

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
GNSO Council Public Admin Meeting
Wednesday 20th November 2013**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Attendance:

Attendance:
Chuck Gomes
Ching Chiao
Jonathan Robinson
James Bladel
Thomas Rickert
Volker Greimann
Gabriela Szlak
John Berard
Brain Winterfelt
Petter Rindworth
Osvaldo Novoa
Patrick Myles
Mikey O'Connor
Maria Farrell
Amr Elsadr
David Cake
Magaly Pazello
Klaus Stoll
Avro Doria
Jennifer Wolfe
Alan Greenberg
Daniel Reed

Staff:

David Olive, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund, Rob Hoggarth, Mary Wong, Berry Cobb, Glen de St Gery,

Jonathan Robinson: All new councilors are welcome at the table. The new councilors are the Council so it's all new councilors, please, at the table. When I said "old" I meant those that had remained on the Council and new councilors that are currently joining the Council. I think those that have left the Council shouldn't even be in the room taking the snacks, please, Jeff.

I'm going to cast my eye around. Are we - are we missing anyone obvious? Is there anyone that's...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: All right. So we'd better wait for him then.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: We're missing - I can see we're missing our Registry Stakeholder Group rep. Jeff, you - ah ha here he comes, the temporary alternate. Right, anyone else missing? Are we all here?

Glen, are you in shape to take a roll call?

Right, so welcome to all of you. Welcome to the 2013/2014 Council. What we might call welcome to the new councilors and those councilors that have remained on the Council.

In the first instance we'll take a roll call. I'll just give poor Glen a moment. So if we - have we started the recording? Thank you. So we're on with the recording. So just to be clear, this part of the Council meeting is twofold. We typically use the - the first part of the annual meeting to come back to the Chair election. That's with the new councilors or the newly formed Council.

And in this case we've also got a second item which is an opportunity to provide feedback and discussion with the ATRT2 team who we expect to join us at the top of the hour for half an hour.

Glen, are you in shape to take a roll call? Please go ahead, then.

Glen de Saint G ry: Jeff Neuman. No, sorry. Chuck Gomes. Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Glen de Saint G ry: (Unintelligible).

Man: Present.

Man: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Oh sorry. Yes, sorry. Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Gabriella Szlak.

Gabriella Szlak: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: John Berard.

John Berard: Yep.

Glen de Saint G ry: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Yes.

Glen de Saint G ry: Mikey O'Connor.

Mikey O'Connor: Here.

Glen de Saint G ry: Maria Farrell. Maria? She was here.

John Berard: Yes.

Glen de Saint G ry: Amr Elsadr. Amr? Not here. David Cake.

David Cake: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Magaly Pazello.

Magaly Pazello: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: And Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Daniel Reed, our new NomComm appointee is absent and his proxy has gone to Jen Wolfe. And, Jen, you are here.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, present.

Glen de Saint Géry: For our ALAC liaison, Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: And our ccNSO liaison, Patrick Myles.

Patrick Myles: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Glen. I see Maria has just joined us so if you could record her as present please.

Glen de Saint Géry: Maria. I do not see Amr yet. Has anybody - thank you so much. Thanks, (Rob). Thank you, Jonathan. Over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. So that was the roll call. We can note that there - we have Statements of Interest from James Bladel, Chuck Gomes, who is the temporary alternate from the Registry Stakeholder Group, from Gabriela Szlak, from Mikey O'Connor, from Amr Elsadr and Avri Doria and Daniel Reed.

So the next item is Item 2, the election of the chair. I obviously, as the incumbent chair, am happy to run this given that it's a ballot with - a secret ballot. If anyone has any objections I'll be more than happy to hand it over to

one of the new vice chairs, who I should make it clear, from all of your perspective, is Volker Greimann from the Contracted Party's House and David Cake from the Non Contracted Party's House. Yeah, welcome. Welcome to both of you as vice chairs.

And welcome, Amr and so we will record you as present.

