
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the OFB Working Group Recommendation Prioritization Subgroup call on Wednesday, the 30th of June, 2021.

On today's call, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Jonathan Zuck, Sébastien Bachollet, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

We also have apologies today from Marita Moll.

From staff, we have myself, Gisella Gruber, who will be doing call management, as well as document management.

And if I could just kindly remind you, please, to state your names when speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORRL: Fantastic. Thanks very much for that, Gisella. Just pull up the action items. I believe it wasn't ... Other than that Marita is going to make annotations. But I assume that's done. And we've got the holding sentence. I think Marita took that one over from last week. We can double check on that as well. And I'm pretty sure that we'd have heard if Marita didn't have editing rights. So the one regarding editing rights should be updated.

Okay. Let's pop ourselves into the document then and let's get underway. Thank you. If we go into the MSM and down to that little green line. Here we go. Oops. We'll remove our green line. We had

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.

actually discussed this relatively deeply at the close of our meeting. I'm surprised Alan isn't here because he was one of the people who were particularly interested in ... We might just need to shrink it down just enough or bring it across so that we're looking more at Column E. Thank you. That's terrific. Yeah. We don't need to see the first column, but Column E is important. And we were stuck on, at this stage, whether or not it was high-priority, high urgency, and medium effort, or whether or not it needed to be high across the board.

Have any of us had further thoughts on all of that? [inaudible].

Thanks, [inaudible]. That'd be great.

Oliver, you're probably walking the streets of Geneva. Did you want to just jump in?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you give me ten minutes, I'll be back in my room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So I'll be back in my room in about five or ten minutes. I'd rather do it there. But you're right about the streets of Geneva. I'm actually in my hotel. But anyway ...

CHERYL CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. They're probably used to people walking down the street, looking like they're talking to themselves. We won't have you walking the corridors looking like you're talking to yourself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The problem with the mask is that people don't see you're talking but they see you walking around in circles and they think, "This guy is weird. Very strange. Walks around in circles." Anyway ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure they'll be saying that at you regardless, even if you didn't have a mask on. So let's see how we go.

The Subsequent Procedures 3.3. Okay. So we're looking at these issues of inclusiveness. So, Jonthan, did you need us to review this? [Or Jonathan, try again] while Olivier gets himself back into his room?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I would just comment that I would feel ... I don't know how [inaudible] the categorization because this is obviously an issue of great importance to us. But as you have mentioned on numerous occasions, it's also an environment about which we know very little because of how new it is. The whole PDP 3.0 is an experiment at this point that's ongoing. We don't even know what we would ask for in terms of a reform.

So I'm really just channeling you when I say that, if there's some way to make it high-priority but low-urgency or something like that, it might

make more sense because, at this point, we don't know. This may very well be the structure that makes the At-Large more influential than it has ever been because it forces us to achieve consensus early and more fully support out representatives to working groups and things of that sort. I mean, I'm sure I have my own bias here, but it could very well be that this is the best thing that ever happened to us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. With the support mechanisms in place, it may very well be. I think that's pretty much where we were humming and harring so much last week, where we were thinking not only of just the PDP 3.0 but also that there is, within the multi-stakeholder model, issues of representativeness, and the expectation of the validity of such modeling even beyond what we're currently working with with 3.0. The example we were using was ... One of the examples we discussed last week to refresh all our memories—Welcome, Alan and Vanda. Thanks for joining us. The review we had towards the end of ICANN71, where they were looking at the survey and the material from that survey regarding the nature of ICANN72. And of course, the issue was we'll now just talk to the SO/AC Chairs. Thank you for all your input. We've had a little outreach meeting. The SO/AC Chairs will now be at their prime focusing direction point.

And the question of whether or not one person can in fact even think without huge amounts of empirical data to represent all of the GNSO's or even the At-Large's view on how they feel in terms of a hybrid meeting or a fully virtual meeting. That type of thing. The [fitness] of purpose of the inclusivity needs to be not challenged but we need to be

mindful of it. I think we left it and it looks like there's a fair amount in this Column B that indicates that we need to make sure that such inclusiveness is constantly considered not just by the rubric of efficiencies and "effectiveness" but also the validity of the modeling.

Alan, did you want to ... I know you're one who is wondering whether high-urgent and medium was where we should be sitting or not. Did you want to weigh in on this while Olivier boots up his laptop?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm happy with that. The whole issue—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, sorry. You were talking over me. I wasn't sure I was being heard or not. I'm happy with that. I'm not 100% that anything related to the multi-stakeholder model representation is a medium effort since I think some of things are near impossible. But, yeah, I can live with this.

