
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary Call number 21 on the 17th of July 2019 at 11:00 UTC.

Members attending the call today are Cheryl, Daniel, Tola, Wolfgang, Vanda, Jaap, Sébastien, Demi, and Maarten.

Observers, Sophie Hey.

Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, Brenda, technical writer Bernie.

We have apologies from Pat and Geoff, Osvaldo and Erica. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, and I'm glad those of you who've been able to make today's call are bright eyed and bushy tailed, and ready to do a little bit of work. And note that we do have a larger than normal set of apologies, but these things happen from time to time.

And of course, the usual administrivia that we run through these calls. First of all, we need to ask if there's anybody who has an update to their statement of interest.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [No.]

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.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Well, we have had a few, so I'm certainly happy to hear any changes of circumstance. But failing anybody putting anything in chat or raising their hand, or making their voice call, we will assume nobody's had a change since last week. And we will continue on just to, of course, remind you that we're all operating under continuous disclosure on our statements of interest, so should our relationships and employment circumstances change in a way that may – or could – be deemed to affect our role and our connections in our work in the review team, we need to mention that in a call and have our statement of interest updated as soon as possible.

Now, you'll notice on today's agenda a slight change [inaudible] from last week where we were already experimenting slightly with a new type of agenda, and that is that we have an action items review, closed and new item.

This is because as we're going to be picking up the pace, working a great deal in matters that [will be a] plenary discussion as well as continuing on work party activities, weaving them in, of course, to our plenary discussions, but also in the solo activities that a number of the work parties are running on. We wanted to make sure we had a pause in each of our calls from now on where we can ensure ourselves that we are not losing track of anything.

For example, if there's something we've discussed in a previous week and it's simply not on this current week's agenda, we will note it for the record. Some things we will have said might be for example a

“homework” assignment. We will note that, and anything that has been completed, we will also note that as well. So this will be a standing agenda item from now on. I hope you all appreciate that this is an attempt by the leadership team to ensure that we are indeed highly accountable and very transparent in our own activities.

We are going then to do our somewhat normal agenda since our changes last week where we look at any input from our plenary work and also the Work Stream 2, the ATRT2, and of course the [IRT] [inaudible] – I apologize, I had to sneeze. Better to have done that off mic.

Then today, we’re going to be spending our topic A time, our main time, beginning our discussion on the community survey. This is becoming a time critical piece of work that we need to look at.

I note Michael is asking to get a dial out. I’m sure Brenda’s got that in hand. We’re then going to look at our IRP as a bit of an update, and call for Any Other Business. Any Other Business, of course, you’re welcome to bring forward now, and [inaudible] mention that we are going to be covering off a few things perhaps in Any Other Business. Of course, we will call for it again before we complete today’s session.

I note Maarten’s point in chat, and I think we might take that at the top of the call, Maarten, rather than wait to Any Other Business, [our follow-up action] will be of course in today’s agenda just to confirm any actions that we’ve made and decisions reached.

All of you should have read in the list Maarten’s message regarding his role as an active review participant, specifically where his assignment of

particular review pieces, but [inaudible] with ATRT2. And I'll welcome him now just to briefly speak to that. Certainly, Pat and I are perfectly comfortable with him retreating somewhat from the assigned work and making himself available, as he always has done. So Maarten, over to you to make sure everybody's as comfortable as Pat and I are with this.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that, Cheryl. It's in particular for assessing the implementation of ATRT recommendations, to which the board already has a role of making sure this has happened well. So it would be assessing also on the board's role, which is why I think I shouldn't be a [lead assessor] here, whereas I am happy to help out in pointing at what has happened and who you may want to talk with and things like that.

I think particularly for that part, yes, I am a full team member, but that part, maybe I shouldn't take a lead in. Not only whether you're comfortable, but also whether the outside community is comfortable noting that a board member takes the lead on assessing some things for which the board is responsible. So, happy to answer any questions. And thank you for your immediate understanding and support for that, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem at all, Maarten. Pat and I appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that's Wolfgang wanting to speak to this. Go ahead, Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Yeah, just I want to thank Maarten. This makes absolutely sense, and you have my full support. And I think the whole group understands this. Thank you. [See you.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Wolfgang. And I'm sure Maarten is greatly relieved with that, because he was concerned that members of the review team may feel he was in some way shirking his responsibility. But of course, it is the utter opposite of that. He's more than willing to do more than his fair share of work in the review team as an active participant, but he's acutely aware of the optic that may be applied from an external view. So thank you very much for that, [and it's noted.]

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You might just need to mute, perhaps. Just do star six on your phone, Wolfgang. [That may do.] Sometimes the room is unmuted as well as your phone, and that will echo as well.

With that, and seeing no one objecting, or having a hissy fit as I would refer to it, on Maarten's intervention, we want to continue to thank him

for his involvement and service, and recognize that he's doing the right thing by all of us in making this decision.

