

---

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary #24 on the 7<sup>th</sup> of August 2019, at 21:00 UTC.

The members attending the call today are Cheryl, Kat, Daniel, Jaap, Vanda, Demi, Sebastien, and Wolfgang.

Observers joining are Avri Doria and Chantelle Doerksen.

Attending from ICANN org is Negar, Brenda, and ... I don't see Jennifer. We have technical writer, Bernie, joining us. Apologies from KC.

Today's call is being record. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking. I'll turn the call over to our Co-Chairs, Cheryl and Pat. Thank you. Ramet also. May I add Ramet just joined us for the call as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Brenda. I'll just kick us off and then I think Pat and I will be sharing the agenda then for the rest of the time. Cheryl for the transcript record, just to encourage you all to remember to say that. The usual administrivia. Has anyone got an update to their statements of interest?

Not seeing anybody's hand go up and not hearing anybody trying to get my attention. Just to remind you all that we do operate under continuous disclosure for our statements of interest. I think all of those of you – there have been a couple who've had changes in statements of interest – have done so.

---

*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.*

---

With that, let's move on now. We have I don't think very many, if any, action items to cover, but I'm going to ask Negar just to double-check us on that, other than the homework ones, which were the ATRT2 material and the survey material that we're going to be doing as part of our agenda.

Negar, have we got anything that we need to know about?

NEGAR FARZINNIA

Thank you, Cheryl. Hello, everyone. No, you've covered it. That was the only item in terms of the survey material and the questions that we are working on. Other than that, there is nothing new, so I'll turn it back over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Thanks for that. Just a little catch-all moment, just remembering from our leadership team meeting call this week. There was a continuing AI on staff from the Board Working Party to facilitate a next meeting with them or for them. I'm assuming that's still in progress. We just don't want that to fall off the list.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

That is correct. That is still on track. We're working on it and we'll keep the team posted on the progress and when the meeting will be scheduled.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. That may inspire some of the other work parties, if they need a meeting scheduled, to let staff know so that they can facilitate. Terrific.

So that's bounced us all the way through, post haste, to what [inaudible] will be about a 25 to 30-minute discussion in the survey materials. I want to thank you on behalf of the – I was a co-lead that worked with the small team that did the survey material. Thank you, first of all, to all the work parties who are getting their homework in and allowing the small team to, I think, operate very effectively. A particular shout-out to [Paul] and Daniel, who did a lot of this, and, of course, Bernie, who managed to capture all the gobbledygook we were saying and making it into something vaguely meaningful at the end of the day. So thanks to everybody associated with that.

I'm sorry if my sound is choppy. It's probably flaky Internet. I will get a dial-out if it's an issue. Brenda, just ring me if you need to.

With that, what I would suggest is I hand over to Bernie post haste and we get the survey questions put up. Hopefully his audio is better than mine is. Over to you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. Whoops. We're not ready with the survey doc to show, so maybe we'll move that on after. I'll make sure they get it in the next couple of seconds and then we'll move it over. Maybe we can go to ATRT2 right now and we'll bounce back to the survey – oh, she's got it. Sorry. It'll be coming up momentarily. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. I'm sure we can hold off the minute or so the minute or so it's going to load up on screen. That's fine. I'll just filibuster for a moment then if you'd like and just make everybody aware that we're not doing work party updates this week. Our focus for today's agenda is a full-throated and fearless discussion on the ATRT2 recommendations, which is the lion's share of today's agenda, and the run-through for your review of our questions that are now up on the screen. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, and thank you to Brenda. Just as a bit of background if you haven't been following this, we talked with staff about what kind of tool we could use (more of a survey tool) to make it easy online, and it was decided that Clicktools would be used. ICANN has a license. We can walk through it. We'll give you some links on what that looks like in case you're curious. We'll have the usual things on this. It'll tell you how far along you are in the survey. You will be able to log back in to complete your survey if you log out or if you forget some things, etc., etc.

Now, as mentioned last week, what we're talking about is several different surveys. We looked at it and it became clear that we needed to separate things out. So we've got one for individual respondents, meaning it doesn't matter where you come from but you can fill this out and give your opinions on these things. That's the first one up. We asked people, "Which SO or AC are you a member of?" and then we go right into the questions. Many of these questions will be the same SOs

---

and ACs, which is the second batch of surveys. The third batch of surveys are individuals surveys for individual groups. There's one for the Board. There's one for the GAC, and there's one for ICANN staff. So that's the general lay of the land.

Now, coming back to the questions for individuals – the survey questions – we didn't want to get into rating text answers, so there are very few text answers possible in this one. We tried to keep it to yes and no and sliding scales or multiple choice and you pick. Then we'll be able to easily use the analysis tools that are provided in the survey tool to give us some results about how it looks.

Let's move right along with this. The first part of the questions is Board-related questions. What I did is I inserted the ATRT requirements from the bylaws as to what we have to do, and then I've classified the questions according to those so that we know why we're asking these questions and what we're trying to get to.

"1.1. Please indicate your satisfaction with the Board's performance overall for the last two years." I'll run through the answers right now in detail so you get a feeling for it. You'll see they repeat quite often. So give choices: very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, no opinion, satisfied, very satisfied. "1.2. Please rate the effectiveness of the accountability indicators as they relate to Board performance as found ..." Ineffective, somewhat ineffective, no opinion, effective, very effective. "Do you consider the diversity among Board members satisfactory? Yes or no?" If no, then we list the seven factors that were identified by Work Stream as being the diversity factors. You can pick any or all of them.

---

A little further down please, Brenda. 1.4. And down. Yeah. "How satisfied are you with the Nominating Committee selection of directors for the ICANN Board over the past two years?" Very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied ... You get the idea. "Please indicate your satisfaction with the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms, such as the Empowered Community." Again, the satisfied rating, 1-5. "Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's transparency." Ineffective, somewhat ineffective, no opinion, effective, very effective. "Do you think they need to be improved? Yes or no?" "How would you rate the importance of the Board implementing the transparency recommendations from the CCWG accountability Work Stream 2, which would effect ..." "Are you satisfied with the Board's decision-taking process over the past two years? Yes/no?" "Are you aware of the training program for the Board members? Yes/no?"

