greg's presentation that he gave last week, if you look at the #20 issue – holistic view – you'll have a whole list of what that's all about and who said what in that category, which then Brian Cute condensed into the holistic view issue. So, in this category, I've got the holistic view, complexity – both internal and external – roles and responsibilities and everybody that's involved in the process, the terms of people – that is an issue that has come up – and accountability and transparency, which belong in a lot of a different places. But for the time being, I've put them here.

Next slide, please. Next slide. Okay, I've got it. Category processes, the #2 category. The different processes that hang us up. We don't get enough precision in scoping our projects. There's an issue about prioritization of the work. There's issues around the efficient use of resources, how the processes are working, and costs. So I stuck them all in the process. Also, you'll see at the bottom there's connections here between timing and consensus, which is the intergroup relations section, and the structure – my screen isn't showing the rest of that, so I don't know what's at the bottom. Oh, thank you. Accountability and transparency. Okay, great.

Let's go with the next one. Participation. This really is about the people that are involved. As you can see, they're demographics, recruitment of people, how representative are they, and how inclusive is the whole thing? They all seem to fit together rather nicely and you can see that he actually had them slotted in as 5,6,7, 8 in his list of issues. Volunteer burnout – #17 – I think is connected here. Brian Cute – I attended a webinar with him yesterday and he was saying that he thinks volunteer

burnout is more of a symptom than issue in itself. So that's just an aside.

Let's go with the next category, one I've called intergroup relations. I think this particular category can be considered low-hanging fruit. To me, I think it's the easiest one to start off with, to deal with. I think, if we deal with some of these things, we'll find that some of those other things are going to be resolved or at least partially resolved. This category includes things like cultural issues and the trust between the various groups and the fact that sometimes we operate in silos and act like different tribes. We're working against each other instead of together. One of the two things that I suggest that immediately impact on this is the #9 issue called consensus. How do we reach consensus? One of the reasons we find it so difficult is because of some of these things – tribalism, silos, and trust. Timing. Why does it take us so long? Again, trust, operating in silos, not really working together. I'm going to suggest that we start with this #4 category – How do we feel that these cultural issues, issues around silos and tribalism, could be resolved? – and that we could talk about some of the other ones next time. Anyways, start with this, create a Google Doc, and see what we can put in there. We just put in [some] examples.

If you go to the next slide ... All right. This is one is from Jonathan's template. What's at stake for end users if we don't resolve the problem? It's quite obvious that that's what's happening right now and why we're having to have this discussion. Things are stalling. Things don't get done or don't get done easily or done with a great deal of difficulty. The processes go on for too long and we all lose credibility. So that is just the reason why, in this particular section, we could resolve

some of this stuff if we came up with some good suggestions on how we could move this discussion forward.

#8. Next slide, please. I'm proposing some of these things just to get our discussions going on things that we could do or say with respect to this interpersonal relation section. We could say that there needs to be more training in the multi-stakeholder processes, per se. Does everybody really understand what's expected on them in this process? If not, then that's one reason why perhaps things aren't working as well as they should. So perhaps there could be training. That's a suggestion we could make. We could ask about a commitment to problems, resolutions, that everyone's committed to resolving problems and not to standing in the way because, if you're going to commit to the multi-stakeholder process, then really it's not just about you, it's not just about how you feel, you have to be negotiate and fit in the system. #3. We could say that a culture of trust has to be supported by penalty for obviously doing things like public sniping of one group towards another. I know what that penalty could be. Just a timeout? That sort of thing just destroys trust and really angers people. We could say that ICANN reevaluate the ways the groups are resourced. There's a perception that there's an inequity in resources. That creates some bad feeling among groups [that are not] powerful. But it's the way the system was set up to begin with. So these and the other one, power inequalities to be addressed – these five – are suggestions I'm putting out there to get the discussion going as to ways in which we could address this interpersonal relation issue that is, I think, very much at the root of some of the problems.

The last slide, the #9 slide, is our discussion slide. What is our goal? How do we get towards developing a positive culture? As I said before, I think starting with the Google Doc and discussion on the list. Depending on what says said today, we'll post some stuff on the list and see how people are thinking their way through this problem.

