

MARRAKECH – ALAC / At-Large Community interaction and input to ATRT3

Wednesday, June 26, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 WET

ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

ALAN GREENBERG: Before we start – can I have your attention for a moment?

I have a colleague who desperately needs a MagSafe 1 power unit. That is the old magnetic power unit for a Mac PowerBook. If anyone has one and can lend one, let me know. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [This one?]

ALAN GREENBERG: MagSafe 1 is what I'm looking for – the old style. I'm told it's a larger connector.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Not this one.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: If anyone has one, let me know.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Welcome back, everyone. Of course, our guests have arrived, so it's just as well. Of course, we're all waiting eagerly to hear about the accountability and transparency review. I did send the questions out. I fear that we haven't had any real chance to go over them together, but I'm sure there'll be some—

[ALAN GREENBERG]: I have an answer.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, good. One person's got an answer. So I'm going to leave it to Cheryl and Pat to introduce their presentation. I'm sure that they will also introduce the members of our team who are part of your establishment as well. thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hello. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team in the third iteration. To my left is Pat Kane. He's one of the other Co-Chairs. We've had the pleasure of having quite a number of our review team members be able to attend the Marrakech

meeting, not as a funded exercise from ATRT but because they're here for other reasons. Because there was enough of us, we've taken the opportunity to go around wherever possibly and have an interaction, a discourse, with the component parts of ICANN. So far, we've met with the GAC. We've – well, no. We're meeting with the GAC tomorrow. My apologies. We've met with the GNSO. We've met with the ccNSO, and we've got another meeting or two planned [after] we've met with the SSAC, for example.

We pretty much have the same set of questions for each group, although you being ALAC and being special, you get an extra one. So don't worry. If you haven't had time to contemplate your reactions and responses to the questions you can see on the screen, the whole idea of today is to have a relatively frank and fearless conversation or discourse where we realize we will just be hearing your individual views – but that's okay – about these particular questions.

We do however have a fabulous number of our review team people in this room. I certainly want to recognize those at the ALAC table. Of course, you have Sebastien Bachollet. You also sent me. You have Vanda Scartezini. I'm just trying – there's Daniel, if he's paying attention. They're the four people the At-Large Advisory Committee sent to the ATRT3. Remember, I did say it in full language to begin with, so now I'm allowed to use the shortcut.

We also particularly want to recognize the other people in the room today. We have Maarten, who is our designated Board member. It's a bit like having a designated driver at a barbeque. Maarten's our designated Board member. We have Demi, who's the ccNSO rep. We have Liu, who is from the Government Advisory Committee, and Jaap from SSAC. And we have – I'm only seeing the two of you from the GNSO. Correct me if I'm wrong. Is Osvaldo in the room?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, if you're hiding. Right-o. We have Osvaldo hiding in the peanut gallery. Is Tola somewhere?

[TOLA]: Oh, there you are. Right, okay. Didn't even see you. My apologies. And we have Michael and Erica. Did I miss anyone? Because I've missed one or two of you before.

No? Okay. Well, now you can recognize these people. They're also people you can approach with any information, feedback, or input, particularly on that last question on screen, the question that says, "Is there anything else you'd like to share from your

perspective on accountability and transparency?” Feel free to approach us, or, of course, send us an e-mail.

The other thing that I just wanted to mention is that this is not the only time that you will get an opportunity to interact with us. One of the things we’re doing is putting together a set of survey questions. There is in fact a large body of questions we want to ask, but given the time and the nature of how we would like to run these interactions while we’re here in the Marrakech meeting, we thought culling it down to just a few questions that we will be asking each group was a worthwhile exercise. And so far, it has been.

I also would like to assure you that such a survey form will be easy to read in plain English. We will deal with the necessities of having multiple languages in some way, shape, or form. We just haven’t got to that part of our planning yet. But we will not ignore the fact that the community within ICANN and especially within At-Large speaks several languages.

[With] that, I’m going to ask Vanda if she can step up to the microphone and just give some depth and color and do a little introduction on our first question to you, which is about the GAC – oh, while she’s setting up, why am I asking Vanda? Because in fact we run in four work parties. We have a work party that is interested in all things GAC. We have a work party that is in

interested in all things Board. We have a work party that is interested in all things community, and that includes PDP processes. And we have a work party – this one cracks me up – which is about reviewing reviews.

Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Hello, everyone. It's of course a pleasure to be here again. It's not ... it's working?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Our first question from the GAC perspective is to see how ALAC is seeing the relationship with the GAC, the interaction with the GAC to the liaisons, [all] the liaisons. What you see can be suggestions for improvement on that relationship since we are looking for an understanding of how the GAC can be more accountable and transparent and how these interactions with the ALAC could be beneficial for both sides. That's the general idea.

I haven't seen my friend from the GAC, [the] liaison, but anyway, all of view can have your personal ideas, and certainly the general idea from the ALAC we welcome. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. I'd like to take the question as it's written here. "Are your community members satisfied with their interaction with the GAC?" I'd like to say a few things. First of all, I think, at present, the relationship between ALAC and the GAC is good and is constantly improving. The liaisons are doing fine work, and we find many issues where we find common ground that we can work together on and issue advice and work together on.

That said, if I think more about the broader At-Large community, ALAC is cognizant – we're aware – that many individual members, individual users, across the world are sometimes in violent disagreements with their governments. So the interests of end users do not always align with the interests of their governments, and those governments are represented on the GAC. So there's a difference there between the two things. So, while we work with the GAC on an ongoing basis as ALAC and as a community, we are also constantly aware that, at the most basic level with our community members, there's often a difference of opinion between the GAC and the people that they represent. But that's not something that ICANN org/ATRT can actually dress in any meaningful way, and we understand that. However, it's

something that I think needs to be said and be made aware of.
Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So noted. I've got Alan and then I've got Joanna.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Having sat as Chair of the ALAC over roughly the four years between ATRT2 and ATRT3, and having been involved in the ALAC before that and knowing what the interrelationship with the GAC is, the concept of night and day does not reflect the changes. We used to meet with the GAC occasionally. There was no great value to either side in doing it, but we also always had to do it. We actually talk about things.

We are getting to the point – heaven help us – where we are actually working together on things. We don't always agree, and the GAC understands and we understand that there are some issues that are hot topics for them which we either disagree with completely or we're smart enough to be quiet on because those are some of the cases where our users are not necessarily all in uniform step. But is night and day. We are talking to them. We have effective relationships with them. We have liaisons with them.

Something I'll note: In the very first ALAC meeting in 2003, when they were appointing liaisons, someone said, "Why don't we have a liaison with the GAC?" We do now in both directions. It ain't perfect, but it's imperfect through lack of will. It's not perfect currently through lack of ability of actually making things happen because we're all busy and have our own priorities. But it's a great difference. I'm not sure it's because of ATRT2, but it sure is a big difference.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. My current order is Joanna followed by Ricardo followed by Tijani. Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just feel compelled to note that there is an unfolding capacity building collaboration between the two communities. We just a joint session this morning. We had a working meeting on Monday. I'm really hopeful for that collaboration in the sense of providing technical and societal information to community members, those advanced but specifically to newcomers. We want to focus on providing information to both communities as the ICANN environment remains the same.

But I would also view this as a platform to foster the differences that John was mentioning. So the GAC is significantly interested in cybersecurity, and they [pertain] to have a broader view of what cybersecurity is as the nations would. That's something that John mentioned as well, whereas have this narrow mission that is focused on the technical aspect of the Internet, whereas the section we just concluded with Patrick Jones, who provided information on cybersecurity, that we welcomed GAC members to as well clearly indicated that there is a link between the technical side, the content side, and the societal side, if you will.

So I'm really hopeful for that capacity building collaboration to help us better understand where we stand as a community and especially where we stand representing the users. So I just wanted to note that as a current initiative. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Joanna. It is certainly well-noted. Over to you, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I will speaking in Spanish if you don't mind because you will have to use your ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, you're in the list now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're next after Tijani.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Ready, everyone? Oh, Cheryl is learning Spanish. Good to know that. Oh, sorry. Didn't see your [big plans].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Sorry for that. The second point is, how can you improve? I think there has been a significant improvement, having a liaison and then the other on the other side. There's a joint training. I think, at this level, ALAC and the GAC have improved significantly, but we are not improving at a rational level. That is, when we do it in the LAC space, there are scarcely one or two governments and [they] don't know really what it is like in original spaces. I do believe that we should tap into what we are having right here now. I especially believe that we represent less people – that is,

less countries – than what the GAC represents in some cases. But sometimes there are other ALSes from certain countries that are not coming and that are not represented formally. So we can have a mixture of completing each other so that the countries can understand, maybe through another country – a neighboring country. The same happens to other ALSes that are not participating here and believe this is important for their countries. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Ricardo. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. The question is not about if we agree on the positions of the GAC or not. Of course we have different interests. We are about public interests. They are about political interests. Of course, we don't have the same positions.