Further down, please, Brenda. I believe we were at 1.10.

BRENDA BREWER: Is that the correct place, Bernie? 1.10? Or 10, I should say? 10.1.

Bernie, we can't hear you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah. I just noticed I dropped out. Sorry. We were at 1.11, I believe, and we're at 10 here.

---

BRENDA BREWER: Oh. Let's see. [inaudible]

BERNIE TURCOTTE: The other way.

BRENDA BREWER: You said ...

BERNIE TURCOTTE: 1.11.

BRENDA BREWER: Oh, I'm sorry. My scroll is so sensitive to this.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Further up. Further up. A little bit more.

BRENDA BREWER: [Now]?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. There's sensitive and there's really sensitive.

BRENDA BREWER: I can't do it.

---

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. Interesting. I'll bring them up on my private screen here and I'll be able to go through them. Whew!

BRENDA BREWER: Stopping right there.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: You got it. You're a great one. "Is your SO/AC satisfied with the financial information as provided to the public by ICANN? If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied, do you have any suggestions for improvements?" There's a text response. "How would your SO or AC" – whoa, no. That's in SOs or ACs. We've got to go further up. That's not individual questions.

BRENDA BREWER: This is the top of ...

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Really? That is just weird.

BRENDA BREWER: It is very weird.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That document looks like it was corrupted, so I'll resend it to you. Let me pull that up. I'm very sorry about that, folks.



---

BRENDA BREWER:                    There's 1.11. Correct?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:                I'm not ... sorry. I see Maarten has his hand raised. Sorry ... right. Okay.  
Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:            Hey, Bernard. Thank you. Can you hear me?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:                Yes. Very clearly.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:            Super. What you just showed before in 1.10, I think – I don't want to  
challenge you in pushing it – is the kind of question you say says "Do  
you believe this is good enough? If not, please explain"?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:                That is correct.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:            I like that because, if you just ask, "Do you believe this is good enough?"  
and they just say yes or no, it doesn't give any information. It doesn't  
help.

**BERNIE TURCOTTE:** Yeah. You'll see that we ask very few text questions in here. We went through this and you'll see there are very few text responses for the individual responders. In almost each of these questions under the SO/AC version of this, there will be a text response. So we're just trying to keep it more compact for the amount of information we're going to have to process in a rapid time. That's the best answer I can give you, unless Cheryl wants to chirp in some more.

**MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:** I fully get that. I was triggered by that when 10.1. I know we weren't to be there yet, but that says, "Do you believe the information ICANN makes available should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics? Yes/no?" Whatever the answer is, it doesn't help me.

**BERNIE TURCOTTE:** Yes. I think we're just trying to identify an issue with ... at least that was my instructions. We were trying to identify the issue when we're on individual responses. When we're going into SOs or ACs, we're asking them to lay out in text form a more detailed answer.

**MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:** Okay. That makes sense. I'm happy and I'm not criticizing or trying to—

**BERNIE TURCOTTE:** No, no. This is about understanding and understanding where we are.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible]

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you very much. Sebastien, you're next.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: More specifically, this question. These are things where you can say this can always be better. That's the danger. So I'm warning that yes/no question on something that can always be better is a trivial question. Anyway, back to you. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Maarten. Sorry for trying to cut you off there. Sebastien, you're next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. I think we need to be clear on what is two years because it may be different for each person who will answer. Then we need to define at least of the beginning what are the two years we are talking about. Is it that the two fiscal years? Is it the two [inaudible]? Whatever.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Good point. I've made a note of that. We'll try to fix that up for you. Thank you.

---

Brenda, can we go down just a bit? Yay! All right. we seem to have this under control now. All right. “1.12. How would you rate the usability of the financial information overall?” Well, let’s go back to 1.11 for a second here. “Are you satisfied with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN?” Here we have very satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, no opinion, satisfied, very satisfied. “How would you rate the usability of the financial information overall?” Not useful, somewhat useful, no opinion, somewhat useful, very useful. “How you ever filed a documentary information disclosure policy request with ICANN? Yes/no? If yes, what information where you seeking? (text box) Did you receive information in your request in full? Yes/no? Did the material you receive answer the question you had? Yes/no? Please feel free to add any other thoughts about the DIDP process (text box).” So those are the Board-related questions.

The next segment is GAC-related questions. Again, a very specific section that we lay out from the ATRT requirements in the bylaws about what we’re looking for. Thank you, Brenda. You can keep scrolling that just a little bit.

All right. This one is fairly straightforward. “Should GAC accountability be improved?” Significant improvements needed, some improvements needed, minor improvements needed, no opinion, no improvements needed. “Should GAC transparency be improved?” Same thing. “In your view, are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the Board?” Satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, etc. “In your view, are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the SOs and ACs?” So that’s the GAC block for individuals. We’re good?

---

Not seeing any hands. Let's move on. Public comments, Section 3. Again, in the ATRT requirements. "3.1. Please rate how effective the current system of public consultations is for gathering community input." Very effective, somewhat effective, no opinion, somewhat ineffective, ineffective. "Do you believe the concept of public comment as currently implemented should be reexamined? Yes/no?" "Have you or a group you directly contributed to responded to a public consultation in the last year? Yes/no? If yes, how many responses have you or a group you've directly contributed to submitted to the public comments in the last year?" None, one two – well, none on this case doesn't apply – more than five, more than ten.

Scroll down a bit, please, Brenda. Thank you. "Would you or a group you directly contribute to respond more often to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a SurveyMonkey or similar format?" Strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, strongly disagree. "If no, meaning you did not participate in a public comment, what prevented you from responding? Select that all that apply." Do not have the time to produce a detailed response, subject was too complex, consultation document was too long, language issues, time to respond was too short, or other. "Would you or you group you directly contribute to respond to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a SurveyMonkey?" Exactly the same question as above.

