BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking, and I'd like to welcome you to ATRT3 Plenary call number 5, on the 14th of August, 2019 at 11:00 UTC. Members attending the call today are Cheryl, Pat, Lou, Jaques, japp, Maarten, Vanda, Sebastien and Wolfgang. Observers joining us are Avri Doria, Everton Rodrigues, Sophie Hey, Herb Waye, and Chantelle Doerkson. Attending from ICANN organization is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer, Bernard. And apologies today from Osvald, Demi, Erica, Michael, and we're adding KC. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to please remind you to state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to our co-chairs, Cheryl and Pat. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, Brenda. I'll just start us off and then most of it is all up to Pat. He's got the lion's share of today leading us through our main agenda items. So, this is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Pat and I want to welcome you all to the call today. And, particularly pleased to see a number of observers to watch us go through our work as we primarily look at the comparisons that we've done between what we stated as completed with ATRT2 and what we can find evidence of completion.

First thing up is, of course, the usual administrative and so we would like to call for anyone who has any update on these statements of interest. Reminding you all that we operate on a continuous disclosure rule with statements of interest. Not seeing anybody in the Zoom room, well I see people in the Zoom room, just not trying to get our attention,

and not anybody typing in chat. We'll assume there's no updates to statements of interest at this stage.

I think that I'm going to move to Jennifer now, that the next item on the agenda will be relatively brief, but just looking at the agenda for a moment; we're going to look at action items new and closed. We have a moment to take in any of the import or updates from the work party, starting- we had a couple of work parties where they had meetings either recently held or about to be held. Then, the lion's share of today's call is going to be involved with going through our assessment sheet. Any other business, we're going to have a quick run through of our logistics and the update on how we're doing and all of that. The actual questions being finalized already, that I believe it's being drafted into the survey tool. And Bernie and the rest of the staff can speak to that. And then of course our usual wrap-up upon confirming action items and any decisions reached.

At this stage, if anyone has any other business that they would like to put on the agenda, please let us know now and we will be calling for any other business again for the end of the call. Not seeing anybody's hands raised, that's fine. So then, we will take this agenda as she is wrote, and ask Jennifer if she wants to update us with any of the action items. Over to you, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Cheryl. This will be very brief because I have no updates on any new or closed action items that will not otherwise be covered by the agenda topics today, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Short and sweet, just as we like it. Fantastic. Yes, most of all, what we've been doing is in-fact feeding to today. Thanks for that. One thing, just if I may double-check, we recognize and appreciate the facilitation staff has done to organize the Board Working Party's call coming up at the end of the week, and I'll note that Pat will be joining the Work Party with that while I am deeply engaged in grandmotherly duties at unfriendly hours of the 24-hour requirements that ICANN put on usually. But just to remind people that if other Work Parties do want to run some calls to reach out to staff and they will be more than happy to assist and facilitate in that as we do our review work.

With that, just opening up now to the next agenda item, which is item number 3; any updates for plenary's attention from any of the Work Parties, noting that we don't have any leaders here from community. But any of the members can of course give us an update, so if you know of any updates then please prepare yourself to pop that information in, and I also note that Daniel hasn't been able to join us, he's got some challenges with communication at the moment. That is unfortunate, but I do believe -- either Pat or I can step in and update you from the leadership team meeting on Monday morning.

There will be no IRP update required, Work Stream 2 we're not dealing with today, although I can report to you as one of the Implementation Team members that we have had a single, inaugural, well, it's actually not inaugural, because we did meet and greet, Marrakech meeting before last, but almost inaugural meeting at last ten days, it was like last week, and that there is another Work Stream to implementation

meeting planned in the next, over the next week. Bernie can type into chat when that is likely to be. That is our beginning at that. And obviously ATRT2 is the bulk of that call. With that, I see Vanda. Vanda, is this a Work Party update, or another question?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, it's just to say, to inform that our group is starting the drafted report, and like to thank Bernard to send us the template we are following. So I believe in a couple days we will start to share what each one is doing, and I believe that we will put something in the Google Doc for this work, because it is a collaborative work, and probably a new set of Google for this one. And that's it, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda, appreciate that. And yeah, obviously we'd like the templates to be beginning to be flushed out as early as is possible, noting that everything will be in very basic and early draft form until the Plenary goes through things. This is excellent to know that the Government Advisory Committee Work Party is already getting some text organized within that.

With that, just noting that Bernie has put the date and time of the Work Stream 2 Implementation Team meeting, the next one, it's the 16th of August at 12:00 UTC. So, thanks Vanda. I'm assuming you're putting your hand down now and not leaving it up, and I'll just ask if there's anyone else who wants to draw attention? It really can only be Sebastian, at this stage. Oh no, we have Jacques. Jacques, over to you.

JACQUES BLANC: Yes, good morning, good evening everybody. It's just a very quick side note for the future Review Implementation Teams; my opinion is, we will have to make future team aware that they do not have a year to go on with the analysis. They really have six months, because a draft cannot be too far away from the final forms, and analysis is going to deliver. Because it's a draft, not just something different. So the real time frame, we should tell the future team that they will have to face is not a year. It's really six to seven months for the first draft, and I think it will have merit to be signaled to the future team, really, because it's a very, very short time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It certainly is a very, very short time. And yes, twelve months start to end is very much a glossing over of the actual time available. Thanks for pointing that out, and what we'll do is we'll put that important piece of information in the parking area, and make sure that we pick it up in, if not the actual report, in the associated introduction and documentation that goes around the report. Thanks for that. And I think it's really useful that the chair of the board governance committee happens to be listening in to this call, so hopefully Avri has also listened to that as well. Thanks very much.   Okay, just coming to you, Sebastien is there anything you want to mention prior to your upcoming meeting of your Work Party at the end of the week?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Cheryl, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. No, I guess you have done a good job of reminding the people that we have this call, and we hope that all the members, no, I know that already not all the members will be there, but as much as possible we are waiting for you because we think that it must be a team work, and not just a single man or two men work, thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed it's a team, not just leaving it to the leaders or a few individuals. All right, in which case, looking at the time I've not wasted too much of the bulk of today's call on the administrative and the usual updates, so that means if we could all look to the Google sheet, and that will be displayed, it might be a good idea if someone could also put into the chat the link to the Google sheet, so thanks very much for that, Jennifer. So, those of you who do have the luxury of a larger screen or multiple screens can follow along in slightly larger viewing. So with that, I'm going to hand over to Pat, and take a sip of liquid to my right hand, it's time to get a bit perky, and I think this now becomes a little bit of introduction from Bernie and introduction from us all. Over to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Good morning Cheryl, thank you. I hope everyone has got the spreadsheet in front of them, not just what's displayed in the Zoom if you can. Either the printout or you are actually in the Google docs itself because it's pretty dense, and you can kind of go through it in the manner that we can participate. Hopefully it's open like we did last Wednesday, but what my intention would be is, I will turn to the

