

---

MONTREAL – At-Large and GNSO Council Leadership: Preparation for ATLAS III  
Sunday, November 3, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT  
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

DAVID KOLB:

Okay, coaches, let's get back to it. What I'd like to do is I want to finish off my bit so you can have the more existential conversation about ATLAS III. So, come on back, have a seat. I actually covered a lot of information, at least in my estimation, on what was happening in the breakouts and what was happening in the various plenary sessions.

So what I want to do is acquaint you with this coaches guide, because I just want to make sure that we get this covered so you know what you are going to be doing in these plenary sessions, and then I'll give it to Maureen to facilitate or moderate the discussion. Sébastien, have a seat for just a second and I'll just go through this real quick.

Okay, so the ATLAS III Coach Guide. Everybody have a copy of this? Yes, yes? Okay, so I'm not going to go through slide by slide because you know it's late in the day and you'll go to sleep. So the way this is designed is I wanted to try to be as helpful as possible to you as coaches and know that when we do go into breakout sessions I'll be roaming around the breakouts, so I'll be there to take questions from you or to help out any way that I can.

So this deck gives you an overview of being a coach for ATLAS III and then each breakout session has its own set of instructions. So what I've done is I've taken the participant instructions as the first slide in

---

***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.***

---

each of the breakouts, so this is the same slide that they will have in their pack, so you have that that instruction in front of you, and then the coach's instructions.

So, for Breakout #1, halfway through the breakout, basically your role, and I'll talk about Breakout #1 for just a sec, so you'll make sure that you've got your group in the room, and we'll tell you how that's going to happen tomorrow when we all gather up, and then you'll be observing the first piece of the discussion. I'll try to be as clear as possible in the room in terms of the instruction and you've got the participant instructions there to refer to for that particular session. And then halfway through the discussion I've given you some questions to ask, then share your observations around for Breakout #1, listening and asserting, and communication. And then return to discussion, continue making notes. This is page #5, by the way, on the coach instructions.

And then for wrap-up at the end, so you stop the discussion about 10 minutes before the end of the time that you've been given, and then here's some more questions. So, how did the second half go? How was the listening and asserting in the second half? What would you do differently if you were going to do this breakout again? So it's those kinds of debrief questions for the coaches. I've tried to be as instructional as possible.

And then the other things are I've included the two slides, page 6 and page 7, this is the Listening and Asserting Framework. And then there's a piece around making questions for listening active. So I've

---

given you those two things so as you're making observations and as you're facilitating or coaching, you've got those right in front of you and you don't have to leaf through the slide deck to find those in some way. So that's Breakout #1.

I've also given you some observation sheets on page 8 and page 9, so as the coach, you've got someplace to make notes and what you're making notes about on those two pages. So you have the first half and you have the second half for your own observations that you'd share with the group. And then you go into Breakout #2 from there, same kinds of instructions for Breakout #2.

Breakout #3, it gives you step by step. So my advice would be to read through this and if you've got any questions on it, see me tomorrow, I'll be in the room at least a half hour before the plenary starts tomorrow, and will take any coach questions and things like that. I'm here to help you and help facilitate your facilitation. So, this is your guide if you serve as a coach that will be most helpful to you. And the other one is just a timeline. You've got the case study, you've got the slide deck. Questions for me regarding content and what's going to be happening on Plenary and Breakout?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Mohamed for the record. Question regarding the coaches and the participant ratios. I did attend the previous ICANN Academy program...

---

DAVID KOLB: I remember.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: ...it was so useful, helpful, that more people to attend it, definitely. But when I check the email now we have about 38 people as coaches received this email. And we have about 45 present so it's like almost like 1.5 or something like that. My concern is because I have seen the training, it was very useful, we might be too many coaches and we are crowding the group. Okay. I was in a group that I think was 5 or 7, and we had two facilitators when we did the sessions.

So my concerns here, we are too many, some of us went through this training, they have seen it in action, some did not, they just heard you for the first time and their performance will be completely different. So my concern is we might confuse the participants by our numbers if everyone is showing up and so I'm really concerned about the ratios. We have about 37 people who received this, basically all of us now are considered to be coaches. I have no problem being a coach, I have attended, I see the value, I can actively facilitate because I have seen others do that to my group. But having 30 coaches for a group of 40, I think that needs to be reconsidered.

DAVID KOLB: A good concern. It's been brought up as well and honestly, there's probably too many coaches for this amount of participants. We also want to accommodate the amount of people that wanted to be coaches, as well. So I would say, I guess my instruction for the

---

coaches would be that to avoid exactly what you're bringing up, which I think is very valid, is to coordinate with yourselves a bit.

So as you get to that Breakout, clarify what's happening in the discussion and maybe two of you do the first half of the discussion debrief and then two of you do the second half of the discussion debrief on a given breakout session. Because we're trying to accommodate the number of coaches, as well, and if some of you want to step back from being coaches, that's fine. Don't feel like you've got to be a coach, because you're in the room, we wanted to make sure that everybody that wanted to be, could be, and you will be utilized for sure, please.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

As a followup, I think it will be useful if you give people a chance to switch to participant if they feel that they cannot do the coaching, because it also depends how you're going to distribute the groups, you're going to go the way, distribute them as in tens or fives. So, if you have a group of five and we are let's say with this ratio, that means we're going to be like three or four in a group. We might not prepare well together, we might have completely conflicting ways of doing things, so I'm just cautious about that, and I think if you allow others to be a participant, that would be more valuable for them and for the group rather than enforce we all be coaches and we can utilize that.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking, sorry, let me just jump in, because we do have to go through all the things that you have to take us through today. Actually, of the people that are here, some actually are not going to be there during the whole time, because they also have other things, like Cheryl is probably going to be here about 10% of the time, and there are many others on the table that are actually doing things outside of this.

