
ICANN82 | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and ALAC
Tuesday, March 11, 2025 – 13:30 to 14:30 PST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello, and welcome to the joint session of the ICANN Board and the ALAC. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. This is a meeting between the ALAC constituents and the Board, so we will not be taking questions from the audience.

Interpretation for the session will include English, French, and Spanish. If we have any participating ALAC members on remote participation, you can raise your hand and speak in the Zoom room. Otherwise, we will not be taking any other comments. Please state your name for the record, all speakers, and the language you will speak in if you're speaking anything other than English. Anyone's welcome to use the chat.

Please note that the private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session hosts, co-hosts, and panelists. I will now hand the floor over to ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha.

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.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Wendy. Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the joint meeting of the ALAC and the Board. This session is going to be moderated by my colleague, Leon Sanchez, and I'm gonna turn it over to him immediately so that we can you spend our next 60 minutes talking with you. Maybe it's fine.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you. Thank you, Tripti, and welcome everyone to the session between the Board and the ALAC. It's always good to continue the dialogue between the Board and the different constituent parts of our community. And we have prepared a couple of questions beforehand for the ALAC to provide their input.

And ALAC has also provided a couple of questions for the Board. But I would like to start with those questions that the Board has put in front of the ALAC. And Jonathan, please feel free to of course let us know who can take the questions and answer them. So the first one is what we see here.

What are the next steps for the ALAC with regard to the CIP. As you know, we are in the process of trying to kick off the Pilot Holistic Review, which has some dependencies in regard to the CIP, the Continuous Improvement Program. And we would like to get to know a little bit more of how the ALAC looks at this process and what are the next steps that you have in store to carry out the CIP. So now the floor is yours, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, and thanks for having us here once again, we always find these conversations to be very fruitful with the Board, and like Tripti, I'm gonna skip any more pleasantries and pass the microphone immediately to Cheryl, who's been voluntold to take the first question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Thank you, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. It's like potato because I'm actually passing over to Bukola.

BUKOLA ORONTI

Hello, everyone. My name is Bukola Oronti, and I'm an ALAC member. So with the first questions, what are the steps for the ALAC with regard to the CIP? Actually, the ALAC has established a structured approach to implement the CIP, and we initially formed a small team of ALAC members to develop criteria and indicators using the five principles framework.

And our methodology adheres to the smart model, measuring our criteria, which are specific, measurable, attainable, achievable, realistic, relevant, resourcing, and T, for timely and time bound. So now we are transitioning to the implementation phase, which will expand involvement to include all 15 ALAC members alongside the original small team.

Additionally, we plan to collaborate closely with the regional At-Large organizations, that is the RALOs, to identify, prioritize, and harmonize the top three criteria for each of these five principles across these entities. Also, this harmonization serves multiple

purposes, that is, to identify common resource and budgetary requirements, preventing siloed operations, and fostering coercive action between ALAC and the RALOs. Specifically, we have identified the following next steps. One, transform the ALAC-CIP theme into a comprehensive ALAC-CIP theme to include all ALAC members while maintaining our established approval process for decision making.

And two, tax this expanded team with incorporating relevant inputs from our recent draft statement on the CIP framework public comment proceeding, and provide recommendations to ALAC regarding which elements should be adopted within each RALO's CIP plan with guidance on harmonization where appropriate. Thank you. Over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Thank you, Bukola. And I might also morph, if you don't mind, into the answering of the next question as well. I need to make very clear that of course, I'm a mere member of the At-Large community who's housed in the Asia Pacific region. I am not one of the 15 people on the ALAC, but I am serving with them as a subject matter expert having actually earned my keep in this sort of standards development in the real world for a number of years.

So I've been giving the small team a hand on how they can explore the guardrails and the opportunities and how to work in a smart system and those sorts of things. So I'm not ALAC, but I'm here to help. In the here to help part of all of this, I wanted to be very proud especially as an ex-ALAC member, and indeed once serving ALAC

chair of how advanced and how quickly the team brought together extensive planning on this, not only use of the five principles that the whole CIP cross-community group has been discussing, but this group has drilled down right down to their indicators for their selected criterion to operate over a three and a five-year plan for each and every one of those principles.

