

---

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hello, everyone. This is Yvette, the host of the room speaking. Welcome to the ATRT3 community meeting number four being held on July 30th 2019 at 18:00 UTC. Members attending the call today, we have Erica, Sébastien, Jaap and Michael. We currently do not have any observers attending the call.

Attending from the ICANN Organization, we have Negar, Jennifer, and myself, Yvette. We also have our technical writer, Bernie Turcotte, and currently, we do not have any apologies. We'd like to remind you today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking.

And I think that does it for me, so either Michael or Erica, I will turn the call back over to you. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE:

Great. Thank you so much, and thank you, everyone, for coming. We might have a few more people joining, I think, just based on what others have said. But in the meantime, from our call – I think that was two weeks ago – Michael and I had sent out a document with some preliminary recommendation areas and we had a call that was pretty productive and brought up – I think helped us to finalize the questions we wanted to refine for the survey, but also brought up a few other questions that we thought may be helpful to dig into as well in terms of areas where either we wanted to have a little more clarification to make sure we're all on the same page or just areas where we don't have that much information yet.

---

*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 and I had a call Monday, just kind of seeing what we wanted to do to make the most use of this call that we have today. I think we're in a good spot in terms of – we have those preliminary areas that we're looking at, we have a good number of questions that should give us the information that we need on the survey, and obviously, most of our analysis will come once we get that feedback, leveraging what we have from Marrakech and then also the feedback that we get from the survey as well.

So in the meantime, we highlighted these areas that you see on the screen, just as areas for initial discussion. We wanted to kick off this conversation today to get some of the preliminary discussion between us as members to get that started so that when we do begin to dive into the data that we get, we have a good understanding of where everyone's coming from, what's missing and anything else that we might need to do between now and then to inform our review of that data that we get from the survey.

So we highlighted these three initial areas, and I think we could probably just jump right into that. Michael, did you want to dive into just kind of leading that conversation or if I missed anything either – we can also open the floor just if anyone has anything as well that they want to comment on ahead of time.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yes. Sure. I'm happy to [inaudible] and thanks very much for that, Erica. We can start to take this forward and [inaudible] folks have [inaudible] that they wanted to comment on. That would also be very welcome.

---

As you can see, the purpose of this discussion today is to focus on some of the areas that are a little underdeveloped in terms of our process and where we've gotten less feedback from our previous stakeholder discussions in Marrakech, and also to try to – some of this, we were looking to spell out a little bit further when we get the survey results back, but [are keen] not to sort of leave it until then and wanted to advance in the discussion as far as possible to try and get some ideas from the subteam about areas that we could look at.

So just to dive right into our first area of examination, as was brought up in the last call, one of the areas that's in our charter, whatever the document that we're working from, that has not been addressed as much in our previous discussions, is about areas of inquiry and focus with regard to the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported by the ICANN community by both the Internet community and the ICANN community.

So basically, one of the areas that we're [inaudible] looking into is that degree of support from the community, and it's left unclear as to whether that means just the ICANN community or the Internet community as a whole, so we are interpreting that broadly.

I wanted to open it up a bit and basically see if folks have any ideas about how we should be either areas of focus with regard to community buy-in of decisions, how it is measured and assessed and areas of positive or negative engagement [inaudible] areas that we should say, "This is good, you should keep doing this, you should expand this," or areas where things are not being done that maybe should be, and

---

generally to try to advance that conversation about measuring and assessing and promoting stakeholder acceptance of these decisions.

With that being said, are there any comments or ideas about how we should be focusing this conversation or the area that our recommendation or assessment should be looking at? I will open it up for just a second. Don't all rush to speak at once.

Okay, well, with no hands going up at the moment, why don't I start off with a few thoughts and ideas that I had? In terms of assessing stakeholder buy-in, in terms of the Internet community more broadly, the thing that I think that this dovetails with in one way is the discussions that we were hearing at the ALAC, and that was differences of opinion between the degrees of engagement that is appropriate for the ALAC to carry out with some folks basically saying, "Yes, let's go to our communities and look for buy-in and etc.," and others saying, "No, our role is limited to using our own experience understanding the policies to assess what's in the best interest of the Internet end user."

