

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 plenary call number 27 on the 28th of August 2019 at 11:00 UTC. The members attending the call today are Cheryl, Pat, Vanda, Jacques, Sébastien, Jaap, Demi, and Maarten.

Observers joining us are Everton Rodrigues, Avri Doria, and Sophie Hey. We have guests Carlos Reyes, Jana Juginovic, Ozan Sahin, and Chantelle Doerksen. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer Bryce, Negar and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie has joined today. We have apologies from Wolfgang and Michael.

Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to our co-chairs, Pat and Cheryl. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten is here too. Just arrived. Sorry for being on the spot, on the minute.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Maarten.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Brenda. We'll just dig in, and a few more people will undoubtedly join, and Brenda will capture them in the record in terms of roll call as they join the Zoom room.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

First thing on the agenda today is to ask for any of the review team that may have any statements of interest updates. We work under continuous disclosure, so if you have any updates for your statement of interest, now is the time to let us all know.

Not hearing anybody or seeing anyone, we'll just remind everybody that as we have a guest team, the public comment team are going to be talking to the review team today about various aspects on the public comments system within ICANN and some of the updates to things that are going on in that. We'll be taking that as our first agenda item.

We're then going to move on to discussing our reporting template, and then look at some of the questions that are still outstanding regarding our review of the ATRT2 implementation, with any of the items from follow-up.

We're going to have a look at our survey and see where we are with regards to that, just a general status update, and then Any Other Business. If anybody has Any Other Business they'd like to let us know about now, please do so. We will of course call for Any Other Business again before the end of what will be a two-hour call today. Just to remind you, we did extend today's meeting to the longer time period from the usual 90 minutes to up to two hours because we do have a goodly amount to get through as we also, in report templating, will be looking at the very specific criteria that needs to be addressed with regards to making recommendations. So we'll dig into that a little later on.

---

With that, that's our agenda for today. I'm not seeing any Any Other Business that people are going to bring forward. So without delay, let's move on to what information and update the public comment team have for us. There's about three or four of you. Who's going to take the lead? Jana, is it going to be you, or whom? Carlos has got his hand up. Does that mean you're stepping forward, Carlos? Okay. Whoever's got the lead, over to you.

CARLOS REYES:

Yes, thank you, Cheryl. Hi, everyone. With my colleagues today, Ozan and Chantelle, Jana, we'll be giving you an update on some of the planned updates and improvements to public comment. The goal here is to inform your work as you look at public comment as a mechanism for community feedback and input at ICANN.

We have some slides. I will not spend too much time on some of the basic information that most of you are likely familiar with. Instead, we'll focus on these improvements that we have been working on for the last several months.

One thing to note as we move ahead, we will be giving you a demonstration of some of the improved pages for public comment. So those are not yet live, but we wanted you to see some of this work. Next slide, please.

Alright. So just a quick, basic overview. As you know, public comment is really a key mechanism at ICANN as part of policy development, but also implementation work, the output of reviews such as this group, obviously strategic planning and other operational activities.

---

Public comment goes beyond policy development, and it's really a cornerstone of how ICANN the organization engages with the public, as well as the ICANN community. You'll see a lot of public comment proceedings from different community groups. Next slide, please.

The policy development support team took over managing the public comment process in 2015, and since then, we've brought in some internal discipline, mostly just managing the process, approving tickets as they come in but also ensuring timeliness. That's on two ends. One, ensuring that proceedings are the minimum of 40 days, unless there are other reasons to limit that, and then also ensuring the summary report is published on time. And thirdly, we're also overseeing the process for quality control, just ensuring the templates are complete, that they're consistent, etc. Next slide please.

This is just an overview of our process. Basically our staff prepare the templates and we review them, the web team creates a webpage and the mailing list, and then our communications team publishes that information, the announcement to ICANN.org. Next slide please.

Moving ahead toward the areas of improvement, internally, we've been looking at public comment, and we realized a few things. One, public comment has never really been defined. It's not in the bylaws. The closest definition we have is the GNSO operational procedures, and because of this lack of a definition, I think over time and over the years, we've seen public comment sort of evolve.

I think that's a good thing as the community evolves, so should public comment. But we need to fundamentally bring in some areas of

---

improvement around purpose, what is the purpose of public comment, how is public comment as a mechanism accountable, how are we communicating about public comment, and what is the infrastructure that we have in place to support that. So these are the four areas we've identified, and we're making progress on these fronts. Next slide, please.

I'll quickly touch on the purpose here, and then Chantelle will explain a little bit more of what we've been doing in this areas as well as accountability. But really, as I mentioned, we haven't had this definition, so in March, earlier this year right after the Kobe meeting, the ICANN Org executive team asked David Olive, and then David Olive asked the public comment team, to develop internal guidelines for what should be posted for public comment and when.

So we've been working on that. We have a draft that should be ready for internal publication to help our colleagues with that. We're targeting really the next few weeks. We had a deadline of the upcoming ICANN 66 meeting in Montréal, so that's all very much on target.

I'll pause here and hand it over to my colleague, Chantelle, and she'll guide you through some of the work that we've been doing on these guidelines.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

The guidelines for public comment that we're working on are to define when they should be used and to enforce the idea that public comment is the primary method of soliciting community feedback. Next slide, please.

In terms of accountability, the idea that by setting up these guidelines, it's going to create a clear process of when the public comment should be initiated versus some of the other alternative tracks that we've been seeing. And this reinforces the transparency expectations that the community and public have on ICANN, and it's also going to create a very clear way to track the comment submissions over time. Next slide, please.

One of the areas that's very important here is we really want to reinforce the idea that public comment [inaudible] is the default mechanism for ICANN to seek feedback from the community and the general public. Next slide, please.