"3.4. Should the responses made to public comments by individuals and external organizations/groups be considered equally?" Strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, strongly disagree. "Should the responses

---

---

made to public comments by SO/ACs and the Board have more weight than other comments?” “How useful are staff reports on public consultations?” “Should staff reports on ICANN public consultations clearly indicate suggestions made by the commenters were accepted, and how?” “Should staff reports on ICANN public consultations clearly indicate that suggestions made by commenters were rejected? If so, why?”

Basically, this takes on a bit of the stuff that was brought up in ATRT2 and tries to have a really solid and in-depth look at what’s going on with public consultations.

“4. Support for ICANN decisions. Do you believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board?” It should be “over the past two years. Yes/no?” “Do you generally support the decisions made by the Board over the past two years?”

KC CLAFFY:

Sorry. Why is it two years?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

We were just trying to give ourselves time. I guess the basis, as I understand it, is we were going from when the bylaws were significantly changed and the Empowered Community came in. That’s the time period we’re trying to slice in there because a lot of things changed when the transition was accomplished. That’s the basis for the two years. As Sebastien has mentioned earlier, we should probably change that to “since the transition has become effective.”

KC CLAFFY: I don't even think I agree with that because a lot of the stuff that was left undone during the transition and promised to be pursued after the transition had to do with accountability and transparency. So this two years is kind of arbitrary to me.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah, but we're trying to understand that, and there's very clear questions on implementing Work Stream 2 also. When you speak, please remember to state your name first.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, sorry. It's KC.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. Hi, KC.

KC CLAFFY: I really have a problem with the wording of that question. We can come back to it later, but I just want to note there.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. So for 4.2?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. And 4.1. All of 4.

---

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Okay. 4.2, 4.1. All right. PDPs, Item 5: the ATRT requirements. “Have you participated in or contributed to any policy development process in the last five years? Yes/no? If yes, did you have difficulty with any of the following? Select all that apply.” Scope is too large or unclear, time required, level of knowledge required to effectively participate, calls at an unworkable time, language issues, or other. “Please rate your satisfaction with the transparency of the process.” “Please rate how accountable the process was to the community.” “If you did not participate in a PDP, why? Select all that apply.” Again, scope is too large, cannot commit the time required, do not feel qualified, calls are at an unworkable time, language issues, other.

Item 6 of the ATRT requirements: the IRP. We’ve dealt with that and we’ve accepted the document. So that’s done. ATRT2 is the evaluation and what we’ll be doing next. That’s done. So keep on scrolling. Periodic review, Item 8 of the ATRT requirements. “How would you rate the effectiveness of the periodic review” – ATRT, SSR, WHOIS, etc. – “as they are currently structured in the ICANN bylaws?” “Should periodic review be reconsidered or amended?” “Should organizational reviews, those reviewing SO/ACs, also be reconsidered or amended?”

Accountability indicators. This was added as a topic by the plenary a few weeks ago, so now it’s included here. “Have you looked at the ICANN accountability indicators, which can be found at ... Yes/no? If yes, how would you rate their usefulness overall? How would you rate these for effectiveness in measuring accountability for ICANN?”



---

Then we have questions which were asked which didn't seem to fit perfectly in one of the above categories. That's the bottom of the individual questions. "Do you believe the information ICANN makes available should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics? Yes or no?" That goes back to Maarten's question. I realize that. "Are you aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms, including the information transparency initiative or the open data initiative or about ICANN's transparency policies more generally? Yes or no?" "Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global Internet community? Yes or no? If no, in your opinion, what level of improvements would be required to protect this?" 1: minor. 5: significant. "Do you feel the NomCom as currently constituted is the sufficient mechanisms for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy-in? Yes or no? If no, in your opinion, what levels of improvement would be required to correct this?" Minor to significant.

That's the end of the individual survey. We're hoping that, once this gets coded and people get the hang of this, it probably can be done in 30 to 60 minutes max.

I see Vanda has her hand up. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you. I have some problems with [thinking better] now about the GAC issue. I don't know if community individuals really have a clear understanding about GAC's role. I ask myself, "It's not the idea to make these questions." Do you understand what this GAC role is in the ICANN

---

community? Because most of them, I believe, never, never have read the bylaws about GAC or know why the hell is GAC doing that. So I don't know if there are able to answer any questions if they don't understand what the GAC is supposed to do. So it's just that I'm asking myself why I'm reading all these. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: In the case of the GAC, Vanda, I understand. Maybe what we should do is preface those questions which are there right now with an introductory text about the GAC – very short – and ask people if they're familiar with the GAC. If they think they are, then they would be asked the other questions. Does that make sense?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes – I put myself on mute – we need to get some quick feedback from the people that never paid attention to the GAC inside ICANN. Certainly, it's not a few of them.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. I think we can fix that and I'll note that and have an intro. All right. Thank you, Vanda. Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. I was just following along with the working draft that was sent along. I was about to make a recommendation but I feel like I may have been missing something. The working draft had up to 10.13, and this one only goes to 10.4. Were those questions included elsewhere? I do apologize

---

if I missed them because I had to step away for a second. I wanted to double-check on that before I intervened.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

I think the questions here we're talking about you will find in some of the staff questions later on. I think that's where they got put on and some others got cut. So, if we finish going through the questionnaires, we can loop back to you and see if you found them.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

My apologies. I didn't realize we were still going through them.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Okay. So this is the first part. This is only for individual responses. This is it for individual responses. We'll move on to the next segment, which is SO/AC questions.

Now, I'm not going to spend a lot of time here. I'll do a few and you'll get the hint of how it works. It's exactly the same questions for the most part except for PDPs that have been asked of individual respondents, except what we've done here in we've included the possibility of text responses in a lot of places. So let's go through the first few and see if you get the flavor of that.

1.1 for SO/ACs. "Please indicate your SO/AC's satisfaction with the Board's performance over the last two years." Yes, we'll do the same fix, Sebastien. [inaudible]. "If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied, do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)." "How

---

does your SO/AC feel regarding the Board's interaction with your SO/AC?" Very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, no opinion, satisfied, very satisfied. "If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied, do you have any suggestions for improvements? (text response)."