And that's done, that's not work to do, that is work already done. So they're very, very advanced. So I'm pleased, proud mama. What needs to happen next however, does involve the Board. It involves the Board in as much as it involves some extensive support and a little bit of longer-term thinking. As these groups like the ALAC start to implement these particular plans in their Continuous Improvement Plan, the first step they're going to do is prioritize just the same as ICANN does, what is of greatest urgency and what is of greatest importance.

So you'll get a P1, P2, P3, P4, just so it fits with the same modeling that ICANN does anyway. Having got all that work done, the company has to consider how it resources all of these good ideas. And there has to be some organized, orchestrated, and preferably harmonized way of getting as much bang for the buck on this.

We don't want, for example, and this is what the harmonization that Bukola was referring to, what's so important, we don't want, for example, all five regional At-Large organizations and the ALAC all asking for slightly different but similar resources. That's not working smart. We want to work smart in this.

So we need to do our homework, and then we need to know who and when we talk to, to get the next stage, including the cost effectiveness of some of these plans and how it's going to be supported because human resources come in here as well. So with homework to be handed in shortly, and then some deep and meaningful discussions to follow. I think that's it for this section. Back to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Well, I think it's back to the Board if you have questions about that answer and the can of worms that Cheryl opened up with her intervention. So I guess I would leave it to you to ask questions.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Jonathan. Yeah, I'm pretty sure maybe Tripti wants to react on what Cheryl just said. And after you, I will also comment.

TRIPTI SINHA

Well, thank you, Leon. And Jonathan, I'm not sure she opened up a can of worms. I must say that of all the review discussions we've had, this is the first one, Cheryl, that is very positive. You came back with, Hey, here's our plan, we've done a lot of work, part of it is already underway or completed, and we've got a lot more to do.

So this is the first one that I'm hearing. So congratulations to the ALAC for all this work, and perhaps you can serve as a model to others. But this does take me to another topic, which is continuous improvement is always good, and of course, continuous

improvement belongs to each of us, each of the constituencies. But we're having a broader discussion on reviews itself. Do you have any thoughts on that and where we stand with reviews in general? Unless you want to postpone that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Tripti, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. There are other questions coming in today that does deal specifically with that. So I might hold my power to dry until then.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you, Cheryl. Before we get deeper into that topic, it's good that you are in your here-to-help role, because what I wanted to convey is that while we acknowledge and recognize that the ALAC is this 15 group of people that ultimately come from the roots, which are the RALOs, yet they have At-Large community, I think it's great that even if you are not seated in the ALAC, you are seated at the table because that kind of reflects that foundation and the work that the At-Large community is doing at the grassroots.

And my question would be, you've done a lot of work, but how are you going to drill that down to the RALO level, to the ALS level, to the most basic level in which it can be adopted and worked through so that it is successful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Thank you, Leon, for that, and now we are into a can with worms, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. We would like to have had a

different model, but that's not what was thrust upon us with this note by intentional pressure on that word thrust upon us with the design given to us.

Again, I'm making words for very good reasons with the CIP-CCG because what was delivered as our model to work in has each and every one of the RALOs independently working from the ALAC and operating on their own plans and working in a similar way to being an entirely independent constituency of the GNSO. So my answer to that is, what a pity we didn't talk earlier.

JONATHAN ZUCK

But at the same time, the RALOs are engaged, and Sebastien is interested in speaking as well as in their own continuous improvement programs. But we're very focused on finding areas of overlap and harmony so that we're not doing redundant reforms and the things that we're gonna work on together, some of which is how we work with each other I think is part and parcel of the joint plans is to find those areas of harmony and working together. So Sebastien, do you want to add something?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you, Jonathan. Yeah, just one thing. As Chair of EURALO, I would like you to be aware that we at the EURALO level, but I am sure that my colleague from the other RALO could say the same, we have done the same job, therefore we are ready. It's not just the 15 people ALAC and the great help of Cheryl. It is the five RALOs and the ALAC who are ready to work on the CIP. Therefore, if you want

to have something as a positive, it's not just one small part of the organization, it's a big part of the organization. We are ready.