As many of you know, when a public comment proceeding is initiated, they typically have a few key themes that are involved. One is the governance document, the ICANN bylaws, operating procedures, community charters, policy recommendations including the draft or initial reports, final reports and registry agreements, organizational reviews that will affect ICANN, supporting organization or advisory committee.

We also realize there's [thought] of other documents that aren't included in those categories but that they also merit having a public comment proceeding initiated, cross-community working group output, implementation work, and we really want this to be the first place that ICANN members will go to when they're deciding what avenue to take when soliciting community feedback.

---

---

So the main takeaway is we want to make sure that anytime community feedback is sought, that the first step would be to consider whether or not the public comment proceedings should be initiated.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to my colleague, Ozan, to go over some of the changes that will be happening. Ozan, over to you.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Chantelle. This is Ozan Sahin, also part of the public comment team, and I would like to talk about the public comment reports prepared by ICANN Org and some of their findings. So if you can go to the next slide.

These reports are prepared on an annual basis and posted on confluence or in other words community Wiki, and you can see a screenshot in your screen on the slide, and please note that the 2018 report preparation work is underway, and this report will be posted here soon. Can we go to the next slide?

And let's look at some of the key findings of this report. I'd like to highlight the number of public comment proceedings. You see a charter showing the number of public comment proceedings from 2010 to 2017, and you may note that the total number of public comment proceedings has declined approximately 10% each year.

If you can go to the next slide, it will show us the percentage of public comment proceedings this time that received zero comment over the course of eight years, and you may note that there's a notable decrease

---

in the percentage of proceeds experiencing zero comments since 2014. In 2015 and 2017, having no zero-comment proceedings.

So if we can go to the next slide on key findings, this is the final one, and this one has raised the length of time public comment proceedings remained open for comment by years 2010 to 2017, and here it's important to note the length of time increase from an average of 43 days to 51 days throughout 2012 to 2017.

If you're interested in further information and findings, you may visit the public comments reports Wiki page and paste in the link to the reports in the chat box for your convenience now, and please note that there's a PDF macro glitch on the Wiki at the moment which IT team is looking at, and you will need to log in to be able to see the reports at this point.

With that, I will turn it over to my colleague, Carlos, for the rest of this presentation. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES:

Thank you, Chantelle and Ozan. Next slide, please. So we're getting to talk more about the next two slides, really just how a public comment is seen outside of the ICANN Org. Another areas, the third area of improvement is communication. Right now, when a public proceeding opens, there's really no communication strategy behind that. How do we promote it? How do we encourage participation and submissions?

So working with our communications team, we're going to look at that and ensure that that changes for the future. This obviously requires



---

some collaboration with our global stakeholder engagement team as well. They do a lot of outreach and encouraging participation from all of our stakeholders. Next slide, please.

So infrastructure, as I mentioned, most of you have probably used public comment, and currently, I think the experience falls short. I think the system is not as nimble or agile as it should be, and it's not as responsive.

So as we're looking at certain areas of improvement, one, to better guide the community and educate for these opportunities that are available based on their interest, two, to empower everyone to participate, and then three, it increases transparency of ICANN Org, ICANN board and ICANN community activities through improved search. And then also internally, we're just working on more efficiency and automation. So we'll talk a little bit about the information transparency initiative on the next slide, please.

You may have heard of ITI, the information transparency initiative. This is an organization-wide effort, and we're really working to improve accessibility and findability of information on ICANN Org. We're doing this through rebuilding the technical infrastructure and then also putting in place [inaudible] governance and taxonomy. And as I mentioned, ITI has focused on public comment. Next slide, please.

What have we been doing as part of ITI? We have new pages that have been designed and approved. We sought feedback internally from our colleagues that use public comment a lot as well as community

feedback sessions at ICANN 64. So we've been able to get a lot of really good input.

Next steps, just so that you're familiar, we are looking at platforms and testing platforms to replace Mailman. Mailman has never really been the best platform for public comment, so we've been testing different tools there. And then as a result of all these changes, we will have new workflows internally, and along with that, we'll conduct briefings and trainings for the organization.

I'll pause here. I think there's been a lot of really good feedback and questions in the chat. My colleagues and I are monitoring that. I'm going to hand it over to my colleague, Jana. She'll give you a demonstration of some of the work that the ITI team has developed. And then we'll leave some time for questions. So Jana, over to you.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

Thanks, Carlos. Hi, everyone. Thanks for taking the time to listen and hear about what we've been doing with ITI on public comment. I'm going to share my screen right now, and hopefully you all can see it.

So you're seeing on your screen right now what the current public comment pages look like on ICANN.org. I'm sure most of you are very familiar with it. Some of the deficiencies that you know exist with the current public comment is you can't search for submissions, search is quite limited on the current public comment pages on ICANN.org. It's not easy to find information and past information, so once public comments have been closed.

So the intent of the changes that we're making to public comment, as Carlos mentioned, is to improve the search, improve the ability to filter your search, search for things that you previously couldn't search for like other submissions, and to improve the process by which you submit public comments. So as Carlos mentioned, we're testing various platforms, which once we have one, we would conduct usability testing with the communities to see how they feel about the new submission process.

What you're going to see now is some of the changes that we're making to public comment. Now, the data that you see on these pages are test data and these are just base implementation of the wireframes.

As you see here, now we have a section of the homepage, this is where you land on the homepage, here you'd see you have breadcrumbs which we currently don't have on the site. This will actually help people find out where they are in the information architecture of the website.

Here you have the ability to subscribe to public comment, so if you're interested in all things public comment, you could subscribe with your e-mail address, and anytime a new public comment was posted, you'd be able to get an alert via e-mail, either daily or weekly. The share buttons allow you to share the page on social media or via e-mail or copy and paste a link to the page.

On the right rail here, you'd see the most recent public comment submissions, so it'd give you a brief excerpt of the public comment, a link to the individual public comment and ability to read more about

---

---

that submission. So the most recent three would be here as a way of promoting the most recent submissions.