So this is basically how it goes unless there's really – so it's not all of them that have a text response, but a lot of them do. Can we scroll down a bit, please, Brenda? You'll see there's text response sort of all the way through there.

All right. GAC-related questions. Let's halt there for a sec. What we'll do here, Vanda, is we'll include the same introductory text and section in the SO/AC section of this, which would preface before Question 2.1. Again, you'll see there are text responses all the way through here.

Next one down, please. Public comments. The same thing here. We haven't included really too many text responses here because the questions seem to quite clearly identify what we were trying to get at. So let's drop down some more to Section 4, please. We've got the section KC wants to come back to. Well, we're going to write the text anyways on this, so let's make sure everyone gets the same text. It'll be simpler. Again, we've got those questions KC wants to come back to. PDPs. We've cut down on the PDP questions for SOs and ACs, and we've got, "What roles should SOs or ACs play in fostering buy-in from their community to ICANN's policy making?" and, "How could your SO or AC improve this?"

Now, there were some significant changes from some of the questions that were proposed, and they were adapted into this. I'm saying this for

---

Michael. These were worded for the ALAC, and it was felt that we're not doing a review of the ALAC. We're trying to find out what people are doing in their SOs and ACs. So this is where we ended up with this. So a fair warning on this.

6. IRP. The same as before. We're not doing this. ATRT2. We're not doing this. 8, please. Periodic reviews. Exactly the same as in the individuals. 9. Accountability indicators. Same, exactly, as the other ones. The other questions. Under 10, we've got more of the questions, which I think is what Michael was asking for. Since we've added things here, I'll take the time to actually go through them.

"Do you believe the information ICANN makes available should be better organized?" "Are you aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms?" "Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable? If no, (text response) what procedures do you have in place in your SO/AC for electing NomCom representatives? (text response)." "Do you feel the NomCom as currently constituted is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy-in? Yes/no?"

[BRENDA BREWER]: Bernie, we can't hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] showing as connected.

---

[BRENDA BREWER]: Yes. Well—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sorry. I lost you again. Where did I drop off?

[BRENDA BREWER]: About a whole minute ago.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sorry. 10.3?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. “Are ICANN’s global mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global Internet community? Yes/no? If no, where do you think these shortcomings lie and how could they improve? (text response).” “What procedures do you have in place within your SO/AC for electing NomCom representatives? (text response).” “Do you feel that the NomCom as currently constituted is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy-in? Yes or no? If no, where do you think these shortcomings lie and how could they be improved? (text response).” “Does your SO/AC have formalized or instituted term limits for membership? Yes/no/does not apply. Does your SO/AC have formalized or instituted term limits for leadership? Yes/no. What is your

---

SO/AC's feedback regarding the presence of a Board member or not-voting liaison but selected by your SO/AC? (text response). Does your SO/AC have transparency policy? Yes/no? If yes, please describe. Does your SO/AC have a transparency policy?" Am I repeating myself? Yeah, I guess so. Sorry.

"Does you SO/AC have a conflict of interest policy? If yes, please provide a link or a description. Does this include an evaluation component? (text response). If no, have you ever experienced or perceived challenges related to conflicts of interest? Yes or no?"

So this is the block for SOs and ACs. As mentioned, we have very generously included text responses on, I would say, more than half the responses. So the SOs and ACs can give us some direct feedback on some of these items.

Before we go to the individual questionnaires, any questions? We're almost done, folks. There's about a page left.

All right. Not seeing anything. I have a note, "Go back to 4.1 for KC." Vanda, you're up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I wrote there, but my question is, do you intend to get feedback from RALOS as sub-divisions of ALAC, or, in the same concept, from each constituency under GNSO?

---

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Right now, we were looking at SOs and ACs. I think that's probably something we can put on the table as far as, yes, the GNSO and the ALAC are a little bit different and maybe we can include the major component parts of that. We can throw that open for discussion.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Good question. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much. Two faults come up for me. I'm thinking from the framework of how we can do something with what comes out of this. Some I see. Some I don't. If you can compare with previous results, that's great. But this questionnaire has not been done before and may not be done again. So then in the questionnaire it might be good to just go back to the questions and see where it would be useful to say, "How has it developed since the past?" So, "Has it improved?" rather than, "Is it good?" or whatever. So that's one fault I give you to reflect upon.

The second one is, if you're making this set and if it's in line with what the bylaws require, maybe we can even recommend the next ATRT to use the same set as staff would allow to see progress over time.

So just those two faults have come up for me listening to you and my inner self. I hope this is useful.



BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you. I think it's very useful. As far as will it be useful in the next ATRT, I think it depends on what kind of response and what kind of feedback we can generate from that. These things, if they're going to be useful, should be on a continuous improvement process.

Michael, you're next.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Thanks. I had two structural recommendations and something else as well. In terms of the structural recommendations, I think it would be good to push away as much as we can from having the other questions having that stretch on as long as it does.

With that in mind, I'd like to suggest the creation of two new sections that'll take a pretty big bite out of that last one, one of them for SOs and ACs. That would encompass 10.4 and 10.6 to 10.11. I think that that can be self-contained in the section on SOs and ACs.

I noticed that the DIDP question is lumped in with the Board discussions, which doesn't really make sense to me. I was thinking that that, which is 1.13, as well as 10.1 and 10.2, could be lumped together in a sub-section for, basically, transparency mechanisms. So I think that kind of organization would be helpful.

I was also hoping to pause at some point and have a little more discussion on the removal of the questions specifically directed at ALAC and the rationale underlying that.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. What I'll do is I'll start a queue for remaining questions. We've got the questions on 4 that KC wanted to get to. I'll put you down as ALAC after that. First, is that okay, Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, that's great. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. And the other suggestions I think are fine. I think we can work that in. Daniel, you're next.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Just in reference to the question that Vanda asked regarding feedback from the RALOs, something else struck my mind. On the individual questionnaires, we could probably add a question of, "Which region would you belong to? In case you belong to an ALS, please mention (probably) the respective ALS," or maybe leave it open if you're a member of an ALS or an individual member. From there, we can be able to drill down probably cross-tabulations of various persons that come from RALOs and ALSes. I think that could also make some bit of sense. I don't know what the members would think.