So the coaches, I'm not going to be around for some of the sessions, so we do need to have enough coaches. The worst thing is not having enough coaches, as such. And, you know, at the end of the day, I don't think there'll be this big thing of like, oh, you're a participant, I'm a coach, we're all in the same room, so it's going to be the same groups.

The only thing is the coaches are there to be able to also usher people around a bit more and know a little more than the participants themselves who, most of them are complete newcomers. But I'm hoping we can go through at least all the basics of what we're going to do this week, because otherwise we're not going to know and then we're just going to have to spend the night reading this stuff rather than hearing it from David, if that's okay.

DAVID KOLB: And I'm only going to be around for half the plenaries anyway -- I'm kidding. Yeah. Yeah, so to your point, just to finish that up, I think it's a great idea. I think the big thing is show up in the Breakout if that's the breakout you're supposed to be in. And if you've got five

---

participants and you've got four coaches, it is then within the coach group to say, okay, listen, I'll keep time, you're going to do the debrief questions, and the other two are just going to participate in the discussion.

And that way you can just reassign. We're all here to learn. And so to Olivier's point, I'm really done in terms of going through this material in terms of just look at these documents, I'll take questions tomorrow. So I'm going to turn it back over to the group to answer some of these other questions that are coming up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think we have Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I'd like to change the wording and to call participants, the participants and facilitators, facilitators, better than coaches, and I would also like to ask people if they want to participate. I think it will be better than oblige them to work as facilitator. They know how to work as facilitator, but maybe they would like to learn, working and participating more than to be outside when it will be time to speak about another item, I will speak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I think what David just explained is that if there are too many coaches for a group during the breakout sessions some coaches will become participants

---

and participate to the discussion. We want to have always coaches in the groups. The difference between coaches and participants is that the coaches can be participants and can help the other to participate fully in this meeting.

**SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** Sébastien Bachollet speaking, that is to say that all the people who are here, the facilitators are also going to be to have a group, they will have a group assigned to them, GAC, et cetera, so it will also be down. Okay you say okay with your head, you're coming here to explain us, but you are not able to explain us the basic. You told us that we are going to be coaches, but how will it work? Nobody tell us how it will work. They told us that the participant will have a group, but where are we?

**OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you, Sébastien Bachollet, Olivier speaking. It's because the explanation was not finished. Now I think everybody knows how it will work, so it's better. Seun, you have the floor.

**SEUN OJEDEJI:** Thank you, Seun for the record. I think the grouping should instead of coming on Tuesday, should come much earlier, it would be good to know who are the members of each of the groups so that if there's a need to coordinate amongst the coaches, it can be done early enough.



---

I strongly support the idea of renaming this word 'coach' to something else, so that the perception that it creates may be reduced.

Olivier, you mentioned that the majority of those who are attending ATLAS III are newcomers. I'm not sure, where are we getting the statistics from, because if you're an ALS, a number of the ALS participants are before, have been attending ICANN meetings, so I'm not sure how are we getting the statistics of a majority being new people? Because I think we are treating this as an education thing, instead of seeing the participants as people who actually already experienced ICANN.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun, it's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. The nomenclature that we have used is one that we tried to make as simple as possible and as culturally neutral as possible. And the idea of a coach is one which I think most people around the world understood. We thought about mentor, but mentor gives the wrong thing. We thought about other names for it. And so, coach is what we settled for as in, okay, somebody that's going to be around to be able to help you out in what you're doing, a coach is in general just there to get you to go further and help you in your journey to be able to learn the things that you're going to learn.

With regards to the newcomers thing, I think that, and I must admit my responsibility on this, I think newcomers are those people that have not held an official function on the ALAC or in the regional leadership,

---

ever. And that for us is, you know, yes, they might have been to two ATLAS's for some of them already. ATLAS II and ATLAS II, but they're not as directly involved with the day to day work of the ALAC. So that's one of the concerns. So we can call them whatever other name, and so on, but it's people who would benefit greatly from what we're doing, possibly even more than the people that already know most of what's going on. Let's go to Pastor Peters.

PASTOR PETERS:

Pastor Peters for the record. I think I'm supposed to be an observer in this section, because this is not the ATLAS III meeting. But since the discussions, what we are here for, I have the following intervention. Newcomers would not be true proper, but you could say new leaders. Newcomers you are referring to who are coming to ICANN for the first time.

Then as for the coaches, I want to advise or suggest that the body coach and the coach of the coaches, let them have a meeting among themselves, and assign responsibilities to yourselves as to who is doing what, as from tomorrow, so that we don't come into the meeting rooms, and they will be confused as to who is going to speak, who is not going to speak, and all that. All we want is consistency so that the purpose for which you have brought us here together will be achieved.

Number three is the issue that was raised, I don't think that has been dealt with, which has to do with the participation of those for that

---

ATLAS III event. The discussion centered on whether participation should be restricted to those who were funded or should it be expanded to those who were not funded, but are here and are interested in participating. So that issue has not been dealt with.