Further down on the right rail, you'd have the most recent content posted, so whether it was a public comment report or other content that's been published, it would appear here in this box. Then you would have links obviously to the expected standards of behavior and the terms of service.

Back to the main part of the page, you'd have the open public comment proceedings where you'd have the selection of the actual public comment here that you'd be able to click on that would take you to the page. If you wanted to see a short description of the page, you'd open this chevron here which would take you to this content here which would give you a bit of context for what this public comment is about and who is requesting the public comment.

You see here we have this is new, it would take you to a column here that shows how many submissions have been made, so you could click on the number here and it would take you to all the submissions that have been made to this particular public comment. And here it shows you how many days are left and the closing date for the individual public comment.

Further down, you'd have the pending reports that are available for public comment here, and then upcoming public comment proceedings, so a promotion of what public comments are on the horizon which show a short description. Obviously there's no link yet until the public

---

comment would be posted, and then you have the ability to see all if you wanted to see all of them, so that's available there.

For closed public comments, I'll show you that in a few moments where you'd be able to search for closed public comments. Going back up here to an individual public comment – I'm going to click on this one – so this is the new layout for an individual public comment page. It shows right up front how many days are remaining for the community to submit public comment. You can follow this topic. So if you were interested in only this particular public comment as opposed to all public comment, again, you could follow this comment and get updates via e-mail when new submissions or content are added for this particular public comment.

If this public comment was available in other languages, you'd actually use the selection up here as you would on a multilingual site, because the new site would be enabled for multilingual content. If there's any content that's outside of the UN six, you would find the different language here, so Portuguese, Korean, Turkish if the public comment was translated.

The timeline is here, so you would see when the public comment opened for submissions, if the public comment was extended, when it's closed and when the report is due.

The timeline's now automated so it's not a graphic as you see here in current public comments which have a graphical representation so it's not as automated as it should be.

This is something that we added here to bring more clarity in terms of what we're seeking public comment on. There was some feedback that we received that was quite confusing, a lot of text on the page, way too much information, so it's hard to figure out what one was seeking public comment on.

So we looked at various other organizations that use a public comment feature to see how they organize pages and obviously sought feedback from the community. After we have this, what we need your input on, you'd have the material section, so the materials that correspond to what you're seeking public comment on, your requester, the staff contact and an e-mail address if one has questions and the ability to submit your public comment.

Here, this is also new, what we hope to achieve, so what this public comment is intended to deliver. And then next steps for the public comment. If there's supporting information, it's here, separated from the actual materials and [what we're] seeking public comment on.

And this is a feature that we have throughout the site that automatically adds content here that is supported by taxonomy that is similar to what one is seeking public comment on, so if it was about a particular content type, like budget or something like that, it would actually have links here to things that were similar, previous budgets or any taxonomy trends below.

As you see on the right rail, you already saw the timeline, and then here you have recent submissions that apply to this particular public comment, and then be able to view all of the submissions, and then

---

here how the public comment works, expected standards of behavior and terms of service.

As I mentioned here, if you wanted to see the submissions, you'd click here, it would take you to a page that shows the submissions for that particular public comment. It would give you these two [inaudible] boxes that show you the materials or the ability to make a submission, or to search the submissions, which we don't have now .So this is a new feature that will take all the submissions and aggregate them and allow you to search by keyword.

So you would enter in your term here, it would create a chip, you can enter in many key terms, hit "search" and your search would apply. If you wanted to change your search, you would just "clear all." If you wanted to download the results of all the submissions to a spreadsheet, to a CSV file, you'd be able to do that. Click this button here and it will download the results which would apply the name and then have a link to the actual individual public comment submission here. You could sort by date as well if you wanted to see most recent or if you wanted to search in reverse chronological order.

If you wanted to see this entire public comment submission, you'd click on it and it would apply, take you to this page which would show you who submitted the comment, if they came from a particular organization, SO/AC or other organization, the date that it was submitted, what they were replying public comment on, and some text if there was any text and any attachments that they added to their individual public comment submission.

---

Down here to the closed public comment proceedings, again right now you don't have a great way of searching previous public comments, so now we're going to have a select year where you'll be able to select the year that you're interested in seeing for the public comment that you're interested in, so a quick search here. Again, it would take you to a keyword search if you wanted to search for keywords within the closed public comment proceedings documents or pages. Again, you could download the results if you wanted to select just wanted to see all the closed proceedings for an individual year, or you could select and download that to CSV and include all the links to the main public comment page of the individual public comment.

So when you're looking at the closed proceedings, it shows you the link to the individual page, shows you a short description, gives you a quick link to the report, allows you to see how many people had submitted comments to that individual public comment, and the date that it closed on.

When I click on the page for a closed one, it would show you that quite clearly that the public comment is closed, what the outcome was – because we thought that it would be helpful to add so folks had a bookend to see what we intended and what the outcome was, and then individual links and download the report and what we received public comment on and the materials and the like. As you saw, that was on the other pages.

So keeps intact all the content that was on the pages, and then just provides a little bit more context for what we receive public comment on.

---



---

That in a nutshell is some of the changes that we're working on for the public comment pages. Obviously as Carlos mentioned, the next steps would be to do usability testing, and once the proposal for the Mailman replacement is finalized, we would obviously seek the community's feedback in terms of seeing the usability of that Mailman replacement and seeing how it works, particularly for search and the ease of submission which obviously would be most important for folks in the community.

That's it for me. Please let me know if you have any questions.

CARLOS REYES:

Thank you, Jana. With this, we conclude our presentation going over these areas for improvement and public comment. I've seen – I think the team, we've been handling most of the questions in the chat, but I'll pause here to see if there are any other questions. Jana, you may want to take a look at the chat. There were a few questions while you were speaking.