If we could go back to the previous slide, #8, I would like to open this at this point for discussion. As I am having trouble seeing everything on this Zoom screen, I don't know if there's any hands up. Someone else is going to have to help me on that.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Cheryl has her hand up.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, Cheryl. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Marita. Thanks for this. As you know, you and I tended to be the vociferous ones in the last of Brian's calls, so you kind of know where I am thinking on a lot of this. But while we're on Slide 8, I wouldn't want to see more than these five positions. These seem like good ones – perhaps that's the best way of saying it – for us to try and attack at this stage, remembering that this whole evolution of the multi-stakeholder model is a particular point in a longer process itself. I think making smart contributions – and I do mean that as the capital letters, not just word in meaning ... We'll have greater effect if we don't try and boil the whole ocean on this matter. I think this is a great way forward.

Just on Judith's point, however, about each group seeing this slide is in a different way, that's actually one of the benefits of us trying to encourage this way of thinking because that then opens up for the wider cross-community discussions, which has to have to happen if any of this will go forward.

I like this approach. It strikes me, for example, where we use the term "penalty" is Position 3. A consequence might be another square-bracketed word there. If there's nothing more, in fact it's being declared as outside the expected standards of behavior within ICANN. That is publicly noted and the consequences with the Ombud's Office follow if it continues. That's okay. That'd be good step forward. That needs to just be seen as an adjunct aid, not as the Sword of Damocles coming down and disconnecting-head-from-shoulders type. So I [highlight] a tool. The Ombud's Office is a tool, not the end of one's life. So I like this and I want to support this [by] going forward. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, Cheryl. I knew that that was not the right word, but I just couldn't think of the [next] word at the time when I did this. "The consequences" is way better, and that will definitely get changed.

With respect to Judith, Judith, I wasn't thinking that At-Large was not resourced enough, but the complaints I've been hearing about not having resources have been coming from NCSG and NCUC and NPOC – all of those people who really feel that they're being squeezed. I know that it's not our fault, but everybody is looking at us.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Marita, what I was saying is that we think we don't have enough resources, and all the constituents will say they don't have enough resources. NCUC always says, "At-Large has too many resources, and they don't have these issues." So each one will see it in their way, and that brings us back to the squabbling.

MARITA MOLL: Exactly. I know that. So there is no intention to name any groups. I think everyone will read this in their way. I don't think that we're saying that we don't have enough resources – I wouldn't say that here – compared to other groups. But then you know there's the resources that business groups have, where they're actually paid to go and fly on first-class flights and all that. So it's just got to be, in my mind, a much more general comment. I don't know what other people are going to say. I'm absolutely certain this is going to come in and, somehow or another, someone is going to bring this in. I think it would be politically correct of us to also bring this up, as some groups think that we're hogging all the resources. So, if we actually bring it up as well, then we're recognizing that there's a resource inequity across the board, really. That was my point here. I didn't think that we could actually ignore this point.

"Are we painting a target on ourselves by having that discussion?" Well, I thought it was a positive target, Jonathan, but let me know what you think about that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Marita?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Marita. We have Jonathan Zuck, Tijani, and Hadia with their hands up. Jonathan Zuck is first.

MARITA MOLL: Jonathan, don't hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. My unmute button disappeared for a second. I have a couple of comments. I guess I can work backwards. What I was trying to say in the chat is that, if we're talking about At-Large positioning in terms of what comment we're trying to make [,a] public comment, I think we need to be careful on this particular point because there is a perception that we have more resources than others, even though we don't have the influence or power of others. So that's all I was mentioning: us bringing it up as part of our comment – the fact that, as Cheryl said, it's already been identified doesn't mean that it's something we need to try and make a point about. I don't know. So we need to be very careful of what we say as part of a public comment.

One thing I'd love to do is have this maybe changed to interorganizational or something like that instead of interpersonal. I feel like that's already a little bit of a hot word in some respects. So that might make it better for the categorization.

Finally, on this commitments to problem resolutions, we've had some experience in ICANN where we've had deadlines imposed on the community. That has lead to people working towards resolutions better.

I think this is related to scoping as well. It could be that something about creating a scenario by which, if there isn't a resolution by a certain time, some default thing will happen that everybody dislikes might be of some value. I just remember the experience with the CCCWG and, to some extent, the EPDP. The presence of an external deadline create a little bit more of a completion mentality than we otherwise have on some of these groups that go on forever and ever – these work groups. So that's something that might be interesting: to create deadlines and also create some sort of default outcome at the deadline that no one would really want to see happen. That's one thought.

