

---

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the first APRALO Policy Forum Fireside Chat on the topic “Let’s talk about GNSO PDP 3.0” taking place on Thursday, 26<sup>th</sup> of May 2022 at 06:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, we will not be doing a roll call. But all attendees both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking for the transcript purposes. And without any further ado, I’d like to leave the floor over to Justine Chew. Over to you, Justine. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Yeşim. Welcome, everybody, to the first ever APRALO Policy Forum Fireside Chat. Since it’s the first time we’re doing it so I hope you will bear with us if there’s any hiccups or anything. But the idea is it’s informal. We’re just having a very nice conversation here so please feel free to jump in. Just by way to make sure that we have some kind of order, I would ask that if you have any questions or comments that you raise your hand so that we can actually slot you in order so that it doesn’t become chaotic and we don’t end up speaking over each other, really.

In that respect, I don’t want to take up too much time with the administrative stuff. I realized that some of the registrants or the participants here are possibly new to ICANN and possibly new to

---

*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.*

---

APRALO as well. So I'm just going to just introduce myself a little bit and I'm going to introduce Cheryl. I'm sure she will introduce herself also.

I'm Justine Chew. I am part of the APRALO, also one of the co-chairs of the APRALO Forum. In my other role, I'm also the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council. If you want to know more about me, you can read my bio or whatever. So let's not get into that so much, really.

I have the pleasure of introducing my guest today, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I think this lady doesn't really need much of an introduction. As far as I know, she's been around forever in ICANN. She is probably one of the most knowledgeable persons I know in the ICANN realm, really. So I'm really happy to be able to spend the afternoon having a little chat with her over my cup of tea.

I would really invite you all to join us so that it's not just dialogue between the two of us. The idea is to encourage participation, interaction. If you have any questions, please feel free to raise your hand and hold them. I would actually ask you to unmute your mic and actually ask your questions in person rather than putting them in the chat so that it becomes more personalized.

This topic itself, Cheryl was saying that it's not necessarily the most interesting one that people find, but I personally thought it was necessary because we know what GNSO stands for. It's the Generic Name Supporting Organization. And we know that GNSO is part of the ICANN community that's responsible for developing consensus policy for the generic top-level domains or the gTLDs. Now, we have to sort of wander into a little bit of terms. We really can't get away with that in

---

ICANN. When we talk about anything ICANN, ICANN terms, ICANN acronyms are part of the conversation, really. So I apologize if you're not following very much the terms but we will try to be conscious about using the full names so that you get the picture.

The next question I guess people might have is what is what is a generic top-level domain or gTLD? In simple terms, I would like to just say that it's the part of the domain name to the furthest right of the domain. So something like .com would be a gTLD. Anything before that to the left is part of the domain name. But the top level part of it is the .com label.

Just going back to the reason for this chat is because At-Large spends a lot of time, a significant proportion of its time participating in multistakeholder policy development in ICANN centered around its contribution towards consensus policies for gTLDs. So we thought it might be helpful for the At-Large to understand how GNSO policy development processes actually work. To that, to get a bit more insight as to where and when At-Large participation in GNSO PDP—PDP stands for policy development processes—is actually needed and is the most effective. So that's just the overall introduction. Let's go into it, really. I think Cheryl is waiting for me.

So, Cheryl, we have heard this term GNSO PDP 3.0. Would you care to just sort of tell us in your own words, really, what that entails? What actually is PDP 3.0, and how it actually relates back to the GNSO policy development processes or even its operating procedures?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, Justine. I'm happy to do so. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record in case we end up doing a transcript to this. Get used to that. You say your name a lot in anything to do with ICANN.

Okay. I might just take a little tiny step back, first of all, because I think it's really important, especially for any newcomers into the APRALO space, to recognize that if you're part of APRALO, then you are associated with the At-Large community, and therefore, know that there is an At-Large Advisory Committee and you've undoubtedly heard about Government Advisory Committee. There's Advisory Committees and there's also Support Organizations, and the SO part of the GNSO. Well described in its role in terms of generic names by Justine. That Support Organization, that's where policy happens. In the case of the generic top-level domains, it's in that GNSO space. And if it's got to do with country codes, it's surprisingly enough in the cc, country code Name Support Organization space.

