
Brenda Brewer: Thank you. Welcome everyone. This is Brenda speaking and this is the ATRT3 GAC Work Party Meeting on the 11th of September. And the members joining the call at this time are Cheryl, Jacques, Liu, and Vanda. And from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Brenda, and Bernie. And the call is being recorded and I'll turn the call over to Vanda. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you, Brenda. Thank you. I believe I haven't heard about Liu. Liu is there, too.

Bernard Turcotte: Brenda, can we bring up the ATRT2 Evaluation Spreadsheet? I think that's what Vanda wants to look at right now, please.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you Bernie.

Brenda Brewer: The one...

Bernard Turcotte: The one we looked at. Yeah, the spreadsheet.

Brenda Brewer: I closed it. Just a second.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay, no problem.

Jacques Blanc: Never close the ATRT2 Evaluation.

Bernard Turcotte: We will close it. We will close it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not sure how to take that, Jacques. It's like a sword of damocles hanging over our head, or you just want to have ready access to it? It could be either.

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah, that's it.

Jacques Blanc: Just consider I'm French.

Bernard Turcotte: Alright. Thank you for that, Brenda. Let's go back up to the second yellow one, 6.4. There we go. Alright. Let's have a look a little further right. Alright, so, yes. So that one was... Maarten's point was the Board does now keep track and open loops are noted. Uncertain what more can be done at this point on this recommendation. Liu discussion at

ICANN65 GAC brought this up. Need to find indicators? Make meeting with Board on communicate is sooner than current. I believe that we all add Liu comments, at least one of them exceptionally, inside the Marrakech communicate.

So, it was around this closing the loop thing, Maarten was suggesting that now with the Board tracking GAC requests and communicates that it was implemented as much as it could be. And I guess when I'm trying to close this one I want to make sure that we're good in our implementation and effectiveness assessments. Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini:

Believe that we could list a little note to say about that because they are, in the last Board Meeting, they have this link. They have approved the process and about the GAC communicate, blah, blah, blah, but Liu discussion, what is that? Liu discussions at Marrakech brought this up, but there is a question there, need to find indicators, so Liu, can you comment about this if you had the chance to talk with the GAC Members during this time? Liu?

Liu Yue:

Hello. This is Liu on record. And thank you, and the [inaudible]. In this discussion, I think if I remember correctly, we already resolved this question on the Marrakech Meeting. No, not too many GAC Members respond directly. They said something about the feedback from Board to the GAC otherwise. So, I think we discard the right... We didn't get the feedback we expected from the GAC Members in that discussion in Marrakech.

But also, we discussed in Marrakech with Brenda and Jacques and that we think that's maybe some KPI to lead the closed loop, it's important. So, we think that this, maybe we can read some maybe indicators, or maybe for the closed loop from the Board and the GAC. And now I copied some comments from the GAC communique. In Marrakech, some GAC Members suggest that GAC ICANN Board exchange following ICANN Meetings be less formal and more in depth and a regular BGIG call be established.

So, I think maybe we can use this as our comments or maybe as our recommendation in our report. And also, we ask for the more regular BGIG process in the future. And also, to beside the period between the GAC, between the Board, discuss the GAC communique and then the period between the Board to respond to the GAC. And the things in, I think the pre-meeting, the period between each two meetings have different periods, from maybe the March to the July is only three months, but for July through November is five months. So maybe we can decide maybe after each ICANN Meeting for Board, maybe one month to discuss to decide how to feedback to the GAC and then after that one month, GAC and the Board needs to have maybe a joint meeting to discuss the communique.

And so then maybe after one month, GAC needs to have decide on some future action. So, maybe like this. I think maybe this some indicators, I don't know. I'm not sure that that's correct for the KPI or to close the loop. So, since this is written by Jacques, could you feedback on this so it's my suggestion is correct for this KPI or for this closing loop, Jacques?

Jacques Blanc:

Yes, so as far as I see it, that's the best we will be able to do with considering what the relationships are, not relationships but what the nature of what GAC is, what kind of KPIs we can try and push here. My only trouble once more is how this kind of suggestion is going to be a recommendation and how are we going to be compliant with the new recommendations in process that we have heard last week. But other than that, yeah, I agree with you, Liu, here.

Vanda Scartezini:

Well, for me, my understanding was about this point is exactly what Liu said. So, I see that the effectiveness, that is not as good as it could be. So, while we could think about putting the comments as the points in the AT effectiveness if looks better, but the point is we need to do something for that. So, it's not closed.

And the way we are going to do that is for the recommendation time to discuss better but we cannot close this meeting as effective completely because we saw complaints from the GAC, even as minor complaints, that is there. So, we need to keep this partially effective because it is. So, my suggestion for your comments is to maybe to improve this effectiveness points and add the need of think about the time among meetings to meet and to less formal and more in depth for the regular BGIG call be established, like Maarten said that. Well, that's for you to comment, too. Bernie or any others?

