

20130701_ATRT2_CSG_ID798205

Speaker: The recording has started. If anybody has any objections you are welcome to disconnect now. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you very much. It's Alan Greenberg speaking. I am acting as chair for this meeting. Brian Cute, the chair of the ATRT is on vacation. And I'm one of the vice chairs.

And the purpose of this meeting is largely to provide any opportunity for the commercial stakeholder group of the GNSO to advise us. Essentially we're listening mode. We've had to put a couple questions on the screen that I hope have been distributed to you before this meeting, although some of them are very recent. But in any case they are on the Adobe screen if you're in Adobe. And we can go over those, or we can open up the floor to people from the business constituency IPC and ISPC to make any sort of introductory statements. Barring any interest or hands on that then I would suggest we briefly overview what the -- well, I'll do that in any case. A brief overview of what the ATRT is looking at and then open it up to questions, either to just ones we've talked about or other things.

The ATRT --

Avri Doria: Alan, this is Avri.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Avri Doria: Unfortunately I can't get online. Do you need to do a roll to see who's here on the meeting?

Alan Greenberg: I suppose we should.

Avri Doria: Sorry I had to break in but (inaudible) the Adobe but I can't type.

Alan Greenberg: No, that's a good point. I was treating this closer to a webinar where we don't do that but I think we should in this case if only to record who from the ATRT is on -- of the ATRT review team is on. Alice or Larisa, can you review who is on the phone bridge and do a callout of those who are on the Adobe as well? Not asking for them to confirm attendance, but just so we have it on the voice record.

Alice Jansen: Yes sure. On the Adobe Connect we have Alan Greenberg, Chris Chaplow, Crescent, David Conrad, David Irving, Dietmar Lenden, Elisa Cooper, Feng Guo, Fiona Asonga, (inaudible), Jeff Brueggeman, (inaudible), Jonathan Zuck, Kristina Rosette, Larry Strickling, Lise Fuhr, Mikey O'Connor, Olivier Cerpin-Leblond, Paul Diaz, Philip

Corwin, Steve Crocker, Steve Metalitz. Is there anyone on the phone that we have missed? Avri Doria? And then of course from staff we have Larisa Gurnick and Alice Jansen.

Avri Doria: Yes, sorry. I was on mute.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. It's Allen Greenberg again. The review team is specifically looking at items that are listed in this section 9.1 of the affirmation of commitments. There are five things that are explicitly called out there. There's essentially a review the board and its effectiveness. That of the GAC and its interaction with the board, continually assessing how well ICANN receives public input and uses it of course. Continually assessing how ICANN decisions are embraced, supported and accepted by the community, that is, the public and the Internet community. And assessing the quality development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberation and there's an emphasis on that, and effective, timely policy development.

The first two items were addressed heavily by ATRT1 and there were some addressing of the issue of public input. Relatively little on the issues of the last two items, that is, to what extent is input is ICANN our acting decisions embraced and the effectiveness of the policy development process and cross community involvement there. So, although we will not be focusing exclusively on those last items. There certainly of great interest to ATRT2.

The questions that have been raised for anyone not on Adobe is a question on the GNSO PDP. Is it working well, if not, what's wrong? To what extent ICANN is able to avail itself of volunteer stakeholder efforts? In other words, are we providing the right incentives, feedback, whatever to make sure we get volunteers so that we do have involvement from all of the stakeholders that need to be involved in the process?

And there were a number of questions in the BC submission, which is the only group within the CSG that did submit a statement and we have one or two questions regarding clarification for any BC people who are on call, that is as a reference to material new obligations that are added. I think the specific reference was during what we are currently calling the implementation phase of policy and can you enhance on what you mean by that?

There's a reference to top-down decision-making, especially in how some working groups are populated and established within ICANN. Again, we like more information. And what evidence -- and there is a comment about the lack of response to public comments by the staff. And the question is, is what kind of evidence would you, the DC, consider sufficient?