So if - are there any objections to me continuing to chair through the election process? Seeing none, I'll ask Glen to distribute the ballots. And as you'll be clear by now, the ballot contains two options for myself as the sole nominee for the 2013/2014 Chair and None of the Above. You'll be familiar with the GNSO Operating Procedures, which allow you to vote for either the nominee or None of the Above.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I would just like to - this is Chuck Gomes. I'd just like to set the record straight. After I said would serve as temporary alternate I got confirmation that I could vote for None of the Above instead of voting for Jonathan so.

Jonathan Robinson: I trust you'll exercise your vote with due care, Chuck. So just for the record we pause to count the votes. Glen will count the votes with the oversight of the vice chairs.

Glen de Saint Géry: The results are unanimous, Jonathan is the Chair.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much, Glen. I wasn't sure what to expect. And I'm sure you've all heard enough from me so I'll just thank you all for your support and for your ongoing commitment as councilors but say not much more because I think you've probably heard enough of me over the last few days.

Now our next item is Item 3, which is an update and discussion with the ATRT2. Do we have representatives of the ATRT2 in the room other than those that are overlap with the Council in order to have that discussion?

Okay I understand they're on their way. I think it was scheduled for 3:30 was it?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so we'll just give them a few minutes. And just to set all of your expectations my anticipation is that we will wrap this up within half an hour. And in fact we probably need to do so in that we have a photographer waiting outside, amongst other things, in order to take photos of the whole Council and each individual councilor for record on the Website so that's the plan. John.

John Berard: Jonathan, while we wait I wonder if - because of the discussion we had about the working groups and because of the attention that the ATRT2 has given working groups and because of Mikey's public comments about how the two overlap, I wonder if we could encourage Mikey to give us a few minutes of his thoughts on that subject. But of course he left. Where did he go?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I think that would be welcome, John. And it's a welcome suggestion. I wonder, Maria, I don't want to put you on the spot but you've obviously been tracking this issue as well.

I wonder if there's anything you want to say in advance of that just to give us a summary of where you've got to and then we can hear from Mikey and then start our discussion because, after all, it's a discussion amongst ourselves and with the ATRT to give that feedback. So let's hear from you, Maria, if that's okay first, then Mikey and then from anyone else and we can take on to our discussion with the ATRT.

Maria Farrell: Hi, it's Maria speaking. So I guess I'm just going to draw attention to four things - well, three things really from the ATRT2 report. The first is some factual data which was the basis of the ATRT2 deliberations and that was provided by - a report by Interconnect. I think the headline - some of the headline from that that I would like to share with you is the representation of - the representativeness of working groups.

And I mentioned this a little bit in the session before now but let me give you some numbers. The total number, on average, across all the working groups over the last couple of years, 70% of all participants are from North America; 20% are from Europe and 10% - only 10% are from the entire rest of the world. So I think that's quite a - it's really quite a worrying number.

Some of the barriers to participation, clearly not everybody is a native English speaker. That doesn't seem to be such as much of a barrier as difficulties connecting. Obviously not everybody has brilliant telecom infrastructure. And cultural barriers in that we are very much a very Western and very - what's the word - adversarial culture...

Alan Greenberg: In your face.

Maria Farrell: In your face as Alan puts it. And that is a difficulty. But also I think that probably the greatest difficulty is the amount of time that is required to participate in the working group. And so we find these statistics show from the studies that have been done of our working groups the vast majority of people participate in a working group once and never come back. So we are scaring them off. And so that's a difficulty.

So in terms of what can we do? Well the ATRT2 report doesn't make a huge number of recommendations on representativeness because I think it's part of overall work that's being done. But they do - coming back particularly to their recommendations with regard to the GNSO PDP I think, Alan, may (take) me up on this but I think there are basically two main

recommendations, the first of which is that the organization should put more resources into face to face meetings for working groups.

And the second is that ICANN, the organization, should also look at funding the provision of professional facilitators for working groups. And if the ICANN organization is to do that then ICANN the community, particularly the GNSO community, needs to put some thought into when and how we use facilitators and what role they would have in working groups.