But I'll pause here very briefly. I know we're coming up on our time.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

If I can be put on the line please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sébastien, go ahead.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I'm not sure that I was able to understand all because I am just on the phone and I don't see what you show. I have just one question. One of the main issues we have with the comment period used to be and still is the fact that there is no possibility to really enter to discussion about the answers previously made in a comment. Is it something that you are looking after, or not?

I just want to remind everybody that the last time we work on that issue at the community level, we had set up two times for comments and the first time was supposed to be for the answer and the second time for the answer of the answer, or comments about the answer. And it was cancelled because of timing. A lot of groups were not able to submit their answer at the beginning and they [used the 40 days,] therefore the second period also to [inaudible] first comment.

Is it something you are working on, or it's outside of your scope? Thank you very much. And I go back to [mute.] Thank you.

CARLOS REYES:

Thank you, Sébastien. If you've been using public comment for several years, you may remember that at one point, we had a comment period and then a reply period. This was a recommendation actually of ATRT1.

The ATRT2 looked at that setup and the data that we produced, that ICANN Org produced, indicated that the comment and reply cycles were not really working as intended, and really, there were very few, almost no replies. Instead, most groups and individuals just treated it like another comment period. So what we decided, working with the ATRT2 team, was to sunset that.

---

At this point, we haven't been receiving feedback that the community wants it back. We had community feedback sessions in Kobe and that never came up once. I think just having a longer default comment period was able to fix that trend we were seeing several years ago.

So Sébastien, to answer your question directly, it's not something we're working on now. The data just hasn't really suggested that that's something that's necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Carlos. I think you've just got perhaps one, if not maybe two outstanding matters from the questions that were coming in in chat during your presentation, and Pat and I want to thank the team for a very, I think, timely from our point of view, but very positive set of slides because we're looking to see that some of the improvements that are proposed are quite welcome.

There was a question regarding archival material and the ability to search that. That came in from Jaap towards the end. It'd be good if that could be answered. If not, if you could take that as a question with notice, and I think Bernie also asked whether or not the closed comments, the search was only working on a year selection. I think they're probably the only two that might need still addressing, but I'm very aware of the time, so if you've got brief responses to those now, that would be welcome. If not, we would appreciate your ability to come back to us with the answers to those. Carlos?

---

CARLOS REYES: Thank you, Cheryl. I think Jana is addressing them as she reads through them. She's our RTI lead, so I'll defer to her feedback in the chat.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Largish, well, we'll look to have answers in chat from that. With that, let's make a last call for any questions regarding today's presentation, but also ask – I am assuming, and I'm sure you'd be agreeing ,that if we have any follow-up issues, questions or inquiries, that if we send them across to you, you'll get back to us because public comment is a very important part of the analysis that every one of the accountability and transparency review teams has done, as your example in response to Sébastien's question s show.

Okay, so we'll look to the chat for a response to any outstanding ones, which I think is happening now between Bernie and Jana as well. So with that, thank you all very much for taking the time to share with us. I'm assuming that this is fine to have on our meeting archives as a presentation as well, so it will be publicly available.

We'd also like to ask you to keep us proactively up to date with things as you're going through a number of points of development. We will be head down and tail up doing our own work, and so unless you have an amazing communication strategy – which undoubtedly will happen one day, but I suspect not the next couple of months – we don't want to miss anything that you're doing. So if you'd be so kind as to give it a bit of a push and a shove via staff to our attention, that would be appreciated. Pat, have I missed anything?

---

PATRICK KANE:

I don't believe so, Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Well, you're more than welcome to stay with us because all of our meetings are open. But you're equally welcome to escape, and we want to thank you once again for the time and energy you've put into today's presentation. I certainly have found it most interesting and informative. I'll be interested to see whether we're still getting a 10% decline in the 2017 through to 2021 timeline as well, because I think as was pointed out in the chat, we have some fairly time consuming from a community point of view activities going on in that time. So we shall watch this space.

Thanks very much, and if we can now have our previous agenda slide back, we will return to our normally advertised activity. You'll notice that we've had a couple of things slip off today's agenda. That doesn't mean they're not being paid attention to for our regular viewers. Those of you who are watching us like a hawk, things like our outstanding items and action items open and closed, as well as our regular work party reports, because we have a desire to have a good amount of time devoted to our report template, etc. discussion and things that run under item three and item four in today's agenda. We have asked for those to be put in writing for today's call. So those reports and updates are all going to be tabled.

With that, Bernie, are you doing the report template discussion lead, or is Jennifer?

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll take that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. over to you then.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. If we could bring up the presentation, please. Alright, report framework and recommendation requirements. For those that didn't follow it, there was some significant changes that were brought to how specific reviews function and can make recommendations. We're going to talk about that today. Next slide, please.

So for our general framework, you'll recognize that we followed the path we used for the public survey to gather more information. We have the standard executive summary and review background, and then we get into the issues which were the same ones we used in the same order for the survey. Issue one, board, issue two, GAC, issue three, public input, issue four, acceptance of ICANN decision, issue five, policy development process, issue six, assessment of independent review process, issue seven, assessment of relevant ATRT2 recommendations, issue eight, assessment of periodic reviews, issue nine, accountability indicators, issue ten, prioritization and rationalization of activities, policies and recommendations, and finally ,closing off with prioritization and interdependencies of recommendations, which is a requirement under the new rules.

---

So that's our breakdown. It seemed to work well when we were trying to structure a survey. I don't know if there are any comments. Not seeing any, let's go to the next page, please.

Under each of these sections, we've got a similar framework. There is the issue number and the name of the issue, there's the introduction section. After that, there is information gathering, there's relevant ATRT2 recommendations and analysis, there are the results of the survey, and there's any other source of information, which could be discussion, presentations at ICANN meetings, etc. but is meant to be a catch all.

