

Zoom Chat: 2021-10-20 At-Large Policy Session 3: Part 1

00:37:23 Devan Reed: Welcome to the At-Large Policy Session 3: ICANN Accountability and Transparency and the ICANN Reviews Part 1

00:39:15 Vanda Scartezini: hi herb nice to see you with us again

00:40:40 Michelle DeSmyter - ICANN Org: @Augusto - please stand by, we will dial out to you momentarily

00:43:47 Claire POPINEAU: Hello, could you send me the French number for connecting

00:45:07 Herb Waye Ombuds: Always a pleasure @Vanda

00:45:31 Herb Waye Ombuds: Hi @Cheryl

00:45:36 Michelle DeSmyter - ICANN Org: @Claire - I have sent you a private chat

00:50:13 Frank Anati: good day everyone

00:50:18 Frank Anati: Frank Anati from Ghana <https://www.linkedin.com/in/frank-anati>

00:52:24 Gerardo Martínez Hernández: Hola saludos desde Aguascalientes, México

00:55:12 Christopher Wilkinson: @priorities: were these assigned by the ATRT or by the Board?

00:56:05 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: @Christopher the ones in the video of Sébastien are the prioritise the ATRT3 assigned to each of our 5 Recommendations

00:56:12 Sébastien Bachollet: The priorities I gave were from the ATRT3

00:56:19 Sébastien Bachollet: Thanks Cheryl

00:58:04 Marita Moll: Would be great to have those objectives on screen somewhere -- kind of a reminder of the intentions

00:59:06 Patrick Kane: those objectives for the holistic report are on page 22 of the ATRT3 final report

00:59:15 Patrick Kane: holistic review

00:59:44 Marita Moll: thanks @ Patrick

01:02:33 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A review is an opportunity and will lead us to the further benefit of a more effective continuous improvement program in the AC and SOs as well as ICANN in general

01:03:24 Leon Sanchez: Saludos @Gerardo. Desde San Mateo Atenco, Estado de México

01:07:22 Gisella Gruber - ICANN Org: REMINDER - French and Spanish available on this call. Please contact staff if you would like a dial-out (private chat or by email [staff\[at\]atlarge.icann.org](mailto:staff[at]atlarge.icann.org))

01:07:34 Gisella Gruber - ICANN Org: And Russian! Apologies

01:12:09 Bill Jouris: +1 Steve

01:12:13 Gisella Gruber - ICANN Org: Kind reminder to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation

01:16:17 Holly Raiche: There appear to be two views of the Holistic review. Patrick Kane talks about the review as looking at the spaces between the SOs and Acs - how they work together. Steve's view seems to be to look at the structures themselves, or at least a power imbalance. Are both views of a holistic review saying the same thing/reconcilable?

01:16:23 Harold Arcos: Saludos @Gerardo! genial nuestros Fellowships siempre presentes ;)

01:16:35 Daniel Nanghaka: apologies am late

01:16:56 Leon Sanchez: Indeed @Holly hence the need to start as a pilot

01:16:59 Heather Forrest: @Holly - thank you for your question. I have noted it for our Q&A session which will follow

01:18:20 Christopher Wilkinson: @Bylaw amendments: Sébastien's presentation mentioned some changes. How is that going to work. Who holds the Pen? What is the negotiation and approval procedure for Bylaw amendments, post Transition?

01:18:43 Marita Moll: @Holly -- 2 sides of the same coin?

01:21:01 Hadia Elminiawi: 18 months

01:22:05 Marita Moll: @Eduardo -- I thought that kind of refinement was the role of the holistic review pilot

01:22:58 Christopher Wilkinson: @Holly.Noted. I lean towards Steve's concept. Concepts may be ultimately reconcilable, but not in terms of our investment in Time. We need to know which direction we are going.

01:24:28 Patrick Kane: @Christopher - the holistic review recommendation as a new review was contemplated as an inter-SO/AC/NC review and not an intra-SO review which is where I believe Steve was going

01:24:47 Holly Raiche: @ Marita - not really. Patrick Kane assumes the given structures and looks at their interaction. I think Steve is asking about the structures - I look forward to answers - and I think the bigger questions being asked need answers - maybe the pilot will ask those questions?

01:26:16 Patrick Kane: @Holly +1

01:26:34 Patrick Kane: on both parts

01:27:11 Vanda Scartezini: the constant improvement is nowadays basic for governance excellence and so not see any specific problem for all AC/SO to continuously perform such improvements. there is no lack of transparency since all documentation from AC and So are normally published and all movement under continuously improvements will also be published. for another side the holist review will give the opportunity to expose and exchange information and the needed changes among whole community.

01:28:20 Daniel Nanghaka: I agree with you Vanda

01:29:06 Christopher Wilkinson: @Patrick: Either way, the main issue is the glenjbar acceptability of the MSM. ICANN is doing quite well, but the experience of the pot transition Bylaws is an excessive imbalance arising from the behaviour of the contracted parties within GNSO. Unless this is corrected, the ICANN MSM model will not be acceptable long-term, notably with respect to competition policy.