---

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I think that's a fair question to ask, since we're not identifying individuals. We try to categorize them to give good feedback. So I think we can work that in. Thank you, Daniel.

Anything else?

No? I'm not seeing anything. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: In the same way of what Daniel raised, [maybe in time] ICANN can give us some expectation about what they can really understand about evolution. But I don't know. I'm just thinking during this call because, considering people that are normally, in my region, are less involved and have less understanding of ICANN, maybe time can give us some perspective about their own answers. That is what I can get, but it's not so relevant, I believe. But anyway, it's on the table. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you very much, Vanda. Any other general questions before we go to our two standing questions?

All right. Great feedback. Given the size of this thing, that's good. Yes. Thank you, Brenda. I was almost forgetting specific questions. There's just a few of these. This would be a question directly for the Board. "How was the implementation report of October 2018 for ATRT2 recommendations reviewed by the Board?" That's the only question we've got for them right now.

---

For the GAC, basically, as we discussed, you will remember that the questions we will ask of the GAC we will ask to the GAC leadership. They will decide if they want to trickle this down further or answer as the FAC. You will see some of the questions are exactly the same. “Do you believe GAC accountability can be improved? Do you believe GAC transparency can be improved?” This one is very specific. “Regarding recommendations from ATRT2 – GAC operations and interactions Recommendation 6 – is additional work required? (text response).” GAC operating principles. That had very few changes. Text response. “In your view, is GAC interactions with the Board and other communities satisfactory? If not (text response), would adding steps in the current process between GAC and the Board improve the interaction effectiveness and transparency? Yes/no?” Go down a bit, please. “If yes, what would you suggest.” That’s a text response.

Then we have a few questions for staff. “As ICANN established a clear process for implementing objectives and mechanisms to generate metrics, do the current metrics and objectives reflect and link with your organizational processes? Is there a communications strategy developed regarding accountability?”

That’s the end of it. Now we’ve gone through that and that’s it. Any other general questions before we loop back to our two specific questions?

All right. Not seeing anything. Brenda, can we go back up to 4.1 on the individual questions? Right near the top.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I was not quick enough. I have the impression that, maybe after the discussion about the ATRT2 implementation, we may have some additional questions. I was thinking about the Board. When I went through the ATRT2, I was thinking sometimes that we may ask the Board for that. Maybe it could be a good idea to have them. But I have no specifics right now. I think it will be easier after our next item review. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. Well, we'll keep that open. Thank you. So, 4.1 All right. Now, going back to KC, the requirement from the ATRT bylaws is assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the ICANN community. The first one, 4.1: "Do you believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board over the past two years?" Yes, we'll fix the two years everywhere. "Yes or no?" We're just trying to get a sense here. This is for individuals, again. For 2, "Do you generally support the decisions?" Do *you*. So the difference between the two questions if the first question is "Do you believe the Internet community generally supports?" 4.2 is "Do you generally support the decisions made by the Board over the past two years?"

KC, over to you.

KC CLAFFY: You slipped in a comment there about making it be two years everywhere here. I think that's part of what's throwing me. This is the first question in the survey that said "over the past two years."

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No. We've got some upstairs in the previous sections, and Sebastien referred to it, saying two years is a little vague. I replied to that that we were trying to keep this space more contained. Really, I think what we were trying to get at was "since the transition." So the proposal that's on the table right now is to replace "the past two years" everywhere in the question there with "since the transition." That's what's being asked. That's at least what's being contemplated right now.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. I'm still confused. Is it the case that every question is only applied since the transition?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No. We haven't made that. In certain areas, we've tried to slim it down. But that's an interesting point. But some of the things have been going on for a longer period. When we're talking about decisions made by the Board over the past years, I think the two years come up when we're talking about the Board because we feel that there's been a change in accountability in the Board. That's where those things are, and that's where you end up mostly with the two-years thing.

KC CLAFFY: I just think all of that needs to be spelled out because, as a person just taking the survey, they don't have any understanding of why some of these questions specifically reference "since the transition," and some don't. Certainly, ATRT3's job is well beyond just what's happened since

---

---

the transition. So I'm confused how this survey fits into the larger landscape of what we're supposed to be doing. But I'm missing some context because I'm coming in after a long time away. Sorry about that. I'll go off and do my homework. But, again, someone who's just getting the survey is not going to use that, either. So use my as an outsider here. It just comes across as inconsistent.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you. I'll note that. Any other thoughts on that?

Okay. So I'll take a note on that. I'll think about it. Maybe some background would help clear that up. Thanks, KC.

Next point up, Michael/ALAC/questions that were reformatted. If we can go down to PDP, please, Brenda. Right. Keep going down. Sorry. I think it's in the SO/AC questions, I think, version of this. Yeah, that's it. You're getting good at scrolling this document down. A little further down. No. Okay, further up then. Or did I miss it?

BRENDA BREWER:

Bernie, did you say PDPs? It's #5.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Yes, that's it. #5. Thank you. Now, 5.1. "What roles should the SO/ACs play in fostering buy-in from the community [and] ICANN's policy making? How could your SO/AC improve this?" Now, as I mentioned, these were originally in a slightly different form but focusing specifically

---

on the ALAC. When the committee reviewed them, we ended up with this version and Michael's got some questions. Michael, over to you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: More than anything else, I was hoping for a bit more information on the rationale for the change because, if the rationale is just, "Well, we don't want to single out anyone ([an institution [or] stakeholder group])," again, we have a ton of questions about the GAC and we have a ton of questions about the Board. We do have specific queries in different parts of this, and I think that, regardless of whether or not we're mandated to look at the GAC, I think that that's an argument for doing this. I don't understand why that makes it problematic. I don't think it's problematic to solicit that level of input from across the community as opposed to just self-examination from the ALAC. I do think that this phrasing of the question specifically by – essentially telling the survey respondents.