TRIPTI SINHA

So you're telling me the positive is much bigger than I originally thought.

LEON SANCHEZ

Exactly. You are far more coordinated than I imagined, so.

TRIPTI SINHA

Congratulations.

LEON SANCHEZ

So that's good. That's good. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

It's a whole model of the agency.

LEAON SANCHEZ

Good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Actually, Leon, if I may?

LEON SANCHEZ

Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

One of the things that we have produced and discussed at this meeting is this opportunity, having looked at all the plans from all five RALOs to see where there is some mutualism and where we believe we can perhaps do the prioritization from all of us. Now, obviously there's some divergence and there's some bespoke work and all that sort of thing. But we are looking for where the connection points are. So we'll get everybody through, but it could have been a smoother start.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Cheryl. Good. So we have something in our screen of Bluetooth pairing requests for something or somehow, but yeah. Good. So continuing with what we wanted to dive a little bit deeper and align with what Tripti was saying in regard to reviews, you wanted to also add something, Cheryl, what are your thoughts on that, and of course, anyone else from the ALAC or the At-Large in the table.

What are your thoughts on the status that we are facing right now with the reviews? We have the pilot policy review that it's somehow stuck. We haven't been able to progress a lot of that. We have many things, we have the ATRT4 coming as well. So we would definitely like to hear what are this part of the community's thoughts on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Well, I know that Sebastien's prepared because he's serving on PHR to respond specifically to the PHR part of the question. But as someone who's been fairly invested in ATRTs, I'm perfectly happy to field any of the aspects of this that are also involved with ATRT4, which I might remind you all ALAC said should simply run.

We think it should already be running. So no reason to delay, and especially not for any form of updating of standards for procedures that have not even been tested a second time. We don't need to delay for that to occur either. In fact, that's another part of our conversation that we'll come back to. So I guess that's over to you, Sebastien.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, no, I was just gonna say we have opinions on this, and I was just gonna give you a heads up, but it's already begun. So Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

We, as ALAC and At-Large, we ask a question to the Board. One of the reasons we are asking is that, as Cheryl said, and Leon also, we seem to be stuck somewhere with this Pilot Holistic Review. Just for the clarity of everybody here and the people online, it's not a review and it's not a pilot, but it's now a Pilot Holistic Review.

Therefore, it's quite confusing because we are not reviewing anything and we will be a standalone meeting, therefore can't be a pilot. A pilot would've been us to be able to discuss evolution of the structure as a Holistic Review must be, and it's not the case. We

are a group to decide to try to set up how the Holistic Review will come, and what are the change in the bylaws that need to be done.

Therefore we as At-Large, ALAC, we are really concerned about all the question raised today because in fact, if you go to the ATRT3 report, and you can ask a lot of people, we have two co-chair who are ready to answer any questions, Cheryl and Pat, you have member of the ATRT3 who are ready to work and who work closely with the Board to define what the Pilot Holistic Review was supposed to do.

And we spend time working closely on what to do, how to do it, and you have also people, and I am not the only one, Rhonda also who were in ATRT3 and who are in the Pilot Holistic Review. Therefore, you have the people to help to answer any question about what's meant to be the idea in in ATRT3.

Therefore, where we are today, it seems that we are stuck somewhere in middle of nowhere that both the chair of the SO/AC and the OAC of the Board tell the Pilot Holistic Review to stop, the Pilot Holistic Review also say, oh, we need to have the CIP finishing its work. But CIP will never be finished at its continuous improvement program. Therefore, it'll be continually helping the organization to evolve.