With that, let us now move to our previously advertised program, unless anyone else has – other than what I'm seeing in the chat, which is support. And we will continue on.

We might just make sure that that is clearly minuted in the records for today. I think it's probably worthy of having a specific line item in our minutes and review of our meeting. It is important that people are aware that Maarten is acting in an at arm's length capacity on the aspects of a number of our review actions [as he is on the board.]

Okay. Let's now move to agenda item three, which is anything that wants to be shared with the plenary from the work parties. I know that Osvaldo was an apology, but Sébastien is here, so let's start with the board. And the floor is yours, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. It's a pity that Osvaldo is not here, because I am just going outside from my flight from Yaoundé, Cameroon, and I must really apologize but it was impossible to work there. No connection or very weak, very difficult to [inaudible]. I understand what is really – and it was in the capital, but in my hotel, not possibility to have Internet, electricity shut down and so on.

I have nothing to report. I must work to see what's happened during the last two weeks and to come back to you next week. But I just would like to be sure that everyone on the board work party are ready to work,

because I didn't see any change in the document since when I left, and I am a little bit in trouble with that. Thank you very much, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. I appreciate your concern, of course, but do note that on the timing, the dates, etc., your work party has got slightly later dates in planning. So I'm confident that everything will be able to be sorted out and caught up with. Jennifer, you have your hand raised. Over to you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Sébastien, I just wanted to give you a quick update because I know you had a number of resource requests from the board work party. In your inbox, if you haven't had a chance to get there yet, there's a few responses to the requests. And of course, if from those responses there's still additional questions on those, please do let us know.

There are some of your requests that are still outstanding, and I just wanted to give you a quick update that we're working on those and we hope to get a few more responses to you this week. And if not, it will be next week or shortly thereafter. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thank you very much, Jennifer. And also, I think we might be picking up some items as we move on to our discussion on the reportables, the dashboards that are public and prepared by ICANN Org that are titled accountability indicators. I think there's a number of

those that will also kickstart aspects of the board work party's work as well.

So with that, thank you very much to the board work party, and let's move on to the GAC. I know Vanda is on the call. Just let me check, is Liu on the call as well? I see Sophie but I don't see Liu. Okay. Vanda, looks like it's over to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Hello, everybody. I just put some suggestions on the Google doc, and [happily, I haven't,] but I have now. I haven't able to upload the document to the GAC group, because the connection yesterday was awful, and I was not in the city. So that's something that is now in our Skype group.

Also, some suggestions on community, and specifically changes [on] questions to GAC members, but we need to confirm all those points with the group. I know our group is going out and come back during July, so welcome again to Maarten after his time in the vacation. Hope he enjoyed. And I certainly will not have Jacques available until the beginning of August.

So we are doing discussion more individually with one or another member to make sure we are aligned with the points we are doing. For the other side, I believe [all others – myself is doing] my assigned points to ATRT2, and certainly Maarten will be very helpful on that.

With that, I guess it's just for today, and thank you for the time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. And that certainly is still progress. One of the things I think with the topic today, looking at the community survey and the questions that we will be wanting to ask is that some of these of course can be discussed now in plenary. So whilst they will be influenced and guided by the work parties, I think we'll be able to fast track in our group thinking the best ways of posing the most appropriate questions, which we will get to of course in short order once we move through the rest of agenda item three. So thank you very much for that continued work, Vanda. We also note that many of us being afflicted by the less than stellar Internet connectivity that an awful lot of the world is still subject to, perhaps it helps us appreciate good connections when we have them a little more.

Let's now move to the review work party. I notice KC has been unable to attend today's meeting, but we do have Daniel. Daniel, if you'd like to give us a brief update if there's anything you want to draw to our attention, over to you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Just a quick update. Following the previous discussion that we had with KC on the reviews, we are waiting for feedback regarding the requests that we made, probably Negar will update us on how far they've gone on gathering the rest of the [inaudible] of the various reviews that have so far taken place for analysis. And from there, we shall be able to pick it up to analyze the respective data of the costs. [Probably Negar] can be able to update us accordingly where she has reached. Thank you. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Daniel. Appreciate that update. One of the things of course with reviews is that as we're trying to take a relatively light touch through the ATRT2 review, you also need to be thinking about a more holistic concept on reviews as well because we will be very keen to have that discussion in plenary in the next couple of weeks as well.

So with that, it's not that [you're] going to have any reduction of responsibility. In fact, you as a work party need to make sure that there's this holistic thinking as we drill down into the specifics on implementation and the effectiveness of any implementation out of a number of these things, Work Stream 2 and ATRT2 in particular.