So those are the questions that we've posed and back to the CSG, but the floor is open to anyone who would like to make any sort of comment at this point or provide any input to the ATRT. As I said, we are in listening mode, we're trying the best we can to be a clean slate, so to speak, to make sure we are responding to what the community believes are the problems and things that need to be addressed in transparency and accountability. So I open the floor to anyone who would like to make a comment. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Thanks. Apologies for the delay, I wanted to get myself off of mute and off speaker. On behalf of the IPC, I would very much like to thank everyone on the ATRT2 for making the time for this webinar. I know that there are questions that (inaudible) has, but just to address, and I think this ties in a little bit to perhaps number two.

Quite candidly, as much as the IPC wanted to provide a response to the questionnaire we simply didn't have the bandwidth. We just were out of capacity. And I think that's an issue that among the CSG. We have talked about extensively and at this point we're planning to, I believe, take up with the board when we meet with them in Durban, simply

because the amount of work and the number of available volunteers simply just isn't commensurate. And so I did want let you all know that this is an issue that's very, very important to the IPC. We just unfortunately had to perform triage for lack of a better word. And it was something we couldn't pull something together for.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Kristina. To the extent you can, or further speakers can, I guess I would like to understand what you view as the solution to that. Simply ask the community fewer questions. And I'm talking about in general, because many of us feel overwhelmed and must do the same sort of triage of deciding which ones we comment on which ones we don't. And to what depth do we do it? Is the solution simply fewer answers or somehow provide the incentives to make people convinced that it really is worth getting involved in to a larger extent? I'm not necessarily asking you at the moment but something for you and others to think about. Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks, Alan. It's Mikey. Sorry the phone's ringing in the background, it'll stop in a second.

I just want to build a little bit on what Kristina said. I think the reason that Tony, who is number the person who would be representing us on this call, isn't here because he's on vacation this week. As many of you know, Tony is key to making the ISPs work well, and when he's not around sometimes we drop the ball. So I think part of the reason that there are so few of us on this call is just because we forgot.

The reaction I had to the questionnaire was partly being overwhelmed by the scope of the questions. They were very difficult to answer without sort of hours of contemplation. And so I started doing the hours of contemplation, and then the questionnaire timed out and erased all my answers and I stomped off in a huff and never came back. So there was sort of a technical issue there that I just add on to the point that Kristina made.

And in terms of bandwidth thing, just one last little point and then I'm done. Another solution to bandwidth is to get more people involved in our constituencies. So I think a lot of this ties to the outreach effort. And I'll leave that for now, I've got little rant that many of you have seen about all this that I'll paste a URL of that rant in the chat. But I really think that the ultimate solution to this is to get a much better process for getting people into the constituencies and gracefully brought up some sort of ladder of learning so that they can be effective participants, both in working groups, just where I'm really interested, but also in the constituencies itself I think. The bandwidth problem is partly because most of the searching -- because with policy people we're not here as recruiters or outreach people, it's not what we do well necessarily. So I think there's a (inaudible) to make.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Mikey. Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: Yes, I would just like to sort of reiterate what both Mikey and Kristina said. And that is getting these comments, although we were able to get some comments, it was a real struggle just because of the sheer amount of work. And so you're asking sort of like would it be better to ask fewer questions? I don't think that's necessarily the answer, but if there was some way to at least eke out the requests to the stakeholder groups, that would be a huge help to at least have no more than say one set of requests going out maybe every two weeks. I mean, as it's been it's just been a flood of information for us to all deal with.

So another option may be to just have kinds of feedback calls as opposed to asking for written submissions because oftentimes it's easier for us to just explain as opposed to preparing a written document and then having to get approval from everyone. So those are maybe just a couple of ideas.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. With regard to the ATRT input itself, did the message come through that we were looking for input period? And here were some questions that you could consider in whole or in part, but the general question was what do you want to tell us? The form of this feedback and that I'm getting from other people, people felt that we were being inflexible and were making too huge demands and that part of the message did not seem to come through. Can anyone comment to that extent on whether that was true in your case? Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: I'll answer that and I'll also to some extent try and answer to kind of provide some comments on number two. And I should just note that these are not official IPC comments, but to the extent they do reflect the views of a number of folks in the constituency.

