
NATHALIE PEREGRINE: ...discussing the policy management process system on the 14th of November, 2014. On the call today, we have Yasuichi Kitamura, Gordon Chillcott, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Glenn McKnight, and Sarah Kiden.

We have an apology from Ali AlMeshal.

And from staff we have Ariel Liang and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you so very much Nathalie. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh, chair of the Technology Taskforce, and I should say co-chair of Technology Taskforce at this point. So, on this call today, we're going to be looking at one of the key ATLAS 2 recommendations coming out of the At-Large summit at London, and that is in regarding recommendation 26.

Recommendation 26 reads as follows, let me just read it for the record. "Current management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable policy management process system, available for you across the supporting organizations and advisory committees, in order to," and several bullet points here, "Enhance knowledge management, improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities, improve cross-community policy specific activity, enhance policy development metrics, facilitate multilingual

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

engagement, create a taxonomy of policy categories, and provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers.”

The ATLAS 2 implementation group assigned this task to three working groups, the technology taskforce, social media, and the capacity building working groups. And given that, we are supposed to present, at the next ICANN meeting in February, how this recommendation is going to be implemented.

I thought it would be useful to offer a special purpose call to start the discussion on this particular recommendation. Just to give some background from this recommendation. This recommendation came from thematic group five, which dealt with At-Large engagement in ICANN. I believe since then, the recommendation was discussed by the SO AC chairs, and there was some, I believe, some broad agreement that the current policy management process in ICANN is insufficient, so there is, I think, this really does have the potential to change ICANN and the ACs and SOs for the better.

So, well I’m trying to think what will be the first step in trying to understand this, or how do we think we should look at how we should try to write something to implement this. In ICANN there is now a new person, the Chief Innovation, Ashwin Rangan, who is the sort of CIO. And I wanted to really [inaudible] to have clear ideas as what we want in a policy management process system, before we schedule a future call with them.

So this support is probably the first one to try to bring what we want in this system. I’ve described the policy management process system

within ICANN as a kind of, something from the 20th century in that it's all of the processes, it's a very manual process. We have SOs and ACs to fill out a form, which is then handed over to the web development team at ICANN, which then puts it up on a webpage.

And I guess I'm trying to find the right analogy, it's like what happens then is that we do a lot of scribbling on the notes on virtual pieces of paper, and send it out to everybody, the way it's copied and rewritten, and sent out again to all of the various persons. So it's not [inaudible] any way at all. And it's a very manual process that is to look at the policy, to look at comments even.

A mailing list is typically setup, but it's not really intuitively aware of where this mailing list is, where you can see the comments. You're not notified when there are comments posted, for example. And as an [inaudible] for our At-Large policy development process, it's a lot of manual copying and then, copying and pasting and retyping of information. Which I think is being handled quite well, but whereby At-Large staff, in particular Ariel Liang, the policy coordinator, but it takes a lot of time to do it, it's time consuming, because it's a manual process.

So, I think I'll just stop here at this point, and just open the floor to any comments, or questions, or observations, if anybody wishes... Olivier? Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Dev, it's Olivier speaking. So, thanks for the introduction, and I just wanted to add one small thing. At the time when I was chair, I did share this contact with other SO and AC chairs.

There wasn't very much response at the time because not all of the chairs were totally aware of what they were doing in their own community. But the SSAC has already started some work ICANN ITN with the Chief Information and Innovation Officer, Ashwin Rangan, on another system which is more like a document processing system.

They have very strict guidelines on how the draft documents, and so they're looking at a system that would provide different types of priority and of privilege to different people who draft documents together. We make use, of course, of the wikis to draft things together, we make use of Google Docs. The SSAC has sometime, also some very sensitive documents that they draft, and therefore they are unable to make use of Google Docs, and they certainly do not use the wiki either.

So, in a way, there is some work that has started, and they are in a very early stage as well, but I'm not 100% convinced that this is the sort of thing that we will [inaudible]...

Okay, the echo is gone. So in effect, I think what our community will really benefit from is having a system that will manage the flood of information first, so some way to reduce the amount of information that comes to their mailbox, and that goes hand in hand with a taxonomy of the different topics that the At-Large has to comment on, and from that taxonomy having a system that will only notify subject experts in our community, or people who are interested in specific topics in our community about the process, and make it as easy for them to be able to, one, take part in the processes, so not just with the mailing list which flood your mailbox, but obviously point them to the

right locations where we are currently working on a document, or on a statement, or on a project.