So I think that's probably, you know, the main information about the ATRT2 report that I would pick out as - maybe to help start off the discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey, would you like to follow on from - thanks, Maria, would you like to follow on from that? And then we can open it up to any discussion or see if there's any sort of consensus or feeling as to how we should feed this back to the ATRT2.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey O'Connor. I'm going to follow right out of the comments that Maria made and point to the same appendix at the end of the ATRT2 report, which if you haven't read it is must-reading for the Council. And I'm going to point to the same chart and use it to springboard into another very worrying, I think, strategic issue for the - for ICANN.

And that is that if you look at the participation in working groups, not only is it not very diverse but it's also not very many people. And in fact if you took the people who actually do the vast majority of working group tasks you could put them on one of the smaller buses that takes people to events outside of ICANN.

And if that bus crashed we would have zero people doing work on working groups because that group is on the order of 20-30 people total. It is incredibly small and it's getting smaller. The trend is going - when I first came

to ICANN five or six or seven or eight years ago, whenever it was, that group was much larger and it was much more diverse.

It's collapsing to people who are either funded to be here or people like me who, through extraordinary circumstances, can take an enormous amount of time to work on this kind of stuff. And that collapse in the number and diversity of participation in working groups puts at risk the bottom-up multistakeholder consensus-based fig leaf that ICANN holds in front of the world as the justification for its existence.

Where what we've got now is a group of 25 people whose work is being reviewed and approved by something on the order of 80, if you include the Board and then up to this, you know, giant 1000-1500 people that show up at a meeting, etcetera.

So we've got an inverted pyramid. And if we don't address that with some sort of change in the way that we do outreach and some sort of way that we integrate the processes of outreach, constituencies, preparation for working groups and working group work itself that trend of ever smaller number of people working on working groups is going to continue and pretty soon we're going to have no (there-there). So there's my addition to your thoughts.

Jonathan Robinson: Right, thanks both of you, Maria and Mikey, for that background and input. Just take his opportunity to welcome Brian Cute, Chair of the ATRT2. Welcome, Brian.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you for all of the work that you and the review team have done. Welcome to your colleagues who are in the room from the review team both - I think on the Council and in the room in general.

It seems, Brian, that we have done quite a bit of thinking about it. We've talked about this in our weekend sessions. We've talked about this in our public Council meeting, our main public Council meeting prior to this. And indeed we've started to talk about this now.

One reflection I have is that it strikes me that in talking with Ray Plzak about the reviews and the shape and nature of reviews in future is one of the challenges we have with the way in which ICANN has done reviews in the past and without any sort of disrespect to the ATRT2, it tends to leave - you know, there's all these recommendations and it leaves it open to the - we haven't properly or perhaps most effectively integrated how we take on the fixes or the output from the review team so that's something we'll all have to be thinking about.

But I think for the moment it seems that our focus should be on either helping the ATRT2 team with support for their existing recommendations since this is - they have a report that they're seeking input on so it's up to us to either give support to or input in the recommendations that exist and particular obviously as they pertain to the work in this case primarily of that which is commissioned by the GNSO Council, the PDP and policy-based work but I guess to the extent that that pertains to the GNSO as a whole and to the extent that those in the room would like to comment on that, that as well.

So but generally I suspect a lot of that feedback comes from - for the GNSO as a whole from within the groups and constituencies. Brian, I'm not sure if there's anything you'd like to say in addition to that? Please by all means do so.

Brian Cote: First of all, thank you very much. I know many of you have seen us already this week but the purpose of us being here is to hear from you in addition to what Jonathan offered. Did we get anything wrong? Are any of these recommendations in the draft off target? And if so please tell us why.

One note with respect to Ray Plzak and reviews, we're aware of the work that the Structural Improvements Committee is doing. We've been talking to Ray in particular. Would like to note that we do view the reviews under the AOC as distinct and different in nature from the institutional reviews. And while there are parallel conversations to have about efficiencies there is an important distinction to keep in mind.