The whole issue is such a messy, complex one that is so prone to misunderstandings and not really making sure that the multi-stakeholder model works. I mean, the whole concept of the multi-stakeholder presumes representativeness and inclusiveness, but as we know, almost every time we try it, there's something wrong. Either somebody has far too large a voice for one reason for another ... And the reasons vary. It's not just because of the rich contracted party. It could be other reasons as well. If you look at some of the most persistent and ultimately successful voices in the ICANN Accountability Working Group, they weren't necessarily the people you would have predicted would be the ones who would hold sway, but it did happen.

So this is a really complex issue, and anything we're going to do is going to be an attempt. But I think to say it's ultimately too high a priority almost makes you shy away from doing it. So I'm willing to live with this—not a priority effort, rather.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Olivier, are you settled yet? Can we call on you? Otherwise, I'll go to either Vanda or Sébastien on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Still struggling for two more minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'll leave him wandering the halls and looking like the madman that he apparently is and ask you, Vanda, how you're feeling in terms of comfort here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I agree with some comments that you have gone over with Alan. I believe that it's not easy to ... In my opinion, [it's just keeping time] because it's something that you need to enforce that will be considered all the time. But to reach the outcome that we believe will be the good one, I believe it will never reach there. But we should keep trying. That is my view on this because there is so many issues to guarantee participation, equity, and effectiveness, knowledge inside the group. So there is so many issues to consider that optimizing this is a work in progress, and we are never finished. But I agree that it's high priority. We must try all the time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Sounds like fighting the good fight. Sébastien and then I believe Daniel and Judith have some input. Sébastien, your thoughts?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. A few items. First, yeah, we are talking about PDP 3.0, and that's an important point, but it's not the only place where representativeness and inclusiveness need to be enhanced.

I see a link with other issues we are talking about. The first one is obviously diversity. As we discussed in the call for Work Stream 2, diversity will not be implemented the same way in each part of this organization, of ICANN in general. But we need to take that into account.

The question of representativeness I feel could be also linked with a holistic review as the best way to have a full picture of the organization, the link, to be sure that we get this representativeness.

Therefore, I think that it's high priority, yes, definitely. Urgency? I will say that it's not so high because, if I keep this link with the holistic review, the holistic review will take 18 months. Therefore, if it's urgent, it needs to be not just started but done in very less months than 18. It's why I will not struggle for high urgency. What is the level of effort? Depends on how many targets we have. We have diversity, holistic review, PDP 3.0, and I can add some others. Therefore, yes, it's between medium and effort.

Therefore, my proposal would be to have high priority, medium urgency, and medium effort. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sébastien. Let's note in chat that Daniel says—I'm assuming, Daniel, you wanted me to read this to the record (that you have audio issue) but jump in if not—"Inclusiveness and diversity would go hand-in-hand in this." That's a wise thing to add as well. Let me know if you want to join the queue to speak.

Judith, you are comfortable with a high/medium/medium or a high/high/medium, which seems to be where we are at the moment?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This for me is a continuous process. I believe it's high/medium because we need to focus on that. But we'll never reach the results, so I believe it's high to start and medium to reach the priority. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, again, we've [flipped] here, although it looks like we're heading a little bit more towards high/medium/high, just to confuse—thank you, Jonathan. High/medium/high.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was just following on Alan's comment. I think he was right to say that none of this is going to be a medium effort. But, again, I think the urgency issue is ... I feel like there's a lot going on. There's already change going on and we need to give peace a chance, so to speak, before we call this a high-priority issue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Olivier, obviously ready to make input because your hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Yes, indeed. I'm now stable, not only ... I've actually read, also, what was on the page.

I do have one question because, in that text, we mention the representativeness and inclusiveness. Is this not something that should be ... Well, yeah. Representativeness and inclusiveness is one thing here, but if you look two things down, two levels down, then you've got

recruitment and demographics. And I think we shouldn't mix the two together. I think that, when we mention representativeness here, we did mention the concern that some regions are not reflected. It says here, "at times the SO/AC leadership group mainly reflects limited regions, and there's a danger that the concerns of some regions are not reflected. Ad hoc [addressment] should be considered." Is this supposed to be in the representativeness and inclusiveness, or is this to be in recruitment and demographics? Or maybe in both? That was one point.

