
BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary #31 on the 25th of September 2019 at 1100 UTC. Members attending the call today are Cheryl, Daniel, Demi, Jacques, Pat, Vanda, and Sébastien. Observers Avri Doria and Everton Rodrigues. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical Writer Bernard Turcotte has joined. Apologies today from Michael, Osvaldo, Maarten, and Jaap. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Pat and Cheryl, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Good morning everyone and welcome. We've got the agenda in front of us this morning so as we do every week, do we have anyone with any statements, updates? I see no hands, I will assume that there aren't any. So we move to through the Agenda Item 2. Jennifer, if you could bring us through Action Items that are new or had been closed, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, this is Jennifer. I actually don't have any Action Items to discuss that aren't otherwise covered on the agenda today. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Moving along with blazing speed, thank you, Jennifer. Alright, for work parties, do we have anything that needs to be brought to the attention of the plenary? Let's start off with Sébastien. Okay, so there's nothing

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.

from Sébastien as he posted into the group chat. Let's move on to GAC.
Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda for the record. From our side, nothing new. We are just working on the report and just go on, thank you.

PAT KANE: Reviews, Daniel, anything?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Nothing from me, thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Daniel. I see that we've got apologies from Michael, so unless anybody from that group has anything from the community? Seeing nothing, then we move on to Bernie, anything with IRP or Workstream 2?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Nothing new on either one of those.

PAT KANE: Thank you, sir. And that will lead us to the Agenda Item 4 which is the big one for today and that is to go through and discuss the survey results. Bernie, you're going to lead us through that today, correct?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, of course.

PAT KANE: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Brenda, let's bring up the PowerPoint, please. Alright, what we'll do here is we will very briefly run through some of the results for individuals mostly to give you an idea of who responded and what it looks like and then we'll dive into the documents. So, this is for the individual survey, you'll remember, we had two surveys, we had one for what we call structures which were SOs and ACs and their subcomponents, meaning the SOs and ACs, the GNSO components, and the ALAC components which are the RALOs. When we did the individual survey we asked people which structure are you a member of and this is what it looked like, so At-Large for individual respondents took about half the survey and we have other at about 24 there, and you see the split for the rest of them.

Next slide, please. And if you answered At-Large, which one were you from, so we were very happy to see that there was about a quarter from Africa about a quarter from the Asia Pacific region, about a quarter from the European region and Americas made up the rest of the quarter, so a nice split as far as individual respondents from the ALAC. They were split pretty evenly from all over the world. Next slide, please.

Which region are you from, and pretty close to matching what we had if you look at. Next slide, please.

Alright, we've got one of these bar graphs for about every single question we have, and we're not going to do all of those. I find them not that useful, but we'll look at this one, if you want to, they'll be posted on the wiki and you can go through them or you can use them in some of your presentations, if you want, but basically, they all end up looking like this. So, read very satisfied, we see a very low percentage; 2, satisfied, we have about 50%; 3, no opinion sitting at about 16%; somewhat dissatisfied 14%; and very dissatisfied about 14%.

Now, at some point, we had some trouble with some percentages they have been fixed since then, so this should be okay but be warned that you should have a look at that I think it's all okay now, but it was a bit of hair pulling out for those that know me, there's not that much left to pull out, but we managed to get it all done, so thanks to Staff, everything's okay. That's all I'm going to do on the presentation, unless there are questions.

Alright, not seeing any, Brenda, let's move over to the other document, please. I will note that the from the structure side, we had great response, considering the time allocated for this even the GAC responded, just about all the SOs and ACs responded, for a total of 13 structures is just outstanding. All the RALOs came in, the ALAC came in, the RSSAC came in, the SSAC, we did really well as far as getting input and I'm very pleased with it.

Now what we're going to look at this morning is not exactly the version that I sent out in PDF or I posted in the wiki, and the reason for that is there was a late entry which I didn't know about which was entered into the data yesterday morning, which was the RSSAC. So, after having written all this, I had to redo all of it because it did change the numbers. So, some of this stuff now is a little bit rougher, but we will definitely, as I said, you'll see the numbers here a little different than the ones that you got, these are the good ones, and I'll be posting this version to the wiki in a PDF for all those that want to have a look at.

Alright Brenda, can you take me down to Section 6, please, which is about two thirds of the way down, I would think. Alright, excellent results of the survey, yes, exactly. Alright, we're going to start with Section 6, because I think this one is fairly easy, first of all, second, there are only two questions, three, it will allow us to get our feet wet to understand how I approach this. Caveat before we start, you will notice, we can go down just a bit, Brenda, I'd like to get all of 6.2.1 on the screen. You'll see that there's the question that was asked, there are the responses in the table, there are comments, if any were done, there's an analysis and then there's a conclusion.

So, the questions are given, responses are what they are, they're from the results, comments are what has been posted by the respondents, analysis and conclusion are drafts that I'm suggesting, so they're not locked, in they're just trying to get us started, and make sure that we're okay. This being said, let's not forget how many weeks we have left before we meet in Singapore. The idea here is we want to finish analysis and conclusion of all the survey questions and we want to finish the conclusion of all the ATRT2 recommendations. Yes, we finished

assessing the implementation and effectiveness, we did not finish conclusions on all of those. So, we've got to finish all of that, then get working on what are the issues that are coming out of all of that, so that we can get to Singapore and start looking at what kind of recommendations or suggestions we'll be making. So there is a lot of work to be done.

Alright, yes, it's very good Cheryl, yes, I'm very pleased. So let's back up to the table a bit, please. Okay, so, first question up, do you believe the internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board? Now this is Section 6, it's mandated by the bylaws so we had to look at it and you'll remember that when we built the questions we built it just for this, so we didn't have anything from ATRT2 on this. Alright, and if we look at it, the responses are very clearly laid out, I hope. First, we've got the individual numbers, which means the actual number of people who responded, percentages based on that, structure numbers, structure percentages, and consolidated.

Now, consolidated, after discussion with the leadership, we've ended up with weighing this 25% individual, 75% structure. Why did we do that? Structures represent the views of the members, have gone through councils or various structures to be approved before they're posted. They represent a lot more people. It did not seem to make sense to try and weigh them evenly so we use 75. But you'll notice as we go through the analysis that we really only use consolidated when the answers from both sides of the fence, meaning individuals and structures, give very similar results. So, there is, if you will, I think a lot of fairness and transparency in the way we're going through this and you will see that. Alright, any questions on the table presentation? Because you're going

to be seeing a lot of that, so if you have any questions, now's a good time.

Alright, not seeing any. Comments on this one, no one posted any comments, so we write in none. Analysis, alright, thank you Brenda. and Brenda, you're going to do be doing a lot of driving today and I'm going to start by thanking you for putting up with me for next two hours ahead of time, thank you. Analysis, alright, so in this case we're using consolidated, so consolidated results of 83% of respondents believe that the internet community generally supports the decision of the Board versus 17% who disagree, producing a net of 66% agreeing, which is very strong. So, you'll see this over and over, we could have gone into some very complex mathematical formulas, I didn't want to do that. Basically, let's keep it simple.