I guess, more generally, I'd love to – I see Hadia has her hand up – hear from Hadia and Alan on the EPDP process because I felt like a lot of the gossip, if you will, that came out of the EPDP was about people acting in an untrustworthy way. It sort of came from everyone about everyone else. I'd love to hear what led to that kind of a feeling within it. "You said it was fine and then you changed your mind later" was something that came up a lot. NCUC was accused of that by us. The Business Constituency was accused of that by the contracted parties. Is there something about documenting positions along the way so that people have to be firmer in them as opposed to throwing them out as stocking horses as part of a negotiation that then leads to a lack of trust? So I'm interested in bouncing that kind of an idea off of people, where it's tougher for people to take a victory and then ask for more; a "give an inch and take a mile" kind of scenario which came out of the meeting from everyone, which is sort of strange to hear. So those are my thoughts. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Jonathan. Just to tell you that that “interpersonal” was a typo. I was using “intergroup” but I missed that one. So, yes, that would be incorrect – “interpersonal.” So “intergroup”/“interorganization” is another possibility.

Your comments around creating some kind of a default outcome around deadlines and processes that take too long is great. It would probably fit in in one of the other areas just as well, so hang onto that and maybe put it in one of the other categories. That’s all right.

Okay. Who’s next on the list? I can’t see it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. Next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. First of all, thank you, Marita, for putting this together. I liked it. Second, the discussion of these five positions – I don’t think that the ICANN community needs training about much stakeholder processes but a definition of these processes, how the stakeholders work together. Are there [acorn] stakeholders is there a different weight for each stakeholder? How do they [base] consensus according to this weight, if there is a weight? These are things that we

have to define before speaking about anything. So I think the first proposal that we need to do is to ask for a development of a definition of the multi-stakeholder processes. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. I seem to have lost the shared screen. Did that disappear for everybody?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, it disappeared.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Stop sharing it.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Well, we'll go ahead with the discussion, whoever's next on the list. Thank you, Tijani. I think that's an interesting comment. I wouldn't throw out the training thing that much because I did actually take a training session when I was at the European [Micense] School. There are things to be learned from that in having to compromise. Not a lot of the people are coming to the table prepared to compromise. I think that's part of the thing that's missing.

Anyways, go ahead, whoever's next on the list.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

I had a comment to similar to Jonathan's in relation to the title, but again, you said that this was a typo.

The other thing I'm not sure ... I thought maybe it would be easier to couple some of the issues together and comment on them. I guess the positions you have that you refer to relate to the issues of culture, maybe demographics, representativeness, inclusiveness, roles and responsibilities, and volunteer burnout maybe. To me, it's not clear how the position relate to the issue and which issues exactly it related to. I would think that, for our public comment to be clear on the issue or issues, we need to be clear about which issues we are coupling together and what are we suggesting in relation to the issue that's listed in the table of contents.

So I like the positions you put. I'm having a difficulty, though, relating them to the issues in the table of contents.

MARITA MOLL:

Okay. Hadia, I have condensed 21 issues into 5, and all of those 21 issues are listed somewhere within those five groups of issues. So the one we're looking at now is only one of those five groups of issues.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Maybe that's why it's not really clear to me. Which part/issues are we looking at? So that's—

MARITA MOLL: We're looking at the five issues that were on that screen. That's the last batch of issues, which is – [hang on]. Now I haven't got the screen anymore. [God]. So there were four groups: structural, process, participation, and intergroup relations. The one we're looking at is intergroup relations, which includes cultural issues, trust, silos, consensus making, and timing. [Those are] all of the things that can be included in there, but you have to split them up one way or another. Does that help?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. You're right. But maybe the place for that would be the wiki page because it's difficult now to look at the issues and the topics and how you group them together.

MARITA MOLL: Well, yeah, if we could have control of the slides, it would help. But we don't.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay.

MARITA MOLL: Sorry. Okay. Who else is on the list of speakers? Anybody?

CLAUDI RUIZ: We have Alan next.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I was muted again. Before I start, I don't know what happens for other people. My name is, just by alphabetizing, is at the top of the list. When I put my hand up, it stays at the top of the list, and I don't see where I am in the queue. I don't know if that happens to other people or it's unique to me.

MARITA MOLL: Certainly happens to me, Alan.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Alan, as the host, I can see the order of the people with their hands raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I think the host has to tell us who's next, not ask the person who's next to speak, because everyone looks like they're next to themselves.

