CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the OFB Working Group Recommendation and Prioritization Sub-Group call on Wednesday, the 7th of July 2021 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonathan Zuck, Sebastien Bachollet, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond on audio-only. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Thank you all for joining. Please state your name when taking the floor for the transcription purposes. Thank you very much. And with this, I turn the call over to you, Cheryl. |
| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | Thank you very much, Claudia. I appreciate everyone standing up to yet another of these weekly calls, but we are getting through it all. Now, in terms of today's recent repeat agenda, we'll be moving more through the MSM issues. The action item on me with the re-edit. In fact, Marita took over on that so we probably just need to change that to be properly reflected. She wasn't able to make the call last time but she did say she's gone through the notes and will be making the various annotations, which I think that she has more than surely done. So let's just plow into it. And I think we're somewhere around row six, if my memory serves, hence the green line. We just need to get to MSM. It's the MSM tab. |
| SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: | Row eight. |

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There we go. The item six, there we go. I knew there was a six in there somewhere, Sebastien. Okay. So that's where we left off last time with a thrill-packed and exciting discussion on the matter of terms. We were probably going to sit with low priority, low urgency, and medium effort. But we also just wanted to let people have a little think of urgency, whether or not they wanted to make any changes. So the floor is open on that, whoever is running the document, either Claudia or Heidi, if you can just remove the green coloring now.

We'll open the queue and see. Are we happy where we are now with the annotation and low priority, low urgency, but medium effort? I'm not hearing any desire for change. Let's jump straight into the thrill-packed and exciting world of demographics and recruitment.

Now, what behoove me, I guess, as we go through the suggestions that Marita has made for us here, to also remind ourselves that a couple of points in last week's call were made regarding recruitment and demographics, and that there is in fact, an interdependency on a number of these things, these two being a good set of examples that one needs to ensure that you've got sufficient and appropriate recruitment in the right area to seed into optimizing—welcome, Daniel—the desire for diversity in whatever shape or form that diversity is appropriate for that part of ICANN. We know, for example, what can be diverse in a measurement for SSAC is different to the GNSO Council, for example. So all that being said, we will note in a lot of these MSMs that there is a great deal of interdependency. In some cases, they really need to be co-related that one has to go with the other for [inaudible].

But what has Marita said here? She's indicated it should be, in her view, high, high, high across the board. I'm not sure I think the effort is necessarily high. But that's one thing I'd love to hear from you all about. I think it takes effort but I'm not sure it's in the scale of efforts of what ICANN does. All that is extremely critical. It's always a high priority for At-Large, although I would argue this is my personal notation that At-Large does a damn good job of it. With the suspension of public meetings, it's made it difficult for all constituencies to bring in new members. We need here annotation. Re-double efforts to make up for the lost time. She also wish to note the highlighting of the importance of diversity, which I mentioned this earlier, recognizing the fact that diversity does not look the same for stakeholder groups.

So I want to open the queue, but I think if we take it as read second part she's made point on the importance of divergence in diversity desired within different parts of ICANN. Let's focus on those first couple of things. Do we all, first of all, agree about the highness of the priority and the height of the urgency? Let's start with that. Olivier, are you at your desk yet or still on the audio-only?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am at my desk but I'm not logged in. If staff could send me a link. A reminder does not have a link.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's annoying. She'll probably be able to do that. Okay. Sebastien, over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. My trouble—sorry, I will jump to the next one—I feel if we are able to decrease the complexity of the organization, we will have less effort to have recruitment and diversity. Therefore, I don't feel that it's a high priority because I feel that the next one must be a high priority. And I will change the high by medium here. And it's not so high urgency. It's something we need to run for the long run, not just for short term. Therefore, if it's not done in the next six months, it's okay.

Is it a high effort? I feel that we are not doing so badly on that. And it's also, therefore, medium effort. If we take into account all the other things we already said and we already discussed, for example, just the previous one, when we talk about term and so on and so forth, but complexity for me it's one of the most important one and will help all the others if we decrease the complexity. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sebastien. We'll note it regarding these interdependencies again. I want to hear what other people are going to be saying about the shifting from high to medium. I'm certainly not discomforted by it. Daniel, did you want to? I don't know whether you're needing to leave the AFRALO meeting. If your audio is working, did you want to weigh in on this while we get Olivier on to screen?