Jacques, I'll get to you in a sec, if the response, yes, I'm sorry, I fade out once in a while, if the responses had been 50/50, it would give you a net of zero and show that it's really a split and you can't use that very much. Jacques, over to you.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yes, Jacques for the record. Good morning, good afternoon everybody. Just a question, as we are looking at percentages and overall responding numbers, could we know, how many do we know, to how many people this was sent to, all in all? I know for the structure, not for the structure, but for the individual, have we got any idea of how many people we did address with that to see just what kind of overall

response percentage we had before going through, to know how representative it can be.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm sorry, my audio just came back, Jacques. What was the question again?

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, so the question was, as we are going to look at overall numbers, do we have any idea to how many people the study was sent to. We know for the structures, of course, but for the individuals have we got any idea? Even rough idea on how many people we reached? So we know if 10% responded or 20%, or whatever, 40% so we know how representative this study can be, before going further.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, that's a good question. Unfortunately, we don't have any real good numbers. What I can tell you is that if I remember my numbers correctly, there were about 220 individuals that started the survey and we ended up with about 80 completing it, if I remember correctly. It doesn't mean that everyone who answered, answered every question, which is why you'll see the variation in it, but we did encourage in our message that we sent to the structures for them to communicate it to their membership and I know for a fact that they did because some people had problem with the individual links and we got a lot of messages back.

So, I would say that the majority of people who are involved in SOs or ACs and their substructures did get at least one notice, not only from various ICANN sources, but directly from there SO and AC. Does that answer your question, Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC:

Yep, absolutely, so we've got a rough idea of what kind of percentage we do have here. Yes, thank you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, anything else? My voice may be a little different, my headset decided that this was a good time to die on me, so I'm running off the computer audio directly. So, where, we were, I was explaining that we will be running nets and basically here we see that we've got a 66% agreeing. Now, a net of 66% is really strong so that gives us a good indication. Individual respondents were not as strong with 62% yes versus 38% no, producing a net of 24% which is weak, but still positive. So, you'll get used to this analysis. I tried to keep it fairly constant so that you'll be looking at the same numbers the same way all the way through.

On a conclusion, ATRT3 will not be making a recommendation or suggestions with respect to response to this question and the reason for that is, if we go back up to the question please, Brenda is, do you believe the internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board? And if we look at the consolidated we've got 83% to 17% so it looks like we're doing pretty good and do we need to really say something about this? There's no ATRT2 recommendations relative to

this where we've got comments, so there's no real reason to make a recommendation. So, that's the general layout that we will be doing and doing and doing until you are all very sick of it, but we've got to do it. So, this is our first one. Are we comfortable with this? Alright, I'm not seeing any arguments.

Now, what I will tell you is we probably, we're going to be tight doing all of the survey questions and going through, because they're not all going to be this simple, some of them are a lot more complex. So when we call for is this okay on some of these questions it may be the only chance we get. So, we will mark these as done, unless we have a chance to go back to it. You can always post comments on the list and we'll be glad to take them but given the number of questions, the amount of work we have to do, let's take the time on the first pass to do them properly and then we can check them off. Alright, let's move on, next question please, Brenda.

Alright, our question is do you generally support the decisions made by the Board? Now, let's remember the previous question was do you think the internet community supports it, now the person who's responding is being asked, do you support it. Here, we've got a bit of a different layout, because it's not just a yes or no. You'll see this again, we use the five segmentation approach, which I will note, Sébastien discussed at one of our meetings that there is a difference between no opinion and not willing to take a stand, versus yes or no thinking, they're balanced, and we recognize that, but our survey is what it is, so now we work with this.

So, our responses are yes strongly support, yes support, no opinion, no do not support, no strongly do not support. Again you'll see the numbers, the individual percentages, the structure, the structure percentages, and the consolidated. So, basically comments, we did not have any. The analysis is consolidated responses of 78% and if we look at it, it sort of matches. Support or strongly support versus 6% do not support or strongly do not support produces 72% support or strongly support, which is very strong. Individual responses of 64% versus 22% producing a net of 42% support, which is not as strong, but still supportive.

Therefore we come with a conclusion ATRT3 will not be making recommendations or suggestions with respect to the responses to this question. Again, given the support, that's the idea here, and maybe one thing I need to make clear here, and I apologize I forgot to make that, in the conclusion similarly to the conclusions for ATRT2 recommendations, we're not making recommendations, we're just saying do we need to make a recommendation? Do we think we need to make a recommendation?

The idea is not to come up with a recommendation in the conclusion, because we're going to have to mix all these things together once it's done, pick our priority targets, there are things which will interact with each other once we've done all our conclusions, and so it will be important to consider all those facts before we decide to make recommendations or suggestions. Some of them, as you will see, are very clear that we're going to have to make some recommendations, but the idea is not to make the recommendation in this area. So, I will

call this one are we okay with 6.2.2.2, or are there any questions?
Alright, I see Vanda has her hand up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, Vanda for the record. We need to do have very clear yes, no, more tendency for positive or negative opinions. In my point of view, the item, no opinion, should not be part of any consolidate idea because if the person has no opinion, it's no matter for the conclusion if the support is positive or negative. So, that's my point, just that. So, looking at that, it's not change the final numbers, but I believe make it more clear if we do not, we explain that we are not considering no opinion as part of our tendency analysis, the number will not change anyway, that's my point of view, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright, thank you Vanda. Well, you will see in the analysis that we're not including no opinion, and I think that place where we will make that statement is in the introduction statement when we talk about the methodology. We probably can discuss this approach and the fact that we're not using the no opinion. Alright, so not seeing anything, this is our first pass at Section 6, I have received no comments, I will consider this closed unless there are major objections that are raised on the list. Alright, are we good? It looks like it, okay, now let me see where I actually want to go next. No we're not going to be doing straight approach, I'm very sorry. The next section I want to do is Section 7, PDPs, because they don't have a lot of questions, either.

So Section 7, let's stop at the introduction, remind ourselves what we've got is Item 5, the ATRT requirements and the bylaws, assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations and effective and timely policy development. Alright, let's go down to the survey part of this. Our first question on the survey related to policy development was have you participated or contributed to any policy development process. So, not a huge analysis question as far as will it influence us in making recommendations, but it's very useful to try and have an idea of how many people participate or not, so it's one of these useful background information which can inform us when we will be considering making recommendations.

Alright, the first question was only asked of individual respondents and so have you participated in a policy development and we see two thirds to one third response, which is very good. Those responding no, meaning 15 individuals, were asked what prevented them from doing so. You remember when we built the survey we thought it would be important to do that. So we've got 47% which said the time required, the scope was too large, or the level of knowledge required was too significant.

After that, it drops off, I was happy to see that calls on workable hours did not really hit nor did language issues, but you'll see in my conclusion, what I'll be talking about those things. Those responding yes were asked if they had difficulties. We presented them with the same questions and you'll notice that those that participated 85% noted the time requirement was a huge issue.

Their second point was not the scope, it was the level of knowledge required at 61% and the scope too large came in third. So, the top three are the same for both groups. Calls at unworkable hours for those that actually participate is in fourth place and that makes a bit more sense. Those responding yes were also asked to rate their satisfaction with the transparency of the process and we have some pretty good numbers there we have satisfied, very satisfied, no opinion, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied. Next page, please.