I don't have any great wisdom on these particular points, just a few thoughts. Part of it is based on EPDP and accountability, which Jonathan made reference to. Almost everything you come up with in these issues are two-edged swords. Deadlines are really effective at getting at an end point, but sometimes the deadline itself forces you to accept things which are much, much less than optimal.

I'll give a silly example right now. It's not silly, but it's not perhaps the best one. Accountability was really pressed for time, and one of the really difficult issues it was working with is the independent review. We ended up coming up with a set of rules on how to pick a standing panel. Three years later, we still haven't come anywhere near to the point where we can pick a standing panel. Goran put out a blog on it saying we should do something, and he was criticized by saying, "Who are you to say that?" This shouldn't be a staff function. That happened because of the deadlines, that we had to come to closure.

So almost all of these things are two-edged swords. As Judith pointed out, we think someone else is over-resourced, and think we're over-resourced. These are really complex problems, and I think we have to be careful as we try to come up with an At-Large position to not look at things, first of all, from our own point of view only and to not look at things in a simplistic point of view. There are problems that are being addressed now because they have been haunting us for years. It's not through lack of trying to fix some of them that they're still with us. So, as we go forward, just keep that in mind and try to make sure that what we're going to propose is something that actually makes sense in the overall ICANN context and not just our context. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, Alan. In response, that is why I put that item about resource and unequal resources on that list: to my mind, it's a way of saying, "Look, we don't only care about ourselves. We know that other people have problems like this." So it's exactly as you're saying, but I

understand that, sometimes, when you bring things like this up, you might be cutting off your own nose to spite your face, as they say.

All right. Who's next.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: No one else has their hand raised at the moment.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. How are we doing for time, Olivier? Is this about as much as you allocated to this discussion? One thing I've lost on Zoom, too, is how much time we have left.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I can unmute myself, it's a little – well, we're kind of running out of time on this. But the only other large topic for this is going to be Jonathan's topic of what topics we're going to have for the next ICANN meeting. Jonathan, how much time do we have? What are you looking for?

JONATHAN ZUCK: To be honest, I'm not even prepared for that, so I don't need any time. I'll need to circulate something on the list.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Then we can—

JONATHAN ZUCK: I've been [inaudible] the schedule to come together [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, Marita, we have until 20:30 UTC. At the moment, it's 20:46 UTC – no, it's 19:46 UTC. So, yeah, there's plenty of time still.

MARITA MOLL: Well, we—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You can have another 15 minutes if you want.

MARITA MOLL: All right. Well, that's great then. I'm going to ask that we go back to the slides and take up one of these other categories. Let's talk about the process category, the prodigious scoping and prioritization and things like that. Can we do that? Can we go back to the slides, which are gone now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Dev's hand is up, Marita. I know you can't see the hands at the moment.

MARITA MOLL: I cannot see that, yes. Please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Can you hear me?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, I can hear you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks. [inaudible] comments forming in the back of my mind in looking at the slides and thinking about ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. [Let me try to state] what I think is a key issue. I think it overlaps several issues as it related to efficient use of resources, which is Issue 13 and I think issue 16, which is cost. In my mind, I think one of the big challenges in finding new persons to be involved with ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, especially to try to ascend to leadership roles that are therefore funded to attend three ICANN face-to-face meetings, as well as potentially, depending on the work, some cross-community working groups, potentially even attending in-between face-to-face meetings, in between the three major ICANN face-to-face meetings.

So I think, from At-Large's perspective, you're basically asking a volunteer to give a month essentially dedicated to ICANN face-to-face meetings if you want them to become really involved in the multi-stakeholder model. For younger persons, and especially those having families and so on, that's a very tough sell, I think. I suspect that the people that then gravitate toward the ICANN multi-stakeholder model are people who are funded to be there. In other words, they are paid because of their job to be there at the table or who have flexible time because they own their own business or they're retired. This is their core activity that they are happy to do. So I think that is an issue.

I think one of the solutions I have in mind is that ICANN needs to consider reducing its three face-to-face meetings to two. What that'll do is it will give us more breathing space in between face-to-face meetings – so it'll allow for more discussions to happen on a particular issue – and I think potentially increase the diversity of persons involved in the ICANN policy stakeholder model. So I'll just throw that out for comment. That's it.