Therefore, we would like to know how we can get out of this trap, and also maybe it could be a first good step to tell the Pilot Holistic Review that they will have 18 months as it was suggested at the

beginning and not the 14 months that the Board decided to offer to the Pilot Holistic Review.

I will stop here, but really be sure that At-Large people who were engaged both in ATRT3, in the CIP, and in the Pilot Holistic Review are ready to advance all that as soon and as much as possible. We are ready and we think that it's possible. Thank you.

LEAON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Sebastien. Tripti, you wanted to say something?

TRIPTI SINHA

So, Sebastien, you said, we're stuck in the middle of nowhere, and that's not a good place to be, and this has come up in other meetings as well. And so the question that this begs is, are we at the right place? No, we're not at the right place. So shall we go back to fundamentals? Just go back to ground zero and look at the purpose of reviews.

They had a very good purpose, they obligate us to ensure that we are being accountable and transparent, and are we meeting our obligations? We've been stuck for a while now in this stalemate situation that isn't producing outcomes. So perhaps we take a step back and reinvent how we do reviews. So I'd like to hear thoughts from all of you on that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

If I can jump in there.

LEON SANCHEZ

Yeah, I was going to say that Cheryl had her had raised, and then I'll go to Sebastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

We need to remember that it is the purpose of the accountability and transparency reviews to review reviews. That is what it is meant to do. That's one of the drivers for ALAC and At-Large to say, let's get on with ATRT4 because much of this work can be captured in that. It's not as if the work of ATRT4 has to say, look at ATRT3 and how did it go? That can be parked, that can be pinned to the side. It has plenty of work that it could be scoped to do, including the sort of worthy work you are describing, and function very, very well in a timely manner in a structure that we already have built into our bylaws, because that's why ATRTs have that power so we can stop reviews and start reviews.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Cheryl. This came up in our previous meeting as well, that indeed ATRT4 could be used as modality to do exactly what you're suggesting. Just one point though, ATRT3 had the same exact motivation that ATRT4 had, so that went off the rails, so to speak.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

I beg your pardon, ma'am. Do you want to meet outside or do you want to deal with that one now? We most assuredly did not go off

the rails. We were piloting the new set of specifications to how we run specific reviews. And to that end, we were very particular about coming up with a few very neatly put SMART recommendations that could act as a proof of concept.

We did that, we haven't finished implementing any of it, but we did do that. And so that's why we didn't go to the broader group of things. But proposing the pilot, sorry, let me wash my mouth out with soap. By proposing the Holistic Review, that's exactly the job we were doing. ATRT3 proposed a radical capability to look at how ICANN is structured and functions. So that's not an off the rails, that's a right on target.

TRIPTI SINHA

Oh, Cheryl, I apologize if I touched upon sensitivities, but I think we are both aligned. In other words, we can use this modality. All right, go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

And if I can add to what Cheryl said, Tripti, you asked how we can change the way of doing reviews, but ATRT3 comes with stopping reviews, two or three of them, to evolve one, the organizational review, to create a new one. What more we can do to evolve the reviews within the organization? How we can be more accountable to what you are asking for. ATRT3 has done exactly what you are

asking for. It's done. Now we need to implement that, and I don't know why so much people, and sorry, I will say including the Board is no, no, no, no, we don't want, we don't want. ATRT1, 2, 3 were supposed to be the more important review of the ICANN, and it was not supposed to be discussed in too much detail by anybody.

It must be organized and done. Of course, with IANA transition, we transition also the way the reviews were done, as you remember ATRT1 and 2 were with the chair of the GAC and with CEO and president of ICANN, and eventually with the NTIA representative. Yes, all that disappears, but ATRT stays the same and needs to be taken into account like it was for 1 and 2. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

So Sebastien, I have a question for you. So why are we stuck in the middle of nowhere?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

I will say for three reasons. The first one, we never-- sorry, ATRT3 members, the co-chairs were never allowed to have a discussion with each and every SO/AC to explain what is inside the ATRT3. I don't know why, but it's happening like that. The second is that the Board decided that, yeah, we agree, but not really agree and we need to do something and you need to tell us before how you'll do something before doing it.

