

20130910_ATRT2_ID815350

- Speaker: Recording is on, Brian. Please proceed.
- Brian Cute: Wonderful. Thank you. Welcome, all, accountability and transparency review team two conference call 11 on Tuesday, September 10. We have a proposed agenda up on the screen. Welcome to ICANN staff and review team members and others. Let's first of all - Sorry about that interference. The first item is to adopt the proposed agenda. We have the adoption of preliminary reports, updated statements of interest, and then the meat of today's discussion is to have interactions with ICANN staff on three issues -- cross community deliberation, community engagement, and recommendation number 15, implementation from ATRT1, followed by an update on templates and issue owners progress. Any other business? Are there any changes? Larisa?
- Larisa Gurnick: Good morning, everybody. Hi, Brian. I wanted to add to any other business a quick clarification regarding the independent expert composite scoring sheet.
- Brian Cute: Sure. Let's make sure we bring that up in item number six.
- Larisa Gurnick: Great. Thank you.
- Brian Cute: Sure. Any other edits or changes to the agenda? Any objections? Seeing no hands, we adopt the agenda and move on to item two, the adoption of preliminary reports. Two calls. There's conference call ten, preliminary reports. I've gone through the report myself. I hope others have on the line. Are there any corrections or suggested edits to preliminary report for conference call number ten? Looking for hands. Welcome, Alan.
- Seeing no hands we will adopt that preliminary report for conference call number ten. Can we see the preliminary report for the call with the ASO members? Thank you. So, we had a conference call on September 4 with members of the ASO. Here is the preliminary report from that call. Are there any corrections or edits to the preliminary report? Looking for hands. Okay. Seeing none, we will adopt that report and ask ICANN staff to please post that to our wiki as soon as possible, both of them. Thank you very much.
- Let's move to item number three which is for the ATRT2 members who are on the call. This is a call for an update to your statements of interest. Under the conflicts of interest policy, we've all filed statements of interest as part of this process. Does any ATRT2 have an update or modification to their statement of interest to make? Looking for hands. Seeing none, no updates to be made at this time by the members on this call. Let's move to agenda item four, discussion with ICANN staff.
- So, we have three areas to discuss with ICANN staff. The first is cross community deliberation process. Larisa, is there someone from staff who wanted to kick off the discussion or lead the discussion? Or who is here to participate with us on the discussion?
- David Olive: Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes?

David Olive: David Olive here. I'd be happy to lead the discussion. We have myself and Bart Boswinkle, our senior director, who handles ccNSO support and Marika Koning who is senior policy director as well as handling GNSO matters will also be here to be part of the discussion.

Let me again thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the ATRT review group for looking at the cross community deliberation process. ICANN, as you know, over time has used cross community working groups as a successful mechanism to organize activities across two or more of our ICANN supporting organizations or advisory committees. And there have been examples of successful cooperation, particularly in the IDM area which results of course in the IDM ccTLD fast track. And also work in the DNS security and stability analysis working group. The thing to note of course and why I think you're look at this topic is some committee working groups were less successful in leading to good advice or recommendations that could be then folded into ongoing healthy discussions and in fact some would argue there was some confusions and misunderstanding across the different supporting organizations and advisory councils as to what the role is.

We know, of course, that cross community working groups are attracting more and more attention. Some in the community are advocating greater use of them but others are saying -- Wait a minute. There are concerns about the principles and processes which they're operating on. To that extent I think it's a good focus for your group. I know in our terms for the policy development staff, we're looking at other ways or other mechanisms that can get the community working together to present ideas and suggests as another vehicle, if you will, to the existing structures. But again, these are areas that we're trying to look more closely at and we're glad you're doing that as well. Of course you know the cross community working groups shouldn't be mistaken for a new way of developing consensus policy or overtake existing roles of our SOs and our ACs. But they could provide as I say an additional mechanism to foster a cross community dialogue and understanding the topics and how best to frame issues or potential solutions or policies.

To that extent, we've been encouraging the GNSO and ccNSO among others and they've been working together on a set of principles which can form guidelines or process relating to such groups that could be agreed upon going forward and also to extend this to other SOs and ACs. I think to that extent, if the working group here would look at both the board initiated and community initiated cross community working groups and talk to the maybe the participants. Some of them are the leaders or chairs of some of them and maybe even the staff to ask how that works, what criteria might work, and the successful ones, those that were kind of linked to ongoing solutions in the policy development process, that could be one area. It wasn't necessarily always board directed though the one board directed one was the geographic regions. Some of them were also coming from the SOs themselves.

So, I think I would just kind of stop here and ask if my colleagues, Bart and Marika, would like to comment from their perspective working with the two policy development SOs, the ccNSO and the GNSO? If Mr. Chairman, you'd want me to do that, I'd like to have them make some comments as well.

Brian Cute: Thanks, David. Please, Brian suffices. What I would like to do is put a little bit of a frame around the discussion too if you're okay with that and if we can come back to it? I'm very happy that Bart and Marika are here in their respective capacities. But I just want to put -- I know that you're very well versed in this, David, but I want to frame the discussion this way. We are chartered to assess implementation, make recommendations under 9.1 of the AOC and 9.1e as we all know requires us to assess the policy development process to facility enhanced cross community deliberations.

Actually, ICANN to assess the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations and effective and timely policy development. In E -- and this is the discussion thread we've been having throughout our work as you know, David, that's a lower-case development process PDP. So, the broader policy development process as opposed to the upper-case PDP where in our jargon we're using specifically to the GNSO PDP process.

So, this is the frame of the work and the discussion. And across the deliberations of ATRT2 you have a number of threads. We have a thread of discussion about the GAC and the GAC and how it may be able to participate in some cross community function with respect to the GNSO uppercase PDP and maybe even with respect to the lowercase pdp across the broader community. We have the independent experts work that is chartered to provide us an analysis of the GNSO PDP process and very welcome to hear from Bart and the ccNSO perspective and also had a very good call with the ASO on their policy development process.

So, all I want to do now is call out the active threads of discussion that are informing the ATRT2 work and point us all back to the language of 9.1e as really the frame around this discussion and sorry that took me so long but if you don't mind, everyone please proceed?

David Olive:

I appreciate that clarification and explanation, Brian. Thank you. If I may, in terms of turning to first Marika for the GNSO work in that area and then Bart, I think that may help in the discussion. Marika? Would you please?