And at the same time, track the progress for everyone, it has become, with some many threats, some many things happening in parallel, it has become increasingly hard to keep track of everything. So the whole concept of tracking is something to really help. And I think, in effect, I would suggest that we independently put together what our requirements are, what we think will be cool, will be good, and not put any barriers to what we would like to see.

And then afterwards, of course, we would be able to take it over to Ashwin Rangan and see what can be done, and work with the IT Department in finding out how much that would cost, if it's a multi-year project. I don't believe it's something that we can do in three months, and it's not a project that can be implemented right there and then. It's something that is much more complex, that's a longer term project, but if we don't like the recommendations and the details, a little bit like the spreadsheet, if you want, of what we need, that really is a first step forward.

If we don't do that, then we're not going to get anywhere, and unfortunately, we might have a system that is imposed on us that doesn't even do 10% of what we would like it to do. So that's the purpose of the start that we are at now, and let your imagination work on this. That's it, for the time being. And I'm sorry, I'm not on the Adobe because I'm travelling, so I'll be shouting my name out if I need to intervene, if that's okay with you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. This is Dev. Certainly shout away when you want to make an intervention. Okay, I see Gordon. Gordon, go ahead.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thank you Dev. Gordon Chillcott for the record. A couple of observations. What I heard from you, and it's a rather good description of the situation, is in part, at least, a communication problem. If I can add to that a little bit, there is time problem. One of the items in here seeks to improve the effectiveness of the all ICANN volunteer communities. One of the factors that has to be born in mind is the turnaround time inside of that community.

My own ALS is a face to face meeting organization, which exists within the greater area of the city, Toronto. But even with us getting together to discuss something and to come up with a recommendation, as an ALS, is rather difficult to do. I short-circuited that within my own ALS rather heavily just in the last little while because of a survey that came out that I'm trying to get input on.

This is not easy. One of the difficulties, as you know, with getting commentary back from the community, is the fact that it's very difficult for most ALSs to get together and discuss it. So what you wind up with in a lot of cases, unfortunately, is the personal view of the primary contact of the ALS who is in that organization. For me, at least, trying to engage my own ALS, that's not good enough. So that is a reality that has to be born in mind because what you have is information just going

out to the communities, and attempt to get some response back from them.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. All right. Indeed Gordon. Thanks, this is Dev. So, just some observations here, of course, anybody can raise their hand if you want to add any comments here. Olivier, indeed, I think one of the challenges through the policy management process system, is that it's very hard to find out what the situation of how this policy comment or issues being tackled within the other ACs and SOs.

And I think, and often we are often accused of working in silos, and not trying to do more cross-community type, being aware of what the other communities are thinking. So if the system would allow for, okay, here is the policy that's being worked on, or policy results for public comment, here is the spaces for the wiki pages, or the document where the SOs and ACs are working on, I think that will obviously go a long way because often what's happening afterwards is that positions are taken at the end, or close to the end of the public comment.

And it's very hard reconcile any differences and so forth, and I think we often... An observation I've noted is that the ICANN Board is often saying that for the advisory committees that we need to be more involved in the policy development, rather not just commenting at the end of the policy, but it's very hard to find out what is happening in the SOs. Gordon, I think, indeed the communication challenge is to get the information out there, then get the information so it goes out to the

primary ALS contacts, then they are supposed trying to get feedback within the At-Large structure.

And indeed, I suspect what is happening, a lot of times the primary ALS representative, meaning one or two persons able to, well they just have to speak on behalf of the ALS. So the idea of the ALS representative sends it out to the ALS, and the public, regarding the input there and channel it back up. That doesn't happen. And I think, unfortunately, the timeframes that are given for public comments for 21 days, in some cases, sometimes 30.

Although I believe the policy comment will be changing. I'm just trying to remember what was the last communication from this from David Olive. But the time period for responding to these public comments, is going to be improved or be increased. So any other comments or questions? I see Glenn has posted quite a few stuff in the chat. Glenn, do you want to just take the floor? Thank you. Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Hi, it's Glenn McKnight for the record. There is, this task, it's huge. It's like eating an elephant and where do you start? And we start with the first bite. This is not an easy situation, because if you look at the scope of the project, it also starts talking about stuff like, how do I limit the number of emails? How do I get them efficiently? How do I make sure that I have adequate time to comment.