When I look at this, what I see is you're asking survey respondents, "What does your SO and AC do in terms of specifying community input, and how can that be changed or how can that be improved?" It's pushing for self-reflection as opposed to a broader discussion about ICANN's role in generating community feedback and – I think which is relevant – the ALAC's place in that.

So, more than anything else, I would just like to know a little bit more about the rationale for pushing this in the other direction because I'm not [inaudible].



---

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

I see Cheryl has her hand up. Before I get to Cheryl, you mentioned have specific questions for the Board and we have specific questions for the GAC. We reason we have specific questions for the Boar and the GAC, as noted, is that those are specific items that are required under the bylaws for ATRT. So that's why we went there. I think that's in part the answer.

Cheryl, over to you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Bernie. Yes, that is indeed more in part the answer. That is the reason there's any questions specifically for the GAC there: it's a requirement to do so.

I'd actually like to ask Michael, noting that what I am looking for is implied or incidental biases in the questions as well, how asking an ALAC-specific question gives you anything more than asking the questions as they're posed here. In other words, what is it your work party seems to be thinking it's looking for that isn't going to be uncovered in this more general approach to all of the SOs and ACs? Because the small team thought it was meeting the need without having to be specific to yet another one of the four advisory committees.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

There's other folks in the queue. Should I respond or are we going to Vanda?

---

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, let's go to Vanda first and then—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I don't see why we should make it specific for ALAC or other SOs more than giving an opportunity to RALOs to answer because they have a cultural behavior that's different. But for ALAC or GNSO, not a specific question for them because the community in general belongs to all those groups. We cannot separate community feedback and the sense they have from ICANN just because they are business, because they are final users, or they are a non-profit organization. That's not the same [inaudible] revision in my view. We need the general view of all for the same questions. That's my view. I believe that we don't need to go deeper than that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. Cheryl, your hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Muting/unmuting. [inaudible]. Sorry. Whenever I hit the return key, it mutes or unmutes me. Interesting concept. What I was trying to say is we also need to remember we need to come back to the question on the sub-parts of the GNSO and At-Large as to who is responding here because, if we are asking these questions in a different way, then the whole concept of what is their community will also be different. But

---

let's see what other people have to say. I shall typing it into chat.  
Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

All right. Thank you, Cheryl. Michael, back up.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

I really have difficulty wrapping my head around the idea that we're just asking the GAC queries because we're mandated in our review to do that. The implication there is that, well, these queries are just a waste of time and we're checking boxes. I see that there's a lot of value in those specific queries. If there is independent value to asking those questions, then I don't understand how the fact that we're mandated to do that on the one side means it's a bad idea to do it on another side.

The reason why I specifically wanted to ask this about the ALAC – I'm not trying to needle people. I know people are here representing different constituencies. I'm really not trying to unfairly cast a spotlight on that, but I do think that the role of the ALAC is different and unique. The role of At-Large is different and unique. That's particularly when you look at generating those perspectives or potentially generating that level of buy-in or at least providing a degree of understanding of the interests of the end user, of the average person there. I think that that is what makes this constituency unique, and I think that it is worth looking at.

I wouldn't be opposed if you don't want it to look like it's singling out one group to expanding that out and saying, "What does the role does

---

the GNSO play in fostering buy-in from the participating communities?” and having that for each different group so that it looks a little more balanced, if that’s what people are concerned about.

I’m just concerned that, if you take this kind of broad approach as it’s phrased now, you’re not going to get as useful information bank. I think I would be really interested in hearing community members thoughts on how these different aspects of the community play their role in terms of generating buy-in. I’m most interested in ALAC, but I think that it would be potentially valuable to ask that of others, too, if that would be helpful to avoid any perception that one single group is being singled out.

Bernie, you may be muted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we’ve lost Bernie, Daniel, go ahead.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No, sorry. I unmuted myself. Yes, Daniel, please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. I understand your pain, but looking at how explicit the questionnaire is, we’re not really singling out the ALAC. Being a member of ALAC and also being a member of the community work parties, we looked at so much of these things and how they can be able to cut across. If you look at the mandate of ALAC and then the mandate of GAC and then the mandate of other SOs or ACs, we are

looking at how effective can they be able to contribute to ATRT3 recommendations. We are deriving recommendations for the whole community, not in respect to what you mentioned about the ALAC.

One thing is that, to avoid any respective bias in the questions, [inaudible] in their responses. These are general questions. So I think, if we say that we are going to be specific or have only one target, then I don't see the mandate for ATRT3. ATRT3 was not designed for the ALAC. It was designed for the whole of ICANN. How can we be able to improve the ICANN processes? I think I would refer you to go back and review as to why we are going the reviews.

If we look again to expound more on the definition of community, then you'll find that community tackles both the ALAC the GAC, the GNSO, and all other communities to mention. So let's stop having this biased mindset of ALAC representing the voices of the end users because it only brings in recommendations that come from the end user perspective. Then, once the recommendations can come in, they can be able to be proceeded, whereby the ALAC advice comes forth or maybe the GAC advice comes forth and so forth.

The communities may not understand the roles of the GAC in this thing, but then also they know that the GAC exists because it is very clearly stipulated in the bylaws. When they know the use of the GAC, then I think it makes sense. I think I'll keep it short at that. Back to you. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Daniel. Cheryl.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Thanks for all that input. Just on that, now you've got Sebastien [on] the wording of some of proposed question versus what's written on the screen from [5] in chat. You can compare the two. This is why my earlier comment, I believe, is important to go back to Vanda's question, which we do need to go back to anyway, and that is the question on who is responding to the AC/SO level of survey. I would argue that, if you are asking it only of the SO and AC, that is entirely different than if you are asking it of the component parts of the SOs and ACs because you would be looking at the contracted and non-contracted parties giving a response at an equal level to the region[a] At-Large organizations within the At-Large Structure, and you would be looking at the IPC, BC, Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group – the constituencies (the [B]SGs and then the Cs as) as some sort of combination equivalent of the At-Large Structures and the member base.