That being said, we're here to listen for your feedback so we can integrate it into the final report which we will give to the Board on December 31.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Brian. Thanks for that clarification, that's helpful. Alan, I see your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I just wanted to make two comments in relation to the summary - the generally excellent summary that Marika did on - not Marika - Maria did on the PDP recommendation in the draft report. And the first one is in terms of inhibitors one of the largest inhibitors, which I don't think we mentioned explicitly, and I'm not sure to the extent the report - the external report does, is time zones.

Because the majority of people are from North America and Europe the meetings tend to be at reasonable times for them, which invariably put it in the middle of the night for anyone in Asia Pacific. Now that's a pretty good inhibitor to saying you want to participate on a weekly basis to have to get up a 3:00 in the morning or something like that to do it. So just something to think about. It's not clear what the answer is.

In terms of our recommendation to fix that problem we have a very gentle recommendation and it - there's a reason for that. The previous review teams have all, to some extent, put hard targets on when something should be completed. And virtually every single one of those targets has been missed.

It didn't seem reasonable to try to put a real, you know, fix the participation problem by 30% within two years or something like that given that we really don't have a clue how to do it. So all we're suggesting at this point is start talking about it and look at the problem. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I know we've got Klaus in the queue. I'll just make a quick response to Alan's point which is to indicate how we dealt with this at the Council level. And I'm not advocating that this is perfect but just to give an illustration of what happened.

What I worked on at the commencement of the term as chair, as you may be aware, there's a requirement actually to announce the next 12 months worth of meetings. And what we did was we looked at the home time zone of everyone on the Council plotted those into a world calendar and took green to be between 8:00 and 18:00, I think, core business hours; yellow to be two business hours on either end of that and red outside of that. And then did a sort of plot and tried to do that.

Now a methodology similar to that may be possible to apply it to work groups in future such that it isn't presumed what time. And that may have problems of itself. It may be a way of, in a sense, weeding out participants from other areas.

But there may be methods like that that can be applied. So perhaps that's even something we can put in as a suggestion that there's a form of - before determining the time zone of the working group or the time of the meetings of the working group and - that one tests the home time zones - or the primary time zones of all the participants and accordingly makes a rotating schedule on the back of that, which is what we did with the Council.

Go ahead, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Just very quickly want to voice my concern about the consideration to use professional facilitators. Out of the simple reason that there is no more - in fact they determine in culturally and content of a group like a working group, like a facilitator.

And when we are talking about we're trying to be culturally and so on inclusive this really can be a problem because the approach a facilitator takes is cultural.

And the second thought is also there is no group known on Earth which is more socially dysfunctional than the group of ICANN and that is actually part of the richness of ICANN and a facilitator would take the edges off this. So I think the use of professional facilitators should be really taken with a lot of caution.

Jonathan Robinson: Interesting point, thanks. And that's, I mean, I think that's precisely the kind of feedback. I think what'd be also useful is if there's any further support for that kind of thing, of course other comments on other areas of the report recommendations as well. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor. I don't know if the members of the ATRT were here when Maria and I did our little introductory stuff. But I think it's worth repeating if they weren't. I'm getting a nod from Avri. I don't know about - from Brian as well.

Maria, you want to go first or...

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey, just before we do that just to highlight one other point and I think it's relevant to you - I think it's a good idea. But I understand that there is some process of training ICANN facilitates as well going on. And so I think if the ATRT isn't aware of that, I mean, I think that's a new initiative.

So in a sense it's - it seeks to professionalize the facilitation skills of those within the community so that variation may be a more attractive - Klaus, I don't know if you want to just respond to that before we go on with Maria and Mikey - if that would allay some of your concerns about professional facilitation.

Klaus Stoll: I think that we are talking about two different things. I would support - if it's ICANN staff-based I would support it. If it's outside ICANN staff-based professional facilitation I really would have my doubts.

Jonathan Robinson: But to be crystal clear this isn't even ICANN staff; this is the training of community members to become better facilitators or professionalize their facilitation skills.

Klaus Stoll: Understood. And I would support that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Maria.

