

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 community work party meeting number two, on June 12th, 2019 at 13:00 UTC. Members attending the call today are Erica, Cheryl, Jaap, Michael, Pat. And from ICANN Org we have Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record, and I'll pass it over to Michael and Erica. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE: Great, thank you, Brenda. And I figure, Michael, I can just get it started and we can switch back and forth a little bit like last time, too. Just as an intro, from our last call until now ... In our last chat we had done a little bit of work on preparing for Marrakech, but I know we focused quite a bit on the terms of reference. So Michael and I had wanted to try to fit in at least one more call prior to Marrakech to focus primarily on preparing for the sessions that we're going to have there while we have the opportunity.

And then if we have some time, also digging a little bit into the resource requests. And just to prepare everyone, since the last call we've done a little bit of work on them. For the Marrakech prep doc we've added in some questions and done a bit of work that I think we circulated to the group about a week or so ago. But just wanted to follow up here and kick off that discussion a little bit more, flesh out if there's any other questions or topics or anything else that we want to look into from there.

So unless, Michael, there's anything you want to add? I'm thinking we could just go take a look in the Marrakech doc, and maybe just go through

---

*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.*

---

the different ... Starting with each session, just review what we've added and then have folks provide any input if there's anything else that we want to put in, or if things look good as is.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yes, let's jump right in.

ERICA VARLESE: Great, so if you're able to pull up that ... Perfect. Even quicker than I could finish this sentence. Alright, so I'll start with the ALAC session. We wrote out the sessions that we have so far, just to prepare any questions ahead of time. And part of this came from our conversation last week, I believe that was. Sorry, the weeks are already blending together a little bit for me.

But as you can see, going through each section, these are the questions that we have prepped so far. Some of them are included in each section because it applies to each group, based on the topics that we're looking into. Okay, great. Thanks, Cheryl. I think there's a couple. I might need to go in and update the dates we have for these because I put that in a little while ago. For the ALAC session, we have five questions so far. I'll just run through them and then pause if anyone has feedback or wants to add anything else if that makes sense.

The first question we have was around perceptions of transparency within PDPs if there's any representation challenges or other areas where accountability could be improved. Second, I was looking for any formalized transparency processes that might exist within the ALAC and

---

how they work, if they've been revised, what that looks like within this community.

Third, and Michael I believe this was the one that came from you in particular. If the group has ever made any use of transparency procedures at ICANN, such as a DIDP request. Fourth was thoughts on the information transparency initiative, or the open data initiative. And then lastly, just digging into the questions around the NomCom, what procedures they have in place for electing representatives. So that's just a quick run-through.

I want to leave that open. If those look like good questions to anyone, if we feel like anything's missing from that conversation, anything that we're overlooking here. Michael too, if you have anything to add to that as well, feel free to just jump in.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Hi. Thanks for starting us off there. Cheryl has noted in the chat that that session has now changed to one on ... The time of that has changed, which is good to know, and we should update that when we get the final details. Yes, we sort of started to sketch out these questions mostly around opinions towards ... It's partly around assessing their opinions and experiences with these mechanisms, as well as getting factual information about things like their own processes.

So our scope of work document is fairly broad, but we were hoping to cover both of those aspects in all five of the different work areas that we have. But really what we want for this conversation is to see if there's anything that we're missing, or to see how our approach harmonizes with

---

what other folks are doing, or with what other folks envision as the process. So ideally, we can throw it open now. I see Pat has a hand up. Should we just start the discussion?

PATRICK KANE: I had a specific question around something that you've got in your first bullet, so I'm happy to wait.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think unless Erica has any objections, I'd suggest we push on ahead, because that's the main purpose of the call.

ERICA VARLESE: No objection from me.

PATRICK KANE: When you say, do you feel that our representation challenges, what are you driving at with that one?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think that that's meant to get at how they feel the multi-stakeholder process is working, insofar as their positions are being adequately reflected and represented, and the degree to which they feel that the outcomes of these processes are properly accountable to the positions and expressions that the stakeholders are feeding in.

---

And as I think about that, I realize that we're probably going to have to be a little bit careful around scope, and not getting dragged too far deep into a rabbit hole of, what is multi-stakeholderism? And blah, blah, blah.

