BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you very much and hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. I'd like to welcome you to ATRT3 Plenary #26 on the 21st of August 2019. The call is starting at 21:02 UTC.
	Members attending the call are Cheryl, Pat, Liu, Jaap, Maarten, Vanda, Adetola, Sebastien, Demi. The observers are Chantelle Doerksen, Herb Waye, Everton Rodrigues, and Berry Cobb. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer Bernard Turcotte. Apologies from Wolfgang and Michael. And joining us after the attendance was read. It looks like Osvaldo has joined us.
OSVALDO NOVOA:	Yes. Hello.
BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you. I'd like to remind everyone today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the transcript. And I'll turn the call over to Cheryl and Pat. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks very much, Brenda. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'll do the administrivia and Pat gets to do the lion's share of the work today like last week. Thanks very much to everyone who's joined the call and we'll note that with Erica having formally now tended her resignation, and Michael apparently not going to dial in to calls from his honeymoon and wedding activities, I think very unreasonable but we wish him well. The

EN

"very unreasonable" was a joke by the way. We are a little short on the community's leadership here but we also recognize that the work we're doing with the ATRT2 and indeed the current survey is what we'd be feeding a great deal into communities so we don't think that that is a problem. And if you disagree with Pat and I then let us know in chat.

So, with that explanation and welcome, just asking is there anyone who wishes to update their Statements of Interest? So, pop some information in the chat and update your forms, reminding you that we work under continuous disclosure with our Statements of Interest. Then failing any updates coming in we wanted to know – and I think it's probably Jennifer who's going to be responding to item #2 with any of the action items new and closed. Jennifer, do we have anything outstanding or are there anything we needs to be drawing our attention to?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, Cheryl. Thanks, this is Jennifer. I have nothing specific to mention that won't be covered in the survey logistics update. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect. Thanks, Jennifer. Yes, that's my understanding and Pat's understanding as well but I thought we did double-check with the people who keep the fingers on the pulse of all of these. Thank you so much for that confirmation. And if anyone is aware of anything we've missed there, again let us know in chat. Which brings us to – and thank you to everybody who has contributed to the survey. It's now out in the wild, getting its distribution and getting recognition in a number of lists

	that I've certainly seen. Is it Bernie or is it Jennifer who's going to update us on the logistics?
JENNIFER BRYCE:	This is Jennifer. I'm happy to start. As everybody has seen, the survey is now live on ICANN Org website with links being sent and invitations being sent directly to SO/AC and other community leaders with the help of the team. So thanks, everybody, who was involved in that. We'll obviously appreciate if the team can do some legwork as well. Where appropriate, circulate to your networks if you feel that you would like to do that.
	So far, quick update on the responses. We have five individuals and two groups that have already started to complete the survey and we will give an update on the numbers each week, so we can keep track of how that's coming along. With that, I don't think I have anything else to say on the survey but, Bernie, please chime in or I'm happy to answer any questions. Thanks.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Bernie, did you have anything?
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	I'll give one minor point, well two minor points. We had forgotten to – we had two registries stakeholder groups instead of a registry and the registrar stakeholder group. Someone noted that. We've had staff fix that extremely quickly and we had someone else complaining on the individual surveys, how could they fill it out if they didn't fit in any of the

SO/AC categories, so we added a "other" category which people can choose. That's about it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Bernie, and I note that the small team that was working on the survey was involved in those two changes and it was done express phased and very efficiently, so thanks to everyone involved for that, with absence of having it at robustly be tested. We just didn't have the time to do so. A couple of little tiny tweaks which is always really were dealt with in a great deal of efficiency and effectiveness, so thanks for that. Are there any questions regarding the survey from anybody on this call today? Scanning up and down the list and not seeing any. Great. Well, now we just wait for the material to come in, although the fact that we've actually had people start already, that's extraordinary. Thank you to those who are doing that because in the wonderful world of ICANN, it's almost a tradition to fill things in at the last possible moment, so it's very exciting to see that people have dived in almost within 24 hours of it getting out there in the wild, which is terrific.

Okay. So, we will come back to survey obviously as a regular item for the next week or so. With that, very briefly, if there is anything from any of the work parties that they want to bring attention to this plenary meeting, so if Board, GAC, or Reviews … There won't be anything from IRP Work Stream 2 today, but anything from Board or GAC or Reviews, pop your hands up. I see Sebastien, over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Yes, just to update here everybody, if they don't have access or take time with Skype chat, I have reorganized a Google Doc for the Board Work Party. At the beginning there is what I call the version 01 of the future draft report, and if there are any comments, addition findings, it's the best place to put it now until the time that Bernie give us skeleton of the report. At that moment I will export current information into that document and we will work from that at that moment. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. And I'm assuming that Bernie will get you the skeleton of the report post haste so there won't be any need to duplicate efforts. Thanks for that. I think I'll say you've recently finished the Doodle for a meeting, and we look forward to more productivity again out of that upcoming meeting as well. I know also the GAC Work Party has been busy with the skeleton of the report that they're working with as well. So, the framework is there.

