
BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Community Work Party meeting #3, on the 16th of July, 2019, at 18:00 UTC.

Review team members joining the call today are Erica, Michael, Jaap, Cheryl, and Tola. I think someone just joined. I don't see – we do have observers – Sophie [Hay] – joining us. Attending from the ICANN organization is Jennifer, Negar, Brenda. [inaudible] has joined us.

Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to remind you to please state your name before speaking. I'll turn the call over to Erica and Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I would suggest that we jump right into it, particularly as we've got a lot to discuss. Erica, I hadn't really discussed the division of labor with you early on. Is it all right maybe if I start us off going through the preliminary recommendation areas and takeaway from ICANN 65, and then you can lead a brief conversation about examination areas and priorities for the survey.

ERICA VARLESE: Hi, Michael. Yes, that sounds perfect to me. I had that in mind as well and didn't vocalize it, so you read my mind. So you can just right in that way.

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.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Wonderful. We don't, I think, need to do too much of a recap on ICANN 65, but I think it might be useful to discuss briefly just so that there is a clear understanding of the genesis of the document that we're talking about how and how it relates to the discussions.

Essentially, as those of you who were in attendance at ICANN 65 will know – and hopefully everybody will know – we at that meeting had a series of very brief conversation with the different groups. According to my notes, it was the GNSO, the SSAC, the ccNSO, the ALAC, and the NCSG. I also believe there was one with the GAC, but I had a conflict with that one and couldn't make it.

Coming out of the discussions that we had that took place there, I had my own set of notes in terms of takeaways on areas of relevance to the community group. Erica had her own. Last week, we compared notes back and forth and looked to pull out any potential areas – action areas, recommendation areas, areas to move forward with – based on what was raised by community members at those meeting.

The result of that conversation and back-and-forth between Erica and myself is the document that was sent around in the run-up to this call. Would it be possible to get that on screen just so folks can follow along as I take us through it? And – ah, wonderful – Jaap, I think, on the e-mail list mentioned some confusion as to the nature of this document and as to where things are coming from. I do apologize because it was a bit ambiguous. In terms of the numbered areas that you see, which are somewhat narrative, as was pointed out on the list and seemed to be

statements of opinion or idea of thing to be done, that's basically either suggestions that were directly stated by folks in some of the working groups. In those cases, I tried to source it, although, looking again at the document, I see that there were a few cases where it wasn't actually literally sourced, where that was an oversight on our part. Or it's conclusions that are drawn from the discussion that we heard.

As we go through this today, I think it would be useful to review these action areas, solicit any feedback on them, and, as we go, I will also mention where this stuff is coming from where it's not noted. The bulk of the conversations at ICANN 65 that were specifically spurred by community related to the PDPs – because we're only able to get one question into that discussion, so that was the area we chose to focus on. One of the things that I think we heard a lot was that – this originally came up with the GAC, and I believe (again, it's left vague if you look at that bullet #1) it was first raised at the GNSO in terms of this idea that policy development processes can go quite a ways down the road and then the ACs tend to jump in later on, which makes it more challenging insofar as they may be trying to reopen arguments that have already been had and people feel are already settled.

Certainly I definitely remember hearing that at the ccNSO, where that as a specific complaint that was made about the GAC, which is that presentations are made and information is offered to them but that the GAC tends to wait until the end of processes to feed in, which can make it challenging.

Then that built on another problem that we heard in the ALAC session, where I think there were also complaints about challenges engaging the

front end since the ACs seem to have a backend role rather than a frontend role. Somebody at the ALAC expressed that that structure disadvantages their participation.

That first statement that you see, which is that “Frontend engagement is important, particularly with the ACs, in order to generate buy-in to PDP processes . There is a perception that the current structure might disadvantage participation by the ACs as well as make the decision-making processes more challenging for the people running the PDPs.” That statement is based on feedback that we got or what the community stakeholders mentioned in specifically the GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC sessions.

Drawing from that, we saw a need to – it’s not a fully-baked conclusion. There’s no recommendation to be drawn out of that, but that’s certainly an area to discuss because it was raised on multiple occasions as a challenge to the PDP process and to engagement to the PDP processes. I think that that could potentially tee up some areas of investigation and further discussion.