The other point is [inaudible]—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. The rest of the text I'm happy with. I think it's captured all the points that we have concerns about. Certainly, the professionalization We might have to add perhaps that, in some regions, the technological difficulties might stop people from being able to participate at the level at which one is asked to participate when being a representative. I don't know how to shorten this, but what I mean is that we'll have a lot of Alan's and Jonathan's because they've got no issue with connectivity. But we might have trouble with people in some parts of the world that have more patchy connectivity and that will therefore be really having a hard time having to follow a high level of calls and professionalization of these calls.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. Like the backwaters of Australia, I understand it well.

Judith, did you want to make an input? And I think I'll do a summation because I've heard a couple of ideas that we want to weave in here.

Judith, I'm going to take it that, if you needed or wanted to make an intervention, you'll do so in chat. You might be stretched for connectivity yourself at the moment.

And I note in chat that, of course, Daniel is also just picking up on Olivier's point. He said he certainly has connectivity challenges, but he does his best. And indeed, that's a very valid point.

Jonathan asked if this is another opportunity for him to mention that we need better mechanisms for asynchronous collaboration. No, I think it's a perfect time for that to be mentioned.

And I think that was what I was picking up on from what we heard from everyone's input. And thank you for your input on this section.

I'm going to suggest that we probably don't necessarily change what's in Column D but we may want to just annotate it slightly and reorder it. It struck me, for example, that we were all tending to agree in the notes that we have here to empower anybody with the background information. It'd be a good argument about fighting the good fight. I couldn't help myself, Jonathan. [inaudible].

The matters of fairness, fitness of purpose, complexity of the nature of our multi-stakeholder model, and the world that we operate in—all of those sorts of things—probably should be mentioned at the start of our debate points. We should take the opportunity to indicate that there are

a number of things either having been recently changed or maybe changed in the near future, referencing specifically the holistic review opportunity from the recommendations of ATRT3, to Sébastien's point, but also, with the interactions of a multi-stakeholder model, that there is a balancing and complexity, meaning the points in the MSM are very co-dependent and reactive with each other. So we start with all of those fairly overarching high-level types of comments.

And then we say, for example, PDP 3.0 has changed how constituencies are. So rather than just lead off with just the PDP 3 example, which is an obvious and an easy one—but I don't think it necessarily should be the lead sentence—we make an attempt as an AI to rejig that information in Cell D so that we pick up—we can go back to the recording and steal some words from my summation and other people's interventions ... So we have the more generalized stuff—fitness, fairness, fit for purpose, and complexity, [inaudible]—and then lead into PDP 3.0 and then what follows. That might be a bit of ordering of it.

Based on that, my personal comfort level is probably more high priority, which I still agree with Marita that it is a high priority. I agree with Sébastien on probably medium urgency because of the number of things that are currently in play and the need for them to be tested and reviewed, as well as modified. And I'm 50/50 on either high or medium effort. And why not, for once, actually note that it is perhaps a medium to high effort. So split the difference there.

Anyways, that would be my proposed way forward. Let's make that as a note and we can come back to that when we've got Marita on the following call. But I think that's one where we might benefit from a

reediting from our D and maybe a stretching-the-friendship of our normal [inaudible] section with a medium/high if not a choice of one way or the other in terms of [effort].

Let's move now then down to our next one, which is Line—

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, it's Alan. I've had my hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry, Alan. I did not see your hand up because I'm only getting to see the speaker view. If I saw the non-speaker view, I would have noticed it. And Olivier's hand is still up as well. I'm still not seeing yours. My apologies. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I had two points. One of them you just covered, and that is that—Sébastien alluded to it—leading off with PDP 3.0 might give people the impression that the whole paragraph is about PDP 3.0, especially since there are no paragraphs. So I think ... But you've covered that right now. We shouldn't be leading off with PDP 3.0. It's one of the items.

The second one was triggered by, I guess, Olivier's or somebody's comment on bandwidth. I have a very significant bandwidth problem. It has nothing to do with telecommunications. It's time. That is one of the major inhibitors of equitable access and impact in the multi-stakeholder model. I have very limited time. There are things I would opine on—I like

that word—but I don't because I simply don't have the time to either wade through all of the other discussions or formulate something that I think is a salient and good contribution to it, whereas other people have far more time on their hands, partly in some cases because they're paid to do this.