Bernie, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe what you're distributing to the work party is the full template framework at this stage and we're just asking them to start fleshing out – I'm using body metaphors today – start fleshing out their heart of it? Is that correct, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. Basically, we've got a framework to help things along. I've included the ATRT2 recommendations because that is part of the framework. I haven't included the assessments yet because we're not finished and people can get working on that. I'll upload it as a Google Doc so people

EN

can collaboratively work on it, or if you prefer a Word version I can send those out too. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thanks very much for that. Okay, I think that it's pretty much it for those standard agenda items, which brings us to the lion's share of today's work. And of course, the lion's share of the time to be committed to our ATRT2 implementation assessment, so whilst the document that Bernie referred to is being uploaded so we can all have a look at pretty colors because I like pretty colors on documents – ah, there we go – let's hand it over to Pat. Pat, it's all yours. You can get this all done today.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I appreciate that, but you want to thank Sebastien for responding to the consent agenda list and pulling some back on, so we'll go through that. And, Sebastien, if I get out of line, I've got my notes here on a separate page, feel free to raise your hand and get me re-oriented. So, thank you for that.

Alright, like I said in the consent agenda, we'll just go through the ones that I've not put on the bottom of that list, again with the ones that Sebastien has pulled back on, and what I'd do, very similarly to the last week, ask some questions and kind of go through that.

So, we're going to start off with line #11, Recommendation 6.6. I see that Jacques is not on the phone on this one, but the questions I had here – okay, so I get that Vanda [inaudible] taking for Jacques. So, the

EN

questions I had for this one – and, Bernie, if we capture this and then send him a note on this so that we can get his input – was under the assessment of implementation, one of the proof points he has on the success here is adding things like travel assistance. I'm trying to understand how travel assistance is an assessment of positive implementation for this recommendation. The second one was more in effectiveness, which was even though these things had been put in place, has participation really improved? There may be some subjectiveness to the answer of that, but I think that [inaudible] driving towards participation improvement, and do we have a position on whether these implementations actually improved participation?

That's a question I had outstanding that we should ask Jacques offline or following up on this. Any questions with that? Any concerns with that? Raise your hand if so.

Alright, let's move on then to line #14, Recommendation 6.9. Daniel is not with us. Okay. So, we have a quick one. So, the question I had here was, in the assessment of implementation, Daniel has indicated "implemented" and I was wondering if we could get some greater detail in this area to say how we believed that it has been implemented. I know that there's some comments that are here on identifying feedback reports, but I'm trying to get a little more meat on how we feel the assessment from an implementation standpoint was achieved. So, we need to follow up on that one with Daniel.

Alright, any questions on that, concerns, raise your hand. Alright, seeing none, we will go on to one that was added back on by Sebastien, #15, Recommendation 7.1, and this is for Osvaldo. Osvaldo, I'm trying to get

EN

a little more explanation on your implementation assessment. It's almost completely implemented, ATRT2 required for planning regarding the number of public comments. And then you say, "Could not find any reference of this." So, I was wondering if you could explain a little bit from there. Yes, Osvaldo, please.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Okay. This is Osvaldo. I added today some notes. There is a document sent in by ICANN on just the public comment implementation after ATRT2, and they added the new procedures and established time requirement for staff for presenting the summaries. So from my point of view, it was quite complete the way they did it. The only point was that the recommendation stated to somehow forecast the number of public comments so that there could be some planning, but I think it's very difficult to forecast how many public comments are going to come in the next months or so. That's why I just noted that there is no reference to that. I think it's very difficult to do it. I don't if you have there the notes I added today, but basically – I put it I think in comments. On the document that they presented – let me find it – is a report on ATRT public comments and casement, they listed the number of things they added or improved. So after ATRT2, all the public comments are redirected to the Policy Department and they have a Staff Advisory Committee that analyzes the public comments. And then there is also a community inquiry protocol. From what I've read in that document, I think – oh, there is my comment – this was implemented and from what I talked with some other people in ICANN, most people I'm fully confident with the way the public comment is working and they find it it's working fine for now. Sebastien had some observations I see.

PAT KANE: Alright. Cheryl's hand I think is raised first. So, Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. No. No. I'll go last.

PAT KANE: Okay, Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much. First of all, I guess I just see one mail arriving about 7.1 and 7.2, I guess, question from staff, maybe others. But my point is the following. The way the comment period was supposed to be set up few years ago was to have two periods – one to add the first comment and the second one to allow people to answer to the comment of the first period. In fact, it didn't work because especially the groups were answering at the end of the second period and nobody was able to answer and to answer into discussion. Therefore, we have today a period of 40 days usually you use at once. And my comment it's not to say that it was not done, it was not implemented, but how we handle that for the future and how with that we decide or not to have specific comments or specific proposal for and then things that are public comment in the future. It was a reason of my comments and the reason why I asked you to put it back to the discussion is that I thought it could be useful. Thank you very much.

EN

PAT KANE:	Thank you, Sebastien. Osvaldo, is that a new hand?
OSVALDO NOVOA:	Yes.
PAT KANE:	Please go ahead.
OSVALDO NOVOA:	Regarding that comment that Vanda made on the chat, one thing I found in general, ICANN, they are not sufficient statistics showing the performance key indicators regarding a lot of things. In particular, in public comments, I couldn't see – they have statistics on the report but that's an old statistics. I couldn't find new numbers of how many public reports were, when was the public comment answer period, and so on. I think they are lacking a lot of indicators in ICANN.
PAT KANE:	Thank you, Osvaldo. Maarten? And congratulations, Maarten, on being returned to the Board from the NomCom.
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Yes. Thank you, Pat. It seems that I will be with the team until the end because that should be within the next three years. I appreciate that. I'm really looking forward to continue to contribute.

