DUBLIN – At-Large ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 – 13:00 to 14:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to start in one minute. Could I please ask anybody who is not going to take part to either take some seats or leave the room, please? Are we ready?

Well, good afternoon, everyone. It's the ATLAS II Implementations Taskforce today. We have earlier today spoken to the Board and we have shared some of our work. As you all know, the At-Large Summit took place in London in June 2014. Our At-Large Structures all worked together to produce a very complete statement with many, many different recommendations, and this working group here, which is open for everyone to participate in has taken each one of the recommendations, expanding them, doing some triage amongst it, and moving them towards implementation.

The work today is actually quite straightforward. We're going to take stock on where we are, which recommendations are complete, which ones are somehow incomplete, which ones need to be pushed forward, so we do need to take every little

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.

minute that we can. Actually, we are 20 minutes behind schedule, but that's how the world goes.

Ariel is going to share her screen, and I think that the first thing that we can do is to dig directly into the whole list, the overall master list of recommendations that we have. The way that the system is set up is that each one of the recommendations, if you click on its number, has a subpage that then has the recommendation, the assignees, and the status. If we click on recommendation #1, for example, as you can see on the screen, that will go with the recommendation. And underneath, we've got all of the different action items that are required, and we can then fill up what we need and follow up with the whole process.

When you make an amendment in the subpage, this is immediately reflected over in the page above it, if I remember correctly. What I was going to suggest is that we first have a quick browse at the master list to see if there's anything that not annotated that we might have not started work on. I know that there are several which are not. Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Yesterday, we worked on the spreadsheet indicating which ones are pending internal process, pending external process. Do you want me to share that spreadsheet? That will be quicker, I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Ariel. That's a very good idea. It was only yesterday. Okay. It feels like a long time ago. Certainly. If you were at the meeting with the Board this morning, we actually showed a quick donut-shaped pie. Maybe Ariel can share that as well so you can have a quick look at that. And it will give us… Just the last slide, there we go. And this slide provides us with a very quick summary of where we are now with these recommendations.

A very small percentage has been discarded. I think it's one recommendation has been discarded so far because it was irrelevant or it had become irrelevant. We have 5% were of recommendations being completed, but we are awaiting a response. These were primarily the ones we have sent to the Board and we are awaiting response from them. Five percent where no response is required, where the ALAC or the working group that was assigned the recommendation has actually completed work.

Thirty percent are on hold pending external processes. These are primarily the ones that pertain to accountability of ICANN or pertain to any bylaw changes or pertain to anything that deals with the end user needing to be at the center of ICANN's processes and so on. All of these are reliant on something

happening externally to ICANN – or sorry, externally to At-Large or to our community.

Then we have 21% that are on hold pending internal processes. These are actually ones that we haven't even started work, and these are the ones I think which you alluded to. And 37 other ones that are in process at the moment that we're working on and that, hopefully, will at some point become complete.

Some of them are very near to completion and some of them are quite a distance from completion, and we felt it was easier to just leave it as that. Mb the next graph we'll do next time will be one to show the percentage completion of each one of the recommendations.

So what I would suggest is that we first have a look through the ones which are on hold pending internal process, so as to make sure that these are actually relevant, I guess. Our chair, Alan Greenberg, had mentioned that we need to perform this triage, so it is important to have a look at those.

I'm not sure how easy it is for us to find those, but hopefully, Ariel has a list of those that are pending on hold internally. We can't do anything about those that are on hold and waiting for an external process.

In the meantime, I open the floor for any comments on the suggestion that we have a [work] practice today. Glenn McKnight?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'm just curious, Olivier, in comparing to ATLAS I, do you have a historical memory on how the process went in terms of the follow up and implementation and where we are in terms of timelines?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Glenn. May I perhaps ask Cheryl Langdon-Orr regarding this because I have a very vague memory of ATLAS I. I wasn't directly involved with the organizational part of it.

I do know that very soon after ATLAS I, we had the At-Large review. And I think that some of the ATLAS I fed into the At-Large review, which then started a new process. It was quite a revolving mechanism. Cheryl? That's a very good question though.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. It certainly was a revolving process, and of course, much of what was going on in the ATLAS I was in fact what we would currently call capacity building. ATLAS I was designed very much

to take our At-Large structures and bring them up to speed at a very almost 101 level in ICANN, and to that end, a great deal of time and energy was spent in preplanning meetings and preparation.