The role we have in terms of being an At-Large community can be several fold in these policy pieces that happen in ICANN. In some cases, you may be an actual participant in one of these processes. There's a few different types of processes, and we'll get to that in a minute. You might be appointed as a representative, for example, from this region or even from the At-Large Advisory Committee itself to take forward to such a process the aggregated views or consensus views from our community or parts of our community into that process. Or you could just be having a watching brief and have general interest. And, of course, the At-Large Advisory Committee itself, those 15 people who are the Advisory Committee, they have a very critical role in terms of policy. As much as they not only have the right and ability to be involved

---

in policy development as it goes on in the Support Organization sometimes by invitation, sometimes by design, but they also have that role of advisor to the board. At one point in a policy process, it usually gets to a board resolution that results in an outcome and something being implemented. So advice from the At-Large Advisory Committee into that end of the process is also another opportunity where your views, rank and file members of their region may have a solid input into that.

Something that will undoubtedly talk about a little bit more, Justine, I'm assuming we'll mention the Consolidated Policy Working Group and the opportunity we all have of working in there as well. But we kind of get a number of opportunities to be involved in policy development, but our part of ICANN doesn't do policy development. The doing happens in Support Organizations. So big breath.

Once we've got that sorted, since we came out of something called the DNSO, which was just this big aggregated group of interested people at the beginnings of ICANN that talked about name support. When we broke that up in the earlier days of ICANN into what we now know as the GNSO and the ccNSO and the ACs, etc., we had principles for policy development. They were enshrined in bylaws, they were established methodologies that work for the multistakeholder model, and many of those came out of this big aggregate of what was known as DNSO, the Domain Name Support Organization. So I'd like you to think about that as version one.

ICANN grew and developed and as this sheer amount and variety of policy that was being worked on, particularly in the generic space by the

---

GNSO, became broader and everything got a lot busier. Also ICANN matured a great deal. We went through a process around, I'm going to say we probably finished it—let me think. I'll pull around 2007-2008-ish. That was pretty much what would have been thought of as 2.0. At that point, there was a great deal more design on ensuring the multistakeholder model allowed voices to come into the process. There were rules and guidelines about how leadership would operate, how independence or representation would be noted, declaring when you had a vested or conflict of interest or commercial interest, all of that sort of rules sort of worked back then.

Then, in more recent times, the GNSO Council, while actually I was had the honor and privilege of serving as the liaison from the At-Large Advisory Committee, which of course is the role Justine has now, I've held that previously. While I was serving in that capacity, the GNSO Council took the opportunity to really look at was this still working well enough? And the answer was, "Well, no, not really." It needed an overhaul. Some of their policy development processes, and here specifically, we want to talk about PDPs as policy development processes. There's an awful lot of importance associated with these because consensus outcomes from a PDP, policy development process, in the GNSO world can and often does result in an effect on the contracts that domain name industry have with ICANN.

So this is damn serious stuff is what I'm saying. It's not just fluffiness. There's real dollars to be considered here. There's real business ethics that had to be considered here. But of course, there's also consumer and user concerns that need to be represented as well. So some of those processes have become incredibly long. They were probably badly

---

---

scoped. Some experiments that happened where bigger pieces of work have been cut up into smaller bits, and that kind of works but still wasn't as good as perhaps it should have been.

So the GNSO Council looked at what they thought was the methods of making it a better model. It's the result of that process and community consultation in that process that's led us to what's now known as the current model, which is PDP 3.0 or actually 3.01. Long answer, short question. I can only get faster. Back to you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

No, no, no, that's perfect. I was going to ask you about based on your experience within several different roles spanning many years, really. But the progression of policy development processes within the GNSO back from when it was DNSO and moving forward now. So that's perfect. You've kind of preempted my question, really.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You should have picked me a script.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I thought I did. No, no, no. This is an informal conversation. Yeah, no. I was just kidding. So as far as I know, I've only been involved in ICANN since 2012, so maybe 10 years or so. There was my first taste of ICANN anyway. I was involved in a PDP working group, so that's my first foray into ICANN, and I wasn't part of the At-Large community at that point in time. I was just an interested individual, really. So as far as I knew, even from back then, all these PDPs, the policy development processes, were

---

always multistakeholder, meaning that it had participation from different parts of the ICANN community, governments, the contracted parties or the business side, and also end users, which is where we stand in At-Large in the sphere of ICANN.