Marika Koning:

Yes. This is Marika. Thank you for inviting me to join this call. Just to share a little bit from the GNSO perspective, first of all, David mentioned, and Brian also alluded to engagement in the capital-P Policy Development. Some of that information I think I've already shared with you with how it's currently possible under the PDP and as well the work that's ongoing for example with the GAC to try to identify how we can engage them at an earlier stage.

But looking specifically at the topic of cross community deliberation and engagement, and maybe worth mentioning that this is an area where the GNSO has been looking at as well, as David mentioned there have been some more successful or less successful efforts that have taken place in the past and I think as a result of those, one of those less successful processes, the GNSO decided it would've been helpful to actually look at first of all from the GNSO perspective what they would expect from a cross community process and what kind of framework they would view from their perspective as a way of moving things forward. With the idea in mind that once they within the GNSO would have a kind of agreement of what they would think would be the principle of such deliberation they could reach out to other groups to ask whether that kind of framework would also meet with their expectations and hopefully come to some kind of common understanding.

They developed at first a set of principles already a while back which was then also circulated to all the different SOs and ACs for their input. And as a result of that they received some feedback from the ccNSO council and the ccNSO community and engaged the ccNSO in conversations on that. And now they're actually in the next step of the process of free forming the group that initially developed those principles to actually take what the ccNSO provided and see how that could be incorporated and help with a next draft that then again will be circulated with all the different SOs and ACs, hopefully there will be an interactive process whereby at the end of the day hopefully there will be a framework by if the decision at any point in time there would be a need for cross community deliberation or engagement that at least there is a framework in place so everyone knows what to expect and how such groups are expected to operate. Just to give

you a bit of a status update from the perspective of the GNSO and the active part that's currently ongoing in relation to that topic.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Marika. This is Brian. If I could ask you to provide some clarity and come back later in the call again referring back to the AOC and one of the key words there is to facilitate cross community deliberations. From your perspective and your experience, and you can focus on GNSO or more broadly, what are the things that ICANN does and-or could do with respect to facilitation of that because clearly we're working in a bottom up multi stakeholder model and ideally one wants to see cross community deliberation occurring from that perspective. But what as an ICANN staffer have you been able to do or do you think ICANN could do to effectively facilitate the further development of these types of deliberations?

Marika Koning: Would you like me to provide some initial thoughts on that? Or wait until others? The only thing from my perspective, I think having a clear framework and an indication on which topics, which kind of areas are suitable for cross community engagement, I think that would help us in supporting those groups and also looking at for example chartering processes or the procedures that would apply. I think again, how to set the expectations for those participating and also from staff supporting those groups so we can clearly direct questions or the operations of the group according to what is set out in the framework or set of principles. I think you know the GNSO working groups for example are working under GNSO working group guidelines where it's clearly set out how decisions are expected to be taken and what the different roles in the working group are. I think that's currently lacking as a broader framework for cross community engagement which makes it more difficult to support those kinds of groups, also to manage expectations from different participants. They may have different experiences or expectations based on how either policy development or working groups are run within their respective SOs or ACs. So, I think any kind of framework and common understanding of what the objective and how such groups are expected to function I think would both facilitate staff but also community members engaged in such efforts.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much. David or Bart? Whoever would like to pick it up from there? By all means.

David Olive: Bart? Would you care to make some comments? Then I can comment as well.

Bart Boswinkle: Yes. This is Bart. Thank you for allowing me to participate. As Marika said, the ccNSO submitted some comments on the principles that the GNSO was developing for cross community working groups. And these comments were based on the -- I would say positive experiences the ccNSO had with several cross community working groups. I think as David alluded to probably the most successful one was the IDNC working group which was also board initiated. That led to the creation of the IDNC ccTLD fast track methodology. I'm purposefully using the work methodology to avoid any confusion with regard to policy. It wasn't a policy with a capital P. It was definitely a policy with a small P.

Looking at these different cross community working groups in which the ccNSO participated I think there are two very critical elements which were not captured in the principles and that really drives I think also the -- say from where I sit, the participation of the GAC is first of all that the participating SOs and ACs need to know and need to be at least adopt the charter of a working group. That's a critical decision. Even say going back to what I said the Board because it was the Board initiated IDNC working group before the board took that decision, both the GAC and the ccNSO knew and published acknowledgement of the charter.

And the reason why I'm saying this or why I'm stressing this is in fact such a charter, no matter about the function of the group, but at least it clearly states up front the rules of

engagement during the process. So, that's for the SOs and ACs participating SOs and ACs from the working group members. So, that's one critical element of what I've seen. The second one and I think -- again that was based on the experience that the SOs and ACs who do participate need at the end the ability to vote or express their support or even if they do not support be able to disengage from the result from such a cross community working group before you take the next step and they've -- if one of the participating SOs and ACs does not support the end result, then there needs to be a kind of mechanism that it will not be represented as a true cross community working group. So, that's in addition to what Marika said and what I view from my experience as the two most critical points why some of these SOs and ACs were successful.

Brian Cute: Bart, could you come back to a point you just hit. It was something whether the cross community working group produced a result or not and how that influenced the view of its success? I missed the point. Can you reiterate what you said?

Bart Boswinkle: Let me make it very concrete. At the time the IDNC working group -- I think everybody has a bit of that history in mind -- the IDNC working group at its Paris meeting, both the ccNSO and the GAC needed to endorse the results of the final report for the recommended methodology. Only if both the GAC and the ccNSO and the ccNSO at large, if they'd objected it wouldn't have been sent to the board as a recommendation for the IDNC fast track. Does that answer your question? That was a critical point.

Brian Cute: I believe so. So, conceptionally, the two groups coming together in a structured process that produces recommendations but the recommendations need to go back to their respective entities so they can be ratified or supported in some way through their own processes?

Bart Boswinkle: Yes. I can frame it in another way to make it clearer. The first decision around the adoption is what I said it is agreeing on rules of engagement is that you discuss stuff through that agreed upon process but that doesn't mean that at the end you agree upon the results. And whoever participates needs to have the ability to for whatever reasons and because they have a broader community throughout the GAC, you may have GAC members participating but that doesn't mean that they represent the GAC because that's one of the issues is that the GAC as a whole has the ability to retract from the end result. That's a very important step. Otherwise people commit up front to an outcome which they don't know.