So there was, if memory serves, five – if not seven – specific work groups that were tasked with primary topics, and many of those then, Glenn, actually ended up becoming existing, and still existing in some cases, or are now archived ALAC Work Groups. Technology Taskforce is the grandchild of the taskforce that Lutz was co-chairing, if memory serves, before ATLAS I back in Mexico. So you've got an evolution that certainly occurred.

We also found that during the ATLAS I, a great number of our At-Large Structures were unclear as to what the particular remit and the limitations on what ICANN is versus what Internet governance and Internet is. It was from that that I think we had the benefit of some learnings for then how webinars and educational material and information and just framing what we do and how we do it came out.

The other thing that I think was particularly important out of ATLAS I is the recognition of increased interaction and activity after a successful face-to-face engagement. That was a wholesale and obvious success.

The other thing that I suppose was an observation but an important effect was we found, during the ATLAS I process, once we were on the ground in Mexico and we were running, in an albeit down the road hotel as it was separate venue, there was a mind shift probably to begin with out of curiosity, but then out of, "Oh. That's what they're doing. That's what these At-Large Structures are. Oh. Look at the diversity. Oh, wow. Heavens above."

We had a little migration down the road from a number of people out of their constituencies. They'd send one or two scouts out to see whether we really did have three Gorgonian heads and breathed fire or whatever. Then we found our rooms almost doubled in capacity because what we were doing in session was of interest and that they felt there was contribution.

For example, a new gTLD session. A new gTLD session was standing-room only. Mainly because we had asked for staff input and staff briefing that was suddenly discovered to be of such value that additional audience came in because it was really useful things to listen to.

I could go on, but it's probably best that I don't. You've got enough from me at that point. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this. Just one other question before Ariel runs away with the mic. There were some recommendations because there was some output from there. I remember vaguely that there were some, but not the same volume of recommendations as what we have here. A couple of working groups started out over there, a number of initiatives started.

How was that treated? There were so few, I guess. Were they just manageable?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, absolutely. They were manageable. They weren't managed in quite the timely manner that we probably had thought they would be. When the treatise, the document, the scroll of output was presented to the then Chairman of the Board Peter Dengate Thrush. We did have wholesale support, but it was somewhat peripheral.

There were fewer issues of logistics and human bandwidth that came into play. We went pretty much straight into our review, and there just wasn't the ability to do very much more than what happened.

That said, you had a set of high-level statements and aspirations articulated in the product out of ATLAS I. That was appropriate for the time.

By the time we got to ATLAS II, where we were in the effectiveness and credibility scale where our voice was being heard and the nature of the work we were doing had shifted considerably. So it really is like trying to look at apples and oranges. They are both good fruit, but you know they're not mutually interchangeable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Glenn, a follow up?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think that was great, Cheryl. Thank you so much. I guess the reason I asked is what lessons learned from I, what lessons learned from II, where we move for III, so as we do this, we get better and better. And it's great to hear which working groups came out. I guess I'm not even sure which ones are bubbling up to the surface for the new working groups or other things yet, even though I've been very active with the ATLAS II implementation.

EN

But that's just my one comment is that people seem to disappear. They haven't been on the calls. It's unfortunate. Maybe that's just my comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Glenn. The process we've used so far is just an iterative process, I guess, where we go again and again and again, perhaps something looking at each recommendation through various angles. Can you think, or can anyone else think, of any better process than this to go through this? Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One of the things that I can see with these recommendations is [the kind of volume]. The recommendations when you look then, it was very difficult. We had to go through a process to decide where to go, what it meant, and all that stuff.

It's not that I'm saying that we should not have recommendations, but these sessions where these recommendations were generated, if we're going to do something like this in ATLAS III, I would have some kind of template. I will ask the recommendation to think about it. Explicitly tell us in which context you're putting this, who you

think this is allocated to, so it's not… because some of these recommendations when you read them, it's like somebody said something and you just put it in.

You have to be more specific because now you have been taking this effort and there have been many, many meetings, and still we're still getting this going through and trying to get them done. I'm afraid that when we go, we will end up in ATLAS III with some of them still open. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank for this, Eduardo. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and we're going to just…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It'll be fine. Audio will tell me if they don't get me. You probably don't even have to hold it, Dave. I will step a little closer though just to make life easier for you all. You need me even closer. I could project.