The ALAC also basically has the most decentralized and kind of grass roots-ish network that's there, so that's an area that jumps out to me to potentially push into a little bit and see if that's an appropriate role there, and if so, to what extent that should be working in that way. That's just an initial thought.

I see Sébastien with a hand up. Do you want to go ahead, Sébastien?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I would hope that you will be going a little bit further in your inputs, and I will jump after. That is why I've put my hand up. But I think your question is very good question, and the question of what is the buy-in both within the Internet community and inside the ICANN, it's a question since – I will say – the inception of ICANN, and it's very difficult to – for example, for a comment when there are comment period, a public comment, how you assess that you have more people on one position or another position if there are two positions possible? And how it's done.

And obviously, the question is for me the one who has the big mouths who usually win. And that's true within each group and that's true within the groups.

Then at the end, if we are looking for – if it's buy-in, sometimes it's buy-in by not speaking or by not willing to struggle for your position. And I don't know how you can really find a solution for that.

Really, I hope that when you talk about ALAC, in fact if I may, you are talking about At-Large, and sorry to be a little bit pedantic here but ALAC – and that's a problem because it's different from the other group, but ALAC is just 15 people. At-Large is ALAC plus the regional organizations, plus the At-Large structures and so on.

I think it's important to use the right wording on that issue. But if you talk about ALAC, I hope that everybody now is convinced that we need to go back to the grass roots [inaudible] participant, even the member of each At-Large structure. But it's very difficult, and at the end of the

---

day, yes, we end up to have a small group, generally more than 15 and more than ALAC, but a small group taking a position.

[inaudible] within ICANN, you can have people – any group – taking care all their members and taking that back to us. The timing, the question, the level of knowledge you need, it's very difficult. And I guess it's the same for other groups, including for the ones we think have a lot of money, time, knowledge, registry and registrar. Therefore, it's a very broad question and very interesting one, but maybe the way we are doing it, it's – I will not say the best one, but the least difficult one to do it, and we don't need to add the complexity on all that.

But that's my thinking without writing something and just participating to the [refraction.] Nothing else. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Thanks for this. Yeah, I do appreciate the correction on At-Large versus ALAC, particularly because if you don't make that correction, other people will. So I'm glad to have that nipped in the bud and to use the correct terminology from the outset, because at some point, people are going to notice it.

In terms of your intervention, I think that's a really interesting idea, taking this from the Internet community – so I think the discussion of At-Large relates to the broader Internet community.

I think a way to also connect this to the ICANN community – or as a sort of separate research track or track or inquiry – relates to what you just said in terms of if I understand it correctly, how do we prevent the

---

loudest speakers from dominating as opposed to supporting true consensus?

And that to me is an interesting area to dig into. It's a broad area around how the multi-stakeholder process operates. But I definitely think that that's something that we could certainly push into, especially insofar as I think the veterans of a lot of the different working groups will have a lot to say about that.

And I also think it might be interesting to push into that as it relates to potential lessons learned from the EPDP, which was a different model. The EPDP had a model of decision making that rather than this open ended, everybody at the table, restricted participation to a couple of presumably highly committed and engaged people from each different stakeholder group, and I think that in discussions with folks from the EPDP, that's potentially an area to pull out, is, how did that work? Are there lessons to be learned? Which I think is already one of our areas of inquiry in terms of lessons from the EPDP to the general working groups. Or did it not work, and is this something that we shouldn't be following?

But either way, the fact that we have this different model, I think, is interesting to dig into a bit. Sébastien, is that new?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah. It's difficult with the system we have, but I use my hand. But I wanted to discuss with you on that issue, because it's a very interesting one, really, and I think we need not just to talk about EPDP but I would like to suggest that we do a parallel between Work Stream 1 and

---

Work Stream 2 and EPD, and if we have the possibility, about how the working group or the PDP or whatever you want was organized a few years ago. Because my impression is that with this way of EPDP is about the participation, not about the timing [inaudible].