So, if you're going to go all the way down, that's going to give it very different types of data, some of which I just don't think is going to help in what we need to do for our job here as much as other sorts of data that you may get asking a question of a more restricted group. So it kind of depends on whether you're taking it further down, whether or not you're asking the GNSO, who at the moment is who it's meant to go to, to send it to the SGs and Cs, or whether or not you're asking the ALAC, who at the moment where it's going to, to send it to the RALOs and the ALSes, etc. So that does make a very big difference.

Of course, I would suggest that many RALOs wouldn't have any idea that the GNSO Council is not the GNSO, for example. [inaudible] going to be biased. Just saying.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Cheryl. I'm keeping an eye on the clock, and unfortunately we're using up a lot more time than we thought. Maybe that is a good way to approach it. We've got two other questions on the table. Maybe the answer to those questions will help us decide what to do with this one. So, Michael, I'm going to put this one to the side for a minute. Let's go to those two other questions. Those two other questions, as I understand them, as Cheryl put it: are we sending this to the constituent parts of the GNSO, and are we sending this to the RALOs?

Let's start with the second one. Vanda brought up the RALOs instead of just the ALAC. When we constituted this questionnaire, we really had in mind those blocks which are used to responding to public comments for those groups. That was the thinking. I'm not saying that's necessarily correct, but maybe we can take a quick temperature check, given our time is running out.

Those that support the notion of making those available to the RALOs, use your green tick if you're in the Zoom room. If you don't support it, use the red X. Let's get a feeling for that. I'm not saying it's a final decision here, but at least it'll be a temperature check. So, if you support making the SO/AC questionnaire available to the RALOs, please click green/yes. If you're not in support of sending the SO/AC

---

questionnaire to the RALOs but you want it to just go to the ALAC, you can click the no.

All right. I'm not seeing anyone who has clicked anything, so we have clear indecision – ah, yes. Okay. So I'm seeing Sebastien is a yes (send it to the RALOs). Paul Kane: send it to the RALOs. Vanda, Michael: send it to the RALOs. Cheryl, Daniel. All right. And no red X's. So that question is answered. We'll be sending that to the RALOs.

All right. Clear your ticks, please. We'll go to the next one. The next one is, should we send this to the component parts of the GNSO? Same thing. If you think we should send it to the component parts of the GNSO, tick green/yes. If you don't think we should send this to the component parts of the GNSO, click the red X. Please do so now.

All right. Looks like we've got a clear consensus for sending it to the component parts of the GNSO. There we go. We've answered the question, which means we would have to restructure the question set a bit to address that. You can clear your marks.

Any final dissenting opinions on those two points? This means we will adjust the questionnaire to send to the ALAC and the RALOs, and we will adjust the questionnaire to send to the GNSO and its component parts. So we will get the answers from both the GNSO as a whole and the GNSO's component parts.

Sebastien?



---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. After this discussion on [this decision], don't we have the same issue? I know it's organized the same way, but it's the same issue with the ISO and the ccNSO. I know that it's not the same, but they are both regional organizations.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, for these kinds of things, I'm not going to commit for them. But with my experience of having to work with the ASO, the ASO would be very happy if we only asked the ASO. They would not be necessarily very interested in having their component parts answer this. This is why they created the ASO the way they have created it. They want to handle all this, what they consider ICANN administrivia. I'm not even sure the ASO will respond, to tell you the truth. But they may if it's an easy enough questionnaire.

As far as the ccNSO, it would be creating – I have a lot of experience with the ccNSO – more problems than it's solving. The ccNSO, in a way similarly to the ASO, is structured to handle this specifically. So I can't agree with those two suggestions, unless the majority of the plenary here sees it differently. But I have experience with those two communities, and those are my comments.

All right. Not seeing anything. Sorry about that Sebastien, but I really do not see those. Now that leaves us with the PDP question. Let's loop back. We've got 15 minutes to get through this. Even my dog is contributing to this. Sorry about that. Let's have a look at this.

Basically, Michael posted the original questions in the chat. The first one was generic and the next two questions were specific to the ALAC.

---

Michael has laid out his basis for saying that it would be good to include the questions as they were. I'm just making sure. We went through these questions fast. Let's remember, these questions are only on the SO/AC,RALO, and GNSO component parts. They are not on the questionnaires for the individuals. I just want to make that really clear. So what we're looking at on the screen right now are the questions that are going to be asked of SO/AC, RALOs, and component parts of the GNSO.

So Michael has made his case. We've heard from Cheryl, Vanda, and Daniel that didn't see the point. I'm going to suggest that we take the same time of temperature check which allowed us to get through the two other issues rather quickly. So, if you are in support of Michael's position, that the original questions as they are presented in the chat should be included in this part of the questionnaire, please click yes/green checkmark. If you are not in favor of those questions the way they were originally phrased and suggested and presented in the chat as argued by Cheryl, Daniel, and Vanda, then please use a red X now. Thank you.

Okay. Along party lines. I only have Michael and I have Wolfgang. So two to four with a lot of people abstaining. Three to four. So we have Wolfgang, Michael, and Demi. We have Cheryl, Daniel, and Vanda and Jacques against. It's not clear-cut, but obviously there is no clear support for putting in those questions.

Would I would propose, if the Chairs are comfortable with this, is that we put this question out on the list and give people a couple of days to mull on it and respond. Then we'll take the result of what has come in

---

on e-mail. The group that is responsible for the questionnaire will make a final decision. Does that seem like a reasonable way forward, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm okay with that, as long as we make the time short. We've got plenty of people on today's call. We have the majority of the people, other than those who are glorified pieces of deadwood that we seem to be carrying for whatever reason. We've got a good turnout on today's call. So let's talk about 36 or 48 hours at the most, but I would not be wasting much time to try and shake more information out of this. This has to put [inaudible] and get finalized because we've committed to get it out in the second week of August. And guess what this is?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Yeah. I was going to propose that I'll write it up as soon as possible and we'll get it out to the list, closing midnight Friday this week. Midnight UTC. People can make their arguments. Everyone can see it on the ATRT3 list. The group, as we did last weekend, will get together and will finalize this and that'll be the set of questions. Does that seem okay?