EN

PAT KANE: That's great. Maarten, thank you. We're not going to make it last for three years. We'll be done much sooner than that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: My tenure or ATRT3?

PAT KANE: ATRT3.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. I agree. Back to the comment that Sebastien made. One thing is that the ATRT2 recommendation has been cleared as it was intended at that point in time. The other thing is do we think that this is still the right thing to do? And in that we can say, what was recommended in ATRT2 was useful but it didn't go far enough, and we can even see in the current circumstance, that isn't useful anymore. But that's two different things. One is the assessment that ATRT2 has done. The other thing, it gives us a step up to show what do we think is important as ATRT3. And to avoid long discussions on the assessment on ATRT2, let's make a good distinguish between those two, because I think there's chances for further improvement. And sometimes the old recommendations are not relevant anymore.

PAT KANE: Maarten, thank you very much for that. What I'm hearing you suggest is that we do greatly consider making our own recommendation on the

comment period itself as ATRT3, so I think we should capture that. Alright, Jennifer, you hand is raised.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Yes, this is Jennifer. Very similar point actually to Maarten's. I did, first of all, actually want to note that I just sent a mail to the list, and apologies because the timing is not great. But I sent that just a minute ago and I guess some more information on the implementation of Recommendation 7.1 and 7.2, hopefully answering specifically probably more Michael's questions from the next recommendation, but included in that mail is some information about changes that the Public Comment Team is currently working on and future plans for improvement. So I had suggested in that mail that perhaps the Review Team may wish to meet with the Public Comment Team. They have made that request to the team to have a meeting. But in that meeting or, however, if you choose to do that, you can perhaps have a useful discussion about the future and then clear off any remaining questions about implementation of the prior recommendations. But as Maarten said, two very different things, the stuff has already been done, and then the planned improvements for the future. Both of them are included in that mail. Hopefully, it might clear up some questions.

Thank you. I hope that was clear and didn't muddy things more than they were already. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Jennifer. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is that a new hand from Sebastien?

PAT KANE: Oh my apologies. Sebastien, is that a new hand or an old hand?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's a new one. Thank you, Pat. Just to say that I agree with Maarten. We have to decide if we add to comment, who is not assessment. This possibility to have specific recommendation from ATRT3 on those topics, or if we go through those after in another round of discussion then I am happy with any one of those decisions, but I think we need to capture the place where as ATRT3, we will need to make some research to see if we make recommendation. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, now I'm going to jump in. Thank you, Pat. I'm glad I waited. Thanks very much. I'm not sure what I put my hand up for. This action now been said, I'm just fully supportive of what I've heard in particular, I think we should take a meeting with the Public Comments Team, but I do also want to point out that we have a unique opportunity based on the survey input, we may also be getting to look at some possible recommendations in the full body of the report.

Also don't forget that some of this indeed will overlap with the governance evolution work. So we probably also need to touch base again with Brian once we've got our survey material back and we've got a small body of work to deal with specifically on public comments. So when we meet with the Public Comments Team, I would propose, Pat, that we probably make sure that Brian is an observer on that as well so that we are complementing our work and we'd overlap where possible. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. If there are no further questions – if there are, please raise your hand. We will move on to #16, Recommendation 7.2. This is Michael's. The recommendation is the Board should establish a process under the Public Comment Process where those who commented or replied during the Public Comment and/or Reply Comment periods can request changes to the synthesis reports in cases where they believe the staff incorrectly summarized their comments.

Now Michael put "likely implemented." Since Michael is not on the phone, one of the things I want to capture here, Bernie, is that from my comment, I think there's evidence that ICANN seeks answers to some of the items that come back from the community in terms of how someone is going to address it, who's on the receiving end of the public comments. Not necessarily allowing clarification against steps, observations, or summarizations. So, we should have a deeper follow up with Michael on that to get where he's [inaudible].

Bernie, I see that you got your hand raised.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Pat. I think we talked to the Public Comment Team on this. If I remember what Jennifer told me, was that this was indeed implemented as a process, and that has never been used. Is that correct, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: The public comment summary inquiry, if that's correct, it has not been used. That's actually contrary to the information that was in the implementation briefing that we provided. So, we'll update that. But yes, you're correct, Bernie.

PAT KANE: That's very helpful. Thank you, Jennifer. Alright, another question there. Bernie, is that the continued hand, old hand, slow hand, there we go.

Alright #17 that we put back on the list is Recommendation #8. The recommendation states: To support public participation, the Board should review the capacity of the language services department versus the community need for the service using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and make relevant adjustments such as improving translation quality and timeliness and interpretation quality. ICANN should implement continuous improvement of translation and interpretation services including benchmarking of procedures used by international organizations such as the United Nations.