So I think time is an issue that has to be mentioned. It's not unique to me and it's a really major factor of where you can actually participate in the model and therefore who it is that ends up taking the lead. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. That's an excellent point. We need to perhaps, if you don't mind, Gisella, add, in the 6B block, that it's resourcing both technological and human that also has an issue. We'll pick that up as we rejig that sentence as well.

Olivier, your hand was still up or is still up now?

GISELLA GRUBER: Cheryl, Line 6—was that part of the AI? Sorry, I was [following, but ...]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Just on D. If we add into Column D because we're going to rejig that AI. The AI is to rejig it. We just need to pick up the bandwidth resourcing, both technological and human, because that was to Alan's point. That's all. I just didn't want to miss putting that in there.

GISELLA GRUBER: [Sorry. I've got it] in the AI.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem. Or wherever it was captured as long as it was captured.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now let's pop down to the next one, but I was just checking with Olivier: whether this hand was an old hand that I was seeing up and I was trying to figure out why I couldn't see Alan's. Probably my own bandwidth issue with a delay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It was an old hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was an old hand. All right. Now we can safely move on to the consensus, the MSM consensus, the consensus playbook, which is still ... I mean, it's now hardly a brand-spanking new publication, but many of us is not well-read or well-understood just yet. Certainly, there's a whole lot more learning to do from it. But it is worthy of noting it here.

Marita has put in that ... okay. If I'm having a time lag, it is literally to do with my bandwidth. So this is a technological bandwidth issue. Looking

up, I seem to be orange, not green. So nothing I can do about it other than switching to phone. I guess I can do that, which is a lot of fun.

Okay. I'm assuming that this bandwidth is going to be better now. I'll have to hear my own echo in my own head, which is annoying. All right. Okay. It's not a big deal. I've switched anyway. It drives me crazy. You all have to speak more. That's a good thing.

Okay. So Marita had indicated medium here. She also felt that it was a medium urgency and low effort because the playbook is out there. We all need to just get used to it.

Let's open a queue on that. I'll see if I can work my technology so I can stop annoying myself with my own sound of my voice in my own head. Okay. Someone step forward, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: We could hear you better before, Cheryl. I can't hear you now. It's Gisella.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'll go back to the other way. At least I don't have my own voice in my own head.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yeah, that's better.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I can manage other people's voices in my own head better than my own when I'm wearing a headset. I did pull one ear out so I wasn't getting it in stereo, but even mono ... Me and mono was more than I could manage. So my sympathies to you all.

So the playbook [inaudible]. Thank you, Jonathan. Do we need to up the ante on our prioritization, or urgency, or our efforts?

If not, we'll leave it as read. Excellent.

Moving now then down, once we've got Marita back next week, beautifully updated with her destination status by then, we will do another quick run through all of this for a last task. Let's now look at the terms. This is an interesting one. Parts of ICANN have particularly large amounts of energy focused, as we saw in our Work Stream 2 deliberations, for those of you who have had the joy of all of that ... were particularly concerned about the overabundance, as it's noted here in Marita's notes, of volunteers to choose from. As a universal suffrage, everyone and everybody needs to have their time, their opportunity to, in many cases, to ... In many cases, the issues is taking particular leadership roles as opposed to leading by example, leading by drafting, leading by involvement in the working group. But that's another argument for another day, certainly from my point of view. But there was a great concern with some parts of the community that we are seeing the same old faces doing the same old things and not enough churn.

Now, there are a bunch of ways that can be addressed. I think Marita's comment here that it's not a priority at the moment is probably fairly

valid from our At-Large perspective, excepting that we do not wish to not recognize the importance of refreshing and renewal and, above all, ensuring that there are minimal barriers to participation for our At-Large community. I guess that goes have a linkage to terms. So things like, does ensuring that, for example, you can only serve one year in one position in the whole of your—this is hypothetical ... Let's assume to make sure we plowed through and gave everybody every possible opportunity for every available volunteer to do apparently, by some gift of miraculous blessing, an equitable job, regardless of training and experience and skillsets, on everything—that, if a ruling came in terms of terms, you get one year or one term (let's call it a year for now) in any position once in your ICANN volunteer career. Is that going to solve the problem or not?

My view, of course, is no. It's meritocracy that's needed to be looked at. The opportunity of in-service training and building your own skill levels up and nurturing and all of that sort of stuff is more important. But just making a blanket rule on terms doesn't fix that problem. We haven't said that problem statement, and I guess I would argue that maybe we could consider that. But I certainly would think that, if it's going to be a low priority, it's probably going to be of low effort because all we have to do is change some rules. But you might feel it is a medium effort because all you have to do is change some rules if you're going to enact that. So that's an embellishment on Marita's work.