In 2002, we would've done like that, ICANN would've been dead. Fortunately, in 2002, we were able to have the split of the DNSO to GNSO and ccNSO, the creation of internal ALAC. So disband of the

PSO, the Protocol Supporting Organization, the creation of the NomCom. Why we are not able 20 years after to sit down to put a group together and to do this?

I am not saying the same, but this type of work can and discuss and find the right way where ICANN need to go. And the third reason, it's very difficult when you give some power to people who already know that they disagree with what it's supposed to be done. Therefore, it's where we are, and I am sorry to be in this situation, and it's not because we, and when I say we, particularly Cheryl and myself, we push to have that done in a timely manner. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Sebastien. Any more comments from the table? Yes, Alan.

ALAN BARRETT

Yeah, this is Alan Barrett. So on the purpose of the Holistic Review, there seems to be some disagreement or confusion where not everybody agrees on whether or not the Holistic Review is supposed to think about restructuring the way different parts of ICANN interrelate. Now, of course, Cheryl and Sebastien, I think you were on the ATRT3, I'm sure you would be able to help us understand your intentions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

I'll start, and then I'll hand over to Sebastien. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yes, we were on ATRT3, but importantly we were on the chartering group that prospectus together for Pilot Holistic Review. So we understand very well what the intentions were and the deliverables were, excuse me.

The problem, as Sebastien will go into greater detail, was the ATRT3 did not think far enough or get the advice that we would not be able to simply have Holistic Review as we envisaged, which would be a very, as the name implies, broad based look at everything, not make hard baked in thou shelves, but community driven recommendations for change, which would compliment what would be going on in continuous improvement programming.

So these two things are complimentary. They aren't, one has to go before the other. What we didn't realize is that such a review couldn't be just started, but as the Board was given the advice, there needed to be a pilot and there needed to be a mechanism to develop language to be proposed for any bylaw change to allow this new review to come into play.

So that's where we were involved also in the development of the deliverables for the Pilot Holistic Review. Now that's like running a shell game. Just me saying it all again is confusing. So I'm not surprised, Alan, that people are deeply confused about which of these badly named things are supposed to be doing what, but the way through that is to sit down and have a broad conversation.

And I would suggest Pat and I, and I'll add Avery in here because she served with us from the Board's perspective, so you can't hide

too much even if you are at the back of the room, Avery, I'll track you down. But we worked together over two completely different iterations of the framework for the Pilot Holistic Review.

It could be that what we have is a lack of understanding in the team of the Pilot Holistic Review as to exactly where the guardrails are. And that's a conversation that we can have. Pat and I are here, Avery's still here. we can help people understand. And if they want to change it, that's fine, but at the moment, there's all this, as you say, confusion.

LEON SANCHEZ

Yes, Alan.

ALAN BARRETT

Okay. So would it be helpful for some of you who were on ATRT3 to get together with the chairs of the PHR and maybe with some people from the Board, and try to just have a discussion in a room somewhere to figure out what to do next?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Absolutely.

LEON SANCHEZ

And Jonathan, and then Sebastien.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I guess I was gonna say the same thing. I think the way this conversation is evolving, it's making it sound in a way like it's a bigger deal than it is. We're stuck, but we don't need to be. In other words, I think that there are some fundamental questions being asked by the chairs of the Pilot Holistic Review, and we can just answer them, and then we'll be back on the horse and headed back to camp.

And I think that's the real answer here is the idea of reinventing reviews is in fact what I think ATRT3 thought it was doing. And that's part of why there's friction now because it's precisely because it was something new. And so, I think that it's fine, I don't think that there's a crisis. I think the issue is to get those questions answered, and I think the answers are fairly straightforward and fairly intuitive.