individual responsible for the assessment, assuming that they are of course participating today, and have them explain a little bit. Especially if it's either not a lot of detail, or partially implemented or not implemented. Just touch upon it, and then people can weigh in, through raising their hand, through participant window, since I'll be looking down at the spreadsheet that I've got printed out here, Cheryl's going to keep me honest in terms of making certain that we recognize folks, and just from there we'll capture, I guess Bernie will capture comments that we need for the spreadsheet, that would be really great.

Let's start off with number 1, I guess Demi has not joined us, we had an apology from Demi today so we'll skip number 1. And Sebastien, we'll go to the number two item, which is recommendation number 2, which is; the Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the materials used from training to gauge levels of improvement. So, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. From my point of view, the number 1 and number 2 can be treated the same; it's what I have put in my comments earlier on, and it's partially implemented because some of the items are not reachable or put in place to gather the measures, and it's what I have written. My document, I think we need to look at, must be added, but even I thank you for Martin to send me the link to the training materials. There is some background noise, sorry, from my side. But I think it's not especially implemented, and therefore we can't assess the effectiveness, thank you.

PAT KANE: Any questions for Sebastien?

SPEAKER: So, Sebastien, one of the items that I had talked a little bit about training as well, and when I take a look at the repository for training material and online training material, it seems rather slim in terms of the actual material. Did you take a look at the courses that were available through, what's that team called?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, you might be muted?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I looked quite quickly at the material. I feel that, for example, there was one with the first part, and we don't have the second part or any other part. Therefore I think it was just done, but not really taking into account for data.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

PAT KANE: Okay, thank you Sebastien. Anything else for Sebastien?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Sebastien, Cheryl here. I wondered, if we can, because obviously we'll take another run through all of this, but I'd like to draw some of the rest of the Review Teams' opinions out, or at least get them starting to think about these things; as this is a very important recommendation at ATRT2, and as you know, this really encompasses rec 1 and rec 2, is this one of the matters that you believe we should be considering making a recommendation on?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you, Cheryl, for the question. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I will not be straight on this question yet, but I suggest that we may ask the Board sub-team to work on that, and propose if any recommendation from ATRT3 on that specific topic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Great, okay, so this is a watch this space one. Thanks. I think Pat, if we can just do an early review, and this is not a yay or nay or a final decision, but if we can get some indicators as we go through as well as to whether or not the reviewers think is their issues is going to require further work, that would be good. A couple things as well while I've got the microphone, I noted that Daniel has joined, welcome Daniel. If there's anything you want to report from the Reviews Team, just type it into chat, and we've only just started on our review of ATRT2.

	Thanks Daniel, he's indicating no report. Just because I said I'd look after chat and the hands, just to let you all know, Pat, for your record, Martin's written in chat that it's a good thing that Sebastien had checked the training materials; he had not heard of complaints about it,

so he wondered whether anybody prior to Sebastien checking has even tried to find it. And that was the, it was reference to the publications of trainings, and I think Pat, that probably feeds into your area as well. Thanks, that's it from me.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Pat, you've got a hand up from Vanda. Sorry, you've got Vanda's hand up.

PAT KANE: Sorry, I missed that. Yes Vanda, go ahead please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm just wondering if we should consider some forgiveness on the parts that's gone. It's not complete, but part of those KPI are there, and then maybe we should look for the effectiveness of that and not just say, "Not applicable," because it's not complete, because especially implementing, in my opinion, we should consider to analyze the part that's gone and if the group is going to be using this recommendation, is going to right path, that's my suggestion, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, sorry to just jump in, rather than put my hand up. Cheryl again. It seems to me Vanda's point is important in as much as this

recommendation specifically referred to metrics. If you have metrics to measure the effectiveness, not actually having any measure of the effectiveness does indicate a failure to fully implement the recommendation. Just marking that as an observation and something that we may need to tease out later.

PAT KANE: Got that, thank you Cheryl. All right, so going to number 3; Wolfgang, this is yours. The Board should conduct qualitative, quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time, and should regularly assess record's compensation levels against prevailing standards. Wolfgang? If you're responding, you're on mute.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Hello?

PAT KANE: Now we hear you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Can you hear me?

PAT KANE: Now we can, yes.

EN

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay, good. So, I contacted some members of the community, and I think recommendation 3 is fully implemented. So, there has been some proposals that the survey, skills survey, should be not only shared with the NomCom, but also with the SOs and ACs. If they select their candidates, because so far the supporting organizations and the At-Large Advisory Committee had no recommendation from the Board, but people think that the analysis of the general skills survey in the Board could increase the effectiveness of the election or selection of the candidates. And, there must be compensation. So, there is no review of the work of the Compensation Committee, but there are assessments of the Director's compensation, so I see the recommendation 3 fully implemented.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Wolfgang. I've got a question for you on the effectiveness portion of that; in your assessment, under the implementation box, you stated the NomCom has forwarded the skills gap items. That comes from the Board, correct?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: No, I can read again. The effectiveness, it's difficult to measure here, because it's up to the- my feeling, and my conversations I had with NomCom member is that this is just effective, full-stop.