MARITA MOLL:

Thanks, Dev. I think that's really interesting. A very firm proposal like that? I'm not sure. I'd like to hear from other parts of our community on whether or not it's a good idea. It's an interesting idea: just to go to two meetings and maybe do something else maybe more specific in between. I don't know if, at this particular stage, we should be proposing things quite that specific. We may be still at a more general stage of this process, but we can certainly look into that. Because you don't want to get too specific until you get really down to the far end of the line. So that's an interesting proposal.

Has anybody else got a comment on that? Is that something we might support?

Someone else managing the meeting? Is anyone else going to say anything about this?

No. Okay. Well, Dev, actually—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm happy to jump in on that.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Cheryl.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because you've got hands up. You've got hands up from Holly and John. I don't know why the host is incapable of giving people the [list], but they should know that you're not able to see the participant pod for whatever reason. So you've got Holly, John, and Alan. And, if no one else will update you, I will continue to try.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. Holly, it looks like you're first.

Holly, we can't hear you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Really? Oh, okay. Hold on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Now we can, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Can you hear me now?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I totally agree with Dev. The time taken to prepare for meetings and to actually read stuff and think about it is a challenge. I think we have to think about how we can help people so that we split up the [tasks] enough to let people have the time to think through carefully and make comments. Just a suggestion. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Holly. We have John next.

John, are you there?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yes, I'm here. Thank you. Can you hear me?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah.

JOHN LAPRISE: I want to second what Dev and Holly just said. On ALAC, we took a poll a few meetings ago. Many of you know, and some of you don't, that my day job from where I'm speaking right now is not involved in the Internet per se on an ICANN level. We're a professional organization, a non-profit organization. I am fortunate to have both an employer and a

wife who are supportive and more than willing for me take vacation time and come and attend three ICANN meetings a year, as well as occasionally take conference calls while I'm in the office.

This is a heavy lift, even more people who are well-resourced. For people who want to be involved or who are not actually involved in the Internet at a high level but who even have an interest, this is really hard. If I did not have as much support as I do, I wouldn't have run for ALAC last time or this time. So not just being on ALAC but also just being actively involved in the meetings and actively involved in the life at ICANN is a heavy lift and a heavy commitment for people who don't have a significant stake, a direct stake, in the outcomes that ICANN is overseeing.

Especially, for instance, when you're looking at the other consistencies or the other advisory committees, At-Large is somewhat unusual in that we're trying to represent the interest of At-Large users, many of whom are oblivious to the work of ICANN, despite the fact that their daily lives probably rely on some element that ICANN touches. So this is a big difference between us and everyone else. There's no real way to remedy it. It just is what it is, but we have to acknowledge it. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, John. I think we all agree it's a time-sucking proposal. Who's next on the list? Alan, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That would be me. This is a great example of what I was talking about. The three meetings a year and occasional other meetings for some of us is a really heavy load, especially if you're trying to earn a living and have a day job. There's no way to fix it. We've talked many times about changing the number of meetings a year, and we've ended up changing exactly what those meetings are. Interestingly enough, we came up with a June meeting which was just going to focus on policy, the theory being that all sorts of people who come who are not actively involved in policy will not go to those meetings.

Well, surprise! That isn't the way it works. It isn't the way it works for businesspeople. They come to the meeting anyway because it's a good time to politick or to have a beer with your friends or whatever. Interestingly enough, even for At-Large, when we proposed, for instance, that people who are not actively involved in policy issues – at the time that was proposed, it was largely the RALO leaders who certainly a few years ago were generally not involved – the proposal was rejected out of hand, that, no, we have to go to the three meetings a year.

So it's not something we're going to be able to fix, and the reason we have three meetings a year is because those who are actively involved in policy issues and try to make decisions and recommendations find that a face-to-face meeting can be far more effective than ten conference calls. And cutting down the number of face-to-face meetings will reduce the amount of output of the reason that ICANN is there.

So, again, we're going to have to look at these things carefully. I think John put it well. Yes, it's difficult. Yes, it's particularly difficult for At-

Large people who don't have money in the game. But it's not likely to change. That doesn't mean we can't talk about it again. This time we may come up with a different answer. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Alan. The double-edged sword, yes. I think we may become – is anyone on the list wanting to speak on this?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Marita. No, no one else has their hand raised at the moment.