But fundamentally I think what's we're trying to get at there was basically their perception of the level of accountability within these processes or the degree to which they feel that these processes remain an adequate vehicle for reflecting community positions, or for channeling community positions. With that said, it's possible that that phrasing needs to be further refined in order to differentiate from broader questions about multi-stakeholderism. Is that what you were getting at, or am I just projecting?

PATRICK KANE:

I think that from what I'm hearing, it's spot on. Because when I read that, my first thought was, are we asking if we feel that the ALAC is actually representing an At-Large approach? Or do we have people within the ALAC that are taking their own personal positions and not really representing end-users or the At-Large community? So that's what I read into that statement there, and that may be me being slanted that way in my thoughts, but that's what I read into it.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

As I look back on it, I note that that question is not ... A lot of these questions are cut and pasted between the different meetings. That one is not, as I look down the document. So it is possible that you're actually getting at that, and that that's a specific question of ALAC and representation and accountability to their own community. And I think

---

that that is a very good question to start pushing into but would welcome other thoughts. Erica?

ERICA VARLESE:

Hey. [I guess my question], I think that's a really good point. My question, and maybe this is just me not fully wrapping my head around it yet, is that the direction we want to go with that question in terms of representing the community or [inaudible] that community, if it's digging more into like you said, Michael, multi-stakeholderism, or if we're looking more the side of representing that community specifically, and those challenges? I can see the benefits to both, but I think in terms of revising that, I wasn't quite sure. And maybe we left it open-ended for other input, but I wasn't quite sure in which direction we were starting to lean there, in terms of that.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

I don't remember how this question evolved or grew. But what I'd suggest at this point is why don't we carve it off into two questions, from the two different sentences, and changing that second question to something along the lines of, what representation challenges does ALAC face, and how does it attempt to address those challenges in representing the diverse global internet community while maintaining accountability to this broad and diverse stakeholder group? Something along those lines. Which again, Erica, I see the cursor there. We don't have to edit this on the fly.

But we can basically come to an understanding that we're going to split it into two and push more clearly around specific accountability

---

challenges and not towards broader multi-stakeholder questions. Pardon me one sec, sorry. Sorry about that. So does that sound like a good solution to folks? I see a check mark from Pat. So, yes. Why don't we, as a placeholder now, just push it down to one and just highlight that to say that we'll take a look at that later.

So, moving further along. Now that hopefully, folks have had a chance to review, are there other areas of inquiry that you think ... Are we hitting the right notes on the others, or are there things that we've left out? I'm seeing silence and going to interpret that as meaning that we have done an excellent job at capturing these areas of inquiry, and it's completely thorough. We can also take it to the list, and further feedback would be welcome. But fundamentally, I think that a decent amount of these conversations will, I expect, be guided as the conversation goes.

So fundamentally, I think there will be follow-ups to this, and as long as we have questions that will begin conversations on each of the main areas of focus that we have, I think that's a good starting point. I do have one question, actually, for our co-chairs that are here, which is, are we being too ambitious here? We now have six questions. This time is going to be divided between the different sub-groups. Are we too ambitious in these areas of inquiry, or is this a reasonable amount of material to expect to cover in the time that we have?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

In the coat of the meeting with the ALAC, you've got the longest time there, that's an hour you've got with the ALAC and At-Large. I don't think it's unreasonable, because, for example, in the matter of the last

---

question, you'll simply be referred to the standing operational procedures for the ALAC. It's part of their 30 pages of rules of procedure. It's also enshrined in parts of the ICANN bylaws as to how the representation on the Nominating Committee is selected.

So that's the real short answer. It'll be, look at page 27 in this document, here's the link. So, that's simple. You'll go in there. Other ones, such as if they made use of the document informational DIDP stuff, again, going to be a really short answer there. So again, I think you've got enough time. I'm concerned that you're going to be still editing these. I think you need to bring it to closure pretty quickly because we really ought to be getting these questions out to each of the groups.

In the case of the At-Large Advisory Committee, they work all the time at three languages at least. Certainly, in an ICANN meeting, they work in English, French, and Spanish simultaneously. And so there's a great advantage if questions like this can be on their own advertised agenda, so that those who don't work in English have time to get the interpretation of these words totally confused and ask clarifying questions at the beginning, remembering that you'll be speaking in English and working with headsets through real-time interpretation on site.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yes, that's a useful thing to remember. Thanks, Cheryl. In terms of the edits, so far it's just a very minor ... We can rewrite that question, the one that we have thus far, right after the call basically. But I think that it is good to know that we should be working to finalize, and the language



---

issue as well is an important thing to bear in mind. Should we then move on to the SSAC one? Thank you.