I'm not seeing any red X's and I'm not seeing any hands. So that is the approach that we'll be taking. Michael and company, what I will use, Michael, is your set of questions. If you want to send me a little text – I'm not talking pages here but a paragraph – explaining why you think it's valid, then I'll use that so I don't misrepresent your words because I know you're very clear in that.

---

For the counterargument, I think I'm familiar with the counterargument and I can make that part. I'll send it by the committee that's managing the survey and then we'll get that out to the list ASAP.

Does that sound acceptable to everyone? If there is violent objection please raise your hand or some red X's.

No. I'm not seeing anything. I see Pat, one of my Chairs, who is hopefully in agreement with that, and so is Wolfgang.

I guess that closes this section. Our 20-minute review of the questionnaires for the survey has taken 80 minutes, and I had it back over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for the ten minutes of meeting left, I appreciate that, Bernie.  
No, no. I [inaudible]

BERNIE TURCOTTE: You're very welcome.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm smiling while I'm saying that to you. It's conversations that we definitely need to have because a poorly-created survey gives useless results. That is not what we want. This is a critical part of our activities. Remember, we also have got to get it out early enough so that the respondents can get it back to us soon enough that we can do something useful with the data. The data was always a question in the

---

minds of the small team. They looked at the survey questions and developed these survey questions on your behalf. We were constantly asking ourselves the question, what likely use can we make of this data? What is it we're trying to find out, and how can we get those analytics appropriated into something useful and meaningful for ATRT3? So don't lose sight of that as well.

Now, Sebastien also raised a very important question about whether or not some additional questions may come into play as a result of us going through what should have been the lion's share of today's agenda, which is clearly going to be the agenda for next week's call, which is going through the ATRT2 implementation assessments. So let's declare that that will be our agenda for the next call now because there's no way we're going to get any of it done in the five minutes we have left.

But I would suggest then that, for those of you who believe there is going to be additional questions and you're already thinking about that, it would be very smart to formulate those and send them to the list now. If, in your review of our ATRT2 implementation assessment sheet, you think additional questions should be looked at, then put them to the list in the intervening time between today and next week's call. Then we will try and deal with them sooner rather than later because right now I am afraid it looks like this survey is going to have to be finalized immediately after next week's call if you believe additional questions need to be added.

The alternative – this is why I'm going to ask you about this now – is to close off additional questions with the exception of deciding original or

---

modified version as is in the current draft document. We know we're going to be doing that in the next little while. That would mean that the survey questions can be put into the survey tool at the end of this week and hopefully will still go out for attention so that the respondents have it in their mailboxes as they start up next week, giving them half of August and partly into September to respond. That was our original plan. That fits with our workplan. I would highly recommend that we follow that approach.

If we have incredibly important questions that need to be asked that come out of our review of ATRT2 implementation assessments, I suspect they might be more likely to be specific for a component part – so specific for the Board or specific for the GAC or specific for another section. If that's the case, I would propose we send those as a standalone supplementary question after we all agree on it.

So I'm suggesting we do not hold up this survey past the end of this week. We settle it this week and it gets put together and goes out as soon as possible. Then, if supplementary questions are agreed upon, we deal with those as supplementary questions.'

Bernie wants to speak very briefly – and I do mean very briefly, he assures me – on ATRT2, but Pat's got this hand up, so I'm going to give him the mic. He can hand over to Bernie.

PAT KANE:

Thanks, Cheryl. Just from [inaudible] about ATRT2 as well since I was going to walk us through [inaudible]. My intention as we walk through this for next week, just so everyone's prepared, is that we go through

recommendation by recommendation. The person who was responsible for that recommendation will actually give us a little about whether they say, “Yeah, we agree with ICANN’s assessment on implementation,” or not, and I hope we generate some of the same critical discussions about each of those as we had today because I thought today’s conversation [inaudible] highlighting the survey was really, really good. So I look forward to next week.

Bernie, go ahead.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you. I’ve gone through the questionnaires – well, the spreadsheet – of ATRT2 responses. I’ve started doing some editing of text. I haven’t changed any meeting. I’ve just fixed some spelling and grammar as you go through. So if you notice, the wording may look little bit different, but hopefully it’s clearer.

I’ve made a point of inserting “implementation assessment” where it’s clear as being implemented, partially implemented, not implemented, or not applicable. Similarly, for the effectiveness assessment, I’ve included, where it’s clear, effective, partially effective, not effective, or not applicable.

I’ve added a column, which is a staff note, at the end of this spreadsheet completely, where, in some of the cases, it’s really unclear what the implementation assessment and/or the effectiveness assessment is. So I’ve noted what the options are there.

---

So I would ask people to have a look at your answers. Have a look at the questions from staff at the end and see if you can help us determine what you wanted to put in as far as implementation and effectiveness assessments. Thank you. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thanks, Bernie, for that. Sebastien, you have your hand raised. Maybe 45 seconds? Maybe a minute? So, Sebastien, quick, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Very short. Thank you very much, Pat. Just one thing. I had some comments still, like I have done in preparing this meeting. Bernie, you need to fix the title of the columns because I guess that somebody erased one and changed the title of another one. It may be good to fix it. Thank you very much.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I will do that. Thank you, Sebastien. I'll have a look at that.

PAT KANE: All right. Let's quickly go to Any Other Business if there's anything that needs to come up today.

I see no hands. I guess we'll move on. Jennifer, welcome back. It's good to have you back from vacation. I hope you're rested. I don't think we had, in the [G] capture, any actions that we need to address or at least list.



JENNIFER:

Thanks, Pat. Just very briefly an action for Bernie. He's going to send a writeup to the list of the argument and counterargument re: the SO and AC PDP questions and call for these from the team. Then, team members, if you have additional questions re:ATRT2 implementation that should be looked at, please send them to the list ahead of next week. That will be the agenda items for next week. That's all I have. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Fantastic. Thank you very much, Jennifer. With that, I will close the meeting and we will follow up on e-mail with the questions that Michael posed. We will see you online. We'll see you all next week. Bye now.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**