CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large ICANN Learn Policy course on Thursday the 14th of May 2020 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Joanna Kulesza, Maureen Hilyard, Jonathan Zuck, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Marita Moll, and Roberto Gaetano. From staff, we have Evin Erdoğdu, Alperen Eken, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcript record. Thank you very much. With this, I turn the call over to you, Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome, everyone, to another call devoted to us developing an ICANN Learn course. The first one has proven somewhat challenging in terms of us trying to develop fast-paced working tasks with the ICANN Learn team. I understand that we're over that hurdle.

Without further ado, I'm just going to go quickly through the agenda. I would like to start with Jonathan giving us an update on where we stand, what is needed, and what we could do to support the work that he has so tremendously been leading. Just going quickly through the agenda, we have the walkthrough of the current ICANN Learn course. That is linked into our agenda. There is a Google Doc that Jonathan has kindly re-edited

or significantly altered compared to what was the original version thereof.

Then, we would like to hear back from you what is missing, what could be done. I have found our last call most informative and most helpful with the suggestions and hints coming from those who have been around At-Large for significant, longer times than myself.

So, thank you for all of that feedback. That has been weaved into this course and into the courses that we're planning to develop once this one is complete. And then, I'll try to figure out how to approach this topic and the next steps with two minutes remaining for any other business.

I am going to ask if there are any changes or requests for changes to this agenda. I'm not seeing any hands raised. I will therefore assume that the agenda has been adopted and we will move straight through point three of the agenda.

I'm going to kindly ask Jonathan to give us an update. We are looking at this Google Doc that Jonathan re-edited, reformatted, and that, I understand, has been shared with the ICANN Learn team, with Betsy and her colleagues. Jonathan, if you would be so kind as to give us an update, that would be most welcome. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, Joanna. So, I had a conversation with Betsy from ICANN Learn about the visual course that I had developed. She and I agreed that the number of hoops that it has to go through in terms of legal and ADA compliance, and things like that—ADA is the Americans with Disabilities Act, so it has

to do with the accessibility of the course—would actually make the approval process for that course even longer than normal.

And so, she asked that I develop the course out the way that they normally do and she's going to work with David Olive to get us permission to have our own sandbox, our own section of ICANN Learn, that At-Large members can get to with a special code, and we can do more experimental courses there that use more visual interfaces, and gamification in the questions, and things like that. And so, that other effort is not dead, it's just going to be moved to something that's not entirely public-facing but instead is just for At-Large to use.

So meanwhile, for the development of the official, public-facing course on "At-Large Participation in ICANN Policy Development," what I did was, essentially, transcribe the other course that I had created into a kind of script format—so this is the words that would be said if it was narrated, I guess—and some of the images. And so, that's what I did, essentially transpose that into this Google document. Basically, it is the combination of a few other presentations.

We did a session that Joanna chaired several ICANN meetings ago on At-Large policy development that included a presentation from me about the opportunities for participation in policy development and a presentation from Justine on some of the technical aspects of development, as well as some examples from the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. And Evin did a presentation on resources that are available, on where to find things. And so, it's those three presentations that are basically blended into this one.

The other thing worth note is that on the last call it was decided that this was not going to be an "Introduction to At-Large" course but, instead, just a discussion of how the At-Large participates in policy development inside ICANN.

And so, to that end, there are two specific course prerequisites to this course that we assume that people will have taken before taking this course. The first one—it does not yet exist—is called "Onboarding the At-Large Community." This was meant to be parallel to similar courses that exist for the IPC and the Business Constituency and others but there is not yet one for the At-Large. I believe Joanna and Maureen are working on the contents for that course.

And so, that's really where the discussion about At-Large fits into the community, how it differs from a supporting organization, how it's described in the bylaws, and things like that. So, that's in that introductory course.

There is another course that is now available that's just called "Policy Development Fundamentals," which goes into some detail about how the GNSO develops DNS policy and provides a real foundation for what the ICANN policy development framework generally is.

And so, this course assumes that you're familiar with the information in both of those prerequisites courses, and so, therefore, doesn't go into a lot of detail about what At-Large is, how it's different, etc., nor does it talk that much about what it's like to be in a PDP. Instead, it just talks about our perspective or vector into ICANN policy development.

I'm looking at my screen. If I see a hand, I'm happy to stop. The one last thing that I was going to say is that this course is forward-looking and aspirational. In other words, we have very few examples, of participating in the ICANN Policy Development Process exactly this way.