Brian Cute: Understood. Thank you. Alan, I see your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: I guess I want to go back a little bit and discuss why this topic has come up in the ATRT other than the fact that it was one of the -- cross community work is listed in the AOC. The first is the continual use of the term silo within ICANN. And the belief that groups are doing things unilaterally when there might be some value in working together. That's a pervasive thing that comes up time and time again within ICANN. Two specific cases, David listed the DSSA as one of the success stories and in terms of a bottom up formation of the group and for those of you who don't remember it was formed essentially as a result of ICANN's decision to create a surge of its own due to emergency response team. And that group has been successful in its operation.

On the other hand the group is in advance right now because in looking at security stability issues and, David Conrad can go into this in far more detail than I can, essentially ignored what they were doing and did something completely different. My take on that is if it's not started by staff or by the board, then this group may just as well - the work may as well not be done if it has this nominally successful process going.

The last is the current discussion on policy and implementation which many people in the community felt the board would've wanted to charter a cross community group on and

chose not to. And that again puts into question are we likely to have effective use across community groups so we have the very same thing saying we should be doing it. The AOC says it. But then there are messages coming out that says don't bother. And I guess it's this continuity that's of some real concern for some of us. Thank you.

David Olive:

May I respond? Alan, thank you very much. You're right. The somewhat genesis -- we hear it as well about the silos and unilateral actions though I must say going back to the original affirmation of commitment, at least from our point of view as policy staff, we try to make sure that there is notification of what's happening in terms of policy development process capital-P within the GNSO, other activities within the ccNSO and to alert pipeline to what the ASO will be doing for global policies and we make every effort to inform people using communications that we have in terms of emails and in terms of my ICANN notification. And saying you're welcome to attend. You're welcome to come onboard and input on that. We do that. And we realize that greater efforts have to be made on that to reach out across the communities, across the SOs and ACs to ensure that they're, one, welcomed and encouraged to engage and have a chance if they cannot participate fully to comment on the public process or whatever as the process goes forward.

The other element of course is that there are both community and staff resources at issue here. To say that there's a working group in the GNSO or within the ccNSO, that requires staff volunteers of experts and people interested but also requires staff to support those works and to that extent when we also hear about community burnout or community fatigue, or being overwhelmed in essence by some of the matters I think we also have to be careful to say what will the cross community working group actually do because it is drawing resources from the community volunteers and resources from staff to support the activities for the suggestions or the proposals that they're trying to make.

So, even in the case of the DSSA as Alan mentioned, it was bottoms up. We had staff support from policy and security to help guide them and I think as I say some of their recommendations or suggestions were channeled in a different direction to the staff or to security staff. In essence it had a useful and helpful effect of engaging those experts from the community and focusing attention on their views.

I think one has to be careful. It's not a cure all for everything. We have to be attentive to when we call for community involvement to make sure it's measured and appropriate and appropriately staffed by both community and staff members. I would just sort of comment that way that we make every effort to put the word out on what's going on. That includes GAC and early policy information. We see the ALEC in particular year after year adding more policy statements than they had before in the previous year and refining their mechanisms for commenting on and inputting into processes. So, those I would like to kind of highlight in effort to get that cross community involvement and to break down the silos that are really structural parts of ICANN.

Brian Cute:

Thanks, David. I see Fiona Alexander's hand up?

Alan Greenberg:

Could I comment on two of David's comments first?

Brian Cute:

Sure.

Alan Greenberg:

David, what you say is true, but being informed about what's going on in other groups and encouraging participant which works very well certainly in several of the directions, is not the same as cross community work because as Bart clearly said, the joint chartering where both groups bless what the intended outcomes are and both groups or all the groups bless or have an opportunity to bless the outcomes of the group makes a difference. So, yes, an ALEC person or an at large person working in a GNSO working group has the opportunity to speak. But when it comes down to it, the GNSO is the group

that makes the decision on exactly what the charter is, perhaps with input from other participants and decides on whether to recommend to the board the outcome. And that's the substantive difference in the two and on the DSSA, yes there was good support, and you're telling a story that it was successful, the participants in the group are rather upset right now and don't quite know where to go as the next step. There's again a discontinuity in how this is viewed and when it's viewed by the participants as something which they may have wasted their time on. That doesn't bode well in the future. Thank you.

David Olive: May I respond?

Brian Cute: Yes, please. Then Fiona.

David Olive: Let me explain how one of the policies -- the policy person who's supporting together with Judy the DSSA. Going back the DSSA is a bit of a complex story. They have been in hibernation for over a year now, awaiting the results of a board committee. Up to that point they move forward and so it's -- they have a way forward now and they will present it to the participating SOs and ACs by the Buenos Aires meeting, again alluding to the point I just said around they report back to the SOs and ACs. And I think saying from -- I may agree with you on the substantive point of view but from a process procedural point of view it is and it has been a very successful joint cross community working group and I think because at the starting and if you have the ACs and SOs participating and say going back and that has to do -- and unfortunately this is where it becomes complicated, it has to do with the topic itself as well which is really cross community. So, if you look at say some of the communications going on around the principles the GNSO is developing, say one has to really understand when something is a cross community topic and when you want both SO -- or at least SOs and ACs participating in developing a topic because there are other ways and with the GNSO as a very good example of where it happens but it happens in the ccNSO as well where the members or participants or observers from other SOs and ACs are invited to participate in the work to see if whether there is -- to at least have an understanding what goes on in other areas and I think a very good example from what I mean there is the GNSO says some of the working groups is looking at ccTLDs because some of the ccTLDs have dealt with issues the gTLD registries and registrars are dealing with right now and they want to learn from their experience. But it is typically a GNSO topic issue but ccTLDs could provide expertise without turning this into a true cross community working group. So, I think what in discussing the cross community working groups one needs to take a very close look what one really means with the cross community working group.

Brian Cute: Fiona Alexander?

Fiona Alexander: Hi. Thanks, Brian. I just had a couple of questions. Perhaps they might be a little bit controversial. I was curious what you all thought was the essence of the ICANN multi stakeholder model. It pertains to me and we'll take the blame for some of this here at NTIA with some of the wording and how things have shifted but any time anyone doesn't like the outcome of a process they say the multi stakeholder model doesn't work because it doesn't include them. This gets back to are the silos a problem? Is the structure broken? And that's what I'm asking. What does this multi stakeholder model mean to you all when you look at things? Is it just the GNSO? Or do you consider the multi stakeholder model to be all the different parts of the community? And do the subdivisions or divisions within the community help or hinder or have no impact on the ability to actually do this?