I want to support what you're saying, absolutely, Eduardo. As passionate a supporter as I was for ATLAS II… Notice the smile starting. This is this face when you know it's going to happen.

I thought, "Oh. For Heaven's sake, children. What have done?" When I saw this enormity of things, not very well [parsed] things, coming out of the proceedings.

That's okay because we learned. What is it? 487 days or something since, and we're still trying to work out what some of them mean. So to that end, I think having a good structure, and not narrow but very specified requirements as to purpose and outcome. There is a place for just relaying general information, and we might need to do that, as well.

But when we're talking about outcomes, we have to talk about outcomes that are demonstrable and deliverable and can be done in a timely manner. We need to apply a little bit of SMART to it. Simple, measurable, achievable, real, timely – all those sorts of things have to come into play.

I think with the learning from this second one, we can definitely do a whole lot better with our third. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm going to ask Ariel whether we do have a page, a Wiki page, or somewhere, where we can put our lessons learned because that sounds like one of the lessons that we've learned, certainly from the post-processing point of view.

When we do have a recommendation, asking the people who make the recommendation to say, "What do you consider success to be?" would definitely help us in closing the recommendation and saying it's complete. Because I see several of them being, is it complete? Is it not complete? Shall we go ad infinitum? Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've run into a few endless circles in some of what we're working with out of ATLAS II, and that is something that could be avoided by, as you say, templating that uses some key words like the rationale, the measurables are, give us seven key points that, or no more than seven key points that. It is doable, but yeah, we've got to do better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, Eduardo, did you – no? Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Olivier. I will speak in Spanish. Clearly, I agree with all the remarks that have been made, with what Eduardo suggested, what Cheryl has been saying.

I am sort of concerned about the lack of interest some people show. People who participate in ATLAS II and who didn't get

involved in this working group or haven't participated in the recommendation, so I don't know exactly how to manage or tackle that or how that could be improved.

I realize that people were very enthusiastic about traveling and about the meeting. They participated in the drafting of the recommendations, and after that, they vanished.

So again, I say what I have said earlier on. There is something which we are not doing properly because we should make this attractive so that people will want to get involved and to keep on being involved. I think we should review this to see if by saying something or giving someone an assignment so that they feel responsible for a recommendation and are not the usual suspects but is finding new people so that they say, "I have this task, and I will carry it out until I get to the next ATLAS." But we need to get to keep those people involved. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fatima. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: One thing we can do is that whatever group or person comes with a recommendation with whatever template which comes

out, as part of the recommendation, we should assign one champion to it to follow through. That's one way to get them engaged and not disappear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. The working group itself, the follow-up working group, does have the chairs of each one of the thematic groups. I think it has the advisors, as well, maybe. I can't remember exactly what the membership was, but it does have those supposed champions on each one of these recommendations.

Now for some reason, just a subset of these has followed up and they're usual suspects. It is strange, and in fact, some of the chairs that were chairs that hadn't even followed up at ATLAS either, which is another thing. Perhaps we should keep a database of missing chairs. It's in Cheryl's head. Anybody can extract it from Cheryl's head without inflicting too much pain on her would be fine. But yeah, it's certainly a concern.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Excuse me, Olivier, in case you have a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Hello. This is Murray speaking. I have no visual, so I would raise my hand virtually when you have a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I see actually a hand up from Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Is that correct? Yeah. So let's hear from Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. My comment is perhaps what we can do is perhaps we could really reconvene the thematic groups, invite them all to the call, and then share "these are the recommendations that came out of these thematic groups, and here's what's been done so far." Then you can get to the answers of, "Okay, is this good enough? Is it not good enough?"

I believe that the automatic mailing list and so forth, so it should be more straightforward to implement. That's my suggestion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Dev. Do you think we should convene it now, or go a little bit further down the line, process the ones which we have as on hold pending internal process, and then go back to them?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, what we can do is we can certainly at least advise them as to the progress of what is happening between what's on hold, what's been in progress, and so forth. I think of this as a sort of like status update and with various slides explaining what is happening to each of the recommendations so far, and then present them to each of the thematic groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Dev. Glenn McKnight?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: What Dev has not mentioned in his two chairmanship to outreach and engagement and technical taskforce, he's been very clear on every meeting we've gone back to those assigned, and we were assigned a lot of these ATLAS II recommendations. He was very diligent in making sure we answered this.

