BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you. We'll give this meeting a heading which is the ATRT3 Survey Meeting on the 31st of July 2019 at 12:30 UTC. And the members attending this meeting are Cheryl, Daniel, and Tola. And from ICANN we have Jennifer, Negar, Brenda and Bernie.
	And this call is recorded so please state your name for the record, and Cheryl, you may begin. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Well, thank you very much Brenda. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and we may begin. We have the document open in front of us in the Zoom Room. You'll have noted a googly amount of comments have come in from some of you. We really don't have a lot of time so we're going to have to be brutal with this and I'm afraid some people will not get all the questions that they want answered because they're just too many of them or some questions will be rejigged to, hopefully, fit the purpose still, but to fit in with it whatever model it is that we want to run.
	I'm going to ask Bernie to manage this pretty well because he's also going to be doing the lion's share of bludgeoning these questions into some semblance of a survey tool. And Bernie, you've also thought about which survey tool you would prefer working with so over to you.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Yes, I've consulted with Staff. Jennifer's been kind enough to work on that and I think we've identified a tool with at least the initial

parameters which could do the job. Jennifer, do you want to talk about that just for a second?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure, thanks Bernie. This is Jennifer. As Bernie mentioned, we recommended Clicktools which is the survey tool. I'm not sure if any of you are familiar with that but it's something that we've used in the past for Review Teams, most recently the RDDS Review and it seems to have the capabilities that this team would need and produce reports that would be helpful and have been helpful to us in the past. So, there's nothing unusual about it. I have nothing really to say other than I think it will do the job. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you Jennifer. Any questions on that? Alright. Oh, sorry. Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, just Cheryl here. Knowing that many of us are cheeky buggers, and probably wanted to play, I'm quite sure there's a "do you want to know more about Clicktools" info bits on their website, if you want a pop a link in so the curious of us can browse?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure, I'll have a look and see what I can find.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Alright, excellent suggestion. So, preamble. I've taken all the questions that were in the public document. I moved them into this document. I've kept the general structure of Questionnaire for Individual Respondents, Questionnaire for SOs/ACs, and then individual questionnaires for the Board and the GAC and any others that we feel are necessary.

In taking a look beyond the comments that we put into the public document on the documents, I also ran through all the requirements in the Bylaws for ATRTs and looked where I could what questions might be useful to add to meet those needs of gathering some information on that and where I've added questions, I've highlighted them in pink. So those are my own creations.

So, basically, we'll just plow through this and we can decide how we're going to handle these things. Sometimes I've rewritten the questions. Part of what I'm recommending for the individual respondents is that we really just stick to scales and yes and no questions because I think that A, we'll get more responses that way, B, it's going to be simpler to analyze the data, C, written answers is open often to conjecture as to what did they really respond to and how we interpret those things. So, that's my opening statement. Are there any questions? Okay, I'm not seeing any.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No questions, but can I ask with the tool, is this one of those that it can show how far along people are as they're going through the survey

tool? Jennifer, you might know that. Excellent. Because that's the other thing that you'll get people to… Add a little cover, should say this isn't a particularly long survey, or it should only take fifteen minutes of your life to fill out, or whatever. Your progress will be shown as you go through. And is it one that they can pause and come back to is the other question?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. They can pause and come back to it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we tell them that up front that'll also help getting them to get it filled out and filled out sooner rather than later. But I'm a fan of designing the questions so the metrics are easy to work with. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, any other questions? Not seeing any. Alright, let's go through this. Now, the toughest one is going to be the Board one. If we look at this, its… Am I cohost? Yes. Oh, I'm a cohost Brenda but it's your screen that has the questions on it and I can't move them on your screen. So, let's not worry about that right now. I'll ask you to move them along and we'll work our way through that. Alright, let me get this up here on my other screen and then we can talk through it.

So, basically, on Board questions, we've ended up with about 20. And the last batch is about DITP and we'll have to get to that. Michael in the Community Meeting yesterday was quite insistent. This is an area he's

very interested in, so we'll have to decide how we handle that. So, let's get going.

1.1. Please indicate your satisfaction with the Board's performance overall for the last two years. 1 to 10. So, just to give us a general sense of where things are. Also, since we've accepted to work on the Accountability Indicators, I've included a question on that. Please rate the effectiveness of the Accountability Indicators as they relate to Board performance as found at blah, blah, blah, 3.3 and 1 to 10. Alright? So, someone just scream or put up your hand if you're not okay with something that I'm saying.