The reason I ask is because sort of the foundational documents for ICANN predate the concept or the term multi stakeholder. It was really industry self-regulation at the time and the world's moved and morphed to multi stakeholder and I wonder if the ICANN structure hasn't morphed accordingly.

David Olive: I think that was directed at me. I'm happy to start the discussion.

- Fiona Alexander: I'd open it up to anyone who wants to answer it.
- David Olive: I know. But I'll start. In essence the multi stakeholder model in terms of the policy development staff, I think we're -- first we see it as a division of labor. The current ICANN structure does divide the labor between supporting organizations that develop policy recommendations for the board, the GNSO, ccNSO, and ASO. And the advisory council that provides input and advice on that to the board as well as to the other members of the community and community groups. To that extent, we're always sensitive to and try to promote and worry about if you will that there is information awareness, openness, welcoming if you will for others to come in and do this and be involved with that. And even to the point where we do document that in a checklist to the board before they make decisions as to who was consulted and how they were consulted. And surely of the structures over time can change and maybe should change. But -- and we also should look at new tools who help us further engage the stakeholders in this process. But in our view it should involve as many in the community who want to be involved and should be involved in the process.
- Brian Cute: Thanks, David. Anybody else on ICANN staff or the review team?
- Marika Koning: This is Marika. Maybe just to add to what David says. I think David already broadly said what I would add from a GNSO perspective looking at the PDP, I think the principle as well as much input as we can get to make sure all views are heard and respected. That goes beyond the GNSO. GNSO working groups are open to anybody who wants to participate. We reach out to all the SOs and ACs to either participate in working groups or give input at an early stage of the process so that can factor in several steps in the process and active outreach is done through different groups to inform them of whether the working group has gotten, what are the draft recommendations and asking input either through public comment or through engagement, through face to face meetings. I think there's a broad base of opportunities that can be taken into account. Of course policy development cannot be done in a vacuum and shouldn't be only the GNSO council as such looking at these issues but there's an active need to engage the broader community and although there are of course areas where we can improve and are looking at improving such outreach, for example in working with the GAC, making sure we have a method or mechanism that their working principles and how they're operating to provide such input shows that everyone recognizes that this is an important part to make sure everyone feels they can participate and can be heard and that input is provided and there is a commitment to provide responses and indicate why or why certain information wasn't incorporated in final recommendations or conclusions.
- Brian Cute: Fiona, is your hand up?
- Fiona Alexander: Yes. Maybe to put a finer point on it, I think the review team in meeting with different stakeholder groups over the next seven or eight months has gotten obviously a variety of feedback from different stakeholders and maybe to over generalize or over simplify just for the sake of this argument, I think it's fair to say that some of the GNSO members suggest that if it's not a GNSO process, it's not multi stakeholder. I guess the question I have for the staff is how do you all interpret that? Do you see the GNSO as the source of multi stakeholder policy development in ICANN exclusively? Or is it a process that's beyond that?
- Marika Koning: I think the GNSO sees itself as the leading body when it comes to gTLD policy development. I don't think they have any views specifically on what the multi stakeholder should be GNSO led. At least that has never come across to me. I think they do see they have the responsibility to take a lead when it comes to gTLD responsibility and policy

development and also as outlined in the ICANN bylaws. I don't think there's a perception that multi stakeholder equates GNSO processes.

- Bart Boswinkle: I can only support what Marika is saying and maybe even add to it. I think there's one complicating factor. If you look at the scope of self-regulation starting from your question, Fiona, the scope of self-regulation is different per SOs. So, that's the starting point. And I think most ccTLDs would be very annoyed if the GNSO would claim that they are the sole source of self-regulation. They view themselves as first of all themselves as a source, a local source of self-regulation and ICANN and through the ccNSO has a means of self-regulation at a global level and the way to do it is through the multi stakeholder model of multi stakeholder processes. That's why they're reaching out to other SOs and ACs to engage them as much as possible.
- Brian Cute: Thanks, Bart. Anyone else from ICANN staff or the review team on that question? Alan?
- Alan Greenberg: I guess I'm a little bit confused. In my mind, the concept of multi stakeholder rather than the components of multi stakeholder vary based on the subject. So, the stakeholders who have an active interest in ccTLD issues are different from those who have an active interest in gTLD issues and from those who have an active interest in addressing issues. It -- I don't think we can claim there is any definitive group of multi stakeholders that must participate and want to participate in any given subject. It's a dynamic combination depending on what the discussion is. So, I think we have to keep that in mind when we talk about multi stakeholder. It's not a fixed group voting on everything regardless of what their interest is on it. I think that's reflected in the kind of things Marika and Bart said.
- Fiona Alexander: Here's Fiona again to put another finer point on it. I think it's fair to say that with respect to the GNSO they have a clear interest in a role and the same thing with the ccNSO and the ASO for addressing. What I'm trying to get at is where are the other stakeholders? Where does the ALEC fit in? Where does the GAC fit in? Who would have interest across all three in some cases and maybe not? That's what I was trying to get at, just to provide some context.
- Alan Greenberg: I can answer that certainly from the perspective of ALEC. We believe and have believed for a long time that users should have a real seat at the table in the GNSO. Maybe the ccNSO also although based on operational issues, there seems to be less need for it there. From that perspective, we certainly agree with you that the ALEC has a wider responsibility than just the gTLD space. We, among other things, feel we're obliged to give opinions on ICANN itself, not necessarily just the technology area of what we do. But there's some indication however that we believe that we should be part of the multi stakeholder model with respect to for instance gTLDs, not restrictive to but for instance. From that perspective I think you've identified an issue that ICANN in the past essentially had said that there must be a mutual amenity between ACs and SOs and you can't have any overlap. That I believe is something personally needs to be changed as we have moved from self-regulation to multi stakeholder.
- Brian Cute: Any other comments, contributions, questions?
- David Olive: If I may? I think I just want to also say that we have to deal with the structures we have and do our best to make them work most efficiently and effectively but that doesn't say that those structures are set in concrete to Fiona's point about the transition and the evolution of the SO and AC structure if you will are I think inevitable to change and as we go forward especially with the new gTLD program and the like, how that will and how best to do that and support things we're looking at from the strategic panel from your group and other reviews, to advise us, inform us, and in a sense provide a guidance or a path for the community as it looks to how best to change if it needs to change and where

to change. So, we look forward to your reports and others that are looking at it in a strategic way to help the discussion.