Those responding yes were also asked to rate the accountability of the process. You'll remember Michael was very interested in those things, which is why we threw in those last two questions so again, we seem to have done pretty good at 62% versus 18%. Again, there were no comments. The analysis, it's interesting that 69% of individual respondents said that they had participated in a PDP. One must assume that individuals who participate in PDPs are also more likely to respond to this type of survey versus those who do not, creating a certain amount of bias.

So I think it's fair to say, and keep in mind that obviously people who participate more in the community will have a tendency to respond to these surveys more, and so we have to keep that in mind. Difficulties encountered by individuals. It's interesting to note that those who participate in the PDP and those who did not both rated the time required as the top issue, followed by the level of knowledge and the scoping being too large.

With regards to the questions on rating transparency of the process, 62% were satisfied or very satisfied versus 24% were somewhat

dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, producing 38% satisfied or very satisfied, which is weak, not really weak, but still, under 40%. With regard to the other one we've got some fairly similar results. So again, as we go into the conclusion this was not really a big issue for a conclusion, it was more about providing data for us to think about when we will be making recommendations.

So, the draft conclusion is obviously some PDPs, there are a number of things which continue to be issues for those wishing to participate or are participating in PDPs. These include the time required, the level of knowledge, and issues surrounding the scope of certain PDPs. ATRT3 will consider these issues the results of the relevant ATRT2 recommendations, as well as the results of survey questions on public comments in making any recommendations or suggestions with respect to the policy development process. So, fairly innocuous conclusion saying we're going to keep this in mind when we look at making recommendations or suggestions. So, that's our first PDP question. Any issues with this? Going once, going twice, done. alright, thank you.

Our second question, are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global internet community? So, here we're not talking about the ICANN community, we're talking about the global internet community. Responses are 53 to 47 for individuals, and 38 to 62 for structures, which I thought was quite interesting. You will see there are a number of comments and since we're saying that we will only go through this once, I'm actually going to read them. ALAC, the global internet community is by far larger than the usual ICANN suspects.

How does ICANN say what is acceptable or not to stakeholders not active within the ICANN ecosystem? Hence there is always the danger of serving the needs of the squeaky wheels instead of focusing on those not in the building. While ICANN valiantly upholds the multistakeholder bottom up model in developing and implementing policy decisions which are accepted by its community, much could be done to improve the organization's exploration of the impact of its decisions on the larger global internet community, especially individual internet users. And you're going to find this theme in a lot of the comments that we've got.

ALAC/EURALO, EURALO has concern that appeals from our community for a stable internet with high consumer trust have fallen on deaf ears by being overshadowed with the board's concern to promote a dynamic growing DNS industry. The majority of end users are not domain name registrants and the needs of this majority are regularly ignored by the Board and the community powers reinforce the power that ICANN's direct communities, most of whom have a stake in domain names, either by being in the domain name industry ecosystem, or by being a domain name registrant have over the board, to the detriment of internet users that use the DNS as part of their internet use, browsing the web, sending and receiving emails, etc. One of the ways to improve the decisions of the policy development is that in policymaking, the GNSO and the Board conduct a simple litmus test to test their decision. Does the decision affect the end user in a positive or negative way? If both, then which one outweighs the other?

Alright, ALAC North American RALO: The PDP process should be more lean and should take a determined time to be done. Work group

charters that are tasked to work on the policy development should be precise, more than they are now. CCNSO: ICANN's mechanisms are too heavy and too slow to provide timely response to the issues that the global internet community is facing. GNSO Business Consistency: The BC believes that the Board gives greater weight to the risks and concerns of contract parties, relative concerns and risks of business users and registrants. So, as I said, fairly similar theme as we go through these. GNSO IPC Intellectual Property: As clearly identified in GNSO Council's PDP 3.0 project launch in 2018, policy development within ICANN suffers from various inefficiencies, including social loafing, lack of representativeness, unwillingness to compromise and lack of accountability.

The IPC's response to the evolving multistakeholder model, and there's the web link, addresses many of these shortcomings and propose solutions for their improvement. The relevance of these earlier efforts makes clear that the ICANN community is not dealing efficiently or holistically with current problems. Rationalization of efforts is needed here. We're getting to the end of the comments. GNSO Registrars: The time required to develop and implement policies is often excessive and when there are external deadlines involved as with ePDP, it puts enormous pressure on the volunteers involved to dedicate more time than they typically have. A better balance between efficiency and inclusivity needs to be found.

And finally, the registries from the GNSO: We answered yes on this question because we consider the PDP an appropriate mechanism and the review teams are on the right track, despite some hiccups. So, the two big themes we got out of this is end users, which are not necessarily

part of being registrants or the domain industry, are they really considered and the PDP process is heavy and takes too long. So, did not try to go into details of those comments in the analysis, this one we just broke it down because it was quite different. Individual responses, I see a comment, please change ALAC when associated with RALO by At-Large. Okay, thank you, I will do that.

Individual responses of 53% yes versus 47% no produce net of 6% yes, which is extremely weak. Structure responses of 38 versus 62 produce a net of 24%, that should be no, which is weak. So, the conclusion obviously, there is no strong agreement surrounding this point, but the ATRT3 will consider the points raised in the comments in making any recommendations with respect to PDPs, and I thought that was the best we could do with the results of this recommendation. So, I'll throw it open, any questions or comments, or are we comfortable with this? Alright, not seeing anything, I take Sébastien's note by At-Large, yes, okay, thank you very much. That will be done.

Our next question is what role should SOs or ACs play in fostering buy in from their community to ICANN's policymaking? This was only asked of structures. Now, given that we're trying to be efficient here and this thing does not actually generate results, let's go down a bit, I'm not going to read every single one, but I will certainly encourage everyone to do so, because you will see there are a lot here and it's very impressive that people took the time to actually produce all this input for this and it will influence how, or it should influence how we're going to make recommendations.

Alright, there you go, that's our third page of comment, and so I did not produce an analysis of this because this is general comments by the community, so this is just input, it's data that goes into the grinder when we will be considering our recommendations. Any questions or comments at this point?

Yes, Vanda, I also am very pleased that we took the time to actually and people took the time to actually do this properly and as you can see by the comments, I mean, you know, three or four pages of comments on this question by the SOs and ACs is very impressive and some of those comments are actually very well thought out and it doesn't mean they all line up and that's our challenge, but I think A, it really shows the validity, supports the validity, because people took the time to actually do these things and so we can rest comfortably I think on the results of the survey in our thinking for how to make recommendations.

Alright, Brenda, please take us up to surveys and Section 4, for the GAC. Next please. So, while we're doing that, Section 6 and 7 are closed now for the survey, if people have things they think about after, then please post them to the list. If we have time, we will get back to them and make sure a quick second pass that everyone is still comfortable, but I'm not certain we're going to be able to do that. Alright, Brenda let's go down to the survey portion of that, please, and that will be 20 pages later.

Alright, GAC. No, this one's a little bit different we didn't necessarily ask the same questions of individuals and structures, and part of that is for structures we just asked, yes or no, but we asked after each question from structures if they had comments, and they had comments. So, our

first question is should GAC accountability be improved? So, you'll see from the structures we have 73% to 27%. From individual point of view, we had no significant improvements needed, minor improvements needed, meaning very low, we've got 29% we've got 13% no opinion, and we've got a 58% yes, it's got to be improved.