Moving forward, I think the PDP processes that we see now still have that element of multistakeholder rhythm, and that's a must because it's part of the bylaws or ICANN. You must have it that way. But I wanted to ask you if you saw any kind of improvements from the PDP progressing from 2.0 to 3.0, whether it's improved the way PDPs are run now, and even with the different types of PDPs. You mentioned before there is the regular Policy Development Process Working Group, there is the Expedited Policy Development Processes, the EPDP Team, and then there's also something called the GNSO guidance process. So, in terms of the regular PDP Working Groups and the EPDPs maybe, do you see any improvements that are beneficial, that maybe streamlines in terms of efficiency that still keeps the multistakeholder-ism element intact from PDP 2.0 to 3.0?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah, I do, actually. Thanks, Justine. Look, the answer is absolutely and yes, but there are a couple of reservations. The couple of reservations are purely from the rank and file At-Large community and perhaps even to some extent other Advisory Committee spaces within ICANN's point of view. Because we've got used to the previous bubble where pretty much you could put your name into a list and you could turn up into a part of the process. I volunteered, it's fine. The cc community, just for interest sake, by the way, it doesn't always run that way at all. And they



---

have invited representation from At-Large and the ALAC in the past but it's not an automatic process because they maintain their country code communities work closely with their local Internet community. And the local Internet community has the opportunity to bring in the concerns of rank and file end users so they sort of got a slightly different model, that being said and focusing on the generic space as we are today.

If someone has got very little else to do or they'd like to do an analysis and a paper or something, if you go back and you have a look at some pretty large, in some cases, or very important, in most cases, policy development processes that have run over the last decade and you look at what is sometimes a reasonably long list of names from labels, all sorts of parts of ICANN, so clearly a multistakeholder design, and then you look, say, out of 52 meetings. 52 meetings is not that many meetings for a relatively short process. In fact, it's extremely short, really. Now, out of 52 meetings, you might have had maybe—I'm going to be generous and say 20% of those that have signed up. I'm being very generous here, people. 20% of those who have signed up actually make more than 40 of those meetings. Now, obviously, there's a bell curve and there's a reason why some people don't turn up as many times as others. In fact, I served on one committee where one person literally could not make any other meetings at all. But their contribution was extraordinary because they did all their work via the list. They were even more integral and more influential, I suspect, than they would have been if they turned up for a meeting and put their hand up several times. So it's not just about turning up to the meetings. It's also turning up to the meetings and being active and being influential and being heard.

---

JUSTINE CHEW:                      And being prepared.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:            Yes. That 20% now shrinks down to like 6%, maybe 8%. About another 20% will have turned up to zero or maybe three of those 52 meetings. That's not a good model. Clearly, that's not clever. It's not a good use of volunteer time, expectations are not being met.

So the fact that we've got now in 3.0 a choice of predictable models with clearly identified mechanisms, which are designed to be as fit for purpose as possible, is a good thing. So the ACs just got to get used to how that works. Because what was happening in that 20%, my generous 20%, is there was really some very strong biases developing. Because the people who were most motivated to turn up for 52 of those meetings were the people who quite frequently had money and all skin in the game. So you were getting strong biases perhaps towards one type or one path of industry or one particular constituency out of the GNSO or one stakeholder group. So because it's a motivation-based model, it really wasn't serving, I don't think, as well as this new one has the potential to do so.

Are we there yet? Maybe. Not-ish perhaps. A lot of it is a lot more work now has to go on supporting the people, for example, if you're in a representative model so you can have an all come, all welcome, absolutely open system in PDP 3.0. It's one of the models you can use. Or you can have what you have seen in a number of what's known as the expedited policy development processes, which you mentioned,

---

where you have an ear and a spare or two ears and two spares. So you have a cutting across a listing of the component parts of ICANN, ACs and SOs, and the stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO. A number of members are associated with each of those lines. So it literally is a table. One Advisory Committee, they say, “No, no. We don’t want to put anybody here,” that’s fine. They’ll be zero. That’s okay. If that’s what they want to do, that’s fine. They have the opportunity, they declined the opportunity, that’s not a problem.

But you will find, for example, the At-Large Advisory Committee will have one or two persons allocated into that lot. That’s still an awful lot of work for just two people to carry. So they have a couple of backups who also need to be well appraised and can observe on the meetings and all of those sorts of things. But it’s not an open model. You can’t all just contribute. You’ve got to be far more deliberate in the input. Dare I say, a little bit more professional, in the input.

In the case of our community, of course, and thanks to talent like yours—and I do mean that literally, Justine, you’ve been an enormously positive contributor to this particular process—is working with the wider community either within our region or also within these consolidated policy activities that ALAC manage to make sure that we get more voice that supports those two or four people. So to me, that’s efficiency, that works.