- Brian Cute: Thanks, David, very much. I see Fiona and then I'll do a time check to make sure we get to the other items with Chris Gift. Fiona, please?
- Fiona Alexander: Thanks. I didn't mean to put anybody on the spot. Just as we're talking through this in an academic sense and based on the history of it, but to that end, the structure of ICANN and the different supporting organizations in the ACs is not what it was originally. It has changed over the course of the 15 year lifecycle and I think people tend to forget that. David, do you guys have anything at a high level that traces the history of the groups and why or what happened or even a timeline? My recollection is there didn't used to be a ccNSO and GNSO, it was just the DNSO. Is there anything you have at staff that provides that structural history or a timeline or map or something?
- David Olive: I can't say that's in the history of ICANN document. You raise a good point of reminding us what it was and those community members who were involved but of course as Diane Schroder is among other things that she's doing for ICANN serving as an archivist in a new position which we're trying to document a lot of this oral history but we don't really have what I would call a definitive history of the various structures within ICANN.
- Brian Cute: Thanks, David. One last shot at this before we move on to items two and three on the agenda. Any last comments before we move on? Okay. Thanks. Very interesting and helpful conversation. Moving on to we have community engagements. ICANN labs and other updates and the third bullet which we want to get to is ATRT1 recommendation number 15, the implementation of stratified public notice and comment. Chris? Are you the bullet number two guy? Or are you both of them?
- Chris Gift: I am certainly bullet number two and I think I can certainly start the discussion for bullet number three and let others join in as well.
- Brian Cute: Terrific. The floor is yours, take it away.
- Chris Gift: Thank you very much, Brian, and thank you to the ATRT2 team for inviting me. An update on ICANN labs, before I provide the status of where we are right now I'd like to take a few minutes to take a step back and remind everybody who perhaps weren't in Durban and weren't following the initiative of why we started this. ICANN labs is a means to an ends. It is not the end but -- it starts with an outreach group, an outreach community group that's been meeting for a couple of years if I recall and also other discussion around the ICANN community around how do we enable a greater breadth and diversity of participation for people who can only participate via digital means because they can't attend meetings or they can't participate for various reasons whether personal or professional. There have been some discussion in Beijing from that same group to look at the relevancy at ICANN.org and how do we make -- how do we make things -- also how do we make things-- by that I mean tools and collaboration, how do we make that more accessible? Not only more relevant but more accessible to the community across the globe.
- So, at staff we were looking at that and thought -- okay, if we start down that path of adding engagement tools and mechanisms or applications if you want to call them on ICANN.org and we start looking at how we make the content more accessible and relevant to people, it clearly led to the believe we would have to redo ICANN.org. It would lead to a new type of website which would have not only just the publication of content which is its primary role right now and the education of people, the publication of content, but to something was working and would work in parallel with that would be engagement of some type, funnels where people could see active means of participating in any of the conversations that are going on in ICANN and then eventually if they felt

like it or felt it was appropriate to them needing to participate in an SO or AC depending on what kind of stakeholder they were or where they felt they could participate most effectively. That in our mind was the end goal to do with ICANN.org, to have these capabilities. We started thinking about this and started thinking about applications and how we build them or how they purchase them or test them, we didn't want to write -- we didn't want to just buy services or initiate that and just sort of foist them on the community. Obviously that's not in the values of how ICANN works with the bottoms up process. So, we started thinking about it and how do we communicate what we are trying to do in terms of engagements, along those same lines we felt that the best way of discussing this was not to share documents back and forth but to actually test ideas online and to see would people use different mechanisms for finding each other or engaging in conversations.

So, given some of these ideas, we thought we needed a place where this could happen. It couldn't happen on ICANN.org on the primary website. We thought it would cause too much confusion and consternation. People would be unsure were these tests real or were they not. So, we created ICANN labs. This is a place where we are prototyping ideas, where we are stating a hypothesis. First off, where we had performed research or we were doing research and we would state the outcome of that research, so the hypothesis would fit the problem and the potential solution and we would build the prototype. By prototype, what I mean is literally a series of HTML with nothing in the background, it's a whole Wizard of Oz effect where we would be staff or consultants would be in the background linking people together if that was necessary or other activities manually. But the process would look automated and allowed people to test the idea effectively online in some sort of form that would be closer to what it would be in production and if it works, if it worked for them and for the community. If it didn't work, that was okay. We could kill the idea early enough and we hadn't invested too much money or effort into it and we could try something else to solve some of those problems.

Then ICANN labs, a brief overview of how we got to ICANN labs, what its goal is and what it's trying to do. Since we started the initiative, we've done our best in terms of outreach. We spoke to the SO and AC chairs. We also gave an overview to the ALEC group. We gave an overview to the GNSO. I think we also spoke to quite a few individuals in terms of one on one interviews prior to Durban, during Durban, and also post Durban. And as of right now we actually have 525 people signed up to ICANN labs to participate in some way whether that is we see the updates from us as we continue to blog on how we're advancing and what people are commenting and what the comments are on the testing and we have approximately 57 members -- not approximately, exactly 57 members who have volunteered their time to participate more fully. They are either -- they're in one of the tracks. We have four tracks. I'll talk about this in just a minute. They are participating in four of those tracks in some way, volunteering their time.

Lastly, we've created an advisory group to help us continue to guide so it's yet another mechanism for people to participate in this project and currently the advisor group has 28 people. The way we set the advisory was really just a call to volunteers. We had sent out an email to the SO and AC chairs which was an email that was an open invite and we asked them to circulate them to their groups to the mail listserves that they have. We also posted the invitation on the GNSO website. We put it there. And again we had discussions with each of the SO and AC chairs follow-up discussions with them to make sure that -- did we miss anybody? Did in fact the emails go out to the listserves and so on?

Out of that outreach we ended up having 28 people and I most note the initial email soliciting volunteers, we'd initially limited it to 20. That was just a manageability issue. We just felt like more than 20 people would make it difficult for people to participate effectively and for staff to manage. But the people who volunteered, when we got to actually 22 very rapidly, we polled them and they wanted more people, more voices in

the group. So, we basically just opened it up. Right now we have 28. I know there are I think three or four others that are seeking to join. They will participate and the numbers are going to grow from there. The advisory group is growing very large.