This is the culmination of experiences and aspirations. It's hinted at by the PDP 3.0 document in terms of what the best way is to participate in these processes. And a key part of that has been historic pushback by the GNSO when the At-Large and other advisory committees wait until the end of a PDP to make their opinion known to the board, after the PDP has been going on for years, etc.

And so, what that has led the At-Large in particular to do is rally its volunteers to participate in those PDPs from the get-go. And so, it's not outlined in the bylaws that the ALAC will do this but we have the volunteers, we have the manpower. And so, I guess, if we had to use a technical term, the ALAC encourages the participation of the At-Large volunteers who participate on the ground in policy development so as to advocate for our perspective the whole way along rather than just at the end.

And so, the course presupposes that that's what we do on a regular basis and idealizes what the process would be to engage in that way with the policy development work going on inside ICANN.

And so, what feels different from what we seem to be doing day-to-day is the idea that we convene to discuss what our position is on a particular topic much earlier. We do that at the point at which a PDP is being convened or when the issues report comes from staff, even before the

PDP, so that we have developed a perspective, and an understanding of the issues, and our positions on those issues prior to sending volunteers into that PDP.

And then, the idea is that those volunteers who participate in the PDP can periodically come back and report back to the CPWG, and then bring up issues that have arisen that we didn't anticipate or pushback that we didn't anticipate, like our point of view is having difficulty getting traction, so that we can continue to support those volunteers as they go back into the trenches in the PDP.

And so, the best example of this to date is our participation in the ePDP on the implementation of [DVTR] within ICANN because what we did before the PDP even began is work through as a group what end-user perspective we were going to bring to the table. We decided that non-registrant end-users were the people whose interests we needed to represent in this case and what our positions were on various issues.

And then, we send Hadia and Alan in to participate in the PDP but they have regularly briefed and updated the CPWG and often asked, "We're going to push back on this. Is there agreement? Is there consensus in the group for us to take this position or that position?" and then they would go back into the trenches.

And when there is time for comment, we have discussions that are well-informed because this is the topic that we've been discussing all along as opposed to having 30 days, total, to figure out what we're even talking about and then trying to comment on it.

So, that's the most idealized version of this and that's the way the course is represented. It's represented as if that's how we do it all the time because the best way to start doing something all the time is to write it down and say that we do it all the time. So, that's the idea behind the course. So I guess that's my overview, Joanna. If people have questions, I'm happy to take any to keep the conversation going.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. That is a very accurate reflection of what we've covered thus far. I'm wondering if we have any questions or comments from the participants? I see Alan has taken the time to join us. Thank you so much for doing that. We have Justine, and it seems likely those two case study examples, that I understand are still in the outline to be developed, will follow the same format.

So, we will need to ask Justine and Holly to present, also, sort of a scenario for that course to be picked up by the ICANN Learn team. So, in that sense, there is a special policy that ICANN Learn wants us to follow. Jonathan has tried to challenge them to redress it, which proved to result in the sandbox that I'm looking forward to.

I see Marita's hand is up. I've seen your comments in the chatbox, and that's one of the reasons I asked if we have comments or questions. Marita, if you would like to take the floor and reflect on Jonathan's introduction, that would be great. The floor is yours. Thank you so much.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Joanna. Yeah, I just wanted to throw in the point that I have been looking at participation in PDPs, specifically the SubPro ones, to see who is there and who they identify themselves with.

We're not lacking in people who identify themselves with At-Large in some of these PDPs. We are desperately lacking in people actually participating in them, and that's the part that concerns me. So, I don't know whether or not your plan addresses that or it may be part of another stream. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Marita.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Marita? Okay.

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes? Go ahead, Jonathan. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm terribly sorry. My audio on my phone just went silent for some reason while Marita was speaking, so missed what she said. I don't know if you can hint at her question in your answer, but I missed her question. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA: Marita, would you be so kind as to repeat, please? Would that work?