Your specific question, Alan, is yes. We were aware that ATRT was looking for input. We were aware of the questionnaire. I personally was aware of the timing out issue. I don't think that that, to my knowledge, that didn't prevent anyone from IPC from completing it.

I will say that I started to and it was extremely daunting. I realize very quickly that it wasn't something I was going to be able to start and finish in the time that I had initially set aside for it. So I didn't (inaudible).

But getting to the second question that you all have posed in terms of the subject (inaudible) and (inaudible) be able to (inaudible) or stakeholder efforts on what needs to be changed to increase its ability.

I think Mikey is correct that I do think that all of the constituencies in the CSG are making a concerted effort at outreach. I don't want to speak for my fellow constituencies, but I know that the IPC to some extent has kind of been scratching its head a little about the -- what appears to be a very significant allocation of resources, both in terms of finances and personnel on outreach. But there hasn't really been much -- an appreciable effort to kind of coordinate and touch bases with us to say what you doing, how can we help? How can we avoid duplicating your effort?

So do think part of it is bringing more people into the process. That to me is only a small part of the battle though in the sense that the learning curve to purchase it in ICANN is extremely steep. Unless you are able to just identify a particular issue that you are concerned about you really -- I kind of make the analogy for those in the US, and this will make sense when I tell this to those who aren't familiar with it. But the Federal Register is a document that the US government publishes that prints all of the proposed regulations that are put out for public comment. And from my perspective trying to stay on top of what's going on though, ICANN is really kind of akin to having to re-comment on the entire Federal Register every day and that is a very significant undertaking.

So I do think there needs to be a way to bring people in so that -- and to make it clear and perhaps identify ways for new participants to contribute in smaller, more manageable chunks of time and expertise. I also think that another thing that would be helpful is that it can be very daunting if you are not coming to ICANN through a constituency, through a stakeholder group, through an SO, through an AT, trying to figure out where you participate and how to become a member of whatever the appropriate entity is also very challenging.

So one thing that I think in (inaudible), I still don't understand how ALAC is structured. So I think time to as an organization to make it easier for people to figure out oh, well here are my interests. This might be the best place for me. To make it easier for people to do that and perhaps to include that type of self-identification information in whatever outreach materials are being put together could be very useful.

- Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Kristina. We have no more hands. Who would like to contribute anything more or would we want to give an opportunity for any ATRT people to go into a little more of what were asking for?
- Fiona Alexander: Hey, Alan, it's Fiona Alexander. I have a question.
- Alan Greenberg: Sure.
- Fiona Alexander: So for the folks that are on the call, and I'm sorry I just got in and have some computer issues, so I'm just logging into the Adobe chat now. But in terms of the challenges you all find in providing input and providing input to the specific questions the ATRT asked, I think they're very similar to the questions that ATRT asked last time. And did you guys provide input into that? And are you familiar with the three-year cycle that was coming and this kind of sort of comprehensive input was going to be asked of you all?
- Alan Greenberg: Mikey?
- Mike O'Connor: Hi, Fiona. This is Mikey O'Connor. I think I'm going to reamplify the bandwidth thing. I think that most of us probably do know all those things, but it's really a question of (inaudible). We've got all three of these constituencies that are on the phone with you today are dealing essentially with an avalanche of very difficult, complex issues that we're being asked to comment on all the time. And you may have missed my comment originally, but part of the problem with the questionnaire was that the questionnaire was extremely difficult to fill out, because the questions were so broad and required either trivial replies or replies that required quite literally in my case hours to think through. And then after putting in an hour or two thinking about a question, the questionnaire timed out and erased my answers. And that was the end of that and I didn't come back.
- Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Mikey. I think when we set them we understood how all encompassing they were in several different ways. And that's why we did try to emphasize that please answer what you feel comfortable answering, not necessarily everything. The time mode of the questionnaire did catch us unawares and then we found out we couldn't change it. So, for that we apologize. We were trying a new tool that hadn't been used widely, and we found out one of its limitations, unfortunately in a very painful way. Kristina.
- Kristina Rosette: Sorry I once to take myself off mute. We were, but the problem is that we -- and I hate to admit this publicly on a recorded call, but we just don't have the capacity really to do as much strategic planning as we want to do. I mean, we know that there are issues coming up that we want to be focusing on, and it's quite candidly, very, very challenging, given our volunteer capacity, to be able to do that. And yes and we did put in comments that are even the last (inaudible). So I wish I could be saying something different, but unfortunately we just really are in a situation where we are having to really do triage on a short-term basis, which I think in the long-term is not helpful, really for the either the (inaudible) or ICANN (inaudible).
- Alan Greenberg: Yes, that begs the question of how to we fix that? And you kept on using volunteer. Is the fact that we're asking for a volunteer and essentially donations from the various parts of the community into very substantive work one of the core issues? Or is it not really that that but simply we're dealing with busy people who are never going to focus that much of time on ICANN? Either Kristina continue or Mikey if --
- Kristina Rosette: No, I mean, I don't think it's that there's indifference, it's just I think for by and large within our constituency I don't know that there's anyone within our constituency for whom ICANN is a primary job responsibility in terms of allocation of time. So just trying to ensure that we are kind of participating coming up with the substantive comments I mean it's certainly not indifferent. Far from it but we just have not figured out a way with the number of participants that we have to accommodate that. And while we're talking about volunteers, ICANN relies on volunteers, so I can tell you that ICANN's recent