DANIEL NANGHAKE: So far, I'm okay. But my view is that it's still sometimes very challenging when it comes to issues of diversity because they cut across various

regions. So if we had to say that it's of a higher priority, definitely there is a lot that has got to be done. And already this is one of the key issues or key hot topics that is being discussed across the board or across the whole community. So as for me, state would be medium right now. Medium, high. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Welcome, Vanda. Jonathan, over to you, and then we're just on the discussion of demographics and recruitment at the moment. But we also recognize that there's a lot of interdependencies between things like diversity itself and complexity as well. And we're discussing whether we're going to be shifting down from high, high, high the recommendation to some other level. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. I guess I may be speaking from a point of ignorance about the MSM process that I guess Brian Cute organized and that Marita was a part of, but this feels like such a generic thing that's so specific to different groups that I don't know what it means for us to say that it should be a high priority for the organization to increase its diversity. I mean, obviously, some parts of the organization are far more diverse than others. I'm not sure. I feel like I might be missing some specifics here to just turn this into a knee-jerk reaction. Of course, we need to make this a high priority. I don't know what the end goal is here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jonathan. Vanda, I know with the commitment you've made over the years to various of the Nominating Committee, it's the aspects of diversity from a Board perspective has been very important to a lot of the work you've done. Do you find that there is a sudden change in attention or temperature required, or we continually doing the best we can, given the circumstances we're in all of this?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I do believe that, in general, we will continue to focus on diversity, but considering the problems that we are seeing nowadays, the participation of most of people from some specific regions will be more and more difficult with the time passing. We finalize and end the health problem that we are facing. But anyway, we are seeing, for instance, in NomCom the fear that candidates were more constantly in some regions instead of why this section of candidates that we used to have in the past. So it is something that, from my view, we cannot anticipate what is going to happen. But what we are seeing now is some kind of diverse situation from the past related to diversity of participation.

So, just some comments about that. But anyway, the reality is that we need to keep in impressions to have more participation for all the countries around all the different aspects of cultural, etc. So, I do believe that that is the reality. That's what I think is reducing of this diversity. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Olivier, now you're comfortably not only at the desk but in the Zoom Room. Jonathan, I assume that's an old hand. Olivier,

over to you. And just a warning, Judith, if you want to weigh in on this, I'll come to you next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I'm going to be quite brief. I agree with the high priority, high urgency, high effort points made on this. The points that Vanda has made are absolutely valid. I was also on the NomCom and saw the kind of demographics of people applying for senior positions and it was tough in some regions.

The concern that I have more specifically is about not about the Board, because I think that at Board level—and very much thanks to the NomCom—we are able to address the issue of diversity on this. But perhaps on some of the Council's, some of the parts of ICANN which gets elected by their own communities, we do tend in some circles to see a complete lack of diversity, both geographic and gender diversity, and it's a real concern. Maybe less so gender but geographic is particularly hard.

I really don't think that it's just for the ALAC to address this, it really is for everyone. So we have a double mission here to not only do it well or excel at it ourselves and recruit and find more members worldwide ourselves. And that also includes, by the way, some of our usual regions, which sometimes are underserved in some parts of the country. But at the same time, we also need to really push and make it known to other parts of ICANN that it's down to everyone to do this and not just the At-Large community or the NomCom. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I can make this short because I have a call coming in. But everything that Olivier and Vanda said is something I also agree with. It's very difficult to get diversity and get geographic, and also to get different people instead of the same old, same old. We have a lot of struggle to get people, especially in At-Large, even with our geographic spread. And it's even harder for other groups who don't have that geographic spread to get them, and so it should be a very high priority, high urgency. I agree totally with all that.

