
JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Jennifer. Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the ATRT3 GAC Work Party meeting #1, on the 19th of May, 2019, at [inaudible] UTC.

Attending the call today is Vanda, Pat, Jacques, Liu, and Maarten.

Observers: Sophie and Taylor.

From the ICANN organization is Jennifer, Larisa, and Brenda.

Today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record, and please mute your audio when not speaking. Vanda, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. Thank you for your patience in setting up the sound. Well, thank you very much for the staff for setting up this call for us and everyone that has joined us today.

Next on our agenda, we need to make some agreement about the terms or reference because Jacques suggested something that is related to the effectiveness of the interactions of the Board and GAC and the GAC and Board.

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.

What he has proposed was something that, after you talk, after they exchange information, there is something that is done with some consequences. Those consequences really were taken care of. They made things happens or the exchanges just at the end of the day and nothing happened. Just exchanged information between those. So that's one point.

The second point we need to talk about here is the way we deal with Marrakech because we need to [conduct the interviews]. I posted to the Skype group that my suggestion would be to [think] about the way the team, the whole team of ATRT3, with the ACs and the SOs but also individually as GAC people, we can define who is going to talk with whom. Or any other proposals you may have.

The third point is we need to finalize questions for Marrakech. Maarten has some suggestions. We need to see them. After that, we need to see the last point. I don't know if we have the chance to read the document on score cards that Jennifer sent to us as a pilot. It was Maarten's suggestions.

So I'd like now to understand what the other members think about that. So member Jacques, who was there, or just Maarten?

Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes? Would you like me to repeat what we should discuss in Marrakech?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I believe that, last week, it started with the terms of reference. Have you read Jacques' suggestion?

JACQUES BLANC: Jacques here. Do you want me to read the rephrase—

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Ah, okay, Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: Hi, guys. Do you want me to rephrase my suggestion and maybe tell you what I was looking at by suggesting that?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. That's a good idea. Please do.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay. So we are looking, overall, in our work at making recommendations. To make recommendations at some point, you must look to see if things have been working or not because, obviously, you don't recommend so much on something that's working. Don't repair what's already working. That's what my grandmother said. I can't believe I'm talking about my grandmother here. Whatever.

So what I was saying is we have to assess how effective the interactions and the recommendations are. Obviously, assessing the effectiveness of a recommendation can go both ways. First is, was the recommendation

implemented? This is a no-brainer. Yes, it was/No, it was not. The second could be, was it effective? I wouldn't go there. I would stop just before that. The recommendation has been implemented. Okay. And, for the future, to say if it has been working or not. So that's a no-brainer.

On the other hand, an interaction is something which is more tricky to evaluate. Hard to evaluate is the quality of an interaction. The only key performance indicator, I could say, is, well, this interaction generated a subsequent action. The subsequent could it be it had been received by the Board. It was a communication from GAC to Board. Or it has been taken into account by the Board, or the community has reacted on the communication. All this showing that, yes, the communication has been received.

Then we can have a look at how it has been received. For example, there has been a GAC to community communication, and the community has received the communication and there's no reaction. Okay. No reaction means let's think everything's good. Or the community went back to the GAC, saying, "Could you please be more explicit?" Or the community does react and doesn't understand such-and-such reaction.

So my feeling was, in our terms of reference, it could be to evaluate the effectiveness of interactions and recommendations by assessing the actions generated by such recommendations that took place.

I'm sorry if I'm not 100% clear.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, it was clear. What you could write is the sentence that you think about in the charter [inaudible] because we can then get an answer and try to agree on the sentence and make it clear in the document of the Google Doc. So I do believe that you can do just what you just said. Evaluate the effectiveness of the interaction. But something simple we can do as a [inaudible] to us then to define better what we're going to do on that, as you suggested.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Maarten, your opinion on that?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think that makes sense, with a little interaction with Daniel that's in the Skype chat as well. My initial silence was ... a lot has been said in the Skype that, and I think it's really worth it for people to read it back. Basically, I agree. It's important to do so. I would suggest to go two ways. One way is to ask, "How did you organize it?" to people who are responsible for making it – often org, sometimes community groups. The second side is then to the receiving side: "So how did you experience it?" because we have a lot of good will and sometimes it works according to as we wish it would. Sometimes we really try to do something but it's not effective. So that's why both the planning of the actions or how do we do it in principle, and also, on the other hand,