Is it perfect yet? No. One of the things I constantly hear is, how can an expedited policy development process take so long? That’s because the term “expedited” doesn’t refer to its time course at all. It was never designed to. Correct?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. I was going to ask you about it. People have this misunderstanding about what the expedited actually refers to. So I was going to ask you to explain what this expedited actually means in this respect.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to dive into that one. So an EPDP, the difference between a full blown policy development process and what's called an EPDP, an expedited policy development process is the presence or absence of an issue report, nothing else. To get a full blown PDP, you need to have this thing called an issue report. In other words, the identification of what the scope will then be built on. What is the problem? The problem statement is always the way you start. Again, remember those PDPs can end up in real changes to real contracts. So it's kind of important to get that right. An EPDP doesn't need that problem statement. It's usually born out of a quite clear issue or well-identified issue. It might actually be born out of a previous PDP. But what it is going to be able to do is also perhaps come up with consensus outcomes which can be binding once it becomes resolved and accepted by the Board and it can in fact be included in contracts.

Those two things, the PDP and the EPDP have that particular flavor about them. But there's other things as well, which I'm happy to talk about when you want to ask me about them. But the only other thing I want to say about the efficiencies is, we have a bunch of stuff that

---

people can spend less attention on noticing and worrying about in PDP 3.0, the really important tools.

For example, if you're going to be part of a policy development process now, you undertake a whole lot of "I understand this is my expectations, these are the things I will be expected to do. These are the outcomes if I don't do them." So you literally cannot have the situation where you sign up for something and don't turn up to do the work. You are already stating that you are not going to miss a whole bunch of work, a whole bunch of outcomes that are agreed upon by everybody else, and then come back at the eleventh hour, and try and open up everything, and get it all done again. At these clear powers about how problems are solved, all of that written in very carefully and very well-designed, and very, very powerful tools that I'm quite excited about, and I think they're a good thing.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, sure. It's fair enough. The PDP, for example, normally takes quite a while to complete. We expect whoever who is on the PDP who signed up for the PDP, for example, to be present, to be participating of the conversations, to be deliberative of what is being discussed so that your comments are taken into consideration. So if you don't join the calls and participate in those sort of things, you can't really complain at the end of the day that "My views weren't taken into consideration." That's the whole point about having this PDP, being open or being representative.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You can complain.

---

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah, well, people do. Mind you, people do, people do. I'm just saying it's not justified. It's probably not justified, clearly. You can't say, "Just because I'm a member, you have to listen to me." It doesn't work that way. That's what consensus building is about. Everybody gets to have a say, and then everybody comes to, hopefully, a compromise, and then you come to a single conclusion, which ends up being consensus policy once it goes through the approval process. That's ideally how it works.

Mind you, I can say for a fact that we take, at least now, attendance by the representatives. If it's an EPDP, for example, we do take into consideration the attendance rates of the reps from each group that they're representing. And if we see that a particular absent rate is high from a group, we do try to take steps to inquire why is that happening? Is it because you're under some whatever? We try to take steps to make sure that it's not something that will carry on indefinitely. If it's a case of somebody unable to join the call because of the time of the call, then possibly they could be replaced by someone else who can, that sort of thing. So we do look at considerations like that to make sure that whatever is being discussed in the calls are participative of everyone that signed up to participate.

Just going back a little bit, Cheryl, we talked mainly about the PDP process or the EPDP, all the different variations of the PDP, we also mentioned—or at least you mentioned—a bit about the process that At-Large undertakes to bring input into the PDP which is the Consolidated Policy Working Group. We should talk a little bit about that. Because if people want to get involved with how At-Large provides the input into

---

any PDP process, that's where they do it in a CPWG, so we talked a little bit about. But I do want to just ask you to elaborate a little bit before a PDP starts. So you mentioned the issues report. So if you could just tell us a little bit about the steps that GNSO undertakes—I'm going to keep the conversation to GNSO, really—the steps that GNSO takes from the issues report onwards. So what are the steps that precedes a PDP being initiated from a starting point, an issues report, and where in that series of steps At-Large can actually also play a role. So it's not just limited to the PDP itself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's certainly not. Thanks for that, Justine. So issue report we've dealt with and we know that there's a difference between the E and the non-EPDP based on that. Just a fun factoid for those of you who want fun factoids, the At-Large Advisory Committee is one of the few places outside of the GNSO that can cause an issue report to occur. So that's just a fun factoid I liked then at the time. We could do quizzes later. Once you've got the issue report and once you've established what the "problem statement" is then the business of creating the PDP falls to the GNSO Council, and in that space, they will call most usually, after staff reporting has been read and discussed, etc., etc., etc., for a scoping team is the terms of reference to be developed. That really is where the next most powerful pieces are, most of the success of the process, and also, in many cases, the opportunity for our voice to come in. So for example, as you well know, Justine, as liaison to the Council, you could very well end up on all sorts of scoping and small teams and terms of reference type groups, and it's how clever that process is that really affects how smart, how measurable, especially how timely the whole

---

policy development process can be. So it really is important that if we're going to expect good outcomes over realistic links of time, that the job description, for the one of a better word, the scoping, and the terms of reference that whatever the policy development process is looking at will be operating under, that they are well-designed and well-written.