What does the floor think? Who wants to go first?

Don't all rush at once, people. I'll start calling names.

Thank you, Sébastien. Over to you, followed by Alan.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. There are a few things I consider, but the term limit is not, from my point of view, the major one. For me, it's a strange discussion to have here, specifically between you and me, Cheryl. But my feeling is that the number of positions could be more important to leave more space for others.

And from my point of view, the question of term limitation can't be for the whole life of ICANN, but my suggestion would be to consider that after, I don't know, two or three terms, you take a leave, at least for one year, to go back to the roots and to see what's happened. You may come back. I'm sure that people can come back after that.

At the same time, I see that we have more and more difficulty to find new people to take a position. Therefore, we need to balance the fact that it's important to leave the space to others, but it's important to have the seats filled by people—let's say the right people; I don't know if it's always right, but with people willing to do some work.

I am concerned with the way we are selecting some of our leaders, including within At-Large, but when we don't have a choice, that's part of the problem. And it's not to say that we don't do something to try to have a choice, but it's a very difficult, from my point of view, situation.

That's my two cents on that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I find this a rather difficult area for a number of reasons. It's a rather blunt instrument to solve the problem that it's trying to solve or whatever. And I'm not quite sure what the problem is it's trying to solve. We all know of cases where, with or without term limits, you get a round robin of people through positions. The same people keep on coming back time and time again for literally decades just because they rotate back in and out. They meet the term limits requirements, but that doesn't stop the same people from being used in rotation pretty much.

Now, whether that is an exclusive club and no one else can break in or no one else wants to break in is not always clear. I see a significant number of times where term limits remove someone from a position where they are being particularly effective and serving their home community well, serving their overall community well, and they are removed because the term limit was set as a somewhat arbitrary way of making sure that we move people around—an arbitrary and not necessarily effective way.

So, if people want to set term limits, fine. Sometimes it helps. Sometimes it does harm. I'm not one to say this should be a high priority or urgent because I think doing it may be politically correct in many cases but not necessarily addresses the core problems that are there. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that it's not high priority because of the reasons Alan just raised and also because, most of the times, when you work in NomCom and other groups inside of RALOs, for instance, to attract people to work with, you find out that, the younger the people, the more commitment the people give is more difficult they say sometimes. They start, and the burden to work hard, for awful hours sometimes, [inaudible] feedback that is a kind of a recognition or any advantage for their work. For our group in ALAC, this is much more relevant than the other groups where, like Alan said, they are paid for this kind of work. For us, it's a commitment for a contribution, free of charge, adjust that with the local work and so on.

So it's something that, in my opinion, does not depend on the effort we do because even people who start recognizing they cannot follow and so on. So I believe that is a medium effort and continuous effort all the time, but it cannot be high priority because we cannot allocate all the time and the effort of this community to bring more people more than do the work. So I believe that should be medium effort and medium priority because we have more issues to do that are high priority than just getting time for attracting people to be part of our group, [that for those with decades here,] I'm more and more convinced that the effort is not paying off. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. Noting amongst your points that the efforts put into recruitment, which would bring us down into the next section as well, needs to be balanced here in the question of terms.

Let's see if anyone else—thank you. Olivier, over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I can understand that maybe some parts of ICANN are overcrowded, that there are too many people queuing up, wanting to go for positions, and so on. But in our community, as it was well-recognized by several speakers before me, this is not the case. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. That's my view on this. So definitely low priority for us.

And it's interesting because—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. I appreciate that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I could just add, it's interesting because some ... We've seen in past At-Large reviews the complaint from some observers that it's always the same people that are rotating positions and keeping in the same positions, etc. With or without term limits, you would have exactly the same thing because you would get this rotation. And yet, when one digs a bit more, you find out that this rotation is happening because there are very few people that are willing to spend the time, the effort, the steep learning curve, and the commitment to be able to do this, and to

do this—I wouldn't say on a full-time basis, but to a level that it actually has an impact, a positive impact, in At-Large. And that's something which is more of a difficulty than the thing of having these terms that need to be dealt with. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Oliver. I appreciate everybody's input on this. So what I'm hearing so far—Judith has been supportive of what Alan was saying as well ... Alan made, I think, a point worthy of adding into our Column D, and that is that term limits, in and of themselves, are a blunt instrument that may and often do have unintended consequences. I think that kind of encapsulates what Alan was saying.