So with that, let's move to community. And I know there's something to report from community. Erica unfortunately is unable to join us today. There's been a sudden change in her circumstance, and she's been unable to join even though she was planning to be, but she's got Michael, I'm sure, well briefed, and hopefully he's connected successfully via telephone. Michael, over to you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. I'm just in transit, and I had hoped that Erica was going to deliver this one, but I'm happy to give an update. The community working group had a meeting on Tuesday to discuss some preliminary takeaways from ICANN 65 as well as to discuss some initial ideas for areas to look into for the survey.

There was a robust discussion about certain action areas. There was some agreement on a few areas and disagreement on a few areas, but certainly, I think some progress in terms of establishing areas that we want to focus on, areas that we want to dig into a little more deeply.

There was a document that was circulated. I believe it's available more generally. I'm not sure if the e-mail gets sent just to the community subgroup or to everybody in the review team, but either way, there will be a revised version of that document that'll go around soon enough, and we're planning to schedule another call next week. I'm not sure if it'll be at the same day, but it'll definitely be at the same time in order to discuss further. That's basically community's update.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much for stepping in at extraordinarily short notice. I'm sure Erica will be greatly relieved when she recovers to know that you delivered that in what sounds like almost on the run. So hopefully, you're not too distracted with talking during transit. And of course –

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

It's a brisk walking pace, not a run.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It sounded pretty extensive. So we'll be obviously moving to the survey questions as well. We look forward to some of your interventions as well.

Okay, so with that, let's move to these full plenary interest topics. IRP, there is not, to my knowledge, a great deal to say about that at this stage, but we do need to keep it on our radar. As we noted last week, there was the action to – I'm going to use the term "backfill," but in fact it's "replenish" the team, and that we were aware of a number of the component parts of ICANN community from the support organizations and the advisory committees were actively pursuing that. And of course, the additional aspect of reaching out and trying to source appropriate and suitably qualified individuals to be available for the standing committee.

Staff, can I ask, is there anything else we need to note on IRP?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

I have nothing from my side. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Jennifer. I just figured that if something had come across in a memo, you'd be aware of it where I might have missed it. But that's good to know, but we still need to keep our watching brief on it. And we might also perhaps take some time in maybe even next week's agenda to see whether we can start putting together some words which will be appropriate for this. I think there's a high degree of predictability on how much advancement on all of this is likely to happen during the lifetime of our project, and I'm pretty sure we should be able to put some placeholder text together.

And I see Bernie's hand is up, and he's probably thinking along very similar lines. Bernie, over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. Pretty much the same lines. Given that the IRP review is still in play, I don't think there's a lot we can do. So I will start working on some placeholder text the plenary can review so that we can tick that box off our required review elements from the bylaws. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Excellent. Thank you. The more boxes we start ticking off, the better, from my very biased point of view anyway. With that, we'll see this is a standing item, but in the not too distant future, we'll actually have some text to look at and review. And that of course will get us to start nosing around the final report template, which in itself will be an interesting thing.

Not much has happened in terms of Work Stream 2. The implementation team— the implementation oversight team, it's just an implementation team – has not as yet met although it is formally convened, and we will know more when we know more on that. But I would predict we will probably carve the review of whatever is happening with Work Stream 2 up in some similar way as we did with ATRT2, or indeed we could decide to look at it as the whole of the plenary.

So at the moment, you should all start thinking about what your preferences would be from that perspective, and of course, we have the advantage of being able to perhaps start writing some text that would have a high degree of predictability about what will or will not be able to be done in the lifetime of our project. So Bernie, I suspect that's another one where we may be able to create some placeholder text to discuss and decide upon before we get too far down the track. And he's got a green tick, which always makes me happy. Thank you very much, Bernie. That will be terrific.

That brings us to ATRT2, and of course, it was only last week when we distributed various tasks. The tasks were the different recommendations, and we were working towards a deep dive on these recommendations, noting that according to ICANN Org and its 2018 reporting, all of the recommendations from the accountability and transparency second round, ATRT2, had indeed been implemented.

We are of course going to look at that and look at the effectiveness or otherwise of that implementation, and run that into at least a spreadsheet. Now with Maarten's resuming an at arm's length activity here, there are a couple of issues which we probably now need to reassign. And I do believe that Bernie's probably already got that in hand, so I'm going to move to him momentarily and ask him to let everyone know exactly what it is that has been – or what has been reassigned to who.

I'd also note a little bit of input in the GAC work party from Maarten, and I'd ask him to speak to that in a moment as well. But first, let's go to

Bernie and let the lucky winners know who may have collected a couple of extra things to be doing a deep dive into.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Alright. Maarten had three items assigned to him. Item 5, item 6.5 and item 6.9 – or I should say recommendations 5, 6.5 and 6.9 from ATRT2.

Trying to stick to the same guidelines we had when we talked about this last week, i.e. not overburdening any one particular person, I would suggest number 5, which is the board review of redaction standards, Michael was very interested in that. He only had two items. So Michael, we might suggest that you take that one on. That's recommendation 5.