how is it experienced on the other side – I think both are important aspects.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I agree, too. It's important to have those. But I do believe that, for the [inaudible] the general sentence and some points that we should take a look at. I believe that's the way we need to put it in the terms of reference. Agreed?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I guess that we have an agreement on that. The second point is just to find an agreement related to how we conduct the interviews during Marrakech. So I'd like to hear from Jacques, then Maarten. Who's going first?

Hello? Anyone?

JACQUES BLANC: Yes?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: I'm not sure you're talking to me, Vanda. [inaudible] Jacques.

VANDA SCARETZINI: [inaudible] Jacques, your point of view related to the second point of our agenda: agreement on how we will conduct interviews. The whole team or we'll talk individually with some people inside the GAC? What do you think?

JACQUES BLANC: Okay. First thing, globally we are acting as a body, as a team. So my opinion is that conducting interviews is good when it's done as a team. The only thing is we must have our rules of engagement, meaning my feeling is, if we can get in agreement on who asks the question – for example, who asked the questions, what the questions are – then it's good to have one person who is one point asking the question. And it's important to have the other ones because, even if everybody is not taking – o we don't overload the person who's alone with our question – then all the others can listen. Very often, when three people listen, we don't all hear the same things. We hear things differently and then, at the debriefing, it's very useful when there's more than one person to listen to the answers. My opinion. Should be done as a team.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Specifically on the interviews, I think it's good to have at least two people, not necessarily more, just not to overwhelm – or two or three. And that're allowed to do more interviews and then bring different views together.

I think, with our community, the danger is, if you talk to the usual suspects only, the answers will be predictably.

JACQUES BLANC: Ha-ha.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Then we will have done our work, but not very well. So I'd rather have smaller teams that talk with more people.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Do we believe that we all, during the team [interviews], will have enough time to get our questions responded to or clear? Because we will have just 40 minutes for all groups to talk with the GAC, for instance. What I'm thinking is, after these general ideas, we select some questions for the whole team, for the whole group. Then, in my opinion, we should listen to the main people from the GAC – [inaudible] and the five others regions – because we need to have different points of view from different cultural behaviors. So, in my opinion, we should talk with each one of the regions and also Vice-Chairs because we need to have more wider points of view. I don't believe that we're going to have time when we talk together with the ATRT team because we don't have the [inaudible] time for all groups.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I agree.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible]?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel. May I say something?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. Go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm sorry. I'm not a member of the GAC review team but I think also my suggestions would work. My suggestion is that probably you compile the questions that you feel are pertinent for the interview, [inaudible] that, when you're these key people or the key leaders in their respective SOs or ACs, you have already [parameter] questions that you're going to ask, which you can keep on referring to. Then you pick up the key points. It seems to be very easy for information gathering.

Or, another alternative is probably to conduct a focus group discussion with all the key players [as Step 1]. They discuss adding specific topics with a second core set of questions. I think also that could work. Then those answers are subject to SWOT analysis. Thank you. Back to you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, Daniel. Yeah. I believe that we do have key points during the whole team together and then go further with some key people during the whole time we're going to be there to get more information and more clear points of view on what each one will talk about because I do not believe that we have really time. I would like to hear from Cheryl how many questions she think will be possible to get from each session during the whole team getting together with each one of the SOs and ACs.