This is Jacques's. I know, Sebastien, you asked to have this put back on, so if you could let us capture what your question is and then we can

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much. My point was we talk about KPIs but not too much about continuous improvement of translation and interpretation, and the question of benchmarking. Therefore, I don't think this part was really implemented either the KPI. That's why Jacques wrote that. Maybe as a follow up for our own comments or our own proposal, I think one way for the translation – I am not talking about interpretation here but it was the translation – it's to take a sample of document in different languages and to give it to read to people in their own language and to see how I created this. I have done that two times with the French and I am always puzzled by the result. I guess it could be one good way to see. But that's from the discussion, we have maybe more for the future than the [analysis] of the current situation. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Very good. Thank you very much, Sebastien. Alright, so if we could move then to – I'm just flipping pages, bear with me – line 9, #18, Recommendation 9.1. The 9.1 subproject implementation focus is on the proposed Bylaws change recommended by the ATRT2 to impose a requirement on the ICANN Board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN's Advisory Committees.

Then this is for Daniel. Daniel is not with us. My question for him was based on the question I had with assessment of implementation was, how so? How was this "partially implemented"? If we could follow up,

Bernie, with Daniel to try to get him to clarify a little bit more about his assessment of the actual implementation that would be great.

Any questions you want to add? Yes, Maarten, your hand is raised.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. Just check because what's been put in place over the last years is a response register to which we keep very clear track of all requests to the Board and all our responses. So please check with him whether he is aware of that and consider that, and if so, why that isn't sufficient.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Maarten, for that. We will note that and get that [inaudible]. Yes, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I spoke with Daniel and he's aware of the response register. But I will get back in touch with him for more details.

PAT KANE: Thank you. Alright, the next one we have is we will move to line #22 which is Recommendation 9.5. This is Michael's. Sebastien asked to have this put back on. 9.5 is the subproject implementation will conduct a review of the Anonymous Hotline policy and processes, implement any proposed modifications to policy and publish a report on results to the community.

Sebastien, if you would comment on that, please? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Pat. You jumped line 20, if we can come back on it. But maybe for both of them, I can do the same comment. It's that we have a lot and maybe we need to put them in one single basket, one link with the Work Stream 2 because we are in difficult situation where nothing was done with Work Stream 2 and therefore, we can't assess because it's not done – the situation. That's the case for the recommendation 9.5. It's almost the case with 9.3 and some other. I think in our report, we may put all of them into one single basket and after, see what we do with that with them. Thank you.

If I can have the floor just to go back to the 9.3, it's to say that I have no problem with your proposal to put "partially implemented." My question is more who implemented it. One of the reasons I put "not implemented" is because it was not implemented by staff or by staff decision, but I guess it was implemented by the wish, willing and goodwill of the current Ombuds. Maybe it could be useful in one time to have short discussion with him, but it's why I put "not implemented," but I have no trouble if we decide to put the "partially implemented." In my comments there – it's not anymore here in the document – but I have put some of the things done by the current Ombuds. Thank you very much.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien. Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Sebastien is quite right. There are a number of Work Stream 2 things. But on this specific one, 9.5, Work Stream 2 Transparency noted that that review had been done. So if we're just focusing on the recommendation as such, the review had been done and the modification had been implemented. And basically, I think Michael was in charge of that transparency section and noted that this had been done and should be done again, I believe. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. Any additional questions? Okay, if not, we will move on to line #24, Recommendation 10.2. Vanda, this is yours. The recommendation is the GAC, in conjunction with the GNSO, must develop methodologies to ensure that GAC and government input is provided to ICANN policy development processes and that the GAC has effective opportunities to provide input and guidance on draft policy development outcomes.

The ICANN assessment was implemented and, Vanda, you said "not implemented." So please go ahead and give us some background on your thoughts here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This came out from our discussion face to face with the GNSO and the GAC because they do not have what they want to, and this recommendation suggests a full process. To go back like they have, GAC and the Board have put in place. So it's something that they started trying to make happen with the liaison, but it looks like it's not working and there is complaint from both sides. So I do believe that that's it.

EN

They didn't make what was suggested to make clear for the GNSO. Just to make it more clear, remember the GNSO complained that they would like to have more interaction and clear, timely responses from the GAC about the communication issues that affected them. Normally, before the next face-to-face meeting, sometimes they need to change solution software or implementation process inside the registry or registrars, and they'd like to have more clarification, feedback for questions and so on. This interaction is not really working. So that's why I stated it's not really implemented.

We have discussed this with the members in the GAC, with the members in the GNSO. And this process is really a need for both sides and maybe uses the same approach done with the Board and the GAC. Adjust in this to fit in the GNSO may be the solution. Sometimes the staff together with the liaison could solve some of those problems but do not have a clear process, it's hard to complain that is not done and the time is passing and the answer is not coming. These kind of things that I believe needs a clear process.

PAT KANE: Thank you for that, Vanda. Cheryl, your hand is raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is but let's –

PAT KANE: Alright, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to say that I know there's something in place and it's good to hear the work that Vanda has done with both teams and she got their buy-in, which is good. Just to say that the process we have in place with the GAC the BGRI, which is really focusing on how do we communicate better? So purely on process improvements and a commitment from both sides has been very well appreciated. Both GNSO and GAC leaders have indicated that such a thing may be good. So I can see this is relatively low hanging fruits with a good buy-in.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. Here I'm going to take off my co-Chair hat with you, Pat, and put on my "I happen to sit on the GNSO Council as the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council" hat, and also draw on a little bit of experience from ATRT since they were ever formed. The matter of Board-GAC interactions and the progress that Maarten has outlined again, it was a particular focus right back in ATRT1. When we came out of joint project agreements, it was part of the mandatory things that ATRTs were to look at because it was seen as so important and, in fact, so desperately in need of sorting out.