And we don't need to spend six months answering them. I think, put people in a room for an afternoon and most of them would get answered and the PHR can be back rolling again and doing its job. ATRT4 can be tightly scoped and it can be launched. We don't need to be so worried about this as the conversation is making us feel. This is very solvable because they're very basic questions and it's easy to answer them, I think.

LEON SANCHEZ

Yes, Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

Can I ask you two things? Who is we in that statement? You said we answer the question, is that ALAC? Is it the Board? Is it the ATRT3 that doesn't exist? Is it the ATRT3 report? I mean, who is we in that sentence?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Well, I come from the United States, so I have a very authoritarian point of view lately. So I really just meant me. No, it was the royal we that I was using. No, we as a community can get together, and Barrett was talking about was that getting the people of ATRT3 together.

The we that it was in my head was the SO and AC chairs because they came to us and asked us for answers, we came back to them and asked for more formalized versions of the questions, and that's actually the we that I had in my head, but it doesn't need to be that group. But I just meant this as a community, we can answer these questions about the importance of frontloading this with the CIP framework or whether it can move on without it about how it would work, who the recommendations would go to, whether they'd be binding.

Those kinds of questions I think are fairly easily answered by the community because we've had reviews before, we know how recommendations work, and even recommendations that are meant to restructure parts of the organization still have a process to go through with the Board and the bylaws. It's not rocket science, I guess, is really the point I was trying to make.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Jonathan. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you very much. To add one point. First of all, Alan, we, and I was a member of the ATRT, I am a member of the CIP, and I'm a member of the Pilot Holistic Review. Too much, but I am trying to do the job. We are ready to meet with anyone who wants to meet with us and to discuss this issue. I was surprised for example, that your group and the Board just met with the co-chair of the Pilot Holistic Review. I was dreaming that you will have met with Pilot Holistic Review members, but that's not what's happened.

Therefore, we are ready, and I am sure that Cheryl, Pat, Avery, and others are really ready to do the same. And it's come to me to the first point of why we are stuck here. The fact that at the beginning it was say you will not have face to face meeting, you have to manage everything online.

When we are stuck somewhere, maybe it's better to fly people to have them in the same room or to use the ICANN meeting. For that, I am not saying that you need to add one specific meeting. It's maybe also one way to get out of this trap, and it's not what's happening. Thank you. We try to have a meeting of PI chair at the last ICANN meeting, we didn't even try this time. It's something missing. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Sebastien. Well, it seems like solving the problem might be easier than we think, or at least I hope. Good, yeah. No, this whole conversation seems to kind of be aligned with other sessions in which we have touch upon the topic about reviews, the ATRT4, whether we should just reboot the whole thing, just using the ATRT4 for what it's meant to be used, and just reboot the full thing.

The Holistic Review came out of ATRT3, then came into the Board, the Board realized that there were some missing bits, then we created the Pilot Holistic Review. It's our fault. Yeah, not shying away from that. And now we're stuck in here, so maybe.

TRIPTI SINHA

Let's get unstuck.

LEON SANCHEZ

Exactly, let's get unstuck. And maybe the right way to get unstuck could be just to kick off ATRT4, and rebook the process, I don't know. I mean, it's just something that could happen.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I'm a little worried by what you mean by that. I think ATRT4 can be a very narrowly focused accountability and transparency review. I don't think we need to launch that in order to solve the problem with the Pilot Holistic Review. That sounds like what you were saying.

LEON SANCHEZ

No, I'm not saying that we should do that, I think that it could be one of the many ways in which could be solved, not necessarily the only way. And as for the scope the objectives of ATRT4, I think that needs to be discussed with the community, et cetera, in the normal fashion that it's carried out. I'm not assuming or imposing anything here.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I guess my feeling is we should get the Pilot Holistic Review back up and running in a few weeks, not after some other huge review. I don't think we need to regard these problems as so insurmountable. I'm very serious about that. Let's get this moving again. There's plenty for it to do, there's plenty of things for it to work on. Let's answer some of these foundational questions and let's just get them answered. As a group, we don't need to launch a review to do that, I don't think. That's the only thing that gave me pause.