These may be a little bit quicker insofar as most of these are just cut and pasted from the previous ones, and I don't think that we have any specific questions for the ... Or any unique questions, I should say, for the SSAC, ccNSO, or GAC. I believe they're just cut and pasted from the generally applicable ones previously. And in fact, on the SSAC at the moment, it's just these two. And I think we could also add in ... Does SSAC not have NomCom representatives?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: SSAC sends a single representative to the Nominating Committee.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I don't know what you have ... Excuse me?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi, Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Hi. I don't know what you mean with NomCom representative, for any ... Do you mean in SSAC or outgoing?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought he means sitting on the Nominating Committee.

---

JAAP AKKERHUIS:                    There is one, yes.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:        So the question about what procedures do you have in place for electing a NomCom representative is ...

JAAP AKKERHUIS:                    All the [procedures in] the SSAC operation manual, which is actually continually revised. Basically, it tells you what the procedure is. I guess that will be the answer, and probably want to add that to the resource requests. But basically, somebody's chosen ... there is a vote inside SSAC when there's more than one candidate. That's [all already been trying] to answer what should be answered in over two weeks.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:        At the meeting? Yes. Okay, that'll be helpful. I've pasted in the other questions from the last one, that I think are equally applicable here, as you guys probably saw. A bit of editing on the fly. And that leaves us with a basically parallel structure, so the real question ... And I think we're probably going to do the same thing for ccNSO and GAC, because in none of these last three cases do we have anything unique to these groups.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:                    Well I could tell you for SSAC that we, as I said last time, it has never been formal DIDP request from SSAC, but one of individuals have [inaudible] by a private person. And I'm not sure whether he will be in Marrakech, so that might actually need to be done by e-mail, whatever.

---

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Just with regard to the question about the DIDP request, that was less meant to be about whether the institution has, or the group has, or whether any of the individual participants has. That was in my mind more targeted at soliciting individual feedback from the people that are going to be there, not necessarily as they're speaking for the SSAC.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Okay.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I see in the chat, Pat has asked, should the SSAC have term limits? Would that limit their number of members? Not sure if that's 'would that' or 'would not'. But that's, I guess, a proposed question? Okay, I'm going to take that as a proposed question, as that we should ask them whether they should have term limits. We can potentially fit that in under accountability, in terms of accountability to the community. Perhaps we could phrase that in a way of, has SSAC ever considered instituting term limits, and what are your thoughts about the implications of such a move?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you're going to ask a question on term limits to SSAC, I would encourage you writing a question on term limits that can be asked of each of the advisory committees, and indeed the supporting organizations you're meeting with, because you will find there a significant difference between them, and you'll find the ability to tease out different reasons

---

for where there is similarity or lack of similarity between them. I would ask that question, but I'd ask the question of everybody.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks, Cheryl, that seems like a fair point. I see Pat's hand is up. Can I just ask one other question? In terms of ... Wow. Pat, you can address this in your statement. You were talking about term limits for the SSAC leadership, presumably, right?

PATRICK KANE: No, I'm talking about SSAC membership. Basically, when you become an appointed a member of SSAC, it's an appointment for as long as you want to be on SSAC. And they limit their numbers, so it leaves ... What I think about that, it kind of leaves an ever ... The same people addressing the problem, then you don't have a refresh of either technical capability or skills, and so from a transparency standpoint, how are they adding to the team in a way that doesn't actually overwhelm their work they're trying to achieve, while bringing in new ideas, new people, and getting turnover?

But I know one of the things they've talked about recently is getting a more diverse population within the SSAC. And it's hard to do that when you have perceived limited seats and you have no term limits. So that's where I'm going with that one, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Okay, that's interesting. But when you phrase it that way, it seems like a question that is specific to the SSAC. So, for example, ALAC wouldn't have

---

the same kind of issue in terms of membership term limits. There would be potential issues around leadership term limits for ALAC, but I'm pretty sure they have those.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, the ALAC answer will be similar to SSAC and different to SSAC. So I think it's one of those questions that's worthwhile asking.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That's good. So I will ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And the same question to the GAC, because the GAC doesn't have term limits to memberships, obviously, but it does have it to leadership. But the SSAC and the ALAC aren't open membership bodies. They are numerically limited bodies, or in the case of the SSAC, limited by a different rationale, a different reasoning of their membership selection. So you've got one AC with a highly exclusive, and a rationale for the exclusivity, managing its size. And you've got in the case of the ALAC, a defined, there are only 15 people serving in the ALAC at any time. And how those people get there sometimes has a forced churn in it, but that doesn't have term limits as such.