decision to issue W9s to all US volunteers who receive travel support has rubbed (inaudible) folks the wrong way. So that's something that we can talk about some other time. But I yield (inaudible).

Steve Crocker: Kristina, has that been mentioned or conveyed to anybody?

Kristina Rosette: Well, Steve, as soon as we got the information, I -- again, speaking in my personal capacity, I talked with my HR folks and obviously my special responsibility folks, because then if we're talking about work are we talking about a client relationship? And then you go down a whole rat hole that none of us really want to think about. And I sent a very controlled e-mail to the accounting e-mail address that was provided, and I got a kind of partial response on Friday. So I'm still trying to kind of get that sorted out, but I think has there been a formal IPC comment on it? No. Is it something that folks within the IPC have been talking about? Yes.

Steve Crocker: I'm personally interested in this as part of a broader theme that is a whole lot less lofty than the big issues that we're dealing with within ATRT. But feel free to cc me if you wish.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Steve, I'll give a partial answer from ALAC on that, even though I'm an ATRT member. We reacted very quickly, especially to the requirement to have the WAB in from non-residents filled out. We sent a message to accounting; we got curt boilerplate answer back saying we need it. We can't tell you anymore. We escalated, we were told we have an answer within a week. That week has been deferred weeks and weeks and weeks. We're now a week away, or close to a week away from needing to get the per diem sent out. We don't know if people are going to get them or not. And we still don't have an answer on whether it's really required from people who never set their foot in the US and are not being paid for services. So there's a problem there.

Steve Crocker: Gee, I thought there was just a little nest, it turns out to be a whole beehive.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. We have I think Elisa next. Kristina, your hand is still up. Were you finished? Elisa?

Elisa Cooper: Yes. So I wanted to go to something that Fiona said and she asked a question about whether or not we were aware that this was every three years and we had submitted three years ago. Frankly I was not involved with ICANN to this extent three years ago and within the BC there are many new members who are not going to have that continuity to know sort of what was done. And I think that's something that's sort of a bigger issue that we're constantly dealing with. New members and in business in particular people change jobs and they change roles frequently. And so we may not have that continuity.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Olivier?

Olivier Cerpin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I have a question actually. To those who said that the priorities so far have been they've so busy in the process of policy development and producing comments, et cetera that they did not have enough time or that it wasn't seen a priority to respond to the ATRT. And I wondered whether there was an understanding, a good understanding of what the ATRT does. Because I've heard this issue of everyone being so busy in ICANN again and again. And I guess our own communities -- all of our communities are in the same boat.

But the ATRT actually is the part of the organization that would be able to make a difference and that would be able to make recommendations -- formal recommendations

to the board about this. So, I just find it strange that we all say we're too busy, but at the same time we're not taking the chance of making ourselves possibly less busy in the future. And that could be attributed to people not knowing what the ATRT can or cannot do. I just wonder. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Olivier. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Oh hi, this is Steve Metalitz. Is it appropriate to turn to the questions that you posed prior to the -- I guess we've been mostly talking about number three. But is it appropriate to address one of the others now?

