

---

**BRENDA BREWER:** Good day everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary Call Number 30 on the 18<sup>th</sup> of September, 2019 at 2100 UTC. The members attending the call are Cheryl, Tola, Jacques, Vanda, Sebastien. Observers joining us are Everton Rodrigues, Avri Doria and Jim Prendergast. From ICANN Org we Negar and Brenda, and technical writer Bernie has joined. We have apologies from Maarten, Yaap, Osvaldo and Jennifer. Pat will be delayed and joining us shortly. Today's call is being recorded; I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking. Cheryl, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you, and I will note, Michael has joined as well, thank you.

**CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:** Just making it in under the wire, Michael, excellent, thanks so much. We're trying to make sure Daniel is back on, and once Daniel is back on, Brenda, I can maybe leave you to deal with that and dial out or whatever is needed, that means that at least we have all of our work parties represented. If we can now move to our agenda display on screen, that would be appreciated.

The usual beginning with administrivia; good morning, good afternoon and good evening. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Pat, the other co-chair for the Plenary Session Number 30 will be joining shortly, he's been held up by a business meeting; he sends his temporary apologies. Our administrivia to start our day after our rollcall and my somewhat inadequate welcome is a call for any updates to your statements of interest. Have any of you got an update to inform us of? Somebody's got a new opportunity for employment or a contract running, now is the

---

*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.*

---

time to join. I note also that for the record that Ramet has joined as well, welcome Ramet.

Not seeing any hands, scrolling up and down to make sure we don't miss them in the Zoom room, and not seeing anything being typed in chat, we will move on from this agenda item. Just before we get into our agenda per se, you'll notice this is a relatively lean agenda but we are going to commit a reasonable amount to reviewing our two major pieces, which are under agenda item four and agenda item five, that is looking at our reviewing of our proposed new work plan, just in case you got use to the old one, we've quickly modified it and made it more beautiful and more user friendly, so there's a new workplan.

We're going to get into the deep diving on the report and looking at how we're going to go towards completion of our outstanding sections. Noting of course, finally many of will be gathering in face in face meeting in Singapore at the end of October, towards the end of October and in those three days we will be doing the lion's share of serious work at a plenary and that report will go from one level to another during that time as well.

Our agenda is in front of you, if there is anyone who has a piece of any other business that they wish to flag now, please do so. We will be calling for any other business again towards the end of the call. Not seeing any announcement of any other business at this stage. Let's go back to the agenda. Jennifer is not with us today, she has a rostered day off I believe, I think that's why she's not here, that she has a rostered day off, it will be Negar going over any of our action items to review, whether they are new or closed. Most importantly, this is going

---

to include a brief update on the survey, which I think might also bring Bernie into play as well. Negar, over to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Hello everyone. No new updates on the action items. Just wanted to note that if you recall over the past couple of weeks we did a doodle poll to gather the count of the review team members that are going to be in Singapore and I believe out of the selected team of the review team, 10 of the review team members will be joining us in Singapore. You should all have received your travel arrangements and hotel confirmations or on their way if you have not received it already. If you do have any issues with your travel arrangements please do drop us a note and we will follow up to see if we can help move those items to a resolution sooner than later. We are still a bit away the meeting date, so there's still a bit of time in case you have not received hotel confirmations and other pieces relevant to your travels, so please do let us know if anything comes up.

As for the survey update, let me hand it over to Bernie to see if he has any information that he would like to share in that regard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Negar. Yes, you'll be glad to know as of this morning we are complete. We finished the cleaning up of the individual surveys and I've been looking over that. We have 88 responses, of course not everyone responds to all questions but considering the time of year and everything I think we did pretty darn well. We'll have a presentation on that next week.

---

Currently we are sitting at 12 structure responses, meaning SO/AC's and their component parts and there are a few that came in overnight that are being entered, those should be finalized today or tomorrow. In section five, the deep dive of the report, to give us an idea of what it could like look if we insert those responses, I've inserted a few of them based on the information that we have so far. Looking good for us to have something very -- have a good presentation on the results of the survey next week and have a bunch of that stuff included in the draft report. That's it for me unless there are questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Bernie, not so much a question as a desire for incredible clarity because we do have some doers on this call and of course the leadership team will be [inaudible] what you meant when you said, "Cleaning up individual responses." There may have been indrawing of breath by some of the respondees if they feel that we are in some way interfering with their fully filled out surveys. Would you just explain to all of us, including the viewing public what was meant by that statement?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes, terribly sorry. We had a number of individual responses which were basically people logged into the application and answered only one or two questions and we did not feel that those were -- which were first two questions meaning, which SO/AC are you part of and which RALO are you part of. All those questions we went through and those replies sorry and we eliminated those because they didn't really bring anything to the survey. If people responded to actual questions in the

---

survey then it was kept and logged. That was what was meant by cleaning up. After the clean-up, then there is some processing to generate some reports from that. Back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much and hopefully after the collected intake of some peoples breathes, I suspect I'm getting a sigh, which is good. Thank you for clearing that up, that is an important understanding and we certainly want on the public record. No interference, the data is the data is the data. Simply having opened the survey and the process started and we certainly weren't going to keep dirty data, which was literally what regional RALO or area are you from and nothing more. Bernie, your hand is up, go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, one minor point I forgot to mention. Just to be clear, the raw data will be made available, so this is not a question of ICANN just keeping this in vest and giving you processed stuff. Of course, we will process it and make it easier to look at but everyone will have access to all the data that we received to make sure that we're doing a good job. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Bernie. For those of you have a great desire to spend your weekends and end of eve vacation doing non-parametric analysis or other statistical profs on the survey raw data, have at it, it's all going to be out there, more power to you if you do. That's not actually a joke,

---

there are people out there who would find that fun, I'm just not one of them, Bernie probably is however, I respect the hobby.