This is a serious problem with ICANN, and it's just not limited to policy. Action items, for example, get buried or lost, or never to be seen again with RALOs. This is quite a serious situation, but just on the policy front,

I had the opportunity to be at ARIN in Chicago, and I was studying their processes for bringing in public comment. And I've given a flowchart, I'll link to the flowchart, but what's interesting is the link that I've just with you, with ARIN policy development process, it has five basic steps.

And I'll just be very quick, need, discussion, consensus, implementation, and evaluation. I think there is some really good wording here. I think they have a very well documented, you'll see in the flowchart I shared with you, it might be an easy way for us to study best practice, and look at how we can, if it fits, massage the content, to make sure it works properly. Because if we go back to the Chief Innovation Officer and we want a tool, what is this?

Is this a hammer? Is this a jackhammer? Is it a stick of dynamite? This is, we have to very well define what the need and what the problem is, and then the second stage is some of the mechanisms or tools, because I know in my case, we've got, we did a project with IEEE and the UN Foundation on managing technologies, and it was an excellent tool similar to what we're trying to do.

And guess what? People didn't use it. So that's my comment.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you, thanks Glenn. Interesting flowcharts. I do recall that we also do have flowcharts of our policy management, how we handle policies. There is a one pager, and I recall that, for the At-Large improvements, there is a kind of a detailed flowchart as how we would handle the responses within the 21 days, 30 day comment period. And I can find the links of that and share that with you.

Okay, I think I found that for the At-Large improvements. And I realized I found it with the policy advice chart. Excellent. So you could see what similarities are between the ARIN and the, how the ALAC policy advice development process works. And there is a far more detailed one that was done for At-Large improvements back in 2011, and I think I have found the link here so I'll just post the link to that here.

So, okay. So I'm trying to figure out... So I suppose the best way to do it would be to scope out the current document, I guess document the issues problems, and then make suggestions as to possible solutions to these problems. I see that will probably be the way forward. Glenn, your hand is raised.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'm sorry, that's an old one.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. No problem. So yeah, I suspect the way to do it would be to document the current management processes as to why it's insufficient. I think we've covered a few of the points, a lot of manual copying and pasting, basically you have to receive everything because it's not, there is no taxonomy. So whether you are interested in WHOIS, IANA, you just have to get everything, and there is no way for you to set your permissions to say, okay, I'm not really interested in WHOIS, but I am interested in IANA, or I am interested in new gTLDs or so forth.

And then you would get a tailored communication, when the policy that interests you is being commented on or being worked on. Okay? So, I

think that's probably what we need to do. Document the policy management processes within ICANN, and then spend some time documenting why it's insufficient, then we look at, okay, those are the problems, here are some of the solutions. Gordon? Go ahead.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: It's Gordon Chillcott for the record. I just noticed something. Going over this list, one of the items is improved cross-community policy specific activities. I just realized, deep in the bowels of things here, there is, isn't there a working group that's studying the formation, creation, and charting of cross-community working groups?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed, that is being worked on. I have to say, I'm not particularly following it myself directly, but yes, there is, within the GNSO, there is a group working on, which is intended also to be a cross-community working group, on the, on how cross-community working groups can be chartered. I'm trying to find that policy, anybody have any idea about that issue?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Dev. It's Olivier speaking. So, there is indeed, a cross-community working group working on this topic on how to form cross-community working groups. Unfortunately, progress has been extremely slow and so far, all the more recent cross-community working groups have not been created using any specific role, this has been ad-hoc.

We've managed to find a way to get the team together first to draft the charter and then passing it on over to the rest of the people who are part of the cross-community working group once it is formed. I would suggest that we don't wait until the cross-community working group on cross-community working group yields results, because I have a feeling its progress is going to be in the way of months, many months, later rather than earlier.

Really, at the start, I think you've really put a finger on it. We need to find what our challenges are, what are challenges are, whether the challenges of our community are, and we already have plenty of knowledge about that, and start proposing things that are IT related, or processes that would really help us.