So I think he's been probably the star in making sure that the implementation strategies were actually put into place. That's a high mark for people to follow.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Glenn. Any other thoughts on Dev's suggestion to have, I guess, it would be an intermediate webinar or a status update on where we are now? Dev, I hope you're not saying we

should have five webinars for five different thematic working groups, each one dealing with only their themes, or is that what you're saying, or should we just have one for every one?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: If we were to have one for every one, that would be a very long webinar to go through all 43 recommendations, so I think I would suggest having a session for each of the thematic groups separately because that way you'd break it up so it's more manageable.

So I would suggest five webinars. It may sound like a lot, but I think it will be a way to [get through].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are there any volunteers to run those five webinars? Dev? No. Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Let's see. I think it is actually important to give updates on what has been done for those who have not followed the process. But again, I think the way for people to get involved is to make them part, to make them take some concrete responsibility because just to report to them what we're doing is the same thing again.

People will reply, "Okay. I know what is going on, but I'm not engaged."

So in the webinar, in addition to reporting, we should be asking for volunteers or have tasks already assigned and see who wants to take the various actions so that we can move forward to the following steps and thus have more people working. We, in ALAC, are not sufficient people to do all the things in the groups. This is taking too much time. The working group actions are taking too much time, and we need more active people in the recommendations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I totally agree with you. In concrete steps, what do you recommend we do? Should we have a webinar and set questions for each one of the thematic groups based on the work that we've done so far? Should we assign the task of closing an issue or implementing an issue? I'm just suggesting various different ways. Any other idea on this?

Should we task the chairs of the thematic groups to reach out to their thematic group? The mailing list still exists, so we can still make use of them. Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: What we might do is call the chairs again, the chairs of the thematic groups, and check their interest. Maybe they are not interested, or they have other activities and they cannot take it on, so first, call the entire group members. And then before or in parallel, prepare various tasks, and then we can match individuals to tasks. Otherwise, it would make no sense to call them if we're not going to give them anything to do.

Then the questions is good because that will allow us to know what situation they are in and what is the status of recommendations. I do not have a clear idea if that is the only thing we can do or if there is anything else that we can recommend to move forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Fatima. We'll have to look for the names and details. The page, of course, is there for all the names of the chairs of the thematic groups. Are there any other questions or thoughts about this?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Olivier, it's Murray speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Murray, please go ahead. I notice Dev has also got his hand up. No, Dev has got his hand down now. Okay. Murray McKercher, go ahead.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Olivier. I am remote from the meeting. Apologies. My computer is still booting early this morning. Just a couple of comments.

I know, Olivier, you had met with the Board after ATLAS II, and they had some suggestions as to how we should proceed. I also like the idea of getting a short list of recommendations.

And my only other comment, so perhaps you could speak to that Board meeting. My other comment would be, as a process, how we align the recommendations that are on the table with the policy groups that exist in ICANN because we're trying to make movement of policy.

I guess the last thing, maybe if people could comment on, are our recommendations too big picture for ICANN, or is there a way that we can put them into more specific language that can be dealt with?

Also, I would agree with tasking the chairs to re-engage with the ATLAS II participants. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Murray. What you've described is what we've been doing for the past year. The whole expanding of recommendations and triage and all that is what effectively we've been trying to go through.

The Board hasn't come back to us with anything this morning, and we didn't explicitly ask for any feedback or implementation. We just followed up on one recommendation and let them know of the work that had taken place with regards to having capacity building webinars. That's some of the recommendations that are complete.

But as far as the work that we have here, it is engaged. We just have to basically push through it, and as Fatima said, we need to engage the original groups back into the process, and certainly engage the chairs of those thematic groups.

Does anyone think there is a better way or any other system? I see Glenn McKnight and then Eduardo Diaz. Glenn, you have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think you're doing wishful thinking if you think you're going to engage them. They haven't been engaged. It's getting old. It's

EN

like stale bread. I think it ain't going to happen. They're not interested. It's just not going to happen. You're beating a dead horse. This is getting old. This is what? It June of last year. At what point do you give it up?