What we're going to move to now is item three on our agenda. We seem to be powering through our agenda ahead of time already, but that's okay, we can work with that. We don't have to fill up all the available time allocated to a call. Any work party updates that the work parties would like to bring to the plenary's attention, we have representatives from each of the primary work parties, that's the Board, the GAC, the Reviews and the Community. We note again for the record, in particular but it affects all the work parties, a lot of data coming out of the surveys, the next big block work and that is particularly the case for both reviews and community.

We also note that the workstream, which is a plenary activity is something that we're handling separately and there has been no update from our last update to bring forward but it is coming into the reporting work, so you'll see what we know about our workstream two activities and the implementation there of, will be reflected when we get into report. Bernie, correct me if I'm wrong but we haven't had another meeting of the implementation team on workstream two since our last meeting but we have put in the questions for the Board's consideration, is that the case?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

That is the case but I did get an update yesterday and I forgot to post it to the workstream two list. The questions are being working on and there is a desire to meet with the workstream two implementation

---

team to go over those to make sure there's a common understanding and we're hoping that that meeting can be arranged for the end of the month.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. There you go, you heard it here first ladies and gentlemen, you got a little bit of preview news before the workstream implementation team even knew about it. Thanks very much for that then Bernie, the update I didn't know we were going to have.

Let's then now go to I'm assuming Sebastien and then Vanda, Daniel and Michael in that order. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Nothing specific. To add I guess, going through the report will allow to maybe have some discussion on where we are but I think the many work was to be on page with the report and we know now we need additional work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent, thanks so much for keeping us updated. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We are continuing to work in our Skype group. What we agreed was in the item four in the workplan because we believe that the date for 20<sup>th</sup> of October will not allow us to go to Singapore to read and be comfort with the work done before arriving. We agreed that we should set this

---

item for 17<sup>th</sup> of October and I send information and asking for notification to this group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent Vanda, thank you very much. Daniel, if your connection is going to hold stable for us, anything from you and Casey? Daniel, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you, can you check your mute?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yesterday we had our meeting together with Casey, together with [inaudible] and I'm happy to share that with you, just waiting for the data to be available and we shall be able to start the analysis of the data, generating input and also shall be [inaudible] to the report together with Bernard because that's where our main core will be coming in the review of the analysis of the data. Thank you, back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, we appreciate the fact that even in absence of the survey data, you and the work party are holding some touching base and pre-planning activity work along with Bernie so that when we start getting the analysis and data to work with, we will have that of course beginning of next week, that you'll be in a position to know how you're going to be dealing with into the documentation. Thank you very much for that. Michael.



---

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Nothing specific to report. But, like Daniel, I think the survey results will be interesting to forming this work towards a conclusion. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Michael. Did you want to take an opportunity, even it's just a finding a synchronized time with Bernie to do some of the report review prep work, to see whether you're thinking in your work party is aligned with the design of the report? Perhaps if you keep that in your mind as we go through to agenda item five today, you might just have one or two questions that are raised and you and Bernie can interact on that just via Skype, via your work party Skype. Cover those things off if they are raised in your thinking processes today or in the next couple of days, that might be a good thing because I know that's what Daniel and Casey has just done. The same of course goes for everybody but it just strikes me that it's a good opportunity to know how you're going to be thinking about final production while you're doing the analysis. Thanks very much for that everybody.

Brings us now to what will be probably about 15ish minutes I guess, we can take more time if needs be so don't hold back if you've got questions, but we're now going to display the proposed new workplan. Jennifer is skiving off here because she's done primarily this work and bring the leadership team up to date on this work but I'm quite sure that Bernie, who worked with her and Negar who's becoming her voice for today's call will now take us through and make sure we are very clear on where we are on our ongoing reporting in the slightly new design of the workplan. Who am I handing over to? Am I handing over

---

to Bernie or am I handing over to Negar? One of you jump in and take it away.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. Why don't we let Bernie speak to it, I'm happy to cover additional items if need be?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, from the top Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you. As we covered last week, this first section we skipped over is basically complete, it's all the background stuff and getting ready to get the work team ready. Next, we've broken it down into a format that looks like the report but before getting into that we have a section that you have on the screen right on which is Community Survey. Really, you see the date's in there, which we're matching up to pretty much. Develop the questions, publish the survey, analyze the results and publish the survey results to the Wiki and get us done. We've got those dates in there and we're trying to line up with that to the extent possible.

Then we get into preparing the draft report. The first part is the executive summary and basically, you'll see completion dates in yellow there, 23 of November. We've got some section that are written and we'll see that when we do item five of the agenda later today, there is some percentage there. But obviously given item 1.5 Summary of Finding and Review of Conclusions and Review of Team

---

Recommendations, hard to write before we finish doing all the other work, that's why we're got 23 November closing date on that, which giving us a few weeks to prep this into a package for a public consultation.