Maria Farrell: Sure. Thanks, Jonathan. So just for the benefit of people who came in. I just gave a short introduction to what I considered to be the particularly GNSO-specific recommendations in the ATRT2 - the R2D2 thing.

They were, first, I just drew down on some of the numbers and the data, which was incredibly useful in the Interconnect report and regarding participation in working groups and how Western-dominated it is.

And then I just briefly summarized a couple of the recommendations. And I think I probably didn't do it so accurately because I said one of them one was to provide facilitators for working group deliberations. Actually I think it was to provide the facilities to be able to have facilitators, if that was so wished, and for the community to develop guidelines and rules around how that is done.

And then the second recommendation that I drew attention to was the desirability of ICANN funding face to face interactions for working groups as well. So that was basically it.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll just charge ahead. Okay? It's Mikey. In our comments just before you all came I came right after Maria and said that I wanted to take that same chart that she's talking about in the ICC appendix and spring a different direction because in that chart what it says is, you know, a very high percentage of people participate in working groups once. If you have them twice that accounts for a huge majority of the people who participate.

And what's happening is there's a trend where the number of - the total pool - the total number of people who participate in working group is shrinking. It's been shrinking ever since I've been participating in them. And it's now, by my estimate, down in the range of 20-25 people total that do the bulk of the work on working groups.

That calls I think, at the strategic level, into question the validity of the claim by ICANN that it is a bottoms up, multistakeholder, consensus-based process because except for the working group layer everything else is not consensus-based, it's boards of directors that vote, it's councils like this that vote, etcetera, etcetera.

And so what we have is a pyramid that's inverted. And in fact a case can be made that the work of 25 people is being reviewed by 80. So then the question becomes, what do you do about that? And I think that the ATRT report does not go far enough.

I think one of the things that needs to be thought about is the connection between the global outreach effort and the staircase - the series of steps that provide a clearly defined progression for newcomers to become experienced and capable members of working groups and that is not an instantaneous process.

The other thing is, as Maria pointed out, the vast amount of time that's required and consequently right now working groups are dominated by not only not a very diverse group but mostly a paid group or extraordinary outliers who can afford to essentially do this huge amount of work for free.

So yay verily. Great job on that recommendation. But a little more would be nice. Now I've got a couple more that I'm - I was sort of hoping that Steve Metalitz would walk in the room but he's not here so I'm going to represent some things that Steve Metalitz I think wanted brought forward but...

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Maybe you could hold off and see if he does appear. Keep - I'll put you back in the queue to come back to that.

Mikey O'Connor: Fine.

Jonathan Robinson: And in the meantime perhaps let James and I had someone else - I had Marika, I've got Chuck and John.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. James speaking. And my comments are probably going to sound very similar to Mikey's. A veteran of dozens of working groups, review teams, drafting teams, and then the thing in Dubai, whatever that was.

And I would say, Mikey, you're probably being generous when you say it's 20-30. You know, I think we've had working groups that go into basically a hibernation mode for lack of participation or lack of representative participation where we just have one or two people and we certainly have enough anecdotal evidence of situations where staff has outnumbered the community in this working group calls.

So I had a couple of quick thoughts here. I think the biggest challenge that ICANN has is the material. And I think they've gone to great lengths to institutionalize some onboarding and training programs from fellowship to the

newcomer's lounge, the training seminar that occurred the week prior to Buenos Aires and all these other efforts I think that are laudable.

But I think that's only one side of the coin; the other side has to be how do you make the material more accessible to bright people who come from industries that are impacted by the decisions that come out of this organization but have not been following this since 2002 and don't necessarily and readily grasp onto all the acronyms.

What can be done to reduce the number of words on a page and the number of pages in every single one of these reports so that someone could take a few documents onto a plane and get up to speed on some of the critical issues. Do we need executive summaries of the executive summaries at this point? I mean, something needs to be done to streamline the material and make it more accessible.

I think that the other key thing - and it's more cultural and I think Mikey was touching on this a little bit with his inverted pyramid is that there is a perception that if you need something out of ICANN you go to the decision makers; the decision makers are the Board; the decision makers are the GAC; the decision makers are this Council. That's not how the model is constructed.