After that, there's analysis of information and identification of issues, so out of all of that information, what can we distill? Are there issues we want to identify? And are those issues worthy of a recommendation? And if so, then we go into the next section which is recommendations to address the issues. Any questions here? Alright, Next slide, please.

So recommendations from the terms of reference that the ATRT3 accepted. In keeping with the guidelines for review teams to develop and follow a clear process when documenting constructive recommendations, the ATRT3 has adopted a system that is fact-based analysis, clear articulation of noted problem areas, supporting documentation and resulting recommendations system that follows the smart framework, specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timebound. That is in the terms of reference. Next page, please.

And right below that, to help assess whether a proposed recommendation are consistent with this guidance, we will be,

wherever possible and practical, testing recommendations against these questions. What is the intent of the recommendation? What observed, fact-based issue is the recommendation intending to solve? What is the problem statement? What are the findings that support the recommendation? Is each recommendation accompanied by supporting rationale, how is the recommendation aligned with ICANN's current and future strategic planning, the ICANN bylaws and ICANN's mission? Does the recommendation require new policies to be adopted? If yes, describe the issue to be addressed by new policies. Next page.

What outcome is the review team seeking? How will the effectiveness of implemented improvements be measured, what is the target for a successful implementation? We'll get back to those in a few minutes.

How significant would the impact be if not addressed? Does the review team envision the implement not be short term, i.e. completed within six months, mid-term, i.e. 12 months, or long-term, more than 12 months?

Is related work already underway? If so, what is it and who is carrying it out? Who are the responsible parties that need to be involved in the implementation work for this recommendation? I.e. community, the ICANN Organization, the ICANN board, or a combination thereof? Next slide, please.

Our recommendations given in order of priority to ensure focus on the highest impact areas, and finally, if only a limited number of recommendations can be implemented due to community bandwidth

---



---

and other resource constraints, would this recommendation be included in the top listing of recommendations? Why or why not?

So definitely some, I think, clarity around what we should be looking at when we're thinking about making recommendations. Next slide, please.

Now, recommendations are subject to operating standards for specific reviews, and the new ones were approved in June 2019 and these were incorporated into the ATRT terms of reference. Next slide, please.

Each recommendation that is made by a specific review like ATRT3 has to answer these requirements. Definition of desired outcomes including metrics used to measure whether the recommendations' goals are achieved, initial identification of potential problem in attaining the data or developing the metric, suggested timeframe in which the measures should be performed, definition of current baselines of the issue and initial benchmarks that define success or failure.

Data retained by ICANN, industry metrics sources, community input, surveys or studies, and finally consensus on the recommendation itself.

So it's no longer the case that you can simply make a recommendation and send it out into the universe. We've got a lot of homework to do on each and every recommendation we make ,and it is expected that by the final report, that all these points will be addressed in one way or another.

And let's be clear here. In many ways, this is good, because as we walk through our ATRT2 recommendations, which we will do again after this

---

presentation, it became clear as we were doing our assessment of the implementations that obviously, there were varying interpretations on what implemented means and to what level. And I think what we're looking at with this is removing that variability so that when there's an ATRT4 and they look at the recommendations from ATRT3, it'll no longer be this discussion of the implementation report, whether it actually reflects the state of implementation of the recommendations that were made by ATRT3.

So all of this to say, yes, we've got the homework that will have to lead us to recommendations. We have a lot of questions to ask ourselves before we make recommendations. And once we make a recommendation, we have to think about answering all of this homework on each and every recommendation.

Questions. Stunned silence. Okay. Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yes. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. It's not so much a question as a personal remark. This is a very good thing, because yes, it puts the audit and the review team in a very professional guidelines organization. There is purely audit metrics that are being asked to be followed, and that's a good thing.

Couple of caveats as far as I'm concerned nevertheless. First one is, do we have the time, the material time to follow all these while the game is changing, while we are in the middle of the game itself because it's already August? And I for my part have recently discovered that we didn't have a full year to have a report, because the draft report must

---

be out in October, so we had six months to get to report, including recommendations. So do we have the material time to do it?

And second one would be, do we have the resources, considering that I don't feel that any of us can dedicate 100% of the time we have to properly follow those very good audit guidelines.

So the first question is, are we able to follow this? And if we think we're not, in the time frame we have been given, do we ask for more resources? Do we ask for more time? That's the first question. And as a side note, I hope that this is not going to prevent us in any way to push recommendations forward, because in some cases, one might think "What homework there is, let's push this aside."

That's the questions I have and the remarks I have at the moment.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright. I think that's a very good point. I see Pat's hand up. Pat?

PATRICK KANE:

Thanks, Bernie. Jacques, I've put a little note in the chat, but I think that it's really important that we do it in a way that is meaningful, as Bernie has pointed out. But what it means is where we are, we're going to have to select the most meaningful recommendations to address and to put detail around.

I don't think we should lose recommendations because we don't have the time to provide the detailed sessions or the detail that is required here, but I do think that we should focus on the meaningful

---

recommendations that we think are the most important from the accountability and transparency standpoint and not try to cover everything. That would be my suggestion.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Pat. Any other questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a question, Bernie, but rather a follow-on from Pat. And we hear you, Jacques, and we are of course lucky enough – in inverted commas – to be running our review team whilst a whole lot of other things are being built, implemented, adopted and otherwise imposed upon us. So hey, yay, lucky us. Tough job, but someone's got to do it.

Can we have more time? No. If we were any other form of review team, the answer might be different, but we are privileged – in inverted commas again – to be one of the very few specific reviews which is specifically timebound.

So whilst I'm agreeing absolutely with Pat's suggestion that we have to be very aware of what we're doing as we're developing recommendations and the quality of the recommendations does need to be measured against these things, there is no gold stars given to each and every one of us if we do more recommendations than the last review team. I'd like to think there'd probably be gold stars given to us if we did less recommendations, albeit more meaningful and impactful with more clear definitions and prioritization and data-driven analysis.