Review Background, I think that's leftover and is actually included in 1.2 and we'll be cleaning that a little bit later. Issue 3, yes, I see in the chat, so to be clear, these highlighted in yellow sections have been recently updated and are brought to your attention, yes exactly, thank you. We'll use the Board Section 3 Issue 1 because all the other sections are going to be basically very similar. The introduction is done on all of those under Information Gathering.

We have 3.2.1 ATRT2 Assessment, we're trying to wrap those up for the end of the month of September. We've done pretty much that there is to do as far assessing the implementation and the effectiveness. What we will see when we go through the report is, we've got to finish writing conclusions for all of those things. We'll be going through some of those, the Board and GAC sections are almost completely done, so that's done. Section 3.2.2 Survey Results, we see to the end of September to get those in and derive some conclusions from those. We will be busy over the next couple of weeks.

Other Information, basically as we come out of the Montreal meeting, that why that 7 November date is there as we may gather some final input for our report before making our recommendations final. 3.3 Analysis of information identifications and issues, that closes off after our Singapore meeting. You will see that 3.4 recommendations to address the issues, also closes off after our Singapore meeting, at least

the initial set of recommendations. What you will notice in the report when we go through it in section 5 is, we've added a new section in between analysis and recommendations, which is suggestions as we discussed on some meetings. Basically, given the requirements to make recommendations are quite significant.

There are things which the group may wish draw ICANN's attention to without having to go through the process for making a recommendations, as such leadership thought it was a good idea to have the possibility of making suggestion and so we'll be adding that to each of the items as we go through them.

That's the general layout for the sections which match up, as we said the other week, to the sections of the reports. We've got the Board, we've got GAC, we've got Public Input, which mostly deals with public comment. Section 6 Acceptance of ICANN Decisions, for those of you shaking your head a bit, yes, it's in the bylaws, that's why it's there. Issue 5, item 7, Policy Development Process.

Issue 6, Independent Review Process, you'll not that that's closed off so we're done with that one. Issue 7 Assessment of Relevant ATRT2 Recommendations, this one's a little bit special because we're dealing with the individual recommendations in each of the other sections. This section is really about a general take on how the recommendations were implemented as opposed to going into individual recommendations and actually we'll be looking at that section today, as I've got some proposed text for you when we go through the report.

---

---

Issue 8 Assessment of Periodic Reviews, I think we're familiar with that. Accountability Indicators, we've added that in, of course there is no ATRT2 Recommendation on that but there are survey questions and the answers are interesting.

Issue 10 Prioritization and Rationalization of Activities, again, there are actually some ATRT2 recommendations which touch on the financial stuff, we've got some stuff to close off in there and there are quite a few survey questions and the results are interesting.

Before I leave the sections of the report, I don't know if there are any questions? You see all the yellows basically give you the same dates. Not seeing anything, okay.

Socialized Recommendations, we will of course seek input and guidance from the Board. We're trying to arrange a meeting with the Board after our face to face in Montreal to discuss the early concept of recommendations. After that, there is the public comment, as we said, we're trying to get that off the ground 9 of December and give till 22<sup>nd</sup> of January to get that done. It's going to take us about a week to process the data once it closes, not to mention that some people always put in the answers after it closes. Then we will try and publish the staff report. The final report will be from 27 of January to 12 March the latest and we should be done. Questions, thoughts, comments? Does not look like it. Over to you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Bernie. I hope everyone else is as comfortable with this slightly leaner but still I think deeply enough detailed for both

---

running a project effectively and efficiently, keeping our intentions clear from a transparency point of view and keeping ourselves on track. We've got this now more specifically aligned to the form of report, we've settled on as well. Hopefully this is making everybody feel a lot more comfortable. You will not, it does not make one iota of difference to our end date. Whilst we've juggled and juggled a couple of things around, to work slightly differently than we had originally planned with regard to our face to face meeting in Singapore and what we'd be doing there in terms of agenda.

In fact, the leadership team and Pat and I and Staff believe that we will getting more bang for our buck and more effectiveness and more productivity out of our Singapore meeting the way things have worked out and are now reflected in this workplan. Of course, what we will be actually doing in Montreal, where perhaps somewhat over ambitiously we have thought we may have draft report already out for socializing in Singapore, those dates have needed to be juggled. There you go, at least we're planning on bringing the train into the station on, we're just got to accelerate around some of the curves at slightly different speeds and at slightly different and we can reach the plan.

Alright, enough of my metaphoring for one meeting. I'll have to come up with some more metaphors for my following meeting. Sebastien, over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think it's a good piece of work and everybody's now aligned on the same date and that's good because I recall during

---

the last meeting, face to face meeting in Los Angeles I guess we were a bit different on the schedule for each part. I have two questions but the first one could be discussed later on, when we have seen the document, it's how we will handle the different recommendation, sorry the different items, item 1 is Board, but for the other how we will be organized, till one of my concerns.

My second, it's a question, do we have any plan to have a face to face meeting between Montreal and Cancun at any date where we will review the final report or something like? Just to know where we think we will eventually be meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sebastien. I note neither of those questions directly relate to the workplan other than the face to face meetings option, which if it did exist would need to be reflected in a workplan as a hashtag number five. We have not looked at and we won't know until to some extent our work being wrapped up in Singapore where we stand on that second question Sebastien but it's certainly something that Pat and I have thought we would discuss, at least in the closing part of our Singapore meeting. You can expect to have it on the agenda at the Singapore meeting.