MARITA MOLL: All right. We may be coming towards the end of our time. I want to ask, before we leave, if it's okay if I start putting together a Google Document focused around this way of breaking up the problem because, if I can do that, then we can continue in our next call speaking about some of the other three categories that are leftover. At least we'll have a way to talk about it. I just don't see talking about it in all these 21 issues. So, if people are okay with that, we'll go ahead in this particular vein. If not, tell me and give me another idea about how we could go about creating a comment on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Hi.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you mean to begin to write prose at this point about using this structure? [inaudible]

MARITA MOLL: Look, we only have until June the 4th, and I suggest that we could begin on the basis of what I'd put here in the slides. We can take some of that and we can start putting together the discussions out of this meeting, for example. Put some words around it in prose, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm happy to be wrong. Did we reach any consensus on any of these proposals as being positions we should take? [inaudible]—

MARITA MOLL: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess that's my only concern. We ought to feel like we have positions that we all agree to or that we have a majority agreement before we start writing them up, I think, because, otherwise, then they start to have their own inertia. Then when we want to remove them, it's sort of what happened to Greg on the registry agreement. I guess I'd prefer – I don't know; we'll have to work out the timeline – is for us to agree on a few recommendations that we want to make and really stand behind, rather than trying to do the whole subsequent procedures thing, where

we go through and just have lots of tiny little comments on which we don't have consensus. I don't know. That's just my personal view in terms of having an impact on this discussion.

MARITA MOLL:

Jon, I didn't hear much disagreement with the positions that we were taking on the intergroup relations quadrant. I'm going to go through the discussion again. There was some, "We've got to be careful on this and that," but on those particular positions I put – and now we don't have the slide anymore. God, this is frustrating. Those positions that I put on there is a place where we can start some prose. I agree we don't want to speak specifically necessarily on every single of the 21 issues as an issue on its own. That's why I think that grouping them together would make it a lot easier for us to just make some general statements.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I love your categories. I'm sorry. I wasn't trying to be critical of anything you've done structurally.

MARITA MOLL:

No, it's fine. I don't mind.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess I'm just trying to think about what our process should be to decide what it is we as a group want to say about this topic. Eventually, I think we're going to make a few recommendations, but those recommendations should have gone through sufficient discussion that

we have some agreement on it. So this is not about me disagreeing with the cluster approach at all. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to trigger all that pushback from Holly and Cheryl. I like the clusters. I'm just concerned about you writing up your recommendations themselves at a point in which it didn't seem we had reached consensus on them. That's all I was getting at.

MARITA MOLL:

I think a good idea would to put these on the list. We have – how many? 22 people on this call. A few other people on the list. People need to start talking about it on the list. The only way that people will start talking is if we actually put something there. So I don't have a problem with – we'll start that. But if we're going to write something up, I just feel like we should get started one way or another.

So I will. I'll put these positions on the list as one way of responding to – I'll put the clusters on the list and I'll put the positions on the list as one of responding or some response towards the fourth cluster. Does that sound okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure.

MARITA MOLL:

Okay. So maybe at this point we should just step back and not go further? I don't know how much time we have left.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Marita. Olivier has his hand up.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marita. You mentioned the Google Doc. I think it's a good idea, if only just to order thoughts together and for everyone to be synchronized on this. I agree it's a little bit concerning if it starts going in all directions and we don't have consensus on these. But, at the same time, if you do this and cluster them, then at least we'll have some visuals for everyone to then work on on the mailing list. I'm a little concerned that, if you just send all this on the mailing list and they get updated, then nobody really knows what the latest update is, etc., etc. So Google Docs are always helpful for that.

But I do agree with Jonathan. Don't start drafting recommendations until you've got a good, consolidated Google Doc of the issues and the answers and can weed them down to the ones that will have a chance to gain full consensus. If we start getting bogged down with minority thoughts and this and that, as you might have seen in previous times, then we've spent 90% of the time on things that we disagree and the 10% of the time on the things we agree on. That's a bit of a concern. That's all. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Thanks. I agree with that. We'll just stumble our way forward, as usual.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right, Marita. Thanks for this. I don't know whether this section is finished. Jonathan, is there anything else on this agenda item?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'm not sure. Evin, did we have something else about which there was discussion? I don't think so.