Now, we will actually go through the comments on this one. Let's drop just a bit to bring the comment up to the top of the page, please, thank you. ALAC: We understand that the GAC members operate largely on national governments' mandates which directly impacts the character for the constituency and the AC, yet from the end user perspective, we would welcome more targeted dialogue on how to best present individual interests in the ICANN community. Issues such as universal acceptance, security, or human rights, are at the focus of both ACs, yet their processes and effectively accountability mechanisms, are structured differently. We strongly believe that the recent efforts of joint meetings and working groups will naturally allow for more transparency and effectively enhance GAC accountability.

Alright, AFRALO: Although work is based on consensus, it's important to document the details of the different conflicting views of the GAC members. North American RALO: Not sure if they have any processes that deal with this issue if not, they should. GNSO Business Constituency: The BC recommends that GAC members from EU governments be accountable for decisions taken by their member governments with respect to GDPR and WHOIS. A little targeted, if you asked me, versus a general question but comments are what they are.

Registry Group: The RSIG is unsure how to answer this question as we understand that GAC members are accountable to the governments they represent. So, the analysis. Roughly consolidating responses from structures and individuals gives 69% in favor of improving GAC accountability verses 24% for not doing so, or minor improvements, giving a net of 45% in favor of improving GAC accountability, which is fairly strong.

Conclusion: ATRT3 will consider making recommendations or suggestions based on the responses to this question, as well as its evaluation of the relevant ATRT2 recommendations. I see Vanda's hand up, Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, Vanda for the record. This feedback, in my opinion, just confirms the needs that we have to strongly be clear how GAC works, because sometimes the lack of understanding of the way GAC works drives people to believe they should behave in the same way, all the other ACs and SOs. So, this is something that we already have discussed in our group, we have already put something in the report, but maybe we should do better. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Vanda, and I think that was the point the RSIG comment and really, you know, that is probably also one of the reasons we accepted to put in the possibility of making suggestions and may be a part of this, and we'll see this in some of the later questions here on the GAC, where we say there is really a need for more awareness in the community

about the realities of the GAC. Alright, so I'll call this one. Any issues with the analysis and the conclusions here? Going once, going twice, sold to the lady with the big hat.

Alright, next question should GAC transparency be improved? We're going to end up doing a rerun of the previous one, basically. Structures is 58 to 42, which is pretty darn close, and you'll see 33 versus 56 for the individuals. Let's go to comments, please. Okay, thank you, Brenda. ALAC: While we understand that GAC members operate largely, it's the same comment basically, but it changes a bit after, providing more information on the background of GAC positions, engaging in dialogue with their constituencies would likely significantly improve the current consensus building mechanisms within the community.

We have welcomed the joint At-Large GAC initiatives of joint working meetings and shared capacity building and look forward to expanding on this recent highly positive experience. We are convinced enhance interaction with other advisory committees that represent a comparatively broad yet structurally different scope of individual interests will largely improve the consensus building process within the community. We would welcome efforts from other stakeholder groups to join in this process.

AFRALO: More public debate and decision making. GAC: Yes, the GAC has taken voluntary steps to conduct a thorough review of its existing operating principles, forming a standing working group to undertake the task of reviewing the current operating principles and recommending amendments, updates and new principles to enable the GAC to function as a full member of ICANN's empowered community into the future.

Let's underline that phrase. Updates and new principles can enable the GAC to function as a full member of ICANN's empowered community into the future.

Wow, for those that participated in Workstream 1 and Workstream 2, those are pretty strong words coming directly from the GAC. The working group formed at ICANN64 in Barcelona, Spain is first at establishing clear documented guidelines and procedures for how the GAC can form and manage working group efforts and topics of interest governments and intergovernmental organizations. Subsequently, the working group will review and assess all the 54 GAC operating principles, the different term in the process and procedure areas that merit additional clarity or updates, and notably since 2015 the GAC has established a broad open meeting policy as a result of all GAC plenary sessions during an ICANN public meeting are open to the public and all members of the ICANN community. Recordings and transcripts of those sessions are also made available on the ICANN Org meetings web page.

Yes, I see the comment from Vanda, this is really relevant, yeah, I think so, and what's even more relevant, well, not more relevant, but it's also very relevant, is they took the time to write this and they took the time to write this in record time because the four weeks we gave them for the GAC is like the blink of an eye, so we have to think that they're really stepping up to the plate of trying to be a working member of this community and providing really good answers. I'm really thrilled about this.

GNSO BC: Yes, the BC recommends that the GAC be explicit and transparent when they are conflicting priorities amongst GAC member

nations, especially regarding freedom of expression and privacy. In particular, the BC suggests that the GAC openly acknowledges conflicting priorities when advising ICANN about how to adjust WHOIS in reaction to the GDPR regime. Again, pretty one issue based comment, but it is what it is. Alright, analysis: Roughly consolidating responses from structures and individuals gets 58% for improving GAC accountability versus 40% for not doing so, or minor improvements, giving a net of 18% in favor of improvements to accountability, which is quite weak.

Conclusion: ATRT3 will consider making recommendations or suggestions based on the responses to this question, as well as the evaluation of the relevant ATRT2 recommendations. I don't think there's a lot more which can be said on this one, but I'll be glad to take input. Alright, I'm calling this one, any thoughts or additions to this? I see Wolfgang's comment, the GAC has changed over the years dramatically if you compare it with the year 2000, yes, exactly. Great progress and a model for other international bodies in and outside the UN system. Vanda agreeing with Wolfgang. I tell you guys, finally sinking in. Alright, not seeing any questions, I'll take this one as closed.

Next question, in your view, are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the Board. Now, this is a five level response, very satisfied, satisfied, no opinion, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied. Okay the percentages there, we will see them in detail in the analysis. Again, comments, GAC: Satisfied. So the GAC is here again and we'll see a very good comment as a result of implementing certain ATRT2 recommendations, communication and coordination between the board and the GAC has improved over the last few years as expectations

have been established, and met for timely board review and considerations of GAC consensus advice.

In certain instances where consideration of GAC advice has been deferred, there is communication explaining why that transpires. At ICANN63 meeting in Barcelona, the GAC members of the ICANN board and the members of the ICANN board agreed to change the name of the existing BDRI to the new Board GAC Interaction Group the BGIG, as evidence of the commitment to continued interaction and active cooperative efforts between the Board and the GAC.

The new BGIG name reflects a renewed commitment to the collaborative work of the GAC and board members. It is expected that the BGIG will continue to explore initiatives and opportunities that can improve the GAC's operations and facilitate meaningful interaction with the ICANN Board. Additionally, GAC members have publicly encouraged the Board at ICANN65 in Marrakech to promote more substantive dialogue between the Board and GAC members as a way to try to overcome the somewhat traditional ritualization and formalization of previous interactions. Formality and spontaneity can be complimentary and equally productive methods for interaction.