The participation was a few years ago, it was a group of people and there were no observers, there were no other people participating to the discussion, and they were coming out with a proposal, it's when to a public comment, and then after the public comment [answer the] public comment, and then it's what is done. It could take one, two, five years.

And EPDP, for me it's coming back to [inaudible] prior to what's happened, I will say, just before around the IANA stewardship transition and was really very well [received] during the Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. A lot of people, everybody on equal footing, except if we have to vote for something. But you know that as well as me.

But I think, don't stay with [EPDP] please, but go do a parallel with what was before [inaudible] Work Stream 2 and EPDP. My two cents. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sorry, can you just repeat that last bit between the Work Stream 2 and PDP? Because I faded out a bit. But I'm also using bad speakers.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, and I am with my phone and that's not very good. I want to suggest that we try to do a parallel between EPDP, Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2, and any work done prior to IANA stewardship



---

transition, any PDP or working group, cross-community working group where it was very close. Like that, we could see three different type of organization for the work, for the participation. Yeah. I hope it's clear.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yes, that's much clearer. So in terms of working prior to the IANA transition, I guess we could potentially survey some of the older hands or the veterans that have been around longer and ask them potentially about the evolution of discussions at ICANN and their thoughts on that issue, and maybe trace back how we would connect that to changes that have been making either for better or worse, or – yeah. Evolving challenges that have come as a result of time could be a potential area of inquiry.

I only hedge a little bit because once we get into the pre-IANA stuff, I personally was not here for that so it's more challenging for me to speak to any of that stuff. But certainly, I understand that taking a more kind of longitudinal approach to the decision making could be interesting.

I see we're 20 minutes out. I think that we've gotten some really good stuff on that question. I would like to – and if there's further feedback on that, folks can always comment on the list, but I think we've got some very good areas to look into based on these initial responses.

So I would like to move on to discussion question number two if we can, which focuses specifically on the DIDP and the direct transparency mechanisms, by which I mean the open data initiative and the information transparency initiative.

---

We are planning to get some survey responses on those issues to kind of gauge community access through community opinions having engaged with this system, but I did want to try to move the conversation forward a little bit.

We've gotten a little feedback which was discussed at the last session regarding – or the last meeting that we had – regarding organization of information and moving in that direction, which itself was taken from one of the stakeholder sessions that we had in Marrakech.

Does anybody in the group have any thoughts regarding the DIDP or other transparency mechanisms in terms of areas we should look into or how we should be focusing this examination? Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Michael. I'll just note that when discussing this area with Cheryl and Pat on DIDP, there was a feeling that given there were a lot of recommendations under the transparency section of Work Stream 2 and that these are not yet implemented, that we probably should not do a deep dive on DIDP as part of ATRT3 since a lot of changes are pending.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Sure. Thanks for this. I will note that this was discussed early on, not specific to this issue, but there was a very robust conversation I believe in LA that I was patching into remotely regarding whether the existence of a review should – how that should impact our own inquiry, and it came up with this – specifically with relation to Work Stream 2, but also

---

with regard to the NomCom, I think, where there's also a review taking place. There's a lot of the areas of existing reviews that have either been implemented or that either haven't been implemented or are in the course of being implemented relate to areas that we are also looking at.

My understanding or recollection of the discussion that took place was that while I think that we should be careful not to make recommendations that are specifically counter to other recommendations that already exist in so far as we don't want to put folks in a position where they're being told to do X by one review and then the opposite by another review, and so we should be respectful of the fact that these processes have taken place, as well as to use these existing reviews to inform our own work but that the existence of these reviews did not necessarily preclude our own examinations into this and that we could feel free to add our own inputs as well.

That was my recollection of the conversation that took place early on in setting the tone for this. So we can go back to the record, folks can correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think that the fact that there are robust recommendations on the DIDP cave this off as an area that we shouldn't be looking at.

That being said, are there specific areas of inquiry that we could look into on this? And again, I'd be happy to open with a few ideas myself. Okay, so just in addition to what was mentioned previously in terms of data management and accessibility, which is not about the DIDP as much as it is about information or organization on the website, I do feel like there is certain scope for digging a little more deeply into the responses that have come back on the DIDP that the responses that

---

ICANN has given, and looking a little more closely at how these responses are processed and the actual kind of step by step that ICANN takes in terms of process and responding to a request.