EVIN ERDOGDU: To our multi-stakeholder public comment?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, just for public comment.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Well, actually, the process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews. A couple e-mails we were sent out to people in At-Large that are involved with reviews or the ATRT3. I haven't received specific feedback on that yet, but we still are lacking a penholder for that statement. So just an FYI. But otherwise, that's it. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. Yeah, so that doesn't sound like something we're prepared to have a discussion about, so I'll try to be ready to have some kind of conversation about that next week. Thanks, Evin.

So, Olivier, we're done with this agenda item.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. I seem to recall that there was something to do with this comment with asking Cheryl and – well, basically, because it was Olivier Crepin-Leblond suggesting, regarding process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews, requesting input from those driving in At-Large review. Sebastien Bachollet also suggested input from ATRT3, including himself and Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Vanda Scartezini, Alan Greenberg, and Maureen Hilyard. Has there been an update on this? Because this is ticked as being done as an action item from last week’s call, but we didn’t get an update on that. Perhaps now is the time to find out what’s going on on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, it’s all very nice for other to put the rest of us into things, but I said in the time no, as Chair of ATRT, I will not penhold. But what Evin also said is true. Every one of us has got an e-mail that says, “Dear person that is involved in these things, could you please contribute?” Guess what? My answer is still the same: no, not directly, but I will be more than happy to assist with editorial processes, comments, etc., to a document drafted by someone else. I’ll also be putting in my own public comment, as I have on everything else to do with organizational or specific reviews. Pick what you want. Do what you want. [That’s] my position, and it hasn’t changed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Cheryl. [By] others being on there, have we received any response from Vanda, Alan, and Maureen? I'm not asking you, Cheryl. I'm asking the others on the call.

Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Sorry. We just got the e-mail today. I guess we need to answer it and to organize ourselves. It's not yet done. That's why the answer from Evin was the right one. It's where we are for the moment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't aware I had volunteered for that, to be honest. Maybe I missed that part of the meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There was no volunteering, Alan. It was an e-mail that you were supposed to have received. I was checking whether you'd received that e-mail.

Maureen Hilyard?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi, everyone. Similar to Alan, I don't remember actually receiving it, but I must admit that I have actually raised both the NomCom review implementation and the streamlining organization review public comments. That was probably in a conversation that was going on about the set topics for ICANN 65 and looking at the effectiveness of specific review recommendations, which was a suggested topic.

I did mention that there are two public comments that we are involved in and that perhaps we really should get some feedback. The NomCom review one is due on the 10th of June. That suggested that we might stick to seven of their topics, which they thought might be relevant to us. So it's a timely reminder for us to actually get something started on that one.

The other organizational review public comment isn't due until the 15th of July. That's a little bit down the track. So, for me personally, I think the real objective of this is to get a penholder who might be interested in doing this. I think that the current penholders are the ones who always do the work, and I would like to see that others are getting involved as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Maureen. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Let me read the exact e-mail. “As per the [AR] from the 9th of May CPWG meeting, this e-mail is requesting input from At-Large members who may provide input/volunteer as penholder for the ICANN public comment on process proposals for streamlining organizational reviews. At-Large leaders who are involved in the At-Large review and ATRT3 in particular are requested [to give] feedback.” That is exactly how it is written. “If you would like to contribute, please comment on the At-Large workspace or CPWG list, or e-mail staff, if you’d like to volunteer as a penholder.”

My answer still hasn’t changed, but you were asking us to be penholders if we possibly could. I’m saying it is smarter, at least from my point of view, to use as a resource once you’ve got the drafting done. One of us wants to step up and run it? Well, then that’s fine. They can time-manage themselves. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. I don’t think I’m the one who has drafted that e-mail, so I don’t know the contents of it [as such]. But, yeah, the point is made. We’re still looking for a penholder for this, and we’ll follow up on the mailing list because we are spending much time on that.

Let’s move onto the next agenda item – oh, I see more people having putting their hands up. Alan, is that still to do with the previous agenda item?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is to address the same agenda item as we've been talking on. Since my name has been mentioned in vain, I think I could be allowed to talk.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On the issue of organizational review, I plan to do something about it. I have more of an interest in putting in a personal comment than I do negotiating something that is a melding of everyone else's comments. This happens to be an area which I think is exceedingly important. To be quite honest, I've authored a lot of comments on behalf of At-Large. This is one I'm likely to put a personal one in on. I have less interest in putting in comments that – I may well try to influence the At-Large one, but I don't have an interest in trying to be a penholder and being the person to balance everything. Just to give you a perspective. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks for this, Alan. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. A couple of things. One is I feel like people are getting really frustrated and hot under the collar, and we really need to try to take

some of the edge out of these conversations because we're all here trying to move forward with a high volume of work.