So that’s the first bullet on PDPs. I’ll just read out the second bullet on PDPs as well and then maybe we can open this up and have a little bit of a discussion if there are any comments on this. The second bullet was also drawn out of comments that were made in a number of different sessions. This one is explicitly sorted. This is what we meant to do for all the sessions. Just as an oversight, it didn’t appear for all of them.

The second bullet notes, with regard to the PDP process, that, while these processes are open and the information is always out there and

technically it's accessible to anybody who wants to track these processes, they're also incredibly technically complex. The sophistication and technical complexity of these processes create a huge challenge in promoting public accountability because it's one thing to say, "Well, the process is open. Anybody can track it," but if you aren't intimately familiar with the subject matter, intimately familiar with the specific jargon and acronym soup which is there, and as well aren't completely caught up on everybody that's been said over the last six months so that you know exactly where the current conversation thread is coming from, engagement is really, really, really tricky. That, first of all, creates a problem in terms of public accountability. It also creates a problem even in terms of the different SOs and ACs who may not fully understand the process if they're just tuning in. They may understand the broad subject matter, but the specific sub-specialization is really tricky.

I think, in the ccNSO, someone mentioned that this was a real challenge, where sometimes you've got one guy or one person who's running points on a particular PDP and then that person has to leave. It's enormously challenging for another person to come in and try to figure out what's going on. That can [disbench] the PDP. That also ties into broader challenges with accessibility.

My own thoughts on this are that I think that talking about the jargon and the acronym is a little bit of baying at the moon at this point because it's so deeply entrenched in ICANN's culture. I think it doesn't hurt to mention it as a recurring problem. The need to simplify things is always there. That's probably not something that's going to change immediately.

One thing that did come out – I think this was from the GNSO as well as from the ALAC that hinted at this idea – is a strong need for better onboarding and for producing material which facilitates engagement by novices and to look into ways to overcome the existing knowledge [bar] to participation in PDPs. So that was an idea with a partially formed recommendation coming.

So those are the takeaway that we had with regard to PDPs. I think it would be beneficial to open things up very briefly for a bit of a discussion before we move on. Are there any thoughts on what's been raised so far? These could either come in the form of disagreements or areas to clarify or take this forward.

I see Cheryl has a hand up. Over to you, Cheryl. What re your thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much, Michael. First [inaudible]. It's almost working in reverse order from what you've presented. When you refer to PDPs and the ccNSO aspect that you quoted, where there was one person that leaves and then a disconnect may occur, are you referring to their own PDP process – in other words, the PDP of ccNSO as a support organization – or are you referring to their involvement in other PDPs – for example, GNSO ones; EPDP is an example there – or cross-community activities? Because they're vastly different things, one of which would be debatable in terms of your assessments and one of which is not. So we need to be clear. So that's the question. [Let's deal with them one at a time].

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thank you for that clarification because it is an important one. I believe the discussion was about cross-community PDPs. I think it was Brian that mentioned that sometimes they have a person liaising with these different PDPs and that they lose that person and then it becomes really tough to track.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So that's a universal aspect that I suspect would also be able to make a commentary there that is applicable even within, for example, all of the other parts of ICANN. I'm relatively confident that, if we did a pop quiz across all of the constituencies or even the leads in the constituencies and stakeholder groups in the GNSO, they wouldn't be totally [inaudible] with a GNSO PDP, let alone a cross-community working group, if they weren't involved. So I think that's something that we need to make sure we're clear on on what we're linking the commentary to. The reliance on a few people liaisons and representatives may have some design issues that need to be considered.

Perhaps recommendations associated with that would be the desirability of having understudies or individuals prepared to step in, which of course is part of the modeling of EPDP, for example. So I think that's something to just make sure we've got the right stuff around the right set of assumptions.