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Vanda. Bernie for the record. Yes, I think that if we can add Liu's point to the ATRT3 assessment of effectiveness, it would help close this off. And in response to Jacques' point about how we're going to include this as a recommendation, we can have a look at it once we've closed everything off, but this is exactly why I brought up the notion of suggestions and recommendations. And if there are things where we're finding it's a bit of a challenge to meet all the requirements for a recommendation, but we think it's important to note something, we could include it as a suggestion. Thank you. Back to you, Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay. Thank you. Then we can put this information. I do believe that we can add maybe it needs to set up some KPI in metrics or other words than that, and also remember that ICANN Meetings with the GAC and Board after the formal face-to-face meeting, be less formal and more in depth and establish in the BGIG Call, like Liu said. In the four or one months or timely organize it. It's something that we put in the F column. So, in my point of view, it's done, and we can pass on those information for the F column. If everybody agrees, it's done. Can we go for the next?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes. Let's go up more to the left, Brenda, and find the next yellow one going up, or towards the top of the spreadsheet. E, yes. So, 6.1E. Nope, back down to the next one please. Yes, thank you. So, the only thing I was missing there is we didn't have a formal effectiveness notion. I see, if we can go to a little bit to the right so we can see the effectiveness assessment. Thank you. So, it sort of says this was an effective solution,

but we didn't close off what the effectiveness assessment is, so are we marking this as effective, is the only thing I need there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Vanda or Liu? If you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

Liu Yue: Yeah.

Vanda Scartezini: I'm not ready.

Liu Yue: Sorry, Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: Go ahead.

Liu Yue: This is Liu on the record. And I think since we know that SOs/ACs are site, and that a lot [inaudible] also have public session during the ICANN Meetings. But I think maybe that's an area that's to ask the Board, to ask the GAC to have maybe a public workshop or public session to the other community, to the whole community. Is that correct or is that possible? Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini: I could not really follow you. My internet was bad. Now it's good again. But I could not hear you, Liu. Sorry, I cannot comment on your talk.

Liu Yue: Yeah, so I will repeat that. The thing that you said that GAC should not be sitting in the room and it needs to have more engagement with other groups, so since we know that as other AC, they may have public session during the ICANN Meeting, so do you mean that we need GAC have a public session to the whole community, or is that possible for GAC or and also as our recommendation to this?

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah, well I can agree. In my opinion, GAC can have those open meetings with everybody, but in some way what we decide to say is the open intersession calls, I don't believe it's possible to open intersession calls. So, I don't see if we can work more on this issue but again, we can add those comments on the assessment and effectiveness of that to make it clear, but for me, it was clear. Let's see what Jacques, what you think about that because it was clear for me.

Jacques Blanc: Okay. So, Jacques for the record. So, I am a bit needy with this recommendation and I will say that's exactly the type of recommendation that seems to justify the process we are now seeing. Because when you say GAC is engaging with the Community, what is behind engaging with the Community? So many things can be

considered as engaging or not engaging and it's too vague as far as I'm concerned.

And you know that kind of sitting in a room debating itself. Well, you know, to be crystal clear, I have the feeling the whole thing might not be, but it feels biased to me. So, as long as, my assumption would be, as long as we do not try and dig in what way should GAC being engaging with the Community and clear what does it mean, and sitting in a room debating itself, I mean, what is waiting from a non-empowered body which has got its own way of working, how it's supposed to work facing this recommendation?

So, in a nutshell, implementation, as far as I'm concerned, it has been implemented by opening GAC Sessions. This is engaging with the Community. Yeah, next step could be let's have the GAC participate in the open, all around, ICANN Org Meetings in a big intersessional Session, but to be honest, this would be implemented but how effective would it be? We all know that GAC Members are going to be even more careful in speaking in public, that they can be speaking when they are speaking inside GAC for all the reasons we've been looking at before.

So, my assumption would be assessment of implementation, yes, it has been implemented by open its face-to-face meetings, okay? And then effectiveness, I would look at digging to precise what is engaging with the community, what is behind this terms, okay? And consider that sitting in a room debating itself is just a way to describe that maybe until ATRT2 and over GAC has been considered like a bit closed, but once more this has been stopped by opening the GAC Sessions. I hope I'm clear enough.

Vanda Scartezini:

Okay, Jacques. That's what we have discussed many times among us about the, in my opinion, almost impossible to have open intersessions meetings, calls, with the many, many members. And as you said, that will be difficult for country representatives to really talk openly on sensitive issues, and I don't know. But it's kind of, I agree, that it's kind of a recommendation that is not understanding in the beginning of what is GAC, how is the work of inside countries and among countries.