For example, we touched on the overload of information that is received by people in their mailbox. It goes further than that, once they go on a WHOIS related inquiry, or with a public comment, once they go on that page, that should also include all of the background to it, all of the previous statements that the ALAC has had as far as WHOIS is concerned. All of the work that has been done by the registration services working group, and the WHOIS working group that took place in the GNSO, the whole lot basically.

So that we really have an one stop shop where someone, even if someone is interested, has no idea about it, they can teach themselves very quickly about it because they would have all of the information at hand, and then be able to form their mind on it and build something on top of it. As you said, as Glenn said, how do you build an elephant? It's a huge thing, and maybe at the moment, we could just bring forth all of the things that we would need and then we would have to prioritize them afterwards, and then when we can present them over to Ashwin, and say, "Well, step one, we will really need something that will do this. Step two, we'll have another module that will draft into that, that we'll then go further. Step three, another module."

The whole thing just becomes one large piece of IT and processes, because I don't believe just a tool is going to do the work. There is going to have to be some people running the tool, some people in charge of it, both on the volunteer side and on the staff side. It's all about accompanying people through the process of then using those tools when they will be available. I spoke for a little bit more than I thought, but that's my thought for the time being. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks Olivier. This is Dev speaking. Okay, so I think first of all, I think, well say if you look at the current public comment page on ICANN, I mean I think what we're trying to do, we can start documenting, okay. So this is how the various ACs and SOs are supposed to work, and we go to this page, and we can't search, there is no way to find a history. And I think this is probably the way to approach it, and we can probably take a screenshot of the public

comment page and just point out, you know, we can even illustrate it, how can we find things?

How can we search for things? And you really have to dig a lot if you want to find out what was the policy updates that happen in say, last year or two years ago. It's very difficult. So I do note that, I see Glenn's hand is raised, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

You know, I have to reiterate, we may be very rich in policy, but very poor in capacity. You can come up with lots of different policies, but they have no light of day, there is no money behind it, and no will. So, you know, there is a reality check on what we're doing that has to be considered.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Okay. All right. Thanks Glenn. Also, I see Judith's comment that, just read this here. Here comment is that the current policy statements that ALAC can vote on are sent to everyone, even when they cannot also take part at that point. Well, actually Judith, that's not quite true. How the At-Large policy processes works, is that the policy, when it's created, the ICANN At-Large staff, Ariel, post, creates a wiki page for it, and then...

Well, Ariel posted a chart. And the idea is that the whole At-Large community communicates their thoughts about this policy. And then a penholder is then assigned, who tries to take all those comments into

account, and then only at the final stage does the ALAC vote on it. So it's supposed to be a bottom up process.

Let's see. Just thinking a little bit also, one of the things that's also been worked on our At-Large website, and there is a website design team, one of the things that's going to be happening on the website, and it comes back to that taxonomy I think, is the... We do have something like a topic area, where the idea being is that, if you're interested in only a particular topic, you will be able to click onto that section of the website, like labeled WHOIS, or new gTLDs, or whoever.

And you would get like some sort of a policy history or background, the intent is to have some sort of background about what this topic means, and then a sort of policy history of policies related to this topic was announced. So, I see Ariel is right on it, and actually posted a link to that wireframe right there. So okay. So I think that, you know, this kind of, having that taxonomy, having persons subscribed only to those topics, it's agreed to less emails, less the deluge of emails going to everybody.

So it's going to be much, much, hopefully, much more streamlined. Murray, go ahead.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: It's Murray speaking. Can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: We're not quite hearing you Murray. This is Dev. You may be muted. Okay, you're going to dial in, okay. Not a problem. While Murray dials,

gets connected... Okay. So let's see. I'm trying to think while Murray gets connected. Ariel, since you're the policy coordinator, do you have, share any insight to what has been said so far regarding the policy development process?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you very much Dev. This is Ariel for the transcript. So for the policy development process, the first step is when we receive a public comment request, I will create a wiki workspace for that. And then I will contact the chair, to forward Olivier and now Alan, and ask whether we need to issue a statement, or who I should contact regarding this public comment request, and then they will point me to the contact person.

And then I will ask the person whether we need a statement, and then that person will tell me whether we need a statement or not, and then usually they will become the penholder for a statement, if they decide to issue one. And so, this staff is a little bit limited, even though we know that all of the At-Large community people can write a statement, but because of that process only a few people were initially contacted, so kind of limit the scope in a way that only a few people can participate in the drafting process.