We also tried to get people not only with that but maybe also people with disability issues. I know we struggle with that on the ICANN Board. On the ISOC Board, we finally got someone there but it's only because someone ran. So that's another issue. I will be back after my other call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Judith, glad you could sit in on that one. Back to you, Sebastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Thank you for all these comments. I want to say that I didn't have the same point of view about NomCom. NomCom is just able to talk about geographical diversity, not at all about the other diversity we were pushing in Work Stream 2 than we are talking here. It's why I consider that NomCom is not able to fulfill what I think is its mission, not just to balance the geographical region within the globe but also to take care of other diversity. It may be because it's not yet into the Bylaws but

it's very painful for me this year in the NomCom. Even saying that, I still consider that we can improve the diversity but it will take time and it will take the other elements to be done. It's why I would like us to consider once again medium, medium, medium because we can't do that without the other elements. And the other elements must be, from my point of view, coming before, it's not succeed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Olivier, I'm assuming that's an old hand. Let me know if not. Okay, good. All right. So let me have a little intervention for you as well, and then I'll see if we can summate what I've said so far.

A couple of things. First of all, I don't believe we need to annotate regarding virtual versus non-virtual, pandemic versus post-pandemic, etc. I think that there is probably a full set of assumptions that face to face is the only way one can recruit. Sorry, face to face in ICANN is the only way one can recruit. But that's just something I want to put out there for your consideration.

I also want to remind you all this has to do with demographics. And demographics, a tool, and a method of targeting aspects of recruitment by looking at certain measurements. They are arguably measurements that also impinge on diversity. But it is where you can say—let me use Asia-Pacific as an example. It is a lot easier to find a more overarching set of representativeness from some regions compared to others. Arguably, one would assume that it should be less complicated to give even cultural diversity from an area that has less countries in its region as opposed to a region which has a massive amount of very dissimilarly

cultured language and traditional based countries. So one could then look at the demographics and say in Asia-Pacific, where are the West Asian influences? Where are the Central Asian influences? Where are the East or Oceanic influences? You see what I mean? It is a fine tuning that can be done when you're using the world of demographics. There's a capability tied in. And I think we probably need to pull that out because, as Sebastien was saying, this is just one thing that goes along with a number of other things to get to an end goal here. And they probably need to be put in the right order and use the right time. Which is why for me, I would actually be saying that from an At-Large perspective, we have it as part of our DNA. It should be part of DNA across the board of ICANN so we recognize that, and in some cases, it's built in, as Sebastien mentioned, Bylaws.

But from an At-Large perspective, can I justify it to be high above other things? I still remain a little unconvinced. So I'm coming down on probably recognition of its importance overall to ICANN and the multistakeholder model but using tools familiar with the school of demography is important as targeted recruitment program developed, that the demographic shortfalls in each part of ICANN should be analyzed and recruitment specifically matched to try and meet those shortfalls. All of that I see as high. Is it the most important thing in the first priority order? I'm coming down with Sebastien on the medium, medium, medium across the board. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm going to be provocative and just ask a simple question. Would it be worth mentioning benchmarking the United Nations?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you explain what you mean by benchmarking the United Nations?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure whether it's the right thing to do or not. But just for the sake of argument, the UN has countless number of committees and so on. If you look at some of the agencies of the United Nations, and of course, our very best friends, the ITU, you will find that the amount of diversity in most of the committees is absolutely way better, if you look at it globally. Then what happens at ICANN, where you have a primarily Western audience and Western participants, you will have participants from very much around the world in UN working groups and in ITU working groups. I don't know whether it's worth benchmarking this or taking this as an example of what ultimately our goal would be or whether it would be not our goal. It might be that it is not our goal. One of the things, of course, that I find in the UN is that it then becomes very, very political. But with taking the politics aside, is there just middle?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm trying not to vomit in my own mouth, Olivier. I'm going to go to Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, it's just because countries are in some way demanded to participate so they need to express their political views, defend their political points. So they need to participate. It's not our reality here. So, you can see in the GAC that we have representation from around the world. So that is the same in United Nation. We have more than 170 countries represented in GAC. So I do believe that that is not our goal here to compare ourselves to United Nation, I hope, because we are talking about a completely different situation where all the interested parties are sitting there. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Far more polite and elegant than I would have put it there. Vanda, thank you very much for that. I'm not a fan of that idea, provocative as she may have been trying to be. We do have a GAC for a very good reason and it plays an important part of it all.