Your questioning there is important. It'll peel back into different things. Some of them were uncovered in work-stream on accountability, as work-stream one and work-stream two, but particularly work-stream two. But yes, I think we can assume we should ask.

---

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Okay. Could I then ask, Cheryl, could I ask you to direct your attention to the top of the thing? Is that phrasing still correct for ALAC?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Top of what thing?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sorry, the screen right now. It says, has ALAC ever considered instituting term limits, and what impact do you think that might have?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, alright, you can try. [inaudible] considered is going to be very different to why it doesn't. The answer, has it ever been considered? The answer is yes, in each of its two reviews. So, yes, you might find it ... But it'll open up. It'll be enough there to tease out, but there you go.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: We could also just say, what impact would term limits ... Do you think that the institution of term limits would be a beneficial change, if there ...?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It depends on your membership versus leadership. In the 15-person ALAC, you have limitation in the amount of time anyone ... You can't be appointed chair of the ALAC without being reappointed every two years,

---

basically. It used to be a one-year term, now it's two years terms. And the leadership team, which can only be drawn from the 15 people, does get refreshed every year. But there is no term limit. While you're on the ALAC, you can be appointed to the leadership team by the ALAC.

So the question there isn't going to dig out that information. But we can make sure that the conversation digs out that information. You might want to say something like, has your advisory committee got formal and institutionalized term limits for membership and/or leadership? That might be more generic but allow for greater open-ended answering.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Could I ask you to repeat that last bit again?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. Has your advisory committee got formalized or instituted term limits, either for membership or leadership? And there you'll get different but useful answers, certainly from each of the advisory committees, and I would believe you would also have a useful answer from the support organizations as well.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That's good. So we can use that same phrasing for the SSAC as well, which is very useful. Alright. So unless there is anything else on this one specifically, what I think now is that we're basically going to ... For the last two, I'm going to ... We can talk about ccNSO and GAC. And I'm just going to paste in on the fly, this revised language, because as I said, I do think that these questions are equally applicable.

---

And maybe we can just briefly talk about notes, also on this list, that RSSAC is missing. Is that by chance? That is by error, so we can correct that. Is that by choice? No, that is an oversight on our part, so we can certainly add that in. Maybe we can quickly go through the last three and ask if there are specific considerations for them, and if not, we can push it back over to the last thing.

Now that we're all extremely familiar with these questions, does anybody have any specific thoughts about how they might apply to ccNSO, or how they should be adapted or new areas we should plug in specific for this group? Going once, going twice. Alright, I think we can keep this as-is for the ccNSO. What about the GAC? Someone was mentioning something around NomCom with GAC in the chat earlier I think. GAC has a seat ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, that was me.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Go on, Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say to you in the chat, but basically, your question that you were asking about Nominating Committee, I would still ask that, but you need to know that in the case of the GAC, whilst they have a ... I just think it's very inappropriate to ask a question that we know what the answer will be if we ask exactly the same question.



---

The GAC has a seat on the Nominating Committee. It does not appoint anyone to it. So there is a seat allocated on the Nominating Committee for the Government Advisory Committee, and for very good reasons and a rationale that has been given to the rest of the ICANN community in previous ATRTs, quite clearly. And GAC often says, "If it's what we've said before, go look it up". And that's fair enough too. It has not been occupied.

However, they also have an active working group on GAC interaction and whether or not it should and could occupy the Nominating Committee seat. So it's actually active work that GAC is doing. And so you may want to perhaps ask a question there in terms of that, rather than as to ... At what point is the government advisory committee currently at in their consideration of how they do or don't participate in the Nominating Committee.

And then we'll get some links through feedback from the most previous work with their internal working group. Which will be meeting and reporting at Marrakech, so they should literally have a document or a report that they can give us access to.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Alright, that's very helpful. And it's been rephrased. We can move now onto this recently created RSSAC section, and ask briefly if there are any specific thoughts to this one.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Again, this one is one that we need to recognize the new work of RSSAC. So purely cutting and pasting of the questions here, we probably want to make sure that amongst all the things we have prepared for, that we look at the proposed new structure and function for the new look of RSSAC, and of course, in that case, things like procedures on selecting and electing Nominating Committee representatives will come out of that and the way that their formalized membership, etc., will also be out of that.