Alright, you read it here in black and white, the GAC is saying there's room for spontaneity. Alright guys, we're doing good here. Are registries satisfied? The registry stakeholder group has been encouraged by the increased visibility into the Board's interactions with the GAC, particularly via the communiqué scorecard process. We also appreciate having the opportunity to contribute to the GNSO Council's

input on the GAC communiqué which gets shared with the Board prior to the Board responding.

Analysis: Structure responses were 62% satisfied or very satisfied, versus 0% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, giving a net of 62% being satisfied or very satisfied, which is very strong. Individual responses were 42% satisfied or very satisfied, versus 35% dissatisfied, giving a net of 7% for being satisfied, which is very weak.

Conclusion: It would seem that the structures have been following the recent evolution of the GAC/Board relationship more closely than individual members in the community. There have been significant improvements as presented in the GAC comments which would align with the structure's very strong net of 62% being satisfied or very satisfied. ATRT3 should consider making suggestions, asking the Board and GAC to better communicate the recent improvements in their relationship.

Alright, I'm calling this one, questions, comments, corrections, edits? Basically the core of the conclusion here is yes, there has been a lot of movement the SOs and ACs are very happy with it overall, a very strong support and so it probably just means that some individual members of the community don't really have that understanding. Alright, last call on this one, going once, going twice, done. Alright, let's go the next one, excuse me for a sec, I actually need to take a drink of water.

Alright, in your view, are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the SOs and ACs? And we see individuals 43 to 38 and we see structures 70 to 16. Again, some good comments. GAC: Satisfied with

the pace of GAC participation and changes in recent years, it has been observed that the information sharing with various parts of the ICANN community is valuable to help GAC members understand the context of various DNS issues. Occasional dialogue with members of other ICANN communities can enhance communications and information sharing and create connections that can be relied on as new policy and operational topics are introduced and discussed.

The GAC holds regular bilateral meetings with other ICANN advisory committees and supporting organizations, including ALAC, ccNSO, and GNSO in ICANN public meetings. At recent public meetings the GAC has interacted with other groups from the gTLD space in a variety of ways, including RSSAC leadership, SSAC members, contracted parties, registries and registrars, business intellectual property, and noncommercial interests. GAC members observe that the ICANN SOs and ACs must still work together to address the longstanding issue of topic issue prioritization that continues to challenge the community. Yeah, we'll get back to that in Section 12 of this report.

GNSO registrars: Somewhat dissatisfied. Typically the GAC has little time to meet with each SO/AC which our registrar appreciates is due to the amount of meetings they need to fit into any schedule. With less time, the session tends to be more informational and there is less opportunity for dialogue that leads to action. However, the registrars stakeholder group would like to recognize the very beneficial and action-oriented meetings that are now regularly held with the PSWG.

GNSO registries: Very dissatisfied. The registries stakeholder group has few opportunities to interact with the GAC directly and unfortunately

one of the most notable recent interactions was when the GAC issued sweeping advice on new gTLD applications, particularly on what is called Category 1 Screens. The RSIG has attempted to establish better communications with GAC, including through meetings with the full GAC or the PSWG but otherwise the interactions are extremely limited. Vanda notes in the chat, GNSO we have heavily discussed in our group. Indeed.

So, what is our analysis here? Structure responses were 70% satisfied or very satisfied versus 16% for a net of 54% being satisfied or very satisfied, which is a strong response. Individual responses were 45% satisfied versus 38% dissatisfied for a net of 7% being satisfied, which is really weak. Overall, it would seem that the SO/AC interactions are rated very positively by the SOs and ACs.

This being said, the RSIG concerns are noted and follow on suggestions of recommendations from ATRT3's assessment of the ATRT2 recommendations relevant to this could to help improve the situation. So, basically, the idea here is we're asking about how satisfied SOs and ACs are in their relations with the GAC and they're giving us a pretty solid thumbs up with a 54% net. There are some concerns and what we're saying, we'll note those concerns and we'll keep those in mind when going over, including the results of the ATRT2 recommendations which were relevant to this.

So, I'll call this one, any questions, comments, thoughts? Not seeing any, I'll call this one done. And we are done with the GAC. So, I have to see where we're going to move on to next. Oh, the heck with it, let's go to 5.

Alright, our first question and five is you'll remember that whole series of questions on public comments. Please rate how effective the current system of public comment consultations is for gathering community input. We're going to have fun with this one. So you remember there were two questions so we've gotten the responses to that question and then we've got the follow on question which is, I see comments I'm sorry. Wolfgang, we should look deeper into the RSIG concerns, is this a general view or depending on selective leaders. I like that almost everyone has an opinion here, Wolfgang this is exactly what we in the GAC group is working on from our own interviews yes, okay.

Alright, so we throw in the second question, because the second question after asking for satisfaction is, do you believe the concept of public comments that's currently implemented should be reexamined? You see individuals 88 to 12 and structures close to split, 54 to 46.

Alright, let's get into the comments. GAC: While the GAC has no formal opinion regarding this question, generally as it pertains to public comments, it is notable that the GAC has made various efforts to provide its inputs and views earlier in the policy development process when there are cross community working groups on certain topics and during those times when a supporting organization process enable GAC participation and contributions, example IGO curative rights protection mechanisms. This method for input and participation remains a work in progress.

RSIG: Effective in the current system and public comments is effective for gathering community input. Information on public comments is centralized on the ICANN website and there is a clear process to submit

input. However, we know that on an increasingly regular basis, the communities invited to provide comments and input outside the public comment proceedings, sometimes these announcements are hidden in blog posts or wiki pages and lack transparency with regard to the publication of received input. I think that's a really, really good comment.

Analysis: individual responses to the first question are 50% effective versus 48% ineffective or somewhat ineffective, producing a net of 2% effective or very effective, which is very low, meaning it's a standoff. Structure responses to the first question were 75% effective or very effective versus 25% somewhat effective for a net of 50% effective or very effective, which is a good result for effectiveness. Individual responses to the second question were 88% in favor of reexamining the concept of public comments versus 12% against, for a net of 76% in favor, which shows extremely strong support for reexamining. Structure responses to the second question were 54% in favor of reexamining the concept of all the comments versus 46% against for a net of 8% which is very weak. The dichotomy clearly indicates the gap between individuals and structures when it comes to public comments.

Alright, now what are we doing with this dichotomy? Here's what I propose we say. The objective of public consultation is to allow as many members of the community as possible to contribute to the subjects of public comments so these processes can be effective tools and assessing input from all parts of the community these results clearly indicate that there is a portion of the community, which has issues without effective public comments are and then the concept should be reviewed. ATRT3 accepts that the responses to these questions flag

some serious issues which it will consider and its recommendation or suggestions on public comments. Alright, let's throw this one open, going once, going twice,

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien, if I may, I don't know how to raise my hand, sorry. I think in your comments and I agree totally with your comments about I guess it was a registry constituency, I think we need to not admit the conclusion because I think it's not just them who have this opinion, it was shared in different discussions by different groups, maybe the other groups didn't say it here or didn't know that it was a good place to say it, but I think we need to take it into account and to take it in our conclusion as something that we will work out as a proposal for evolution. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, Sébastien. I think to a certain extent I've only got one comment on this and we say flag some serious issues, which we will consider. If people feel that we should be stronger in our conclusion here on that, let's talk about it right now. If not, I think we've flagged it to say, yeah, that is, I absolutely agree, it's something that has been brought up elsewhere, but here our conclusions is talking about the results that we have.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe we can add something into brackets, including request for comment outside of the comments, something to not forget that it's one element of the decision. Just a proposal, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, thank you. Pat?