The question was if we have good interaction with them and if there is room for improvement. The answer should be, yes, we have good interaction with the GAC, and, yes, of course, there is always room for improvement. I don't think that, today, we have any contention or any problem of interaction with the GAC. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. That's excellent to hear. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. This doesn't directly address the question, but I know there's some room to go off-road here a little bit. One of the challenges for being an advisory committee has to do with the timing of your input into the policy development process. Ostensibly, it's funny if you go and look at the ICANN website that described the policy development process. Both the GAC and the ALAC are described as advice givers. But at the same time, giving advice at the tail end of a policy development process leads to a bunch of resentment as well. "Well, we've discussed this. We've done public comments," etc.

So I think we've all tried to get engaged earlier somehow. Sometimes that involves participation in work groups, and sometimes it involves just being engaged in the comment process associated with them.

I guess I'm curious about going forward with PDP 3.0, etc., if it's going to be more difficult or more challenging to participate earlier in the process, which is what the GNSO really asked all of us to do. So I wanted to raise that as issue that we share with the GAC that's more procedural rather than substantive and that we should potentially have more conversation about it. I don't know whether it's something for ATRT except that, if ALAC ends up in a

disadvantaged position in the context of these work groups and PDP 3.0, that'll feel like less accountability to the end users that we hope that this community serves.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jonathan. That is very well-noted indeed, and I think it would also perhaps have an impact of some of what the community is doing – I see them nodding up there – because the effectiveness of input is something that group is looking at.

While I'm talking about that work party without any other hands up or cards up, Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Just a follow-up question to you, Jonathan. You mentioned the respective roles of the ALAC and the GAC. Are there points whereby both the GAC and ALAC have driven consensus on giving respective advice to the Board? And if there are any occurrence, can you be a little bit specific on where consensus has been driven at? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just repeat or rephrase, please.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'll make it a little bit simpler. Both the ALAC and GAC give advice to the Board. Are there points whereby, in your introductions, you've come up with joint advice after coming up with an appropriate consensus to the Board? If at all there exists any, could you just simply outline one or two examples where that has occurred? Thank you – also, Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If Jonathan can't, I know who can: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You'll find on record two statements to the Board made jointly by the ALAC and the GAC on producing material which allows our novice and new people to have some clue on what we're talking about in this organization.

The first one was misinterpreted by the Board. We issued a second one that made it a lot clearer. We've yet to see the results, but they've said yes. Sort of.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: "Sort of." Okay. Thank you very much. Any other points on this first question? If not, we'll move to our second question. Here – okay, John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. This question is ... The types of challenges we face in ALAC in representing At-Large ... We have a unique challenge in this in that we strive to represent the interests of Internet users around the world from any walk of life, whether or not they are registrants, whether they live, whatever situation they find them in. For us on ALAC, our constant struggle is to listen. The individual members and ALSes are one conduit for information. We take their input and channel it into our decisions when we're voting and expressing ourselves on the lists and at meeting. But we represent a broad swath of users, and the constant challenge for us is just listening and doing right by the people whose interests we're trying to represent, weighing the differences even in particular regions of interests and trying to find the right balance and position. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, John. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I would like to start by saying that we are truly a diverse community and not in terms of only where we come from but also relation to our backgrounds and experiences. This in itself is an advantage because we carry different perspectives, idea, and experiences. So all of this should be to our advantage, to our advantage in coming up with new ideas and new outcomes.

But I think our biggest challenge is, how do we consolidate all those different perspectives and ideas in order to get the benefit of this diversity, which is truly a blessing? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Hadia. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll guess I'll present the opposite side of that coin. There are a number of issues where we are very diverse and have different positions and we'll never come to agreement within At-Large. Privacy is one of them. We have different perspectives.