Overarching is a wealth of guidelines and GNSO documents which are publicly available. I'm perfectly happy to talk to people offline if they want to read them and ask me or somebody else about them, we can help you with the "what if" and "maybes" about all of those. But pretty much, if you want to search, you will find something. But it's how well that scoping and the terms of reference goes is the next most critical step and one that certainly we ought to have an active role playing.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure. That's great. So in terms of the scoping one, if I can just simply put it, key output of that process would be the charter of a particular working group or EPDP or whatever it is. So there is still opportunity for communities outside of GNSO to participate in the charter building, is that right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Depending on what it is, there are times when GNSO can keep it very much themselves, and that's okay, too. It might be something that is so unique to industry, for example, that very little in view of the rank and file from the At-Large end user would be relevant at that point. So it's not a requirement but it certainly is. The charter is, of course, part of those terms of reference as well, that you've got a particular job. This



---

PDP's job is to do the following and that's caused by good scoping and tight terms of reference.

JUSTINE CHEW:

The point I was trying to get at is that what the PDP actually ends up talking about is limited by the charter. So if a question doesn't appear in a charter, then technically speaking, the EPDP can't talk about it. So it's important to make sure that the charter is accurate in that respect so that you take into consideration things like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If during the process, there's a blatant and clear oversight, there are a number of pathways that the GNSO could choose to take. It might run parallel process. It may agree to alter the charter, that's not impossible. But there's a whole lot of kerfuffle to go through that, and there's a whole lot of other things like timelines and project plans, and all sorts of things that have to be changed, and all of that involves other paperwork. So it's not done lightly, put it that way. It's done really, if at all, but it's certainly never done lightly.

But it is also possible to say we won't come up with a consensus outcome on this but we will recommend this is looked at. So in some cases, a report out of a policy development process will not just have recommendations to be implemented, but they'll also have recommendations for further follow-on or adjunct work. So there's a couple of pathways that you can fix up the [inaudible] if they do occur.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, that's great. It's just to highlight to folks who are interested in policy development that it's not just the PDP itself. Obviously, that's the main part of the policy development process. But there are steps that precede the initiation of the Policy Development Process Working Group that impacts on what the PDP actually does. So as far as where there is always opportunity for the ALAC and the At-Large to provide input into steps that precede a PDP, the initial initiation of a PDP, we should always take that step. Even if we don't end up saying anything, we need to consider that. So don't forget that bit of it because it's important, really. Great.

I'm looking at the time and I just want to ask people to raise questions if they have. It's becoming a dialogue between Cheryl and myself so I'm a bit concerned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Have a dialogue with anybody.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm happy having a Thursday afternoon conversation with you. I don't think there's anything better than I want to do right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, darling. While people are putting their hands up, though, I just wanted to take us back to a tiny little bit of ancient history, which is kind of important now, because we mentioned EPDPs. But they were a new thing only a little while ago. Well, they're a new thing only a little while ago but they actually were caused to be able to happen back in—

---

I'm going to say 2015. In 2013-ish, pretty [inaudible] thereabout, we had the GNSO look at inputs to policy and there was a non-PDP Working Group on PDP policy input. As you would have a name like that in ICANN, it's important to have names like that in ICANN. But it was the result of that couple of years of work that three things came out in particular. A lot of stuff came out but three things came out. I think it's about 100-page report, if you want a little light reading. But there was this business called a GNSO input process, which is really very important. There's something that we haven't seen exercised yet, but I hear from you that it may be, and that's called the GNSO guidance process and, of course, the expedited policy process. That work has been on the books, it's been able to be done for quite some time. Some of these things aren't being pulled off the shelf and tested until recent times. That doesn't mean that there's not solid and very broad-based across ICANN. It was a cross-community work group that came up with that at the time. I see Satish's hand is up.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Satish, please ask your question.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Justine. Thanks, Cheryl, for the great informative session. My own experience about the whole GNSO policy development process has been through the EPDP on IDN. And representing the ALAC in that group, I find the very interesting contrast between the ALAC or the At-Large style of functioning and that of the EPDP. In fact, the rigor is amazing. We have to kind [inaudible]. In fact, we also had a situation