Coming back to assumptions then briefly, I think we also need to pull out the difference between the different types of PDPs. So there'd need to be an intro paragraph that recognizes that, of course, ASO/NRO develops their policies in the following ways. We know that. You don't

have to tell us about that. It's managed in its own fashion, but it's not terribly [inaudible]. I would be equally criticized under the "put up all the billboards and see who can come." If you put all the billboards up in the desert or if you put them amongst nine million billboards, where is the public accountability, let alone the community accountability, within the ICANN community in that model? I think that's something that all of those PDP processes can be subject to some criticism for, along with the sheer numeracy of them sometimes or scope when you look at the GNSO ones. So that's an important aspect to pick up on. I think that goes across all of them.

The concept that you raised in terms of the AC – we probably need to also recognize that we recognize what the bylaws say the role of the different ACs [inaudible]. There is a slight difference between the GAC and the ALAC, although both are primarily advisory to the ICANN Board. The ALAC is specifically required and listed to be engaged in the policy development process, so it has a stronger mandate to be at the friend end. So if there's aspects of its design that is not facilitating that, then that has to be fixed and addressed, whereas the GAC doesn't actually have the same aspect focused in its bylaw mandate.

So they're the points that I think we might just want to shake up and expand slightly. I'm not in any way criticizing any of the points, but I'm just not sure we clearly recognize the differences in definitions. Otherwise, all we'd get back from our audience is, "That way is special," or, "[inaudible]," or, "We have that." Thanks.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks, Cheryl. That distinction between ALAC and GAC is quite well-taken.

Bernie, do you want to go next?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sure. Just a few points from my personal experience. I'm also supporting the ccNSO PDP on retirement right now, and although there's no official process, we go around asking everyone – the ccNSO asks all the community members – if they want to send someone or two people to participate in the PDPs. Now, this one is on retirement. It is very specific to ccTLDs and has limited interest, but it should have interest to the GAC. I know we've specifically asked them several times to provide us a liaison, someone who could participate in discussions as we're going through the PDP and report back. But so far, just absolutely no traction in getting a person to participate.

The second point is again on that same PDP. Jaap is on that with me. The language and knowledge bar is not very high on that one. To Cheryl's point, we have to be careful in not putting everything into a single bag here because I could honestly say that anyone who would want to join that PDP to follow it probably has a half-day's reading to do and they would be fairly up to speed. So I was just trying to set some expectations here. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks for that. Jaap, do you want to go next?

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yes. I just want to make a small remark about the matter of, when somebody drops out, that people have a problem. It's apparently [inaudible]. It is partly that the community itself should be aware of the problem. I know, for instance, at SSAC, we always have somebody in the back who's willing to take over when somebody drops out for one or another reason. So it's partly due [inaudible] organization of the group delivering the representative or the liaison on how to organize that. If you put everything in one basket, then it is a problem in the short term.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Yeah, it did strike me as both Cheryl and Bernie were speaking. The flipside to this idea of having a secondary point of contact or an understudy the work – somebody ready to step in – is this challenge in getting people to serve as liaison or to get people to engage in the first place.

Now, with the specific point that was mentioned with regard to the GAC, I think the GAC is a bit of a special place and a bit of a special case. The complaints that are there about their engagement or the way that they engage is obviously going to be addressed more directly by the GAC sub-group, who I think have their work cut out for them, in trying to square that circle between the role that they play and the role that governments generally are going to expect to play in this process and what would make things work smoothly or what's best for the multi-stakeholder process. Certainly I can definitely see a tension between wanting to defuse engagement out in a way that losing one point of contact isn't as fatal and existing challenges in securing participation for all the different working groups that people are doing ...

Just to note something that was put into the chat by Cheryl, another reference point on jargon and onboarding issue, “We will need to recognize the joint paper on that matter published by ALAC and GAC a few years about.” That sounds like a very good thing to reference potentially in light of a lack of progress or – I don’t know about if I should say “lack of progress” but continuing challenges tackling this issue.

Cheryl, if you could provide a more specific reference or point us in the right direction of where we could find that, that would be very much appreciated.