On most of the issues related to both ICANN internally, which we often comment on, and with regard to the actual policy issues that we're working on, there is surprising uniformity across the regions. I can think of very few times over many years where there's been real, major discontinuities because of the [region]. Regions help us divide the people into groups, but they're not necessarily despite the wide range of backgrounds and perspectives. [They] often do not vary.

What we do have a significant problem with is demonstrating to the rest of the world that, in fact, we are not just making it up as a bunch of people sitting in a room but actually can prove that this is in fact the will of the people who many times do not know

we exist. That's our challenge. It's more of a credibility challenge than actually formulating the positions in many of the cases.

I have strong confidence in the positions but proving is harder. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. That's one to ponder. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Alan, you bring forward very interesting remarks regarding the challenges that are faced. Are there situations whereby the views that have been presented by the members of the ALAC represent their personal opinions and not the opinions of the respective community that they represent?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're presuming the two differ. They don't necessarily.

DANIEL MIGAULT: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: But remember, of the people who get involved in ICANN, some of them have a group back home they can bounce things off of. Some of them just have a vast number of years of experience

dealing with those people, even if those people cannot spell “ICANN.” So it’s a combination. How do you differ with a personal view which everyone agrees with? It is a personal view.

Our challenge is really to represent the needs of these people, not necessarily their personal positions of everyone back home because many of them don’t have personal positions on the kind of things we discuss here. It’s a challenge finding enough people to make sure you haven’t gone off the road.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan. I’m quite sure I’ve heard any number of times in an ALAC room, referring to why you’re gathered together and what you do, the phrase, “Acting in the best interests of.” I think they are very important sets of words for us to recognize that what the ALAC does is act in the best interests of Internet end users and individual registrants. I think you’ll find that printed in a few places.

Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: That’s interesting. I recognize what Alan says. It’s a general challenge for ICANN as a community. How do you reassess whether you’re still representing the people you should represent at that moment? How do you ensure that new users are in there

or prospective users are in there? How do you deal with that? I'm just curious? What mechanism is next to the regional members, etc.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess I want to make two points. One is that the At-Large is always trying to experiment with how better to get feedback. We're working this year in particular on an outreach over universal acceptance because it's this non-controversial issue that anybody that hears about it agrees with. So that opportunity hopefully allows for a more fluid interaction all the way down through the ranks of the At-Large and can begin to reveal what those points of contact could look like for the future in terms of getting feedback.

The other issue is that I think there's a danger for us of taking this paternalistic view that we're representing some other people other than us. It's the idea that somehow there's people out there that can barely type their name and that those are the users that we represent and something like that. In reality, when you talk about an individual Internet users, you're really talking about a set of activities online. You're talking about making reservations

online. You're talking about doing online banking, planning your travel, doing research, etc., and what effect does that have on your privacy, what happens to your information, are things easy to use or not easy to use?

If I put my universal acceptance ... If I buy a .gallery domain and I try to put my e-mail into the American Airlines site and it's rejected, that's an end-user issue. And it doesn't require you to be an idiot to have that issue. Right now, if Vint Cerf bought a .gallery domain name and tried to book flights on American Airlines, he wouldn't be able to. So that's the thing. The idea that there's some nameless masses that just have no idea who we are and they are the only one we represent I think is a mistake. I think what we have to do is think about what life is like most of the time for all of us and look at that end user experience and make our job about improving that. Then I think this issue starts to be much less stark because it's really much more obvious that way because we're all experiencing having these individual Internet users experiences.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jonathan. At the moment, I've got Tijani followed by Joanna followed by Alan. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I don't think that there is anyone in this room who can say, "I am expressing the point of view of the people who I am representing," except if, each time we want to discuss a point, we make a survey and we come up with the consensus of all the community. This is impossible. So we are expressing our point of view, personal point of view.

The second part of the question, which is the most important in my point of view, is how to maintain the accountability towards those people. I think this can be done only by the selection of the representatives of the community. We have to change those people. They don't have to be there very long. We have to change them. We have to try to touch all parts of the community we are representing, all regions, for example, in a continent, men and women, etc. I think this is the only way to try to be close to the community we are representing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So noted, Tijani. Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. I wanted to respond to Maarten's question, but I also wanted to address the questions that are on the Board. I might sound like a broken record. I apologize if I do, but I'm going to say capacity building once again.