But now I'm wondering, the first draft is uploaded to the wiki workspace, we send out the call for comments, email, so that all the community members can comment on that statement. So that's open to all, which is great. And then after the comment process close, the penholders, well they will finalize the draft incorporating the

suggestions he received, and upload the final draft to the wiki space for the 15 ALAC members to vote on.

And then we will send out that announcement that the ALAC is voting on the statements. Then some members get confused, and they say, "Oh, why didn't get vote credentials or the link to the poll?" And I think that part, everybody is not very educated on. Only 15 people can vote, but not everybody knows about that.

So that's a part we need to build capacity for. And on the other end, after the vote ended, usually when our statements are going through votes, we already know they are going to pass. It's a very rare incident that something doesn't get passed. And so, anyhow, when they're passed, I will make them into PDF document with introduction, which is drafted by me, detailing the process, how this statement is made, and then I will summarize the statement in collaboration with the Chair, and I will submit that to the public comment process.

And the web admin to public it on our website. So that's the process. Yeah.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks for that succinct summary about the policy development process. And again, I note that, a lot of the things are manual process, you have to actually website, to update the website and so forth, and hopefully these manual processes will be, these handing off, as I call it, writing on a piece of paper and asking somebody else to process it on another department, will become much less.

I hope, Judith, that you understand a little bit more the policy process. Murray, are you connected now and able to make your comments? Okay, Glenn, well Glenn has beat you to it. Glenn, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Hi, it's Glenn. I didn't beat him to it, I don't know what happened to him. I just put my hand up and he disappeared, so I'm not sure what happened to Murray. I just want to get something clear on the policy process. So I understand how an idea goes through the process currently, I'm just curious on some numbers.

How much participation is there in terms of public comment? Are we having the same old suspects doing comments? We have over, what, 128 ALSs? I'm just curious on what percentage of people actually are participating in these policies.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Okay. Well, this is Dev. I suppose this is probably something that we will have to look at on our side of how the ALS are engaged in. I see, Olivier, I think, wants to say something. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Dev. It's Olivier speaking. Very good question from Glenn here. So, it really depends on the public. There are times when you'll have a couple of dozen people who will read it, and they might make comments, they might discuss it. There are times when you'll just have one or two, just the usual suspects. What's sure is that is not

enough. We need a lot more people to be able to read this, and to be able to understand it, and to comment on it.

The problem, of course, is the barrier is there. They land on this page. They've received the announcement in their mailbox, they land on the page, they're straight on the topic, and they might just feel discouraged just reading the introduction and thinking, oh, God, I don't know about this to even make a comment about that.

Because they have no idea about the history of it, as you mentioned. They have no idea about any previous statements that have been made. So there is obviously much to be done for that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed. Thanks Olivier. I thought I saw Ariel's hand up just now. Perhaps she was about to say something very similar. But Ariel, do you have anything else to add?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, thanks Dev. So I'm just pasting policy development platform pipeline to the chat, and then you can see, there is one column called assignees. That's the names of the penholders. And you can have a quick glimpse through it, they're mostly ALAC members, if not ALAC members, RALO leaders. But recently we had one person, Thomas [Davenport?], I think, [Lowenhaupt?], he is a NARALO ALS representative, and he, in collaboration with Raf and Leon, drafted a statement on the GAC subgroup geographic names.

So that's encouraging, but most of the penholders there are either ALAC members or RALO leaders at this point. Yes.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks Ariel. This is Dev. Just to add some additional comments, I agree with what Olivier and Ariel just said. The thing is, mind you, you see the penholders there but you don't really see the bigger [inaudible] discussion that happens on a mailing list, or on a working group mailing list, to discuss the issue. And sometimes there may be a lot of comments on the Wiki page by, that's open to all members of the community.

So there is some interaction there. The penholder is the one that crafts the statement based on the feedback of the discussion. Sometimes that feedback is not enough, and that penholder has to really come and make a judgment call as to what as to what the At-Large community wants. And at least, this is approved by what the 15 member ALAC committee when they look at the statement and so forth.

But the penholders alone aren't the sole persons, I'm just trying to point out that. I remember for one of the policy comments that I was working on, there was like 40 or 50 emails on this issue, within a short period of time. So there is an interaction there, but it's not as visible, or it's not easily seen. And that's why we always encourage, even though the email discussion happens, it's hard, really the best thing is to have it on the wiki, so all the community comments and feedback happens on one location, rather than multiple locations.