PAT KANE: Yes, thank you Bernie. Sébastien, this is really focused on the conclusion on the survey, but we should use this with additional information and form our own recommendations within this section as well. So, while I'm not certain that we should be stronger in the conclusion on the survey as Bernie said, we should certainly use this as input with other information that we've gathered to make our own recommendations and make our make the recommendation stronger as opposed to the conclusion of the survey, would be would be my opinion.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright Pat, thank you for giving me a break from talking. Alright, so we'll take it as that, if there are no other comments, this one will be closed. Alright, thank you, next question please, Brenda.

Have you or a group you directly contribute to responded to a public comment consultation in the last year? In the chat from Vanda, for me, it's clear we need to make a recommendation. Yes. I think it was pretty clear to everyone when -- and as I said, let's remember earlier in the process, you know, we're clearly stating here -- we'll consider this and making a recommendation. We're not making the recommendations here. We have to get all the meat on the table, and then put it into the stew see what comes out.

Alright, this is one of those questions that it's more about providing general information, or as it were grist to the mill about where we stand and do people respond to public consultations. So we see, have you responded to a public consultation, individuals 82% to 18; structures 71 to 29. I was a little shocked by 71 to 29 from the structures, but when you think about it, basically, let's not forget, we opened the survey to substructures and often responses will come from the SOs and ACs; that include, you know, participation from those substructures. So if you think of it that way, it's probably explainable.

Those that responded yes, how many have you responded to? Very impressive under individuals that we have 46% at two, and 32% at 10 or more. My god, some people, let's make a living at of doing this; structures 11% at two, 33% at five or more, and 56% at 10 or more, which is about what we'd expect.

Let's go down a bit please, Brenda. Those who replied -- no, I want that last table please. Those who reply no were asked what prevented them from doing so? And basically, we look at did not have the time to produce a detailed response, which is the most cited one; subject was too complex - quarter of the respondents; consultation document was too long - quarter of the respondents; time to respond was too short - only 13%; and other 25%. Alright, let's go to comments.

GAC: did not have the time to produce a detailed response and time to respond is too short. Not all public comment forums address matters of priority interest to governments, but among those issues where GAC members may be interested, but are not able to file comments as a committee. Available time is a substantial issue. Unlike other members

of the ICANN community, government representatives also need to share graphs and points of view within their government structure. Typical ICANN comment periods, even 45 days, can often prove too short to enable the GAC to fully develop consensus views amongst its members. As a result, individual GAC members may have to resort to file their own comments.

For a number of GAC members, the length of public comments, the complexity of the topic terminology, and the general issues being discussed can also complicate the ability to sufficiently absorb and prepare collective responses in a timely manner. Given the common time period provided, this context is the reason the GAC has commented in other fora regarding the critical need for ICANN to provide sufficient background and summary resources to help GAC and other community participants understand the issues at hand, so they can provide informed feedback and input. Alright, that was our only comment. But again, we see the GAC is taking this very seriously.

Under our analysis, we have 82% of individual respondents have responded to at least one public comment in the last year, which is impressive, but does not give one an idea of the general participation of the individuals to public comments. 71% of structure respondents have responded to a more public comment consultations. However, one has to consider that in many cases, SO/ACs will respond for their constituent bodies, which are included in the structure.

So this was just about providing general information so we're not getting carried away with a conclusion here. It would seem obvious that those individuals who regularly respond to public comments would also

respond to this survey, and as such, may not provide a good indication of the true numbers of individual respondents in the community. The results of the previous question clearly indicate that reexamining the concept of public comments to allow greater participation is supported.

Alright, let's throw it open. How we doing on this one? Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, I do believe that ICANN -- Sorry, VANDA for the record -- I do believe that ICANN org has all the statistics about who responds to public comments. And maybe we should consider those statistics to better analyze this survey in this specific question. I do believe that it's a good input that we could consider. That's my view; just to not use only those that respond this as information about this question. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Very good suggestion and let me take a note on that. Or maybe since we're lucky enough to have a lot of staff support, Jennifer, can you note that as an action item to get from the public consultation team? Just some sort of statistics that they've added them over the last year or two? Thank you.

Any other points? Vanda, your hand is still up. Do you have something else?

Alright. Thank you, Jennifer. Alright, let's go on to our next question.

Alright. Would your structure respond more often to public comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a SurveyMonkey or similar format? So we've got an 82% agreement from individuals, and a 28% agreement from structures.

Alright, let's have a look at this. Comments: GAC, agree. Specific targeted questions may prove more useful for the more complicated issues that are raised by some ICANN topics. However, one common approach may not fit all topic circumstances. Good point.

GNSO RSIG, disagree. Besides, survey questions do not always make it easy to respond as a group. Closed questionnaires like this one are tricky as respondents can interpret questions differently. They also limit out of the box thinking and bringing new ideas.

Analysis. The structure results do not provide any indication given they are split 28% agree or strongly agree, 43% no opinion, and 28% disagree or strongly disagree, producing a net of zero percent agree or strongly agree or strongly disagree. Individual results, on the other hand, provide a very clear indication with 82% agree or strongly agree versus 10% disagree or strongly disagree, producing a net of 72% agree or strongly agree, which is very strong.

And let's not forget, and that one also, the GAC seemed to like that idea or also, even if the RSIG really hates it. And I think one of the things, we didn't expand on the question, but the idea was, as stated very clearly in the question, but it may have escaped people; we're not talking about replacing the current public comment. We're talking about adding

sections to it, where some people don't have the time or the knowledge or whatever, can at least provide some input in the simplified format.

Alright, conclusion: ATRT3 accepts that the responses to these questions show very strong support for this option by individual respondents, which it will consider in its recommendation or suggestion on public comments.

Alright, let's throw this one open. Questions? Thoughts? Comments?
Paul -- Pat, sorry.

PAT KANE: That's twice you try to do that, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sorry.

PAT KANE: No worries. So maybe in the conclusion, we should read it a little bit by suggesting that this would be an augmentary option as opposed to a replacement option.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good point. Alright, let's note that and I'll include that in there. Thank you, anything else? Going once, going twice. Sold to the gentleman with the mustache and the pipe. Alright, next question, please. Should responses made to public comments by individuals and external

organizations or groups be considered equally? Alright, let's get into some controversy here.

So we're saying the question is -- sometimes even I forget -- the question is, should responses made to public comments by individuals and organizations or groups be considered equally. So if you're for this, it means all comments should be considered equally, if you're against this, it means no, comments don't need to be considered equally. So if we give it a quick scan, on the individual responses, shock, we have 68% that think all comments should be seen equally, and 26% that don't think comments should be considered equally. On the other side of the fence, we've got 33% that think all comments should be seen equally, versus 59% which don't think so.

Let's go to the comments. GAC answer, disagree. Well, all points of view can have merit in certain circumstances. Consensus views on ICANN policy matters that are expressed by governments through the GAC should be accorded substantial weight, and it would be inappropriate to weigh them equally with responses by individuals. In many respects, the current ICANN bylaws recognize this appropriate consideration.