So more is not more, unless you're talking about truffles or high-quality chocolate. This is not the case with recommendations, so we've just got to work smarter, not harder. But as we formulate each of our recommendations, as we even contemplate out of the data that we are gathering, out of the analysis that we are about to dive into in greater detail, the question of, "Is this something we need to make a recommendation on?" As we're thinking along those lines, we need to have this checklist of materials and criteria and look at it.

Now, it may be that we come up with a vitally important recommendation that may not meet all of these benchmarks, all of these intentions, all of these things. We will simply have to annotate it to that effect. So I don't think it should mean that we can't make an important recommendation if the consensus is that such a recommendation is important, but we should make sure that we are using the rigor that this system offers us to our benefit from the very beginning. So let's be mindful of the criteria and the objectives relating to each of the recommendations as we formulate and develop them.

And remember, ladies and gentlemen, we formulate these recommendations as a full review team. The work parties may propose areas here recommendations might be beneficial, but it will be the whole review team that does this work together. So I think you might know an awful lot of what we'll be focusing on when we have our next face-to-face meeting. Back to you, Bernie.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Nice job, Bernie, and I guess it will be very useful for our team. Regarding the question of Jacques, I think that we may need to have [a step] and not jump to the end, but first of all to decide if there needs to be a recommendation, and after that, to see if it's enough important recommendation that we spend more time on it, and at the end, if we are able to do the whole homework on the recommendation, then it will fit in our report.

My second point is that this report gave me a question. Are we currently organized in the same way that the report suggests that we need to work? Therefore, there's no problem I guess for the GAC team and the board team, but I have question, not about the other two teams but about the other topics on the report and how and who will handle them.

And my third point is just to be sure that as a matter of [improvement] is the way I have fulfilled more information into the report, the way we are looking for, and especially Bernie is looking for. Thank you very much.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sébastien. Cheryl, Pat, anyone want to take a shot at this?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I think they're good suggestions and observations. Not so much questions that we can answer. Rather, they're discussions we need to consider. Pat, your reaction?

PATRICK KANE: I think it's a good point, but I'd have to think through it. I'm not certain I'm in agreement, but I have to think through it. So I don't really have a comment right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. But also, I think Sébastien, part of what you're raising is not counter to the thinking that we've been talking about today, that we are already recognizing that we have opportunity to interact and to ensure that a number of these data points and requirements are collected. We have the time to do that, providing we're not being overzealous with too many recommendations. So if we look at the quality and effectiveness of our recommendation.

And of course, there's nothing wrong with making a recommendation that recommends someone else should be looking at something and making recommendations about it. That's perfectly valid. But I wouldn't use that as a passing on for everything. There'll be some things where that may be relevant, just the way the priority and the resourcing of our own available time needs to be done.

We've also got the opportunity, of course, to interact with the ACs and the SOs as Vanda said in the chat. In fact, Sébastien, because you are on audio only, I'll take the moment to just read out what's happening in

chat. Vanda asked about the timeline. Not seeing face-to-face meetings [inaudible] before the next opportunity to talk with the ACs and SOs and make sure we're getting aligned with them regarding recommendations will allow our group to discuss each recommendation face-to-face as she believes that would be a good alternative.

Pat responded to her saying, "Vanda, are you suggesting that AC and SOs need to agree with our recommendations or at least weigh in on each of them?" And then Daniel pointed out that one of the discussions we heard with KC was a request for an external reviewer.

So that just brings up the point that of course, our report will be going out for public comment. We've just had an enormous amount of information delivered to us about the public commentary and the desirability and effectiveness and efficiencies that are being looked at regarding the public comment mechanisms and methodologies used within ICANN, and perhaps we might be lucky enough to benefit from some of these changes and have our public comment managed in as almost a beta testing of some of these new changes. Who knows?

But I do think we will need to look at the fact that it isn't our job to make everything palatable and in line with the thinking of the ACs. It's our job to act as a review team that is populated by those that are acting on behalf of and in the best interests of the wider ICANN community, and to make these recommendations when we are making them, which we believe will be the closest things, which will be most impactful as a result of what analysis we have made based on issues raised by the community.

---



---

So I'm not sure we need to sell it quite the same nice way as Vanda was proposing, but Vanda is undoubtedly far nicer than I'm likely to ever be. So we don't really need to get them to agree. It's not their thinking because each AC and So may have very diverse thinking. In fact, there may be diversity even within the ACs and the SOs. I'd be surprised if there wasn't, for example.

But we do have the opportunity of public comment, and we also have the opportunity of modifying our own timeline, recognizing that we do have the looming end date which is of course a product, albeit I would suggest probably an artificially designed one these days. There was a good reason for having a 12-month binding time for ATRT1, but it's got baked into the bylaws for all ATRTs forevermore now until such a thing might be changed. That's kind of what we've got to stick with. But we do have some flexibility within our own timeline.

So to that end, Bernie, have you got some more to do, or do you want to have a word about timelines, what may or may not happen effectively when?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Really, the only point is I don't see us having a full report done and in public comment for Montréal. Probably sometime after Montréal, we're going to have to look at the schedule because I just don't see that happening right now. So looking forward to talking about adjusting the schedule to be more in line with what we can deliver now that we're starting to be organized the way we are for what we wanted

---

to deliver and we understand what is required of recommendations.  
Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for this, Bernie. I'm not sure whether that's going to give our review team members pause or panic, but we will need to look at that and we'll discuss that in greater detail with the leadership team, recognizing of course that whilst the leadership team will be interacting on this, this is a plenary activity, but we do need the work party perspective on the modifications that we suspect might have to be made to our milestones within our timebound timeline.