But I'm not here to speak on that issue. My take on that will be that the essence of the ATLAS III is to develop more leaders, more ambassadors for ICANN. If ICANN can fully fund 60 and you have 20 more out of the interest they have for ICANN, they are here. So I don't see ICANN losing anything in allowing those who want to participate or want to learn or want to be mentored or coached, I wouldn't want it to be a closed meeting, it should be open. I have a member who is not funded but who is here, and I've asked to be part of all the activities. I will not be the only one that will represent my ALS.

Then lastly, if I'm not mistaken, there is a program that says ATLAS III preparation meeting that was supposed to start at 5:00, so this is to 6:00 now, so is that program still going to hold? That's why I come here before the reception. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Pastor Peters. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So first with regard to getting coaches to talk to each other, I think that by the very fact that we've got all the coaches here or whatever we call them here, I would hope that they'd be able to continue discussion afterwards when we break off for whatever evening activities and things and then by tomorrow maybe if there are

---

further questions, and so on, they can come to any of us in the organizing committee and ask their questions and we can try and answer to our greatest ability.

With regards to opening this up to everyone, one of the difficulties that we have with the little amount of time that we have here is that we can't start with someone who doesn't know anything about ICANN, and this is why all of the people that are participants that have taken part, that have prepared themselves and that are funded, have all taken the ICANN Lean course or have followed those five webinars and have brought you to this specific level that you already know all the basics.

One of the difficulties with such a program is if you have one person that suddenly goes, oh, wait a minute. I don't know about that a very basic question, then everyone else switches off. And it spoils the whole thing for everyone. So you already are on that journey, ATLAS III has already started, it's not even that we're starting tomorrow, it's already started with all the webinars and everything and you can't have someone jump on the train after the train has already started moving.

We did tell everyone please take it, now with regards to the coaches or the people on the At-Large advisory committee or regional leaders, I have said it many times, if you are not 100% sure about all the things at ICANN, I recommend that you take those ICANN Learn courses or that you attend these webinars. I have taken the ICANN Learn courses

---

and I've greatly learned a number of things from them, as well. It's going to be very difficult.

We can't get additional people to jump on board without them potentially disrupting the process. And I've seen that we have the next person that's jumped in, so if you can ask if you the question, I'll sort of step off. You ask me the question and I'll try and answer you directly, is that okay? Keith has arrived, yeah, exactly, but while Keith is here, I can certainly go to the people that have questions and try and answer them.

PASTOR PETER: I just want to say, I yield to you, I think that is okay by me, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And I give the floor over to you because I was going to deal with Abdeldjalil directly, or did you want to ask a question that everyone needed...

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: No, I can ask the question. This is Abdulkarim for the record. I was looking through the Coach Guide and I just wanted to find out what is relationship between taking ICANN courses and what we have here? Because what I can see here, listening skills, conflict mediation, things that doesn't have to do with ICANN courses.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Because, it's Olivier speaking, the reason is because we're applying all these skills to the ICANN topics. So if you don't know the ICANN topics you can't apply the skills to the topics that we're discussing. I'll talk to you in a second. Back to you, Mr. Chair.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you, Olivier, this John Laprise for the record. We are now in Point 2 of the session. We are welcoming Keith Drazek, GNSO Chair. Keith is here with a presentation, and I will turn it over to Maureen and Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Maureen, and thank you all very much. My name is Keith Drazek I'm the current Chair of the GNSO and the GNSO Council. Thank you very much for inviting me to be here today. As Maureen and John noted, Pam Little and Rafik Dammak my Vice-Chairs, had conflicts at this time, but I'm very, very pleased to be here and look forward to engaging with you, answering any questions, and I do have a few slides on the PDP 3.0 discussion. Thank you, Cheryl.

So anyway, good to see some familiar faces in the room and look forward to meeting some new folks. So, thank you. Perhaps I could go through just a very quick overview of the GNSO Council's work on our PDP 3.0 implementation and I know that one of the topics that you all would like to discuss with me today is better understanding of how ALAC and community groups can provide input and engage with the GNSO Council earlier in the process and continually throughout the

---

processes of our updates and improvements and reforms to our policies and procedures.

And so let me just take one note to say that the GNSO's operating procedures as it relates to managing our policy development processes and for everybody's benefit the GNSO is where the policy is made for the generic names supporting generic TLDs. We have operating procedures that are in place and are actually part of the ICANN bylaws. Our operating procedures that basically govern how we as a supporting organization conduct our work and develop our policies is all, as I said, part of the bylaws, and is a very stable document. It doesn't change easily and it doesn't change often.

The PDP 3.0 as it's been described and discussed are a set of recommendations that are designed to help the GNSO Council as the Process Manager be more efficient and effective within those operating procedures. And so it's just important to understand the differences that the operating procedures are essentially our formal guidelines and these PDP 3.0 recommendations that we're currently implementing are designed to give the Council guidance and to give PDP leadership Co-Chairs guidance on how to be a little bit more effective and efficient in their work and our work as the process manager. So just setting the stage there.

What we're talking about here is not revolutionary, it's more evolutionary with an eye towards helping to fix things that we've identified as perhaps being a little sloppy or without appropriate or needed sort of guidance and framework. So with that, let's go to the

---

next slide. So, the process of PDP 3.0 began approximately two years ago. The recommendations were finalized a year ago now, and we since that time since the AGM last year, have been going through the implementation process. We're not complete, and essentially these are recommendations and guidelines for the use by Council and by PDP leadership.