PAT KANE: Okay, because the question again Wolfgang is that the NomCom receives information about a skills gap, and then they go and they select

members to be parts, to be members of the Board. I the NomCom selecting individuals that meet the skills gap, or is the skills gap that's being handed to NomCom not being used effectively in identifying new Board candidacy? So, did the skills gap continue even beyond the NomCom selection is how I'm reading this, and the question I'm putting forward?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Yes, so I see it's an effective mechanism. So, the NomCom is partly independent from recommendations from the Board, but they take this seriously. There could be individual basis where other arguments, you know, are relevant. But I think the Board analysis of the skills set is a clear guideline for the NomCom, and it works.

PAT KANE: Okay, thank you. Cheryl, you have your hand raised?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do. I'm impressed you can see, I was just going to jump in, but there we are. I'm going to make sure- Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record- but I'm now speaking as an ex-leader of the NomCom, and of course Wolfgang's also served in his capacity in days before mind of course, but one of the things that I think is important to recognize here is that, well, it's actually two things, but the first of them is; a nominating committee in any given year, regardless of what the desires are for skill sets and experience, or specifics from any of the bodies it appoints to, is limited to who applies.

EN

So, it seems to me that the critical point is less with an issue of the Board conducting this qualitative and quantitative studies, etcetera, etcetera, then it is the Board and ICANN org. To the best of its capacity to facilitate that the adversity and opportunity for a really good set of potentials gets to a NomCom in any given year, it's a resourcing issue. NomCom can only appoint from those it's had statements of interests received, and if nobody with the appropriate skill puts up their hand, fills in the form, and puts themselves forward, then nobody can be appointed with that particular skill set. So, I just think we need to be aware of that.

And I guess the other thing I wanted to, just sort of the secondary point is; that this particular question, to some extent, has also been highlighted in the recent, that would be the second, Nominating Committee organizational review, and there are a couple of pieces of recommendation that are going to be implemented in the not-too-distant future regarding this, so that's not an answer, but it is a couple of observations. Thanks.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thanks, Cheryl, this is Wolfgang again. Thanks, this helpful, but you know, this is a delicate issue because the Board, even if they declare or inform the NomCom about these skills gaps, has no right to interfere into the internal affairs of the NomComs whom to select. So, for the NomCom, this is just additional and very useful, and needed information; the survey produced but the Board.

But you know, the NomCom is independent from the Board, and as Cheryl has said, if you have no candidate which meets the criteria for a special skill, which is seen as a gap in the sitting Board, then the NomCom has a problem. And they cannot then fill this gap, so that's why one has to be very careful not to allow the Board, or give the Board any instrument in their hand to interfere into the internal affairs of the NomCom, so it's an instrument; the Board analysis, it's absolutely needed, but in my eyes, the Board does what the Board should do, it informs the NomCom so that the NomCom in the light of the information they get from the Board can make its independent decision.

PAT KANE: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Pat. Sebastien Bachollet, just to add one point, it's one amongst different criteria that any given group, NomCom in particular here, need to take into account. The first thing they have to take into account is some geographical balance, and there is other items to be taken into account. Therefore, this is just one item to be looked at, and the effectiveness is much more difficult to assess, because if you have the right skill, but in the wrong region, you can't do anything about that.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thanks, Sebastien, you are right.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien. So, I've got a couple of questions, one for you, Cheryl, on this topic. When we see the list of candidates that have applied for Board seats through the NomCom, we get a picture of their diversity, it gets reported of the diversity of the candidate, but not necessarily the skill set, and I do think, at least in my observation, that some skill sets remain unfilled on the Board over time, so I'm just questioning the effectiveness of, and to your point, and I get it, that it's not trying to interrupt the independence of the NomCom, or to influence the NomCom through this skill set gap analysis, but is that process in itself ineffective in actually providing a broad skill set that is needed at the Board level? That's the question I have.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, I'm happy to jump in on that. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. And here I feel I should also declare I'm still and continuing an ongoing leader within the Nominating Committee Review Process, and now Vice-Chairing the implementation on the 27 recommendations agreed to by the community, the Independent Examiners and the ICANN Board to improve all things Nominating Committee. So, that declared, first of all, if anyone is seeing lists of candidates and their skills sets, then we have a problem. Because in fact, all you should ever be seeing coming out of a Nominating Committee is very generic information such as gender, geography, that type of thing.

Nominating Committee works under very strict confidentiality guidelines, and I don't want to bore you with the reasons, but they are good, and I'm happy to bore you with the reasons at some other time, that they wish to have their processes as public and as understandable

as possible, so they adhere to as much accountability and transparency as they can manage, but they keep the information regarding candidates, and that goes down to the identity of the candidates as confidential as possible.

But to that end, if you are a candidate, to use you as an example because I know you pretty well assured you could never be, but if you were to become a candidate, you could say in public, "I'm a candidate, and I've put in my SOI." But none of any of the serving NomCom could confirm or deny that, so it really is strictly uphill.

The other thing about skill gaps is; the gap requirements change over time, and some skills can be backfilled in other ways, not just by appointing people who declare -- note that term, I'm using it specifically -- that they have particular skills and experience. Some people, of course, may have sat on an audit committee in a Fortune 500 firm for ten years, they still, if we put them in the ICANN Board, which is quite small, and very demanding, its Board members, may not really know how to read a spreadsheet. So, sometimes what people have done, say they do, and demonstratively can do, is also different. And with the rest of the questioning, I'll take it offline, thanks.

PAT KANE: All right, I think we've covered that one fairly- unless Wolfgang, did you have something you wanted to say, since I see you've unmuted?