MARITA MOLL:	Oh, okay. I was just saying, Jonathan, that I've been involved in SubPro, especially the GeoNames in SubPro, generally speaking. I've looked at the lists of people who are involved. I've checked out to see who they are identifying themselves with and I was just saying that there is a lack of participation of people who are identifying themselves with At-Large. There is no lack of people there, it's just that they're not actually participating. So, I think that's a very big challenge. I don't know if you have addressed that or plan to address it in another stream. Thank you.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Marita. Again, I guess that's why I put this as "aspirational." I think, as a parallel stream separate from this ICANN Learn effort, we're going to be doing all the things that we can through a number of different channels. For example, Alan is working on getting recruits out of ALSes, for example, and how best to identify them. We're going to, hopefully, participate in the CPWG. I give people a heads up about issues that we need participation on.
	So, ideally, we would formalize the process of, "Okay, this PDP is coming up. Who is going to participate in it?" and end up with a couple of volunteers, and then have expectations of them along the way to brief us and to give us updates about what's going on. I think that will help but I imagine that the struggle you have identified will be ongoing and we will be working on it into perpetuity.

So, I think we will just be making incremental improvements to our communication and the discipline of our volunteers over time but I don't think there is any magic wand to wave, there. I hope that helps.

JOANNA KULESZA: Okay. Thank you very much, Jonathan. I just want to pick up on your answer. I see Alan's hand is up and I'm certainly going to give Marita a chance to respond or to comment. But trying to reflect on your points, just let me emphasize that this is exactly why we're doing the course.

So, we want to give a better understanding of how we approach this task of representing end-users and, as Jonathan so comprehensively described, we're doing that in a number of ways, which includes developing a position within the Consolidated Policy Working Group. So, that's where we're trying to figure out what the end-user interests are how to best represent them, and that is an open group and we welcome suggestions.

So, maybe explaining the process, Marita, will incentivize our representatives to take the stand, to raise their voices, and to have a unique or consensual understanding of where we stand.

So this is, indeed, a first step. Again, Jonathan is doing a wonderful job in trying to overcome the hurdle of actually setting up an ICANN Learn course. But as already said, there are clearly demands to have an ICANN Learn course that introduces the At-Large, and that is something I'm happy to work with Maureen on.

There is also a demand coming just this week from Daniel whether it might be possible to have an Outreach and Engagement course on ICANN Learn. That would be our long-distance goal once we have the strategy approved and we know how to tackle that issue.

So, indeed, that is an observation that is shared. We're trying to address that need. As Jonathan says, it is an ongoing process and the ICANN Learn course providing an understanding of how we do is of concern. Alan, I'm going to stop talking and give you the floor. Of course, sir. Go right ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll start off by saying I haven't read this document so this is the first I've heard about this. I've been focusing on just a few other things. I think the example Jonathan gave as the best example is perhaps an archetypal example of the worst example.

What we're doing in the ePDP is pretty much what we did in CCWGs and a few other groups that we have participated in heavily, whether the people were appointed or not, and what Justine is doing in the SubPro right now, and it's not addressing the problem properly.

The problem is we have one or two experts who spend a huge amount of time on it, and then we give them a couple of minutes periodically to educate and bring the rest of the world up to speed, which provides, to be honest, very, very little guidance other than … If we say, "Do you support this?" and everyone yells, "Yes!" then we can go back and say we have the support and it, morally, is a really good thing. But it's not necessarily an effective thing in terms of really developing positions.

As Marita said, and she got it exactly right, and Justine in the chat, we're missing people who are willing to participate in the process, go along with it, become embedded in it – not necessarily as members of the group, although in many cases that would be allowed.

EPDP allows four people but, to be honest, we've only had two who have actually participated in this work. So, we're missing the core group. The CPWG was created as the place to bring things at times when we needed to bring everyone up to speed, and get the whole community involved, and perhaps make a decision.

The concept of the CPWG also included core … I'll call them "special interest groups" who would be following these things on a regular basis and providing input – a caucus group where the people who were heavily involved could discuss the issues, not as an education initiative but as a way of getting/coalescing ideas; a group who could work together to support the PDP and produce things to bring to the CPWG.

But we've lost that concept completely. We never did it very well but at least we had the concept. Now, we don't even have the concept. I think what we're missing is the actually participation in it, not by one or two people but by a somewhat larger group. Not a huge group.

So, until we do that, the work that we were going to do on the CPWG or something like that, with a couple of hours a week, is only going to be a token. It's not really going to be part of the core work.

Jonathan said that we have gotten pushback from the GNSO that we're not participating enough. In fact, we've got more pushback over the years that we're participating too much. There are parts of the GNSO who really

want us just to make comments at the end when it's too late. They don't want us to be vocal people within the group.