Do you consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory? 1 to 10. Then we had a question from Sebastien. Do you consider there is an issue with gender balance amongst Board members? I've rephrased it but essentially that was his question. And then a follow on is, do you have any suggestion to improve the Board's diversity? Daniel had come back and said, "Well, why don't we ask about all the different factors of diversity?"

And I was noting in the public document that having worked on diversity in Work Stream 2, there are the seven areas of diversity and I think for the average reader going into that would start being quite complex. So, I'd really like to leave it a very high-level, maybe include gender balance if we really want to and this is where I need some input. Any thoughts from anyone? Cheryl?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Yes. So, the question you're asking, you're not suggesting that we don't have question 1.4 and 1.5 in. You're suggesting they stay lightly written as they are now, is that what I'm hearing?
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	No, I was suggesting maybe… Well, first of all let me back up a bit. Yes, we can keep 1.3, 1.4. 1.5 is asking for suggestions and we're saying that for individual respondents we're trying to stay away from written answers. So, 1.5 I'm definitely suggesting we don't have. But, in the context of 1.4, Daniel's suggesting, as we see in his comment on the righthand side, I suggest breaking down the various issues of diversity. The issue of gender balance stands out since it's a standalone question and question 1.5 seeks various issues of diversity.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Cheryl here. Does this tool allow us to have one of those little multiline, tick the circle type thing, or pick the number sliding scales where we could say at the top, "Indicate your satisfaction ranging from totally dissatisfied to absolutely happy on the scale of 1 to 10.", or whatever else, 1 to 5, doesn't bother me, but a scale? And then have a line that says, "gender", a line that says, "geographic regional language, age, skillset", etcetera. And then we've sort of given them one question but allowed them to look at the gamut of diversity, albeit at a high-level.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	So, what you're suggesting along Daniel's lines is we have 1.4 as it is, and then we have 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8. For each ask for a satisfaction,

asking if there's an issue with diversity in that specific category for the Board for each of the seven diversity criteria?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I mean, my immediate reaction is yes but I wouldn't have had them as separate questions, but I'd have them as one table and have the heading at the title.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You pick off which ones, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. So, it's effectively one question but we have…

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So, we would have 1.4 as is and 1.5 would be a list and you could click which ones you want, you think there is an issue with.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're not asking for suggestions. So, I wouldn't be asking them for suggestions to improve the Board diversity. I think we ask their opinions on the diversity. So, do you consider there is an issue. See, I have a problem with that terminology. Do you consider there is an issue with gender balance amongst the Board members? Well, I might say, rather than yes or no, I might say, "Well, there is no transgender undetermined representation, so I have a huge issue there," etcetera, etcetera.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But if I had a single question that said, "Indicate your level of satisfaction with the diversity on the Board in the following criteria ranging from totally dissatisfied, neutral, to absolutely delighted", and I have one line that says gender balance, one line that says geographic regional balance, one line that says language, one line that says age, one line that says skillset, etcetera, then I'm getting useful information.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, understood. Good suggestion. We'll take that on. And Daniel seemed to be happy with that. Tola, are you okay with this?

TOLA SOGBESAN: Hello, yeah. This is Tola. Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, thank you. Great. The next couple of questions are questions that I threw in that I thought would be useful. How satisfied are you with the Nominating Committee's selection of Directors for the ICANN Board over the past 2 years? Which sort of fit in with the diversity question. Are we okay with that one?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I'm okay with that one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Following the transition away from the USG oversight and the implantation of the Empowered Community and other accountability measures, please indicate your satisfaction with the accountability of Board under these new rules. I thought we should have a question that would frame it in the context of all those changes and see if people were happy with the accountability because for all practical purposes this stuff is sort of all new. Was that okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: How would you rate the importance of the Board implementing the Transparency Recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 which would affect it? So, here one of the things that we have in Work Stream 2 is, one of the places which would affect the Board the most, is the Transparency Recommendations so I thought it would be useful to actually go right to that and sort of get a rating from the respondents about how they feel about that. Does that seem…?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. It does make sense. Is it not superseding the following question, 1.9? Isn't that sort of rolled up in that or do you think they are separate?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, 1.9 was an original question which I slightly restructured. Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's Transparency. And so, I changed that to a sliding scale one which I think is different than drilling down all the way into Work Stream 2 Recommendations. So, a general comment on Transparency. That's fine as far as I'm concerned. Do you think they need to be improved? Yes or no. If yes, what would you suggest? So, here again, it would be a text answer and I don't know if we want to go there for individual respondents.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, my lip is curling at the short text answers I must say. I also wonder whether 1.10 should be asked higher than 1.9. It's sort of cart after horse as far as I'm concerned.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Where would you have 1.10, Cheryl? I'm having trouble following.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we've asked about the importance of the implementation of the Transparency Recommendations, right? Then I would ask the more generic about improving, yes or no? I would ask the Boolean after that. And then I'd ask the rating question after the Boolean.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, so 1.8 you would put in as a yes or no as opposed to a sliding scale?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, fair enough. I can do that. And then we go into rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's Transparency.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And then do the ratings, yeah.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 1 to 10. And do you think there is a need for improvement, yes or no.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And then we have to make a decision on the text answer for 1.11.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Frankly, I don't give a damn. I don't particularly care what individuals think about how they would be making changes. I care about what