So please, just remember how long it has taken then for the Board-GAC interactions to get to where they are today, and that's a good thing where they are today. But we're pushing a decade now. The Board-GAC

EN

is a good example but the work has been done with the GNSO and GAC has also been going on for a very long time. It has had recommendations come out of all previous ATRTs, and I would suggest reasonable amount of work has happened including – I would encourage us to consider rather than a "not implemented" ranking on this, a "work in progress" ranking on this because there is work and an intention, as Vanda has indicated, a desire to continue to work on this issue.

But the point with the GNSO is a little bit more complicated than it is with something like Board-GAC because the liaisons are between the two, the AC and the SO. So the liaison is between the GNSO Council and the GAC as she comes together that interaction-wise with the GAC leadership. Of course, policy development processes are managed by the GNSO Council but they don't happen in the GNSO Council, they happen in policy development processes. So we also probably need to link in here and recognize what is happening in a more positive light that also encourage it to continue to improve and to look for ways for codifying and solidifying good ways of this earlier intervention that even Work Stream 2 talked about. That is of course things like the GAC's recent development of focus groups on particular policy issues and that those focus groups are meeting where possible and proactively independently with leadership of the various policy development processes.

So there's stuff happening but there is a big difference. It's not just a matter of throwing a couple of liaisons at each other because of the nature of how policy development occurs in the GNSO world as opposed to a more puristically bilateral opportunity between Board and

EN

GAC. So, work in progress in my view. Recommendations we should be making include "thank you, keep up the good work" but a whole lot more needs to happen and recognize the unique aspects. Thanks.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I can agree because we heard what happened, it is not [ever] happened and that we could put this in the yellow one, that is work in progress but not really reaching what they expected from both sides. Even the working groups for Policy Working Groups that I have answered in other questions, that was working is not large enough for keeping some points that may be of interest more from GNSO members done for GAC.

Those are issues that need to be addressed. That's why I put "not implemented" but I can live with this idea of a yellow that is "work in progress." They are trying. Sure they are trying. It's not reaching there but they are trying. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Do we have any more questions? Okay, not seeing any. Let's move on then to line #25, Recommendation 10.3. This came off the consent agenda. And so, Sebastien, we'll go to you when I read this. The Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need for ensuring more global participation in GNSO policy development processes, as well as other GNSO processes.

Now, one of the comments that Erica made that I wanted to follow up with her on after this is it's unclear to me which specific program or

design to complete Recommendation 10.3 specifically. So I would ask from an ICANN assessment standpoint, do we have anything from staff that can point those to gather in terms of what we say ICANN assessment is implemented, what programs are you using to say implemented? Then, Sebastien, if you would go ahead and make your comment here, that would be great.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. My question was more about – I agree with your question and the question raised here. And I don't see why CROP is one of the items. Maybe the CROP was in the GNSO. It's used differently from the one in At-Large and in the RALOs, but I a have difficulty to match the two items here. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Okay. So we'll follow up with that with the one note to staff and we'll also follow up with Erica on that if we can catch her offline. Alright, thank you, Sebastien.

Alright, the next one we've got is line #27, #10.5, and that is the Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities, of those ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players.

Tola, this is yours. I know Sebastien pulled this back onto the discussion list. So, Sebastien, if we could start with your question. And then, Tola, if you'd be prepared to respond please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. My question was, can we have a little bit of meat around the bone to know what was the implementation, how it was done? Because I have trouble to follow that. Thank you.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Yeah, this is Tola. Sebastien, can you please clarify the question?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My question is, can we have a little bit of – but it's the same that, in fact, Pat has written. If we can get some detail about how we can be sure that it's implemented and how it was implemented and how it's effective. I have trouble to follow that. Thank you.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Okay. Thank you. While I was reviewing … first, let me read again. They both must facilitate the [equitable participation] of [inaudible]. My network is going off and on. I don't know what you can hear from me now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I also hear someone typing, Tola. So if everybody could mute, it would really help, then we could hear you a bit better. Thank you.

TOLA SOGBESAN: I have not been hearing everybody clearly. The network is going off and on but I'll manage to … Maybe what I'll do is while people can hear me properly, maybe I'll just quickly chat and type in the chat and maybe

EN

that will be better. I'll manage to speak. If nobody could hear me properly then I'll quickly type in the chat, whatever is better.

PAT KANE:	Tola, this is Pat. We're still having a little bit of trouble hearing you and the clicking is actually coming from your phone I think. Everyone else is muted. So I would take you up on the offer of you going in and actually adding the additional details inside the spreadsheet to address the question that which is, "Let's get a little more meat on the bones." Alright? Any objections to that? No? Good. We'll move on. Thank you, Tola. Sorry that we can't hear you very well today.

Alright, so let's move on to the next one. The next we have is #28. Osvaldo, this is yours. December 28, Recommendation 11.1. Institutionalization of the Review Process. The Board should ensure that the ongoing work of the AoC reviews, including implementation, is fed into the work of other ICANN strategic activities wherever appropriate.

You've got implemented with a question. You say "it seems to be implemented." My question was, what do you mean by "it seems to be implemented"? Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA:	Sorry, I was on mute. Excuse me. I didn't do this one. Let me check. I forgot I did this. I'm sorry.