EN

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: No, that's fine. And, you know, Martin made a good comment in the chat, and I support this. The key to this really is no names, just the balance, so the key point is the balance, and the balance is changing year by year, and what the board has to do is to update the NomCom, that the NomCom is always up to date and understands the situation of this very setting Board in this year, and what is needed. But then, it's up to the NomCom, and we do not review the NomCom, we review the Board, and the recommendation of the ATRT2 was going to the board, and in my eyes, this is implemented. Back to Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Wolfgang. So, I think we should move on to the next item, which is one of Erika's. I know she's not here today, and her response and comment about the effectiveness really revolves around GINA specifically, and Sebastien entered a comment into the spreadsheet that was looking at the other SOs and the other ACs. Anything you'd like to add on that, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat. Just I think, if we take just the ATRT2, it was not, it seems that it was not taken into account, therefore I don't think this part was implemented, but it's maybe something we can revert to whatever group you want, the community or the Board one, it doesn't matter, to look at the specifics, and I guess it will be better in the community one, after thinking. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien. Do we have anything else on number 4? I know, again, since Erika is not here, any questions? Very good, let's move onto number 5. This was Michaels. Hold on, let me get there, 5. One of the questions I had here on number 5 is that, in Michael's assessment, it kind of says he's not only certain what the intent of the recommendation was, Bernie, if we could take a note here to interrogate Mr. on what the intention was here so that we could go back and take a look and confirm implementation or not implementation, since the ICANN staff assessment was that it was implemented.   Concerns with that from anyone?   We've got a confirmation from Cheryl. All right, very good. We'll go onto number 6-

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry Pat, before you go, Sabastien Bachollet speaking. I think one of the difficulties we hear, and it's the same with some other, is that it's just writing assessments and it's implemented. Maybe we can have some feedback from staff to tell us how they come to this conclusion, that's the prime of this work that we have to, as an ATRT3 Team, to try to find what is the rationale of all the assessment from ICANN as implemented. Maybe we can ask them to give us some more feedback on some specific items here, and this recommendation 5 could be one of them. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you for the suggestion, Sebastien, and if we could capture that, Bernie, that would be great. But one of the question that I had from Michael, and maybe next week, since if we don't get through all of this

EN

today, we can come back to this, and the question I had from Michael is; what specifically was he looking for in making the assessment that it was not implemented, which I think would be a good question to ask Michael when he's available. But I guess we said that he's not available for two weeks, so maybe some time on that.

All right, so let's move on to number 6; this was broken up into 137 parts by Vanda. No, I'm kidding, I think about 7 parts. So Vanda, if you would take us through 6.1A, so convening GAC 101 or information sessions throughout the ICANN plenary to provide greater insight into how individual GAC members prepare for ICANN meetings in national capitols. How the GAC agenda and work priorities are established, and how GAC members interact intercessional and during GAC meetings to arrive at consensus. GAC positions that ultimately afford the ICANN Board ask advice. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, Vanda for the record. Well, I have considering this implemented for the question is a little complex on that, but the GAC intercessional calls are to define the agenda. GAC has the problem to dedicated time, intercession to the ICANN. So, when they meet, they have a specific agenda, and the intercession fo calls are to do that. And this is, what they ask is, how they arrive to consensus. They follow the United Nations process and negotiate it to the less time to arrive at consensus. If not, they just inform that they didn't reach complete consensus on one point or another, but they go through that. It is not, in my opinion, effective for various points.

EN

The first one is because the community language is too a problem. Of course, as a diplomatic approach on that, but they recognize, GAC itself, recognized in our interviews that they need to improve that, because in much time it makes a little confusion what they really want to say. So, more clarity on the reaching a kind of consensus was reached, is also interesting and difficult, but we say that in another question that's similar. But we believe that could be more clear is the percentage, for instance, for who is in favor, who is not, to make clear, to give some idea to ICANN and Community what they are in that specific point into the communique.

So, I believe it's not effective, because of those many points that need to improve, and make it more transparent and accountable to the Community, specifically to the Board to make actions from that communique. We have seen during many times that there is misunderstandings what they really want to do, and sometimes the implementation of that gives a lot of parallel discussion and sometimes the action itself is not really implemented because it's not clear what really the GAC meant. So, that is my analysis on that, and regarding the process to arrive consensus is just about the percentage that could be interesting to give some sense of agreement among counters. That's it.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Questions for Vanda? Vanda, I have one question for you on this one; when I read the recommendation, and it says, "How the GAC agenda and work priorities are established," I read that as, "What are the overall objectives of the GAC?" Not necessarily the individual meeting agendas, but what are the goals of the GAC in terms

of the overall participation from the ICANN Community? And, is there a set of -- are there guiding principles, or strategic objectives to the GAC that is available?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry, Vanda for the record. Normally, the agenda is about their priorities, and the intercessional sections, the calls, they're just to discuss priorities in that agenda, so it said in that specific point is completely done and implemented. They do that and they publish the agenda and the meeting itself. That is another point, another question, that later on in those A-H, that is specific about the calls, that regarding these priorities, it's done. So, it's completely implemented, because the agenda is public, the priorities are discussed during the calls and then are published and they followed this agenda during their face-to-face meetings. Maybe we should write this again and put those points also in that response.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I said that if you read the assessment in the implementation part, you see that the intersessional clause allows members to make their [inaudible] preparations so it's completely implemented, the process to arrive to consensus is the problem in that in the face-to-face but not the intersessional clause because they just select the agenda to be discussed in the face-to-face meeting.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Let's move on to 61.B, publishing agendas for GAC meetings, conference calls, etcetera on the GAC website, 7 days in advance of the meetings and publishing meetings on the GAC website within seven days after each meeting or conference call.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda for the record, this is completely done because the agenda is posted timely and much longer than the days they suggested, and posting the websites and the information about the agenda is easily available in the GC website. Everything, as I said, the language and the links are published. All improvements done in this website make it quite effective to find and to read and understand what they put in that agenda. That's it.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Any questions? I think that's pretty straightforward, pretty clear. 6.1C; updating and improving the GAC website to more accurately describe GAC activities, including intercessional activities as well as all relevant GAC transcripts, positions, and correspondence. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, well this is also well implemented and quite effective. You can access the new GAC website and it's easy, easy to find anything because there is a menu, and you can find and the menu takes all the links and its navigation on that website is clear and easy. And many members I

EN

talked to are very happy with the website, and they use them in their interaction with their government to show what they are doing and it's really effective and implemented.