Recommendation 6.5, the board should propose a vote on appropriate bylaw changes, formally implement documented process for board-GAC bylaws. I think that should be fairly straight forward, but I would propose KC for that. She is board liaison and probably it'd be good for her anyways and might make sense. So that's recommendation 6.5.

And for 6.9, the board should instruct the GSE group to develop with community input a baseline set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement. I see Daniel had a light load, so might suggest Daniel for recommendation 6.9. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. I see Vanda [inaudible] interacting with the GAC work party and Maarten. We'll ask both of them to speak to [inaudible] in a minute. But I'm assuming that all of you are happy with those

additional assignments. If not, well, tough. No, [I shouldn't say that.] If not, let us know, and we will try terribly hard to make your lives easier. But if you are in need of any support, please let us know and we will do what we can to support you in this deep diving.

I noted from my own experience as I jumped into the ones that have been assigned to me, I feel like I'm beginning to flesh out the skeleton structure of a whitepaper. So I'm going to have to exercise self-control on what I bring back to the plenary in next week, or no later than the week after. Whilst the light touch and what will be tabulated in the spreadsheet may not have a great deal of information, I've made considerable notes – opinion pieces, I'll admit – on my particular parts of ATRT2 recommendations, and of course, if any of the rest of you are doing that, don't discard those. We may find some use for that. Let's keep them to one side in a parking lot, because there may be some material that is worthy of reference, if not inclusion in final reporting. Certainly, one or two of mine got me perilously close to leaping up on a soapbox at one stage, but anyway.

The link to the document we're talking about, certainly, simple spreadsheet. And thank you very much for that, Jennifer. It is the listing of the ATRT2 recommendations and the allocation as to who's going to be doing a little bit of a deep dive on them. It's just a light touch review. In other words, you need to assess, were they indeed implemented – noting that every one of them has been claimed to be implemented – and if so, how well or how effectively? And it was in that last part that I found myself making side notes that got pretty wordy.

Okay. We will come back to that next week. I suspect we will make our ATRT2 topic B, if not topic A, in next week's call, and it would be strongly encouraged for everyone to at least have some material to have been included in that document, that spreadsheet document, and be in a position to speak to and/or defend their opinions on the implementation status of each of the ATRT2 recommendations.

And it's okay to say – they say it's been implemented. I don't think it has, but I also don't think it doesn't matter, because things have changed significantly since the implementation recommendation was made. That's okay. But we do need some sort of closure on each of them.

So with that, we're now going to leap into the substantive topic for today, which is of course a rather time critical and particularly critical thing for the community working group, which is the community survey. There is a link to a Google doc in the agenda, and what we're going to be doing is these are the questions that were not asked in Marrakech. We want to make sure that if there are additional or clarifying questions, that we try and capture those as soon as possible.

We will then take a stab depending on the tool we use – it'll be one of the ICANN available tools. It might be SurveyMonkey, it may be Google Forms. That's yet to be determined. We would like to see a small group, perhaps four or five of us commit the additional time that it will take to work on taking these very generically designed questions, all of which are trying to encourage verbal and fairly [involved form] responses, and put them into a form of question so that longform answers that then need deep, and somewhat a perhaps I fear

cumbersome, and certainly time consuming analysis are minimized and that there is more question design that leads us to very simple and very effective analysis.

The aim is to have – correct me if I'm wrong, please, Bernie – and I see your hand, Daniel – this survey out into the community. We're going to let it run wild by mid-August so that we can capture people over the last part of August and the beginning of September. And then of course, we are very aware that, should we be suitably clever in the way we design the questions, the analysis should not be a terribly complicated task. If we design them poorly however, the analysis may become far more challenging.

So with that, let me go to Daniel, and then I might ask Bernie if he'd like to take us through some of this. Daniel, over to you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

I wanted to inquire [what we're going to do] with the questions that we had [set at compiling] under the reviews work party. There's also a document of those questions, [but] there are more questions that have got to be added. Thank you. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Pop them in the mix and see what makes the cut. That would be my suggestion. Or move them across into these documents, look at them with a critical eye, look at which of them are going to gain the most useful information, prioritize those if you can, and then we'll see how they do work out in a survey.

I think it's important for all of us to also recognize that we do not wish to have an incredibly long and cumbersome survey. We want to make it easy but still effective for people to fill this in. So if there is a chance that a rephrasing or a redesign of a question where we can demonstrate we are still drilling down into the same area or opening up the opportunity for a response on a similar topic, that we will take the simplest and most clearly metric-based way of doing that. And of course, all of these questions currently in the document are pretty much designed for short form answers, but short or long form answers do take specific analysis.

I'm also very aware [that the] questions from the GAC are not in here. If possible, let's make it that someone from staff – Bernie, Jennifer, one of you – can own the moving, the uploading of the reformatted questions that Vanda's put into the GAC work party discussion. They need to come up into here.