Cheryl, can you give us some idea?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, Vanda. Hopefully, my audio is coming through okay. If we've got 30 minutes or 45 minutes, then I would aim – can you hear me or not?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes, we can hear you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, okay. All right. If you've got 30 or 45 minutes – we've asked for 30 minutes; hopefully we'll get a minimum of that – then, noting that you'll be using three to five minutes – we'll be using a little bit of that time for

general update and preamble and what the intention of our interaction is – I would have three significant questions that you want interaction of, and one or perhaps even another to spare. You want to leave enough time. Most of them would like the questions published in advance so they can contemplate them. That’s the case in the GAC. So, if you’ve got three questions in that time and something in wings, [even] if you run out of time, I think that would work. Pat, I guess I haven’t discussed that with you, but that’s my gut reaction anyway.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What—

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Excuse me, Vanda—

JENNIFER BRYCE: Vanda, this is Jennifer. If I could be added to the queue, please?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Who talked?

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's Jennifer. I'd like to be added to the queue. But I think someone – I think it was Jacques – was trying to speak, so I'll let them go first. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay.

JACQUES BLANC: Sorry. [inaudible] to talk.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm not clear who is talking.

JENNIFER BRYCE: This is Jennifer. I just wanted to jump in and let you know that I had a conversation yesterday with our GAC policy colleagues. The GAC are very keen to take the time to fill 40 minutes, if not more, that the ATRT3 Review Team have requested. It's likely that that discussion will take place on the Thursday morning. As Cheryl had said, they're very keen to get the questions in advance. They usually circulate a briefing document to all the members a couple of weeks before the ICANN meeting. I know that we had discussed deadline, I believe, of around the 15th of June to get the final questions. But if this group can consider trying to get at least a draft final before that, then that, I think, would be very helpful, just to get people thinking.

I would also say that the GAC is interested in setting up a smaller subset of members who are interested particularly in this review that would serve as a group of people that would be your point of contact. Although, obviously, yes, the Marrakech meeting is going to be an important use of face-to-face time, it's not going to be the only opportunity. There will be other times where you can consult with this work party that the GAC set up themselves.

Also, I would emphasize as well – Vanda, you referenced this – that one-to-one interactions can be useful as they come throughout the Marrakech meeting. We encourage you to take that time when the opportunities arise to have discussions when you can, outside of the review team session that, as I said, is probably going to be the Thursday morning. So I hope that's helpful. Thank.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Thank you, [Cheryl]. I believe very badly this idea. Liu, welcome. Do you want to say something about the terms of reference?

LIU YUE:

Yeah. This is Lie Yue. I agree with Cheryl that, if the question is to GAC, it's better to send to the GAC before the session. [inaudible] the GAC Chair a requirement to e-mail that GAC ... is planning to have a session with ATRT members for three minutes. I'm not sure whether it's enough for us. If we need more time, I can ask the Japan Chair and GAC leadership to attend the session. So maybe 45 minutes or more.

For the [interval], I think I agree with what Vanda said, that each region is needed. Also, since we [reviewed] the policy and the decision-making process in the last three years after the IANA transition, I think we can include some former leaders of GAC and [maybe ask them to help]. Also, maybe the GAC has some liaisons to GNSO, ccNSO, At-Large, and the [SOs/ACs]. So maybe we can [inaudible] one or more [inaudible] from the GAC to other ACs and SOs as an [interviewee]. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay, thank you. Yeah, I do believe that, certainly for the GAC, we need to send previews of all questions because I know – I have been working in GAC – it takes time for them to [show] this to get some feedback. So what I believe we should give priority to is to write those questions to make it possible to send them in one week or something like that. We need to finalize our main questions. And probably we can ask if we can get different regions' opinions on that. On the correspondence we send to GAC, we can ask for feedback from different regions and different points of view. So, in my opinion, that could work better for the GAC

Agree?

LIU YUE:

Yeah, agree.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Thank you, Liu. First of all, we need to really work on the questions during next week, trying to finalize some, I believe, first draft for the questions. Maarten had suggested some of them. So we need to

go further and have this by the end of next week, maybe for the Monday meeting. We have a [hold on] for the correspondence to the GAC to have their feedback timely because, if we leave more time – we are in middle of May, and at the end of June will be the meeting, so they have just one month to respond. It's for the GAC. [If not really] – and that's fine. So we need to further and work hard on those questions to finalize them for the beginning of the other week.