They've put together a document if I recall correctly, on how that's done, but I do think that there are procedural aspects that we could look into. Certainly, I wouldn't suggest that we specifically try and pick apart the exceptions to the DIDP, because I do agree that that's been gone over with a fairly fine tooth comb by Work Stream 2, and so given that there are revisions on deck for almost all of those recommendations, almost all of those areas of discussion, I would be a little cautious about digging deeply into that.

But I think one of the areas that Work Stream 2 is a little more broad about was about internal procedures. So we could potentially registry to dig a little more deeply into how consultations are done within ICANN, how and to what degree there's any back and forth between ICANN and the requestor, and other areas that haven't been looked at or weren't really addressed by Work Stream 2.

That being said, no one seems to be biting on this too much, so I'll throw it open once more for any discussion on this other question, and then if there isn't a lot of interest or engagement, we can certainly just move on. Going once, going twice. Okay.

So in terms of the final area for initial consideration, just looking at this question, I'm just looking at this discussion question – and I have to apologize because I see it's phrased a little bit vaguely – Erica, do you

---

remember what we were trying to drive at with this third discussion area?

ERICA VARLESE:

Yeah, I think our conversation was pretty open ended too. I think perhaps part of why the question is open ended. We had talked a little bit about what we have gotten so far, which is mostly just the different procedures within each group. In relation to that, NomCom, and I think we just wanted to poke at this topic a bit more to see where else we wanted to – areas within this in particular that we might want to explore a bit more.

So I think that's still vague, but I think that was part of what we wanted to discuss, just seeing if we can narrow down that vagueness.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Yeah. Going back to my original notes, I think that we were a little bit flummoxed on the NomCom review question, which is supposed to be something that – or sorry, by the NomCom question in so far as we were trying to find – we were supposed to be looking into NomCom but were trying to find a good avenue for approaching that. But we wouldn't restrict it to that, but that's something we were particularly interested in hearing from. Sébastien, did you want to say something?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, please. Thank you. Yeah, my thought, if you want to have after when I read this question – and I don't know, my answer will not be

---

based on the nature of responses received thus far, because I don't know what were those responses. It's my lack of reading everything.

But my point is that we are the only structure within ICANN who could have systemic view of the organization. Therefore, our goal, it must be done mainly by the subteam on reviews, but it's that we need not to focus on what is happening in one part of the organization but what could be trans-organization or cross-organization, how you want to name it. And that's an important point. And how we deal with a question where we want to review something done by one specific group, it's what are the interactions between this specific group and the other group within ICANN.

I don't know if it's more vague or less vague of your question, but that's my answer for now. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thank you for that. If I understand you correctly, the main thrust of your input is to say that the contribution that we can make – and I'm not sure if that relates just to NomCom review or to overlapping areas more broadly, relates to our structural consideration of the organization as a whole as opposed to – so maybe it can relate back to the interaction between these different groups as opposed to the specific operation of one part of it.

Which is certainly useful as a kind of scoping or targeting question, but I'm trying to think of how we can take that forward into something a little more concrete.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may, I don't know if it will be more concrete, but one of the questions for me, it's what is the overall structure of the organization and how we can try to decrease the complexity. We can try to decrease the complexity within one silo, one entity, but we can also try to decrease the complexity of the overall system.

We have had a lot of complexity with Work Stream 1. I guess we will have some with Work Stream 2, but it was mainly in Work Stream 1 that we had complexity. And I think it could be interesting to – see, I just want to take one example, and maybe it's not a good example, maybe you disagree with it, but that's just to give you one idea.

Today, we are talking about relationship between the different subgroup to send liaison from one group or another group to send and to have two liaison, binary liaison, not just one but two. If you'd compare with what is happening within the board, the board don't send any liaison but they receive liaison from groups.

At the same time, we have the NomCom appointing people to GNSO, ccNSO, bla bla who are there to add diversity in the group. Why can't we think about putting this together and say, at the end of the day, what we need is more diversity within the GNSO or ccNSO? Why we don't just organize better the liaison with more power, more possibility to talk? And we decrease the number of people nominated by the NomCom.