The other thing that we will need to take into consideration is the nature of such of a gathering. There are a number of ways to fur the work, they don't all have to evolve around flying people to a particular hub location in the traditional for of face to face meeting. To that end, depending on available budget and a needs analysis that we will all be

---

involved with and the expert advice that we can take on, what choices of gathering should one need to be made, we can move forward with that one, we have more data available to make decision on.

One of the things for example that has been done in a few cross community working groups is specially the one was involved with the very heavy workload on the IANA transition, was to have not so much a face to face gathering but a several day event, which was still virtual blocked out significantly, great big lumps of people's times, even though they were attending virtually. Three-hour blocks were spent furthering discussion and drafting as we came towards final reporting on some of that work, that is another model, one of several we may look at. I'm sort of not answering your question but answering your question as much as we will need to discuss and answer your question.

The first question I think is going to be a perfect segway into our next agenda item, without going back to agenda, I think we can just slip now into final report and bring that up. This is going to be back to you Bernie, hopefully you've had a sip off water, lubricated your voice box because we're going to move now to agenda item five and I believe this one is all yours as well. Over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Alright everyone, this is the first look on something that's starting to get slightly some meat on the bone. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on the introduction, everyone can review, it's been written, some people have looked at and I'd be glad to take your comments on that.



---

Subject background, again same thing, it's been drafted based on the core information available. Please have a look at it, I'd be glad to take your comments. The document has been included as a Google Doc and you can use that or if you prefer you can use Word and send me your comments and we'll get them.

Review scope is just taking about the things that we have discussed in the line to report on. No great surprises there.

Two, as I said has got to be determined there and I think it's going to be cleaned up as it was just an artifact of the things. The numbering will be redone. Sebastien has mentioned that it really bothered him that item three was issue one and he's done a draft at relabeling these first parts that we looked at as the A and then making issue one item so that it's easier to follow and we'll be looking at that to just facilitate everyone's handling of this. The first one is Board, been working with Sebastien and Pat and a little bit Osvaldo, as with all the sections the introduction what is being asked in the bylaws for what we have decided to look at, in this case it's in the bylaws as the requirement.

Moving down to the information gathering, the first part of information gathering in all the sections, this is of course relevant ATRT2 recommendations. What we have here is the recommendation and below it implementation that is a copy paste from the spreadsheet that we've all learned to love and hate at the same time and that is a Google Doc. Some of you will notice that it's been edited, I have cleaned up the language in certain cases, I have not changed the meaning as far as I can tell. I just made it consistent across all the assessments and turned it

---

into, if you will, a slightly better English sometimes. We have the implementation and we have the effectiveness.

Then we have a conclusion. We'll go back up and we'll do this one because Board is one of the ones where we've actually done quite a few conclusions. This first recommendation, the Board should develop protective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members and the success of Board improvement efforts and analyze the findings over time. We've got the implementation, I'm not going to read that thing, we've gone over those things. We've got the effectiveness. Implement it but no applicable because it's not possible to gauge. The conclusion of this recommendation has been implemented as much as possible, as such, no further action is required in respect to this recommendation. That gives you a flavor of how we're handling these things.

The next one is, the Board should develop metrics to measure effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts and publish the materials used for training to the gauge the levels of improvement. We've the implementation assessment, which has been published. We've got the effectiveness assessment, oh forgot to clean that up, sorry. Partially implemented and partially effective. The conclusion is, only part of the material used for training is published, like in 2016 only part one of the developing a high impact board, ATRT3 should consider making a suggestion or recommendation that the Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Boards functioning and improvement efforts or if those measures exist, allow the ATRT3 to evaluate.

Basically, you can go through those if you will, I'm not going to read every single one of them, they've been gone through. Those are draft conclusions because as we agreed, the conclusions on all the recommendations will be reviewed by the plenary and we'll make sure that we're all comfortable with them.

Just to give you a flavor, you do not have this in the document I emailed out but apart from that it's the same document, but I included some of the results of the survey to give you an idea of how it could be structured for us to work with. Under Board, the first question is, please indicate your satisfaction with the Board's performance overall. We have the individual responses, very satisfied, no opinion, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied and we have structure responses, by structure you'll remember, that's the term we came up with because we decided to expand it beyond SO's and AC's and include the underpinning structures that are associated with the GAC and ALAC and so that's stretched out a bit.

Right now, you'll see that's in yellow because as I mentioned when we were talking about the survey, we're not quite finished cleaning up the structured data and entering it because quite few of them sent it in via Word Document, we're still working on that and we hope to have that done very shortly. As of last night, the data looked like this from the point of view of the structure responses. If you look, we're doing pretty good. We've got 11 responses on that and they're still a few coming in. I think we did really, really well verses the structures. Everyone worked really hard. And last night, believe it or not, we got the GAC response and it was very well done also. Kudos to all the SO's and AC's and structures, really worked hard. Some of the responses are excellent,

---

---

really excellent and thought out. People not only worked in a short time but actually provided really interesting response and you can see it's been thought.