---

where one of our team members was removed. The ALAC chair has removed one of our team members. That period is the kind of the style of doing things. I really enjoyed and learned a lot and still continue to do that. So my question to Cheryl is you've got something you can adopt from the PDP 3.0 into At-Large and ALAC? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oh, Satish, right off the top of my head is if you're signing up to be part of a workgroup, work team, or other substructure that has important work to do, you should damn well sign up stating what you're going to do and accepting that there will be consequences if you don't do it. You should always have the option to just be an observer. But if you're going to occupy a space as an active participant, then they're the two words you really need to sign up to: active and participant. So if you just want to watch, just sign up to watch. Just join the mailing list, just read the stuff. Okay. There's a few other things but that is in immediately one that I think we could do a whole lot worse than adopt.

I've got a question from Mark in chat. Mark, do you not want to talk to me? Haven't you got a microphone in Brazil?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Come on, Mark. Come on and talk. I want to hear your voice. Mark, are you there?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oh, he hasn't set up.

---

JUSTINE CHEW:                   Come on, Mark.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       Where's a geek when you need it? All right, let me read it out. This is from Mark, who I will pay out badly to when I see him next for not having his mic set up when he's on a meeting. "We are currently experiencing a stall in our ability to actually implement policies, potentially due to bottlenecks in the Board, but it seems that the machine has halted a bit." From my experience—in other words, from Cheryl's experience—"What do you think are the reasons and what actions can we take as a community to get this process back to a better pace?"

Okay, Mark, Cheryl again, and with utter and absolute bias. That's right. These are just Cheryl Langdon-Orr's personal and very, very biased views. Survive a little bit longer because I think we're at a bit of a tidal change in what's happening. So just a little bit of patience, hang in there, keep working at it, because we have had a backlog caused by really bad [inaudible] things. Too many things to do, too broad an area to cover, way too long a time to do them in. Instead of things taking 5-18-month periods or 5-12-month periods, they're taking six or seven years. Just huge reports, ridiculous complexity. All at a time when the ICANN Board is, in my view, justifiably so, more concerned than ever about ensuring that the multistakeholder model is actually a bottom-up one. So we've got a whole lot of stuff that's been thrown over the fence and go, "Come on now. We've approved it. The resolutions have been

---

gazetted. Why isn't it implemented?" That implementations have costs and resources associated with it, and so all of that is a backlog which is being cleared but it's not quite clear yet. But what we've seen in more recent things, and obviously subsequent procedures, which you know I'm passionate about. We've seen the situation now where the Board is causing, and I think quite reasonably, to do what any good business does do and ICANN Org would have done anyway, but not publicly, not transparently, and not called an ODP. So there's this Operational Design Phase, and then even some specific interactions with dedicated small teams managed by, again, dedicated staff, interaction with Council, as you well know, but what it means is that you don't say yes to something and when to something until you know what it's going to cost, how are you going to do it, what can we do in terms of actually implementing it. And sometimes, when something has been proposed way back here in this timestamp, a whole lot happens between now and the actual implementation. There might be a reasonable adjustment or modification that could be quite reasonably approved, and there's a mechanism, as you will know now, we just haven't exercised them yet, to take those changes back into Council and the GNSO, why the GNSO, and get some of those adjustments. That means you can make adjustments to even consensus policy both before the Board has approved things and after the Board has approved them by using different but now clear pathways, and a lot of those pathways haven't even been explored yet.

JUSTINE CHEW:

One of those—

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Long answer.

JUSTINE CHEW: One of those pathways is what you mentioned before the GNSO guidance process. The reason why we keep raising that is because there is something that GNSO Council is considering using as a tool to do the outstanding work on SubPro. Okay.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Cheryl.

JUSTINE CHEW: There you are, Mark.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He has a voice.

MARK DATYSGELD: That leaves me quite hopeful. Hopefully getting back to face-to-face meetings will also help us kind of speed things along.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. We can't lose hope, Mark. If we lose hope, we might just quit altogether.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Remember, we signed off on these processes in June 2015. So you're worried about losing hope?

MARK DATYSGELD: Okay. Renewing my hope.

JUSTINE CHEW: Good to know. Good to know. I'm glad that Cheryl has provided some inspiration to you. Any other questions, please? Does anyone have anything they want to clarify? This is your opportunity. It's not the only opportunity, obviously, but this is a good opportunity. Come on, guys. There's no question that is too small or too new to tackle. Nobody else wants to ask us a question, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, maybe we should ask them some questions, Justine. That's a possibility.