So I won't read each one of these, but there are essentially five buckets of recommendations, we've not been doing them all at once, we've been doing them in stages or phases. But it talks about things like terms of participation for working group members, alternative to the current open working group model, I know that's a particular area of sensitivity for groups outside of the GNSO to understand, if you're going to change this fully open working group model, how do we ensure that we have participation and proper engagement. And that's a great question. And that's something that we've discussed at the Council level as well.

Talking about criteria for joining of new members. This one really speaks to like if you've got a PDP that's been underway for several years and then you suddenly have new members wanting to join, how do you ensure that they're up to speed and not going back and re-asking questions that have been settled previously or not being fully informed about the work of the group? Expectations for working group leaders. It's like, you know, what do we expect of our Co-Chairs in managing the policy processes that they're responsible for?



---

And, you know, there's a range of things here. I'll let you read them. I won't go through each one of them in specifics. I'm happy to talk to any of them, but I think the key here is that these are improvements that are being implemented today. We are looking for opportunities to test new things within this group, to try to identify areas and things that have worked.

And I'll give an example. The GNSO Council just had our meeting with the GAC and one of the things that we discussed was the Work Track 5 Geographic Names discussion. And that actually, that structure, that construct of a separate work track that invited different people from different parts of the community was a bit of an experiment.

It's not something that we as the GNSO had done before in terms of structuring and chartering something in that way. And while not everybody was fully 100% happy with the outcome, the sense that I'm getting, generally speaking, is that with the equal unhappiness, the group came to compromise and came to consensus. And it appears that that was actually a successful experiment. Right? Thank you, Cheryl.

And I think that's one example of the type of improvements and experimentation, or, maybe being a little more creative in terms of how we, the GNSO Council consider the work of our groups, the groups under our remit. And further to that, there is ongoing discussion between the GNSO Council and the GAC on the question of ITO protections.

---

I don't know if everybody's followed that, probably not, I wouldn't blame you, but this is an ongoing topic of friction and contention, and we're trying to learn from, for example, the Work Track 5 effort, to identify another way of bringing the right people to the table, which would of course include the IGOs, and make sure that we have the ability to work through and develop policy in a successful way and a timely way.

And so that's, I think, just a couple of examples of, okay, we've had this experience, we're going to take and learn from that and apply it to something in the future, and this is going to be a process of continual learning and improvement, and as I said, not revolution, but evolution in terms of how we look at the policy processes. Because, frankly, we have currently three PDPs underway right now that have been going on for at least three years.

And so if you consider the amount of community bandwidth, ICANN policy staff bandwidth, just the resources needed to keep something like that going, so we have the RPM PDP working group that's the Rights Protection Mechanisms, we have the Subsequent Procedures PDP, which Work Track 5 was a part of, and we now have the EPDP, I guess that hasn't been going on for three, but it's going to be pretty close. So I think what we've recognized is we have to find a way to drive these policy development processes to a more timely conclusion. And the question is, well, how do we do that? Do we set certain targeted deadlines? Do we make sure that the group is properly scoped and chartered?

---

That's one of the big concerns that we've seen, that was a major problem for the RPM group. I know it's been true also for review teams. It's not just a GNSO issue, in terms of that scoping. Are you asking the right questions and setting the group up to succeed? Or are you hamstringing them from the very first day of drafting the charter? And those are the types of things that we're trying to avoid. So, maybe I could move on to the next slide. Actually, let me pause there. Any questions, any comments, any thoughts? I'm happy to have a dialogue here. I certainly don't want this to be one way.

JOHN LAPRISE: Alright, so I see Javier, Holly, Holly deferred to Javier, and Marita. Okay, take over then, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll try to be really brief. I'm going to start with the GNSO overview and the recommendations that came out of that. Some of the primary recommendations were how to involve more people, and there were a lot of things in there that that are very sensible. I would say go back and look at what you promised. You might actually try holding working groups at times other than what suits the US and Europe. But on a more general, a couple of things.

Number one, I actually think yes, it's good to make that efficient, but when you talk about participation and making it easier, have you thought about things like conducting a primary, right up front, a webinar, having somebody come in and talk about the subject so that

---

when it comes time for looking for membership you've already sorted the people out who are interested in them, you've given them the background, and you're probably going to get more active participation and then as you go through, have the kind of we're up to here webinars or I'm going to say CCWG, but sometimes that's so big you don't actually get participation, but if you have like a one on one, this is our issue, and you come in and you talk and say this is our issue for today, trying to actually help us understand what the issues are so that the feedback is much more constructive, the people who join are the ones who really are interested and assist us, because one of the things I've been saying in this context to this group is participation is not just being a member of a working group, it's being active within ALAC to provide the kind of feedback that you want, not necessarily directly to you, but through our own processes so that we have empowered somebody with a range of views that you have helped us empower.

So, I think I'm talking about the kind of dialogue that will actually help us understand, and to that end, some of those recommendations make a lot of sense, bite sized chunks, well chartered, I don't know, I think you're probably on the right track, but I would end with that, my comment in reply, participation, think about participation as not just being a member of the working group, think about participation involving all of us in talking to each other and then having the tools, the knowledge or whatever to meaningfully participate in a working group. Thank you.