On the next one consolidation. Of course, when you've got two different surveys you've got to bring those in together and how do you do that? Right now, the suggestion is weighing those not evenly but saying that the structures will represent 75 percent of the response the individuals will represent 25 percent and that's what it gives. The logic behind that is, that the structure response is being made on behalf of the membership or the participants and represents a lot of people. I see Negar's hand up, please.

NEGAR FARIZINNIA:

Thank you, Bernie. I just wanted to point out that RSSAC has also submitted their answers to us. They submitted in an email attachment so we will be sure to include that information into the survey data, you can mark them as having submitted their response as well.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Negar, that's great. Yet, one more. I think we're going to be up to about 15 structures having answered, in my book, that's absolutely stunning.

This is the consolidation. I will tell you I've run the numbers with what I have, the consolidation is usually matches both fairly well. There are a few exceptions and we will show them. We do require a consolidation. That's how we've structured it and I'm looking forward to your inputs to

---

see if this is a good way of doing it and really presenting the information. Now, of course, what's the work to be done? It's going to be fine putting in those graphs and charts here but we move on to the next section.

Analysis and conclusions...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sorry, just before you do, just to pause and make sure while people are getting their head around it because that's an awful lot and a lot of excitement in what we've been shown in just a preview, just a peak under the covers or under the hood here, it's very exciting, at least to me. But I did just want to allow anyone who wants to question the rationale in the waiting, if they want to do that now?

Obviously, there is the gathering together part of the equation that Bernie outlined but there is also the recognition that many structures will have had their opinion pieces and surveys created by people who also will have put in individual responses. We need recognize that there is always a possibility of double dipping there and the weighing is a way of dealing with that in a well-recognized, statistically valid methodology. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you for that Cheryl and yes, that completes that quite well. I've done another one because as you'll see, there's another section here that we can add into the consideration. The next question is, do you consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory? The

---

individual responses were 52 to 48. The structure responses were 4 to 7, so here we see there is a dis alignment here as far as concerns. It's fascinating to see that the component part of ICANN to almost two thirds have a problem with the diversity on Board members. If we consolidate it with 46 60, which I think is a fair representation.

Then if we go down a bit more on the document, you'll see we've added a section comments because on those questions where there are comments, we will include them. Basically, we've got and this is not final here, I just grabbed what was easy to grab to give you an idea of what it will look like once we do the homework properly on this. We've comments from, the bylaw should be amended to reduce the maximum of directors, if they're not attributed to anyone it's because they were individuals. Was someone speaking? No, okay.

The Asia Pacific region is considerably diverse and is the largest region within ICANN with approximately 61 percent of the world's population and the global end user population. Diversity in the size is not reflecting in the Board's composition. There's other stuff, it got cut off and we'll find it. Work on recruitment with women on boards, organizations and other gender board diverse strategy. Yes, request that 50 percent of candidates be women. Whilst so obviously from Europe. EURALO has responded no to this question. Our members recognize that diversity amongst Board members is improving but is still not a geographically gender stakeholder balanced as it could be, improvements are still in order. The comment goes on.

Then we've got North America NARALO with some other comments. The analysis section taking a first stab on this and you'll see why, a 60

percent dissatisfaction with the diversity of the Board is significant. When respondents were asked, what elements of diversity should be improved, the main areas noted were, geographical, gender and stakeholder group or constituency. What's interesting is the much stronger responses from the structures regarding this. Here are the results as they are in the survey. Hopefully this gives you an interesting preview, will allow you to adjust your minds as to how this going to look and gives you an idea that we're going to be burning the midnight oil here, getting that into those documents. Then, as a group, we're going to have to be working to generate some conclusions from all this data.

I've been talking a lot. Let's have a look if there are questions or comments. As I said, I'd really like to know if this type of approach or presenting the survey information seems okay to everyone? Please, comments are welcome. It just seems like a straightforward way and being very transparent about it. Not seeing anything, let's move on.

The next major segment is -- we've got as we've always said, analysis of information identification of issues. As noted, we've inserted a new section, 3.4 suggestions related to issues. As I mentioned, we'll be adjusting the work plan to include those but they'll have the same timelines as recommendations.

But, basically these are for things which are optional obviously from our point of view for the Board because of the requirements for making recommendations which we see right at the bottom of the page here, which are quite important. If there are things where we do not think we have all the materials or we can't get to it but we think it's important to flag in our report, then we can label it as a suggestion and we are not

---

---

burden with that entire requirement for making a recommendation. Is that okay also? Not seeing any hands so I hope I haven't put everyone to sleep.

The next section is the GAC. Basically, on ATRT2 we've included a prolog which is a work in process. Basically, trying to explain to people that the GAC is a special creature and although sometimes recommendations are made about how or where the GAC should work in the recommendations of ATRT2, we end up with [AUDIO BREAK]; sorry, my headset drops off every once and awhile but I've learned to recognize it.

Basically and we're not going to do each item but as you go through the ATRT2 recommendations, which touch on the GAC, you'll find several times on implementation or on the effectiveness or conclusion that we're saying, "This is about as much as can be done with this recommendation in the GAC and so we're considering this implemented, we're considering this effective and here are the conclusions." I will leave you to go through those and we will have a conclusion review party but that is not today. Let's keep going down.