I think there's a determined group that wants to see this through. I think you can spend a lot of time chasing people for their comments. Is it worth your time or someone's time?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Glenn. Is that your response, Fatima? Is that in response to Glenn? No. Okay, so Eduardo is next.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Olivier. The other point that I want to bring out is that between ATLAS II and now, we didn't know that the transition was going to happen, so it's like many people have been sucked into other things, and here, we're struggling with this. Otherwise, I think we would have more participation. Take [Liam], for example. He was a chair of one of the meetings, and he doesn't have bandwidth to do this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Eduardo. That is correct. Yes, there has certainly been some changes. But yet, I don't see dozens of

people from At-Large in the transition that would have been here working on these ATLAS II recommendations. We're not talking large numbers. There's always this concern of how do you get these people still interested in those recommendations which they themselves drafted?

Let's go over to Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Oliver. I certainly agree with what you have just said. But maybe if we call them back and develop an inventory of new people with what people we have, it could be a good starting point to match people and tasks.

Another thing we could consider is to manage on a yearly basis. For next year, this list of recommendations are a priority to be completed, to be fulfilled by the end of the year, and do not attempt to cover them all because that is something that we might not do, and we might work improperly with some.

So prioritize. A given number of recommendations should be completed by yearend. With this so-called inventory of people to be developed, see if we can do that. That could be a way to make a more efficient work. Thank you.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Fatima. I think we've got a way forward to try and push these. I've heard the feedback or the pushback regarding contacting the session chairs. I've got the list in front of me, actually.

We had subject matter experts, session moderators, assistant session moderators, and a session reporter, and also an assistant session reporter. So we had a heck of a lot of people, many more than the number of people sitting around this table. Some have become ICANN staff. Some have come on the Board. Some have left ICANN. Some have disappeared, and some… Well, anyway…

We can try. I would suggest that we continue plowing through. We haven't got very much time. We've only got five minutes left on this discussion. I would suggest maybe we can just quickly look through our on-hold pending internal process list.

If Alan is ten minutes late, we might get ten minutes extra. For the reason that this is just a quick triage, moving forward, there isn't anything drafted on any of these yet. With regards to the others, the ones which are pending awaiting other work outside with the accountability, we can leave them on the side. That will certainly reduce the amount of work that we have. But there might be some quick ones in there.

So let's go to 4. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: "ICANN should study the possibility of enhancing and increasing the role of liaisons between its different advisory committees and supporting organizations to do away with the silo culture."

Of course, it says ICANN – ICANN, the organization.

I think that we have seen the GNSO certainly do some work to try and get a liaison with the GAC. They do have a liaison with the GAC (the Government Advisory Committee). There has been no further liaisons from At-Large. There might be a way forward with At-Large asking for a liaison with the GAC. That's something which has been in discussion. Perhaps we can add this for At-Large to discuss the idea of having a liaison with the GAC.

And on top of that, the doing away with the silo culture is something that on the staff side has been, I guess, somehow not implemented, but is in the process of implementation since we had the visit of Jean-Jacques Sahel who has spoken to us about the civil society engagement. And these are cross-community initiatives, which will ultimately do away with the silo culture.

Satish Babu, you have your hand up.

SATISH BABU: Thank you. Satish from APRALO. I've been personally largely out of this whole process because of NomCom responsibilities last year. But I'd like to volunteer my time for wherever it is relevant. But I would perhaps call for a review of these 43 points, especially those on hold, to see whether they are really relevant in the post transition ALAC and At-Large.

If we still feel that they are very important and those that have gone on hold should be revived, then I think one more round of asking for volunteers may be relevant. As Glenn says, some of them may not be relevant, and it's probably flogging a dead horse.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Satish. That's what we're doing now. Is this one irrelevant? If it is, then let's get rid of it. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, for example, if we take this one and you mentioned a few things about trying to get a liaison going with the GAC and things like that. Maybe what we can do is we can take ALAC as a whole

an action item to follow through that and close this as the solution to this.

I mean, if we're going to take a proactive action, it doesn't mean that it's going to happen, but we [inaudible] and we follow up with the ALAC itself and close this, for example. Bang. Done with it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Eduardo. Glenn McKnight?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: It's standard with brainstorming sessions for strategic planning for any organization to have lots of ideas, as we have here. Then you boil them down and there are similarities and you get down to the core values, the core ideas. We have way too many that we're dealing with. We've got to get down to that core number.