We also had a public webinar in early September where we described the projects, the same discussion, the goals, where we're trying to go, methodologies we're adopting. We had a public call for people to volunteer and participate and to join us on ICANN labs. We have the work itself. We have four streams or four tracks that are ongoing. We have four tests that are going on right now. We have something -- they're each solving a particular problem. The four tracks, each of these tracks have a syllabus. We did research and wrote up what the problem statement we were trying to solve, who this would work for, we have those personas up on ICANN labs and people have commented on them. And then we have these four tracks. The first track is around advisors. We after many, many discussions with newcomers, again, sorry if I take one more step back. Labs in this initiative is very, very focused on newcomers. It's not focused on supporting working group activity or anything like that. So, it's an engagement on the outer circle, people who participate in ICANN who are curious about ICANN, want to learn more or want to engage in the multi stakeholder process. That's where this initiative is focused.

So, after many interviews with newcomers or people who were embedded in ICANN but remember their newcomer days, it was clear that there was a pattern to those who were successful. We talked to some newcomers who hadn't been successful as of yet who may have been participating for a year and really hadn't gotten anywhere or who had been participating for a year and were already members of a working group or two. And we were curious what we had noticed and learned, the distinction between -- one distinction we notice is ones who were successful, more successful if you want to call it that in terms of diving deep into ICANN, if you want to call it success, is they had advisors or mentors. They had people who could help them identify who they should talk to, what working groups were working on what, and where the work was happening and to help them navigate the community.

And so, that was very interesting to us and of course we had many -- we were trying to understand how do we scale this globally, how do we do this digitally because we're very focused on digital tools, and we came up with several ideas, one of them we're testing now where we have this somewhat lightweight advisory concept where people can sign up to be an advisee and say -- I need help. And to post a few questions they need help around in terms of navigation and then the advisors can volunteer their time and answer a few questions here and there when it's appropriate and they can give access to the person's profile to really understand what they're looking for and things like that. It's an idea that people are interested in. We do have some traction there. Right now we have six volunteers on each side. We have six advisor volunteers and six advisee volunteers. And so it's I think being utilized. I know it's being tested right now. So, advisees are posing questions digitally and we're displaying the questions and advisors are then posting responses. We're also testing mechanisms of evaluating the responses and loading on them and other things like that to see about that. We're also supporting translation around those comments for understanding how we can -- advise. That's one track.

There's another track around streams of content. So, this is again an issue of relevancy. There's been quite a bit of discussion and problems around for newcomers to make information relevant, content within ICANN can be very dense and rich. And it's not always necessarily very intuitive content and so how do they make it relevant to me by geography, by Company, by country?

We're working off my ICANN concepts. Somebody could curate a stream of content coming out of ICANN and people could request a translation. By that we don't mean a translation into another language but a translation into plain English or plain French,

Arabic, whatever it is they require, but really translating the concepts of the content, whether it's a policy document, a new contract, RAA, something like that.

Again, people are volunteering to work on these translations and say -- Sure, I will curate a stream. And the people who curate are visible. Here's this individual, they're part of this SO or AC. Here's their viewpoints and here's why they curate this stream and here's how they're translating into plain English this content. Again, that's another experiment we're running. We're also running an experiment around profiles. Here the concept is that we really want again another issue was that newcomers were faced with -- they found it difficult to find out who to talk to at ICANN, especially if they did not attend meetings, they found it very difficult to discover new people or they had questions or could better understand who they should be talking to in the community. And so we thought about that and thought about the community itself could also benefit from understanding who is participating, not only who the individuals are but how they're participating. This goes to expertise location as we try to staff working groups or other committees as these efforts grow. There is that question that was broached earlier about too many working groups and then fatigue and it's hard on the community.

So, as newcomers come onboard we really want a mechanism for working group committee leads or the SO-ACs to be able to find people either within their stakeholder groups to participate and staff these groups. So, the combination of the two to this concept of a profile where somebody would understand what the committee belonged to, who they were, their interests for this individual and how they have participated in ICANN in the past and by that I mean what working groups they participated in, what comments have they made, and so on and so forth. And again, still very much an idea that we're testing out and we're looking at. So far, the validation on that has been successful. We've asked for volunteers to have profiles created and we're going to create the profiles to test the idea. We started off with six. We got people to volunteer for six. And we put a call out for more people and so far I think 42 people have volunteered to have their profiles created or want their profiles created. That's -- I'm very pleased about that. I do think that will be something successful in the end.

The last one, very quickly, is a roundtable and this one was -- the initial idea was to support more fully the comment process in the sense that when we talk to newcomers, there was a question of relevancy around public comments. They didn't know how to comment on the issue that was put out. They could read the document but they weren't necessarily sure how it was relevant to them or how they should participate in the process.

So, rather than -- so what we looked at was could there be a means of -- associated with a public comment could there be a roundtable discussion of key stakeholders, experts on the issue that would have a roundtable discussion around that topic to solicit different points of view around this document. And then how is that visible next to the public comment or the document on public comment. I think this one is -- we're not getting much traction around the idea. There's a lot of discussion around the mechanics of it, is that in effect a public sense when people do this? Does it infringe on the public comment process? There are many, many questions and issues on this concept, on this test, and so right now we're effectively I think -- I'm hosting an advisory group tomorrow. Our initial ideas, this one is probably not going to succeed. But we'll take the learnings from it and I imagine end up killing this prototype and moving on more directly to some other public comments.

So, those are the four tracks we have going in terms of ICANN labs and the end goal of where we aim to be. That's it for a status update on this.

Brian Cute:

Thanks, Chris. Before we move to the third bullet, we have about 20 minutes left in the call. Are there any questions for Chris on this? Looking for hands. Not seeing any hands.

Okay. I think you've convinced everybody, Chris. Okay. No thoughts for, Chris? No questions for Chris at all on this? Okay. Could we then to the extent that you can take us down the road on the third bullet which is recommendation number 15 from ATRT1, the implementation of stratified prioritized public notice comment periods? If you need to hand that off to another colleague, by all means, please do.

Chris Gift:

Will do. So, ICANN labs, I'm going to continue that discussion for a little while because when we're looking at public comments, one of the things we want to do which is improve the experience on ICANN.org for public comment. We felt that the experience is difficult for many people. The public comment is not -- while we've done a great deal around being more clear what the document is and adding information around the document, the open and close dates and so on and why this document is -- why this document is up for public comment, we've added quite a bit there and I think it's been very successful work. But the process itself of the public comments had not been improved. It's the same technology we've been using for years and the experience is not very good. I think everybody can acknowledge that. The comment itself is hidden. You have to click through on a link and you go to this list of emails and you have to navigate your way through the emails. So, at the very minimum we wanted to make this more visible on ICANN.org so that people could just read them true very -- right next to the document that's there. We could read through what people were saying, what the various communities or individuals or groups or individuals were saying about the document.