I guess we should go all the way down to the ATRT2 section. Basically, we will do a dive in the section that is on ARTR2, which is section 8 or 9 I think, I can't remember. Alright, as I said, basically given that we're dealing with the ARTR2 recommendation in each of the individual sections of the report directly, this section, assessment of relevant ARTR2 recommendations is more about looking at how the organization implemented this in a general fashion. It's not about individual comments, we've done those as we saw in some of the Board ATRT2



---

recommendations. This is about looking more as to, do we have any general comments about how this was implemented?

Information gathering, we're actually going to do this one because I think I'd like to present it as a draft and see if we have comments so we can start ticking off sections for our report. The STRT2 implementation program Wiki contains a series of executive summary documenting the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations. The latest such executive summary is dated October 2018, the reference is there and was the starting point for ATRT3 assessing the implementation and effectiveness of the ATRT2 recommendations.

This report noted all of the ATRT2 recommendations as implemented. ATRT3 assessed each of the 47 distinct recommendations for implementation and effectiveness. The assessment criteria for implementation were implemented, partially implemented or not implemented. The assessment criteria for effectiveness were effective, partially effective, not effective or not applicable.

The table below summarizes the results of the ATRT3 assessment of the implementation of ARTR2 recommendations. This is from our beloved spreadsheet, basically I copied the assessments here. I think you get the idea. Then we have a little summary table. Basically, on the summary we have 70 percent that we evaluated that is implemented verses the 100 percent. We have 25 percent which we noted as partially implemented and we have 6 percent which are noted as not implemented. That is for the implementation.

For the effectiveness and those are supposed to be on the top of the column, we will fix that. Effective we have 35 percent of the recommendations being effective. 26 percent being particularly effective. We have about 60 percent which are either effective or partially effective. We have 6 percent which are not effective and we have about 33 percent of the recommendations where we could not conduct an assessment of the effectiveness.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I can't help myself, Bernie, I have to jump in. This is a new way I think, of graphically representing our analysis. I find this very powerful part of our reporting tool and I think it's going to send some very clear messages to how the perception of implementation and whether or not passing something on to someone else classifies as an implemented, needs to be looked at by ICANN as an organized. I'm delighted that Avri is onboard at the moment and I hope ease have crept up and eyes have opened as she's looked at this because of course she invested a huge amount of time into ATRT2 before she got snaffled up by the Board. I doubt she's surprised by these statistics but it's going to give some empowerment to what hopefully will change. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you for that Cheryl. I have to include that term in Alexa column. Did you say that Avri was snaffled? I like that. Sebastien.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bernie, one question. The sentence as a complete copy of ATRT3 assessment isn't in the previous part of the document?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, what I was thinking in that section is our spreadsheet, basically it will in an annex to the report.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: -- it's not one we have put it in the text because it's the same, people will be to the same thing in two different ways.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I agree with you on that, yes it will be the same thing but the point is, is if you're looking at this section and you see the recommendations and you want to go see a particular recommendation, as you will have noticed, they're not in sequence throughout the document, we all of a sudden jump from -- the first set are not too bad for Board and GAC but after that, they're spread all over the report and I think it would make it hard for people who are interested in tracking the ATRT2 recommendations to have to hunting all over the report. We've got it done in the spreadsheet format; I'm proposing that we just include as an annex. But yes, it will be the same information. I hope that's okay Sebastien?

That's our data and let's move down to the next section. I've drafted some text for the analysis of information and identification of issues. This section will focus on the general approach the organization has used to report on the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations while

---

specific issues with specific ATRT2 recommendations are addressed in the various relevant sections of this report. Although the October 2018 executive summary reports that all ARTR2 recommendations were implemented, ATRT3's assessment of these found a number of recommendations which were either non implemented or only partially implemented.

These differences in assessment can be classified into three categories, transferred to the CCWG accountability Work Stream 2, ATRT2 recommendations 9.2 and 9.3 were transferred to Work Stream 2 and the October 2018 executive summary notes these as complete when Work Stream 2 recommendations remain to be approved and implemented. As such, it would have been more precise and effective to note these as either partially implemented or as having been transferred to Work Stream 2.

ATRT2 recommendations -- although there is no agreement on these being completely implement, the new operating standards for specific reviews which were approved in June 2019, should prevent any such misunderstandings on the status of implementation going forward. Non implement, ATRT2 recommendations 5, 11.7 and 12.3 although the new operating standards for specific reviews should prevent such misunderstandings going forward, it is of great concern that the organization can report these recommendations complete when this is clearly not the case.

Although this analysis clearly identifies come issues with the assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations, the new operating standards for specific reviews, which was approved in June 2019,

---

specifically addresses these issues in section 4.2. We're by this point familiar with these as these are our requirements for us to make recommendations. Give the adoption of the new operating standards for specific reviews, should address the more serious issues raised in this analysis, there is no need for any further recommendations to mitigate the issues of partially implemented and non-implemented going forward.

However, it is a serious concern how the organization could note recommendations as being implemented when they were not. It is however unclear if the new operating standards for specific reviews would address the issue of transferring responsibility for implementation to another process as was the case for ATRT2 recommendations transfer to Work Stream 2.

ATRT3 notes that in such cases, implementation reports should clearly identify if the responsibility for the implementation of the specific review recommendation has been transferred to another process. Basically, you've got this and what we get out of that is a suggestion. Implementation report should never mark the implementation of the OC review recommendation that's implemented when this is clearly not the case as this weakens the credibility of the organization verses the community.