So, I don't know if we should ignore this, or leave this effectiveness as a reminder that we should put in our report something more clearly explained that is not, in fact, not recommended to have people outside the GAC in intersessional when they discuss a specific issues. Like in the other points of ATRT2 Recommendation, like the one that said that the communique writing was closed, was not. So, more open than that in my opinion in GAC work, is almost impossible.

So put more people that has no clue and may be just political objectives to join those calls and complain about something not related to the ICANN, it's very difficult for the Leadership GAC Team to deal with. That is my point and I don't know how to make it, but we need to make some information in this assessment effectiveness that allows us to put a comment in a way that is not a good recommendation anyway, and all the openness in the engagement with the community is done. So, I don't know how to put this. That's my question to Bernie. Bernie, can you help?

Bernard Turcotte:

I'm not sure. Let's just say that I'm not sure if we're talking about effectiveness or several things at the same time. My point is that I'm with Vanda, on a personal opinion note, that opening the intersessional calls doesn't to make sense for me. And as far as the other thing, how well the GAC engages with the Community, along the same lines. I mean, having worked with my government relative to our ccTLD and having had a Canadian as Chair of the GAC for a while and listening to how things work, I don't think we're going to get much more mileage out of this.

I think the GAC has done what it can versus what it is able to do. Governments like to talk to governments, and they like to talk to governments in a certain way and that process is not going to change because of the recommendations we make. So, in my mind, is just the only thing, the assessments are okay. The only thing we have to do is decide on an assessment for effectiveness, and it's probably either partially effective or effective. And we close this off. And let's not forget that once we close this off, we will get back to it in the report and decide if there is anything that is either a suggestion or a recommendation that we want to make following that. That's the best I can offer right now. Back to you, Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini:

Yeah, well, I agree. That's, for me, what is written there, GAC is choosing to have the intersessional calls as the closed one. It's the best they can do, and all the engagements are done. So, we could put this partially effectiveness, partially effective because effective completely, we just

forget that. And that is something that we need to avoid, again, public comments on those points that needs to be clear about how GAC works.

So, my only point about the effectiveness is not to put effective because what they expect is, the recommendation expected something that is not done. So, we need to explain but put related to ATRT2 is not completely effective. So, my vote will be for partially effective, but I need to see what Liu and Jacques believes.

Jacques Blanc:

Jacques here, for the record. My vote would be as effective as can but I'm not sure we can put this in the report, so partially effective, I would follow that.

Vanda Scartezini:

Yeah, that's good. I don't know if this alternative is open for us, but I completely agree with your suggestion. Liu, your point?

Liu Yue:

Yeah, this is Liu on record. And I agree with you. I think this is not, for the GAC as a whole to engage at the intersessional activities, I think is not easy for GAC as a whole to do that. So, maybe we can ask GAC Members in this region to maybe to attend, to participate the regional activities to introduce. And so, I think effectiveness, yeah, it's okay but I think the intersessional call or intersessional meeting to open to all, I don't think it is easy for GAC to do that.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you, Liu. Can we use Jacques' suggestion? Effective as it can be?

Bernard Turcotte: Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah?

Bernard Turcotte: Okay, this is Bernard. What I've done in a few other places, I've used an explanation in that it is as effective as it can be, and then given the situation and given it an effectiveness assessment of effective. So that's what I've done in other places. In this place, we could use the same text that we assessed that it is as effective as it can be and then if you choose to only rate the effectiveness as partially effective, that's fine. But what I've done in the other ones when we've been in this situation is to say it's as effectiveness as it can be, and the effectiveness assessment is effective. Over to you.

Vanda Scartezini: If I believe we all can agree with this text, so you can add this text for us, and we are done.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay, I will do. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you.

Bernard Turcotte: So, we're done with ATRT2 and we can go back to the report if you want, Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay. Thank you. Let's go back to that report because there is some conclusions on ATRT2 points that we should be told.

Brenda Brewer: Okay, so you want the first report you sent via Skype?

Vanda Scartezini: That's the points that we want to start to work during this meeting, too. Can you put that back?

Brenda Brewer: Yeah, just a second. Let me find it. Here you go, Vanda. Is that the right report?

Vanda Scartezini: Yes, thank you, but go further into this because in that one, yeah. In the 4.2.1.1, I believe that's the first one, there is no conclusion. A little further. Yeah, conclusion, here. Bernie, this you didn't put the conclusion. Do you have some points that you want to raise for the conclusion?

Bernard Turcotte:

This is one of the ones I did early on before I guess I got into my speed of making recommendations. The point of the conclusion is to begin with are we thinking that we want to make a recommendation or a suggestion or do we think this is done? And that's the point of the conclusion. We've rated the implementation, we've rated the effectiveness, in this case we have not effective. So, I was uncertain on how we wanted to proceed going forward, which is why there's a question mark on the conclusion. So, if we can go back up a bit, Brenda, to the recommendation itself. Okay, thank you.