And I think that that one's a tougher one to address but I think that part of the culture needs to be communicated front and center to newcomers and outsiders that are looking to - looking for their handle on this institution and how to get engaged.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, James. In the interest of time I'm just going to keep it moving. We've got a hard stop at 4 o'clock so I've got Marika, Chuck, John, myself and Alan.

Marika Konings: It is Marika. I'm not disagreeing with what people have said before on participation in the working groups but one thing I have noticed over the last couple of years that I think more and more we see also working group participants actually representing their respective groups or serving a function of liaising between, their participation in the working group and their stakeholder group groups and constituencies.

So I think if we're looking at level of participation, diversity, geographic, we also probably need to dig a layer deeper because I think in certain cases just because, you know, the it's the wide American participating in the working group it doesn't necessarily mean that that person is not representing a broad range of views through their stakeholder groups or constituencies.

And I think similarly as well that the public comment forum process because I think there was also an analysis made on, you know, from where comments were submitted. And, again, just because it was submitted by the stakeholder group chair or constituency leader that doesn't necessarily mean that there's no geographic spread or diversity behind that view. But, again, it's something that probably would need to be researched to see if that is, indeed, actually the case or not.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. Without detracting at all from the points that Maria and Mikey made, because those are real issues that need to be dealt with, first of all I won't say much about the last point because I was going to say the same thing Marika just said and that is is that there are quite a few participants in working groups who actively participate but they're really representing quite large groups of people.

And to the extent that they're going back to their groups and getting that input there are lots of indirect participants. Now I'll leave that alone because I think Marika hit that very well.

I would like to cite two recent working groups, one fairly new one that's going to have a working group meeting after this. But first of all the IGO INGO - Thomas shared over the weekend - and he can add to this if he wants but he shared over the weekend that there were over 40 participants in that working group and about 50% of them were very active, were very active. So I think the numbers are probably at least in that range.

I will tell you in the Policy and Implementation Working Group that just started, although I think we're going to have our eighth meeting today, it's hard to believe, we have over 35 participants and a large percent are very active and getting on sub teams in the working group and so forth. So I don't think it's all dire. Do we have to work on this? We do and we always have and we always will. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. I've got John next.

John Berard: John Berard. Now following on Chuck's point there's no doubt that politics can always engender extraordinary enthusiasm for any particular working group. And I would suggest that both the INGO and IGO and the policy - is it Policy or Implementation Working Group - benefit from that energy level.

But that doesn't represent the broad swath of working groups which I think, especially those of a technical nature, probably tend more to the other end of that particular spectrum, as has been described.

It's possible we could, you know, so having said, you know, the sky is falling then thinking about it from a different perspective. You know, we do have comment periods, we do have the response to the comments. You could look at the working group as a facilitator of a much larger environment, as Chuck said, individuals going back to their constituencies or stakeholder groups. So it might not be as stark as it seems on paper. But the problem is that it feels stark as well.

And I think when I put those two things together it's a cause for concern because it would be - it would be bad form as ICANN begins to step out on the Internet governance stage holding the bottom up consensus-driven multistakeholder shield or badge as its point of entry to be told, you know, to be told that the facts don't substantiate your point of view. So again I guess I'm adding politics into the working group.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. I've got a queue with myself, Alan and Maria in it but I know Brian wants to make a question or comment.

Brian Cute: Just a quick question back to Chuck, the working group on Policy or Implementation, is there any recommendation that this review team could make that would be particularly helpful on that question? We have looked at the implementation of the recommendation from ATRT1, see that the work is not done but the community is engaged. That's an open question for us.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Brian. I don't think so at this stage. We're in the very early stages looking at principles and some - making sure we have common definitions on the key terms and so forth. There's been a lot of good input into that.

And, again, I'm very impressed with the team that we have. It's - and I'm looking at some of them as I look around the room. They're all jumping in and helping. And they're coming from a lot of different sources. So at this point, no, okay? We might come back to you after your - thought you were all done with your work and ask for some.