I would go further and say that term limits in whatever form are only part of a toolset to increase diversity and role-sharing, not the only way of increasing diversity and role-sharing and opportunity. So we might want to make that annotation, if possible, Gisella.

I actually agree with everything being said. It's just that I personally have seen, in entities that are not just ICANN-based, that the use of term limits alone or as the primary lever, just like the use of mandatory levels of certain diversity measures alone as a primary lever, can in fact cause all sorts of complications and issues and, unfortunately, in some entities—again, so far, so good with ICANN, not as yet—can actually have a rebound effect. So when there isn't people to step up on strict term limits, you either get utter uselessness in the role or, even worse, not uselessness but highly inappropriate directions being taken and very little being able to be done because it was just the wrong fit for that

particular position. That usually then ends up with a reviewing of the roles, which brings you back to worse situations than in the first place.

Just before we try and settle on our low—I think we were either deciding on low/low/low across the board, or low/medium/low; I think that’s what I was hearing; thanks for scrolling back up—I also just wanted to share with you, from the point Alan was making, or was it Olivier? Anyway, one of our esteemed gentlemen were making regarding previous reviews with observers and making these strong claims regarding terms. Alan, of course, presented empirical data to say that it is not a rotation of the same people [in the same roles at the same time], that we do have churn and more rotation than people would actually first agree to or believe.

But just a little giggle for you all. My personal experience out of Work Stream 2 is Steve and I were—Steve DelBianco and I—dealing with this particular issue of terms in one of the areas we were working in. In fact, it might have been Work Stream 1. Anyways, in one of those work streams, one of the noisiest wheels on arguing the importance of strict term limitation and a brutal adherence to them as the only way forward, who I believe was possibly in a situation where they felt that their ability to step up to a leadership role was in some way, shape, or form being hampered by others in their area—not within At-Large, I will hasten to add—blocking their way ... And in the ensuing years since 20-whatever-it-was (‘15?), [I thought had] the opportunity to step up to the much obviously desired leadership role in that part of the organization they were involved with, which is obviously going to be proof-of-concept of why term limits were so important. And they didn’t make it between one ICANN meeting and the next before they were

either replaced or resigned. Anyway, I had to share that because I can be just so pleased when I see chickens coming home to roost.

Anyway, enough of that. So let's look at our time now. I was filibustering us slightly. I think what we'll do is we'll put it as a low priority from an At-Large perspective. We'll make it low urgency but probably medium effort if it was to be changed because it would be rule changing. We can review that as we start our meeting next week. We've got five minutes now for our next back-to-back call, which two of the leaders stuck in the call with us need to get off and get ready for. So let's mark Line 8 and read. We'll just come back to that and make sure—sorry. Not “read.”—

ALAN GREENBERG: Except for my hand being up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I honestly wasn't seeing you. Now I'm looking down [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, I keep on volunteering positions and I keep on getting ignored. We need term limits on who speaks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We do. We clearly need term limits. In fact, Alan, I'm going to go further than that and suggest, next week, you can run the meeting. I'll have the whole time off and I'll put my hand up and down like a semaphore. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not accepted, I'm afraid. Your filibuster did partially cover what I was going to say. Olivier or someone mentioned that we had complaints in our At-Large reviews from external people, that we need term limits. In fact, those complaints often came from people from within the community. And more often than not, they came from people who indeed were trying to volunteer for positions and never got them, for very good reasons—the kind you alluded to, Cheryl. Not everyone is suited to do everything, and they don't necessarily realize that. So it's one of these interesting subjects, where there are different perceptions. And where you are in the organization and this area and things like that have a heavy impact on whether we "need" term limits or not.

Back to you for your capable management of this session. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I always find it amusing, Alan, that so many people believe you have to have a title to have influence. But anyway, that's another story.

Okay. Let's wrap it here. We will start up in this line at the same time, same day next week. We'll also make sure that we bring Marita up to speed on our current discussions from today, but we do all have that need to do a rejigging of 6D.

Gisella, if you're concerned about the editing of that document, just reach out to me in the week, and you and I can work on that and talk it out.

With that, I'm going to say thank you, everybody.

Sorry, I should have said good to work with you, [Luke.] I haven't worked with you before. You managed to manage us relatively well. Thank you very much.

With that, we'll see most of you, I hope, in the CPWG call momentarily. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]