I see Jaap is still – Jaap, is that an old hand? Yeah. And I see Bernie with a new hand because I just saw it go up. Do you want to go ahead, Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Yes. As I’m listening to all of this, one of the points that strikes me, as I said, the PDP I was talking about from the ccNSO a few minutes ago about retirement is, from a knowledge bar point of view, fairly low for people to join. There are, however, other PDPs where I agree. But I think what’s most important is that we should be able to understand where that knowledge bar lies. It’s not necessarily a point to lower it. There are some PDPs which are going to deal with some highly technical or highly complex issues. It’s not the job of the PDP, I think, to make itself simpler.

But, this being said, maybe what could help things along is going into a PDP understanding what level of knowledge bar we’re talking about and

what would be required of participants because, right now, I don't think that's done. At least I know it's really not done in the ccNSO because we just throw things open. But I don't remember seeing it in other areas. Maybe that could fit into what you're talking about here because then people would know what they're getting into. Just a suggestion. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks, Bernie. I wonder if there may be scope. Certainly there are very, very technical issues that are engaged. It's not to say that the work of the PDPs should be dumbed down to not address that because obviously that's not always possible and not desirable from my perspective. But I do think that there's potentially room for discussing some kind of a more robust onboarding or briefings process to allow folks at the very least to grasp where the conversation is, and ideally, for people with a baseline toolkit, to maybe get up to speed on the specific toolkit that might be needed to engage on a particular issue. Certainly I think there may be something there.

Cheryl, I see your hand is up and I see you posted a long thing in chat, which I will not read but perhaps you could summarize or discuss.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] I could do, but I typed the long thing in chat because I didn't want to take up valuable conversation time. And I think the chat will be part of the formal reference. But that's okay. That's not why I put my hand up.

Why I put my hand up is the sudden “uh-oh” that happened in my head, or actually my heart. That comes from someone who runs – and I do means runs – and leads an awful lot of PDPs and has been intimately involved in PDP processes through all the SOs. Yes, including at the RIR level. There is a scary consequence that just came across my mind as I hear you talking, Michael, and that was, if we have – an easy example within on of the numerous and poorly-scoped GNSO PDPs. Who’s going to be this care and feeding of the individuals who want to step in, let alone step in and step out and then step back in again, with the PDP process going on the way it currently does? Here I’m selecting my language very carefully.

If it is an expectation that that will be done in-house within the PDP process, then that’s going to seen, I believe, as an unreasonable and an undue burden on those trying to run an effective and an efficient process – in other words, your leaders and the staff associated with that PDP process.

If, however, it’s materials that are created as a requirement, if not highly recommended activity, it can in fact be as simple as the recording of the webinars which are now frequently done. Many, many PDPs and things have webinars upfront, before, and around various report releases – initial reports, mid-reports, final reports – and any calls for public comment. So that type of stuff has improved. How many people up to them is a question of [inaudible] actual webinars happen.

But it strikes me. If you were creating a useful tool to do this onboarding that was housed in, for example, the ICANN Learn world – as I say, it can be as simple as a few questions at specially-curated webinar set that has

to be created anyway – that is going to [cost] the same in cost. So we need to be careful about what we recommend as solutions associated with this because then people can make sure that they are up with the basic stuff, the onboarding stuff.

In terms of where things are up to, that's where a well-designed and appropriately updated, continuously updated, advertised workplan comes into play. That is variable between PDP processes because it's variable between leadership styles. So a recommendation on harmonization on expectations on methodologies associated with that sort of things could certainly do a lot to benefit. Thanks.

And I don't think I really will speak to the message I popped in, but it's got to do with the differences between what we're seeing perhaps with one of the support organizations and the other recognizing that the GAC work with the GNSO has been a focus since ATRT1's recommendations. We might be seeing the benefit of that long-term work. Perhaps a benefit might be from suggesting that a similar activity is looked at between the ccNSO, the GNSO, and the GAC. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Can I just push back on something that you mentioned earlier? Why do you think it would be unrealistic resource request to have staff points of contact do some kind of an onboarding?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very simply, because when, for example, you've got ... Let's just take a simple PDP process that is meeting once a week for 90 minutes. You

also have a leadership team meeting which would be at least 60 minutes. You have the development of all of the in-between work that goes on, including making sure that the full capture of what goes on what is then, let's assume (rounding it up), 180 minutes of facetime. It usually takes between two and three times of facetime to do the administration. Unless that someone in staff is almost exclusively allocated to just that PDP, we're talking in excess of a 40-hour week being required for staff to support any more than one-and-a-half or two PDP processes. I doubt that any of them only have the support of a PDP process on their job description.