So there's probably a document you want to have a little read through before you get there as well. So when you ask the question, it's with deference to knowing what their current plans for public comment are.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Pat.

PATRICK KANE: Good.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Okay, so I see Jaap has his hand up.

---

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes, I was pointing out the structure of RSSAC is quite different than all the other ACs, I mean they have the RSSAC proper, which are the root operators, and then there's the RSSAC caucus, which is basically anybody who shows up and shows interest, and which kind of advisory function to the root operators community, and then there are various working groups which are mostly led by RSSAC operator people, and filled by the RSSAC caucus people, so that's kind of a complicated business, and RSSAC is really in the business of trying to restructure that, because it used to be very strict.

I think that the RSSAC document Pat Kane mentioned in chat, they don't really have to do with RSSAC as an organization, but more to do with how the root server operators are working together. You always have to watch that you're not ... The root server operators are really different group than RSSAC, so that's ... We try to untangle these issues, because that was also in the latest RSSAC, the review [a year] ago, there was quite some complaints that these functions were mixed.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks for that. These sound like important considerations to bear in mind for the conversation that ...

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Very useful from that perspective. Are we good with the language as-is? I guess on both of these counts. Is the language alright, and can that stay?

---

And I'm not seeing people jumping in with corrections to the language. So I think that we can take that as an almost ... Bearing in mind all of the feedback that we've gotten in terms of important areas to bear in mind.

And as the conversation goes, I think that we can take this document as almost completed, subject to revision of the second bullet regarding ALAC, which I'll revise after this call. Erica, do you want to take us through the next agenda item in the time that we have left?

ERICA VARLESE:

Yes, I think maybe we could be spending about ten ... Obviously, that's the time that we have left, but about ten minutes going through this. I don't know how much we'll be able to get done now. Just in the sense ... I feel like all of the conversation ties into everything, right? But some of the conversation that will come from Marrakech I think will feed into this as well. But just to review from our last call, we had ...

And prior to that, we've had some discussion about the resource requests that we have and wanting to fine-tune those a little bit more, because they've been a little bit vague, and we had some discussion in our last call that helped to clarify some of that. And Michael and I circulated that document as well, with some edits. So I just wanted to take a little bit of time today to go through some of those proposed edits. Whether we decide on those today, we can do that. If not, just flagging them for folks to maybe read through and provide some more input later, if we decide we need that as well. Just on the list, taking it there.

So if that sounds good to everyone, we can just scroll down in the document a little bit. I think there should be a section ... Let's see, [if we

---

can do it.] The resource requests and actions. So in here, just starting with community and long-term planning. We had this conversation in our last call, about which specific five-year plan we wanted to look at, and how we wanted to approach that.

So these are the edits we made for that, based on that conversation. I'm sure folks are reading this right now, but just specifying which five-year plan we're looking at, and then looking at the development of the five-year plan going forward after the 2016-2020 five-year plan. So I want to pause to see if folks have any input on that resource request in particular, or if it sounds better than the last time, based on our last conversation.

I don't see any hands going up immediately, but if anyone has input, feel free to just pop your hand up. Okay. I'm not seeing anything, so I'm taking it as us being okay with that change. Jaap, I see your mic is open. Did you have something you wanted to add here? Because I know you had some feedback on this before.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

No, I looked at it earlier, and I think it's fine. I don't know how to have more precise or anything, but still, it is the way it is. It's fine. I just had my mic open by accident.

ERICA VARLESE:

No problem, thanks for chiming in anyway, though. I appreciate it. Great. So it sounds like we're pretty good with that for now, and I assume all of these will be ... It's always going to be an on-going process, but it sounds

---

like we have a good start with that for now. Going down ... Tola, go ahead.  
Sorry if I jump ahead, I see you have your hand up.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Apologies, I just want to have some clarification. How do we go about asking this question? Are you going to distribute the questions [per] members, or we allow the work party leaders to ask the question? Thank you. Just came to my mind, and I want to clarify.

ERICA VARLESE: Tola, just to clarify, do you mean in the sessions we're holding meetings [cross talk].