That's why there are Ten Commandments, not 35 where they adopted it from the Egyptians. They just boiled it down to ten essential ones, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Glenn. What I've been told by Heidi is that the next session actually deals with the At-Large Summit

recommendations and update. Since nobody else is here to be updated yet, we can probably run overtime.

So I hear two stories here. I hear from Eduardo, let's say this one is complete by saying, "Yes, it's all being done." The ALAC will work on having a number of liaisons with other ACs and SOs, the ones that they don't have, and staff is doing all they can to do away with the silo culture.

I'm hearing on the other hand, this one is obsolete. So is it complete or obsolete? It would look better to be complete. Obsolete sounds like we've not done anything since then. Raf Fatani?

RAFID FATANI: I think I was with Eduardo and [Liam] when we wrote this. One of the things that we were considering when we were doing this in [inaudible] was sometimes some of the social and corridor activities become an obstacle in creating these – well, the NomCom becomes an engine in creating these silos.

For instance, some of the evening activities that happen within certain groups that are invite-only events create an us-and-them sort of culture. I think that was one of the things that we had in mind, among a long list of things.

I know it's a very difficult thing to tackle because these are private events that are outside the remit of ICANN, but also they are under the broader umbrella of ICANN, and I think it does create a dividing culture. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks for this, Raf. I don't think this working group can do anything about it except, of course, creating a cross-community working group on obtention of party tickets. But it would be a good one to be on, actually, and I think a lot of people might want to chair it. But anyway, it's a tough one. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: The other thing that should be ongoing is that there should be a lot of participation by ALAC in other areas and other activities. And if we're going to actually look at, for example, we've got liaisons, do we actually take anything out of and do something as a result of what the liaison say?

I think in terms of ALAC's participation into the community is another really big area that we should think about because that's a terrific way to break down the silos.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Ariel is taking notes? She's not taking notes? Yes, she is? No, she's not? Okay, I'm just relaying.

ARIEL LIANG: I will listen to the recordings and take the notes after.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Ariel. Satish Babu? Okay. Let's mark this one as complete. I think it will look good, and we've had pretty much everything we need to have for this one.

Next one, please. Number 8: "The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We're doing that. Complete.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sounds like we're doing well on this one. But it is ongoing, though. We can't say that it is complete yet, otherwise, we can go home. So this one is ongoing.

Let's then just move on. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is an example of something that we are doing, and we don't have to leave it there because we're doing it, and probably we have been doing it even if it wasn't a recommendation. So we should take it away.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But if you take away the duty of doing it, then will you still be doing it after the duty is taken away from doing it?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I didn't follow, so I don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: See. You've already now taken it away, and you're not doing it anymore. No, I'm kidding.

So shall we just mark this one as complete? Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: No, sorry. Murray is raising his hand.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you. It's Murray McKercher.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you. It seems that, if I read this carefully again, we have the duty to keep track of actions taken on the above recommendations. I think that's a statement. We could vote on it and say, "Yes, we do have the duty," and then that recommendation is complete.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I can see a lot of cards up. Any objections? Cheryl Langdon-Orr? Your mic is not working. Okay, it works.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is recommendation number 8, right? When one reads that, "the above recommendations," the above recommendations, above 8 is 7. We've got 40-something. I'm not being overly flippant here. I think this is an example of if you're going to do something with it, then do the right thing with it, which is clarify it properly.

That is a beautiful example of a really badly written recommendation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. That must have been the 2:00 AM recommendation. All accidents usually happen at 2:00 AM on a Saturday night. Well, most accidents.

Okay, let's mark this one as complete. Noted. I note that there have been no objections to mark this as incomplete, and we are doing what we're doing. It's pretty much the thing of like "the ALAC members should wake up in the morning." Same thing. It's quite obvious.

Number 30 please. "For each public comment process SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements." That's an interesting one due to the word "impact statements."

Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I propose that we close this one. I think we're doing this. This is a very subjective thing, how you produce an impact statement, and we're doing it, right? That's part of the process that we're doing it. We can prove that we're doing it. We have a Wiki page that has been done. We follow. We do the process.