There were also ideas about having supported threaded discussions, having a response right next to a comment. So, being able to support that. Again, people could see an inline or threaded discussion around a particular comment or idea or topic associated with it. Their ideas around testing that as well. Again, engender more comments and discussions which was the goal for us which we could interpret some of this. We decided -- for staff what we decided was to test these ideas, what would be best is before we test ICANN.org, it would be best to test ideas on ICANN labs. We thought it would be a good venue for us to test new ideas and new tools to help engender more comments and at least test the tool. Would it engender more comments or would it not? And if it doesn't, then okay, maybe it's not successful. Unfortunately, the test so far, I'll be frank, rather than testing those very direct new technologies, we went with the roundtable first and in hindsight, I think that was a mistake. I think the roundtable again was trying to add relevancy to the public comment process rather than just fixing the nuts and bolts of just making the comment more visible which we thought would be a good success. That test again I think it stands. I still want to talk the advisor group and get their input on that. We're meeting tomorrow morning. That's my personal opinion at least to date.

So, what I'd like to do is take that track and focus it directly on that problem and not fiddle around the edges anymore and very much see -- Okay, what technology can we use to make public comment more visible and more direct. So, that I think is my update on that. Any questions around specifically on that and how it relates to ICANN labs and what we intend to do? Sorry, I may just wrap up. If those tests are successful over the next few weeks, you'll see those appearing probably in about a week and we'll start showing things. Then I would like to update the ATRT2 team as appropriate in probably about four to six weeks to show you the results. If not, it's also going to be very visible because it's all online all the time.

Brian Cute:

I see a hand up. Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. Just a couple of pointed comments about why the comment process, and why looking at comments is so difficult right now. I'll give you some really nitty issues. Currently almost everyone posts a comment that's detachable which adds an extra link you have to click to see what the thing is. On top of that, a lot of mail programs do not use the right mind type and therefore for security ICANN changes them and therefore when you click on a link you cannot read it. When you click on one that's detached

because it's really a PDF but it doesn't say PDF. It says something else. That's the stupid thing when I originally saw that five or six years ago someone said you can have viruses in attachments. If it didn't come as a PDF mind type we won't label it as PDF even though it had a PDF file type. Some of the annoyances are nitty technical issues which could be made a lot easier and then of course if everyone's going to use detachments, why do we have to go through the intermediate link to see their email? Some of them are just mechanical things which are almost designed to make it as difficult as possible to look at someone else's comments, never mind comment on them. So, when you're looking at high level ideas also make sure to address some of the nitty things which are some of the real annoyances along the way. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Chris? Do you have any comments?

Chris Gift: A very quick comment. You're absolutely right, Alan. I fully acknowledge we made a mistake over the past six weeks working on this. We were trying to hit a home run when we should've just looked at some very simple mechanical things. That was -- we were reminded of this quite forcefully internally by some staff saying -- Look, there are five or six very, very basic things we can do to make life easier for everybody. So, we are definitely pivoting and turning our attention to doing that on ICANN.org, forgetting waiting for some of the other stuff as we develop the new website. I'll definitely have an update for you personally and ATRT2 soon on this.

Brian Cute: David Olive?

David Olive: Thank you, Brian. I just wanted to comment on some of the internal processes we used and as Chris pointed out, the need to upgrade if you will and explore a new platform and new tools that could augment the existing systems but in terms of the processes at the moment and the staff uses them, we appreciate the ATRT look at comment reply and the possibility of providing a little more exploration of other strategies as the reply comment has not been used as effectively as we thought although the longer process for comment is something that people have mentioned helps in getting a comment and organizing groups to input into a comment by their various networks. To that extent I think that's very helpful.

The other thing of course is that we have broken up the forecast of reporting. I'd just like to return to Rob who focused on that and kind of refreshes it every trimester as we look at it as a better way to focus the attention on the community of what's coming up. So, if I could turn to Rob and then I'll finalize something on the period. Rob?

Speaker: Thanks, David. I appreciate it. And thanks to the ATRT2 members for letting me sit in and listen and learn during your conversation today. As you probably discussed with David and Chris in the past, the policy team is one of the biggest customers of the public comments tool in and of itself. As we've gone through various organizational changes and the rest we've been happy to start playing more of an advisory role in helping Chris and some of his teammates develop new ways to look at this. One of the places where we've sort of jumped into the breach to help out is in this upcoming public comments area. I think it was Olivier on this team that pointed out that was an area that had become quite fallow. And so David asked me to step in and help rejuvenate that effort. We've essentially taken things and continued in the same direction that the original senior director of participation and engagement started and fine turned it a little bit. So that we're at the point where now the goal is that on a trimester basis that's between each of the public ICANN meetings we're conducting internal polling of the staff, the various departments, including that liaisons to the various community groups like some of you are from and asking them for information on three timetables.

First, what's coming up between now and the next ICANN meeting. Then what's in that time table between the next two and then the third, looking at almost a year. The hope is -

- and I started to get some good feedback a couple of most ago that that timetable seems to be realistic in terms of how the different community groups set their agendas and time frames and the thing that we're looking to fine tune now is really getting that process regularized within the staff so that it becomes more of a -- Oh, yes, we have that to do and that's a part of our regular job as opposed to -- What? Rob's sending me this new email. I have to produce what? I think over time we're going to see more and more improvements on that as quite candidly the newer staff become regular staff and people who are regularly aware of and assigned this duty and providing to a central internal staff resource information about the upcoming public comments. There have been some side benefits of this effort and having it run by staff internally and that is it drives more staff collaboration. We've had in the five years I've been at ICANN fits of saying -- Gee. Are we too silo? Are we not aware of what's going on in other departments? I think what we're beginning to see is not only more benefit to the community more broadly in terms of being able to plan their work and agendas but also from an internal staff perspective, a better understanding of what's coming down the pike for different departments. For some it's really been an education for them to say -- Oh, someone's interested in what I'm doing? You need that information how many months in advance? That's been a positive development as well.