And in fact, with PDP 3.0, there is a real danger that we may be disenfranchised and not even have the opportunity to participate at all in some cases, or certainly very minimally.

So, the direction we're going in is right but I'm not sure we have the mechanisms. And to be honest—and again, I haven't read this document or what we're talking about here—I'm not sure it's the right time to build a course when we actually should be thinking of a methodology first. Thank you. I'm sorry to be negative but that's my gut reaction.

JOANNA KULESZA: We need your feedback. Our see Olivier's hand is up and I'm as excited to hear about it from Olivier. Just please let me address two elements, here. First, this is a tool to increase participation. Once people know how we do it they can offer their advice and they can offer their participation. If it's in concerns then it becomes more challenging.

So, this course comes as a result of a demand that we've managed to identify previously. People ask us, "How do you do it?" So, this is freezeframe of how we do it right now and I'm really grateful that Jonathan has taken the time to try and put this into words, and we have Olivier, here, who has also provided wonderful feedback on how the Consolidated Policy Working Group was developed.

If we decide to change it back and go into smaller working groups, that's for us to decide. But this is a freezeframe of where we have arrived. I also

wanted to plus-one or to applaud your concern. The feedback that I've heard from the community is that At-Large is, indeed, too active. This is the way for us to explain why we do it the way we do it.

So in that sense, I find it to be an interesting way to approach those concerns that both you and other participants in the chat have identified. I'm going to stop. I'm going to give the floor to Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Joanna, before you give the floor to others, I didn't suggest that we go back to small working groups. I said there are complementary things. Now, whether we call them working groups or caucuses, I don't care, but they're complementary and they're needed to make each other work. I wasn't talking about reverting back. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Yep. Thank you. I'm just saying this is a freezeframe and we need to summarize it in 20 minutes. So, this is as good as we could do. I see the comments in that chat. We will get back to those. I'm going to give the floor to Olivier, and then Jonathan, and then we'll come back to the chat. Thank you, everyone. Olivier, the floor is yours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Joanna. It's interesting because, of course, many of us here on the call have been involved with policy from close, from far, from the edges for quite some time.

What Alan just mentioned, here, is correct in some way in that, yes, first, we can never be right with the GNSO because we get more involved, they want us out. We stay out, they say, "Why did you not get involved?" We're always wrong, obviously.

We shouldn't comment at the end. We shouldn't be in the GNSO PDP process because that gives us two chances of pushing the process. We've got both a chance within the group and then, if we don't get what we want in the group, we can get it again later on by commenting on it. I mean, it's just ridiculous. So, I've kind of gone beyond that.

The concern that I have, I guess, is the amount of time that is needed, and especially in this PDP 3.0 if we end up with something like the ePDP. I put in the chat while Alan was speaking, how many hours does he spend on ePDP? I asked Justine, how many hours does she spend on SubPro?

If we end up with wanting to have more people in those groups then we're effectively looking for the characteristics of very, very few people that get involved in At-Large because it pretty much is … I wouldn't say a full-time job but it's a job that is more than 25 hours, if not more, per week. Maybe 30. I don't know. I have no idea how much time these guys spend but I think they spend an incredible, heroic amount of time on this.

And I used to think, "Oh, let's try and bring our community to that level so they can take part in these PDPs," but the way things are going these days it seems to be death by PDP: "Exhaust people in a PDP. Kill them. Make sure that the only ones that are able to speak at the end are the ones who are actually paid to be there who can do their eight, nine, ten

hours a day." They can even clock up overtime on this, and then everyone else will just fall by the wayside.

So, we have a real problem on this. This is why I think that if we can get our superstars and try and support our superstars as much as we can … It's going to be difficult to find more superstars and we're not going to get that many. But occasionally, there will be some that will suddenly turn up and step in.

There will be some who will die by exhaustion from these PDPs and there will be, of course, the rest of the people who will be trying to help here and there, especially when it comes down to comments. And so, I think that we look at the pyramid.

Mikey O'Connor had this beautiful thing a few years ago—I think I shared it with you, Joanna—showing the number of people that make decisions on PDPs and on policy is the inverted pyramid. There are more people that make decisions on it and vote on it than people that actually write it and draw it. So, if we can get at least a handful of people to comment on things then we're fine.