Alan Greenberg: It certainly is.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I'd like to actually focus on number six and broaden it a little bit more. I don't know what was in the BC statement, but the issue that I think Kristina raised early in the process, which was how the public comment system is working. I think if you look at the people on this call and you're talking to some very avid and active participants in the public comment process. And I know that I almost never read the summaries that are prepared by the staff of the public comments without kind of sinking feeling that they either didn't get it or they're not giving certain comments much weight or that half the time it seems as though that public comment summary is just written to provide enough window-dressing to say we're not changing our mind on anything, but we read your comment.

I think sometimes the problem goes even beyond that. And I'll just refer to the public comments on the registrar accreditation agreement. The ones, I think they were posted in March, and that comments were filed at the end of March, March 28. So the IPC filed comments on a number of issues, several of which dealt with Whois and the Whois accuracy specification in the proposed RAA. So we had a lot of very specific comments, redlines, change -- we think you should change this requirement, here's why. And in order to do that you would also need to change this. So we were trying to be as helpful as we could and to explain why we felt that these changes should be made.

When we read the summary of public comments, we saw this paragraph at the end on page 19 of the comments -- the summary prepared. And it said well, you know there's a lot of work going on on Whois. There's this expert working group and there's -- ICANN is committed to reinitiate work towards the proxy privacy accreditation program. So far as I've seen that work has consisted of one workshop that, parenthetically, that I participated in in Toronto and it was kind of planned about 72 hours in advance.

And it says further revisions to the Whois related obligations in the draft 2013 RAA were viewed as inappropriate in light of this pending work. Well all of this pending work, to the extent it was really work, existed at the time that the agreement was put up for public comment on March 7. If we'd known that ICANN was really not interested in public comments and wasn't even going to analyze them or discuss them on the Whois accuracy specification, we probably -- well, we wouldn't have been happy about that but we certainly could've put our time to better use, the limited time and bandwidth that we've all been talking about.

And instead, if you look at our comments that was probably the single area that we devoted the most detail to. And so now the staff tells us well, we didn't really want comments on that because there's other stuff ongoing. That's a standard refrain about Whois. The staff is always eager to dodge -- seems eager to dodge these questions. But if we'd known it in advance, maybe we could have had more active public comments instead of spending our time on something that apparently the staff had decided they weren't going to consider anyway.

So I would urge you to look at the public comment process in detail, not just in terms of how the comments are analyzed and responded to, and Kristina's already raised that, but also in terms of this kind of activity, sort of a bait and switch process, where comments are sought on something and then we find out that they didn't really -- weren't really interested in comments on this at this point. They were deferring them to some unspecified point in the future.

That is I think a frustration that many of us who have participated in the public comment process very actively feel. Maybe it means that we shouldn't spend so much time working on public comments and I guess that would give us more time to respond to questionnaires from the ATRT, but we're not usually here frankly to address those questions. Our main interest is in addressing the policy issues that are subject of the public comments. And when this type of thing happens, I think it reflects very poorly on ICANN's commitment to real accountability and real transparency. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Steve. We have Mikey and Elisa in the queue, but Steve, I have a follow-up question for you. Do you see that there is a substantive difference between the comments that are essentially put out by staff and the comments that are put out by policy working groups in that although for the latter, although there is a staff summary, they are also addressed point by point, certainly in the last couple of years, by the working group. And typically come up with addressing why it is going to do something or not do something on a particular comment. Do you see a substantive difference between those two or are you putting them all in the same category?