Let's look at what we need to do here. We need to annotate this to indicate that using demographics as part of a recruitment program is important, that I think we need to make in the annotation. Recognize that the importance of this aspect of the multistakeholder model is an ongoing and continuous worthy piece of work, that it will change over time, and that it is a part of the toolkit of getting ourselves to the end game of the desired diversity across ICANN and within parts of ICANN. But just to justify a little bit why I had such a visceral reaction to you, for example, with that suggestion, Olivier, is—can I come back to APAC again—as soon as you start taking those types of geopolitical or even country based, a mapping based solutions to things for just one aspect of diversity. Now, we're not talking age, we're not talking capabilities.

We're not saying we're the voices, neuronontypicals, right? We're not doing any of that yet. That all comes into demographics, just the geographic. As soon as you start putting that many countries in the mix, you cannot have Asia-Pacific as a single region. Or if you do, it is underrepresented and not being allowed to have a voice because it needs five voices, not one. That is going to cause a whole lot more problems. So we kind of almost went down that pathway when we did our geographic regions review. And we learned very quickly why that was not a good idea.

Okay. Where are we now? Can we sit comfortably with changing those annotations? Can we just make an action item or highlight those couple of sentences in the D cell, please? It keeps going blurry. They're all going blurry. We'll make that as an action item to re-annotate that to indicate our conversation. And if we run medium across the board from At-Large, recognize the high priority that ICANN overall needs to maintain in this area. Are we comfortable there? We'll loop back to this one. We've got Marita next time.

Okay. Let's move on then to complexity. Sebastien, you did preface this. Can I ask you to run that through again now that we're into complexity? Just briefly, just so we've got everybody who now has joined a little bit later up to see. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I feel that complexity is one of the major questions when we talk about ICANN. And it's ambit a lot of things. The organization itself, when I talk about the organization, it's the Org.

ICANN, not just the staff. It's the processes we are using and we had the process to process, and process to processes, and that's a difficulty. I feel that we need to find a way to decrease this complexity. It's hard work and, for me, a high priority. If I can summarize like that, I feel that it could be a very good target for the holistic review to have any responsibility to discuss the question of complexity of ICANN. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that, Sebastien. And I think we should note here from Marita's annotation that she was also drilling down on to and to discuss with the MSM work indeed. It wasn't just the complexity [inaudible] then. I agree with everything she said. The group today came out of ATRT3 discussions on it. So she said Daniel and Vanda, we will all be as one. It's also the complexity of what ICANN does. And they are, as she's indicated here, a number of things that are in process in terms of scoping, prioritization, [inaudible], all those sorts of things, which should make it easier. And that in itself has an important foundation and set of principles which will assist things like gaining greater diversity, improving recruitment, getting people involved.

I think I saw Jonathan's hand go up. Sebastien, is that a new hand? I'll go to Jonathan first.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Go to Jonathan. It's a new hand but I may wait.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That's the order. Jonathan, then you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. I'm inclined to agree with what you're saying, Cheryl, about simplification, if you will, being a gateway to greater participation and greater diversity. I think one of the biggest challenges that ICANN has is that it requires people to become experts at ICANN in order to participate. In reality, the ICANN community and the policy development processes within the ICANN would benefit from greater participation by those who know nothing about ICANN but have a great deal of domain expertise in a particular area. And the only way to get the participation of those people is to break problems down into things to which domain expertise can be applied as opposed to everything being join a workgroup for two years and you may be able to follow what's going on. I think simplification is a lot about breaking things into smaller pieces and identifying those pieces that can be communicated in a way that non-ICANNers can comment on and participate in temporarily as opposed to making the long-term commitments to an ICANN process a lot more functional. I don't know that we need to equate those two.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jonathan. Sebastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Just to follow what Jonathan just said. One reason we are at EURALO organizing a monthly roundtable is to try to bring people from outside of our circle to give their input on some topic while link

with what we are talking about within ICANN. The reason why I wanted to take the floor is because today—and I just received the mail about the meeting invitation about At-Large capacity. And she told me, "What does it mean this sentence?" The sentence was this facilitation session will offer tools and ideas that are conducive to fostering joint investigation of issue with productive dialogue and relationship building. I am sure that all of you because your level of English is much better than mine and [inaudible] but if we within At-Large don't try to use simple language, we are facing the same outside and we will face more trouble because the professional while working on domain names will keep those words difficult to understand. It's why I consider this question of complexity also very important regarding language. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Going to Daniel next, I'd note that to your points, Sebastien, Heidi's note in chat about the GAC-ALAC joint statement, which very much went to the core of plain language, etc., is an important link here. Daniel, over to you.