---

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Holly, I really appreciate that and I took note of your comment about the GNSO review and the need to go back and make sure that we understand what came out of the GNSO review and how that was taken on board. I have to admit that I have not done that recently. So I certainly take that on board and thank you for that.

And I think your point about the GNSO and the GNSO Council coordinating better messaging to ensure that we're informing the broader community of what the issues are and helping to, as you said, sort of inform, so that the engagement can be informed and constructive, not just within the group, but to make sure that ALAC and your structures are engaged, I think is actually a great comment. So thank you for that.

And I think the idea of a webinar sort of at the early stage of these processes would actually be a really helpful thing in being able to do that, so we ought to take use of technology and if somebody can't join the webinar in real-time it will be there recorded for them for future reference. So, thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you. Javier?

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Javier Rúa-Jovet for the record. Thanks, Keith, for coming to ALAC. I just wanted to say that, I just served proudly in Work Track 5 as one of

---

the co-leaders and I can unquestionably say that it's a proof of concept that happened there. It has to be made a norm for the future and why, because what this type of cross community leadership structure creates, it's legitimacy since the beginning of something and cross community conversation since the beginning of something. I wouldn't have had the chance to meet some of these other great people from other communities. It wouldn't have happened.

Today, I was at the GAC helping out Olga, it's just something that creates such a message of ICANN communicating with itself and breaking down walls that it's proof in itself, and just the idea that co-leaders leaders will not be steering communications in things that are out of their interest, but you can definitely keep your communities well informed and every community knows more clearly what the other community kind of stands for, but then you also realize that every community is not crystal, like a cement block of opinion.

You have multiple opinions in ccNSO, multiple opinions in At-Large and ALAC, multiple opinions in GAC. The result substantively was ICANN result of consensus of people, there were people who were actually generally content with the process and I invite you to go back to the record on yesterday's noon meeting at the GNSO. You had people that are substantively on the issues on different sides of the spectrum, saying that the experiment worked, and that people were heard, that conversations were strong but cordial.

And I think the cross community type of leadership enables that cordiality because it happens, you have your own differences in

---

leadership, but then you work to create a joint type of umbrella feeling in the group that has real results. So, I congratulate you for just opening up today's conversation, mentioning that. Because I was going to bring it up, but you brought it up by yourself, so that means that the message is already taking a foothold. So I'm so proud, I feel so lucky of being part of that group and really, really hopeful that something like this will become the norm and not the exception. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Javier, and I couldn't have said it better myself. I think this was a successful experiment, and just recently successful. This was a big day yesterday. And so I think absolutely, we are in the business of learning lessons and trying to make improvements, and I think this was a significant step forward.

And just to note, I've had experience in cross community working groups. We have a cross community working group ongoing now for auction proceeds. We have other, at times when the community can come together but GNSO PDPs with the exception of the ePDP have always been open to anyone who wants to participate. But this is an example where there was an issue that spoke to enough people from different perspectives and people came together and it was an excellent opportunity.

And just so everybody understands, you probably know this, but in order to develop a consensus policy that can be implemented or

---

incorporated into contracts for gTLD registries and registrars, if you want something to be included in a contract and become a contractual obligation, it has to go through a GNSO PDP. A cross community working group cannot produce by itself, something that would then be required to be implemented by contracted parties registries and registrars.

So there's a difference in approach and some topics will be okay for a CCWG. But if you want contracted parties to be obligated for something new, it has to come through that GNSO PDP, which is why it's important that everybody be able to participate in those processes because it does have contractual ramifications at the end of the day. So I take on everything that you said, and I think that was, like I said, we'll learn from this positive. Yeah, Javier, go ahead.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Just quickly, one thing that also happens here is that, in the past, or hopefully in the past, you have GNSO PDPs that, they're open to participation, of course, but when you have this type of cross community leadership construct, once the final product is delivered, in some ways you disarm naysayers, because you have somebody from their community telling you why didn't they participate? Why are they saying this now?

So the issues regarding timing, before we all had excuses. It kills excuses because it's the process designed to do outreach in your community. And then if that outreach doesn't happen it's someone's I



---

mean, but it's more the fault of the people that did not want to, all the avenues are open and there's no excuse at the end. And then, in any case, there's now the main working group process.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, and just to respond to something you said earlier also about how there are differences of opinion in different groups. The GNSO is one of the most diverse groups that we have, in terms of contracted parties and commercial interest, non commercial interest, that's one of the challenges of managing things in process in the GNSO. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, Marita Moll for the record. I totally agree with everything that's been said about the process, which I was part of, a member of that work group. The process was great. The co-leaders were amazing, did amazing work. But as a member of the work group I'm assuming that when you say it was a success, procedurally it was a success, whether or not 2-1/2 years of work which resulted in absolutely no change was a success, that's another question.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks Marita, I think that's a good point. And, one of the things that I think we'll be looking at in terms of our PDP 3.0 improvements is this idea that unless there's consensus to change something that we revert

---

back to the preexisting state is, I think, something that needs to be considered.

And of course there will be times where that's probably appropriate and times where it does that really give the group the opportunity or the incentive to be creative and to come up with something better? And so I hear what you're saying in terms of the substance and I was not involved in that group and I'm purely here as a process manager at this point. Thanks.

JOHN LAPRISE: Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, obviously part of this problem is structural that the customers, if you will, of the DNS, 4-1/2 billion of us or whatever that are the customers the DNS aren't necessarily central to the decision making of the organization that's trying to execute policies on it.