ACs/SOs would suggest, but this is the individual's response so frankly I don't give a damn.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel, for the record. Can I say something?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sure.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, I think I agree with what Cheryl is talking about, is that if we're wanting the individual response, then that individual response has at least some key issues or elements that I think would pick out, that would reflect in the survey. So, once the subject data analysis as well as give us a relation of what the other groups are saying, whether they correlate. Because if an individual says that they are clear with this aspect, and then the group says that they are not okay, that will then give us a predefined recommendation however we can be able to handle individual feedback with the group feedback. Thank you. Back to you Cheryl.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Danny. I mean I'd see this as a more general and widespread temperature taking opportunity, so I'm really not interested in the gory details from individuals.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, so what we're saying here is we would take out 1.11 but it may well reappear in the SOs/ACs Surveys?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Excellent. Okay. We'll note that. 1.12. Do you think the Board is efficient in it's decision-making process? Now, I had an issue with that in my comments in the public document in that I'm not certain that we've got any facts to base that on. Thoughts, comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we're also not testing efficiency. We're looking at accountability and transparency, to be honest.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. I mean we're testing the satisfaction with the Board, we're testing the satisfaction of the Board's accountability, we're testing the satisfaction with the Board's transparency. I'm not sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can ask, "Are you satisfied with the Board's decision-making process over the last two years, yes or no?" That's okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to find out satisfaction but that's, you know, efficiency is a whole different ballgame.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: This is my point. So, we could restructure that with, "Are you satisfied with the Board's decision-making process?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Time-limited.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And have that as a sliding scale? Over the last two years?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, over the last couple of years. Can I make a point about scales? I see this and I know you're a numbers man my friend but I'm not sure we're going to get more information out of 1 to 10 than we will out of 1 to 5 or a fully satisfied scale.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You just want an odd number. I know you want an odd number. I know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's just I desperately want an odd number, you know that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I know that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But there's a good reason for that as well. It's not just my need for odd numbers.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm not webbed to 1 to 10. Just a suggestion. 1 to 5 is fine. We can go through that. Alright, so we've got 1.12 rewritten.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We may get a lot of 3's but it makes a 4 or a 5 more meaningful. 7, 8, 9, 10 is less meaningful in these things than a 4 is on a 5 scale. Trust me on that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Depends on the size of the sample. But we won't get into that right now. Okay, fine. Never argue with a statistician, right? How do you valuate the training for Board members? Again, there are, we've got

those indicators in the Accountability Indicators. But how do you valuate the training of Board members? I'm not sure what we would end up with there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure of what use we would make with what we end up with there. We could ask, "Are you aware of training for Board members?" That could be a yes or no, and that's important because the Board might be doing brilliant training but if the community doesn't know about it, then that's a measure for their Accountability Indicators or in fact the Transparency Measures within their Accountability Indicators. So, if we got this overwhelming supply of people going, "They train? I didn't know they trained.", then that is useful information that we can get a recommendation out of.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. I can switch that into that.

TOLA SOGBESAN: This is Tola. Can I…

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, sir.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Clarification. Two things that I wanted to learn from there. What is the objective of asking about Board training? Is it the transparency of