RSIG, registry -- structures. The RSIG is unsure of the exact meaning of questions 33 and 34. Comments submitted by individual persons should have a different weight than a comment development supported by an entire stakeholder group. When a stakeholder group or constituency reaches agreement to develop and submit a comment, the recipient of that comment should consider the size of the stakeholder group and the amount of organizations or individuals that that group represents.

Alright, let's get into the analysis. What is striking about the responses to this question is the mirror duality between individuals and structures; 68% of individuals agree or strongly agree that all comments should be considered equally, versus 33% of structures. Inversely, 59% of structures disagree or strongly disagreed, versus 26% for individual respondents. This gives us for individuals a net of 42% agree or strongly agree versus a net of 26% disagree or strongly disagree for structures, which is a strong dichotomy between individuals and structures.

Let's go to the conclusion: ATRT3 will consider these responses in a holistic fashion when looking into making recommendations or suggestions regarding public comments. I did not want to step any deeper into that one, given the dichotomy. Thoughts, comments?

Alright, I'm not seeing anything. I'm calling this one. Are we done? Going once, going twice. Done, thank you. Next question, please. More controversy.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Consider my comments before done, please; Sébastien.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, sorry. Your comment in the chat, I guess, is why we don't consider equality.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, we are talking about the equality of each individuals and groups. And here we are taking a stand. We are since the beginning saying that

it's not equal. We have to be careful on -- it's not to say I am against the fact that we didn't take into equality, but we see that the answer to this question must take us back to how we treat those inputs from individuals and from the community. We have to say that we are deciding that it's not equal.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I don't think we're making any kind of that decision. I'm not sure it would be wise to say we're making that decision, which is why I structured a conclusion the way was. I think it's something that we have to consider. I don't think unless the group says differently. Yes, our own work reflects that we have weighed structures over individual. Yes, that's quite true, Pat, in this result. But here, we're talking about public comments. So unless there is a wave of support for otherwise, I'm just going to keep this the way it is. Pat.

PAT KANE:

I think that people could take a look at what we've done and say, "Here's how we think," but in terms of trying to analyze that particular one for the community, I think it'll always be that way and I like the approach you've taken on this one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright, thank you, Pat. People were at half past, you've only got to put up with me talking for another half hour. How's that? And we are doing great. Alright, the next question, should the responses made to public comments by SOs and ACs have more weight than other

comments? Another controversial one. Pat, your hand is still up. Okay, thank you.

So we're going to have fun with this one too; as we see, amazingly enough, things have switched around here. There were no comments on this one. Our analysis is: individual responses do not provide any significant information with 48% who strongly agree or agree versus 42% which agree or strongly disagree for a net of 6% strongly agreeing or agreeing, which is extremely weak. Structures results, however, paint quite a different picture with 70% who agree or strongly agree versus 23% which disagree or strongly disagree producing and a net of 47% agree or strongly agree, which is a strong result.

Conclusion: Obviously, structures will be biased when responding to this question which should be considered by ATRT3 in making any recommendations or suggestion based on these results. ATRT3 will consider these responses in a holistic fashion and looking into making recommendations or suggestions regarding public comments.

Alright, let's throw this one open. We're almost done with public comments, folks, a few more questions after this one. Basically, this follows the same tangent that we set up in the previous question. Alright, going once, going twice. Sold! Alright, let's go to the next question, please, Brenda.

Should responses made to public comments by the Board have more weight than other comments? Ah, amazingly enough, we finally get consensus.

Comments: GAC answer, no opinion. There have been rare occasions where the Board has needed to comment on certain matters being considered by the ICANN community, e.g. the IANA transition, but those circumstances should be rare. When the Board seeks public comments on certain policy recommendations, it should be open to listening to and considering views from the SOs and ACs.

I can't believe how much the GAC has matured over the years, guys. And just like for veterans, I think here, we're in shock. Welcome her. Analysis: consolidated results at 26% of agree and strongly agree versus 39% of disagree or strongly disagree producing a net of 13% disagree or strongly disagree, which is quite weak, but provides a fair assessment of the responses, so there's no clear road here. The comment is very interesting from the GAC saying, "Well, you know what, the Board doesn't respond to many public comments in general."

Yes, Jacques, the GAC is taking ownership of its role. Yeah, actually, I guess that's a very good comment.

Conclusion: ATRT3 will not be making recommendations or suggestions regarding the results of this question, given the week support for any change. So, thoughts, comments? Going once, going, twice; done. Alright. Let's go on.

How useful are staff reports on public comments. And that's came up pretty clear.

Comments: GAC, useful. The production of staff summary reports of public comments submissions are an important resource used by some GAC members to help them follow certain ICANN proceedings, they

should be continued. There may be areas where those documents could be improved and specific suggestions should be welcomed, including the application of plain language standards and the provision of specific textual explanation of concepts rather than simply providing web links to background documents.

RSSAC: Useful, the staff reports are useful to get an overview of what others sent in, but they remain summaries and often the original thoughts are lost in dilution.

Analysis. Consolidated results of 88% rating the reports as somewhat useful or very useful, versus 4% rated them as somewhat not useful or not useful produces a net of 84% somewhat useful or very useful, which is extremely strong. So I'm very happy for the public comment team on that one.

Conclusion: ATRT3 will not be making recommendations or suggestions regarding the results of this question given the strong positive outcome. Alright, throwing this open. Alright, seem to be okay. Sold.

Alright, next question. Do you agree that staff reports on public comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by commenters were accepted and how they were accepted? And here we've got some interesting results.

Comments: GAC, disagree. The staff reports on public comments offer helpful summary of public comments and some information about the next step in a particular matter. But as they generally are prepared well before any actual decisions are reached, they do not consistently

provide reliable information about the treatment or resolution of comments

RSIG, strongly disagree. The staff reports published at the end of the public comment proceedings are mostly limited to a summary of first analysis or first analysis of the comments, and are published before changes are implemented in the draft report or document that was published for public comment. We acknowledge that after the working group, a working group considers the comments, they do publish a final report where they state how they treated the comments. This information is not included in the staff report, and not made available on public comment web pages. So that's a really interesting comment.

Analysis. Individual results are neutral with 43% agreeing or strongly agreeing versus 41% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing producing a net of 2% agreeing or strongly agreeing, which is extremely weak. Structure results at 50% who disagree or strongly disagree versus 36% who agree or strongly agree, producing a net of 21% disagree or strongly disagree is weak. And so there's just, you know, we've got from structures, they don't like it, and we've got neutral from the individuals. So the conclusion is ATRT3 will not be making recommendations or suggestions regarding the results of this question. Okay, throwing it open. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you, Bernie. As you say, that one comment was useful; can you say that it will be using the holistic review of the comments, be taken into account? Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think that's probably a really good suggestions, Sébastien. I like that. Thank you. Pat?

PAT KANE: Yeah, Bernie, I was just going to say that I think that one of the suggestions that came to my mind from the standpoint of the stakeholder group is to have the staff go back and update their reports for final posting.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, and I think that's going to be part of our considerations in the general one and sort of fits in with Sébastien's comment. So let's note that, I like that. Good comments, thank you. Anything else? Alright, not seeing anything, we've taken on those comments. Thank you very much. Those are really good additions.