So, 6.1a, convening GAC 101 or information sessions for ICANN Community to provide greater insight into how individual GAC Members prepare for ICANN Meetings in national capitals, how the GAC Agenda and work priorities are established. I think that part, we're doing pretty good. How GAC members interact intersessionally and during GAC Meetings to arrive at consensus on GAC positions that ultimately are forwarded to the ICANN Board as advice. And you start unpacking this thing, there's just a lot of stuff there. Literally, there's an expression in English, it's got just about everything except the kitchen sink.

So, it was a wide ranging recommendation and that is the reason we've got new rules for recommendations because these kind of recommendations would be impossible to make under the new rules. So, we've got an implementation assessment of implemented, and we've got an effectiveness assessment of not effective. And I'm counting on you. I could not draw a clear conclusion from this. Do we want to keep asking for more based on this recommendation or do we

think it's gone as far as it can? And that's back over to you. I cannot judge that. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini:

Yeah, I believe that we have the same point here, that to go inside into how individual GAC Members prepare for ICANN Meetings is not our business. They can do what they want to. And it's something not to be there. It's interference in how individual GACs prepare. The only thing that we can see here is they have the intersessional, they have emails, they have the website, but how individuals use this is not the business for the Community of ICANN.

So, again, we could use in effectiveness, the same idea as effective as it can be because we cannot interfere in the way individual GAC Members prepare themselves for the ICANN Meetings, in national capitals, wherever. This is not our business. This is as ridiculous as a recommendation in my opinion. So, we explain that in some way in the assessment, but we could conclude that maybe because we conclude it's not effective because of that, but it's not. In my opinion, maybe we should use this effective as can be. So, let's hear from other colleagues. Jacques and Liu, the floor is yours.

Jacques Blanc:

Yeah, so, Jacques here for the record. I am reaching, I mean, I completely agree with Bernard here, saying this type of recommendation and whatnot is exactly why a process has been rightly put in place. My conclusion would be exactly the same as before, meaning as effective as can be and partially effective. And at the end of

the day, we might add a note saying that once more, reading the part in our report where there's an explanation of what is GAC, what is GAC here for, and how GAC works, might help understanding the way that this recommendation has been assessed. Over.

Vanda Scartezini: I totally agree. And what's your point, Liu?

Liu Yue: Yeah, you remember my homework about the GAC Meeting participants that you can find that. For the whole members of GAC it's moving very quickly, but the participants in GAC Meetings remain about the 60 members, so that is some status of the GAC participants. So, like this, so that can be maybe some answers to how GAC Members they are interacting or prepare us in their national capitals.

So, I think this is a maybe implemented but we need to, so I think maybe we can have our recommendation that is to ask GAC to disclose which members participate in the meeting, or to explain their participation in the communique and then to and also maybe for the consensus of the GAC in this. But I think this, the writing, the words in the implementation, it's not draw a clear conclusion on that. So, I think I agree that this recommendation is not effective, but we need to reset our recommendation to the one that's how does GAC improve that, improve this.

Vanda Scartezini:

Okay, I believe that we have, yeah Liu has some points that we need to consider. And maybe the conclusion here is better [inaudible] how better... The conclusion here could be now better analyze the... Most of this, the conclusion in my opinion would be, most of this recommendation is done, is implemented, and some we need to analyze better how to improve GAC Members participation on the work.

Something like that, because all the other issues is what the impact, interact intersessionally, and during GAC Meeting, as Liu said. Normally, not all members participate really. They listen, they take notes, and send back to their governments what happened, and send the communique back, and so one part they do not effectively participate, that this will be up to them to do that. They decide to participate or not. Well, let's listen to Bernard. Bernie, the floor is yours.

Bernard Turcotte:

Thank you Vanda. Bernie for the record. Yeah, I think I understand Liu's point of view, but to bring it back to what Jacques said in another point, how would we generate recommendations from this, and the point is not to do recommendations at this point. So, I would say as a conclusion, Vanda's probably got a good suggestion in saying that for most of these things they are implemented as much as they can be and as effective as they can be, and that we probably need to consider if we want to make recommendations or suggestions relative to how things can be better measured to see where improvements could be made, if I can capture everything that was said. Vanda, back to you.

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah, I do agree. I believe that's the best conclusion that we can have. If the others agree, you can use this Bernie and add to this item and we can go on.

Liu Yue: This is Liu on the record. I agree with Bernie. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you Liu. Jacques, I believe Jacques is...

Jacques Blanc: Jacques is good there. You believe right, Vanda.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay, thank you. So, let's go. Can you add this conclusion then, Bernie, and we can go on?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes ma'am, will do.