PAT KANE: Thank you. Any questions for Vanda on this one? All right, let's move to 6.1D; considering whether and how to open GAC conference calls to other stakeholders to observe and participate as appropriate. This could possibly be accomplished in participation liaisons and other ACs in that sense of the GAC if that mechanism is agreed up on and implemented.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda, for the record. This is a quite problematic point, because open conference calls, it's quite complex on that because the amount of members that the GAC has and the small time they have to dedicate to ICANN make it quite difficult if they raise some specific points during those calls may, some interaction with the audience out of members could take it to an infinite discussion, and they have limited time for that. So, one point, the other point is that the solution for that and that solution was implemented to circumvent this problem of having those calls completely open, is the liaisons.

So, they have liaisons, and the liaisons are able to attend the calls and report back to their communities. So in my opinion, that is the ideal situation for those calls and they have some problems that I put in the comments. You know, these sensitive issues can arise and can create problems for members and it's, in some way, it's something that you

open like a webinar, it's something that is not the intention of the call. If they open and deny interference or questions for the audience, it will be, will be something, you know, half, and not a very good behavior with the audience.

And so, the liaisons is the preferred alternative for not opening completely for At-Large; they have more than 107 participants, so it's almost a webinar. And if they allow openly and some people against one position of one governance or one can raise sensitive calls, and this is completely difficult to make things working in this short period of time, so I do believe that even the accommodation has recognized that, because they said this could possibly be accomplished through the liaisons, and that is the real way to make it happen, and effective for the work of the GAC and the transparency. Liaisons have that job and should do that. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Questions for Vanda on 6.1 B? All right, Vanda, you're up again, 6.1 E; considering how to structure GAC meetings and work intercessional so that during public ICANN meetings through the year, the GAC is engaged with the community and not sitting in a room debating itself.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, this is Vanda for the record, again. So, just a justification; divide this one question into the points that we could assess and analyze the effectiveness, because it was so large and complex. So, that's why I put those 8 sub-items on that. From E point, it is completely open, the

meetings is completely open, you can sit there, wherever you are. You can interact with the GAC during those face to face meetings, so it was very important accomplishment for the community to self. You can see that the meetings of ICANN during the face to face meetings is huge, there is almost everybody goes there, especially when they are interacting with the other groups.

Of course, they cannot dedicate all the time to just interacting with the others; they need to work, because those are the times their members have dedicated to ICANN. They don't have other times, they are not working for that, that is a very small part of their work, so they need to use these face to face to do everything; to interact and to do their particular work. In my opinion, just sit there and interact with the others, it's impossible. They cannot finalize the communique, they cannot reach consensus, it's quite difficult to do what this recommendation suggested, like they are seeing nothing from the GAC.

So, with this openness, in my opinion, it's implemented, and is effective. You can understand everything they are discussing; you can make questions wherever you are, and they need the part of those meetings to sit together in the GAC and try to reach consensus and write the communique. So, in my opinion, it's implemented, and to make other way around is almost impossible. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thanks, Vanda. Sebastien, your hand is raised?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Pat. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I guess in this question we may wish to add as part of the answers that specific inter-community session, interest topics and so on and so forth are now organized during ICANN meetings, and some of them are led by GAC, therefore it's one example of how they have implemented or participated to the implementation of this recommendation, thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I do agree. They have both sides; they have all the AC and the SOs requests, either put here engaging with the NAC in particular meeting, request for AC or SOs, and they also invite those AC and SOs to talk and make panels to debate specific items in their agenda. So, in my opinion, it's really completely implemented and very effective. From the beginning, when I was there, we never interacted with the community; we were close, nobody entered, nobody goes, and nobody knows what we are doing inside, so nowadays it's completely open. So, I do believe it's a good idea to have this openness in the GAC. Thank you.

PAT KANE: So Vanda, this is Pat, I just wanted to challenge one item in your assessment of effectiveness; you call out that members cannot dedicate more time to the work with ICANN, and in my limited observations with the GAC, it seems as though there's a lot of start-stop from irregular participants, and that there's a lot of input from regular participants that it seems like the conversations may come across as a little one-sided, so is there, are we not effective in the intercessional in keeping

folks engaged that aren't on top of this all the time? It seems to me like we lose some effectiveness there.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I don't believe that this is what the recommendation suggested, this is something that we are putting in our report regarding the problem they have of constantly renovating members. Some members just show up once, and the next meeting there will be another one. So, it's something that they need to focus as preparation or something like that, but it's not what the recommendation, in my opinion, is suggesting. They were more interested in the participation of the outside GAC than inside GAC. You are right that a lot of countries are not really understanding what they are doing there, because it takes time to get considering government work.

ICANN is another animal, and it takes time for each member to understand what is there for them, and what is important or not. And this will depend upon the qualification of the member, the interest of the country in that issue, because most of the countries just see that something is going there, I need to be there, but they do not first understand why, and second, sometimes the selecting of the people that will sit there is not the correct one.

So, those are points that are not in those recommendations of ATRT2, but should be in ours, because there is a lot of things that we talk with members of GAC, there's interviews and time during the Marrakesh that we can use to improve the effectiveness inside themselves, not related to the effectiveness with the board and the community. That's my

answer to you, Pat. I don't know if I was clear, but I'd like to hear your feedback, thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. I think that's very clear, and I get the distinction between what the intent of the recommendation was in ATRT2, and your suggestion that what we just talked about be a recommendation of ATRT3 for the GAC, is that captured correctly?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, exactly what I do believe the recommendation was suggesting.

PAT KANE: Right, thank you. So, we should then capture that. We will talk about intercession, the GAC work party will make a recommendation on intercession roles and continuation of participation throughout the calendar year. Alright. Thank you on that. Anything else? Yes, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Hi Pat, thanks for this interesting discussion. I recognize that this is difficult at times, but it's not so much because the GAC only met three times, but also because even member countries often change their representative. So that being said, almost half is new every time, and it's also true that some countries have better embedded their GAC representative in national policies than others. In general, my feeling is

that is a recognized thing. For instance, a lot is happening to brief newcomers and to do capacity building in GAC perspective.