And so historically there has been criticisms of advice to the Board as coming too late and so I think there's been a real effort on the part of the GAC and ALAC in particular to get engaged earlier and I think there's just a concern that structures like the ePDP one is designed to limit participation from non-GNSO participants in a way that's not necessarily productive to that idea of hearing sooner rather than later, which is what I think the original complaint was, when we were more advice oriented.

---

And so I think that's where we're trying to be vigilant is to make sure that we're getting in and participating early in that process. And I think that's what we're most worried about. I think having better scoped charters, having deadlines, having, I don't know, metrics for success all I think would be great ideas for PDPs but I think the concern here is just one of being marginalized on a decision that's going to have an impact that goes well beyond the participants of the GNSO.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks Jonathan, I completely understand and agree with the concern there. And that's one of the challenges that we're faced with regard to, like, let's just take a couple of different groups, for example. We have, I don't know, close to 200 members, I'm probably not getting the number exactly right, but it's a lot of people subscribed and participating at times in the Subsequent Procedures group. That's an open structure where anybody can come and participate and so that's one example.

I think what we've seen over time is that participation has decreased, through attrition there's not as many people engaged over the course of three years or more. And that's a challenge. And I think the question is does the size of the group and the number of people subscribe participating members, is that causing challenges for the group to be able to move forward more quickly?

---

And the answer may be yes, may be no, but it's one of the things that we're trying to wrap our heads around. On the other hand, we've got the ePDP which was designed to be a representative structure. In other words, there were members from each of the interested groups that wanted to participate.

I think the only group that decided they didn't want to participate was RSSAC out of the ICANN community structure, and that's fine. It was made available to them and they chose not to appoint anybody, but it was supposed to be a representative structure that was small in number because it needed to be nimble, it needed to be able to act quickly, because we were under a time crunch or a deadline imposed by the temporary specification. So I think that was again an experiment, we basically went with this representative structure. Would we do that again, will we do that again? I don't know because we actually haven't quite seen the results of this group in phase two.

And I think that that's something that we will learn from again. But I completely take on board that this question of being able to engage in the policy development discussions provide input early rather than only advice later and you will always have the ability to provide advice to the Board, but to have that early engagement is something that the GNSO community and certainly the Council very much welcomes. We've been working with the GAC on that topic for many years now.

Really going back to the last round of new gTLDs in 2012 and all of that, because we found that coming in with advice at the end was causing further delays. It was counterproductive. So that early

---

engagement is very important to us. I hope that answered your question.

JOHN LAPRISE: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, and welcome. If I understood you well, you said that since the GNSO PDP will affect the contract with registries and registrars, the PDP should be developed by the contracted party only?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks Tijani, great to see you as always. No, I said, and I'll clarify, is if a policy is to be developed that requires registries and registrars to change their contracts and to incorporate accept new obligations, then it has to go through a GNSO PDP. That is the policy development process that in our contracts and in the ICANN bylaws requires registries and registrars to take multistakeholder bottom-up consensus policy recommendations.

So in the gTLD space we have CP, Consensus Policies. It's a definition in our contracts in the ICANN bylaws that says as a registry, for example, I work for VeriSign, VeriSign has a contract with ICANN to operate .com. We are obligated to take whatever comes out of a GNSO PDP and incorporate into our contract, provided the Board's approved it. And that's a very unique situation where typically a

---

contract is a bilateral agreement between two parties, to simplify things greatly.

In this instance, we actually have provisions in our contract that require us to take the output of a third party, essentially the GNSO process, the bottom-up multistakeholder community, and take on those obligations. And as such, if you want contracts changed in the gTLD space, it has to go through that defined formal process, as outlined in the bylaws.

Now you could have other things discussed in a CCWG, for example, the auction proceeds question and all that, those don't impact the registry and registrar agreements, and that's the distinction between the two. But any GNSO PDP process, any PDP is open to anyone and the way that the GNSO itself is structured is the contracted parties and registries and registrars are just one part of that component. So I hope that's helpful.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I understand that, but what I understood from your presentation that it will change, and the GNSO PDP will be the job of the GNSO only. And the GNSO is not only made of registries and registrars, so why not the other parties?

KEITH DRAZEK:

In any GNSO PDP, registries and registrars are just part of the contributors, the commercial stakeholder group, the noncommercial

---

stakeholder group, the noncontracted party house, so all of these different groups absolutely contribute to and at the end of the day, are able to vote on whatever comes out of the recommendations from a PDP.

JOHN LAPRISE:                      Abdulkarim?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:           Thank you very much, this is Abdulkarim once again. I just wanted to point out, you mentioned the fact that when there is no consensus we stick to existing text. And I just want to point out the danger of this, because over time, what we have is we have, let me say communities that has been marginalized.

I have some of these texts that were written by probably you have the developed world, they were written by one side, it's actually one sided. So by the time you say when there is no consensus we will stick to the existing text, it seems like communities that have been marginalized would continue to be marginalized, because the existing text was written by those that were probably awake when some had not even gotten to that level yet. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:                    This is Keith again. Thank you very much for that comment, and I agree completely. I think that's one of the risks of a situation where if you go into a policy development process and assume from day one

---

that if there's no consensus, nothing changes, it encourages parties who like the status quo to block consensus, and that's a problem. And that's something that is extremely wasteful in terms of time and resources, but also blocks the potential to do better and to improve things.