Just yesterday, we had – you guess it – a capacity building session. The takeaway from that session, just to specifically address the concern that Maarten raised, was that, as I understand, there is an improvement in the way we develop policies. So there is actually a diagram – I know engineers love diagrams, so we actually have a diagram – of how the policy has been developed thus far, but we want that model to be distributed in term of capacity building. We want to teach the community how this is done, how this has been done thus far. We understand that implementing the At-Large review implies that we need to improve our processes.

From yesterday's session, the slides of the company that – I'm going to thank Justine once again for the lovely graphics that were included – will be transformed into an ICANN Learn course, which is supposed to make that process more transparent, more available. That course likely will be provided in different languages. In that sense, we are reaching out to the community to get them more engaged in this policy development process.

I will not discuss the details of that. Both the session and the slides are available, and we are working on making that more comprehensive, more transparent, and more available. So this works generally as with any other constituency. It's just that we're bigger and we speak different languages. If you want graphics or a better explanation, we actually have that and that's going to be

propagated. As I keep on saying, we welcome all the users to come forward and help us develop policies and advice. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, I think we would as a review team value a copy of the graphics, etc. The infographics would perhaps make a very valuable appendix in some of our work. It would certainly help us focus. So please feel free to send us material or links to materials. We'll definitely look at it.

Jonathan, is that a new card? No. Okay, so I have Alan and then I have Tola.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm responding to the question of how do we do a sanity check to make sure we're not off the rails and that we're just speaking on our own behalf. I'll make it easier for you. Hadia, Justine, Joanna, Daniel, [Liu], Natalia, and maybe Anne-Marie, depending on how we define it, were not involved at all with At-Large when I started becoming Chair four-plus years ago. And those are just the ones on that side of the table.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Very good to see all those new people, committed people. Very much [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't think this a static group, I must say. Thank you, Alan. Tola?

TOLA: I have a bit of disconnect that I want to clarify. I'm sorry if I'm wrong, but I just feel – we're discussing accountability and transparency, so my thinking is, while addressing this question, we're looking at accountability of ALAC activities to your constituencies, to your members, and accountability of whatever you advised to the Board if it's been done and the transparency of this process.

But the disconnect I have is what I have had, expect for a few – Alan and Tijani mentioned a fear about that accountability. What I have had so far has been the activities of ALAC and not the accountability and transparency of your activities. So that's the disconnect I have. I don't know if we can have that [done], that these questions address the accountability and transparency of your activities to your members and to ICANN.org, rather than describing the activities of ALAC. I just need some clarification. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan? Sorry. John.

JOHN LAPRISE: I think she meant me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I did mean you.

JOHN LAPRISE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a "J" word.

JOHN LAPRISE: It's a "J" word. I think, to that end, what I would suggest is that – our activities here are broadcast in multiple languages. Our activities are public. Our discussions are public. We have vibrant discussions on e-mail lists. Our meetings are open. Jonathan has done a fantastic job at the Consolidated Policy Working Group. We've been having, lately, weekly meetings discussing pretty much everything that we talk about at these meetings. So people who are interested in seeing what goes on at ALAC can call into a meeting, listen in, phone in, read, and either be involved or just lurk. They can see the decisions that are being made as they're

being made. So that's how I would deal with the transparency and the accountability.

Well, I just lost an election to the gentleman to your right for an ALAC seat.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Aww.

[JONATHAN ZUCK]: I'm very sad.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: See, that's why I already was changing the names as if I've moved forward.

JOHN LAPRISE: I represent NARALO right now and, after the Montreal meeting, I will not. When we had our election, we both said what we were going to do. The people who voted within those elections made that choice, and they chose Jonathan. So if that's accountability, then that's accountability.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to note, it was a close election.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thanks, Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien? No, Sebastien? Okay. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Cheryl. I'd like to point out that ALAC has also changed over the ears. When I first came into ALAC, it was confined to organizations as members. Just an instance. Today we are open to individuals also. So that dramatically increases the reach of ALAC for people to participate.