It's just one example of something who – nobody can do it, because either we are looking at the NomCom or you're looking at what is done

---

within one part of the organization, and the only place where we can do it is here, or we organize a systemic review of ICANN, it's one of my requests. The last one was done in 2002 with creation of the ccNSO and so on and so forth, [inaudible] technical – I don't remember the name, but technical group, technical So and etc.

Once again, it's just one example where the only place where we can discuss that is here. But I'm not sure that you have so many people who can talk about that and put that idea on our table. It's where I think it could be useful to have good question and to try to dig those out of them, [little signal,] and we can take them onboard.

I hope it's useful, what I say. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. Thank you for that. Certainly, as we look at the interaction between these different working groups, I think that that also builds on what you said previously, as well as what you said just now. And we can potentially look into recommendations for [inaudible].

So if I understand you correctly – I understand that it was more of a structural comment ,but to take the specific that you mentioned, was the main focus about streamlining interactions, or streamlining like the processes themselves so that they're more simplified in terms of the way that these groups engage with one another?

Okay, well, unless I hear differently, that's how I'll write it in the notes, that our consideration – certainly, that is a specific area that we can try and pin down, is looking a little more carefully – and this also ties into



---

some of the questions about PDPs that I think were raised earlier, looking to specific interactions between these groups and how these processes can be streamlined and made – I guess – I don't know about necessarily easier, but made more efficient in terms of their engagement [or] interaction.

So certainly, that is a start in terms of pushing a little bit more into how we can find a NomCom-ish area to focus on a little more, to claim a little space in.

Are there any further comments on this area? Not seeing any hands, I'll move us on to the kind of areas for refinement that we were looking at discussing, These are areas where we have a little more subject matter to work with, either from previous calls or from discussions, feedback that we got from the different consultations in Marrakech, and where we can, I think, push into things on a little more of a specific basis.

So with the 20 minutes that we have left, I was hoping we can have a brief discussion to try to refine these areas down a little bit as well. So the first of these relates to the complexity challenges and engagement challenges related to PDP engagement.

So just to refresh folks, this is something that was raised in a bunch of different settings in Marrakech, and touching on a number of different issues, but complexity and [challenging of] engagement seemed to be a consistent one where in our session with the ALAC, there were folks that were saying that there is a high level of technical sophistication, there's a high kind of bar to engaging in a lot of these processes which can make it very challenging, which relates as well to something that

---

was raised both in the ALAC and in the ccNSO, I think, where they said these processes are open to anybody that can come and sit in, but the technological sophistication of the process makes it difficult, as does the fact that a lot of the time, you have these conversations that unfold over the process of months, and if you want to join in, it's extremely difficult because there's a context that's there and it's really challenging to catch yourself up on.

So we discussed this at the last meeting. One of the suggestions was to have some sort of structure for catching folks up. Cheryl cautioned us that the time that we needed to be mindful of resource limitations and to not create a solution which was extremely onerous to implement as far as staff time goes.

So that's one of the areas of discussion that we've had. That kind of caution was raised early on, and I wanted to carve out a little bit more time now to see if folks have any ideas in resolving or addressing or looking more deeply into the complexity challenges and these sophistication challenges related to PDP engagement.

I think that it's a core challenge around ICANN engagement, but maybe something that we're not going to solve, maybe something that's inherent to the process, but certainly something that's worth looking into and addressing and examining if we can think of any ways or potential avenues for it.

Does anybody have any thoughts about areas where we could take this in terms of promoting transparency and accountability by promoting

---

accessibility of the subject matter of what's being done? Yes, Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I'm sorry it will end up to be a dialog. There are different part in this question, but if we just talk about participating to a PDP and to a large extent to any cross-community working group or activity, but if we take for example the EPDP where you have two representative from different structure – no, it's not two.

okay, if you have few representative from each structure, what could be interesting at the beginning of the process, I am not talking about how you can join in the middle of the process and follow what is happening, but at the beginning of the process, one idea could be to have, let's say if you have two people today to have three people, two are senior people and one is a junior one. It's someone who will be there more to learn. But of course, they will participate also. But with not the same level of knowledge, but with on the specific topic but with different, less engaged previously or ...