With regard to—and I'll close very quickly, here—the legitimacy that we have, we need to reach out further, and therefore, we need to tell more people how to deal with policy. I think it's a real uphill struggle and it's one of the major problems of the multi-stakeholder model in that a lot of people don't really know about the topic. A lot of people that don't know about topics and that comment on it, sometimes their comment is totally worthless. I fear that I might be reaching that territory. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Olivier. I agree, ICANN is very much about diplomacy and everything you described is very much like diplomatic practice. I see that Maureen has a "speed up" symbol. I'm wondering if that's a hand up or if you really want us to go faster?

I'm going to give the floor to Jonathan to respond to all of that feedback. I'm keeping my fingers crossed we're staying on course and actually developing an ICANN Learn course. Just [to go sure], I'm going to start with Jonathan, and if indeed that is a hand up from Maureen, I'd be happy to hear back from her, and then we'll go back to Alan. Thank you, everyone. I'm following the chat. Jonathan, the floor is yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Yeah, I really take Alan's lament—

JOANNA KULESZA: Jonathan, if you're speaking on mute …

JONATHAN ZUCK: I am, can you not hear me? Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You can hear me?

JOANNA KULESZA: We can hear you, Jonathan. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can everybody else?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yep.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, sorry. Yeah. I really take Alan's lament to heart and I see this as an evolving process. I guess I feel like we have, for better or for worse, moved away from a caucus or subcommittee model that requires a group of people to transcend an actual Policy Development Process that might be transpiring and, instead, in a way, operate on a kind of jury model where we put together a group for the purpose of a particular Policy Development Process.

And so, Justine has her small team that are working on Subsequent Procedures. If we had to find alternates for the ePDP, the way that they have in, for example, the Business Constituency, that might be the way to think about it, that there are active participants and more passive participants, or something like that.

I feel like that development needs to continue on. I think there is no question, and nothing that we're doing here is in any way addressing that problem except to lay out our aspirational structure for engaging with the rest of the community on DNS policy development.

So, I know that you haven't read the document, Alan, but it's not particularly complex. I think, in many ways, it does somewhat map to how we've done the ePDP, and I understand your issues with that.

I guess we should work on how the work gets done, the volunteerism, etc., and how best to share that information, the best use of the calls. Things like that, I think, are going to be constantly evolving. This is more of a conceptual outline of how we intend to engage whenever possible. I hope that's helpful.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I'm going to give the floor back to Alan. Indeed, as you can see in the comment, there are issues to be discussed. Just for me to be clear, this is not where we discuss how we do policy. This is rather just a description of how we've done it before and what are the aspirations at this point. I see Maureen's comment in the chat, I just don't see a hand raised, so I'm going to give the floor to Alan. I hope that is okay. If you want to speak, Maureen, please raise your hand. Alan, the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of things. More than a couple, perhaps. Olivier made the comment that comments from people who really don't—and I'm paraphrasing him—know what they're talking about are sometimes less than useful and can be damaging, and that is indeed the case.

That's the whole point of what I was saying to begin with. The ability of multiple people to bounce ideas off each other, who understand our environment and understand the issue that is being discussed, is really, really critical. That's what we're missing right now.

You mentioned, Justine, small group. Well, I'm a member of that small group and my participation is so small that I almost don't count. Unfortunately, that's probably true of several of the members of Justine's small group. It's nice to refer to it but it's not working very well as it should and Justine is bearing the load.

On the ePDP, I have spent … I don't know how many. Something like 300 to 400 hours in meetings and I don't know how much other time on other things. To expect me or Hadia to get a group up to speed in an hour-and-a-half webinar when we're talking for 40 minutes is just ludicrous. I mean, it's nice. We have to do that at some point to involve people but it's not what we need to help develop the policy.

What we are talking about is developing policy. CCWG is not policy but comparable stuff. I understand there is a demand for this course. We're getting good at actually getting people interested and they want to know more. But I'm not sure that we know what we want to do enough to embody it in a course, and that's the point I was trying to get at.

It's really important that we give out a message that we can stand by, and I'm not sure we have that message right now. I wish we did but I'm not convinced we have it. I think the time would be better spent with a small number of people who have actually been involved in policy processes.

I mean, I've been doing this on the ground now for, I don't know, since 2007. Count the years. I've lost track. There are others who have been doing it for either longer or almost as long. I think the input we need from us on how we can move forward, how we can a larger number of people involved …

Yes, I'm working on the ALS Mobilization Group and we should be working on individual unaffiliated members to get them more involved. But it's not clear what we tell them right now because I don't quite have the mechanism that we can use to tell them what to do to actually get them involved. So, we're finding ways of finding them.