But that's a challenge. Sometimes that happens on the Skype chat, for example, which is not easily linkable. So, let me see. Murray, are you able to connect now or make your comments?

Okay, well Gordon, go ahead. I see....

GORDON CHILLCOTT:

What I'm hearing, I think, is the old, an old, old problem we've been having, and that's engagement. You can post something for a public comment, and I remember the first few times that I looked at something that was there for a public comment, what I was seeking out to comment was, something that it was obvious I was going to have do a serious amount of digging, before I could make any intelligent statement on it.

We're going to have to find a way to make the things on which people are going to comment, a little bit more clearer, or at least invite them a little bit to engage somehow. I'm looking at this policy advice development chart, and I'm seeing, what I'm seeing is a kind of [inaudible] very first one. I think part of the difficulty is, to get people at least to interested in a topic enough to keep them on so that they can make their comments on that wiki page, and at least get that part of the ball rolling.

Now the penholder is going to be very, very badly handicapped if there is [inaudible] and there are no comments.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, all right. Thanks Gordon. Let's see.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev, I have to go through security control. It's Olivier, so I'll be unplugged from my ears for a few minutes. And you might here some noises and things, but I'll put it on mute.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No problem. Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Dev. This is Ariel. I just want to comment on Gordon's comment about the process. [Inaudible] revamped At-Large website, we're actually having page envisioned, it's called "Get Involved." And on that page, we will have a section about the policy development process, and we're in the process of writing that section just to make it crystal clear to any member or newcomer to understand how this process works.

So hopefully this will help people to understand and be able to get involved in that process. That's just one thing I want to add. It's in the process, we're doing that writing part at this moment, but of course, we would welcome input from the community. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks Ariel. This is Dev Anand here. I was just scrolling through the comments while Murray is sorting out his connection problems to be able to speak, so Murray typed in, "Are the processes sufficient and will technology apply to a four process help."

I guess it's one of those chick and egg situations, right? If people aren't informed, then how are they going to be able to effectively participate, and so my thinking is it's a bit about, certainly the improvements that sort of the process can happen, but it does need, it's not technology alone, it's more about, as I say, it's about how the management system happens at ICANN itself.

Right now, it's a kind of, how should I put it? It's almost like the way the comment system works, this is a more personal observation if people want to disagree with me. The ALAC is almost seen almost like outside, you might as well become, I think, on something outside of ICANN, in the sense of the way this thing is presented is so very distant to us. And it's because the information is posted on that webpage, and it's very difficult to extract the information. And we go to some of the issues here, in that, okay, it's very hard to find the information, find the history, you know, if we do a search, and we just wind up with a lot of topics...

It's very difficult for anybody to make sense of, and it's very discouraging, I think, to any newcomer, as has also been mentioned on the call, to just look at this and say, "This is just too much, I can't make sense of this." So I think what the policy management process system, I think as I envisioned it, is that it's going to be something that's personalized to you.

So, as you are, the ALS that you're particular interest in, say, who is, and because you have an interest in privacy, for example, you're going to be, you will get more communication about that issue, and you'll be able to see not just what's happening in your, in the ALAC, but also what other

people are commenting on from the various GNSO constituencies, and maybe the SSAC and so forth, and that helps you build a better understanding of this policy issue.

So, Glenn, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Because of time, I'll be very brief. Yeah, Dev, you're getting into, moving forward, some of the mechanics of what this new system will do such as starting and refinement, and Judith brought a point up earlier too about unnecessary volume of communication to people who are not in the process. My comment is that I would really like to see a communication expert, read our communication, look at how things are being forwarded to the wider community, and assess whether or not we're doing a good job.

I think plain English is lacking, I think there is a lot of policy wonks that love this sort of stuff, but the vast majority of people want plain English, they want things summarized as abstracts, and we need some work in that area as well. It's not just the policies, but how we communicate in simple abstracts, in simple ideas. So then the relevance of what this policy is, and that's what is really necessary.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Yes. Glenn, I see some hands now raised here. And I see applause and plus one from Judith and Gordon on your comments. And indeed, obviously one of the things that also visiting for the At-Large at least, our policy process, is that when the policy comes up for comments,

ideally what would happen is that, because the persons who are more interested in the topic, and I guess we could say they were subject matter experts could then respond, and then perhaps elaborate as to why should I care, because when you see something like RITP part D processes, well it's not obvious as to why I should even bother to read that.