If it's coming to the actual leadership team, well, interestingly enough, they're the volunteers who are trying to lead. For example, GNSO is [run, as I know you know, with] a very regular beginner's update-type onboarding in general activities, which is to encourage the individuals in the constituencies and stakeholders groups [who] are just very interested in a fresh PDP process, they do run how GNSO works and what all the jargon is about and what the PDP process and what the PDP process rules are type webinars regulars very, very regularly. It is devastatingly disappointing to see how many people, if they bother to do an [inaudible] do run those.

So that's why I think that we could run a real risk of staff spending more time. For example, let me use the Subsequent Procedures PDP. There is, without referring to Work Track 5, in simply the plenary, recognizing that there are different set of people engaged in Work Track 5 than is necessarily engaged in the full PDP – so you've got some overlap of actors but not a full overlap of actors. So ignoring Work Track 5's people, you've got around 200 people signed up as members of that

PDP process. That's a whole lot of onboarding and updating when you've got a core of around 35 to 42 who are carrying the burden of the work. That's why.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think that that difference between the 200 people that are signed up and the 35 to 40 who are actually participating is key. I guess we might have different understandings of the level of demand for this. I wouldn't necessarily track this back as a responsibility insofar as creating digests every week of everything that has happened. I mean, the calls are there. I definitely agree that we can't be dumping this onto the work party leaders who are volunteers for the most part who are extremely – Cheryl points out in the chat, "They do do something of a digest." But they do do ...

Anyway, my point though is I think that there might be scope for a short onboarding session for new members at the request of new members to get them up to speed. I think that it's one thing to say, "Well, the material is out there," which speaks to something that we're going to talk about in a second, and it's quite another to start digging more deeply into its accessibility and how easily available and digestible it is to new members. I still think that that's potentially role that we could hand over to staff if placed within appropriate constraints that recognize how overburdened everyone always is.

Bernie has mentioned that we only have 26 minutes left on the call, so I think that we should try to push forward, as efficiently as possible, and

address the rest of this and to leave a little bit of time to discuss the survey.

The next issue on there is regarding access to information. This again was not properly sourced in here, but it comes pretty directly from a recommendation that Stephanie Perrin made at the NCSG session, which tracks into a broader issue. Availability of the information is a practical challenge, given the volume of material that is being made available. That I think we've heard not just from her but from a number of people. I think that that's not going to be a controversial challenge if we spell that out.

The solution that Stephanie – it's also I think not controversial to discuss the need to focus on data management and accessibility. That is something which I know is already a priority of ICANN with their information transparency project and with the open data initiative. But the solution that Stephanie proposed was to look into hiring a librarian or archivist who specializes in helping people find information and navigating the material and who are fairly inexpensive as far as employees go. That is a potential alternative to focusing on wikis and just dumping the information out there.

So that was a potential avenue forward which was suggested. Are there any thoughts on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. I'm going to jump in, Michael, because I don't think that's any different than what I was obviously failing to clearly state, that, by having properly curated materials available, by using material that are

already being developed, like workplans and webinars, etc., and having them available, not presented by the staff – I think we might disagree on that. I would prefer it to be available whenever people want it so that there's less requirement on the volunteer to say, "I want to step in [there]. Please, ma'am, can I have some help getting up to speed." Sometimes people don't know what they don't know until they're in the thick of it. There's a whole lot of other things to help people, like peer support and staff as well.

That aside, properly curated material from material that's already being produced is vital in my view. So Stephanie are in no way in disagreement. I think the only point of divergence between what I was saying and what you you're saying here is the who-does-it. I would like it to be freely available rather than needing to be asked for. That's it. Thanks.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: These are separate points of discussion, so certainly disagreement on one does not preclude agreement elsewhere. It's wonderful to know that you are in agreement with Stephanie on this. Certainly we can flesh that out more broadly as it needs be. So it sounds like that's an idea that we can flesh out a little bit more on the access-to-information side.