There we are. Look at that, just like magic. It's already happened. One of the first things we'll do, of course, is go through all of this as a small group activity and see where there is degrees of duplication that can be perhaps avoided, recognizing of course that duplication of survey can also be deliberate. It could be used as a tool to give a greater degree of trust in the validity of a response. If you ask the same thing several ways and the response doesn't change, then you have greater trust in that response than if you ask something similar three times and you get [quite] different answers.

So, thanks, Vanda. Nothing you're considering to cut question five. That's great. Any of those sorts of notes can be made, of course, on this Google doc under comment mode.

So with that, Bernie, is there anything we –

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Could I get in the queue, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, Michael. Go ahead. You can jump the queue in front of Bernie.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks. Just on the issue of short form answers. This was raised in the [leadership call] and I tried to interject there but fumbled with the mute. From the community perspective, I understand why that would be preferential, but there are certain questions that we're going to be asking that I don't think will lend themselves to that kind of a format.

And I understand what you're saying in terms of the ease of processing, but it's also simple in, simple out, and there are certainly types of responses where just knowing things like yes/no answers or basic proportions won't actually be as valuable. And there are aspects of the survey like for example trying to assess particular feelings about different transparency systems that ICANN has, where a longer form answer I think from my perspective is necessary.

So take the [DIPD] or the open data initiative for example. We can approach those and say, “Have you ever used it?” But honestly, the utility of those kinds of yes/no questions, and “Have you ever used it? Did you like it?” Is not super useful as opposed to saying, “What was your experience like, and what complaints or critiques do you have of the process?” That to me is vastly more useful in trying to develop recommendations. So I just wanted to flag that. For some of these questions, I think a short form response may not be as possible or as useful. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that, Michael. It strikes me – and I am an amateur, I will hasten to add, in the world of survey design – with some of those [parametrics] that you're looking at, there is often the sliding scale style analysis where the inquisition is perhaps a statement – or a question, but it may be “The ease of this was ...” and put it on a scale of one to five or one to ten or whatever. Or you make a hypothetical or a hypothesis [inaudible] perhaps which says, “What is your reaction to the following?” And you make a statement like, “The ease of use is bla bla.”

So there's a bunch of ways of dicing it up, and obviously, if we can get some professional advice and assistance on this, that will also be great. So have a think on those particular questions, so [do link to] DIPD, and just see, are there ways where there are styles of interrogation in survey that will best allow, without too many demands on either your respondent or your analysis to ask the question?

Short form, or even long form, is not some sort of devil incarnate that we need to avoid, but the more we have, the more specific time is going to be taken. And indeed, the debate and discussion associated with interpretations on text also needs to be considered. Maarten, over to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you, Cheryl. Two things you asked about the question five in the GAC list that we currently see on the screen. The arguments I was making in the GAC group was that as both Amazon, dot-amazon, and the two-character codes are in the current GAC communique from Marrakech, we just need to be very careful that we're not going to make any judgment statements as ATRT in a phase where board and GAC are still discussing this. I hope that Vanda felt with that [I think, hence her] suggestion in the chat.

The other thing I wanted to say has to do with the questions to the board. I've been chewing on that in multiple ways. One is like I could answer it myself and see as a kind of beta. The second thought that came up then, so how would individual board members respond to it? And actually, it seems to me that such questions to the board may be best asked in writing so you get a response from the board as a whole.

We talk about 20 well-identified people here, and I think the board would prefer to coordinate its response rather than have individual responses there. And that's just a thought, I haven't checked it with Legal, nor with the chair. But I hope that makes sense. I wonder how you feel about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I don't feel one way or the other about it. I think what we need to do is get you to ascertain the board's preference on this. And certainly, we put the survey out to the wider community, then the component parts of the ICANN community, board included, can decide how they are going to be responding to it jointly or severally. It will be a decision for each of those component parts. And it may be that the Government Advisory Committee and the At-Large Advisory Committee similarly might want to respond as an entity as opposed to individually. And that's fine. That's not a problem at all, providing the responses are timely. I think that's the most important thing.

We want to make sure that the opportunity for feedback on these questions is as easy to do, but as effective and efficiently, as we need it to be to extract the data. This is a data capture exercise, unashamedly so. But it's also a data capture exercise with relatively tight time [inaudible].

Okay. So let me now, looking at the time, which is ticking away, of course – Bernie, is there anything else we need to do at this stage? I think Bernie, you and Pat and I – and let's ask for a couple of volunteers today from the plenary here – need to take an aside focus on all of this and do a little bit of additional concentration. Is that a plan that will work for you, good sir?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Well, I think as we discussed, from a timing point of view, we probably should try and gather all the questions that people have in draft format

over the next two weeks, meaning this is week one, next week is week two, and have this group you're talking about go through this. And then it'll probably take a week to try and draft what would be a set of potential questions for the group to review on week four.