making Board members aware of the opportunity for training? Or is it the accountability of the fact that they are expected to be trained and they are not trained, and we want to learn why they are not trained? The objective to me would guide me to knowing why or how to ask that question. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want me to respond? To the best of my knowledge, Tola, because the very specific recommendations out of ATRT2 regarding the desirability of certain types of training for Board members has been apparently an inverted [inaudible] enacted and it is reported in the accountability mechanisms that we need to test whether or not people are aware of it. So, it is not a matter of evaluation of the training at all. It's a matter of measuring the community degree of knowledge of its existence or otherwise.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Okay, thank you Cheryl. I read that. I saw that in the ATRT Recommendation and Implementation, and I saw a question which was separated. It commenced and activities are included place to add, but that was only part of the policy. Okay, yeah, I won't object but know if they're aware and if they have been exposed to information about what the Board is doing in that regard. It's okay. It's clear now. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because, remember, one of the things we might also find out of this is that all of these Dashboards and very detailed transparency efforts may not be doing the job that they are designed to do. In other words, they're out there but attention isn't being drawn to them. People aren't aware of them, or we may be coming up with some sort of recommendation, a mechanism to, in some way, shape, or form, ensure that the community know they're there, not just have them available should they accidentally trip over them one day. Yeah, that sort of thing. Testing the awareness is an important thing.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, listen, I'm looking at the amount of work we have to do. I'm looking at the time. Is everyone okay for stretching this an extra 30 minutes so at least we can get through the individual questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. I've got to stay awake until I start chairing my next call anyway, so it's fine.

TOLA SOGBESAN: I'm okay with that, too.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, Brenda, are you okay for that?

BRENDA BREWER: I'm good, Bernie. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, great. Alright, so let's take as a given that we'll take an extra 30 minutes and at least we'll be able to make it through the individual questionnaires. We're down to 1.13 on the screen please.

And, okay. 1.14 is what is your view of ICANN's long-term financial stability? Just really unsure how we would scale that on a scale answer and if it's a written answer, it's going to be tricky to figure out what to do with it. So, I'm leaving it open to you to see what we do here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd like to hear from the boys on this one because I guess I'm inclined to put Occam's razor through this one but Daniel, Tola?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel speaking. Bernie, could you please refer a bigger pattern on what your measuring on that just so that I can give my clear input.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Firstly, we've said we're trying to not get text answers for individual respondents. I'm not sure how we could structure this for a non-text answer. I guess I could change how it's phrased, and we might be able to beat it into something. But even if we do that, I'm uncertain as the information we would gather out of this, what it would be used for. How it would assist us in any of our required fields of inquiry on Accountability and Transparency.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel speaking. Personally, I would be very happy to hear the opinion from the individual members or from the individuals, what's their feeling towards this. And by the time when input comes in, you can begin to identify a trend of feedback and the patterns that are coming in which can contribute.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. My turn to push back. For what purpose, Daniel?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To what purpose, Daniel? I'm going to push back on this. If I get 15 percent of the respondents indicating that they are deeply concerned with the financial stability of ICANN and I get 30 percent of the respondents saying they are absolutely satisfied with the financial stability providing the following things happen, and I get 20 percent of the respondents saying something else, what do I do with that?