For instance, there's a specific GAC newcomer session every time again. In addition, I know that Manal was very active in engaging with members intercessionally. So saying that maybe they should be more poor intercessional would not value the fact that they already do some of that. So let's make sure we get a good picture of what happens in the session before any recommendations like this would. There's a lot happening and yes, it's a problem and it's being addressed as we speak. So let's make sure we know what the addressing actually entails at the moment.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, Scartezini. Thank you. Yeah, I understand Manal is doing wonderful work and tried to capacitate and allow people to understand better. But even counters like mine, that was there since 1999, the first one, have changed too much persons, but at least the pool of persons that can attend the meetings is large and then they can be supported by the ones that are more informed about what is going on. It's not the reality for some countries and this makes the situation quite difficult.

But yeah, I understand there is some recommendation for us, must touch specific points because Manal is doing a lot of other points that was not raised into this ATRT2 because they saw the problem by themselves, and they are trying to solve those problems, but certainly needs some improvement and we need to focus on ATRT3 on those

specific points. Thank you, Maarten and certainly you've been very, very helpful on the reports. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you Vanda, thank you Maarten. The next one is 6.1.F. This one looks pretty straightforward unless Vanda you've got something you want to add here, I think we can move past this one.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, it's quite easy to understand that that is implemented and if it is so, I do believe that everybody can understand that. I believe that what is quite relevant is maybe H.

PAT KANE: Yeah, I agree with you, but I do have a question about G, if we can grab that one.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay.

PAT KANE: 6.1.G is providing clarity regarding the role of the leadership of the GAC and specifically one of my questions here was, now you talk about in the assessment that the enlargement of five vice chairs improve the effectiveness of the leadership team.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Because in the leadership and the support leadership was posted and the operating principle is clear what they must do, so it's quite clear those things. They are enlarging the implementation, because that was one point that most of counselors were asking for because like the idea to have more wiser representation of the globe and different cultural behaviors, et cetera, and what they put in the website, what they are supposed to do and what is the role of those leadership teams.

PAT KANE: So, if can challenge that a little bit. So the diversity is helping with the work, but I guess when I read this from an effectiveness standpoint, I was thinking do we end up with more transparency because we have regional participation? Are we more effective in communicating the positions and the communiqué and the agenda for the GAC, or are we doing something more in terms of getting the message out, I guess which will end up rolling into H.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, what has happened inside the GAC is normally the vice chairs during intervals go to their regions for instance and try to explain or answer some specific questions for that group so the assets to those people from different regions make the ones that are not so aware about what is going on inside the meeting, to understand easily and bearer what is going on. So it's a way to be more effective inside ICANN.

At the same time when we need for instance in our region we have normally someone sitting there so if we have some issues from our

RALO for instance and we assess our people sitting there in the vice chairs to understand what the communiqué really is suggesting or is demanding. So those roles are wider than just sitting there and make comments for any issue and to have the small groups also helps the GAC itself to finalize the issues or respond to questions or interact with the liaisons to make it more effective. So, maybe we could go deeply on the effectiveness and enlarge the role of this leadership team.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. I think that's clear, I think that's helpful. Any other questions for Vanda? Alright, Vanda we've got one more for you and then we'll you a break for a few.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, thank you.

PAT KANE: 6.1.H., when deliberating on matters affecting particular entities to the extent reasonable and practical give those entities the opportunity to present to the GAC as a whole prior to its deliberations. And you've got partially implemented and partially effective.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, Vanda for the record. What I said is the GAC is reaching out to such position to working groups they establish a way to involve people from many counties to work on those matters that are particularly of interest of some countries, not for everybody, and they really

implemented these working groups and the idea of implementing is a good one because people come out with some more clear input for the whole GAC and it helps to also write more clearly the communiqué, but it is a working process. So they are implemented and not all issues that are of priority or interest inside the GAC are implemented.

So, maybe that is due to lack of time for some numbers to go more deeply parallel times but it's partially implemented the way is good and liaisons in some case is facilitating these engagements with the GAC prior to the decision and this makes also like a funnel, you know, to narrow the issue and discussing this through liaisons, and narrow the point to both sides understand, the community SOs and ACs, and the GAC itself about one policy issue. So, in my opinion it's in the right way and maybe we should insist on that, to make it more and more participative inside the GAC and that is going in the right direction. In my opinion I put partially implemented and partially effective, as I said, because it's not all issues have some work party to help the whole GAC. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. One of the notes I have here, is that it would be helpful I think in the assessment of implementation to actually cite [AUDIO BREAK].

Sorry, Vanda, what I said was that on 6.1.H. where we have the assessment of implementation by ATRT3, that we should probably cite a couple of examples.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, there are a lot of examples in the website I can put here.

PAT KANE: Great, thank you very much. Any questions for Vanda? Alright, Vanda you are relieved momentarily.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, I need water.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel Nanghaka here, this was in the chat, I'm seeing that in this case 6.1.H., there is a challenge of achieving full effectiveness that will take some time. So is there a probable projected timeline in which the full effectiveness of this recommendation will probably be complete, or not? Or probably just leave it as an open recommendation as a work in progress through and through. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, that's my point, it's the right direction and partially implemented and in my opinion we should insist they follow this path because it's the right way. Thank you, Daniel.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Daniel, thank you, Vanda.   Let's move on to Recommendation 6.2, Jacques, you're up. ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRIto facilitate the GAC formally adopting a policy of open meetings to increase transparency

into GAC deliberations and to establish the published clear criteria for closed sessions.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, so, can you hear me well, first?

PAT KANE: Yes, we can.

JACQUES BLANC: Which is a good start hopefully. So, implementation, well that's rather an easy assessment, I mean, one just has to go to the GAC website, it's white structure, it's here, it has been noted above by Vanda. You get all information available, all needed information available there, admitting you are willing to get into it and search, and informal note here is as Vanda says, a lot of people might not take the time to understand what is GAC, what kind of animal is GAC, what they are really supposed to do, and what are the implications on their ICANN activity. But once this is noted, yes, this is implemented. Effectiveness is a bit more difficult.

So, if we stay to the language and look again at the language, the language says formally adopting a policy of open meetings to increase transparency into GAC deliberation and establish and publish clear criteria for closed sessions. So, on the first level there had been an adopted really open policy and communication you can find on the same website the criteria to see what are the open meetings what are the closed meetings and in this regard the recommendation and its implementation have been effective.