And as you said, you have demand for a course from people you've already found but I'm not sure we know what we want to tell them. It's not a six-month endeavor to do that but I really think we need to have that careful, quiet thought and propose a plan before we talk about documenting it and making it available to the world. And again, I haven't read the document so I may be really off on a tangent. But from what I'm hearing, that's my thought.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Alan. This is really interesting. I would love to hear from Cheryl before I share my thoughts or questions on this. Cheryl, and then Maureen. Cheryl, the floor is yours. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Joanna. Might I say, if I had been spending less ridiculous amounts of my full-time job in policy development for ICANN—

and by full time I mean upwards of 70-plus hours a week sometimes—it might have been easier for me to wake up at 3 AM for this call.

So firstly, my apologies for being late. My body caught up with me. But I can blame Subsequent Procedures because they shifted a leadership meeting to make sure I was awake at midnight and, of course, didn't fall back to sleep until just before our call was meant to start.

That said—and that's an example for a reason—that is exactly the type of degree of commitment that those that we will be putting in on the front line in the policy development work going forward at least for the foreseeable future in the GNSO are likely to be having to deal with.

I guess part of what this course can do is help people be better equipped—and I think this is one of several steps, not a panacea—to decide whether or not they want to get in at that level, or is there another place for their wisdom, their voice, their very necessary opinions to be discussed [in this course] and developed into, some form of, hopefully, consensus outcome.

That may or may not be them directly plugging it in. I would like to think that what we're doing with this course—and I'm a supporter of this as one of several things that should be being done, and perhaps even one of several levels of course that should be offered—is a stage.

We also, I think, need to focus in this course—that's how positive I'm being because I want this to happen—is a matter of timeliness, as well. We have to make sure that what our committee does, what our volunteers are doing, is prepared in such a way when it gets inserted into

the process, however it gets inserted into the process, whatever the process is at the time, it has maximum effect.

And I think as leaders of At-Large, that's the role that should be being seen, whether you're the chair of the ALAC, the chair of the policy committee, or someone who has strong opinions and specific skillsets and experiences as an individual or ALS member. If you're in that role, you should be really keen on getting that timeliness.

So, I'd love to see some skillset development that also helps people do things in that SMART way. We will never have the same sort of megalithic PDPs as we are currently coming to the end of, so try not, as we do this, to constantly—as I'm going to be guilty of doing, I can assure you—looking back on history.

As I lick my wounds, I'm going to try and make sure that, any of what little wisdom I may be able to help put into this material, we'll have that from now on and going forward approach. But I do know that a model that we have now in the CPWG, whilst it is badly out of sync—I mean, really badly out of sync at the moment—is still well worthy of following and giving a good shot of. Anyway, it has been my very biased views.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Joanna, and thank you, Cheryl, for your comments. I'm very much aligned with them myself. I think that this is one of the reasons why we're actually having this meeting. We've got a collection of what are

very committed, high-level participants in the whole Policy Development Process – the advice that it is that we're actually supposed to be giving, and that sort of stuff.

I mean, I think that we really do need to actually have these inputs because I think one of the things that we've actually got to do, and one of the reasons why we're actually offering this course, is to convey, not only to our own people in At-Large but also to outsiders, the process that we're actually using at the moment.

And as Cheryl said, we've got to actually explain that process because we want people to engage. People are going to want to engage at different levels. For some of them, I know that with the CPWG we're getting a lot of people who come along.

They're coming along to actually learn. They're coming along to listen to the discussions, actually sort of like [inaudible]. They're not going to be putting things in the chat because they're not comfortable yet about what they know, what they don't know.

So, it's going to take a while. I've been in the ALAC for years and there is just so much that's coming upon us that I'm never going to pick it up. But I do enjoy going along to those sessions. I do enjoy, recently, listening in to the recent presentations. Justine's presentations blow everyone away. That's the kind of training that we're actually offering people.

Although we're having our policy inputs and policy development, there are so many aspects of what we're doing at the moment, which I think is really important. It's important to At-Large. I think that what we've got

to do is we explain the process that we're going through. Some of those aspects could also explain that CPWG policy development is multitasking.