Jonathan Robinson: I think my point follows on, to some extent from - in the context of the kind of statements that Chuck and John were saying. I mean, I think there's a real danger than one sounds defensive here and I don't mean it to be. But I do think there's a danger or some risk with any kind of review process that seeks to ask the question what's wrong, that you get to hear everything that's wrong and not the bits that are right.

And so I think what I'd just like to highlight to the review team is the work that we've done particularly over the last year or so where we've sought to set out on a program of improvement and, in fact, the sort of - one of the culminations of that is we've immediately interwoven into that improvement program the draft recommendations of the ATRT2.

So we are trying to build in a culture of self correction and continuous improvement into the work of the GNSO. And that work I've not doubt will continue with this audit-based review thinking and all of that. So it will be great for me if in some way the work of the review team could recognize that in looking back it could also look at the present and the prospects for the future. So, you know, and that ties into some of those points as well. So thanks.

The queue I've got now is Alan, Maria, Mikey.

Alan Greenberg: Just a very quick note. As we often do when we have these kind of conversations we say we need outreach and we need to get more people involved and bring them into the fold. It strikes me, however, when you look at the 20 people that Mikey is talking about, that's the core PDP group, compared to the sum total of people who participate in Tuesday's stakeholder group and constituency meetings we perhaps also have an in-reach problem.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, what was the last thing you said, Alan, that we perhaps have also have a...

Alan Greenberg: Perhaps also have an in-reach problem. That is the people are here at the these meetings, they're part of us, but they're not, you know, a very, very tiny percentage of those is participating in working groups.

Jonathan Robinson: Maria.

Maria Farrell: Thank you. Jonathan, I take your point that there's often a great emphasis on what's wrong. And one of the - actually quite gratifying things about the research report underlying the ATRT2 recommendations was a table that compares ICANN's multistakeholder model and what we do, you know, do you have to pay to attend meetings? Are they open, etcetera? With all of our, you know, peer organizations.

And we did extremely well and so it's gratifying, you know, and it's good to have that information out there and to remind yourselves what we're doing and the ideals that we're aiming for.

One thing I forgot to mention in my summary at the beginning was the ATRT2 also recommended and the insertion of a new step into the PDP which is that ability for people who are not happy with how their public comments were summarized to insert a response.

And I think that's quite a useful thing, which makes me wonder - suggest even - that the GNSO Council perhaps or some subset of it might consider - should consider doing a written response to the ATRT2. And I guess I'll put up my hand to coordinate that if it something that people would like to do.

And finally I have a slightly madcap idea and here's what it is. I mentioned this the other day at the NCSG meeting. When we're at an ICANN meeting we tend to lapse into this particular very reasonable tone of voice and we all speak in the same way. And we, you know, we have a certain way of talking and we have a certain way of presenting information which is when we're talking about a PDP we will give a recital of all of the procedural steps that it took to get to that PDP.

And we will not tell a story in a way of what it is. Now I'm not proposing fairy tale time. But what I am thinking of is there a way that we could insert into when we introduce a PDP or create the materials for people to learn about a PDP a discussion role where somebody from, you know, the community or,

you know, either one or more parts of it would say, look, this Privacy and Proxy Accreditation PDP, here's what it's about.

You know, some of the people are worried it's going to cost too much money; some of the people are worried it's going to, you know, destroy privacy. Some of the people are worried that it will create an unnecessary barrier to, you know, pursuing trademark claims and such. So, you know, is there something we could do to make this a bit more discursive?

And having raised earlier the - that our culture is very adversarial I'm going to go 180 on that and say in response to something Brian and I discussed briefly the other day is maybe we should have debates. You know, maybe we should have sort of staged debates about particular policy issues, put a couple of people up on the stage for half an hour, you know, five minutes each, start off some comments, two or three minute responses.

And so like could we dramatize this stuff a bit better? Because, you know, one of the barriers to being involved is not being able to kind of decrypt the terminology of, you know, what is this issue really about. Why should I care about it? And am I implicated in this?