But if it says, if you have registered a domain name and you want to switch between a registrar, this is important to you. And then you might say, "Oh, okay. This is something that I need to read because I'm interested in that particular issue." So a kind of why should I care section could probably happen, but right now it's too much right now with the flood of emails coming in, and the process of announcing it to people, in itself, takes up some time. So that part, why should I care, probably isn't apparent until much later on towards the end of the public comment period.

Sorry about that. So I saw Murray, your hand is raised, go ahead.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: So it's Murray speaking. Just checking to see if you can hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. We can hear you.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Very good, thank you. I had trouble getting connected. So I just, as part of the process, I had to do a search on WHOIS, I typed it into the chat a

little while ago, so there is a search capability on ICANN dot org, and I just was curious as to what would show up if I clicked on WHOIS, and I did that. My question was, where is that information coming from? Because it's like a start, I want to know about the whole discussion of WHOIS, it goes back to 2001.

And it continues on through all sorts of things. So if you actually go to that page, anyone who wants to go to that page and do a search, I mean, that's like, how do I start with ICANN and WHOIS? And that's... Does anyone know where that data comes from? Is it all the archive data about WHOIS? And do I have multiple ways of searching it? That's the question. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. This is Dev. Well, I'm not sure if you noticed, the search is kind of strange because if you start interacting with the left, you start seeing lot more options being presented. So, in terms of how to refine the search. For some reason, it's about the English version. If you go to the different language version, you would see options popping up to break this down even further.

But even so, the problem is that it is all very static. Static webpages, how should I put it? I don't know how to describe it. This is kind of like a dumb search, in the sense that, all this is doing is just finding if the word WHOIS is mentioned in a policy statement, or in a text that was issued by any AC SO. So it's not really structured in anyway. There is no timeline to say, what happened here, what happened there. And obviously, it will require some sort of, somebody doing a proper wright

up to put these things into context, because right now, there is no context to any of these things.

It's just like, you know, so... Okay. I see we're almost coming to the top of the hour here, I think we got some ideas in our head as to what we need to do. Let's see. Well actually, we've heard from quite a few persons, but there are a few persons on the call that haven't said anything, and I just want to give them the opportunity. Kitamura? I hope I pronounced your surname correctly, do you have any comments or observations? You can either take the microphone or you can type something in the chat.

Similarly, Frank Dossou, if you have any thoughts or comments. I see Olivier wants the floor, go ahead.

Okay maybe not. I see Tijani has also joined the call. Tijani, do you have any... What we've done, one of the things moving forward is that we need to document how the current management processes are insufficient, and that gives us a starting point of well, once you've identified the problems, then we can think of brainstorming solutions, or ideas, of how these problems can be solved. Do you have any comments? It's just coming to the top of the hour.

So Kitamura, usually the policy development process of APNIC. So, okay, that's interesting. And I think Glenn, you pointed out ARIN's policy development process. So maybe one of the steps is also looking at, and I think this has also brought to our attention during the LA meeting, and it's probably something we need to study, the policy development processes at the RIRs, to see whether there are some

insights as to how they manage their policy management process, like how does a policy get put up for comment and so forth and things like that.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yeah. That's why I shared the links in the five step process, and the flowchart of ARIN. It's very similar to the other locations, but I can tell you, I sat through the policy process, and it's very efficient, and I think it's a very good model for us to duplicate.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. All right. So maybe that's one of those action items then, is to document, that if we get the documented links to the policy development processes at the RIRs, I think that's probably one action item we can look at, and then by reviewing that, maybe we can get further insights to the ICANN [inaudible]... Kitamura has also posted in the chat, that he's usually at the policy, that you're at the policy development process of APNIC, but ICANN needs to look further from the APNIC, and needs to get more opinions based on culture, or language, and so on.

So okay. And actually it also brings up another point here. To facilitate the multilingual engagement. Right now the multilingual engagement is sort of like a tact on afterthought, in the sense that a policy, at least for a public comment, and is only English. And then what happens is that, several days later, language services provides the translated document and it's kind of uploaded silently to the public comment page.