The other thing that I'll mention is I think this emphasis on penholders is wrong-headed, and I said this from the beginning. We need to have brainstorming sessions and say what points do we want to make because those are things about which we can have a discussion. As soon as we assign a penholder and we just start drafting things and we're trying to discuss drafted text, we have draft documents up on the screen in front of everyone, and those discussions are worthless. We really need to take a step back on all of these things and use these calls as an opportunity not to talk about how busy we are but to say, "Here's three ideas I think would work," and then capture those and then ask for somebody to be a penholder to capture those ideas, as opposed to asking a penholder to somehow generate all the ideas and go back and fight for their prose after the fact.

So that's just my two cents. I think we need to start all these conversations with bullets and not paragraphs. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Jonathan. That's another process that we should look at, definitely. I'm not seeing any additional points here, so that's something we can take on to the mailing list.

Back you, Jonathan, for Agenda Item 5: Policy workshops and talking points at ICANN 65.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry. Yes, thanks. Over on the ICANN 65 planning meeting call, where we're headed with this is away from the kind of policy workshops that we did at the last meeting and more about working with folks to participate in the policy meeting as a whole. So we're going to schedule a meeting at the beginning of the meeting on the Monday morning to go over some talking points and then also try to solicit volunteers to attend different meetings and to raise the points in those meetings and then have a report-back meeting toward the end of the week about how those meetings went, what came up, what there should be further discussion about, what follow-up the At-Large needs to do, etc. So that's a different process that we're going to try to engage in for the next meeting. We'll try to get a [strawman] of talking points going at the next CPWG call. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Jonathan. We look forward to the next call. That then takes us to the next agenda item. That's Any Other Business. In this, there's one item that's listed that says CPWG subgroup regarding the NomCom review implementation.

Maureen Hilyard?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay, finally unmuted. I think I just commented on that earlier, Olivier, and mentioned that it has been suggested that we concentrate on seven topics. I think I sent that out to everyone. Again, it's trying to find a penholder. But I would suggest that we might put those seven topics onto a Google Doc and get people to respond, just so that we've got

some sort of starting point. It's not due until the 10th of June, so we've got a bit of time, but we've just got to get started. Then, hopefully while we're putting comments together, someone might put their hand up and say, "I'll coordinate all that." Buy, yeah, we'll get [down] onto that one very soon. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Maureen. Shall this be an action item then? To get the Google Doc done. Should staff create a Google Doc—

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, please. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Or do you want to do that?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Staff.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, great. Thanks for this. Is that noted?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Do we have a—

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes, it's noted.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yeah, [you bet].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks for this, Evin. Now, any other Other Business? I've not seen anybody else flag any further Other Business earlier on the call, so if that's the case, we can move to our last agenda item. That's the next meeting. We operate in strict rotation, so the next meeting would be next Wednesday. At what time would be the next meeting be, bearing in mind there is an ATLAS III webinar?

[CLAUDIA RUIZ]: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes? Go ahead.

[CLAUDIA RUIZ]: Okay. It's scheduled for 21:00 UTC next Wednesday. Let me just check and make sure the calendar for the next webinar ... one moment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So we're missing the earlier slots because of the current webinar.

[CLAUDIA RUIZ]: The webinar—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The ATLAS III webinar.

[CLAUDIA RUIZ]: Is scheduled for 12:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: 12:00. That's correct, yes.

[CLAUDIA RUIZ]: Yes. So for next Wednesday, it'll be at 21:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Are there any clashes for – I know there are clashes for a lot of people. This is the last time we swap between the two later times. Then we'll be able to go again for a 12:00 or a 13:00 UTC slot in a week's time, or in two weeks' time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's no clash that I can see at the moment, Olivier. 21:00 works. In fact, it's a better rotation. So there you go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks for this, Cheryl. That's helpful. That's a good thing at this time. Let's just [cast] it down to 21:00 next week, May the 22nd.

Thanks, everyone, for this call. I think it's been pretty good. We've made much progress. You've got some time – you've got nine minutes – clear until the next call, if there is one. I'm sure for some of you there will be some. So have a very good week, evening, morning, night, or day. Take care. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]