Alright. Next question. We've got a bit of the flip side of the first one. Do you agree that staff reports on public comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by commenters were rejected, and why they were rejected? And so as we were looking previously if comments were accepted, now we're looking if they were rejected. And let's have a look at this, and it should come out in the wash pretty much the same.

Comments: GAC answered, disagree; the staff reports on public comments are often helpful. And that's a repeat of their previous comment.

RSIG: The staff reports published at the end of the public comment period are mostly limited to a summary and blah, blah, blah. That report -- and it's the same comment again.

So the analysis, individual results are neutral with 42% agreeing or strongly agreeing versus 36% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing for a net of 6% agreeing, which is extremely weak. Structure results of 50% who disagree or strongly disagree, versus 36% who agree or strongly agree producing a net of 21% disagree or strongly disagree, which is weak. Conclusion: will not be making any recommendations.

I think what we would do is, yes Vanda, the conclusion on this one would be adjusted to reflect the conclusion we came to in the previous point. Alright, anything else? We're done public comments. Alright, that one is closed. Let's see what our time is like. Oh, yeah, we've got lots of time. Let's continue. Brenda, take us to Section 11, please.

Accountability indicators. So we had results, we had a few survey questions on this. And this should be fairly light, so let's go through it. So the first question is, has your structure looked at the ICANN accountability indicators? And only asked of the structures survey, just to be clear. Alright, so the responses are, Yes, 50%, No, 50%; Comments, none; Analysis, none required.

Conclusion: Obviously, there is a communication gap if 50% of structures are unaware of the existence of accountability indicators ATRT3 will consider making a suggestion that the accountability indicators should be the subject of communications efforts by ICANN. Thoughts, comments? Seems agreeable to everyone.

Alright, next question. Please rate the effectiveness of the accountability indicators as they relate to Board performance as found in Section accountability indicators 3.3. There were no comments. What's our analysis here? Individual responses were 42% effective or very effective, versus 26% somewhat ineffective or ineffective for a net of 16% effective or very effective, which is very weak. Bye Demi, thank you.

Structure responses were 33% effective or -- it should be or very effective, versus 67% somewhat ineffective or ineffective, producing a net of 34% somewhat ineffective or ineffective, which is weak in the opposite direction of the individual results.

Conclusion: The 67% of structures which found the accountability indicators somewhat ineffective is of concern, which is strongly echoed by the assessment of these by the ATRT3. ATRT3 will consider making recommendations or suggestions regarding the accountability indicators based on the responses to these questions and the assessment of these.

Now, as a little bit of background, the only other information we have on this is actually commenting on the actual accountability indicators. And we're working up a document so this is previewing that we will have gone through this. Alright, any thoughts comments on this one? Nope, that one's done too.

Alright. Well, I think we have done great here. And I'm going to say, let's give it a break before my voice gives out. And I'll hand it back to Pat and Cheryl, at this point.

PAT KANE:

Thanks very much, Bernie, for taking us through that. I know it was a lot of work to get that analysis done and put together some of the conclusions. So thanks again very much. So Brenda, if we can bring the agenda back up, please. Want to cover a couple of all other business and getting ready for Singapore, and looking at our meetings to point forward.

So one of the things that we need, I think that we need to take a look at our two pieces on Singapore face to face to face meetings. One is for those that are arriving, if we just get an idea [inaudible] people so that we can pay attention to know who's arriving, what times. And second, for those that are not participating, that are not coming to Singapore, if we could get availability in your hours, in terms of how they match up to Singapore, we could identify specifically what areas we should talk about when based upon your availability if they have to do with the sections that you worked on and work parties that you've been a part of. So I think that would be helpful to get both of those.

Jennifer, if we could set up some kind of doodle poll so that we can capture that information if you haven't already, I would greatly appreciate it.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Pat. This is Jennifer. I just posted the link to the doodle poll in the chat there, that the people who are not going to stay up received already. I don't think anyone's filled that out yet, but please do that. Thank you.

PAT KANE: You are tremendously efficient, Jennifer, thank you very much. Okay, the other item that we have, or that we've got scheduled for any other business is the timing of our call. So currently, every other Wednesday, we've got the 21:00 UTC time slot. We've suggested to go for an additional two hours, where we were 90 -- to move to two hours as opposed to the 90 minutes. And do we want to move that call up a half an hour or extend it a half an hour? Or how do we want to do that, considering that we've also got -- in most places around the globe we're coming off of daylight savings time? So any conversations or suggestions about what to do there? Yes, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. This is Jennifer. I just wanted to insert into the conversation that Brenda actually has reached out to her Secretariat colleagues and to ICANN org and confirmed that there are no conflicting SO/AC calls at the earlier proposed time slot for the two meetings that we would have before Singapore. So from our side, from SO/AC calls for those dates, if the team does decide to change, there would be no conflicts. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jennifer, for that. And thank you, Brenda, for the research. Any question? Should we leave it the same; move it one direction or the other? Commentary? Seeing none, I'm --

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's Sébastien, sorry. I prefer the earliest, but I will manage any time you will choose. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Sébastien. And since we only have, you know, one person that wants to move it, is there anybody that's opposed to moving that time slot?

I don't see anybody opposed. Cheryl, any input for that? Because I know that, you know, you're in a different part of the world so that timeframe --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, it's fine. Not a problem at all.

PAT KANE: Right. So why don't we put the time that we are moving to a two hour or 120 minute meeting? Why don't we move for one half hour as opposed to extending the other direction? Any objections to that?

Alright. Jennifer, Brenda, let's make it so. Any other business from anybody?

Alright, Jennifer, we can move to you for the last item on any actions that we logged or decisions that we've reached, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So actions for stuff is to ask the public comment team to provide the statistics on who's responding to their public comments. And we can provide that to the team once available. And then as just discussed, we will update the calendar invites for the two meetings prior to Singapore, which will begin at 20:30 UTC for two hours. Is that right? Did I get that right? So anyway, Brenda will have it. So that's all I captured. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Jennifer. So that will be the end for the day. Thank you, Bernie, for taking up the lion's share of the meeting today and walking us through the results. That was very helpful and very informative. Thanks everyone for extending 20 minutes longer this morning. And just a reminder to go ahead and fill out the doodle poll, but if you're going to, you know, from a rival standpoint, as well as if you're not going to be present in Singapore, what your availability is, again, so that we can make certain that we talk about topics when you're actually available to be on the remote participation.

Cheryl, anything you want to add at the end?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All good and thank you very much for taking today.

PAT KANE: Yeah. Bernie, your hand's raised?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, thank you. Just to note, I'll be updating the report and posting that. And given we've done so well, on our next call I would be looking forward to finishing all the comments because we believe we've gone past the halfway mark. So if we can do half of them on one call, let's hope we can finish it on the next call. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. One quick question on that, should we be looking for version 3.6 when you publish?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Probably, let me look at where we are with versions right now. Yes, that is exactly correct. The next version that will be published will be 3.6.

PAT KANE: Fantastic. Thank you so much. Everyone enjoy your day, your evening, your morning; we'll talk to you on next. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]