EN

DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Then you get a recommendation for probably more clear transparent processes.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	That's got nothing to do with the transparency of the process because you've asked about the specific issue, the financial stability, a measure. My view might be that we need seven years with the operating expenses in reserve funds, and so I'm going to say I'm deeply concerned about it. I don't think this is the right place to ask these questions. There are places to ask these questions. This isn't it.
DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Okay.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	The Board's responsibility, it is the Board's responsibility to look after the long-term financial stability of the organization. I understand that. I might be interested in finding out whether individuals are aware of the documentation regarding ICANN finances and do they find those accessible and easy to read. But I'm not actually interested in their opinion.
DANIEL NANGHAKA:	I think that also makes sense because you'll find that probably not everyone follows the way the Board is handling accountability regarding the finances.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Actually, I'm listening to this conversation.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'll give an example. When it came to the issue of CROP, no one was aware about the scrapping of CROP until Olivier worked out a clear interpretation of the documentation regarding how the CROP funds are going to be structured following the meeting that happened in Puerto Rico and then when I looked at this critically, I saw that it made sense. And that opens up an incident that not everyone is aware about appropriate documentation regarding the finances and the codes that they use, the reference documents. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think back to Bernie because I think he might have had a aha moment a minute ago.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, to me it sounds like we could transform this question into something more along the lines of are you aware or how satisfied are you with the financial information that is made available by ICANN?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Publicly available.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Publicly available financial information. How satisfied are you. Yeah, that makes sense.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So, change 1.14 to publicly available financial information.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Remember we're not asking about the process, we're not asking about the 18 months working up for it, we're asking about the availability of the documentation.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: How satisfied are with what comes out of the other end. Okay.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel speaking. Just to add something. Sometimes the documentation may be available, but the challenge would be that the community or some of the members are not aware about where the exact text for reference could be. I think that comes up. Probably it could be [inaudible] is relate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that is information we may get out of this.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, 1.15. What do you see as the main reason for appeals regarding the Board's decisions? That's impossible to quantify as a scale question or a yes and no, so it has to be a text answer. And I'm uncertain.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure what it's gaining us.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. Well, that was my other point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I mean bloody mindedness and difficult behaviors would be probably the main reasons for appealing a Board decision. Boo-hoo, I didn't get my way. So what? I would ditch that one. That's the one I would be ditching personally. Doesn't matter what the reasons are. If you've got a good reason, there's mechanisms.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, any argument with killing 1.15?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think let's just bury it now.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, let's just bury it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Pronation, done.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 1.16 to 1.20 are about the DIDP Process which Michael feels very strongly about so I'll throw it open to the floor here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, the good thing about this is if they say no, the rest of them don't need to be answered. So, that's fine.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: But if they say yes, we'll have a bunch of text answers.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, but there's only four of them in the world who's ever bothered, so that's fine. We're going to be handling tops 12 pieces of information.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, so…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael will have done four of them so, you know?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, fair enough. We'll do it like that. Alright, moving on. I think that was the rough one. The rest should be a lot easier and allow us to get this done in time. 2. GAC Related Questions. Should GAC Accountability be improved, yes no? Should GAC Transparency be improved, yes no? In your view, are GAC interactions with the Board satisfactory, yes or no? In your view, are GAC interactions with SOs/ACs satisfactory, yes or no? If not, what kind of improvements would you suggest? That's a text answer. That's really my only question is 2.5.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, if I can jump in on 2.5, I don't care about details of the improvements to be honest. And with some of those yes or no's, I'm wondering about a sliding scale on a couple of those. Interactions with Board, satisfaction and interactions with AC/SO, satisfactory. I would slide scale those.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You would put them on sliding scales 1 to 5 for 2?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think so.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I could see that. Sliders, okay. And 2.5, do we keep it or not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Any arguments on 2.5 being dropped?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'd be very happy to hear the recommendations that the individuals say can be done to improve satisfaction. Just in case…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I care about the groups. I care what the ACs/SOs say about it, but I really don't give a damn about what the individuals say about it.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: So that I think then let's leave it to the groups.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, so 2.5 is…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it's a question for the groups.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And let's be clear here. Most of these questions we'll be asking of the SOs/ACs also and of course we'll have the opportunity to have long

form answers on some of those. Excellent. 2 is done. Am I hearing talking? No. Okay, can we move 3 to the head of the page please?

Alright, Public Comments, which is Item 3 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws. We didn't really have any questions on that, and I thought that was unfortunate, so I drafted a set of questions based on some of the input we've gotten, some of the questions I've been asked, and we'll just run through those quickly. And I've included scales 1 to 10 but obviously now they will be 1 to 5.

Please rate how effective the current system of public consultation is for gathering community input. How many responses have you or a group you directly contributed to submitted to public comments in the last year? Would you, or a group you directly contribute to, respond more often to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format? 3.4. Should the responses made to public comments by individuals and organization groups be considered equally? Please rate your satisfaction with the Staff Report which analyzes the response to the public consultation. How useful are Staff Reports on Public consultations? Should Staff Reports on ICANN Public Consultations clearly indicate if the suggestions made by commenters were accepted and how? What impact should the results of the public comment have on the subject of the public comment?

So, those are my suggestions. Please feel free to shoot away. I thought we'd cover the gamut having played quite a bit in public comments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I like them all and I certainly, as someone who's been playing in public comments since the dim dark distant days, think these are important questions to ask. I'm wondering if one of them is a bit duplicative.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I was waiting for that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just as you're going.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 3.5, 3.5.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Gentlemen, Tola and Daniel, what you need to realize is Bernie has known me for probably half your lifetimes and he sets little traps to just make sure I'm paying attention. This is an example of it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, no.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is Cheryl paying attention?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I've been outed. So, 3.5 goes. Okay. Gentlemen, as Daniel had a green tick with those. Tola are you okay with those? Oh, we've lost Tola I think. I don't see him in there anymore. Alright.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hopefully he'll call back in.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, so 3.5 is killed. 4. Support for ICANN decisions, Item 4 of the ATRT Requirements. I threw in a couple of questions because I haven't seen anything in the stuff we've been talking about relative to that and just for the form, I thought we should have something. So, I've got 4.1. Over the last two years do you generally support the decisions made by the Board, yes or no? But we could go to sliding scale. And 4.2. Over the last two years… Let me finish and then you can beat up on it. Over the last two years do you believe the internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board?