You know, so if you're not checking back frequently, you're going to miss it. So sometimes I think that the service for our diverse multilingual community, because they are missing out. Because potentially, when something is not in their language, it's kind of like well, that's that. There is no need for me to be involved. But if at the onset, different language versions are available of the policy that's under for comment is available, they could probably, as I said, they could start their personalization as a Spanish speaker, say, I want to see all of the links of the policy comments in Spanish, for example.

So that's one aspect we could also look at in terms of documenting. Okay, I see multiple persons are typing, and we are coming up to the top of the hour. Anybody else want to take the floor to say anything? And thanks Kitamura for comments. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Dev. I'm just about to board my plane. I think as next steps, we should be able to perhaps make a full shopping list of what we would need out of a policy management system. I think we've discussed other good points here, which is great. Put them down to paper and send them to our list, and see where we can take it from there. And we should have quite a long list, hopefully. Then we can make scratch on that. So that's the suggestion I would make. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you Olivier. And I think [inaudible]... Does anybody want to... Do you want to use the wiki on this? Or do we want to try to go to

Google Doc? I think a wiki might be sufficient at this point, at least in these early stages.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. A wiki sounds great, if everyone is okay with it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I'm seeing nobody objecting, raising, objecting to that. So let's just use the wiki. I'm seeing, Gordon agrees, Murray agrees, okay. So let's use the wiki, and I think we have started this process of thinking, okay, what are our problems? It's clear that we all agree that the current policy management process within ICANN is insufficient, so let's start documenting some of these issues.

So I think we'll just, let's create a separate wiki page underneath the recommendation 26, so we could just start documenting... So start to create a wiki page for documenting the current policy management processes. So that we can all start comment about how they are insufficient. And I think a lot of stuff was brought up in this call today.

And I think also, the second action item would be, let's find out some more about how the policy development process works at the RIR level, and see what system they are using, systems they are using to track policy comments and so forth, and maybe there are certain things that ICANN should be doing. Okay.

Any final thoughts, comments? I should say, Glenn go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'm sorry to do this on you Dev, but we did have a meeting earlier this week. Murray and I were asked to contact the ombudsman on his communication, I just want to report to the group very quickly, that I did chat to him, believe it or not. I don't know, he must have been an insomniac, but the same day he contacted me. And I posted my comments on the conversation with him.

It's to do with how he's using social media effectively or ineffectively, so if you guys have time you want to read my notes, but Murray and I will continue to follow on the second call with him.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. So very good, such progress is being made. Usually it would have been we have to write a letter, email and send it, it was good that you were able to have a quick dialogue with him, what almost instantly or such a short time. That's great work Glenn and to Murray.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: The reason I'm pointing this out, is that he said he's going to be meeting with Laura, who is the, with ICANN IT team on a new template. So this is perfect timing because if we can impress upon them that when everything rolls out, we can see it from a social media taskforce. Everything from, you know, synchronization of this to Facebook and Twitter, the size of the font, the use of pictures and video.

So I think it was an eye-opener for him. See that's why the dialogue is important.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed. Great. This is Dev. Thanks to Glenn and Murray on that. So it's good to see some immediate impact happening there. Just one little final thing, I don't know if, do we want to have more special purpose calls? This is probably the last item, yeah, on recommendation 26? So that we have special purpose calls just to deal with recommendation 26, and if so, well, what type of schedule would we want to do it on?

Okay. Let's see. We need to see what people are saying. Yes to the special purpose call, I'm seeing yes from Gordon, yes from Kitamura. Yes from Glenn McKnight. Murray says his time is limited, but keep him in the loop on that. Okay. So I think we would try to do another special purpose call, on recommendation 26, given the complexity of this, this elephant, as Glenn said earlier.

I'll send out a Doodle. Just let me ask you a question. It's November 14th, do you want to have it next week, or do you want to have it on the 28th? And we would just try to make sure we would have something put up on the wiki by then. Is the 20th okay, or do you think we need to have it sooner?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The 28th is okay for me. It's Olivier. I'm in the aircraft now.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, excellent. Seeing nobody objecting, okay tentatively the next call will be on the 28th and we'll do a Doodle poll, I'm sure, from staff to get the appropriate time on that. Okay, I think we can, I see green ticks all around. Okay, I would like to thank everybody for this. Very good call,

and good afternoon, good evening, and this call is now adjourned.
Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]