What I am seeing though as we go through some of this is we seem to have a dichotomy in between group-specific questions, meaning questions that are strictly for the board or strictly for the GAC, which is very understandable given our remit, and general survey questions we would like the community to ask. So we'll have to be careful about how we approach that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That's fine. Let's see if we – very aware that we don't have a full house here, but is there one or two of you who want to put yourselves forward to be part of this small party, small working team to focus on these survey questions and then bring it back to the plenary? I got a tick from Daniel. Is that you volunteering, or just agreeing, good sir? Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm putting myself to be among this small team. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Volunteering it is. We've taken your name down. And if we could grab one other of you. Would someone else like to step forward? If not you've got a couple of days to get on with that, but do contemplate doing it. That would be terrific if you could.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tola, that's you volunteering?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Fantastic. Okay, that's good. Right, we've got a couple of people we can start working with. That is terrific. Okay, if we can just make a side note on that then, Jennifer, because we'll need to start some sort of methodology, perhaps a Skype group will do, so we can effectively communicate as we start looking at these questions over the next week or ten days, and putting them into a formula and a format that will work as a survey.

Daniel, just for the record, I note you're talking about having a breakdown of the interviews and the targetability of the interviews, etc. That's great as well, but of course, we do have a situation with any of the more laissez-faire, the more interview-based materials, just as there's an art to creating successful surveys, there is also an art to the analysis of interview. Inherent bias for example is something terribly common, that what we hear is what we want to hear.

So there's a whole bunch of special tools and tricks of the trade, for want of a better term, that are normally deployed when one is using an interview system for interrogation on data acquisition. And I don't believe we've set ourselves up for that. That doesn't mean we can't, but it might take a little while to successfully do so. So I'm not demeaning or downgrading the value of interview, I'm just saying to do it well and to do it with such robust [and process rigor] that it cannot be criticized and devaluated by other analysis. There is a whole lot of stuff that needs to be built into it to do so. But perhaps I'm just overly cautious.

Alright then. One of the things that strikes me is that I don't believe we've captured everything we probably should. Just harking back to one of the interventions that Avri Doria made. She pointed out to us that in the ATRT2, something she did was to create this vessel, the ICANN Bad Attitude group within Facebook, and let it run free and see what indeed may or may not be discussed and reported there. That's another space that perhaps we could analyze and have a look at.

So let's just put that in our parking lot now, but it was raised particularly by her, and should time be available and the resourcing, human and otherwise. I'm very well aware that Bad Attitude is a private group, Jaap, but it is in fact a private group that she specifically set up to see what might shake out as an alternative to finding out about criticisms and concerns in more public forums or interview mode. And because she's raised that with us, I think it's probably worthwhile, if nothing else, even perhaps discussing it further with her. But we don't want to lose it – we don't want to do nothing. Even if we decide to do nothing, we need to decide to do nothing formally.

Okay, so is there anything else we need to do on this topic today other than set the homework assignments for everybody to make sure that we are satisfied over the next few days? Certainly between now and next week's call, with the questions that they have got in this Google doc that reflect the interests and concerns, any drill down questions or "also" and "if" type questions need to be added, any that you can live without that you noted, or [inaudible].

Wolfgang, your microphone is open. Did you want to take the floor?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: No. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Not a problem. Does anyone want to take the floor on this? Okay. If not, [I'll] try and value your time as best as I possible can, knowing many of you are busy at other events. Let's move on to our next agenda item, which is our topic B. So if we pop back to the agenda, IRP, which I think we almost covered – I'm not sure we're going to draw much more out of that. Correct me if I'm wrong. Bernie, is there anything else we need to wring out of this one?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, not IRP.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We do however need to look at some text in perhaps the next week or so regarding – placeholder at this stage –text for the final report regarding the IRP.

We've got a little bit of time, so it's, I think, probably a good idea – and I know Pat had already agreed that if we did have time, we might just look at these accountability indicators which are a current methodology, a tool that ICANN Org deploys. That was their titled accountability indicators. And Jennifer, I don't know whether you can bring up anything for people to look at. Perhaps the webpage or something. It's a bit on the fly, but if you've got something that we can lean to or whatever, that would be great.

Thank you for that link, Bernie. That's terrific. There's a link in chat. These accountability indicators, of course, like some of you will immediately say, "Well, hang on, some of these are in fact issues that are related to transparency, not accountability," and that's true too. So we can certainly look at the nomenclature that's being used here.

But basically, what this is is an effort to make a relatively easy to navigate access to information. So if you haven't explored this webpage, I would strongly encourage you to do so. ICANN obviously see this portal as a primary mechanism of their accountability, and indeed access to any details that are available on for example financial reporting is a very important pillar of the transparency of financial planning and management within an entity, and accountability associated out of that transparency as well.