Let's go now to the document on scores. Anyone had a chance – Jennifer, quickly, can you put the [score] that you suggested for Amazon on the screen?

Yeah, that's it. I don't know if our members had the chance to go to that. Maarten had asked to have a scorecard for some of the [inaudible], and this was done for Amazon. So I'd like to hear from Maarten – for me, it looks interesting; the way it was done – since it was Maarten's idea, if it's okay for him, that that's what he expected, to allow the staff to do the [change to the form] in the other cases. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We talked about doing case studies, and then we just brainstormed about what cases may be of interest. Obviously, case studies will help to better understand it. The specific case with Amazon right now is in a crucial phase where interaction with GAC an Amazon and everything is happening. So it's very hot in that way, so I don't know whether we will get the best responses on that.

We can look at the process, how it's been, so far, but to really look back at .amazon, I think we would be able to do that much better after summer than in Marrakech itself. I expect it to be a hot topic over there.

For instance, if you look through the character codes, that was another one that, for me, seemed to be a logical one. That has been more or less brought to completion very recently. So that's a process where people are generally okay with the outcome. So you can look back at it in a good way without the [inaudible] political. That allows better analysis, I think.

So, if we're going to use case studies to include in our questioning in Marrakech, I think Amazon would be a bad one because it may be a bit higher on the GAC's agenda than the other ones.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's not solved yet, yeah.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I [would] agree with that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Well, what will you need? Yeah, I can agree with you that Amazon is not solved yet, but also, we need to give feedback for Jennifer. The way she has done this case [study], it's what you expected to allow them to make other case [studies] in the same way. Or you want to suggest some changes on that? That's what we need to have clear for

Jennifer and all staff member to succeed with the case [studies]. What do you think, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. Better to do .amazon or not in Marrakech.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I know. I'm talking about the format of what Jennifer has done for Amazon as a pilot. No matter if we're going to use Amazon or not, the format that Jennifer has done – is it what you expected from your suggestion?

MARRTEN BOTTERMAN: I think yes in the way that it makes a clear reference to public records. So [inaudible] [is useful] because that is demonstrating not only how the process works but also shows in here and here and here that you can see that. So, in general, I think it's good to have reiterated what the process is that now has been put in place after ATRT2, I would say, by the end of 2016, early 2017, which has really been a model for Board-GAC interaction that was solid and has been used to even further improve the communication between Board and GAC. As you know, I often see you in the room when we're there.

In that sense, it's a good demonstration. It's a factual record. So I think that will help us to understand what happens in practice.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you, Maarten. Thank you, Jennifer. It's what we expected from that. So can we further with the other case [studies] for us, as the list we have suggested before, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, Vanda. Thanks, everyone, for the feedback. Yeah, we have the list of the four or five others, so we will continue working on those in the same format as this one. Thanks.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. So, Liu, do you want to talk about the forecast, please?

LIU YUE: Okay. Thank you. [inaudible]. Thank you, Jennifer other ICANN staff, [inaudible] for the information shown on the screen. Also, I [inaudible] later about the .amazon at, I think, the Beijing meeting. I [was] in the meeting room. Also, the staff showed the GAC the communique of the Beijing meeting. In their meeting, the GAC representative from the [inaudible] countries, like Brazil and other countries ... I remember now that one of the high-level officials from Brazil, the country, at the Beijing meeting [inaudible] countries asked the [inaudible] to organize a session to discuss the issues of .amazon's application. I remember that, after that session, the [inaudible] American to have an internal discussion. Then the American [inaudible] attitude to that application. Then, after that, the GAC came to consensus without any objection, and then transferred that to the GAC and otherwise to the Board. So we

[inaudible] Board solution in 2015 that said that the Board accepted the GAC otherwise.

After that, [inaudible] some opinion [inaudible] the IRP, the Independent Review Process. .amazon applied asked for the panel to decide on how to continue their application. So we can [inaudible], after three years, after [inaudible] resolution. So the Board also asked the GAC, and the .amazon [inaudible] to continue their negotiation. So I want to complete some information [inaudible] the material of .amazon.