There are things for ATRT4 to do that have nothing to do with CIP or Pilot Holistic Review, and that's what the narrowly focused scope of that review team would be. But let's keep that separate. We already have a decent set of recommendations out of ATRT3, let's clarify what needs clarifying and get back to work. I think that's the answer.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Jonathan. Good. Any other comments or questions around the table? No. Okay. So these topics that were brought to

the Board from the ALAC are tied together. So we still have a little bit more time. I don't know if you have any more questions to the Board or any more questions from-- well, what do we-- Yes, Claire.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Thanks. Claire Craig for the transcript record. My question, I'd like to rephrase it a little bit, and while folks may think that this is a question that's more of an organizational question that's coming to the Board, the reason we are bringing it here is because as you mentioned earlier, Leon, the At-Large community is a pretty wide community and relies heavily on the work of volunteers.

We are passionate about the interest of the end users, and so, we take this work very seriously. Our concern, however, is that in recent times, we have seen that this work continues to mount. There are a lot of public comments, which sometimes they're very short timeframes within which we have to answer them. But more importantly, we have found that the timing of these comments may not always be appropriate.

For instance, having public comments launched at the end of December and opening at the beginning of January. This is a time when families want to spend together and things like that, and we need to seriously consider those things. I also heard at one of the, I think it was the question to the Org when someone spoke about the timing of even meetings during religious holidays and those kinds of things, while I know that we cannot always take all of these things into consideration, it is important that we pay more

attention to them so that our end users are not overworked and do not feel as if they are unappreciated and that they get burnout.

We are very concerned about end user burnout, and especially since these are all volunteers in this At-Large community. So I just wanted to know-- it's more, less a comment, but it's something that we would like to hear your perspective on. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you very much, Claire. Well, first of all, let me say that the Board is aware and very much values and recognizes and celebrates all the effort that is put by community volunteers, not only within the At-Large community, but in the full ecosystem that forms ICANN, and we're very grateful for that. And I think, Alan, you might have some comments to do on this end too.

ALAN BARRETT

Sure. Let me try. This is Alan Barrett. Your concerns are very valid. I think it's worthwhile to try to avoid these holiday periods, but practically there are so many different holidays in so many different parts of the world, so many different religions and so on. It's probably not feasible to avoid them all, even if we do try. What we can do, I think, is to extend the length of comment periods. So if we're aware that a comment period crosses some kind of an important holiday for some part of our community, then extend it to 50 days instead of 40 or something, that's something we can definitely do.

CLAIRE CRAIG

That sounds reasonable. We have asked for extensions and we have received them. We are also aware that there are quite a lot of comments that happen at the same time. For instance, over December, there were, I think it was four public comments that came up, and the same community members are working on some of these. So these are the things that we really need you to look at when these are being presented so that we don't have to always feel that we have to ask for the extensions.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Claire. I think that is something we can all work together to try and distribute the workload and try to have these public comments not overlap if at all possible. Of course, you want to say something, Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

Alan actually said what I was gonna say, if you anything to add to that, sorry. So, no, I mean, what Alan said is what we try to do and how we have done this, and I think it was discussed yesterday as well with the meeting planning, that is, we try to avoid it to an extent possible, and that's taken into account. The comment periods, again, we try to deal with them, obviously that depends on the workflow, the policy flow that this goes through. So within that limit, I think extensions are planned for granted to what Alan said.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Kurtis. Good. Yes, Alan.

ALAN BARRETT

I see on the screen here a question about the relationship between operating standards for specific reviews and ATRT4. I don't think we've discussed that yet, have we? No. So I could say something about that, right. So the revised operating standards have been out for comment for some time, that that's one of the public comments that went over the December period and it has been extended, it's still open right now.

So of course, after the comment period closes, the comments will be evaluated, they'll be fed back into a new revision. It could happen that we want to kick off ATRT4 before all that is completed. And I think it would be okay to use the revised standards as a kind of a, I hesitate to use the word pilot, but that's the word that comes to mind.