Without getting into writing a small thesis on terminology and what are or are not valuable, viable [counts] versus desirables, I'm going to ask if perhaps – Bernie, I know you drilled down into these recently. Did you want to mention anything, the high points and the holidays that people might want to pay attention to in this accountability indicators section? Over to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, as Cheryl has said, they're based on the five pillars. One thing right away that would be of interest to this group – although they are all labeled accountability indicators – is under section 3.3. Jennifer, can we go there? Because these are the board KPIs that were talked about from the recommendations of ATRT2. So basically, you can have a look at some of the things that are in there. Woah, you're going way too fast. Thank you.

So we've got ICANN public meetings. They've defined an accountability indicator as participation. You can see the various ICANN meetings there. It's then broken down by regions. Next one, down one more, then we have ICANN Learn, new learners. Next one.

Years of service, so we're talking about achievement of a globally diverse culture and knowledge levels within the organization. Next one, please.

Then we've got [advancement] of global knowledge development program in the organization. Next one, please.

Then we've got globally diverse culture and knowledge levels of the board, so where are the board members from, and how that breaks down. Next one, please.

Then we have achievement of global knowledge development programs from the board. You will recall that on the recommendation from ATRT2, that there be training of board members in areas where there are gaps, and this reflects that. Next one, please.

And then Nominating Committee composition, where people are from geographically. And there, if you click on that, of course, as Jennifer is doing right now, you get to see where people are from.

Is there one more, Jennifer, I'm not sure. I think that's it. Yeah, that's it. So it gives you an idea of what there is in here, and I think we are encouraging everyone to go through that, because we will probably have to comment on some of these, if not most of them. Cheryl, back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much for that, Bernie. And I think from my personal perspective, comparing back in the ancient history days of coming out of the affirmation of commitments and being involved in the very first accountability and transparency review team, these are remarkable pieces of dashboard publication. It was only back in ATRT1 – which isn't all that long in the scheme of things – [where] the accountability and transparency review team quite literally had to try and almost fight tooth and nail and battle its way through all sorts of potential barriers

and concerns to get access to information which was equally relevant but far less digestible than this.

And I think this is one of those things that whilst we may have some recommendations for improvement, definitely need to be recognized as very helpful efforts. And more importantly, efforts made, unlike what is often the case, where there is a great deal of care in allowing the initial material to be, whilst accurately, nevertheless, simplistically as possible to still allow a high degree of specificity being reported.

So of course, you've got the opportunity to drill down and get to greater detail on many of these things. So it ticks a couple of boxes regarding things that, first of all, were recommended to be done and are now being reported as done with some quantitative material as well as qualitative statements backing up how useful or otherwise those activities were, the [training] for the board for example.

But it also is a space where if one wants a helicopter view, you can get that. And if one's interest is piqued in a particular aspect, you can drill down further and further. This is one of those things where the ability for the community who desires transparency to actually digest the volumes of material and the way material is often published has been considered.

So I'd like you to contemplate this particular tool. I think we should also bring this back as another topic for more fulsome discussion in a future call. If not next week, perhaps the week after. But do have a good browse around, make some side notes. If you think this is all very fine but these are in fact matters of no interest or [even] greater interest, or

shouldn't be filed in this way, then let us know. But I do think this is one of those times where we will hopefully be able to give credit where credit is due for a good effort, and all we can do is perhaps help them make it a superior one.

Daniel notes in the chat that this is also in line with the recommendations of the benchmark report [wherein] section 5.3, recommendation was discussing metrics, and indeed the sorts of [inaudible] are very much a satisfaction to those who desire metrics and measurables in these sorts of things, [all] they do.

So with that, I'll just briefly open the queue. I see Sébastien. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Yes, on one hand, I think it's a very good first little step in the good direction, but it strikes me that we are talking about achievement of globally diverse culture and knowledge level board and we are once again just talking about [region] and regional balance and so on, and we need much more than that.

I hope that we will be able to [do] some additional work on that. I'll start to work on that, maybe I will be able to deliver something. I am not promising anything yet, but I think we need – if we don't do ourselves, we need to ask for more [inaudible] because here, we stick with something we have since the beginning of ICANN, with just geographical balance.

And the other point, it's quite difficult for people who don't know – it needs to be really clear that it's not the board member, it's board member and liaison. And I know that since a few years, we want to have them all equal, but it's not the same thing. They don't have the same way of being selected, [time,] and so on and so forth. And on the bylaw for example, it's written clearly that they can't have more than five people from one region. And of course, it's six here because we are taking the liaison also.

And my last point is that it will be interesting to go in a little more detail about the region, because if you take the current situation of the board, it's not five elected board members from North America, it's five elected members from US. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Sébastien. Appreciate that. And of course, it is a measure of diversity that they are showing. It's certainly not all of the desirability for a truly inclusive and diverse mix. That's a point well made.

But please do have a drill down and a wander through, and we will come back to this later. Is there anyone else who wants to get in the queue?