In terms of transparency protocols within – I don't see any hands, so I will move onto the next one. In terms of stronger and clearer rules on statements of interest, conflicts of interest, and clarity regarding representation and identity, this flows from something that was mentioned at the GNSO session, I think, by Michele. Essentially,

somebody mentioned that sometimes you're walking around and you see people and hear a comment and it's very easy to say, "Oh, that's so-and-so from the GAC," or, "That's so-and-so from elsewhere," and other times it's way less clear to know whether someone is representing themselves, if they're an individual, if they're representing some interest group, if there are shadowy forces at work behind them pushing the discussion in one way or another. It's a bit of dramatic way of saying it, but the point there and where I take that challenge to be actionable is in terms of stronger, clearer rules on statements of interest, conflicts of interest, and clarity regarding representation and identity. So that is a broad area to look into more clearly now.

Cheryl, I think, in the chat is noting, I believe with regard to this one, that this is something that she also agrees with. "SOIs and continuous update is only part of the story but may need reinforcement." Yeah. I think that the whole conflict of interest challenge is something that we've certainly grappled with at the NCSG level. I think that that's something that would benefit from digging into a little more clearly, at the very least from providing some discussion of the problem and potentially pointing towards some possible solutions. So that is a broad area to focus on more clearly.

The other area of discussion that came out of the ALAC session was regarding the challenges in terms of their role as representing the interests of the end users. This to me was probably the most interesting moment of the discussions that we had with the different groups because it's probably where we saw the clearest divergence within a particular group like this, where there was a lot of back and forth about their responsibility for transparency and accountability, as well as the

challenges with engaging Internet end users whose interest they represent and whether or not they even have to.

So you had Tijani on the one side basically saying, “Yes. It’s super challenging. I try to do this but it’s difficult. We look at the different options and we talk to people and we really try to flesh this out. I try and do this as best as I can,” and then Alan on the other side basically saying, “This is all useless. I don’t need to do this at all. I have a lot of experience. I know what’s in the best interest of the end users.” Between those two was Jonathan Zuck basically turning around and saying, “It’s super dangerous to pretend that we can do anything but speak for our own accumulated interests.”

Anyway, there is a lot of divergence of opinion within the ALAC on this particular issue. I think that it’s an area that we should be looking into and providing our own thoughts. At the very least, I think it needs to be clarified. Ideally, I think you need to have some sort of policies relating to enhancing this structure. Here, as you see, with the paragraph, a little bit is – I’ll take credit or take responsibility that that’s me pushing a little bit towards where I think the conversation needs to go.

I also think that this potentially ties into the previous thing in terms of rules on statements of interests and conflicts of interest. That is I think a challenge that ALAC particularly faces given the nature of their organization.

Tola had his hand up and it’s now no longer up.

TOLA: Yes.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Please go ahead.

TOLA: Okay, Mike. Thanks for what you've done so far. I just wanted to add that you did not include Sebastien's own point of view on this same diverse opinion in saying that no member of ALAC, comprised of just 15 members, would be able to represent At-Large, which is compromised of such wide numbers of our membership. And to that extent, no member of ALAC would be able to speak the minds the entire At-Large membership. What you are saying was not in between what Alan and Tijani was saying. Totally different, saying everybody must be left to air there views. A non-member of ALAC would be able to represent the entire At-Large membership. Just wanted to point out that we need to put that into perspective. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thank you, Tola. That's very helpful particularly because I very clearly remember that intervention. I did not understand it because I didn't have a headset with me. So that's very, very useful that you have now summarized what he said. I will take your word on that, and we will certainly include that perspective.

Cheryl, did you want to add something?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just briefly. And thanks for pointing that out, Tola. That's a very important thing and actually is a great segue to what I wanted to say. We also need to remember that ALAC of course is the representative democracy model. It is 15 people whose job it is to represent and to advise the ICANN Board and to act in the best interests of the wider Internet community of end users. Note I'm not even saying At-Large membership because that is not in fact their representational role. But that's what the mandate is for the 15 people.