Similarly, there have been some other instances – for instance, the use of social media – that have actually put us in close touch with multiple communities. So ALAC has not been static. We have been reinventing ourselves gradually, but I still agree that there is probably lots more room to improve. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have Olivier and then Sebastien. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. On the matter of accountability and transparency to our members, I also wanted

to point out that our process for writing statements is entirely open. We've got a wiki that's open to anyone for everyone to look at. We go as far as having a Google Doc page that's also open to everyone. Everyone can go into there. It's not without its negative sides because there have been some people that disagreed with some of the points that were there and were very vocal about it. A number of other people were vocal about it the other way. It just ended up with some of those people being unhappy because they didn't have their way. But that's the way that we work: very openly. So we've got that.

We've got our working groups that are open to pretty much anybody and everybody. I suspect there might be a few dogs that are currently in our working groups as well or non-humans, but that's ... But basically it's really, really open. I can't think of that many places in ICANN that are as open as At-Large is.

Now, of course, as seen from outside, it might be a little mysterious because of the language and the acronyms and all that. That obviously is a problem that is not just an ALAC thing or At-Large thing but is something that goes across all of ICANN. We try to be as welcoming as possible. There might be some individuals that are not particularly welcoming. But in general, it's ... and I'm saying some individuals are not welcoming. Not "not welcomed." We welcome everyone. But some of us might

not be particularly friendly to other people. But that's a character thing and it's individuals.

So that's the whole—

JONATHAN ZUCK: But you're improving all the time, Olivier. Another decade of ICANN service and I think you're going to be a friend to all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: With your help, I'll be able to both become approachable and also be able to keep my statements short. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. We're never going to get him to make his statements short. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: With my hat as an ALAC member and not so much as an ATRT3 member, in this room I would like for all of us to use the right words. ALAC is 15 people. At-Large is all of us. I know it's difficult to make the difference. It's difficult for us, but can you imagine outside what people are going through? So let's make an effort.

Satish, when you're speaking about ALAC, you're actually speaking about At-Large. It's not the same thing. ALAC is 15. At-Large is all of us.

So when we talk about users and the fact that we should be accountable to them, what I can tell you is that my kids, my parents, people that I train to understand how to access the Internet for the first time with a tablet, I am back to basics on why and how I access the Internet and what I do with it. That's how I personally can remain accountable to end users.

So please do not try to make us believe or say that we should speak in the name of all because there's no point to our meetings. You can send someone and that person will say whatever he or she wants because we need to include diversity in the way that we express ourselves, in the places where we go. Of course I'm not going to say the same thing as my neighbor and I'm not going to say it in the way he or she might say it. I use French, and you use a different language. So let's leave diversity alone. Diversity is going to exist. We are not going to have the same face, the same way to express ourselves, the same way to say things.

I am very serious about that because, for the past two days, I have constantly been hearing, "We need to find consensus, consensus, consensus. And we should say the same thing." Well, no. I will continue to defer. That's how it goes. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. If I read the two last questions, I would not answer as they are answered here because our accountability to our community – the question is not Question #2. Question #3 and 4 are general. They are speaking about a policy development process. So it is general. It is not our policy development process. The last one is about accountability and transparency in ICANN.

So I don't think that we have to speak about our transparency or our accountability. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. It is in fact open to both, and we welcome all of it. But we certainly need the general as well as the specific. John?

JOHN LAPRISE: [inaudible] three [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We are about to be on Board 3. I'll just note we will not get to Bullet 4 – I'm apologizing for that – unfortunately, but that is one

we would very much value Madam Chair having feedback, formal or informal. Perhaps you might distribute these questions as a little teaser through some of the lists before the survey comes out. It'll be a bit while before we have our survey prepared. People might be thinking along lines and help them do the survey.

Go ahead, John. [inaudible]

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you. Regarding the perception of transparency within the policy development process, including the emergency PDP, I think that there's a lot of transparency in all these processes. They are really open. You can get all the information and you can interact and join. That's all great, if you meet a knowledge bar to get there. Otherwise, those processes are completely opaque unless you have the specialist knowledge to really dig in. At this point, I'll put on my hat as a PhD. You need a lot of specialized knowledge to really interact effectively in a lot of these PDPs. Unless you have that knowledge base, you're just flailing. So it's a really heavy lift. It's a really steep learning curve. It's really hard.