                           So, I've asked the respondent to give us their point of view and I've asked the respondent to give us their point of view versus the internet

community. Now, I'm not really webbed to those, I'm just trying to make sure we get some data when we get to this question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree with you on the desirability of getting some data capture on this topic. I'd flip them however. I'd have your 4.2 as the first one and I'd run a sliding scale for the personal support or otherwise, as opposed to a Boolean. Because you're going to say no if you don't like even one where you may be generally happy but are concerned or dissatisfied on one or two, you know what I mean?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, so 4.2 becomes 4.1 with a sliding scale and 4.1 becomes 4.2. Oh no, sorry. 4.2 becomes 4.1 with a Boolean and then 4.1 becomes 4.2 with a sliding scale.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, no. 4.1 becomes 4.2 1 to 5. Okay. Daniel, are you okay with that?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel. Yeah, I think that should be fine, but I would just have a question to get a clarification. Does this follow the report, sorry, the Board Work Plan that they set forth in FY 18 for the next two years? Because if it does then I think these questions are good questions to backup with

backup Board performance and actions based on what they are focusing on. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Daniel, Cheryl here. The Board Work Plan of course is a looking forward planning document, and this is specifically about decisions. This might be an ideal place however to put in a Board Work Plan specific question which could be something similar to what we did with financial. In other words, because it's public documentation, are you aware of and satisfied with the Board's publication of their two-year Work Plan, etcetera, etcetera. Would that, you know?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, that makes sense but also looking at the actions that the Board has set forward to conduct and they're expected to, I think they come forth after an explicit decision that came as an outcome of key focus or emphasis. Does that make sense?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Board decision is a resolution. The Board decision is a decision, and decisions are made at almost every Board meeting. Some of them are monumental, some of them are administrative. There are many, many, many, many of them over a two-year period.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay, Daniel for the record. I think let's proceed because this discussion [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Alright.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would be happy to ask about the plan because that's the forward-looking document where they've recently just updated that actually, Bernie. So, they did a presentation in Marrakech on it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, I'll try to slide in a question with 4.3 and we can circle back to it. Alright, 5. PDPs, Item 5 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws. Have you participated or contributed to any Policy or Policy Development Process? I'm not sure about the wording of contributed to a Policy. I'm not sure how you contribute to a Policy. But anyways, if no, what has hindered you from participating?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, just contribute to Policy Development Process would be fine. Participated in or contributed to Policy Development Processes.

EN

BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Right, okay. Good, we understand each other. And 5.2, if no, what has hindered you from participating or contributing? So that would be a text answer. But we might be able to flip that into a question with a scale in saying, "If no, was it because you were hindered?"
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	True, or we could give half a dozen or five reasons. No time, not enough background, don't understand the subject, not interested in, whatever, and get them to tick any or all of the following. If you said no, were any or all of the following issues and those issues you could almost steal straight out of some of Brian Cute's work including the bits that he's already ditched.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Right, okay. That's interesting. [inaudible]
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	You could ask, "If no, was it the scope of the PDP, was it the time commitment required in a PDP, was it the hours of the day that the calls are done, do you feel ill prepared in whatever way to contribute, or other." And if it's other, then it's other.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Right.
DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Daniel for the record.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I strongly agree with this section. Very strong questions. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, great. Have you faced challenges?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That then means, well, that means we get rid of that one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: What? I'm completely missing it.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Please, please don't. Don't get rid of it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, no. We're not getting rid of them. She's teasing you. 5.3. Have you faced any challenges with the ICANN PDP?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just say first of all, is there such thing as an ICANN PDP to begin with?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Secondly, if we ask those questions above, the questions, the one we just discussed was that if you haven't participated, what stopped you? This is one that could be framed, "If you have participated were you challenged by...", then a list of things?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, okay. We have the same understanding. That's how I would restructure that one. Okay. If yes, what are some of the…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You give them another [inaudible]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, so, 5.4 then we would restructure similarly to 5.2. 5.5. In the PDPs you participated in were there any issues related to transparency? Okay. If yes, please describe these.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't understand what is meant by this question?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I guess, you know, after Yannis's point in his presentation today that he feels that PDPs are the most transparent in any organization that he's been processes, I'm not sure where we're going with this one, but I don't have anything against the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure what the issues related to transparency actually mean. I mean, I could say, "Yeah I've got issues related to transparency. We actually publish far too much information to the point where no one can actually look through, digest, and make use of any of it." So, that's what you might get from someone like me, which is not what you want, right? [inaudible]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. The next two questions are very similar.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, I think I understand what it was trying to ask. Let's see if there's a better way of asking it. So, in the PDPs you've participated in, where there any issues related to the transparency? Can we rather than yes or no, ask on a scale of, in relation to the transparency associated with PDPs you have participated in, please indicate your satisfaction, or something like that. You know what I mean?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. Okay. But they were trying to get to a text answer in 5.6 and 5.8 relative to those issues which was the core of these questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's the next one. 5.6. Okay. Well, first of all, I would defy most people on even understanding what organizational transparency is, but that's just me. I'm going to argue that what we're doing for the individuals is a satisfaction survey and if we want the gory details, we ask the ACs/SOs. The ACs/SOs can describe. Let's take 5.6 out for the individuals.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, so 5.6 and 5.8 would go away and maybe we would just slightly restructure 5.5, 5.7.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. I'm comfortable with that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Daniel are you okay with that?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Just thinking deep about this issues coming in because if you look at community accountability and the PDP, the points thereby the process, during the process, the person's required to get community feedback and then in case the community feedback hasn't been got, then the responses were then the members who are participating or actively engaged are closed to themselves without giving back to the community.