Vanda Scartezini: The next recommendation, you can further to the where there is no conclusion, I believe, it's not that one. Go further, further. That one. The 4 one. Considering whether and how to open GAC conference calls to other stakeholders, is the same that we have discussed a lot. So, it's just marked off of the whole recommendation and there is something that we can go to the same conclusions because it's the way GAC is.

And we know that the liaisons are able to participate, so the liaisons are the only ones that understand their behavior during their calls and contribute with suggestions and shut up when there's sensitive points. So, I do believe that we have done this completely and the conclusion is that the GAC is doing whatever is possible and the liaisons are playing a good role on this assessment and effectiveness for interaction with the ACs/SOs. From my point, it's just that. There is nothing else that we can do about that. That's my point. Let's hear the other members of this group. Jacques and Liu, if you want to make some comments on that, the floor is yours.

Liu Yue: Yeah, this is Liu on the record. Thank you Vanda. And this, I think...

Vanda Scartezini: It's not Bernie. You have your hand up?

Bernard Turcotte: No, Liu was speaking. I'll go after.

Vanda Scartezini: Bernie?

Liu Yue: Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini: Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte: I said Liu was speaking and I'll go after him, Vanda.

Liu Yue: Okay. Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini: I lost you.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay, you're having trouble with your audio. Liu is speaking. We'll let him speak and then I can speak if no one else wants to speak. Thank you.

Liu Yue: Yeah, this is Liu. Can you hear me Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini: Yes.

Liu Yue: I think the liaison premises is good for the interaction between GAC and other ACs/SOs. And also, I know that GAC, they have put some liaisons from GAC to other ACs/SOs and also the on the process to improve the

operating procedure on how to on the liaison from the GAC, so I think for this recommendation it's good enough, but if there is no other place to raise on the to improve the liaison from GAC to other ACs/SOs, maybe we can save some words here. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you Liu. Yes, I could not hear Bernie saying because I lost record for a moment and can you repeat Bernie, thank you.

Bernard Turcotte: I didn't really say anything. I was just saying Liu should go first.

Vanda Scartezini: Oh, okay.

Bernard Turcotte: But this being said, I agree with you. To be consistent with what we said in the other recommendations, basically this has been done as much as it can be done, and really uncertain if there's any significant follow-up to this recommendation that we would consider.

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah. I agree and we could add this conclusion. If you can put this conclusion, it's done because there is nothing else to do than continue with the liaisons and maybe we can make some points in the rec or not a recommendation but recognize that the liaisons are playing an important role in the engagement of GAC.

Jacques Blanc: Yes. Guys? I'm not sure I have unmute. Do you hear me?

Vanda Scartezini: Yes, go ahead.

Jacques Blanc: Oh, sorry. Yeah, Jacques for the record. So, it's a side not but I think that during the public comments, we might want to be prepared to give, I don't know if we have to do that, but to give very clear additional explanation why we consider twice, or three time, or four times, as many times as needed, that GAC has been as far as it could. You know, considering Vanda, you've been in GAC. Liu, you are actually in GAC. We are a GAC Party. I feel that maybe some public comment, and it's a side not once more, might consider that we are not pushing enough GAC to reform itself, which is or is not our job. I mean, it's for everyone to decide.

And I keep my opinion for me but just think we will have to be very clear that we think that in its actual stage of being, GAC is going as far as it can, and this is our assessment and going further might need complete revamping or rebuilding in the GAC code inside of ICANN, which is completely out of the scope of this recommendation. I think we might have people saying, "You know what, ATRT3, you didn't push enough." It's just a side note, but that's a feeling which is growing inside of me.

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah, I agree because the lack of understanding of the GAC and comparing with the other ACs, maybe this lack of understanding bring persons to think that the GAC is not doing what they expected, but it's important to reinforce that it's another kind of animal and that they can behave in a way, they cannot behave in a way that, for instance, ALAC or SSAC or other ACs can behave, so they have an anarchy they need to represent their countries. It's not like individual persons state something.

So I do believe that's important if you're going to do that in Montreal, and talk about the results of survey and so on, this is something that we need to go into the responses from the survey, and prepare ourselves to talk about the, I believe that we are going to have a meeting, I hope a meeting, with about the ATRT3 and maybe put some points out about GAC, about Board, about reviews, and blah, blah. Not so large ones, but some specific points that allow general understanding about the GAC, better than they do now. Thank you. So, we have this...

Liu Yue: Hello?

Vanda Scartezini: Hello.

Liu Yue: [inaudible] I very appreciate Jacques side note but Jacques, do you remember that I talked with you in Marrakech that when I looked through the GAC operating principles I am very surprised to find that

GAC is a form of governments members. So, I think if we want to push GAC reform, I think the forum, we all know that when the forums and when the forums working, so I think this is the basics of the GAC's structure, so I think it's not easy to push that, but we may read this question our further recommendation beside this review of the ATRT2 Recommendation, I think your idea is very important and for GAC.