What constantly happens is this ongoing confusion between the world "At-Large" and "ALAC." At-Large, which of course is beyond the 15 people – they might part of it, but that's not their representational role. The whole purpose of having At-Large structures and the later creation of regional At-Large organizations to facilitate direct input from At-Large structures – this is how the whole At-Large movement was designed – was to allow the "closer to the end user community" – i.e., the general population that we're trying to act in the best interests of if you're in ALAC – to have exactly that, Tola: the direct input.

The effectiveness and efficiencies involved in all of that have been looked at in a couple of reviews, and recommendations have been made and are currently being enacted from the most recent review. But we also need to remember that we've got to talk about the apples and the oranges differently here. Some of what looks like difference of opinion here is colored by at which bit of the layering they're referring to. So the difference between, for example, a Tijani comment and an Alan comment is that Alan is purely focused on the representational democracy model. That is the way ALAC is designed. Tijani is focused on the direct model, which is, of course, closer to what goes on in the

regions, which is where he's going to now because he's leaving the ALAC. So he's got a peachy job description for his new role in the "closer to At-Large structures and membership."

[Again], when we're making our comments, make sure we're really specific about which bits we're referring to. Thanks.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That distinction is well-noted. I'm not sure it's at the root of the disagreement though.

TOLA: Exactly.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Oh, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Whatever]. Sorry. Can I just say ... Alan and Tijani would not agree about the color of the ocean, if given the opportunity. So please be aware of that.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That's a fair point, but I will note that, when you talk about representative democracies, if the elected representatives are not acting in the best interest of their constituents, a representative

democracy has solutions for that. That is how you keep those representatives in check. I'm not—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that is why the ALAC is what it is. The ALAC is appointed in that way because it is in fact specifically a representative democracy which, every two years, can be refreshed or not. And more specifically, at any time, individuals who are not acting in the best interests not only of the wider community but of those who select them or elect them, depending on whether they're a NomCom appointee or a RALO representative, can be removed, and indeed they have been.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: But that—

TOLA: Michael, I think we need to be conscious of time here. We have less than ten minutes.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sure. Let's—

TOLA: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] But I'll also note I am the only person in this group in this meeting from the ALAC. I'm not here as Chair. I was appointed by the ALAC as a member of the review team. So if you want to hear from an actual ALAC perspective, I will continue to intervene. If not, I'll pop my other hat back on.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: We definitely are interested in hearing the ALAC perspective, for with the recommendations that we come out with at the end of the day, the ALAC perspective may not be the best perspective to take in developing recommendations with the ALAC, if there are problems. So, yes, it's extremely valuable to hear the ALAC perspective, but at the same time, there needs to be a debate among the participants and among the different stakeholders at ICANN about the appropriate shape of the process.

Bernie, I see you have a hand up. I do want to – and, yes, Cheryl, we should definitely consider ALAC's recent review. Bernie, do you want to intervene briefly before we just take a few minutes to talk about the survey?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes because it may be relevant. After looking through your document – and I was trying to do some cross-match with what's in the bylaws that is required of an ATRT3 – there's one thing that I think is the responsibility of the community working party that I didn't see, and that's assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community.

Anyways, if—

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That's interesting.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That's one of the seven key points that this review is responsible for. Sounds pretty much like it should be in your bailiwick. If that's the case, then maybe we should consider that, especially before crafting anything for the survey. If you don't think it is, then we should talk about it at the plenary. I'm just trying to make sure that no one forgets anything here.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That's very useful. Thanks. I think that that ... yeah. I guess the ... Could I just ask a follow-up? When you say "the community," is that the ICANN community or the global community of Internet users?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Let me pull out the exact wording here. "Assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community." Full stop.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: So in my mind, that ties very, very closely to the discussion that we were just having because, by far, the broadest area of engagement that ICANN is supposed to have, I think, is through these At-Large structures.