9.4.2 if the implementation of the OC review of recommendations is transferred to another process, the implementation report should clearly note this and factually report on the implementation of such recommendations and not simply mark these as implemented simply because they have been transferred. Recommendations, none.

---

A first cut on this and I see Sebastien has his hand up. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEB BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. One question about the last paragraph 9.3, starting however it is unclear. Yes, ATRT2 recommendation was transferred to Work Stream 2 but I have a feeling that what it was request for the ICANN Ombuds office was more than just a recommendation transfer but also an action to be taken as we had to do the review and engage an external reviewer for the Ombuds. Therefore, I would like to suggest that we -- it could be harder to see how it must be taken into account, it's not just recommendation but it's also some action to be done by Work Stream 2 coming from the ATRT2.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm going to argue this one a bit. ATRT2 made recommendations, we're talking about the recommendations and we're talking about the operating standards for specific reviews and how they align. Now, I will agree with you that transferring this recommendation to Work Stream 2, this was not a small recommendation and there was a lot to do and maybe we can address that with some text. But I believe that that is the point of element 9.4.2, after the review for marking things done which are not done, that's why I'm proposing there be a suggestion that if things are transferred to another process, the implementation report should clearly note this and factually report on the implementation of such recommendations and not simply mark these as implemented because they've been transferred.

---

The idea here is that if we end up where there are AOC recommendations that are made and the organization transferred them beyond the standard implementation process to other process, they should still have to report in their report how that implementation is going and I think that's probably the most important as far as transparency and understanding how recommendations get done.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are few other sections here but there is no surprises if you will. There is nothing else in the text. I'll be glad to take any other comments.

CHERYL LANGON-ORR:

Thanks, Bernie, have a quick sip of water, that's a huge amount of information you just talk us all through. I'm quite sure that you'll also be making yourself available if a few people think of something after this call, take it to the Skype chats and we will deal with it in follow up as well. One of the things I wanted to note for the record apart from what I think is a very strong structure and design trend here in where we are in this documentation, is how we are going to have I think, with the graphs and the tables, a quite easy look up document to leave the organization with, which I think is important.

We may also wish to think about what aspects of this document, even at this stage, we might wish to start socializing, perhaps in advance -- a bit of preview work I suppose, perhaps even in advance of releasing it for public comment. There may be an opportunity as you all gather with your groups for example, in Montreal to give some indicators on where some things may be heading, providing we all agree that that is

---

where we're heading, which should come together at the Singapore meeting. We need to put out thinking caps on about that as well. Let's start that in an offline discussion, you can use the lists and you can use Skype to further that thinking.

Given other people time to put their hands. Pat, I know you joined us pretty much as this part of the meeting began, I think you came in towards the middle to end of the work party discussion, you're still driving, do you have anything you wanted to say about this? I'm quite sure you could visualize this report because you and I have read it through so many times. Bernie keeps sending us homework, Pat and I aren't allowed to have weekends off anymore. Bernie has us by 24 7 on call. Pat, anything from you? Not hearing anything, let's assume he's either happy or he'll come in later. We don't want him to not drive safely. If can't unmute and he has to be in listen mode, that's fine too, I just wanted to open up an opportunity.

Okay ladies and gentlemen, if we can go back to our agenda now, that is the lion's share of today's call having been done. That is indeed a deep dive on the report but it's not the last time you'll be seeing this. We will be revisiting this again at some of our future weekly meetings. For next week's future meeting planning we will be focusing very much on the survey and the survey analysis. For next week's call you should imagine to see pretty much only one primary agenda item, with the objective of running through the survey in detail, that will of course then feed into more material to go into this report and then at the following meeting, one assumes we will be coming back to this report to see what is being shown in the tables and graphs and some of your thinking in these next seven to ten days can be brought in at that stage. Bernie, over to you.

---



**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** Thank you. You're quite correct in that statement and maybe I would like to suggest that we plan right now for a two-hour meeting and as we go forward from this point on, I think that's going to be the norm as a minimum because we've got a lot of homework to do.

**CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:** Bernie, it is just scary how you pick things out of my brain and say them. It's only been 25 years so I can't imagine why you can do that. Yes, indeed, one of the things that Pat and I wanted to raise was that we believe even though it's only a single primary objective for next week's agenda, that we should plan for it to be a two hour meeting and happy to foreshadow that we probably should be slotting our calendars to mark off two hours for future meetings, certainly between now and Singapore.

We'll get Staff to update the calendars and the marking of those events in keeping with that. They were the bits of any other business other than to let you all know that Pat and I, particularly as we come out of next week and the week after's call, when we have far more knowledge on what the survey is going to be telling us and what we are plugging into the report and where likely trends may be heading, certain suggestions and indeed perhaps even a number of recommendations, that we will as a result of that work then put of final Singapore agenda together.

On the Singapore meeting, coming back as we did have some update in action items and review section of today's call, whilst we won't have a

---

full compliment of our review team member on site in Singapore and that is regretful but it is what it is and we all have real work and real lives to get on with as well, with the acceptance of some of us, you are all volunteers and not as I am, a retiree. I must try the retirement some other way shortly. With that, we will have the availability of Zoom room participating, which will be public. All of our sessions will be open for anyone to join.