And this ATRT1 and ATRT2, didn't bring this idea and the reason I think is maybe for our ATRT3 can revamp this question to our GAC to take attention that situation. I was also said though GAC enlarge their member amount, but the participants in GAC meetings is remain as the normal, the regular one, and only the participants is not increased as the whole members raised and most new members they didn't participate in any GAC meeting or even reply any GAC email.

And so, I think this is the important passion, this is important for GAC to have some change to engage all members. So, also like we discussed on the poll question for the how many people and how they get to into the consensus I think is also the basis of GAC and also the structure of GAC. They have some limitations for GAC to further their power or further their effectiveness on the policy, on the public policy. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini:

Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte:

Thank you. This is Bernie for the record. I think some of these points go back to what we were talking about in 6.1a. Sticking to this one, the

trend I'm getting is that we had agreed, I haven't written it yet, but we said as part of the introduction to this section, we would write a few paragraphs explaining what the GAC is to put a context on our analysis of the recommendations. And maybe that should be a chapeau to the ATRT2 also as a reminder to people that the GAC is a particular creature versus some of the other points in that. Sorry, I will try to kill this if I can.

Okay. So, the other thing I was looking at while we were talking is on some of the learning tools that are available in ICANN, there is a lack of stuff from the GAC. And maybe that really should be maybe a good point for a suggestion coming out of 6.1a relative to including the materials, so that not just GAC Members can understand what the GAC is, but the Community can understand it. Thank you. Over to you. Vanda, if you are speaking we're not hearing you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

We're not hearing you.

Vanda Scartezini:

I'm speaking now. I was mute. Sorry. No, it's just my point that I put some issues in this report related to the information about GAC, but certainly can be improved to make it more clear and I believe that in this specific point, point 4, in the effectiveness, what we said that liaison performance will depend on the persons, the location, and that we should in my opinion, emphasize that liaisons is so important and how to choose liaisons maybe deserves a kind of key points.

Like in the NomCom Groups, we are suggesting that for instance NomCom recommends some profiles that could be effective from the group. Maybe that could be one of recommendations to be discussed further that we could GAC could suggest specific profile for liaisons to guarantee better performance and to be effective for the engagement, the full engagement of GAC with the Community in ICANN. So those are my points. I believe Liu, you are with the hand up. Sorry, go ahead. Liu, this is an old hand, or you want to talk?

Liu Yue:

Sorry, I'm lost. Sorry, I think just as I said, I just reaction to side note of the GAC and the conclusion is I think it's effective and also it's good enough for this recommendation as GAC and also the interaction between GAC and the other ACs/SOs.

Vanda Scartezini:

Okay, thank you. So, well, I believe we have this done. And maybe the conclusion will be suggested by Bernard, and we can move on. Can you go further with document please, Brenda? Here. Where conclusion, the h, the h. When deliberating, thank you, when deliberating on matters affecting particular entities to the extent reasonable and practical give those entities the opportunity to present to the GAC as a whole prior to its deliberation. We believe that was partially effective because difficult to measure the effectiveness of this using Working Groups.

Liaisons, again, in some cases have facilitate in this engagement with the GAC, prior to the decision. That was as we remember the GNSO complaint, that they need to implement some communique issues for

instance. And it took too long for them as a business people to if they have some points that is not clear in the communique how they can go further and quickly and not wait for the next interaction, face-to-face with the GAC. So, that was the complaint and that was why we put partially effective in that.

So, the conclusion in my opinion is that maybe we need to make clear, make the process clear and the conclusion is we need the process for the interaction of large community, like GNSO or ccNSO, which ccNSO is not so difficult because a lot of them are part of the government and they can work inside their countries with that. But for the GNSO process, and we suggest a process like the Board has to be duplicated and address to GAC and GNSO relationship.

So, it's something and what is Daniel said here is also there is need to enhance GAC reporting process in response to community feedback and reactions to policies and procedures that are going on. So, sometimes in my opinion, yes, the communique, that is the point of language into the communique that we have this discussed a lot. Because to reach consensus, and it's quite difficult and the maker is specific points from a specific countries may be sensitive, and that is a lot of issues going on on the communique negation that is quite difficult to translate into clear words.

That is exactly why we need a process established to quickly respond to GAC, to GNSO for instance, demands to implement communique suggestions, and the same could be for community feedback. But with the community feedback, there is no clear need in my opinion to be so quickly because the community is not really implementing any specific

business on that. What is demand for the communicate is for the GNSO Members to implement some policies and start some policy that the community also participate.