So I think that we can potentially tie those together, but certainly we could pick that up at the plenary as well.

Why don't we just take a minute to briefly go through this survey discussion? Erica, do you want to take this forward? This is also included in the same kind of planning document.

ERICA VARLESE:

Hi. Thanks, Michael. I'd be happy to jump in here. Actually, I also have questions for the group as a whole, too. I think, looking through this document, obviously we've pinpointed a few areas that we think we should explore more. At the same time, we also have the document we had written in preparation for Marrakech. As you know who were there the third time, we only asked one question from community for each of the groups, each of the meetings that we had. So there are those questions that we still have, the majority of which, when we had written it out, was the same questions for each group for the most part, with a few exceptions, which I think, if we're on the same page, will likely go into the survey.

But from here in the conversation we'd like to have going forward, and knowing that we only have few minutes left, I think our best bet going forward on this too will be to have some of this conversation in the plenary call tomorrow around the survey but also I guess two points would be to talk about this on the list, looking through this document that we have here and the points that we've highlighted for any additional potential questions that we want to add to the survey that touch specifically on these preliminary recommendations areas.

My second thought on that note would be that perhaps now is maybe a good time, as we start to dig into this, to have more of a standing call. Up until now, we've had a community call when we've needed it. So I'm curious, Michael and anyone else too, if this seems like a good time to maybe already set up another call. Maybe plan to have it weekly or biweekly as start digging into not only these recommendations because I think there's a lot more discussion to have and there's a lot more material that we're going to be reviewing but also to discuss things like the survey as well. So I know that was just a jumble of words, but, Michael, I'm curious if that sounds about right to you or anyone else, if you want to weigh in on that as a plan going forward.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, that sounds good. Certainly I think that we'll, as an area of focus, be looking at areas that we're weaker on the discussion end to flush out areas that both we didn't get as much discussion on and where [warrant] is conducive to the kind of feedback that was structured in the last session.

Does anybody else have any thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did you want to add some additional questions based on today's interactions? Because it seems to me like there might be some drill-down or some sub-point questions that could come out from the meeting today?

ERICA VARLESE: Yeah, Cheryl. I think – oh, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no. Sorry. Remember, I'm in two calls at once, so give me a microsecond to switch between things. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE: Sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt Cheryl. I think from here there's been a lot for us to dig into. I think I'm inclined to have our conversation tomorrow on the survey informing where the group as a whole is going next, and then perhaps before the end of the week on the list we can try to compile any additional questions that relate to these areas specifically that we feel we need to dig into even more and then share on list to have that discussion and drill into it as [you put] it, Cheryl.

Noting the time and not seeing any other hands, I think that's a good place for us to wrap things for today, knowing we're going to obviously continue some of this conversation on our call tomorrow. I think, Michael, for you and I it'd be helpful to maybe connect before the end of the week if we want to try to come up with some additional questions to share with others and also maybe float the idea of another call, just to continue having this conversation as new information comes in.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, we should definitely, [within] that timeframe, try to do another call next week.

ERICA VARLESE: Perfect.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: All right—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just be selfish and say, from my perspective, another call is fantastic, but I would really appreciate if it is around this time of day. For me to start at 4 A.M. is certainly not a problem, but if I'm doing a midnight or a 1 A.M. local time call, that means I don't get back to sleep, which means I do end up in 36- or odd-hour flight cycles because now my ordinary day starts. So if it is possible to be around the time you did today, that would be very selfishly my preference.

And we should also try and get more of the diversity that you've got in your work party because I note right now it's the GNSO abomination with the [inaudible] I sprinkled in for decorative purposes. You might want to poke at some of your other work party members to make sure you get the full diversity that you should have in it. You'll hear less from me that way.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Certainly we can give that a shot. I am surprised at your enthusiastic endorsement of a 4 A.M. start time, but definitely we can keep it at the same time if that's helpful. Or if that's—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. Too many years at ICANN. You've gotten too used to the sleepless nights.

All right. With that, should we wrap it up and say thanks for all of you for joining us as we are now, what, one minute over, and we'll look forward to chatting with you all tomorrow?

All right. Take care. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]