And it could be one way to train to form people who will become senior, and then another junior can be – and the next process in the loop. Because one of the problems we have, even if there are a lot of things done with NextGen, with fellowship, is how we bring them not just two or three times to a meeting but to a full process of a PDP or cross-community working group.

So that's my one [and a half sense] on this discussion. Thank you.

---

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks for this. No need to apologize. It's always better to have a dialog than a monolog. And particularly because I think that's the first time I've heard that idea phrased. We heard Byron I think at the ccNSO, or somebody mention this idea of, well, wouldn't it be great if – I don't think it was Byron that raised it, but I think it was in response to Byron's comment at the ccNSO.

Wow, it would be great if there was like an oversight or more people engaging, because the way that it works now is you lose your one point of contact and now you're just lost on the whole process if the person moves jobs or whatever.

And of course, the challenge there, as you say, we want to get more people involved. The challenge there is resourcing limitations all the time. So it's tough enough to get one person involved. How are we going to find two that are going to be a liaison to a group?

But while it's not going to necessarily solve the problem of groups that can only afford or only have one person with the capacity to go and engage, this idea of appointing kind of senior and junior folks at the beginning of the process, and particularly the idea of directly connecting that to NextGen and other ICANN onboarding systems, more of a substance specific or a thematic specific type mentorship program, that I think is super interesting.

And that's, as far as I know, not something that I've seen proposed before. Maybe it's certainly quite possible that it already exists and I just

---

don't know about it, but I think that's an interesting issue that we could potentially raise. Erica, I see your hand.

ERICA VARLESE:

Hi .Yes. Semi-related and kind of more just kind of thinking of the middle of the process so to speak, as you were talking, I was thinking back to what Cheryl said about not creating a solution that's kind of overly burdensome, but I think the needed a way to get people up to speed if someone leaves or someone new is joining, because like you said, a lot of this also goes back to resource issues too, and I think most of the time, the policy development process in general has a lot of challenges, but having an active participant or having too many active participants is generally not one of them, I think. And I wonder if there's a way to kind of also in the beginning of the PDP as part of kind of setting things up and as the PDP gets up to speed, that it be part of the process to decide within the group how they want to come up with that process or those materials for getting people up to speed if someone leaves or joins in the middle.

And my thinking with that is kind of a little open ended, but I wonder if making some sort of recommendation along those lines would keep it flexible enough so that depending on each group that's working on it, they would be able to take their own resources and time into consideration while still recognizing that that's part of the work that they have to do in terms of making the information accessible for other people, whether it's a newcomer or whether that trickles down a bit, if it's something public, if it trickles down into people who are observing as well. So that's just kind of another thought along those lines.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks so much. Yeah, that's very interesting. I think that there's been some discussion around – certainly, we don't want to – I think there's concern about resource constraints that have been raised, and we don't want to – just like we don't want to dump a bunch of new work on to staff, we don't want to dump a bunch of new work on to the groups either, which makes it difficult because there's not a lot of solutions to be made without extra work.

But at the same time, I think that that specific idea of at the very least, having these groups at the outset developing an onboarding or communication strategy to at least ask the question of saying, so, let' say somebody wants to join in a month; how are we going to make it hopefully less painful to do that and less challenging to do that, other than just dump all the documentation on the website and see?

Like it could be as simple as starting every meeting by saying “So, for those of you who are just joining us, last time, we decided this and this and this. And we are at this point in the discussion, and this time we're going to be talking about this and this.”

I've been involved in some working groups that do that, and I've been involved in other working groups that totally don't do that and just kind of jump in and are like, “Let's go, let's pick up again.”

So that's potentially an idea of a recommendation. I see Bernard's hand is up. Do you want to go ahead?

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Something that I've seen which is not codified but along those same lines, I think this is a really good line of inquiry for this group, is sort of assigning a mentor to someone who's coming in from the cold in the middle of the process.