Okay, yes, sure. What I detected was that in the new Bylaws, there are reviews that are established that was in the Affirmation of Commitments. From what I see, all the reviews are done periodically as

EN

before. So I think the institutionalization was in the Bylaws. That's why I put there "it seems to be implemented" and it seems to be effective. Was I clear? Sorry.

PAT KANE: No, no. You came across clear and I get what you're saying. Do we have any other questions for Osvaldo here? I don't see any, Osvaldo, so thank you very much. We'll move on to the next one which is –

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Pat. It was my written comment in the document, but what was the role of Work Stream 1 on that issue? Because if I remember well, yes, all the AoC review are now in the Bylaw following the Work Stream 1 work. The question is that, is it included in the strategic activity? That's another point. I think with the new strategic planning, it is, but I'm not sure that it was before. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien. Alright, let's move to #30 which is Recommendation 11.3. Appointment of Review Teams. The Board should ensure that AoC Review Teams are appointed in a timely fashion, allowing them to complete their work in the minimum one year period that the review is supposed to take place, regardless of the time when the team is established. It is important for ICANN to factor in the cycle of AoC reviews. The Review Team selection process should begin at the earliest point in time possible given its mandate.

EN

Now, Sebastien, you had asked that we pull this back onto discussion today, so if you would go ahead and give us your concern or question?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. My question is that – in fact, it may be a more global overarching comment – when we have recommendation about link with the Affirmation of Commitment with the role of the Board, the situation have completely changed within ICANN because now there's no anymore AoC, there is a new type of organization with the community, and it's sometimes difficult to know what was really done and in which [inaudible]. Here we have to have a look.

At least one of the reasons I wanted to put it back is to be sure that we will have a discussion on what ATRT3 think about that, not about what was done with the recommendation of ATRT2 but what the current situation is. We may need to come back on that to have a full discussion. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you for that, Sebastien. The one thing I would add on to that is that since this particular one is really about the review teams themselves as well, and since all those review teams found a way into the current set of Bylaws, that I think it's still pertinent to what we're talking about, regardless of it being AoC or not. And I do like the idea that we very strongly consider adding our own comment into this particular space as well. Cheryl, please.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. Yes, we must stop thinking like each other. People will begin to talk. This is another one of those spots where I think it's an opportunity for our report to note the significant change of the nature of the organization as well as a lot of the nomenclature that has changed in the time between ATRT2 making its recommendations and of course where we are now with an Empowered Community and post all the work of the IANA Transition Cross-Community Working Group and in the Cross-Community Working Groups using Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 activities. We just need to make sure – and I believe it is the intention, even shown in the template the skeleton of the report at this stage that we did do that. But this is a good example, maybe a little highlighted boxed example of where we can point that out. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Cheryl. If we could then now move to line #31 which is Recommendation 11.4. Complete implementation reports. The Board should prepare a complete implementation report to be ready by review kick-off. This report should be submitted for public consultation, and relevant benchmarks and metrics must be incorporated in the report.

Staff recommendation or ICANN assessment was implemented. Jaap, I'm not sure – we didn't take a position on – implemented partially, not implemented? So, I'd like your thought as to why we can't put our finger on what the assessment should be there. Jaap?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Sorry about that. This is Jaap speaking. Can you hear me now?

EN

PAT KANE: Yes, we can. Thank you, Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Headset just went out. Battery power. Sorry about that. [Sure it is], it's not being done at all. There's no report. It cannot be found anywhere. I mean that's the basic problem there. But if you look, follow the various links which I put out in memo, then you will notice that it's actually changed [for the worse]. And somewhere there's a note that says that – what they did was they did create some templates which are nowhere to be found and started doing the work. The leaders should be able to able to go back again to the beginning, it's kind of a mess. In the end, you find somewhere that they actually do some work and make stuff. I get impression that I think that the indicator [inaudible] things are actually being seen as [inaudible] instead of the report. The quality of the various [dashboards] seems to be failing. Since people are allowed to give comments on it, they might say that completely [morphed] into this effort. I guess the best way to be is to actually check with the organization if my conclusions are right because that's why I said I'm not sure whether I'm whether [inaudible] at all here.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jaap. Jennifer, if we could take an action to try to find what Jaap is looking for here since he can't find the foundation for this recommendation, it would be very helpful.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: You can find the recommendation. You find that it may show implementation, and that's where we sent it. If you could follow that, it points to some site where it says this is where the templates. Then you find they don't exist anymore. But if you search things – and I think I put it in my memo – that talk about [inaudible] and looked like it was put into the dashboard, but if that's so, probably we want to know that for sure.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jaap. Any other questions for Jaap on this one?'

Okay, the next one we have is line #34, which is Recommendation 11.7. Demi is with us today. Good. Implementation Timeframes. In responding to review team recommendations, the Board should provide an expected timeframe for implementation, and if that timeframe is different from one given by the review team, the rationale should address the difference.

There's not a assessment, Demi, in the implementation standpoint. I was wondering what you can share with us on your thoughts there.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Hello?

PAT KANE: We can hear you, Demi. Yes.

EN

DEMI GETSCHKO: Okay, I really don't have much to add to this. I don't find really the clear report of the timeframe for implementing things. I look at some documents here and there. I have to make a more precise question to staff to help them to find that. But it's just reflecting the fact that it seems to be working well, but I didn't find really an exact point where we have the report of the time used to complete the request. It's just the initial comment I have to work more on that. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Okay. Thank you, Demi. Any other questions there? Jennifer, again, if we can find some [indication] that would be appropriate here, that would be great.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel speaking. Just a side question.