JUSTINE CHEW: Go ahead. Yeah, do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd be very interested. People perhaps could plop some of their comments in chat here. How many of you think that you'd be interested in contributing to policy but you're still just not sure how? It's okay.



---

Even after listening to Justine and I prattle on to say still not quite sure. Because that will give Justine and her team within the region maybe some capacity building opportunities or some possibilities to help get you across the line.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah, please, please. Give us an indication. The whole reason why we're doing this series of Fireside chats is to try and dumb down topics so that it's easy for people to pick up, easy for people to understand, and hopefully a solid stepping stone to getting involved. So we would like to know what is it that you want us to help you with. Some of the other forums where we're talking about policy, it really gets into the meat of the issue. So it's harder to step in there as a fresh person, really. So we are trying to get you to a basic level of knowledge so that you can at least start participating. Even if it's not actively, like if you just want to join up with the observer just to see how things go, and then build up your confidence there. And then get into more a more active participation where you're actually contributing, but you're actually speaking or providing comments in the Consolidated Policy Working Group chats, wherever, for example. We need to know feedback of what you want us to help you with, really. So the Fireside chat is one step that we thought would help with that process. But we still need input, really. If you're not finding this useful in any way, then why am I doing this? Why is Cheryl doing this?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Justine, if we're not going to get a lot of feedback from probably a very difficult question while people suggest, obviously, we'll be interested to hear about those things later on from people. But not everybody perhaps within our space within APRALO and here today might also be involved, they might know about but they may not yet be involved in what is also done in what's called the APAC space, which of course is the Asia-Pacific space that both the ICANN regional office APRALO was certainly involved, but we're often more involved at that sort of leadership level. But APAC space runs a meeting every two months. Now, often it's on things that have come out of ICANN meetings, but just as often it's about policy. So through Subsequent Procedure's work, we often had people like Pam Little or Donna Austin or, for heaven's sake, Justine Chew or Cheryl Langdon-Orr, just to name a few, talk to that APAC space and have an interaction and try and glean from a mix of not just APRALO but also regional industry, both players in the DNS space and just players in industry in general—ICANN, I-star, all sorts of people—to allow a friendly Asia-Pacific-friendly time. No criticisms, just ask all the silly questions, any silly questions, only people who were silly enough not to answer them, all that sort of stuff. And it's just a safe space that you can also build up your confidence and your skillsets in. So I think it's more out there than people realize.

The other thing is don't forget that there's always Skype channels. There's always e-mail lists. Maybe you don't feel comfortable putting a public e-mail list. If you're a part of the At-Large Skype in chat, then you just click on any one of our names and just ask us one-to-one question, the same as you can do in a meeting.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Just reach out, just reach out. If you're interested, you want to know anything, just reach out. I confess that I don't necessarily have all the answers but I can still try and find out for you, really, or refer you to a person who does know the answer like Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do not have all the answers.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Well, I noticed that we're running short of time now. We promised that we will keep this to not more than 60 minutes. So we're on the dot, really, five minutes to spare. Since there's no questions, really, I would like Yeşim to run a poll because that's another way that you can tell us what you think about this particular series. And while Yeşim is running that poll, I'm going to try and insert a little bit of promo on other things. So, Yeşim, can you please run the poll?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Yes, sure. One second, please. So let's go with our first question. I believe everyone is able to see the question. I'm going to read out each of the questions. So our first question says, "How is the technology used for the webinar? Very good, good, sufficient, not good at all." Please cast your votes. I will be waiting for a bit before I move on to the next question.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Is anyone who actually is just on audio? Because if everyone is in the Zoom Room and is seeing the screen, then I don't think we need to spend time reading out the answers. Perhaps just post the question and let people vote, really. I'm just trying to save a little bit of time.

While that's happening, don't forget, if you're interested in getting involved somehow even in taking baby steps, the first thing you might consider doing is just subscribing to certain lists. I would recommend two in particular. One is the APRALO Policy Forum list and the second one would be the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group list. If you want to know how to get onto that list, just send an e-mail to staff and they will point you in the right direction or they will subscribe you directly. So just a little bit of plug on that. Can we move on to the next poll question, please?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Yes, sure. Let's move on to the next question. So I'm not going to read out the questions, right?

JUSTINE CHEW: You can read out the question but just not go to the answers because everybody can see.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Oh, yes. Sure. So the second question is, "How did you like to non-formality or form of this event? Like very much, well enough, neutral, ambivalent, dislike, not at all."