David, if I can, while I have the benefit of this great soapbox, one thing I'd like to sort of throw out is something for ATRT consideration and whether this group number two or a future group is that the public comment process is just one channel potentially for input into policy developments, small p. I mentioned that while the policy team is one of the major customers of the resource, it's also a mechanism for getting comments on the budget. It's a comment channel for the ICANN strategic plan, the ICANN operating plan, the SSR activities. So, it's a channel that's used in a number of different ways and it would be helpful to explore as we go forward sort of the evolving expectations that the community has about not just this channel but potentially others. That's where I think we're seeing some tremendous value in the expertise that Chris Gift has brought to ICANN. That ability to think -- Are there other ways? Are there other mechanisms? Chris is constantly challenging us in this regard to do something better. It's not just to improve the existing channel like public comments but it's looking at all the channels and trying to find inventive, creative, effective ways through workshops, through webinars, through tweets for example just to find more effectively ways for people to contribute to ICANN activities, to the policy development efforts. So, I'm sure you guys are talking about that from time to time but that conversation and any advice you guys can provide as a regard team in that regard I think would be very helpful. And finally just more specifically on the public comments channel, as David noted, we're gathering data on how things improve over time but one of the areas I think we can get more guidance and help on is what you all as the review team see as what potentially is a successful public comment forum for example. Is that that we get 10,000 comments from individuals on a particular issue? Or is it enough to have an efficient process that ensures that the various SOs, ACs, and their subgroups within ICANN contribute their representative comments. I think that continues to be an ongoing debate in conversation we have as staff and the more input we can get from groups like yours would be very helpful.

Thanks, David, for letting me chat. I'm happy to take any questions.

Brian Cute:

I'm going to offer a few thoughts I hope help to the team. We just have a few minutes left on this call. All excellent points and questions and directionally, providing tools and approaches to broaden and allow for fuller participation in the comment process for the policy development process of the lower pdp is the right way to go. I don't think there's ever been a measurement of the efficacy of comments based on the number filed. And I'm not sure that's a useful direction to go in terms of metrics although it's certainly interesting metrics for a number of reasons. But getting back to recommendation number 15, and the recommendation on establishing a comment and a reply comment process, we've had some discussion already on the review team recognizing that that new

approach hasn't worked the way it was envisioned. And I think in a sense that certainly new techniques, new tools to provide open access and more participation is the right way to go. Whether it's a question of the reply comment cycle as so broken that it should be discarded or that it can be maintained as part of a broader set of approaches is an open question. I don't think anyone's pushing anyone one way, one direction or the other on that. I think what's important to focus on is the why those recommendations were made and looking at the implication of stratified and prioritized public comments, what's really underneath that is that anyone who wishes to participate obviously that they have access to participate fully and effectively but that there's clarity around the process that you're engaging in, that there's an understanding of what is this particular comment process focused on? And what's the issue and what impact does it have on me as a stakeholder? The volume of the comment process itself is an issue in terms of how effectively any stakeholder can participate over time and so clarity around the purpose, around the issue, around prioritization and around just overall management of that process whether it's through our comment and reply comment mechanism or some new tools or a combination of both is really what was behind the original recommendation and to what I'm hearing based on feedback from the community, those remain central concerns. So, if I can offer that as guiding thoughts as you move forward down this road. And this is a very helpful call. This is exactly the kind of call that we're looking for as we move toward our draft report. This type of input from the staff and please keep bringing more of it to us, that helps us inform our assessment of past implementation and having recommendations and please with those guiding thoughts if you have more to add with what you're developing as we get into October and November before we get our final report we'd be very interested to hear what direction you're going.

Alan Greenberg:

I'm sensitive to the fact that we're out of time but one quick comment. One thing that's changed in public comments in the last couple years is we went from a few paragraphs to describe the issue and appointed to the document to what amounts to a page or two or certainly several screens worth of very carefully formatted information. The latter is a great source if you're looking for something particular but is also overwhelming for someone who's just scanning something. Somehow we have to get to the point where we are concise at least in the equivalent of an executive summary in the comment field. I would give one example outside of the public comment field, the GNSO was trying to put together a drafting team for a working group and basically nobody came. And they just reissued the call. The call doesn't -- the title of the group is uniformity of reporting. It is almost impossible reading the documents to find out exactly what this working group is supposed to be doing. When I've described it to people on the phone on teleconferences they say -- Oh, well, I'll join. It's interesting. But you'll never get it from reading the documents unless you actually go and read the 100 page document that's the backup document. We've got to figure out how to write things to catch people's attention.

Brian Cute:

Thanks, Alan. We're out of time. I have to get on another call myself. But two quick items. First of all, thank you, ICANN staff. Very, very helpful. I appreciate all those inputs and take the points from us forward and happy to hear more as you go forward in your work. Second, for all ATRT2 members on the phone, in terms of templates and issues if you have any to put into the wiki as drafts, the objective before we get to our face to face next week in Washington is for each template, each issue, each assessment that's been assigned, there is a full template. It does not have to be perfect. It does not have to be polished and shiny. But that all of the background information and analysis you have to date be in that template so that we can have fully informed discussions next week and that is the clear objective. Please deliver those before we get to Washington, as soon as you can so we can hit that objective.

Lastly, Larisa, you had a specific issue for any other business before we closed. Can you remind me what that was? Larisa? Are you still on the call?

Larisa Gurnick:

Yes, Brian. I am. Can you hear me okay?

- Brian Cute: Yes.
- Larisa Gurnick: The issue had to do with the composite score sheet for the independent expert. We just wanted to clarify that it was the review team's intention to post publically the composite result.
- Brian Cute: My recollection is that it was. I know we had some discussion. I think some people raised questions about whether it needed to be out publicly. I might want to do a quick check of that transcript to be sure beforehand. My recollection was we would follow the practice we followed last time. Is that any --
- Larisa Gurnick: That was in keeping with our review of the transcript on the staff side as well. It is consistent with what the ATRT had done. So, the response is to RFP obviously would not be shared for various reason but this team has already discussed that the composite that shows the final scores by each of the firms that had provided a proposal would be shared.
- Brian Cute: That's the total score, not the score in the individual areas. One point of process might be that we give a friendly heads up to each of them before posting. I think that might be an issue someone raised. If that's the case that's probably something we should do as a matter of course. That would be appropriate.
- Alan Greenberg: I may be wrong but I thought we decided to label them ABC and only identify the winner and not identify the losers.
- Brian Cute: That's what it was. Thank you. That covered that point. So, identifying the winner only and anonymity on the other two then provides some comfort if you will.
- Larisa Gurnick: Very good. Thank you for that.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks, Alan, for that recall. Thanks, to staff. Alice, I see you typing. I do need to hop on another call with the independent expert. Thank you to everyone. Talk to you soon.