So the PDPs are transparent, but it's really technically difficult.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, John. I've got Holly and then I have Eduardo and then I've got Daniel. And I've got Jonathan and we're going to close there.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, thank you, John. You took away about half of what I was going to say. It is a difficult process regardless of how transparent. The other difficulty of the process is that I can't tell you how many times I've say in on PDPs and I have been one or one of two people on ALAC and I'm facing a community with very, very different views and very, very different needs. If you're a public interest advocate, what can I say? That's what you do. You're constantly saying, "I'm sorry. Think of the end user," and in fact there's 20 other people in the room that just don't have that in mind. So transparency is not the only problem. The language, who you represent, how many people are in the room, how many care – all of those are issues that should be added to that question. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well noted. Thank you. Back to you, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to comment on the last question. I always feel uneasy when I see the schedules of meeting when they have a "C"

for closed. We're talking about transparency. When I see a "C," there's no transparency.

So my suggestion is, if you're going to have a closed meeting, do it like the NomCom does this. Do not publish it. Do it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm smiling because I couldn't agree more. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: My question is just a little bit specific to the representation of At-Large to the EPDP. I'm very aware that we as At-Large have representatives to the EPDP who played a very much significant role in EPDP Phase 1. I'm very much aware that there are some recommendations that were rejected in Phase 1. Has the representative got back to the community and updated them on the status of the [occurrence] of the EPDP?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll take that. That's a GNSO matter. We'll discuss it there. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. This is a great question and one that's been asked by every ATRT team since ATRT1. I guess I'll give the same answer that I gave to the ATRT1 team. I think that the biggest problem of

transparency with the policy development process is related to what John was saying. It's an expertise problem but it's also a volume of information problem. It's a time commitment problem to gauge as an external to that. So the transparency problem that I think is primary is actually the affected people outside of this tight-knit community that'll be affected by this policy.

I see that in two ways. One is that the public comment periods themselves are huge and complex and inside-baseball. I still to this day believe that there should be a way to phrase questions so that in fact people with more expertise but more specific expertise are able to answer questions from that impacted community. So boiling down some of the questions that come out as a part of a public comment in a form that's designed for an expert out in the world to answer just that one question I think could do a lot to allow for people to engage in what I call periodic participation in this process as opposed to it being a life sentence.

The second piece of this that is a little bit of a transparency problem is how the comments are consumed by work groups. The staff does an incredible job of breaking them down, creating Excel spreadsheets, saying who thought what about what. What isn't always clear is what then happens. Sometimes it's been as bad as the final report being finalized before the end of the comment period. So it creates a perception that the comment period is perfunctory.

On the CCT review, it was very onerous and difficult because some of the comments are ridiculous. But we went through every single comment and tried to say how we addressed it. “We took it on. Here’s the change we made. We disagreed. Here’s why,” etc. As somebody trying to throw comments over the transom from outside the community again with a different kind of expertise – the PhDs that John is talking about – then it’s opaque as to what happened to that. Did it just go in the circular file or was it really taken on by that work group? Finding a way to improve the transparency of that I think could go a long way to improve ICANN’s credibility to the outside Internet community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I think we could suggest there’s an awful lot of work and trust involved there as well. And, yes, you’re right. We heard that in ATRT1. “Get it right by some time.” There certainly are improvements. It’s possibly consistency in it as well.

Is there anyone else who wants to make any brief comments?

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just want to follow on to that comment. I think GNSO PDPs and review teams for that matter are doing a really good job of analyzing comments now. I wish I could say the same for the

comments that are put out by ICANN org and the Board of actually saying how we understand your comments and what we're doing about it and how we took it into account because those, I think, are still back around 19 ... well, 2006. I'll be kind.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I suspect that the example Jonathan gave of publication of reports before period finished fits into that category in fact. Yeah, I figured you were talking about the one I was thinking of.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask Pat if there's anything he wants to add in the last minute-and-a-half.

PAT KANE: Hi, everyone. It's Pat – no. One of the unique things, of course, about the ATRT review is that we have a one-year timeframe to get this done. So we are targeting to be done in March of next year. We just finished up our terms of reference. So we've put our goals, so it'd be helpful if anyone wants to take a look at that and give some feedback on that.

We're now going to start do our analysis. We're in the data gathering mode. We'll go through our analysis, and we intend to have an initial working document from the different work parties complete by the middle of September or the end of September so that we can start polishing that up for an initial publication at

some time before Montreal. Probably that first week of November is what we're targeting in the work plan. So there's a lot going on.