So, I like the fact that the process is an evolving one. I've already mentioned the [OFBSC] that is actually developed from it. But at the same time, we do have a structure and I think that if we just … I mean, you go to the CPWG meetings. The structure is there. That's what I think that we should be conveying in this course. It's the one that like, "This is what we're doing at the moment."

It may change. Hey, new chair, new change. That's bound to happen and the course can be pulled and adapted to whatever is new. I really think that what we're doing at the moment is working but we just need to pick up on some of the comments that Heidi has made in it – very much focused on looking at keeping to what we're mandated to do in the bylaws, which we're doing anyway, I think.

But we've got to do it our way and I think that it can't be … Just because it's not ICANN's way, I don't think that's important. I think that we've got to actually find a way of engaging people and also where their level of engagement is going to be. Yeah. That's just my [inaudible] at the moment, anyway. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Maureen. I see Alan's hand is up. I'm going to give you the floor, sorry, but just please let me emphasize this is not an opportunity to work on our processes. This is rather just a piece of information going out—if I'm trying to respond to Marita's question—to those who are testing waters, trying to figure out where they want to get

involved. If they come to us and say, "How do you guys do it?" I would be very reluctant to say we don't know how we do it or we don't have a process.

I would rather give them a simple answer that Jonathan has put on four or five pages of a manuscript and tell them, "This is how we do it right now. Come join us. Help us out. If you think we can do it better, we'll update the course." Alan, we have eight minutes. I'm very mindful of the time. I would be more than happy to give you a few of those to hear back from you. Thank you for all your input. Alan, the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I don't know we should tell them we don't know how. I think there are answers we can give them. I'm just not sure it's time to formalize this into an ICANN Learn course, which is a really significant development effort.

People have the tendency to react to the current crisis and the current problems they've had. PDP 3.0 is, to a very large extent, the reaction to the failed RDS PDP and to the extensive ePDP, but those are not necessarily typical. I think we're reacting to that, to those same sort of things, right now, and I think we have to be careful not to.

We need communication and we need to … Hold on, sorry. I've lost my thought. One second. We need something in between what we're doing right now because the number of people who participate at the level that Cheryl and I have in the past, or Justine is right now, is always going to be limited.

I can't think of another person in At-Large who has put that amount of effort in, and maybe I'm passing over someone I should be thinking of, but I can't. I can think of a handful or a little bit more than a handful of those in other parts of ICANN who have done it on a similar level. It's a tiny number.

That's not the people … We need those people. Those aren't the ones that we need to cultivate. It's the level in between, the number who are not going to make the kind of commitment that Cheryl makes, or I make—or I used to make, anyway—but the ones who are interested enough to get really knowledgeable on the subject. I think that's where we need to focus our energy and I'm not sure we're ready to embody this in a course at this point. But thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Alan. That is duly noted. I'm looking at our participants list. I would love to hear in those few last minutes back from Jonathan but it looks like we've lost him.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm still on the phone.

JOANNA KULESZA: And it seems like Olivier … Great. Wonderful. Jonathan, I would love to hear your thoughts on this. We have six minutes. I'm sorry, I'm watching the clock again. I would love to hear back from you and I would like to hear your thoughts on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're a very good [cross talk]. Olivier in the queue, as well.

JOANNA KULESZA: Sorry, has someone …? I'd love to start with Jonathan and then go back to Olivier. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Yeah. What I guess I want to say is that the level of detail in this course, or any ICANN Learn course, is not such that it's going to present any kind of conflict with the effort that we need to go through to cultivate that middle tier of people. I mean, I'm well aware of the difficulties that you've raised, Alan, and I've done a lot of PDP participation myself. That's not going to change.

As you say, it may only change incrementally. But most of what you're saying won't change how we're writing this course, at least in the near-term, because we're at a little bit higher level than that.

So, one difference I could see making reference to is recruiting a broader number of people than just those who will participate directly in the PDP. And we can certainly build that into the course, as well, and get to that idea of having people that …

I think Greg Shatan is an example of somebody in the At-Large who is a passive participant in even more groups than he's an active participant. He listens to the ePDP calls and things like that so that he's up to date.

Olivier, I think, sometimes does the passive participant thing. I do, sometimes, too. Listen to the recordings after the fact, that sort of thing.

And so, what we could do in terms of modification to this aspirational, idealized version of how we participate is make mention to the fact that we try with each policy development process—the small, uncapitalized policy development process—that we recruit a larger number than will actually participate, but we have the active participants and we have the alternates, sort of like alternates on a jury or something like that.