PAT KANE: Hey, Daniel. If you could [inaudible], that would be helpful.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Regarding the implementation timeframes, I think sometimes it might be a little bit challenging to come up with the timeframe for specific review. What is the process of justifying the timeframe is adequate enough within the stipulated period versus one year. In case it goes beyond one year for the review, because like some other review teams

best challenges. For example, SSR review. The team has been having challenges. How are those challenges mitigated? Because those challenges affect the effectiveness of the process. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Daniel, I'm not certain I caught the exact question that you got. I heard some of the lead-up to it. Could you type into chat the specific question that you have please?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'll type it. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Now I heard you great. While Daniel is typing, Maarten, please go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Just very much aware that – and I don't want to disturb this assessment as such but what's very much at the core of our focus at the moment is how do we get prioritization and budgeting right of recommendations. That is the step before this. This will influence how we will be able to handle this as well. Just for our mindsets.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Are you suggesting that maybe what we do here is part of ATRT3 and nay set of recommendations that we provide around

rationalization and prioritization but [inaudible] here and not focus so much on – whether it was done in ATRT2 or not.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes.

PAT KANE: Okay. I think that's great. Daniel, is that acceptable for you in terms of what your question is? Does it give you thumbs up or a thumbs down? Yes or a no? Please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think that's fine. We can proceed.

PAT KANE: Great. Thank you very much. Alright, any other questions on 34? Alright, so the next one we've got is 37. Recommendation 12.3. Cheryl, this is yours.

Every three years the Board should conduct a benchmark study on relevant parameters suitable for a non-profit organization. If the result of the benchmark is that ICANN as an organization is not in line with the standards of comparable organizations, the Board should consider aligning the deviation.

You've got a lot of information here and I think that you've sold me on "not implemented," but since it was listed as "not implemented," I just would like to get a couple of comments from you here if we could.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Although I did think I was pretty explicit in my notes. In my notes you can see the genesis of where this came from. I simply can find no evidence of this having being implemented in a post ATRT2 world, it of course has been a busy time and an enormous amount of change has happened within the organization, so I think this is another one of those we need to recognize the significant, almost revolution at one point but certainly evolution in a number of ways that the organization has gone through. But we also need to recognize that even though ICANN is a very unique beast, it is not utterly and absolutely isolated in terms of some of the parameters that these recommended benchmark studies can call upon. It is a recommendation at ATRT2 and for whatever reasons and perhaps Maarten might want to take this up and ask a question on our behalf that it appears to have not been implemented because of all the reasons I'm giving. I'm happy to answer any questions but putting up other benchmark transparency initiatives is not looking at the organizational standards in terms of comparable organizations. There is no single comparable organization but there are aspects of other organizations which are comparable, and that is what ATRT2 recommendation was asking for. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Maarten, your hand is raised.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. I'm happy to respond this. The best response I can give right now which is that I know that the loop in particular for levels of staff

EN

composition is very much a benchmark. Staff internally is obviously work not for the C-level. We make sure of the comparisons. I'm not sure it happens every three years but I think this is almost a permanent basis. It's true that it's probably not true for all the other factors in terms of that. I'm not sure about that comparability of composition has our explicit attention for sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Maarten. We need to see that. From an external point of view, looking at transparency and accountability, you can do it in a cave and that's great for the cave dwellers. But shine a little light on it. That is what an ATRT2 recommendation was asking for. That is what is not evidential at least in my [inaudible] apparently very limited abilities to search the ICANN archives. And we do recognize that there are issues with the knowledge management within the ICANN web world. But you'll note my tone, my friend. More work really should be done. Just to get back to [inaudible] who's talking about KPIs, etc. – and I will not go down the rabbit hole of what I think about the antiquated terminology of KPI, let alone how useful or should I say useless that actually are in a modern governance environment, so you can see where my views are coming from on that. But no, we are talking about significant comparisons on similar organizations. The organization itself may have KPI linkages to remuneration, and that's fine and that's dandy, in fact. But for those that have been remunerated, if they're successful – but this is talking about keeping on par. The reason why this is important is this allows an organization to maintain and attract top-notch staff. That's why from a governance perspective, this issue is important. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Cheryl. That brings us to the end of the spreadsheet. What I would recommend that we do from here, unless there are any objections again by hitting no inside the participant window, what we'll do is we'll go through and we'll have the follow-up questions that we need to send to those that were not on the call when we cover them and then we'll get the updated spreadsheet. Then next week, if we've got specific questions or conversations in those areas, we'll do a follow-up.

And, Cheryl, I know you and I haven't talked about this yet, but I'll recommend that we take one last look at it, call out the things that are clearly not in alignment, and then declare this thing done in the next couple of weeks. So unless there are any objections to that process, we'll go ahead and do the follow up and have outlier discussions next week and then declare done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, despite my typos in the chat, yeah, I'm happy to follow your lead on this. I think I just wanted to compliment everybody on the progress made and the good work done in this way forward. Remember, we are taking "light touch" on this in terms of making our own recommendation, but this is a very useful piece of work. One of the things I think we should also stop thinking about, Pat, is having got this data acquisition and review work done, when we declare "done," how are we going to formulate it in a easy-to-digest-and-understand way in our final report. I mean, sure, we can just end with this but I think it

deserves a great deal more than just an appendix status and a single line in the introduction of the report and a section. So we might want to start putting our thinking caps on on ways that we can also display this, whether it's graphically or otherwise. That might just need to be contemplated.