So, go back and kind of read the question. In the PDP you participated in, where there any issues related to community accountability. That is, I think, try to check on whether these inter-process or the process of the individuals they are involved in, were they trying to get community feedback regarding to a specific issue.

I'll give an example. During the RDS Working Group, the Former RDS, is that the points whereby we had to get back to our [inaudible] ask them to clarify the respective data elements. I think that is one of the key, that is an example of whereby as the process is going on, you get back, get community feedback and come back and report back to the PDP. So maybe that would create a little bit of sense. I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is simply one marble of how a PDP may run. Other PDPs will have entirely different models and if you're talking a ccNSO PDP it'll be an absolutely different model. So, why not ask about accountability in a similar way to however we are going to ask about transparency. And so, if someone has participated in a Policy Development Process, let's ask how satisfied were they with the process's accountability to community?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, yeah, I can see that.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel. That makes strong sense. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. Good suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is [inaudible] paying you the big bucks?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, that's right. [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a very happy ringtone. Wow. Bernie really wants to talk to those people.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Really. Subsection with processes versus community accountability or something.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Accountability to the community, not community accountability.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Accountability to the community. Okay, so we've got 5 done, excellent. IRP. Even if we don't have questions, I listed all the key elements from the Bylaws. That's taken care of. That will be closed this Friday. ATRT2, we're doing the reviews. That will be taken care of. The assessment of the implementation. We could go up to 8 please. Paging Brenda. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: She's probably multitasking.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Probably. Thank you, Brenda. Periodic Reviews. Item 8 of the ATRT Requirements in the Bylaws. We didn't really have any questions on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We need to.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I put in a few. How would you rate the effectiveness of the periodic reviews as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws? 8.2. Given periodic reviews in one form or another have been making recommendations to improve ICANN for over a decade and considering the changes which were the result of the Transition away from the U.S. Government oversight such as CCWG Accountability Work Stream 1, should periodic reviews be reconsidered or amended? And that's a sliding scale. And finally, similarly to previous question, should Organizational Reviews, those reviewing SOs/ACs, also be reconsidered or amended?

So, just trying to get some feedback so we can have some food for thought on here. I know it says Periodic Reviews and maybe it shouldn't go straight into Organizational Reviews. So, thoughts, comments, on those? Cheryl?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It helps if I come off mute. Sorry, I was voice testing in my other Zoom Room. I have left however with my right brain. You'll be pleased to know you've got my right brain, people. I'm giving Subsequent Procedure my left brain. Well, I haven't started yet, but I was just, you know, figured you didn't hear me needing to voice test.