So to that end, we will be taking, I think, another little bit of time now. We'd like you all to digest, have a look at the slide deck, raise any questions on the list between now and next week, and we'll spend another little bit of time in next week's agenda amongst other things to come back and have a look at how you all believing we can effectively approach these very particular criteria regarding recommendations.

We'll also by then have a bit more information back regarding our survey, and of course, remind you that there's going to be a goodly amount of work required in the analysis of the survey even though it was designed – particularly with the survey for individuals – to make the managing of the metrics as – in inverted commas – easy as possible.

But that's still work that has to be done, so one of the things we may find ourselves doing which has been done in other cross-community working groups before is taking some large blocks of time for longer teleconferencing. I have not discussed this at all with anyone else, but

some of you who've been involved with other cross-community working groups over the last five or six years will know that some considerable work was forwarded by having a couple of days where you have a virtual meeting but with the focus of a face-to-face so people would dial in for a block of up to three hours before a break and we would deal with a specific topic in great detail and do real-time drafting and all that sort of stuff.

So there are a number of ways we can get our work done even within the timeframes. This may be a full review team, it may be partial, but I would remind some of you who perhaps are not pulling as much weight as some of the others, that all of your voices are important, and so I for one would be encouraging, if we go down that type of pathway, to have it being done as a plenary rather than some of you relying on the commitment of fewer volunteers to get this lion's share of drafting and analysis done.

Okay, enough about my biases. Looking at the time we have left, we have a little bit of material we need to go through. Bernie, is that it for your slide deck on these recommendation criteria and the general skeleton that our report will be going into? Did you want to remind everybody that there is the link to the documents, etc.? Just mention all that so they all know?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes. Thank you. So the draft document has been evolving. It's in the Wiki as both a Word document and a Google doc if you want to find it, and we'll be posting the link in the chat in a few minutes. Please have a

---

---

look, and we'll also be posting this slide deck under the Wiki so you can have a look at it if you want to. That's it for me. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Bernie. Just on that collaborative document, the report, obviously we would encourage you to make comments, not edits, but I believe Bernie, correct me if I'm wrong, you're working with each of the work parties, but the idea is that if they have problems putting their materials specifically into the document, you're happy to assist them in that. Is that not the case?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So there is no excuse. We should be starting to populate that document, and in fact, those of you who want to go and browse through it – and I'd encourage all the review team to do so – you'll find that there are already a couple of sections which are getting fleshed out quite nicely with text which hopefully will go through to final text as well.

Okay, so Pat, going back to the agenda, I think the next thing is –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, Sébastien. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted to be sure that the way I populate the document is the one we're looking for, or is it something else? We need to do work, but it's also useful to have feedback, and we'll be happy to get that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm not quite sure I followed, but Bernie, can I ask you to specifically take that offline with Sébastien, make sure that whatever feedback it is he's seeking is happening?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. Sure. I think he's saying that his work is under the work party Wiki for board and they're filling in the template with what they have, and if people want to have a look at it and provide comments, they're more than welcome to do so. And I'll be going through it with him shortly also.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thanks for this, and I would suspect that all of the work parties would appreciate that sort of feedback as well.

Okay, so with that, pat, and I believe we're diving in for the next I guess ten minutes or so, anything to do with ATRT implementation assessment, any follow-up, and then we'll probably need about five minutes for the survey update. There is no Any Other Business, I

---

believe. But if there is any, it'll only be short. And obviously, the confirmation of actions and decisions reached. So over to you, Pat.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. One of the things I wanted to walk through here were just take a look at the follow-up items we had where [we're] seeking more detail or explanation in the document of the ATRT2 evaluation and assessment. IK don't think we need to bring up that document. There we go.

We've got six line items, so if we can scroll to line item number 13, recommendation 6.8. Alright, so Vanda, one of the things we wanted to do here is the assessment of effectiveness when we talked about the high-level meeting in Barcelona at ICANN 63 was a huge success, I think it'd be helpful for us to document further in that box how it was a success in Barcelona if we could.

And then if we could scroll to the next one, number 14, recommendation 6.9, Daniel, I think we're looking for a bit more detail when you say implementation assessment implemented. I think if we could put a little bit more detail into that, that'd be helpful.

And then if we could go to number 15, recommendation 7.1, Osvaldo, we'd like to get a little bit more detail in the assessment of implementation if we could.

And then scrolling to – this one's from Michael, o we'll get Michael when he gets back, which is line item 16 number 7.2, we'll talk to him

---

next week when he returns from his honeymoon. The next one is line item number 18, recommendation 9.1.

BRENDA BREWER: Excuse me. Michael actually is on the call today.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh. There he is. So let's go back to then 7.2. So if we could get a little more detail on the assessment of implementation, Michael, when you talk about it being likely implemented, I think that would be helpful there.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Is it possible to find the original written inputs that I plugged into there? Because I'm not seeing that on screen, and I don't think I have a copy other than what I plugged in.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think they're in the comment field, Michael. Since we've added some columns, it's not showing, but it's more to the right.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Right. So in terms of it being likely implemented, if we had to plug that in as a [binary,] I would probably [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Michael, we're having a lot of trouble hearing you. You're quite faint.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sorry. Let me get my microphone plugged in. I think that what I was getting at in terms of saying likely implemented as opposed to implemented is kind of reflective of the challenge and reflecting this as a binary determination. The recommendation itself had some layers to it, and there was a little bit of ambiguity in terms of how ICANN structured their determination that it had been implemented.

I think that that, to a certain extent, reveals part of the challenge of this exercise, and I also think an important consideration where rather than looking at these recommendations as a box to check, I think it's important to consider them in terms of the structural direction that they're trying to move the organization, and whether the organization accepted that and moved in that direction or whether they thought about how the box could be checked and found a way to do that while doing as little as possible in terms of the two kind of aspects of that, the two ends of that spectrum if you want to think about it that way.