Then, if you go deeper, you will have to note that one meeting is still closed which is the communiqué redaction meeting. The communiqué redaction sessions are still stipulated as closed by the GAC and you cannot see any clear and implemented criteria as to why the communiqué redactions have to be closed. So, that's why it's difficult to analyze the effectiveness, because if you consider who is GAC who are the representatives inside GAC and other representatives of GAC and the fact that every time they push an opinion forward in a meeting they engage the country which is behind at least on media level, but that's a lot to say then, one can understand why some sessions have to be closed.

But on the other side, you know, being an outsider, even an educated outsider as I am, compared to Vanda, for example, and others who have been in GAC, it still gives the impression you know, oh, so the exact session where there is going to be the redaction which is going to go out to the public is exactly the closed one and the question is why? Is there is something to hide here?

So, that's why my overall assessment is yes, the implementation has been overall effective with regard to clear criteria for closed sessions, you know what closed sessions you can go, what are the closed sessions, which are the open sessions, yes, there is a policy of open meetings now over and over and over, and there is still this communiqué redaction that might still be recommended to GAC to consider again, and I'm not giving any direction in a yes or no, but maybe consider again the deep motives for keeping the communiqué redaction session closed and eventually consider making it public because if this was public apart from private GAC deliberation from

some internal members sessions but it is stipulated into the information available on the website, then it would be complete openness and transparency.

Last things, and maybe one of the former GAC members or maybe staff will have an answer, I've noted that website information seems to contradict itself. You know, you've got both information saying that since mid 2013 GAC meetings have been open, including the communiqué drafting sessions and on the contrary it said that the exceptions to open meeting are the communiqué drafting sessions, so this is a clear opposition and I haven't found you know the rationale beside that. But, overall, yes, there has been a clear adopting of open meetings increasing transparency, and clear criteria for closed sessions.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jacques. So I understand when we talk about the assessment of effectiveness to where you've indicated effective as feasible but I do think you're right and I think that Bernie has captured that inside the document right now, is that we should or at least should consider making a comment as ATRT3 about the communiqué drafting sessions as to whether they should remain closed or be open. Sébastien, your hand is raised?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, but my memory didn't serve too much on that, but I had a look to the current schedule of the ICANN65 in Marrakech and I don't see that it's written closed meeting. I have a feeling that they changed their policy and it maybe had changed in Marrakech, I don't know, I

can't say, but it will be useful to ask GAC directly or GAC or ICANN staff helping GAC. But I was surprised to see that it was not closed session. But I will not put my hand to the fire for that. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Maybe Liu could help here?

LIU YUE: This is Liu for the record. The GAC have opened almost the meetings to the public and I think I need to ask GAC leadership what is the criteria of the closed meeting raised by Jacques. I don't have a clear idea why they close this meeting.

JACQUES BLANC: Jacques for the record. Thank you Liu, because I just want to quote what Maarten just said on the chat saying "not sure what to gain by having communiqué drafting session open." Maarten and the team, probably nothing, only if there is no reason to close them, then why close them? And what will be gained by opening them? Probably nothing, I don't know, I have never seen a GAC meeting yet so I should have, but not yet, so probably nothing, except for increasing transparency which was, you know the ultimate increasing of transparency which was one that was recommended by ATRT2.

So, it's only in the effectiveness analyzed that I've been redacting that and by the way I'm not saying that communiqué sessions should be open or should not, I'm just saying maybe GAC should consider again its deep motives and consider making it public. And I had been told by

Vanda and others that GAC is too particular a body, that they might have their own good reasons for not opening such sessions but in this case why not put them formally on the table?

PAT KANE: Maarten you had your hand raised earlier, is there something that you wanted to add?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Well, actually the point was just made by Jacques. For sure, particularly the communiqué session shouldn't lead to any new insights to the GAC, it should be reflecting what has been concluded in the public session, so I don't think there's a lot to be opened but as Jacques said, why close it, then? And as I think Sébastien said, maybe it's easy to walk in and nobody will kick you out. So, this is not a hopeless point we're going to make with ATRT3, it seems to me.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Sébastien, to you please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, once again if you look to the schedule of ICANN65, you have a lot of meetings open. The only one where it's written closed, it's GAC Leadership meeting. The GAC communiqué drafting session, 1 of 3, 2 of 3, and 3 of 3 is not written with a C, which means closed session. I think before we spend time to discuss if they need to be open or not just check if it is. I guess it is now. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Tola, your hand is raised.

TOLA SOGBESAN: This is Tola for the record. It's based on us getting understanding of the closed meeting during communiqué drafting. I know we have GNSO liaison to GAC, we have SOs and ACs specifically to the GAC, and I just want to clarify are these closed meetings closed to [inaudible] or closed to public?   That's the first question I have. Secondly, my thinking is during the communiqué all the discussion had been held, whatever is on the agenda, and the [AUDIO BREAK] at what point do we say they're not transparent, is it simply because one of the meetings is closed, which is only for communiqué drafting as the case may be. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Tola.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda for the record, Tola, just for clarifying you are fine. I believe that for GAC, liaisons are part of the group, so it's open to calls, open to drafts, open to any session. So, they are allowed to participate.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you, Vanda. That settles the point I was making. If SOs and ACs are part of what they are doing, then my question is are they still not transparent to the broader community? Another question. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Alright, thank you Tola. Let's move on to the next one, Recommendation 6.3, Liu, this is for you. "ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI, to facilitate the GAC developing and publishing rationales for GAC Advice at the time Advice is provided. Such rationales should be recorded in the GAC register. The register should also include a record of how the ICANN Board responded to each of advice."

LIU YUE:

This is Liu for the record. I think maybe we missed some words, that we also assess GAC's recommendation if implemented. I sent an email about this recommendation in the assessment. So you can find the result of the assessment of the implementation on that email. Since the GAC Advice has improvement and also thanks to what Maarten added, the system has been improved in place to follow up the GAC Advice, so we can see on the GAC website.