DANIEL NANGHAKE: Picking by the temperature of the room, I think we have been looking so much at MSM throughout from the time of Brian Cute when it comes to the reviews and all that. The issue of diversity is a complex issue that cannot be solved within a respective timeframe. But all through collaboration together with the various stakeholders, we can still be able to achieve diversity and inclusiveness. It takes the role of capacity

building such that those who have a particular interest to the domain industry, it can be reached out to, then we build their capacity and lure them to have interest into the various points development processes. So this will help reduce the challenge of diversity.

But I see I'll give this thing a medium, medium, medium because it is something that isn't ongoing and you cannot fully close the chapter but to continue advocating for it all the time. Also, it might even take 10 years to achieve this. Those are just my few cents. And with that, I request to drop off the call so that I can join the AFRALO call. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem. I did note the timing for the AFRALO call. So thanks for joining us, Daniel. Okay. Well said indeed.

Let's look at where we are now. It seems to me that we are all comfortable with the medium across the urgency and effort. But Sebastien was calling for it to be a higher priority and it should be, in his view, an integral part of the holistic review. So let's see what we may or may not want to change in that. Daniel, I'm going to assume he's leaving and that's an old hand. Olivier, over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I think that if we make it high, high, high, it could be seen as a way of saying, "Well, we don't think there is anything happening on this at the moment." And we do have to recognize that the public consultations—what is still weirdly called public comments—have really improved greatly over the years and are

much more simple to understand these days, especially with a brief overview, a description and explanation, a link to the background of the whole topic and so on. Yes, it's a lot of reading but it certainly is a lot easier than a number of years ago. So while the issues we're dealing with are complex, the work is already, in my view, in hand. And if we mark everything as high, high, high, it might seem to be that there is currently no work happening on this. That's just my feeling. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well noted. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I tend to agree with Olivier because we are in the process of the [inaudible] that is high in some way is something that will not happen and it's a waste of time, in my opinion. I believe it's medium. And I also agree what Sebastien said that should be important points on the holistic review. And that we already put holistic review in the high priority but not the multistakeholder model as a whole. Because like Olivier said, this is in the middle of the process. So if it was abandoned or if it was two years ago, should be put on high because we need to start the process that we already started. But not now. Now we're in the middle of the process so we should go on in this step by step, and medium looks okay for me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just noting up from chat that Jonathan is reminding us that we need to be careful not to conflate At-Large and ICANN priority. Thank you for that ready reminder, Jonathan. Sebastien, back to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I get your points, of course, Vanda and Olivier. But I still feel that it's high priority. Even if it's already started, I will argue that it started in very small area. But let's consider that that started. Why I would like very much that we push high priority, it's maybe more a political view, I will say. We discussed the question of priority of the holistic review. If we say that the complexity must be a part of the holistic review, we need to have something with a high priority, urgent to be made and discussed. As you know, the holistic review will take 18 months. Therefore, if it's not starting now—and it's one of the discussions we will have tomorrow with the Board—it's twice I say, "Okay, let's do a pilot," but we can wait for the start because the timing proposed by ATRT3 is not feasible. I still feel that it's feasible and we need to push for that. And it's why I would like to argue that here we put high for that reason. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We've heard that view clearly. Thanks, Sebastien. Anyone else want to weigh in before I say here we may be able to move forward on this? Okay. So let's see what I've heard.

I have heard that there needs to be recognition of work already underway. And we might need to modify some of what is said in cell D. We certainly need to add a link to our ALAC and ALAC-GAC document

and say that overall for ICANN the continued commitment at highest priority possible to the reduction of complexity in what ICANN does so that it is more accessible and there are less barriers to involvement and engagement can happen. I think we can all agree that that needs to happen.

Then we've got the issue of whether or not taking a political approach, which Sebastien is trying to weave everything together that ultimately increases the likelihood that a highest priority will be given to not only ATRT3 but the holistic review within the ATRT3. And I respect that, but we also need to look at can we say it slightly differently by annotating here that it is an essential part of a already established highest priority from At-Large perspective holistic review, and that as such it needs to be an integral part of its prioritized efforts? And then still, to pick up what Jonathan and what I heard from Vanda and Olivier in particular, then give it a medium across the board. Is there a middle ground there with annotation? Reactions, people?