There's a lot to get done because we do just have a year. We're certainly going to try to not boil the ocean and manage scope clearly, but you'll have plenty of opportunities to engage with the members that you sent to the review team, as well as others, in terms of gathering more information and helping us understand things. So thank you very much for your time today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Madam Chair, back to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I was just looking through the schedule, and I thought that you were actually doing the whole lot, taking all the time. [inaudible]. It says, "Follow up on ATRT3 discussion," and I thought we'd actually had all that discussion. Is there anything else that you would like to get from us?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No. We've had our hour with you. We've valued it. We've got an enormous amount with you. I don't see what follow-up. We're in data gathering mode.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I don't know who actually wrote that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I'm not responsible for what your agenda says, [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, that's quite all right. I'm sure I can find something to talk to these guys about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But I am responsible to get my ATRT3 to our next engagement, so if you don't mind, we will take our leave. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of us might appreciate a longer break.

PAT KANE: I just want to say it's nice to see that Cheryl treats you all the same way she treats us.

MAUREEN HILYARD: She's consistent.

JOHN LAPRISE: ... discussion. So if there's points of business, okay, but for a substantive discussion, this is not the time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The person to your left would like to say something. She's got her hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Actually, I must admit I apologize for that, that I did not actually read that properly. It wasn't my input, but because we have this additional time, and although the room has emptied – that's okay – I would just like you to know that I have actually sent out to the RALO Chairs the link to the travelers list. I would really like you to cut and paste the letter to your – because I haven't got their e-mail addresses and I guess you have. You only have six. Poor Satish has 20.

Yes?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. In view of the GDPR issues, I do not believe that it would be appropriate to share the travel list publicly. Therefore, notification of the people who are traveling

separately would probably be in order. I do remind you that our travel schedules and so on are behind a log-in.

I would add that, with the latest registration system that ICANN has put together, there is no published list of attendees at the ICANN meeting anymore. There might have been a reason for this. That's something we might wish to query as well. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, I'll take that under advisement. Sebastien? Sorry.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Madam Chair. Don't be sorry at all. It's an interesting discussion. I want to publish on Facebook the list of participants but I stopped immediately because it seems that some of my European colleagues have trouble with that. Okay, I'll send just to my friends the link to tell them they are selected – the ones who are not on here.

I just wanted to take 30 seconds. I have a request from one of my friends and colleagues who is running a registry in French but who has an office in Montreal and who is proposing that we, the ICANN community – but first I talk to At-Large – spend a new sum of our time to help [inaudible], the food world bank. It's something to help disabled people in Montreal. He's willing to organize that. I think it's exactly, where we were discussing the

meeting strategy, something that we wanted to do. I want to remind you that we went, or some of us went, to paint a school in South Africa, I guess.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Durban.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think it's something we may wish to do. Therefore, I wanted to inform you. As soon as I have more information, I will transfer this information to the engagement and outreach committee and to ALAC. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If I might just quickly, I just want to endorse that idea. I was trying to organize something for Puerto Rico, but it turned out that it being an island meant that the materials couldn't even get to the island for us to help with some of the reconstruction efforts. So that was a tough issue. Luckily, Montreal is not an island we can participate. I think it's—

ALAN GREENBERG: Last I heard, Montreal was an island.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of a different sort. I think it would be a good idea for us to try and help out, so thank you for that suggestion, Sebastien.

ALAN GREENBERG: Isn't an island something with water all around it? I think we qualify.

JOHN LAPRISE: You know us Americans. "Geography? Eh."

MAUREEN HILYARD: Is there anything else that anyone else wants to raise that's pressing?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: I reckon. I'm freezing. Anything else? Can we just close this meeting? Because I've actually got to go and get – I've got a splitting headache at the moment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]. Lots of follow-up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Lots of stuff we've got to follow up on. So we're going to let the interpreters go early.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [inaudible]. Tijani.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, sorry. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. If I read the agenda, I don't know if this is the follow-up on the ATRT3 discussion or if it is the next steps. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's the next steps. We're closing.

And now I'd like to thank the interpreters for staying so long. We're just to have a long bit of a [break].

JOHN LAPRISE: And thank you, technical support.

Our next session is at, what, 5:00? 17:00. At-Large workshop on consumer safeguards. Compliance will be back to talk with us, so please be here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]