And so, I agree with you completely, that's a pretty significant concern. And one of the things that we look at, or will be looking at and learning from, are we starting with a green field approach or is the previous policy, the status quo, essentially the default. So I agree with your comment completely.

BILL JURIS:

This is Bill Juris for the record. If you're having a process that says we will operate by consensus in order to say something must be changed in the contracts and the contracted parties are in that, essentially you have a veto over any changes being made, correct?

KEITH DRAZEK:

So the contracted party house is one half of the GNSO in terms of the voting structure, and as such we certainly have an input into any suggested changes to our contracts, yes.

BILL JURIS:

No, if you're half of it, you've got a veto.



---

KEITH DRAZEK: We actually have two voting NomCom representatives in the GNSO and a third who is nonvoting, typically, but there's an opportunity for that type breaking to take place. Thanks for the question.

JOHN LAPRISE: Alright, I am seeing no other cards at this point in time. No other questions. Alright, you want me to close up? Oh Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun for the record. The comment that has been made about status quo of policy, it's a difficult one. If a policy does not meet consensus obviously status quo has to be maintained. I really don't envy you, I don't know how you're going to work out that to make it in a way to encourage that we have consensus of policy.

I think there is always going to be people who prefer status quo in terms of the policy, and if there is no consensus all the other policy making bodies in AFRINIC, that's the same thing, if there is no consensus, then the status quo remains. I don't think the fact that the status quo remains is the problem. I think the participation in trying to get a new policy is the most important. So, if those who want the policy to remain have the largest decision making weight, then it means that the status quo remains. So I think those that are on the table decision making power is the most important. Thank you.

---

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Seun, great to see you again. I think there's a couple of different ways to look at that question of the status quo and decision making and making changes to an existing consensus policy. On one hand if you have a contractual provision that has been implemented as the result of a consensus policy, then it should take consensus to change that because it's in a contract, but for example in the Subsequent Procedures group, what we're establishing is a policy for a process to launch new gTLDs.

That will have contractual implications, but it's not necessarily just a direct change in a registry agreement. It's about establishing a policy to develop a process that would then be implemented and all of that. So I think there are some nuances in terms of how we would look at that, certainly as a contracted party. But I agree with you that it's important to make sure that you've got well represented broad community engagement informed participation from the early stages, as we've discussed today. So thank you, Seun.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, I would like to be inserted after you, Keith, and before you close the meeting.

---

JOHN LAPRISE: Actually, in that case, Keith, I think we have nothing else for you, so thank you very much for coming here and speaking with us.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Maureen, thank you John, I appreciate the time. Thanks so much.

JOHN LAPRISE: And I revert back to Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Mr President. We had a long discussion on participation to ATLAS III. The discussions outside the room have also given result for an issue of transparency, because we announced what was decided I propose a motion for ALAC to discuss immediately about the topic and I would like to know what is the answer given to the discussions we had today, this afternoon, and if not, I can take the floor again. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I thought I explained it before, so Sébastien, what exactly are you after?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Seun for the record, for me, specifically, I would like to get an answer from the Chair. Those who are funded, those got their funding to this

---

place who want to participate in ATLAS III, what is the conclusion? ALAC stated that they are not going to be able to participate fully in this or is there a new decision? Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: For participating in ATLAS III, ATLAS III funded participant, ALAC, RALO leaders, and those people who have actually been designated as coaches and the outgoing and incoming leaders, so does that exclude anyone that you think should be there?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, as I understand some ALSes who are not funded by ICANN, but who are here, who want to participate.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, the ones who can actually participate are those who completed the five courses as a prerequisite as Olivier mentioned. To be fair to everyone else who is actually here as an ATLAS participant who actually completed those five courses before they made the application and then they were selected. The process was devised by the leadership development group, and those people who were selected as participants went through that process.

If we just allow everyone who comes along who has not at least achieved that level of understanding as Olivier pointed out before, we do not want to have to go through having people within the discussion groups who haven't achieved even the basic level that we were

---

expecting. We want to be fair to everyone else who went through that process. Okay? Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, this is Eduardo for the record. I think there is a confusion about participation as participating in the discussion with our trainer versus the people that want to participate as observers of the process. And, you know, and I believe what Seun is saying is can we participate when he says that, it's can we be there as observers? Is that what you're saying? No, okay, then I'm wrong.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay, my suggestion is that where you turn it, if you need an ALAC decision, I would suggest following decision, that we invite as an exceptional guest as a full participant to the ATLAS III Sandra Hoferichter, and I would like that to be put as a motion to ALAC. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you for that recommendation. I think we've already made that invitation.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Exactly, and why I was asking you for some transparency and accountability, you didn't announce that to the group and you didn't tell me that, for example, as I was asking the question. Then you already make the decision, but we didn't already make the decision and we, as ALAC, we need to make the decision, not one of us here. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you, Sébastien for that clarification. I think there are two people that from my personal perspective that I would have actually, I have agreed to as observers, real observers and participants and they were Sandra and Adrian, who have in their ordinary lives have probably exceeded the level of knowledge expectation that we actually have had for our ordinary participants.