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Each time, we have a couple of questions for each of the SO and ACs, and as we were discussing, it just came to my mind. How do we go around the questions? Are we going to assign a couple of numbers to each members, or we allow all of the work party leaders, or the chairman and co-chair to lead the questions? Or it's going to be open to any one of us? Thank you, back to you Michael.

ERICA VARLESE: Great, thank you Tola. Actually, maybe Cheryl or Pat, you can weigh in on this, too, depending on if you know the format. Or Michael, you might know this too, just based on previous experience. I would be completely open to assigning people numbers and having us all distribute that. Michael, do you have thoughts on that? And Cheryl and Pat, just based

---

on how the format is looking so far? Especially if we're planning to send these ahead of time to the different communities.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm happy to jump in. Most of the ACs and SOs, if they're having a meeting with another group in ICANN, do take a prep for that. So the advantage in fact of having questions and things to an SO or an AC before we meet with them is that they can decide how they will respond. And so some of them will allocate answers to particular questions from particular people.

You'll find that's a very formal approach that you'll see definitely for example out of the government advisory committee. It'll be 'insert name of country' reacting to any particular one of the questions we pose. And then in the case of most of the advisory committees, that will be followed on by the ability for any of the members of that advisory committee or supporting organization to also ask questions, interact, give more information, etc.

So the answer is, it's really up to the entity we're visiting. We do need to make sure that there is plenty of time if they've got a large group or a group that will have a larger number of people interacting, wanting to interact, that that's properly managed. It's usually smart to have queue management and recognition of speakers done by someone who knows everyone in the room. So you tend to have a shepherd, often the chair but not always the chair. Could be a vice-chair or someone else of the entity working with us. And the same thing is here, I would suggest that the questions of opposed, modified on the fly and/or embellished in the room, by whoever is in our review team from that entity.

---

So, in the case of the meeting with SSAC, you should have the questions restated, proposed, reviewed, if not by Pat and I, certainly by the people who've been sent to NomCom from SSAC. It allows an ownership, in case of the ALAC, there's four people to choose from. But not sure that that's answered it adequately. The other thing is, do remember you were going to also put surveys out, and some of these questions may find their way onto the surveys.

And a survey will be a much more general tool, where for example in the case of the GNSO, members of the constituencies may wish to respond, and in the case of At-Large Advisory Committee, in other words, entities which have connections to wider communities, those communities may answer. So the regional At-Large organizations, the At-Large structures or individual members may respond to a survey. But there's going to be less of those in the room for these face-to-face interactions. That's a very long answer, but I hope I've covered what [inaudible].

ERICA VARLESE:

Actually, that was helpful Cheryl, so I think that does answer it for us. I appreciate that. And I think actually on that note with surveys, diving back into the research resource. This was a list of resource requests and actions from us, brainstorming. So if we're okay with reviewing those real quick, and moving back into that. I'm assuming that's okay. If we could scroll down in this doc, I added a few recommendations for actions that we can take related to some surveys or the request NomCom selection procedures from the different SO/ACs, that's part of the questions we'll be asking in Marrakech.



---

And then further down there's also a suggestion for a community survey on the PDPs as well. And I think that's something that we'll flesh out more. But I just wanted to highlight those in particular, since we have added some changes since the last call based on our discussion and conversation. And I think the action items are probably something we can save for a little bit later.

I think the part that we were really working through that required a little bit more detail was the five-year plan. And it sounds like folks are okay with that so far. And from here, anything else that's been added also kind of touches on some of the questions we'll be adding in Marrakech, so that like I said, I think that that's going to just come in down the line, as those things need to take shape. But from my perspective, it seems like we're in a pretty good position.

I know we have about six minutes left, so I will stop talking for a moment. Having gone through that, if there's any thoughts on what we've flagged here for the resource requests, or if folks are pretty much in agreement that we're in a good shape here, and we'll see in terms of the action items what we're going to dive into further after we start these conversations in Marrakech. Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

I'd like to – it's a kind of inquiry or suggestion. Could questions be outlined? Probably this is for survey questions, and then this is the answer [to shall be] having a kind of dialog questions. Probably [inaudible] questions with respective SOs or ACs. I think that would help. Thank you.

---

ERICA VARLESE: Cheryl, I don't know if you're going to answer directly to Daniel, or do you want to?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I'm not answering. [inaudible].