But, so, in my opinion the conclusion in the process. It's as clear that to engage completely with this specific community and specific GNSO, needs to be established a concrete process that can be inspired by the same process that we have with the Board Members. So, that's my point. I do like to hear from others. Liu, the floor is yours. You have the hand up.

Liu Yue:

I think that for this recommendation implementation, there's a liaisons and Working Group of GAC is one side, and also GAC has to give some opportunity for the other one group, like you know the [inaudible] for the Brand, when they even the new gTLD process that some subgroup in GNSO like branch out the group and also for the geography name TLD group, they also express their concerns of their ideas in front of GAC and also discuss with GAC.

So, I think for this conclusion that I think GAC is considering the particular entities, their interests, and to give their opportunity but maybe GAC needs to improve their liaisons process to have more feedback from other community to improve the GAC otherwise. Yeah, that's all. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini:

Any other comments Bernie? Bernie? Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte: Oh, sorry. I was muted. Bernie for the record. What I'm hearing here is the process, overall the process is working and similar to other things, it may be a continuous improvement thing but there is no significant work to be done and the reason I'm saying that versus what Vanda was saying on the process for the GNSO, is we've got another recommendation in the PDP Section for the GAC dealing specifically with the GNSO so maybe we could note that in the conclusion of this recommendation and then we would have this one done. How does that sound?

Vanda Scartezini: Well, sounds okay to me. Maybe we need to look at further what does Daniel say in that? And Daniel was talking about in the process, when look in the chat, there was a response that GAC Members do not involve themselves in other working group process and it becomes a challenge to know what GAC response will be. That is true, but normally in that time in the ATRT2, there was some feedback because there was no clear liaisons working at that time, and nowadays we have those liaisons.

So, the liaisons goes and go back and bring back some feedback. The challenge you have GAC members advice during the process for instance, into the policy work is nowadays, we cannot complain about that because there is always a member of GAC participating in many Working Groups around, so once is Liu is working with us, and in auction proceeds and new gTLDs and any other policy issues and process, there is always a GAC Member nowadays.

So, I do believe that the complaint we've read from the ATRT2 is not anymore real. So, let's see what we're going to get from the survey, but anyway, in my opinion it's quite clear that GAC Members are participating in policy working group around the community. And the liaisons are much more effective nowadays than they used to be, even sometimes in the past there was no liaisons with the GAC. I believe that is my feedback, and I agree with you, Bernie, that the main point is in the other points. Cheryl, you have the floor. Bernie, you want to get because your hand is up before Cheryl.

Bernard Turcotte: Oh, no. I'd like to let Cheryl go first. I'm looking something up while she'll be talking.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay, Cheryl. You have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Vanda. I think what I'm hearing is a desire to recognize the improvements that have been seen over the years, recognized I believe by ATRT2 because it built on recommendations made by ATRT1. So, recognize that. Recognize the liaisons, but perhaps we can seek to have in the report, the strong requirement, the encouragement and desire to see continuous improvement and ongoing commitment to a very proactive and deliberate improvement in effectiveness of early engagement, that type of thing. Thanks.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay, thank you. Bernie, you go now.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you Vanda. Bernie for the record. I just decided to have a peek at early results of the survey and we've got from the SOs/ACs, and other structures, we've got 50 percent that are satisfied or very satisfied with their interaction with the GAC, about 37 percent that have no opinion, and only 12 percent that are very dissatisfied, so overall I don't know if the trend will continue by the time we rake up all the data, but so far, those kinds of results would back up what we're talking about here. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay. We could consider in the idea of Cheryl for our conclusion and go forward, and let's see if someone disagrees with this idea.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay, I'll include that.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay. Not seeing anyone to really disagree with that. Yeah, Daniel is saying that it's good to dig into the 12 percent and certainly we need to know who is those part of community that were outside the community that is respond to this 12 percent. Let's go to the conclusion of a survey when we get that. So, thank you Bernie and you can add this, and we can go further, Brenda, thank you.

BREBE: Want this one, it says conclusion wait for Maarten comment?

Vanda Scartezini: Wait for Maarten comment, that was, yeah, go ahead. Bernard?

Bernard Turcotte: Let's back up to the recommendation itself, Brenda. Board working should develop a document, normal process for notifying or requesting GAC Advice.

Vanda Scartezini: That's what we discussed in the General Meeting. It's not that? Yeah. It's 6.4.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, okay. So, we're done on that and basically I think what we wrote up for that should help me write a conclusion for this one.

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah, Maarten comment on that and we think that could be included into the Liu's point and Maarten points to be included in the effectiveness points, okay?