So I want to say that maybe we can edit scorecard information. The scorecard is after each GAC public meeting. We can find the scorecard. So maybe add some scorecard information to the materials so we can see more clear what they come from and what the next action after the meeting will be so [inaudible] to our research or our analysis. This was [inaudible].

And there's the question that maybe we can [integrate] the former GAC Chair to maybe learn something for our deeper research on that case study. I think the format is okay and to add some more information. Also, for the further case studies, maybe we can [use most] of the support staff from ICANN to GAC. I think maybe we can now [include] the key person and maybe we can learn some key information [inaudible] they're making. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for your offer, too. I believe that it will make it easier more easy for the staff for that. Thank you very much.

We don't have much time now, so let me ask your general opinion on this, [if this call, and in this small group, thinks it's] a good idea. What do you believe? We should continue that? Or just when [inaudible]? Because what I see is that is not see easy to deal with those because we have – let me start again. What I'm thinking about the calls is that we [resume] the ideas that we are talking about. As such, we can get some agreement going forward into the progress of our work.

During the exchange of ideas, into Skype is a good way to do so, but it's not easy to reach consensus on points. So that's my idea for this call. But I'd like to hear from others what they think about to have the calls? For instance, I don't know, in two weeks or something like that, we do what we have done and finalize the issues that are pending. What is your opinion? Please, anyone?

LIU YUE: Yeah. Hello?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hello? Go ahead, Liu.

LIUE YUE: I saw that from Maarten's side. We need to focus on the next case study on the [two-characters].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Maarten has just suggested that—

LIU YUE: Yeah. I think, since we not much time, maybe we can focus on some case study. I think .amazon is one of those, and the [two-character] is maybe the next one. These two are several ones between the GAC and the Board and maybe other communities. So I think these two may be the best for us to learn how the interaction between the GAC and the Board and other communities works.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I already heard that Maarten is okay. It make sense to have this [inaudible]. But, Jacques, your opinion?

JACQUES BLANC: [Hmm?]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Jacques?

Jacques? Are you on mute?

Jacques?

Jacques [inaudible]. Okay. If you are here, just say if you believe, when we meet, some kind of resume or [inaudible] understand we [don't ask for a] call? Do you believe that will work for you, it's a good idea?

Just type. We are not hearing you.

Okay. So, if everybody agrees, because Jacques just typed, I believe we can exchange [inaudible] because I do not believe that we need to add more work to our rather busy agenda in all things that we are involved with. But when we have anything that makes sense to talk together and get some agreement on, I do believe that we will ask staff to set up another meeting.

So, if that's all we have today, I would like to know if Jennifer or [another colleague] could make the idea of what we got from this call, some points, to make it closed with everything understood – what we have done. Can you do this, Jennifer or Brenda?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, Vanda. It's Jennifer here. Happy to. So, as a first action item for Jacques, which was on the terms of reference discussion, he took an action to write down what he thinks should be included in the terms of reference for other team members to react to.

On the case studies, the team agreed that the format of the .amazon was acceptable, so staff will continue to work on those, with the next one being the two-character case study. Then the team agreed to develop questions for the GAC and the SOs and ACs in Marrakech. I believe the date for that was Monday, if I understood correctly.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Then the team disagreed there that calls would be best but did not agree to meet regularly but staff can help set those calls up on an ad hoc basis as necessary. I hope I captured everything. Do let me know if I missed something. Back to you Vanda. Thanks.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you, Jennifer. I guess we are done. If anyone has any other business for this call, please raise your hand.

Okay. If there's not, I just want to thank you very much for your time, your contribution. Thanks for the members. Thanks for all others that joined the call -- [inaudible] and Daniel. Thank you very much, Sophie and [inaudible] Taylor. Everyone that contributed for us, I appreciate your time and willingness to work with us.

Thank you. Have a nice day, night, evening, afternoon, or whatever. We're going to continue to work on Skype. Thank you very much. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]