I see Bernie's hand is up. He's already contemplated it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Yes, I've already been thinking about that. No great solutions proposed yet. Another point though is once we do finish this as the icing on that cake, we may want to think about some general recommendations about this whole exercise about ATRT2 having made recommendations and the Board having gone to them and why the assessments are different in a number of cases. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It works for me. Pat?

PAT KANE: Thank you. Yes, that works for me as well. Alright, if we want to move on to the next agenda item, which is Any Other Business, ATRT3 Fact Sheets. Cheryl, I'm going to give this back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Thank you very much. We had appended to the agenda that went out to you all the current fact sheets that we have asked you to

review. The leadership team took a little bit of time with staff after our meeting on Monday to look at the documents. I just wanted to make sure two things with those documents. First of all, we'll open up in a moment for any questions or any clarifications or any comments because they haven't become public yet. So if you want to make any suggestions or editorial comments, do so in the next couple of minutes and we will discuss them and take those into account. But just to remind ourselves and also to make sure we remind our communities that these fact sheets are snapshots in time and these fact sheets are to – correct me if I'm wrong, Jennifer – but these are end of June snapshot. So there has been, for example, when some of you look at things you go, "Hang on. We're further along than that." Well, that's actually happened post 30 June. But these are standardized reporting templates that are published for all review teams and we wanted to give you the opportunity to review them and raise anything we ask for on list ahead of the call. But we've also said, if you've got anything in the chat function during the meeting, please do so. Jennifer has affirmed that the snapshot 30 June is accurate. Because we've got about five minutes to spare, if you haven't put anything into the list that haven't seen anything on the list, or you haven't put anything in chat and I've missed it, feel free to raise your hands now.

I noticed Maarten's hand is up, so we'll go to him next. But just any brief comments at this. No, Maarten's hand is down. So, one last opportunity.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	No, no. I just have one question that struck me because as such, these are useful. We understand them. But for instance this whole ATRT3 Fact Sheet June 2019, there's a Section 1 which is people's indications of hours and Section 2 which is financial resources. Just trying to understand financial resources for ICANN Org support $150,000. Is that other stuff than hours? Because there's 233 hours spent but zero dollars. Maybe this $150,000 is for other things like computer time or whatever. That was the only inconsistency that I couldn't get my fingers behind.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I'm going to ask Negar or Jennifer to respond to that. Thank you.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	This is Jennifer. The fact sheet that we're looking at here, it says the ICANN Org support $150,000, nothing spent and committed to date. Off the top of my head, I have to confirm what exactly is included in that figure. I think it might actually have some more details on the wiki page, but I'll confirm that and then get back to the list on that one. Thanks.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	So, Maarten, what you're suggesting is that this is not sufficiently explained and that what we may need to do is have an annotation or an additional note made around what that $150,000 is for. Noting that of course June 30 what that $150,000 is, is the approved budget, it may not have been allocated and therefore "removed or spent" and this might be an artifact. And if it's an artifact, I'm sure we can pick that up

in an annotation as well. But to have that clearer is important but I need to remind all of us that what we're using here is a standardized template across all of the review teams, as staff has made clear to me when I've asked questions about these things, and so we would need to annotate on our wiki, not on this actual template. Back to you, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's actually that professional services is pretty clear. Travel is pretty clear. ICANN Org support is just like, "What's this $150,000? Is this hours or is it something else, basically?" That would help. Anyway, we'll find the answer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maarten. May I suggest finding the answer is important. Staff would take an eye to do that, but what's equally important is to have that annotation, that explanatory as part of our wiki page that goes to be published along with the publishing of this standardized template. Obviously, we can't change the template but we can annotate our wiki to make an explanation so it's clear to everybody.

Okay, I'm assuming silence is absolute agreement with me. Is there any other questions raised on that? Because obviously staff want to get this published as soon as possible, and I now have a single AI associated with it. If not then I think that section of our agenda is done. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: I was muted. Apologies. Close out with confirmed actions or decisions reached. Jennifer?

EN

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. A couple of action items. First of all, there's a number of areas of clarification that we noted during the ATRT2 implementation discussion. So we can go through those and pull out the areas of clarification for staff and questions for other review team members. I think that staff and Bernie can work together on that one. Then as a follow up to that, obviously send out those questions, and then the AI there just to double-check on the ICANN Org support and the fact sheet, and we'll add some annotations to make those clear as to exactly what they are.

That's all I captured. Let me know if I missed anything. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jennifer, for that. With that, Cheryl, unless you've got anything else, I think nobody has any questions, I think we're done for the day. I see no other indication by hands or checkmarks. So, yes, we're done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everybody. And thanks, Pat. A lot done today. Between last week and this week, you've really done an amazing amount of work on some extremely important issues. But I've got to say the details behind that are also very impressive. So, thanks to all the individuals for the proprietary work on all of the ATRT2 implementation assessment as well. Thank, everyone, and bye for now. We can stop the recording.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]