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah, I'll be reincluding the new responses for implementation and effectiveness. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay, thank you. So, I believe that with that we have no more open conclusions. Go further. Conclusions, here. Go back a little bit to the recommendations. The Board work jointed to identify and implement incentive that can remove barriers for participation, language barriers, and improve understanding of ICANN model and access relevant information. Well, in that time, I believe that in that time of ATRT2, there was just English and then they expand to the Spanish and French, and there is all the United Nation language, and even Portuguese is added. So, it's about the language, is something that was okay and let's, can you go further in the effectiveness.

Jacques Blanc: I'm sorry guys.

Vanda Scartezini: Yes?

Jacques Blanc: Jacques for the record. This is not up to date. This is one of the recommendation assessment I've been working and obviously it has been gone much further as this is, and most of the points I believe have been solved. The only thing is I just finished working on that a couple of days ago, or three days ago maybe, and my assumption is that they are

not yet get to time to get all this up to date. But this, I believe, has been treated in recommendation 6.6, I guess, we saw it today.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay.

Jacques Blanc: Bernard, you concur with me here?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, well, this is a version of the document that doesn't have the updates that were done this week, obviously, and you know again, if we consider all the updates, it'll probably end up being one of these where what can be done has been done, if I remember correctly. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay. So, this we can consider that is the new version will be full done. Is that what we are saying, because Jacques points are not here and the conclusion regarding those points are done. So, we can exchange those points after the meeting because we are running now, we have two minutes to have one and half hour of our meeting, so I do not believe if the people has all the opportunity, because we had agreed from 9:30 to 10:30 my time, so we have more eight minutes to reach the time defined for this meeting in our agenda.

So, we start early and could use but we need to conclude on the time. So, we can go forward with that. Brenda can you go further to see if

there is other points? I guess not. So, we can start to use the opportunity to we have two alternatives here. We can have the full work starting into the reports, information, introduction, information into the introduction, I can start to work in the Bernie also work a little bit on that, so we could do that, or we could finish our work and not start another point because we really need to digest those reports and we can continue by Skype or email and have those concluded.

And then next time we can work on the points that we have added as explanations about what GAC is. So, would it be great to have Liu's and Jacques' addition, Jacques have done a lot of addition on that is over there, and but I'd like to also have Liu's input on the explanation on what kind of animal GAC is in the introduction. So, with that, I do believe that we have almost used our time, and I can open the floor for anyone that wants to see what people want to do? Jacques, the floor is yours.

Jacques Blanc:

So, if I read correctly, we have got something like six to eight minutes, definitely should have at 3:30, so I mean, I would really, the best thing I think we could do is plan ahead. What do we do next? That's the only thing that I see really. Not taking on anything oppresional more than we have already done. Just forecast what do we do next.

Vanda Scartezini:

Okay. In my view, and I'd like to hear from Bernie, let's see Bernie first. Bernie the floor is yours.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you. This is Bernie for the record. I think probably what would make sense for me is I'm going to try and turn around this next version of the GAC section within 24 to 48 hours so that you can look at it, including some text on an introduction to GAC. And so, I think if we want to concentrate on that, review the recommendations over the weekend, you should have it in your hands by Friday, and that will provide I think a good basis for closing off this section, and then we will start looking at, let me back this up a bit.

So, I will get this in your hands for Friday. Next week, we can finish finalizing that as we discussed on the plenary, the week after we're getting into the survey results and there will be quite a few for the GAC that will be relevant, so I think that sort of chops up our work quite neatly to get everything done. Over to you Vanda. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay, thank you. Vanda for the record. Finally, I believe, Jacques, you want to make a comment again or this is an old hand or a new one?

Jacques Blanc: I love your concept of old hand. Yes, this is an old hand, yeah.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay, thank you. Okay. Yeah, I agree, Bernie. We need to have this review document to work with so let's wait for Bernie's feedback and we can work on that after and I'm looking forward to seeing the survey

that definitely will be interesting points for us. So, for my side, thank you very much for your participation and let's wait for the Bernie feedback and the work on it and we can see each other next week, nice weekend for everyone. Bernard, this is your new hand? No, old one. So, if no one wants to make any comments, I do believe that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini: Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Did you want to get a calendar? Thanks. I just wondered if you wanted to get a calendar invitation out for a Work Party Meeting next week or wait and see?

Vanda Scartezini: Let's wait for the feedback and let's leave members, because we haven't the participation with Maarten and Maarten normally gives us some good feedback, so we need for to get this feedback from him and work on the final meeting, final conclusion in the ATRT2 to define if we need next week or the other week, and so it's better to have first the feedback from Bernie and feedback from the colleagues about the conclusions of the ATRT2.

So, for me is that. Anyone? So, if not, thank you very much. You can stop the record. Brenda, thank you for your assistance and thank you all the participants, Daniel, Sebastien, and all we see each other next week. Thank you.

Jacques Blanc: Thanks for the friendly work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks everyone.

Liu Yue: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye, thank you all.

Vanda Scartezini: Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]