So my point in this comment is that it looks as if the box was checked, and if this was a binary determination, implemented versus not implemented, I probably would say that it's implemented. But I would be interested in digging a little further into how it was done in order to provide a little more information about the approach to implementation both in this recommendation and more broadly. Is that helpful?



---

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Michael, I think that's helpful. Alright, so we'll go ahead and then move on to recommendation 9.1, which is line 18. Daniel, again, if we could get some additional information in the assessment of implementation on what you mean by partially implemented, and then the last one I've got on my list is recommendation 11.7, which is line 34. And I know we talked about this, Demi, but so I guess what we should probably do, Bernie, is just take the comment that Demi made in the conversation last week and pop that into the assessment of implementation window as well.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Okay for me.

PATRICK KANE: And that's the only follow-ups I had from the last two weeks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for this, Pat. Can I ask? Bernie, you've been managing to make sure the input has got into this particular table. Is there any interactions that you need to have to extract more information from any of the people on this call? Is there anyone you need to reach out to to set up a brief interaction with?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Probably should have a chat with Demi on some of that stuff, and now that Michael's back, I'll probably reach out to him on a few of his and

---

we'll try to close the loop, as it were, so we can get that one checked off our list. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And what about the ones that were Erica's? Because she's no longer with us.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: She replied to me by e-mail. I think I fixed most of hers. I'll give it a final check as we go through.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alright. Well, Demi, if you can make sure you and Bernie touch base, maybe even do a quick Skype chat or something after this call, or you can stay in this Zoom room while the rest of us leave, that's fine. Just a number of us have back to back meetings. That would be excellent. And Pat's going to look into the information that Daniel sent to the e-mail list again.

Alright, well, it looks like that's in pretty good shape then, Pat. Anything else on that?

PATRICK KANE: No, I think we're good.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alright, then back to our agenda, which means we've got a couple of minutes. First of all, has anyone else who's joined since we started the call got Any Other Business to raise? No. Okay. Jacques, go ahead.

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah. No, I'm sorry. It was just on the ATRT2 implementation because Pat has a question for me on recommendation 6.6, line 11, but I guess it's solved as he didn't raise it again. I just wanted to be sure that the question he was asking on recommendation 6.6 [works here.]

PATRICK KANE: Jacques, I think we're good there in terms of what I've read in the line item, so nothing further.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd just point out that Ramet in chat has asked the following question. I'm assuming it's to you, Bernie. "Is it possible to add more details to the Google sheet until this week?" And he's followed up with a question mark again.

I'm assuming the Google sheet hasn't been locked off, so my reaction is, well, yeah. But not much later. Bernie's saying yes, so the answer to that, Ramet, is yes. That is the case.

---

So, who's going to tell us about what's happening with our survey? Because it appears that there's no Any Other Business for today's call, so we'll spend a couple of minutes [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE:

I can do a quick update on the survey just to keep you all informed of the progress. At the moment, there has been five groups who have made a start on to the survey and already have answered a number of questions. That's very good news obviously, and I think this was noted on the leadership call. We can expect probably that most of the responses would come in closer to the close date, but it's good to see that people have already been making a start on that.

And in terms of individual survey responses, so far we have 18 people again who have made substantive start on the questions, I believe answering 44 or more already of the 65 questions.

One final note that I did actually make in e-mail is that obviously, Bernie had forwarded the comment from Rod Rasmussen from SSAC regarding the inability to provide a group response by the deadline, so we're working on providing a response back to them based on leadership call discussion on Monday to say that the input would be welcome at a later date.

That's all I have [this side,] but I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for this, Jennifer. I certainly find it heartening, and I know Pat and Bernie and others on the leadership team did as well. There's a considerable number of people who now you're informing us have actually got even more substantial progress on the surveys, but I've also been taking a look, in other words have logged into the survey and have looked at one or two questions.

So if they all come back and fill it out, we should have some very useful data indeed. Vanda raises in the chat "Maybe we can push a little within our groups to respond to the survey in the following week." And indeed, we would encourage each and every one of you to do exactly that, and I don't know whether Jennifer, we can reach out to the communications team and just see if it can be a reminder in next week's details that go out to the AC/SO chairs, etc., just to remind them to remind people that that would also be useful.

I think that's one of the few AIs that we might get out of today's call. Jennifer, what have we got in terms of confirmation of actions and any decisions reached?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Yes, so noting the action item that Cheryl's just mentioned there regarding following up with our groups on the survey, and we will do some work on staff's side as well to help get the reminders out.

Another action item that I captured, review team members just to take a look at the slides that Bernie shared today regarding the recommendation requirements, digest them, think about any questions as this item will be on the agenda next week as well, and then just on

---

the ATRT2 implementation items, Bernie is following up with a couple of the review team members, Demi and Michael, on a number of those items.

Other than that, that's all I captured. Let me know if I missed anything. Thanks a lot.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Excellent. Alright, well, we asked you to budget a little bit more time just in case, but having that time in reserve, we did manage to get through this workload in a faster fashion than I thought we were. But many of us have back to back meetings – or for me, throughout the whole darn night – but throughout your day.

So as ever, Pat and I and the rest of the leadership team appreciate everybody joining us on today's call. There is a goodly amount of work for us to do between now and next week, and please do get into those documents and start making some content and some comments on other people's content as well. Think about today's information and look at what we're going to be doing in terms of discussion, some small changes to the intervals of some of our milestones in our timeline, and at next week's meeting, amongst other things, we'll be looking at our workplan again and rationalizing what we're doing and how we're doing it to build on the information we've shared and discussed today.

Pat, is there any final words from you?

PATRICK KANE:

Final words. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: With that, thanks very much to our fabulous staff, as ever, and we can hold the recording now and look forward to talking to you all again next week after you've had another week's worth of work and input. Bye for now.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Bye, everyone. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]