I am concerned about the age specificity, the sophistication of the language in 8.2. Everything else has been relatively simple language and on 8.2 we've jumped right into pretty ICANN-ese and I'm wondering is there a way… that would be fine for an ACs/SOs. Can we dumb it for this?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We can dumb it down a lot and just ask is it time that reviews be reconsidered?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Something really, asking the same thing but much more simply and then leave this 8.2 for ACs/SOs.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Right, okay. Understood. So dumb down 8.2 for this version. Okay, so we're okay with 8.1. 8.2 we'll fix. Do we keep 8.3?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would like to see it left in. Go ahead Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, I was saying that I think the question 2 also makes sense. In fact, it has been a comparison to the previous reviews that have taken place.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So, we'll leave that in. Alright, 8 is done. 9. Accountability Indicators. Have you looked at the ICANN Accountability Indicators which can be found at, yes or no? If you have looked at these, how would you rate their usefulness overall, sliding scale. If you have looked at these, how would you rate these for effectiveness in measuring accountability for ICANN, sliding scale. Thoughts, questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noting that that is slightly duplicative, but not specifically duplicative of what we've asked in the Board. I still have no problem with it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, Daniel are you okay with this one?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record. I think it's [inaudible] the first one is looking already at kind of [inaudible] organizational reviews.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sorry, I missed that.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm saying that I think it makes sense because the first one actually includes looking at periodic reviews and that 8.3 is looking at the organizational reviews.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, yeah. We've moved on to Item 9, Daniel. Sorry. We're asking about 9.1, 9.11, and 9.12. That's why I'm confused.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Sorry about that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No problem.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think I'm okay with 9.1 and 9.2. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, great. Alright, so 10, these were the other questions which I didn't know where to fit in to the above categories. 10.1, do you have any thoughts you wish to share regarding ICANN's open data mechanisms including the Information Transparency Initiative or the Open Data Initiative or about ICANN's transparency policies more generally? We've asked about this in a simple format above. I just don't know how to deal with it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I almost am concerned that we have this opening to text here which I'm less excited about.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I mean, it could be a great question for ACs but…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel, for the record. [inaudible] for other considerations that you could probably chip in and look into during analysis because I still believe that you can always find somewhere where they could be able to suit. Because if you look at open data mechanisms and the way information or data is relayed to the community or in the public domain, it contributes greatly to the level of how accountable or transparent the organization is. So, in case the opinion is that, sorry to choose opinions but the feedback that we get from the individuals will contribute greatly to understanding how the level of transparency or how accountable the organization has been.

And if you look at 10.2 the mechanisms. So, [inaudible] policies, that means in case the level of transparencies open and then one says that the levels are sufficient then that means that you can be able to at least give a substantial contribution to the respective question regarding to how accountable the organization has been. Thank you.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. They are a grab bag of questions. I really would like to keep the individual's questions at an almost survey satisfaction level. So, let's look at what we can do with it. On 10.1, rather than ask about any thoughts, let's ask are they aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms including these things and then it can be yes or no. And then a subpoint about ICANN's transparency policies more generally, a satisfaction sliding scale. Then that means 10.2 can become a yes or no or a sliding scale, either, don't mind.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Then if 10.2 is a Boolean, we are then I guess able to ask about shortcomings if we want to open it to text. If it's not a Boolean, then we could ask. So, if it's a sliding scale on whether it's sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global internet community, then we could ask something about their opinions on how much improvement needs to be made to them. Do you see what I mean? So rather than ask what the shortcomings are, ask what their opinion is on the amount of improvement that's required. Then let's turn 10.4 into a satisfaction level rather than a Boolean, and the same again as we did with the one above about [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 10.4 to a certain extent is very duplicative to the question we had up in the Board. Because we had 1.6 which was, how satisfied are you with

the Nominating Committee's Selection of Director's for the ICANN Board over the past 2 years, and a sliding scale of 1 to 5.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, but that is specific to the Board, remember the NomCom appoint to a [inaudible] the Board.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That's true. Fair enough.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Obviously this is the other as the rest.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Agreed. Okay and then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if need be, we can be specific about that and say, other than for Board appointments do you believe?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, right.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I agree.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Okay, Board appointments. Okay, excellent. And then if not, how could it be improved? Do we keep it text answer?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Or as we've done for the sliding scale above in the new 10.3, to what degree of improvement could be given, satisfaction, absolutely satisfied or not. I'd do the same there.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Okay, so 10.5 becomes do you believe there should be changes or should be improvements?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	To what degree to believe that improvements could be made, you know, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Right. Should be made, 1 to 5. Okay.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	That needs wordsmithing.
BERNARD TURCOTTE:	Yeah. Okay, listen, we're three minutes to the agreed end so I think that's the big part we had to do. I will try to get a revised version out by end of my business day so you guys can have a look at it tomorrow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's great, Bernie. Now are you going to based on what we've done, remaster some of these others because we've now got a new style in thinking on some of them which I think would just be able to be literally plugged into the other the ACs/SOs and even the GAC and others?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. I'll start by cleaning up the individual one. Once we get agreement, then I'll plow that back into the SOs/ACs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bloody marvelous. Excellent in fact.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay for you, too, Daniel? I'm going to suppose it's okay. Alright guys.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He's running on a battery run tiny phone. So, let's…

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Tiny phone. Alright thank you everyone. Have a good day. I'll get working on this.

BRENDA BREWER: Thanks for that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I feel good that we've done that. Thank you, team, bye everyone.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thanks everyone.

BRENDA BREWER: Bye.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]