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Stop sniggering, Cheryl. Okay. The poll questions are designed to be instantaneous response so you don't really have to think hard. You just put in your vote, and then we can move on, really, because I want to make sure that I leave you guys to get out of this room by top of the hour. So let's move on to the third question, please.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Our third question is, "Did you find this Fireside Chat useful in presenting an overview of the topic? Very useful, useful, sufficient, not useful at all."

JUSTINE CHEW: While you're putting in your poll answers, I just want to do another little bit of plug. Assuming that the reception or your feedback on this particular Fireside Chat today is good, we will be looking to have more chats in the future. The next one that we're looking to do is on the topic of closed generics. That's likely to happen in the week before ICANN74. So we're looking at the 8<sup>th</sup> or the 9<sup>th</sup> of June. We're just trying to finalize the dates with the moderator and the guest speaker. So just bear that in mind and look out for the announcements like we did with this particular Fireside Chat and sign up if you're interested in finding out what closed generics is all about.

Okay. Question four is "Was the guest speaker helpful in sharing knowledge and addressing questions on the topic?" I promise that Cheryl won't kill you, although I doubt that you would rank her badly on

---

this question. Honestly, I can't think of any other person who would be more knowledgeable to speak to you about this topic than Cheryl Langdon-Orr. So if you're going to rank her low on this one, then I'm at a loss at what to do, really.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Get them to make a suggestion of a better name, if you like. That's not a bad plan.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. All right. Let's move on to the next question. I think that's the seven altogether. So let's get through them quickly. "How many years of experience do you have in ICANN community?" This is always good to know so that we get an idea of what sort of range of people we're looking at, whether you're new, whether you've been around for a long time. So we can make certain assumptions about the level of knowledge that you have already coming into a chat or any other events, really. When you do something like this, even if it's a webinar or presentation, you typically like to know who you're speaking to. You need to get an idea of who you're actually addressing so that you can customize your message in the correct way to get your point across.

Okay, question six. So this one maybe requires a little bit more of thinking. So we may want to keep this up a little while longer, if we can. But again, don't take this as the only way of giving us input on the topics that you want us to address in the chat. You can always send your list to staff after the call or get in touch with me because I'm the program

---

leader for this series of chats anyway. So I'm always looking out for input from anybody, really.

Mark says he found out about this through Siranush. Oh, so thank you to Siranush for promoting this event. Yeah, we tried to hit all the lists. And I apologize because we probably didn't give enough notice for this particular event. I guess I will take some responsibility for that. I was trying to do my best to get the word out, really. But hopefully, there will be a lot more notice about the next Fireside Chat. But don't forget this chat is recorded so you can always go back and listen to the recording. Okay. Can we move on to the last question, please?

While Yeşim pulls out the last question, I'm just going to ask Cheryl to think about any concluding remarks that she would like to share with you all. So the last question is quite straightforward. "Do you think that it would be better served if you had interpretation?" We always had to do this just in English, and English being the main communication medium in ICANN, but we also realize that English is not necessarily the first language for everyone who comes along. So it would be nice to know if you need to arrange for interpretation the next time. Okay. So that's a fairly straightforward answer, yes or no. So while that's happening, Cheryl, did you have any wisdom to impart in concluding this chat?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm happy to have a tiny moment. Thanks, Justine. Policy is really the mainstay of what you can get your teeth into and get enormous rewards from in ICANN. There's a lot of good stuff you can do in ICANN.

---

But if you really want to make a difference, consider making a contribution into policy. But you've got so many good pathways at so many different levels, there really shouldn't be an excuse even though you don't find one that works for you. So let's hope this started those little seeds growing and we'll help fertilize and water them hopefully to blooming plants as the years go by.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Absolutely. Thank you, Cheryl. Absolutely. I, in particular, am very focused on policy work. I don't typically look at the other aspects that At-Large considers. And I can tell you it's fulfilling for me, which is why I've been at this for like 10 years, really. For the foreseeable future, I will still be involved. So I encourage you to take the first step. Whatever is comfortable for you, please take the first step. Again, just reach out. If you have any questions, we'll be happy to help you along.

So that being the case, we never look at the results of the poll. We'll look at it internally. This is actually for my consumption, really. So thank you very much, everyone, for coming along. I hope you have a very good weekend ahead. I know it's still Thursday but I know Cheryl and I are going to gulp our drink now. I think we need one, really.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If only.



---

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Anyway, thank you very much for coming along. We hope that you will come again for the next Fireside Chat. Please again look up for the announcement. Have a nice day. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye for now.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you all. This session is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**