All right. We're going to have to loop back to this one when we've got Marita in [inaudible]. But we need to perhaps make an annotation in D that we could go high across the board with SC initial next to it, a hybrid noting the highest priority with the linkage to ATRT3 recommendations specific to our already highest prioritized holistic review and medium, and we can come back to that as we polish this off next week.

Just being mindful of the time, I wanted to see whether or not we can just do a run-through on the rest of these. So let's look now to our next one which is the efficient use of resources. An interesting one because efficiency and use of resources is all about being in the eye of the

beholder, as far as I'm concerned. If you feel that it's your hard-earned profits from an industry point of view that is being willy-nilly willowed away by ICANN doing something that doesn't necessarily make your life any easier, you might have a very different view as to whether you're the At-Large community trying to make sure that the voice of end users is being heard. So with that preemptive bias from me, we've noted here at Marita's, has indicated that it's a high priority for her but it's a core issue. And that here it really is a matter of the annual budget cycles and the prioritization into various processes. She said that it's an efficient use of resources and an ongoing issue for all large organizations. But in her view, the current processes in place allow for considerable input as issues arise, and then in the context of the multistakeholder model, resources need to enable participation and must be maintained at a high level.

So I'm very comfortable with that approach. I'd almost make it—unless non-applicable—as a competing priority. This is just me being, I guess, a little bit inflammatory now. Almost tempted to make it not applicable as a competing priority and annotated to say these are the key principles to do with [resource uses] and show At-Large appreciate as of the ALAC the ongoing and continued improvement and opportunities for improvement in the budget and resource allocation cycle.

So open the cue on that. Who wants to go first? Nobody? Olivier, your [inaudible] voice differs on resourcing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. I was going to just say no further comment besides what's already in the two boxes. I think they capture well the points that I've made in the past and my mind hasn't changed on this. ICANN is not a business.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a rare and unusual thing, this multistakeholder model. And I think the point that we could highlight is the ending of that part, which is the enable participation aspect is essential on that. What do you think of the removal of it as a high priority and making it non-applicable but an overarching thing? We did that earlier on, remember, in a number of other areas. Let's not forget the tools we've used for other terms.

Jonathan, what's your reaction to that proposal?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Putting me on the spot?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yup.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'm okay with that proposal.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. The reason I wanted to perhaps ask you all to consider that is that I am concerned when we put all of this together, too much high is going

to reduce the effectiveness of, for example, our highest priorities. That's what I'm fearful of. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I put in the chat that it would be provocative to say "not applicable" because I know that the efficient use of resources is something which I have discussed that SO/AC chair level in the past, and no doubt you have, and no doubt others in such positions have, and there are some in the community that believes that ICANN is a business just like their business and it's a business that they're contributing to and they want to contribute less, and to think their payment is too high, they'd like to reduce this. They have no interest in the multistakeholder model. As far as they're concerned, they need to maximize their profits. Now their point of view is very well understood and it's absolutely legitimate in their own context, of course. But in our own context, we are looking at ICANN as a multistakeholder model that makes decisions, that is a unique thing, and that makes ICANN a very unique organization. Thus, when one speaks to me about efficient use of resources, I immediately say, "Well, how in the hell can you apply this? Can you put an ROI on a volunteer? If you can, please tell me without turning that person into a robot or without having some kind of a way to track them in their every move. Oh, I'm sorry. You're not even paying them because they're volunteers." So yeah, N/A. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I think the provocative nature of it is it will actually make it stand out. And what we want to do is give whoever is at the table arguing

these points enough information to win the day, if they possibly can. To me, I think this is an ideal opportunity to actually change it from high to N/A but to make sure that our At-Large and ALAC commitment to the continued development of these ongoing improvements in efficiency and use of resources in the manner it is currently managed with a community-wide set of interactions and specifically designed to make the multistakeholder model is important.

Well, exactly, Fellowship. There's so many. Many people will argue, yes, Olivier. Olivier in chat is saying is the Fellowship program a waste of money? Is NextGen a waste of money? There's a whole bunch of people who will say, "Absolutely yes." But then they would also prefer to have an industry organization of a multistakeholder model. That's not what we've got. This is all about the multistakeholder model. And let's change that to N/A if we can and that'll put a cat amongst the pigeons.