So, the GAC advices is getting better registry and so we can find a clear track to follow up by GAC reply. So the BGRI have been working on this recommendation. So we can assess this recommendation as implemented. Also, we can find this improvement is clear in the website, so it is effective in relation to the recommendations of that objective. So, we also accept this recommendation as effective. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Liu. Any questions for Liu? Alright, it seems there's none, let's move on to 6.4, so Vanda, you're back up. "The Board, working through the BGRI working group, should develop and document a formal process for notifying and requesting GAC advice (see ATRT1 Recommendation 10)."

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, this is Vanda for the record. First of all, this was my mistake to jump on this and answer this one, it was supposed to be done by Liu. But once it's done, it's done. I posted this one, and of course he can make his comments on that, please. But I put, there is a clear process between the Board and the GAC. And I also posted here one clear statement, Maarten, because he was part of this work inside the Board, so you can read the statement, it is quite clear. And what I put, so it's implemented, but during this Marrakech, we understood that there is some lack of closing the loop that end of the process, talking with the GAC, and so I posted here as partially effective, it's 9% effective. But this closing the loop is something that it's supposed to be done to improve and really get effectiveness in this process.

So, some comments, we need some KPI and metrics on the actions, and it's better to shorten the period for clarifying and formal response. And GAC members suggested that GAC/ICANN Board exchanges following ICANN meetings be less formal and more in depth, and a regular BGIG, that's the group that designed this process, to be established. So, in my opinion, it's 9% done, 9% effective, but needs to close the loop as we defined in our final meeting after the Marrakech meeting. Our group

found that closing the loop could define better what we meant on that. So, that's it, thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, thank you Vanda, I can see where you come from and I can see that sometimes the outcome of the meeting is not satisfactory in every sense. The thing is that we do keep track now if a loop is kept open it's explicitly indicated like that in the information online. So, we only keep it open when we really can't close it, sometimes also because it's not a Board/GAC matter but other constituencies are part of it.

For instance, I think the big improvement is that we do keep track of it now it's transparent it's accountable So I don't know what we can do to improve that more, I wouldn't know which recommendations would really help there. A recommendation from Erin to have ICANN, the exchanges to be less formal is I think the solution to a different problem which is not always being open to close loops. I hope this is useful.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Liu?

LIU YUE: Yeah, remember that at the Marrakech meeting we discussed it with GAC, so if we can put the further action as indicators for the interaction

between GAC and the Board, so this is also raised by GAC and also agreed by Linda and I. So that's why we read this closing the loop. Also, I collected the BGRI activity from the GAC communiqué so we can find the BGRI now the BGIG. They have done very good work and also they push the advices into action and also can get feedback from the Board. If we can find some indicators to show what the further action of the advices, also how much began on this advices. So I added a comment and I suggest that KPIs or some indicators and metrics should set up to push the advice into action.

Also, Maarten after the GAC meeting, GAC also has a workshop to explain the GAC's source about their [inaudible] and also the Board will feedback before the next ICANN meeting, and all this will be recorded through the scorecard. Also the period between the last meeting through the next workshop between GAC and the Board, all the GAC's feedback is recorded through the scorecard to the GAC. The period I think maybe can be shortened so we can get more information and clear result as soon as possible. Since we can find that in the ICANN meeting but the Board has their open sessions for the meeting, also to explain what they think about the decision. So the GAC and the Board, their discussion advices on the communiqué can be more quick, so that will be benefit to push the advices into action.

Also the last comment that GAC members suggest that GAC and the Board exchanges following ICANN meetings be less formal and more in depth, and a regular BGIG call be established. This comes from the Marrakech meeting communiqué. So I picked up this sentence from the communiqué as a comment. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Liu. Alright so it's about 5 of the hour, we've been at this now for almost 120 minutes. I think we will declare that we're going to stop here for the day unless Cheryl you want to jump in on the next one but that 6.5 seemed pretty binary. So, if we could bring the agenda back up for the meeting, because I think that we're almost there in terms of time. Thank you. So any last items on the surveys logistics update that we want to add here? Cheryl? Alright, Sébastien you've got your hand raised.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, people, I just wanted before we leave the discussion about ATRT2, what is the next step, is it next week and we put two hours or we try to do something else? Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. I was going to suggest before we left today that we schedule another two hour session for next week and have this be the primary topic again. We've still got a long way to go through the spreadsheet, but I think that this has been helpful at least from where I'm sitting in terms of all of us understanding how we made these assessments. I would welcome feedback as to whether it was effective or not effective or if there's a process that we should go through differently, so I welcome that feedback. Marten, your hand is raised?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, just sorry for maybe missing it, but the timing on the survey?

PAT KANE: Jennifer, your hand is raised?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, this is Jennifer, just from staff perspective I have a few things to share from the survey. So, obviously the questions are finalized and we have put them into the tool and needs a bit of cleanup before we can share that with the review team.   From my perspective I think we should be able to share it tomorrow I understood from the leaders call on Monday that we might give the ruby team members a chance to briefly look at the final survey before it gets published to the community and I would suggest that if we may have the link prepared by the end of this week I would suggest in terms of an announcement and communication that we do that next week, given that by the time we get the survey ready it's going to be Friday and not the best day for announcements.

That said, we can share the link with the team as soon as it's ready and then you all can do distribution within your own networks if that would be suitable. But that's what I had to share from the timing I don't know Bernie is in agreement or has anything else to update from his side, but I'm happy to answer questions or take comments. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Bernie has given a green check on that, it is positive. Cheryl, anything you want to add to this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, nothing from me, as long as we get the timing right on logistics for getting the survey into things like the weekly update on issues that goes out to all of the SO/AC leads, that sort of thing.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. And so Jennifer, I think all of the actions or decisions have been captured in the spreadsheet by Bernie, so thank you very much. On demand updates, appreciate it. Is there anything else, Jennifer, that we need to identify about the decisions reached or actions confirmed?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, this is Jennifer, just to confirm, I didn't see any disagreements so I'm assuming that we'll go ahead extend next week's call to the two-hour time slot.

PAT KANE: If there is disagreement, go ahead and check No in the participant window. Seeing, yes we'll declare that's what we'll do next meeting. Alright, thanks everyone for spending two hours with us today and we will see you all next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]