We can make some reference to that and we can edit these courses at any time, too. They're not set in stone. It's just to provide a context for people because, frankly, even the one that the GNSO created, the policy team created, on policy development at ICANN doesn't really get into the level of detail that we're talking about here in terms of what it takes to participate.

And so, I completely agree. We need to continue to deal with those issues. I'm just not sure that any of those discussions are in any way incompatible with the course as currently laid out. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Joanna. Jonathan said it all. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA:	Perfect. Thank you so much. Thank you. I think this was a most productive meeting. Thank you for all the feedback. Thank you to Alan for the constructive feedback. I'm certain this will be taken on board.
	In terms of process—and I'm looking forward to advice from staff who know our processes all too well, much better than me—we have proposed this document for comments. The comment period ended. This is the document submitted to the ICANN Learn team. I know that Jonathan will be working on this and, in that sense, I understand that the feedback we have gotten will be in process. So, that feedback will be weaved into the final product.
	I'm wondering if we want to make this … The document, Evin indicates, has not yet been submitted so we could open this up for comments for another week. Is that something we want to do, Jonathan? Because I understand we have shared this with the group. We got feedback and you have responded to that feedback. Would you welcome more comments on this directly on the document, or are you happy with it? Go ahead, sir.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	I think it's worth putting into Betsy's hands and that we work in parallel because I think we need a good understanding of whether or not we're giving her the material she needs because we can always make additions and subtractions.
	The thing that we need to do now, in terms of the ICANN Learn process, is come up with the places and types of assessments we want to do sprinkled throughout the course. So, that's what's currently missing from

the Google Doc, the placement and specifics of assessment that we want to do. I think that we can ask that question to the community and then they'll make other comments as they see fit. I think that's the next agenda item for us, to come up with the assessment while Betsy's team begins to look at the basic narrative.

JOANNA KULESZA: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Hi. Thanks for this, it has been a great discussion. I think that we likely should have the discussions or the comments open for one week, and then we can consider sharing that with Betsy. I think that, given that many of you have not had a chance to look at this document yet, it really wouldn't be useful to Betsy to see a document that's still in obvious drafting form. So, if we could just have a week of comments, and then taking a look at incorporating those, and then we can give that to Betsy. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Great. I note in the chat that's something that Maureen also supports. So, one more week for all those comments that have been made during this call to be put on the Google Doc. I know where Jonathan is coming from. Betsy tends to be very specific with instructions for us and understand you guys have been in touch. We will get input from Betsy and we will work in parallel on this document.

I don't want to take more of your time since we're all very busy folks working on ICANN calls, various calls, that are starting shortly. So, Jonathan and myself ... I see Alan's hand is up. I will give you the final word, Alan, just let me summarize.

I'm trying to wrap my head around where we stand. So, we will welcome your comments on this document. We will be in touch with Betsy in parallel, and within a week we will get back to you how this process will move forward. Alan, last words. Sir, the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG: My last word is a question. On the bottom of each page of the document is a gray box which says "reply added." Is there supposed to be something there that I'm missing or should I just ignore them?

JOANNA KULESZA: I think you're welcome to ignore this because these will be questions, I think, but there is a mailing that I certainly can pick this up on and get back to you with details. So, it's more the gist of the course that you're welcome to comment on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The point I was asking, there's not an image there that I'm missing because I can't see it for some reason? It's just a gray box and I should ignore it?

JOANNA KULESZA: Indeed. That's what it is, sir.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: So, we welcome your comments. There is a mailing list that we will continue this discussion on. It's up to Jonathan and myself to make sure that those comments get reflected. We will be in touch with Betsy, giving her an update on where we stand.

Is there anything specific I'm missing and that needs to be added, also from our phone participants? That would be Jonathan and Olivier. If not, I would be inclined to close the call. Thank you, everyone. This was most productive and most—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, nothing from me.

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I said, "Nothing from me." Thank you, Joanna. It's a great call, that's what I've been thinking. Great call. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Great. Thank you very much, Olivier. So, we will take all of those comments on board. We are still pushing forward with providing information to the community and we will make sure that those comments are not too controversial.

Thank you, everyone. I'm going to close the call. Thank you to our staff. Thank you for taking the time to join us. This was really, really helpful. Thanks, everyone. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]