And so they actually have, for me, the true role of observers as such because, to be fair, as I mentioned before, the webinars, the programs that were prepared by the program committee, these were actually undertaken by those people who were selected. So I have explained to both, it has been explained to both Sandra and to Adrian that the observer status is as such, so that those people who were actually selected had undergone a special sort of like training thing, but I acknowledge that both Sandra and Adrian actually do exceed that.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. I wanted to Sébastien on the motion moved originally, and I also wanted to say that rather than taking a decision

---

this way, can we know the number of people in this situation, that you you now take a holistic decision, rather than saying we are going to accept these two people, what if somebody comes in tomorrow and say, you know what I have been this before. I've been this before, I've been this before and I want to participate. Why not say anybody in this situation, we give you from now till probably tomorrow morning and you now take a decision after then?

JOHN LAPRISE:

Well, I can speak to Sandra's position in that she actually was involved in the selection committee in terms of helping us devise some of the criteria. So she's been involved at a very high level and her background in the governance around the world, it's an exceptional case and quite honestly, from my perspective, it was an oversight that she was not granted that status early on in the process. This is the correction of an oversight. I don't know Adrian's credentials but given what she said, I'm fairly sure it's in the same category. This should have been something we remedied long ago.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

But if someone comes tomorrow and is in this category, what is going to happen?

---

JOHN LAPRISE: Well, if someone else with Sandra's credentials comes tomorrow I'll be happy to vote for them, but I doubt very many people have that level of credential. Humberto, you're next.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I have a question, I'm going to speak in English because we don't have enough time right now. So what is the difference between observer and full participant? To be honest, I don't see any difference. So if that is the case, I support Adrian, and of course Sandra to be involved in ATLAS III.

MAUREEN HILYARD: From my perspective, there is no difference except that they did not complete the first five courses. But it's what we know of their level of knowledge that actually gives them that status.

JOHN LAPRISE: Sergio, I believe you're up next then Tijani.

SERGIO: Just to clarify, Adrian has been leading the Internet Governance School of the South, and he is fully prepared to be here. I believe he is the Dean of all the Internet Governance schools. He has been in this for 12 years, so I believe he should be able to participate, just like Sandra.



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Tijani speaking. I retreat what Sébastien said, it is only the ALAC who can take this decision. So, you propose that, I second motion, and I want ALAC to decide on. It is not the decision of the Chair of anyone, it is the decision of ALAC. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can I just add one more, Humberto, full participation status. But as I mentioned before, we've got a metric with regards to participation and that is the presentation of a certificate at the end of it, which the other two will not be able to get.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I apologize, Humberto Carrasco for the record. Do we have a voting process right now?

MAUREEN HILYARD: We're just checking on quorum.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay.

JOHN LAPRISE: So the motion on the floor before the ALAC. We have quorum and this is a voting matter, so this is for ALAC members. So this motion is to grant Sandra Hoferichter and Adrian...

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I believe there are two motions, to be correct. Because there is a Sébastien motion, no, no, no, I'm sorry, I'm a lawyer, and we have two different motions. This is the proper way to do it.

JOHN LAPRISE: So, the first is to grant Sandra Hoferichter observer status for ATLAS III. This is a vote among the ALAC.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, and the observer status means full participation, but no certificate and no ambassador status.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: First of all, I think the one who put the motion on the table must be the one who says what is on the motion. I don't think that any Chair can take the role of the one who puts the motion on the table.

JOHN LAPRISE: Alright, Sébastien, make the motion, then. I don't care about the credit. Make the motion.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's not the question of credit.

---

JOHN LAPRISE: Well then, just make the motion already.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could we get on with it? For god's sakes, just get on with the vote.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But we disagree with what is on the vote. Sorry.

JOHN LAPRISE: Then make the motion.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, okay. The motion is that we accept as a full participant both Sandra and Adrian. Thank you very much.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Hi, Bartlett, a practical question here, because I'm not sure what's going on here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I wanted to say that we have a motion, that was all.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hold on, a practical issue here. I understand that very many months ago the authority for running this process was delegated to a group. I think there is even a Chair for this group. How the hell was this

---

brought before the ALAC at this time of day? How? It makes no sense. This is not for the ALAC to vote on. We already delegated authority for this process to a subgroup. Unless we are now saying that we want to remove that authority from them, then this makes no sense. I'm not going to be a part of it.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think we're in the lovely position of we've had a clarification from Bartlett that in fact the authority to make the decisions was delegated to the party who is sitting over there, and this is an opinion. Now, we also have an opinion from a lawyer over here that the motion was put by Sébastien which is not supposed to be made in the first place. It can't be put the way it was because we're told. In fact, it's got to be one each. So we've got three choices. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you, Maureen. I'm so sorry that I opened a can of worms. We have to be honest, I just wanted to say we have to rethink the concept of ATLAS but be pragmatic now and find a solution that works on the ground and don't make it too complicated. Don't make it now a matter of higher politics or so. I'm happy if I can be in the room, I think Adrian as well. And I don't need food, and no certificate.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: The organizing committee has said that it's fine. Yeah, we probably is like, yeah, yeah. It's fine. So, I mean. Yeah, that's right, we probably lost our quorum now. Yeah, I think more people are walking out.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, if we need two motions, the first one is that we accept as a full participant Sandra Hoferichter to ATLAS III, and the third motion is accept Adrian as a full participant to ATLAS III. Thank you very much.

JOHN LAPRISE: Alright, and with that I would like to thank our interpreters for putting up with us. And we'd like to thank technical staff for also putting up with us. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**