Steve Metalitz: No, I think in my experience there has been a substantive difference. I'm thinking of the - - when we had the Whois drafting team, that's not really a PDP thing directly, but we did the ALAC and GNSO Whois issues drafting team or something like that title. We did go through them individually and respond to them, make changes in response. Granted the volume of comments was not all that high on that, but I think there is a difference, yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, because the reason I mention it is because those do have a staff summary, but that's not the final thing the public gets on it if they are interested enough in to look into the details. And I was wondering if in your mind it made a difference. Mikey.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks, Alan. It's Mikey. I'm going to pile on with Steve, except I'm going to pick a different comment cycle. I posted it into the chat, but I want to bring it up into the audio transcript and that is the budget. I hate to do this, I hate it when people quote their old jobs, but I used to be the controller of a \$2.5 billion university and I can't figure out this budget process. And if I can't figure it out then I can't imagine a normal policy oriented constituency member can even begin to.

And after puzzling my way through a couple of multimillion dollar arithmetic mistakes, and data that changes from year to year in format so I can't compare it, I'm struggling to get my constituencies through putting a comment together, which we did and I was pretty proud of our comment. And getting a promise from the controller's office that we would see their reply by the 21st of this month, and now finding that reply is not yet published. And that the deadline for the board reviewing the budget and approving it presumably it's supposed to be done before the fiscal year starts which is now been pushed back to Durban.

I just kind of want to throw down the gauntlet here and say look, part of the reason why we don't respond to this stuff all the time because it's badly crafted and it's badly managed. And you guys in the staff community should really think hard about getting your act together. Sorry to be so grouchy, I don't like to be grouchy but there you have it.

Alan Greenberg: All right. I have a comment and I could add, but I will hold myself because we have a long queue. Elisa.

Elisa Cooper:

Yes, so I know you did have a couple of questions on the BC statements. I wanted to quickly answer those. So, number four was use the term material new obligations. And I recall what we were really trying to get at there was if there was a requirement that had some new contractual obligations, that would be an example of something that was material. So before looking to try to define really when it was something really new, something that was major that would impact contracted a party's ability to complete a task that that would be something that would be considered material.

And then the next question, which we haven't addressed, that was in the BC statement was about this trend for top-down decision-making in the way workgroups are established. That has to do with the fact really what were talking about here their -- the one that comes to mind is the meeting strategy working group, which I believe that was one where they requested that basically one candidate from each stakeholder group would be selected or something along those lines, which puts us in the CFG in and a very difficult situation because then that forces us to spend a bunch of time negotiating between the three of us.

So between the IPC, the CEC and the IFCs we've got to identify a single participant to participate, which is just given we've already talked about how we're sort of overburdened on often unable to respond to comments? Well, adding that additional requirement for us to negotiate who gets to be on a committee or who gets to speak on a panel is basically more time wasted in our opinion -- in my opinion. So that's what that comment has to do it. And then I think we've kind of covered number six already with Steve's comments.

Alan Greenberg:

Okay, thank you. We have Jeff Brueggeman.

Jeff Brueggeman:

Hi, thank you. I just wanted to follow on to some of the comments that have been made and try and translate that into perhaps some constructive input into what's working well and what could work better. I think you're hearing a lot of pent up exhaustion and somewhat frustration about just the daunting process of ICANN, which has been a long running issue. In some ways I see signs that ICANN is trying to address that and I think some of the issues we're talking about today about the ATRT have broader applications.

So trying to crystallize the request for input as much as possible and to Elisa's point make sure that there is good information so that you're assuming that if someone was coming into the ATRT2, with absolutely no background, what would be good for them to have as a starting point? I think that's something that ICANN can help get better inputs by being very crisp and clear for the community, especially for new participants, about what the issues are and getting people up to speed as the first step to then getting input.

The other is the frustration that Steve and others have mentioned, which is in order to be incented to provide input, you have to feel like your comments are going to be -- have a meaningful impact on the process. And I would say I think what I see the board doing with the GAC advice where they lay out the reasoning and very clearly hear the issue, here's our response and here's why, I think that's been a long-running request by the community as a whole to say that level of rigor and responding to public comment is what's going to make people both feel better about participating and feel better about the outcome of the process, whether or not they got what they wanted.

And then finally I think the third big issue is just the overwhelming amount of issues and work means that the more things are moving quickly and proceeding along and prioritized, as we will talk about before, I think that's going to be an important part of the process. And that's why I think the BC has focused so much on trying to improve the policy development process, because that's -- if that is viewed as the black hole then that really is a deterrent to getting people to participate in ICANN.