So someone will take the time. You don't only get [the dump, the] documentation, but someone [will] take a few hours to sort of lay out the key activities that have been going on, the key issues that are being considered, what documents are more pertinent, maybe less pertinent, and also answer questions.

And the times I've seen that done, it's usually been very productive, because people feel a lot more engaged when they come on board and they're contributing much more quickly. Just a suggestion.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Thanks very much for that. So I think that that mentorship idea dovetails very well with what was mentioned previously on kind of senior or junior folks within a delegation, if you want to think about it that way, from a constituency as well as the idea of finding ways to have the system interfacing with NextGen and all these general onboarding things that the ICANN fellows and all these general mechanisms that ICANN has.

And I think that between these ideas together, I think that there's a lot to dig into in terms of potential avenues to look into that are not necessarily going to be too resource intensive.

---

So I see a comment in the chat that says that we're talking about solutions before we have looked at the problem. Yeah, I think that the timeline and the pace of discussion is something I'm sensitive – I do think that it's important to be mindful of that, particularly – I think it's less about the fact that we haven't discussed the problems, because I think there's been a decent amount of discussion of the problem. I think really, all the meetings that we had so far were not the community subgroup but the ATRT3, the discussions in LA, a lot of the discussions, the broader discussions taking place were aimed at isolating the problems, isolating areas of examination.

And then on this specific one, I think that we got, beyond those general things, a specific statement of problems here in specifically the discussions in Marrakech with the ccNSO and the ALAC that really specifically pushed into this, and I think it's been generally floating around in one way or another for longer than that.

So I think that we have the problem, but in my mind, the timeline issue and the idea of whether we're getting ahead of ourselves relates just as much or more to questions – or the fact that we don't have survey data back and that we're still waiting on more information gathering that's still coming in and trying to find a solution while we're still getting information, I think that's a bit challenging, but that's also sort of the timeline that we have where I believe that this process is meant to be finding very preliminary areas of recommendation.

So while I understand the concern, I think that we kind of have to keep pushing things forward if we're going to keep to the timeline that we have. So that being said, none of these are final solutions, none of these



---

are fully baked solutions, these are really just trying to refine down more closely what we're going to be saying.

Hopefully that's alright. We have just a few minutes left. I'd like to have a quick conversation if there's any possibility, about two more areas that were raised, both in the discussions in Marrakech and in our last call, namely about SOs and ACs looking at conflict of interest policies and transparency policies.

I think that there's something that we can say about that, hopefully related to a recommendation to at the very least have these kinds of policies. Maybe if we get some good examples back from the different SOs and ACs, we can point to some examples of how this can be done or a good way to frame it or what.

Those are the things that I heard coming out of that, but I'd be very interested to hear if anybody has any thoughts about further refining how we can structure those recommendations in advance of getting survey responses back which should allow for more specific information about this.

Does anybody want to join in on anything with that with the few minutes that we have left? There's one minute left, so if you would like to say something on this issue, it is your almost last chance for this call. Obviously, we're going to be talking about this for a while. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Just one point. I think we need to have somewhere outside of each of the subgroup – I would say somebody [inaudible] where we can go back

---

to them and say [inaudible] we have a problem with conflict of interest or we have a problem with the election. And today, it's for part, it's nowhere. For some, will be, or is, within the ombuds office, but some of these topics are nowhere, and it could be useful not to leave that [inside its silo.] Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yes. That is very well taken, and I think that the lack of a central point of contact for any issues that come up here is definitely something we can add to that discussion, and certainly something that we can address as well.

It is 3:00 on the dot. Erica, do unless there's anything else, do you want to wrap us up?

ERICA VARLESE: Sure. I will wrap up then. I think from – first of all, thanks everyone. I think this was a really helpful discussion. I think we got some good stuff out of here. I've been taking notes too, so if we want, we can probably send those out to the group too just to have those on hand to look back to as we move forward, and from there, I guess we will all chat tomorrow morning, or at least morning for Michael and myself.

But with that, I think we can wrap up from here.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Great. Thanks very much to all of you for coming. We got a lot of great material, and we look forward to chatting tomorrow.

---

ERICA VARLESE:                      Thanks, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]