EN

But saying "SOs and ACs," I mean, can we actually go to another SO or an AC and say, "You should do same"? I think it's part of the process that we do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for your information, I think it was in the policy implementation group, but impact statements are now something that will be required for GNSO PDPs, and some of those impact statements are going to be non-trivial to create. So just for the record, it's not something we can control, but it is going on.

To the extent that we actually make recommendations that are actionable, the concept of being funded or resourced to do it properly may well become significant for us at some later time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. We have Murray McKercher online. Murray, your hand is up?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Sorry. That was an old hand. I'll take it down.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Thanks. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. I just have a point for clarification. Alan, what's the difference between a statement versus an impact statement? What's the difference there because I'm confused? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you please explain, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you look in the world of building pipelines, the word impact statement has a specific relatively technical meaning and can be a relatively in-depth study. In the case of GNSO policy, when you look at the impact of making a specific decision, which may have financial impact on organizations or restrict usages and stuff like that, it might significant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Yes, this doesn't relate to the statements we draft. There's relates to the impact on end users, I would say, on any issue that is being dealt with at ICANN or any

action of ICANN. What is the impact on end users? I guess the way I would interpret it for the ALAC would be that.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to go a bit further, at this point, we often pepper our statements with a statement saying this will have an impact on users. This may imply that we're supposed to actually provide a study that will demonstrate and prove that as opposed to our opinion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: This is an example of, if you look through the list and realize that some of us were there pretty late – and you were there later – if I were going to actually write an action item, it would start with "ALAC should…."

I'm really puzzled that we have now gone on campaigning for funding for everybody else. I'm not sure I agree with that. So if we're going to have an action item or whatever, it should be the ALAC should include in budget requests money sufficient to

provide the resources or should be able to provide the resources such that ALAC is equipped to provide information on the impact as included in its comments or something like that because it's the only way you can make sense of that. Or can it actually translate what's there into what we should be doing?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Holly. You'll notice the recipient is ICANN SO and AC chairs, and that could be something that Alan could bring forward for discussion by SO and AC chairs, the use of impact statements across ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do note it says we should be resourced for it, I think was the verb – which I'm not sure is verb. Does that mean that if we don't get explicit resources, we don't have to do them? Cheryl would like to speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I actually have a queue with Fatima, Satish and…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Definition.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Specifically to this? Okay, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I've gone through a number of definitions because there are many types of legal and other forms of impact statements including environmental and all sorts. In fact, I now know more about impact statements than I ever wanted to. But I think here is one that could be quite useful for us in this matter.

That is as follows: an analysis or study, which describes the expected effects of a policy, project, or action being contemplated by a business or government organization.

So perhaps if we're going to make a statement that uses the term "impact statement," and that is a term of [art] including in courts of law, we should go for a definition, which makes what we are asking for clearer. I would put that definition forward for consideration.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you. I do not remember this recommendation at all. I might have been somewhere else at that time. I do not remember.

Now that I re-read it, I have this impression that it is more a principle than a recommendation. This might be a guiding principle for ALAC statements or something like that.

Is it possible now to move it away from the list of recommendations and turn it into something different – a principle, a guiding rule? It doesn't sound to me as a recommendation but as something that should guide us in the making of our statements. From now on, or as we should have done it, or with just a minor comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Fatimata. Next is Satish Babu.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Olivier. I think I echo the points raised by Fatima right now. I also think this is something that needs to be institutionalized as we go forward, rather than being something that is one-off and being done away with.

I think we have to isolate the other points also, which I think are the same bucket, that we need to procedurally isolate them and

ensure that they are institutionalized and that's the way ALAC operates for the future.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. I think and I wonder whether I was in. I can't remember what thematic group I was in.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Dev? Oh, you have your hand up. Sorry, I didn't see you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. I think what this recommendation spoke about is what you alluded to, Olivier, is that the intent was so that ICANN would ensure impact assessments showing, "okay, this is affecting end users or this is affecting registrants" and so forth because often what the text for public [consultation] usually says, "Okay, there was an issues report [deemed] from the GNSO report on IRTP Part D," for example. Most end users would look at that statement and say, "Well, what the heck has that got to do with me? Why should I care?"