So I thank you very much for giving us all the opportunity to meet with you today and give these comments. And I think as the ATRT2 develops some specific recommendations, I think the community certainly understands the importance of this proceeding and will provide more feedback to you through various forms over time as well. So I would just say keep up the engagement. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. We still have Kristina's hand up, I assume that's an old one, Mikey? Or was that a false hand, Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: I'm checking to see if that is indeed an old one for Kristina. (Inaudible)

Alan Greenberg: It was in the queue before --

Kristina Rosette: It's not, but I'll yield to someone -- I'll yield to Mikey (inaudible).

Mike O'Connor: No, no, go ahead, Kristina.

Alan Greenberg: No, go ahead. Kristina. I'm sorry.

Kristina Rosette: Okay. Just to kind of trickle back and try to get to the questions and provide some -- following Jeff Brueggeman's lead, some constructive input. It's my understanding with regard to the current GNSO PDP process that we have not yet seen a full PDP under the new rules and procedures. So I think the jury is still out. I know that in terms of the -- if you put it to them as a timeline, the amount of time that is required to go through the whole process is still very long.

And I understand that obviously you want to make sure that when you are developing consensus policy, or are in a process that could lead to the imposition of consensus policy, that you need to be very balanced and thoughtful. But I think to some extent that impedes the agility that may sometimes, particularly in this state, be necessary. So my sense is that after we see a couple of these go through the whole process we will be able to provide better input. But my instinct is now at a minimum that there needs to be some thought about are there ways to condense certain parts of the process or to expedite them in certain circumstances?

In terms of the question time that obviously this is a BC comment but just I wanted to just clarify something from my understanding in that going back and looking at the BC statement with my understanding that the reference to the trends in top-down decision-making was made solely in the reference to non-ATRT and even in working groups. And the way it's phrased here on the question seems to suggest that it might be broader, that wasn't my understanding. So if I misunderstood, I apologize. But if I am correct, I think it's probably helpful to note that.

And in terms of the comment what type of evidence, I think following on what Steve and Jeff both said, and picking up on the point that Alan had alluded to, I think it's very helpful to have a more specific mechanism within the public comic summary or even as part of the board's rationale to identify. We received -- and obviously can't necessarily respond to every single comment, but to be able to group them in a way that is fair and objective has not always frankly been the case. And to be able to say we understand that there is a strong view that, et cetera, and this is why we decided to do X.

The question I have for you all is I keep going back to the actual affirmation of commitment. And I guess I'm just trying to figure out where do things sit? Which review team takes up things that don't necessarily get in one, two or three? Is it you all?

Alan Greenberg: It depends what the thing is, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: I'm thinking kind of implementation of PDPs. Broader -- Mikey had referenced earlier, some of the issues and concerns that the ISPs have had about the budget, which I can tell you were shared by the other constituencies. Technically, that wouldn't really seem to fall into a 9.1a but maybe because there's nowhere else to put it. I mean I'm just trying to get a sense of that for further reference.

Alan Greenberg: Well, I can give a quick answer. Certainly when I look at the policy process I don't think you can separate implementation because it doesn't have any end effect until it's implemented. So I certainly think implementation could be deemed to be under there if also it relates to how well the public embraces the decisions of ICANN because that speaks directly to how the policy changes it makes are embodied. So I think certainly those kind of things can sit either place. Exactly where we'll put it remains to be seen.

The budget issues, clarity of budget I think comes right down to number A on judging whether the board, which essentially is the entity that has to approve the budget and controls the staff who create it, I think it falls into there.

From my point of view, issues should be raised, if they really don't fit anywhere we'll say so. But if it fits under 9.1 logically, then I think the intent of this ATRT anyway is to try to see where it fits within its scope. And we've received a number of things that we're a bit unclear as to whether they're really within our scope or where they fit, but we're doing our best to try to put that.