To let ATRT4, if we kick it off before these things are formally approved, to nevertheless use the new standards, to try them out, to test them, and perhaps the experience from testing them in ATRT4 may lead to further evolution changes to the standards. So yeah, I hope that would be okay. It's definitely something the Board could consider.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Alan. Yes, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, that's another hot topic. I mean, we didn't put it on the agenda for today. I'm amazed at how efficient we got through the topics that we had there. But I think that that's a document that many in the community feel like is sort of rushing to a finishing line and that it might possibly be viewed as a kind of an overreaction to one particular review that is viewed as having gone off the rails sort of, and I think we need to be careful not to overreact to that as well.

So I think when you see the comments from us and others, there will be substantive comments, but I think also procedural ones about kind of how this document is getting over the finish line and perhaps the need to bring it back and make it a community generated document if possible.

LEON SANCHEZ

Yes, Claire.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Claire Craig, again, for the transcript record. With specific reference to the operating standards for specific reviews, we are grateful that we were able to get an extension for the public comment. What we would have hoped is that there would have been an opportunity for dialogue among the community at this ICANN meeting.

Rather than bringing it straight to public comment, we could have had the opportunity. Even when the ALAC met, we specifically asked to have more of a dialogue, and a webinar was set up which we were able to ask a lot of questions, and it was at that time that the extension was granted. But what we would have really liked,

this is from the At-Large community specifically, is to be able to meet as we are all here in Seattle, and have a dialogue on that. And we hope that following the public comment, that that would be forthcoming.

ALAN BARRETT

Thanks, Claire. This is Alan again. I think that's a very good idea that in addition to the public comment process, which we do online, we could try harder to have an in-person comment period like during a webinar or a session at a face-to-face ICANN meeting. It's not always going to be possible, but maybe it's something we could organize for some of the more important processes. And maybe we can ask the Org team to figure out how to do that within the limited time and budget that we have.

CLAIRE CRAIG

That would very much be appreciated because we believe that this specific review, as it's called, the specific reviews, is a very important one and needed that type of ventilation. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Claire. Thanks, Alan. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Yes. Thank you very much. I think a lot of things we say today could be put into as a discussion on how we met. How we met, we need to have cross community discussion on the Pilot Holistic Review, we need to have a cross-community discussion on the review of the

reviews, and so on and so forth. Therefore, maybe it's also a good time to put that back to this group working on how we met in the future. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Sebastien. Good. So are there any other comments or questions on the table? If not, I think we have gone through the agenda, through all the questions that have been posed by both sides. And do you have something, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN

I've been listening with interest and I've been part of ATRT3, so I know the intent. That's not what we talk about. It's really about also the practical steps forward. And what about ATRT4 forward?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Question about it?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN

Well, do we have a Holistic Review and ATRT4, and how would that be adapted to make anything happen that is useful to all of us? Because that is in the end what it's about, right?

JONATHAN ZUCK

I think that comes through narrowly scoping the ATRT4 because the actual accountability and transparency components are still there to evaluate that are separate from the Holistic Review. And I think as long as that's scoped tightly that it can happen

simultaneously and that the recommendations can be looked at in a compatible way.

LEON SANCHEZ

Yeah, it seems to me that needs to be a broader discussion at this point, and that I don't think we're gonna come to a conclusion here at this moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK

We've got 15 minutes, Leon.

TRIPTI SINHA

Yeah, I don't think this is a forum for a decision. We're having a very good discussion on it.

LEON SANCHEZ

Good. Okay. So having gone through all the bits and pieces of this agenda, I would like to thank everyone, thank my ALAC colleagues, my At-Large community colleagues for being here, for your thoughts, your insights. And with that, I would go back to you, Tripti, to close the session.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Leon, and thank you very much for a very vibrant conversation. And enjoy the rest of your afternoon and you have 10 minutes back. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks for having us.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]