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

I think that was the intent of the recommendation so that when the public comment comes out, there's some sort of an assessment. "Okay, why should you care? This public comment on this proposed policy impacts end users in this way; registrants, this way; registries, this way," that type of thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Dev. I think I'm starting to remember the discussions that we had in that working group, and indeed, yes, it was often the case. We often hear, "Well, the ALAC sends a note out to the mailing list and says anybody wishes to make any comment on this obscure thing" and nobody feels interested because they don't know how this impacts them or how this actually will impact the end user community.

So in order to be able to produce such a thing, an impact statement, either our community would have to draft this or we would have to have a staff resource to be able to do such a thing.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think what Dev said is absolutely right, and if we maybe want it real action item is when whoever the penholder is and you're drafting a statement that will be part of a PDP or whatever, one of the things you have to include is: why are we making a comment in a way that is relevant to/important for end users?

Then included in that statement it means people can actually realize, well, this is really important. IRTP-D and C are relevant and important to users, but who would know? If you don't live there, you don't know.

So it's a calling to say anybody who's a penholder has to include an explanation as to why it's important for end users and what impact it will have if it's implemented or if it's not implemented.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Holly. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There are a number of ways of looking at this. If we included what Holly just put in, there are certainly a number of groups within ICANN that would say, "Fine. That's your opinion." Demonstrate that you've actually done a study that you know this is fact as opposed to an opinion. So that's part number one.

Part number two is if we were to actually try to do something other than an opinion, there wouldn't be enough time in our comment/response period.

Number three, it does give us an out to say if the group putting out the recommendation did not do an impact study on users, then we have a way to say, "Sorry. We can't comment because you're not providing adequate information," and we will categorically reject it until we see the impact on our communities.

So we can play this a variety of different ways, but I use the word play carefully because it may be what it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: So I recommend we can close this because we are discussing this in a group dealing with these recommendations. What I'm trying to say is if this is important for ALAC, make this an action item for ALAC to change the way we do the statements to add an impact or something like that, and we take that as an action item, and then manage that as an action item within the whole

ALAC and decide there what you want to do. That's why you are closing this because you are following through somewhere else.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Satish Babu?

SATISH BABU: Thank you. I support this because this particular thing has to outlive the current ATLAS II recommendations. It has to become a permanent part of how we work, so it has to be outside this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Part of the DNA.

SATISH BABU: Yes, part of the DNA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Satish. Next is Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Olivier. This is exactly what I was going to say. I agree with Eduardo. We should decide this internally within ALAC.

I'm also concerned that if with each statement we have to submit our research, a survey, or an impact analysis, we won't have any more penholders. There are already very few penholders, people who draft the statements, and this way, we would just have [Anna] writing the statements. I think we should discuss this internally within ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I have a slightly different view. If we can scroll back to the recommendation, please.

I agree absolutely with everything that's been said here regarding the amount of resources that it would require from our own volunteers in needing to do impact statements for every statement that we draft. Eduardo, I don't think we'd end up with any volunteers to draft a statement if every time it needs to be for, against, what does it mean for the end user, what does it mean for my mother, what does it mean for the person who rides a bicycle, and the whole lot.

I'm having a laugh on this one. But, no, it is a serious matter.

I think what this statement says here, though, is that adequately resourced means there should be some staff time allocation given. When a public comment period is sent out, we have seen

actually that there is a statement about how this impacts or how this has the potential to impact different communities.

Should the At-Large community be given some help to translate an IRTP part D public comment (and C) into what this means for end users because we have to bring in the point of view of the end users? We are extremely overworked in this community, and adding some more things for us to do the translation as a group towards the end user is something which I find a little bit difficult.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think this is a recommendation which raises an issue. It does not provide a quick path to implementing it. I think it has raised our consciousness. I think we need to focus and think about this and how we deal with it and perhaps how ICANN on a larger scale deals with it.

I, personally, would say it is not actionable in its current form, but it is something that we must put on our "to-do" list, as it were. Not necessary an action item to complete tomorrow, but it's something that we need to keep on thinking about. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. I realize we are now 20 minutes over the end of this session. The next session is going to start with specifically an update on this.

What I suggest for a clean break is that we end the session now, we have a one-minute break for the system to be able to reboot itself or whatever needs to be done, and restart our discussion. We have another ten minutes until half past, I think, is when we will have the roll out of the ALAC website.

ALAN GREENBERG: You'll have seven minutes after the one-minute break.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's fine. This call is adjourned, and don't leave us because we're starting in one minute again. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]