One very quick comment to Kristina on the revamped PDP. The group that revamped the PDP did a lot of work and changing a lot of details but it didn't really change the overall process and to get more people involved, or to change the overall way it works. So although there certainly were a lot of changes, and yes, you're correct, no PDP has actually gone all the way through to implementation yet. It wasn't a substantive change that really addressed the kinds of things we're looking at, although it did make it longer. I'm afraid that group was guilty of that.

And next we have Fiona.

Fiona Alexander: Yes, (inaudible). I just had one other question, not specific to what was asked of you guys, but just something that I thought about as I was listening to the responses, which have been very helpful. You guys have raised a lot of concerns about the volume of work and the need to coordinate and how to get all the new people involved, which is important. Have you given any thought to or I would be curious as to whether or not you think the subdivisions within your structure are helpful or harmful in any way? Or both?

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, is that a real hand or a magic one?

Mike O'Connor: It's a real hand.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Mike O'Connor: And let me segue out of Fiona's question because I think that where I was going to comment fits with that. Some time back up in the chat I posted a little rant that I did months and months ago about working groups, which is something I'm sure you all know I'm pretty keen on. And one of the nice things for me is that I hang out way down at the working group layer and that's where the silos don't fit.

And so for me the -- to the extent that there are issues brought up by silos, they are less of a problem for me because I hang out in working groups. So I don't think it's the structure of the CSG and the rest of the non-contracted party houses is that a big deal, but that's because I live underneath it. And to that extent, let me just reemphasize that the reason I pasted that little link into the chat is because I would like my little rent to be part of your

record and be considered in your deliberations. I don't want to drag you through it today but to the extent that you have questions about it I'm happy to answer them. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Mikey. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. I guess my response to Fiona's question is, she asked about subdivisions within our structure. We don't view the constituencies as subdivisions within a structure. We view the structure, the CSG, as something that was imposed upon us by ICANN. And we're doing our best to work within that framework. But it was never contemplated by us and it's made clear in the CSG charter that in terms of policy development constituencies are maintaining their integrity and their autonomy.

So I think there is a problem with the structure but I think the way the question was phrased part of the problem is the disconnect between how people outside the system view the structure. They're looking at an org chart and they see three subdivisions whereas in fact for those of us who have been active in the constituencies for the last 14 years, this has been a dome that's been forced down on our constituencies by ICANN. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Steve. We are at the 56-minute mark of the hour. Are there any additional questions or comments, or does anyone from the ATRT review team want to provide any final questions or summaries?

In the absence of one, I'll give one in the relation to the W9 form that I think Kristina mentioned and the corresponding ones for non-US residents. Certainly there is a perception at this point that (A) they're not needed except as a convenient thing for ICANN to ask from everyone whether they're really legally needed or not. And it's the kind of, not penalty, but demand put on volunteers, which sometimes makes one question should I bother?

And I think ICANN needs to -- and ICANN staff need to look at those kind of things and saying are we really showing volunteers we appreciate them? Or are they being treated in such a way that we're encouraging people not to bother to participate? I think that's a really important aspect of how we try to attract people. We clearly need to provide education and tutorials to direct people where to go if they don't already know. And we have a huge problem there, everyone knows that. But I think there's the subtle messages we send also. Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: Sorry to butt in again but this is my key. And I just have to say one thing. The reason that I participate in ICANN is because ICANN is this amazing organization that does this incredibly cool thing that's ultimately important to the world. And for me, it's a blast. It's a lot of fun. It's incredibly rewarding and I really want to leave the final taste in your mouth that there are an awful lot of people who really enjoy what they do for this organization and I think that there's room for a lot more. And I think that we need to get better at welcoming the others who want to do this stuff. Because when it's working right, when there's a working group that's really running in a tight team and doing a great job, there's nothing better. So it's just got to stick to (inaudible).

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Any other comments? We have one minute left. We have several people typing. The chat is going to be preserved so we will be able to see that, but if anyone has a last word, this is the time.

Not having any and we're just about on the hour, I thank everyone for attending, both CSG people of the three different independent constituencies and ATRT people. And hopefully when we come up with our final report you'll see some of the issues that you've identified be addressed and hopefully enough successful in a proper way. Thank you all.

Steve Crocker: Very nice job, Alan. Thank you everybody.

Speaker:

Thank you.