01:30:09 Marita Moll: @Holly -- I would see the pilot as designing a path forward which could suggest big questions and ways of working through them

01:30:13 Christopher Wilkinson: glenjbar: that was GLOBAL, post transition

01:30:36 Daniel Nanghaka: @Christopher ICANN has done a lot in the MSM, alot of open initiative are available to ensure transparency and openness

01:30:45 Jeff Neuman: OK, i am going to make a controversial statement that I would love to hear a reaction to. Reviews should NEVER be prioritized over substantive work that we all have to do. Things like PDP implementations, for example, should ALWAYS be prioritized over implementing review recommendations unless there is a substantial justification.....ok.....discuss :)

01:31:35 Holly Raiche: @ Marita - I hope the result is more than a path. I hope the outcomes are about the structures, their interactions, and - to Steve - power balances

01:31:52 Patrick Kane: A community led prioritization process is key @Neuman

01:32:05 Daniel Nanghaka: @Jeff, Reviews have recommendations, these recommendations can be prioritized in the implementation of the recommendations

01:32:42 Daniel Nanghaka: Work is always done but how effective is the process.

01:32:47 Chokri Ben Romdhane: I Simply think we need a holistic review, to get homogeneous reviews based on a global view

01:33:11 Daniel Nanghaka: @Jeff unless you need to define what Work is in this case

01:33:39 Jeff Neuman: We have a job to do here, which is first and foremost to ensure the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet, and to promote and maintain a competitive environment for domain name registrations. That is always job #1

01:33:59 Patrick Kane: @Chokri - Interesting, can you expand on the homogenous objective

01:34:02 Marita Moll: @Holly - I agree with all that, but a pilot should be short and really focussed. Otherwise, we will never get to the real thing

01:34:16 Jeff Neuman: The more time we spend on as Alan Greenberg said the other day "Navel Gazing", the more we take our eye off the ball on what we are really here to do.

01:34:53 Daniel Nanghaka: @Jeff This is ongoing throughout and we cant take the eyes, the mandate of reviews remains relevant

01:34:54 Holly Raiche: @ Jeff - true, but the issue is who plays what roles and determines what pathways to ensure security, stability and resiliency

01:35:44 Marita Moll: +1 @Holly

01:35:53 Jeff Neuman: @Holly - ICANN is a corporation....the ICANN Board is the one with a fiduciary duty to ensure the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS.

01:35:59 Vanda Scartezini: Jeff I do not see conflict on do PDP - we are doing mostly of the time PDP work. the holistic review is something related to the general overview of our structure and if we have moving and progress accordingly with the whole evolvement of our mission and reason to be

01:36:48 Christopher Wilkinson: @Jeff Neuman: The delays have been brought upon themselves by the principal participants: PDPs have given us Vertical Integration, Concentration of Registry ownership and - more recently - no regulation of geographical names. The need for a more global responsible policy is essential The ALAC Advice to the Board on Subsequent procedures refers.

01:37:27 Jeff Neuman: @Vanda - i was disappointed to see during the prioritization presentation last week that implementing review recommendations were intertwined with review recommendations. In other words, the community could choose to prioritize all review recommendations over the implementation of PDPs. This to me seemed wrong.

01:38:13 Jeff Neuman: We can prioritize which review recommendations we can implement and when. We should never be prioritizing them, however, over PDP implementation.

01:38:24 Jeff Neuman: This is of course just my view.

01:41:07 Jeff Neuman: To force a choice by the community to either (a) review the structures of ICANN or (b) implement a new transfer policy to protect registrants is, in my opinion, not a choice that should ever be presented (in my view).

01:41:47 Holly Raiche: @ Jeff. The issue is NOT that the security, stability and resiliency should be the outcome of SOs and Acs. We are now asking about structures and powers within that corporate structure to achieve those aims.

01:42:10 Xavier Calvez - ICANN Org: The review-related recommendation from ATRT3 is offering ambitious mechanisms that are innovative for ICANN (though well-known). Prioritization and continuous improvements are not new concepts, but they are generally new in a multistakeholder environment. It will take constructive collaboration across the entire community to design and learn to carry out these new activities.

01:42:21 Jeff Neuman: The world looks to us to actually address issues that arise with respect to the management and administration of the DNS. In order to stay relevant, that is where most of the focus should be (in my opinion)

01:42:48 Chokri Ben Romdhane: @Patrick for if we are going to conduct review of each so/ac separately without any global we generate some conflictual issues

01:43:24 Daniel Nanghaka: @Chokri, which conflicts?

01:45:23 Pari Esfandiari: Thank you everyone

01:45:25 Gisella Gruber - ICANN Org: SAME Zoom room for part 2

01:45:26 Herb Wayne Ombuds: Take care everyone, stay safe and be kind

01:45:26 Chokri Ben Romdhane: functional conflicts for example with could generate some attributions conflicts between so/ac

01:45:33 Vanda Scartezini: @jeff agree the session was a good one but too short regarding the possibility to discuss details. In my view our main work is certainly guarantee policy shall be defined and implemented . since ever, reviews are interfering into the policy work and many of reviews is just waste of time and \$\$\$. the continuous improve will not allow to have a better focus on policy work since it will be a normal part of each AC/SO internal work without stop to explain their own work to external groups - many times with no clue about that specific Ac/Sp

01:45:36 Gisella Gruber - ICANN Org: Please join shortly before 18:30 UTC

01:45:51 Michel TCHONANG LINZE: Merci tous

01:45:51 Heather Forrest: Thank you, Seb. We'll be back together for Q&A when the session reopens.

01:45:55 Chokri Ben Romdhane: Thank you all

01:45:57 Jaap Akkerhuis: I need to step out for a while