ERICA VARLESE: Perfect. Then Daniel, just to understand, I think I misunderstood your question for ... The questions for the surveys, you wanted them ... Do you mean outline them now in terms of what that might look like, or based on what questions we have now? I didn't quite understand, so I apologize. Daniel, if you don't mind repeating.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Because like some of the questions are maybe applying to the survey, it would be good to split the questions, the discussions, up for the survey, and then these ones here do not apply for the survey. Back to Erica.

ERICA VARLESE: Thank you. Yes, I don't think we've talked too much about what we will or won't include for that yet, so I'm not sure if we want to do that now. Michael, too, I'm curious for your thoughts on that. I think it's a good point, we don't want to repeat too much stuff. But at the same time, we also haven't had too much discussion, and I hesitate to leave the questions open ahead of Marrakech, just because we do want to finalize

---

those. I'm also not sure if it's a problem to have some stuff that's a little bit repeating, because it's a chance for a little bit more detail. Michael, I'm curious for your thoughts on that too, if that makes sense, or ...

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Yes, the main reason [as to why I'm] making that survey, is that this will also help to avoid repetition of questions, especially because you'll find that a question is coming up in the survey, and again the same question coming up in a discussion. So I think if the questions are split, it can help. I'm open for thoughts. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE:

Yes, Daniel, that's a good point. And I think anything going forward, any communication we're sending out, including the questions we worked on today, but I think any other questions or surveys that we come up with, we should definitely share with the review team as a whole, but also with reviews. And just to make sure that we're not ... I know we've discussed that there's quite a bit of overlap with what we're doing.

So I think to make sure that we're not all sending out the same questions, definitely flagging that down the line as those are developed to make sure we're not asking a variation of the same thing as everyone else. I think if that makes sense then I agree with you there, that we'll need to work on that going forward just to make sure we're not overwhelming people with the same questions, but also getting each what we need.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Erica. One of the things that Pat and I are keen to have you all do on our day on the 23rd is look at where we can get some harmonization in certain things, and developing surveys is certainly one of those things. So we want you to start all working together in some aspects of your work, and making sure that the single survey, because each of the work parties shouldn't be sending out their own surveys, you'll get very short shift from community if you send out five surveys when one will do.

But they obviously need to be a well and carefully crafted set of questions. I don't have a problem with a certain amount of repetition from what you ask and discover in your face-to-face interactions, and in the written surveys. In fact, that could be quite useful, because in particular, it is going to, not exclusively but to a degree, different audiences. Your survey, I believe, is likely to be open for wider response than your interactions in Marrakech, or any other webinar or face-to-face meeting that may or may not get [inaudible].

One of the things that strikes me looking at this list is whether or not you should be asking a question about the PDPs and how the ICANN community you're talking to believes their views are being considered, or how relevant they are to the process of developing a PDP. The reason I would suggest that's a very worthy thing to have a conversation about is that that was one of the most common concerns and complaints that has been dealt with by previous ATRTs, and a goodly number of the recommendations, right down ... I mean things that you all probably think are just normal good practices, but no, right down to a minimum time for a policy development process, the 40 days you're used to, that came out of implementation of recommendations from ATRT1, because of concerns in the community.

---

The fact that there is a standardized set of expectations on how community input is managed by staff. What happens to public comments? How they're processed, how are they analyzed? Who responds to them? What's the recording and accessibility to other people to look at how that all happens? That's all come out of ATRT1 and ATRT2. So it's not a thing to be avoided in your face-to-face interactions, even. You might want to have that as an additional question.

They may come out just in ... What have you got for us? Remember your questions for Marrakech shouldn't take up all the time. You should have, these are some questions that we'd like to cover, but we also would like to hear from you on anything you want to raise. That's important. Where the survey's very much, these are things you want answered. And you usually just put a space at the bottom; would you like to tell us anything else type stuff.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. I think that's okay with me, and I'm happy with the response. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE:

Just to reiterate what Daniel said, thank you, Cheryl, that was very helpful. I also know that we are a few minutes over now, so I think from here, Michael and I have just a few things just to edit and share with the group today.

So unless there's any last-minute things, I think we could wrap up the call and take some of these action items to the list and finalize things. I also

---

know we'll be meeting tonight, so I guess we might also have an opportunity to chat if time allows on that call as well. Great, so Michael, unless you object, I think we could probably wrap up here and take things to the list. And we'll also chat with everyone tonight. And many thanks to all of you for taking time to come and attend this call, it was so very helpful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, all.

BRENDA BREWER: Thanks, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**