I think if Alan was here he, like you and I, Olivier, would be saying, "Haven't we all argued this across the table before?" So if we can now make the change, please? On cell C row 11 to N/A, please. Thank you.

Okay, trust and silos. I'd like to remind you all that—I don't know why the bottom one went to N/A but anyway. The trust and silos—that is actually something that I believe the ALAC and At-Large community would particularly boisterous about when we had our public meeting. Marita has indicated it should be high, with a significant level of effort expected, and a medium sense of urgency. So she's got high, high, medium across the board there. I'd love to be able to read this but it is so blurry on my screen, it's actually—oh, there we are. Back again. She's also indicated the issue will require a considerable amount of time and

patience, and to build in trust and changing culture would require ICANN-wide buy-in. I guess we also should mention here—and I trust we've been saying this anyway—that the whole aspect of silos can also be integrally linked as something that the holistic review would and should they're looking at as well. So we want to note the interdependency on this as well.

So, Olivier, I'm going to take that as a new hand and ask you to go first on your reactions to high, high, medium on this one or do we take another approach totally? Over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is not a new hand. I shall put it down. I need a little time to think through.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Who shall I pick on next? Sebastien, since we've got a crossover here, I would say at least in terms of silos, as to holistic review should be taking up a lot of this, and so it would need to come before this would actually be fairly dealt with. Your opinion on this one?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I feel that what is written in the document, it's okay. The question is when we want to add that to something in other parts, we may not need to say it's high, high, high. It will depend on where we put it and if it's high, high, high in the other arena. But except that, I agree with what is written here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I got a check from Vanda as well. Olivier, that's going to be a new hand now. We'll come back to this one, obviously, but very briefly, on this one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. The difficulty I have with this one is that we're batching under the MSM, the multistakeholder model culture, trust and silos, the three are actually addressed in different ways. The culture of the multistakeholder model in ICANN, when it comes down to policy development, seems to be pretty much well oiled and works quite well. But as we know, there is a lack of balance inside it. At least from our perspective, there is a lack of balance inside it with some of the stakeholders having more control than others. That brings their lack of trust. Over the years, I have not seen that trust between communities improve. It's unfortunate, and I've witnessed in even recent times, the distrust of one community with another over being able to actually do things, which I was just really flabbergasted about.

But the silos, on the other hand, I feel certainly are less stringent than they used to be, at least from my perspective, having seen more people work in policy development process but also with the Cross-Community Working Groups and some of the ICANN-wide discussion plenaries that have been implemented that have gotten the community to talk with each other, more than talking in their own silos. I vividly remember my first ICANN meeting in Paris where I heard the same discussion in the GAC room and the GNSO room and the ccNSO room and the ALAC room.

I can't even remember what the discussion was about but it was the same discussion and with each being incomplete because they didn't quite have the point of view of the other stakeholders, so they were missing information. I hope that we have gone beyond that and we don't have that happening anymore. I haven't seen it because of these things. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We haven't. It's part of an evolving process. I'm going to ask if we can now put a green line across row 12. This is where we'll pick up again next week. My finishing note on this is I suspect we probably do need to split this out with some more annotations. And with that, it'll be the same time, the same place. Slightly more people, I hope. There's Marita being able to join us again.

Yes, Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's going to be the IGF USA. I know I will be out and I don't know if others will be out. Probably not anyone else. Maybe John, I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's all right. We'll note your apologies. That's not a problem.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. Sorry about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Lots of other things we're doing as our volunteers.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Also an apology for the CPWG, it was three, two after that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right then. Well, for those of us who can make it, we'll continue on with this next week. If there is an overwhelming large number of us that cannot make it next week, particularly Marita, I wouldn't want to miss another one with Marita, that we could look at rescheduling. But, Heidi, if we can work with Marita directly on that and double check because if she's involved with IGF USA, I behoove to have her to do the polishing of exercise. So let's find that out. So let's leave the confirmation of that, Claudia, until we [inaudible] with Marita a little bit more. Sebastien, I'm sure you will not be deep in your cups even though it is the best day all day. Talk to you all. Bye. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]