Okay, well, homework assignment is to have a look at this amongst all the other things you're doing with your ATRT2 work, and we will be coming back to what comments we may be able to be making, and recommendations relating to the way in which they are currently –

ICANN Org is currently curating and organizing its reporting on what could be seen as a set of key indicators.

Okay. I believe that is probably it, and appropriately enough time taken for the main part of our agenda today. So if there is anybody who wishes to make any comments outside of the topic or further conversation on any of these topics, please do so now. I'm not seeing any mics open or hands waving at me, therefore I believe we will ask for Any Other Business. Is there any Any Other Business?

Bernie, did you have any Any Other Business with your workplan and getting us organized?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Probably just one question as I'm running through the required elements for ATRT3. There is the question of public comment, reviewing that, and it doesn't seem to clearly fit in any of the work parties' mandate, so I was wondering how we want to tackle that or assign it. Do we want to work on it as a plenary, or do we want to farm that out to subgroup? Just so I understand how we're going to arrange ourselves to be able to tick all the boxes from what's required of ATRT3. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that, Bernie. That's a good catch. Appreciate that. My initial reaction is we may as well, at this stage, own it as a plenary and put it on an agenda as a topic A as soon as practical, but let's very briefly open the queue and see if anyone wishes to speak to that matter.

And I'm not seeing anybody wishing to come forward, so in the absence of any objections or otherwise, let's assume that we'll own that as a plenary activity and weave it into our near future meetings as best we can. And we'll obviously be able to come back to this if needs be. Wolfgang, did you wish to – I know you were just on the telephone. Did you wish to speak to this at all?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: No. I wanted to support you to say the plenary is the right place for this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thanks very much. Michael, I know you were just on telephone. Did you wish to speak to this at all?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No, no comment from me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Okay. Alright, well, everyone else is in the Zoom room, so they've had the opportunity to put things in chat or wave at us, so let's make that so. Which means, of course, we've got a decision reached, at least one of them. If there's no Any Other Business, I'm going to see what Jennifer has made out of all of this prattle. Jennifer, did we do anything? Was there any decisions reached?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi. So there certainly was one decision. As you just noted, the public comment will be addressed at plenary in a topic A or B meeting coming up. And then the actions that I recorded are all homework items, so pay attention.

Bernie is going to work on the draft text regarding IRP and Work Stream 2 for plenary review in an upcoming meeting, and then team members are going to work on their ATRT2 implementation assignments for discussion on next week's call.

Tola and Daniel volunteered to work with Pat, Cheryl and Bernie on the survey, so staff will set up a Skype group [inaudible] with that, and any other review team members interested, please volunteer in the coming days.

Team members to continue to input questions into the Google doc for the survey, and note any suggested edits, deletions, amendments in the Google doc. And then also, team members have a look at the accountability features dashboard, make some notes as this will be our topic discussion on a future call.

I think that's all the homework that I captured. That will keep you busy, but please let me know if I missed anything. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Fantastic, Jennifer. Thank you so much for making it sound far more effective and efficient than I felt it actually was. Seriously, ladies and gentlemen, we have indeed progressed today, and I certainly know that speaking on behalf of Pat and I, we appreciate the progress that you are

indeed all making, and looking forward in fact as we ramp up in these plenaries to relatively fast turnaround. And of course, all those homework assignments [getting done.]

Please, remember, if you need any assistance, if you have any questions, any need to make formal qualifying questions or get any resourcing or find anything, the staff and Pat and I are here to help. So just let us know, and we will do our best to make the magic happen and assist you in whatever [inaudible] you're being challenged with.

Bernie, is this you saying, no, you're not interested? Or are you backing me up? Over to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Just a minor point. If we're moving the public comment item to the plenary, there's probably two things we can ask staff to look into. If we look at the implementation of ATRT2 documents from the Org on public comments, there's a new procedure that was put in for people being able to correct their input. So we would ask if that procedure has been used.

And second, there was an internal group that was tasked with looking at the evolution of public comment, and maybe we can ask, was this group formally constituted, and did they produce anything? Or can they talk to us about it? if the plenary is okay with asking those questions, just so we have the material when we're going to talk about it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Bernie. You are, as ever, proving yourself a vital part of these sorts of teams because of your, dare I say, somewhat encyclopedic knowledge about all things ICANN. [No, that would be great captures.] Thank you very much for that. So let's add those sourcing of materials as a couple of extra AIs. And Jennifer has indeed noted that.

Alright, ladies and gentlemen. We are almost to the end of our time, and I see no point – particularly at this time of my night after the day I had, and the lineup of ICANN meetings for the rest of the night anyway – of taking any more of it for this call. So unless there is anything from anyone else, I'm going to ask staff to stop the recording and bring this call to a close.

Maarten, there's no way I'm going to be sleeping. I have, I think, no less than four more calls to fit in before dawn. At least they're not overlapping. Thank you, everybody, and by for now.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you, [inaudible]. And bye. See you next week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's always a pleasure, Wolfgang.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]