What we want to do, is find out from those members of the review team who are not, let me repeat that, not able to attend face to face in Singapore, Staff will be reaching out to you and will be finding out, are there particular blocks of time in your days, which would probably be the reason you're not able to travel to Singapore, that you cannot attend sessions. What we'll do our best to do is, set the agenda for Singapore to make sure that people who are engaged in particular activities or have been working with particular work parties can be available via remote participation to engage more completely or as completely as they can in our work. I believe that is all that was that we had to bring.

Bernie and Pat, can you remember anything from the leadership team discussion we had on Monday that I've missed there? Noting for the record and I'll go to Jacques if need be, that you said two hours will push Europe to 1am, not sure you can be very operational in this case. Super loaded with coffee is my suggestion. Starting the meetings at 10 UTC will of course not only affect other time zones Jacques it will also affect other meetings because we have already a number of times where our meeting overlaps at the beginning and often even at the end with other -- usually GNSO but not only GNSO regular call.

---

---

Staff could have a look at the overall calendars, reach out to the GNSO secretaries and the At-Large Advisory committee staff and see whether there are any obvious clashes in doing what you suggest by bringing it forward. Nagar, can you also make sure you reach out to the MSSR staff that are assisting the nominating committee, review implementation working group; from memory they are the three parts of ICANN work running along and in parallel at the moment that are interacting with our normal call time and rotation.

I'm not going to say yes or no Jacques, I'm noting it but I'm also reminding everybody that we rotate calls to share the pain and if we're going to move our calls forward, we need to not create other pain points for other people, if can avoid it. If we can do it, we will certainly make it so. With that then, I would suggest -- sorry Sebastien, you hand is up, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I think that Jacques wanted to say 20 UTC not 10 UTC because we are starting at 21 and my request before was to look if can as want half an hour more, we can decide to have it at the end but we can also decide to have it at the beginning, therefore it's 2030, would be okay with me but I think we could have a look it would be great. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We also do meet in rotation at the other UTC time or near about. If Staff can clear on exactly Jacques is asking for, to satisfy the Europeans, we should look into that as I've just said. Whether it goes at the

---

beginning or the end, is yet to be determined but we shall see and we still will call rotate so we will still be sharing all the pain, well some of the pain anyway.

With that then and I'm no doubt going to hear that now as an action for us to pick up on, does anyone have any other business that they have to raise with us today, if so let us know now? Not hearing anybody and not seeing anything coming up either chat or hand raised in the Zoom Room. Let's move on to our final agenda item for today, with this I delightfully, slight fully ahead of schedule, meeting will come to a close, Negar over to you for confirming any actions and decisions reached.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. I've got a couple of action items listed. One is for us to ensure we add an agenda item to the Singapore meeting for consideration for any special meetings in addition to the week we want that we currently have in place, this is to cover next steps in finalization of reporting, we've got that captured. Second action item is for Staff to determine if an earlier meeting time can be arranged, we have checked and the meeting times are at 11 and 2100 UTC and we will see if we can revert back to the earlier time, we'll get back to the team on that one. A decision reached was to plan for a two-hour plenary call moving forward, which of course will be incorporated into the time changes if any for the meetings. That's all that's captured.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much for that, Negar. I think you've captured everything. I'm just going to channel Pat here, seeing as he hasn't yelled at us over

---

the phone yet. Pat has a standing meeting, which is a work commitment, which under normal circumstances means he is fully occupied almost up until the minute we start our call at this time on our cycle, our 2100 UTC, Pat is already committed to an important standing work item. If we are to move one of our calls back to earlier, to start at 2000 UTC, to meet the request from Europe, you will be putting up with me as the sole meeting lead for at least the first half of each of those calls.

That may not be a bad thing, it may not be a good thing but it will be an observation that outsiders may make. It's simply that Pat has an unmovable meeting that means starting earlier for him won't be possible but that doesn't mean we can't do it, one of the benefits of having a working leadership team is we can step in for each other very easily indeed, as happened by accident today, he has been with us but unable to contribute audibly or of course by chat because we all know typing and driving, that would be dangerous.

With that, I believe we have covered just about everything, almost taken up our fully allocated time for today. Please do take time to go over and look at the workplan again, just refresh yourselves with the dates and the expectations so you can get yourselves in an agile enough frame of mind to get what is as Bernie described, a lot of homework done over the next coming weeks.

Also, do read into the report and how a look at what Bernie took us through today, there was a lot in there and there will be a lot more to come. With that, thank you to our fabulous Staff, to our -- I like to think of them not just as observers but almost cheerleaders at this point and

---

time, our regular viewers thank you so much team and thank you very much on behalf of Pat and I to all of those who turned up from the review team today, noting a couple of apologies, we even had I think at least one person who sent an apologies turn up towards the end of the meeting anyway. Bernie, your final words are?

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** That I received the final of the structure surveys so the work is now underway, yay.

**CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:** Okay, yay structures, that's very impressive for any survey, to get that level compliance. You usually get excited if you get 60 percent of your target market let alone all of it, that's fantastic. All right ladies and gentlemen, we can now thank you all finally, release you all to the rest of you day, evening or otherwise and stop the recording. Thank you very much. One final thing, Brenda, happy birthday to you, happy birthday to you, happy birthday dear Brenda, happy birthday to you. I just had to embarrass her. Bye for now.

**BRENDA BREWER:** Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**