So, you know, I think there are things we could do just sort of step outside the kind of the roles that we play and the way we express ourselves. That could help to bring more people into the policy process in the large.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. You make me think it's a very interesting point because we talk a lot about (help) and inclusivity around the world but in a sense that's an ICANN culture which, in a way, is what you're describing. And that culture itself may not be that ideal at times so that's a very interesting point.

I've got Mikey last in the queue - well Amr, and then we'll have to perhaps bring it to a close.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. By the way, you made the Marika mistake too. That was Maria that was speaking. I'm channeling Steve Metalitz now. We did get a hold of him. And we had a conversation at least in the CSG about the ATRT2 recommendations and I just want to quickly rattle off the ones that we wanted, you know, yes please more, etcetera.

The two that we focused in on are the finance operation one, Number 12, and that whole story that's a big long story that if you haven't heard it we'll do it very dramatically for you with much beating of the breast and we'll certainly be able to fulfill Maria's desire for more drama because those of us who are dealing with the finance stuff, and many of us are, know that that's a - that's a big one.

The other one is the public comment process, which is in your Number 7. And, again, great enthusiasm for improvements there. More of the same please. So I'll just kick off those two as channeling Steve. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. We'll be sure to let Steve know. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: All right I want to go ahead back to the working group participation issue. There are already a number of programs that are targeting outreach and getting more people involved. Some of them are the regional strategies. There's the community regional outreach program, which is a pilot program. There's this new Website that is supposedly being developed for purpose of capacity-building for new people into the program.

So you've got some people in the community who are involved. You've got some staff activities as well. And you've obviously got members of the community who are concerned about the lack of participation and the lack of regional diversity and you've got all these things popping up but there doesn't seem to be much of a connect between everything.

And maybe that is what we need to start working on since this is a concern that has been expressed and obviously lots to share. And since there are already efforts and investments being made into this we should see how we can capitalize on combining the efforts of all these things that might - at least hopefully have a synergistic effect.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Amr. Thank you, everyone, for your contributions. I'm going to make one very minor remark and then I'm going to thank the ATRT2 team and hand over to Brian for a closing remark.

And it's just one thing I picked up on the way during the course of events, and it's not to sound defensive again, but occasionally working groups have a very specific purpose, a very more technical or more specific interest. So a narrower participation is not necessarily a failure of the working group notwithstanding all of the efforts to improve broad participation.

So my thanks to the ATRT2 for your work to date and for your careful listening to our input. Really appreciate that time. Over to you, Brian.

Brian Cote: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, everyone. Just quickly something I should have said earlier. Well first a comment - reply comment period closes December 13. Please send whatever you have in in writing that's welcomed and we look forward to it.

Also, just for reflection, we are thinking about prioritizing recommendations. We may not. We're thinking along the lines of not is one more important than the other but is one more urgent than the other in terms of ICANN taking action to implement. I'll leave that with you to reflect. Please include those thoughts in your comments as well when you provide them. And thank you again for your time.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck, last comment seems to get...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And I want to mention and offer that the ATRT2 made to the Registries that has proved to be very helpful for us. We were having trouble because we are getting the whole group to comment in time for Friday. And they of course said that they - that we can do it in the reply period but they'd really like them earlier.

So what they offered to us was an individual or individuals submitting some comments and following up with the whole group later. So I wanted to make that aware. We're taking advantage of that. There are a few of us that have some comments that'll probably be ready tomorrow. We're going to submit them as personal comments.

And then we're going to let the Registry group evaluate it and endorse them if they'd like. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay we're done so thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: All right, everyone, so that draws the formal proceedings to a close. If all the councilors could be available for a group Council photo and then individual photos just outside the room and then you are free to enjoy the rest of your day as you see fit.

Yeah, for the record, the houses decide who the chairs are - the vice chairs are and they simply communicate that to the Council.

Mikey O'Connor: We newbies, we're not shy, you know? We may not know what we're doing but we're right in there with you.

END