

---

**BRENDA BREWER:** Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 Board work party meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> August 2019, at 14:00 UTC. The work party members joining the call today are Pat Kane, Liu Yue, Maarten Botterman, Osvaldo Novoa, Demi Getschko, and Sébastien Bachollet. From ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie has joined. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record, and Sébastien, I'll turn the call over to you and Liu.

**SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** Thank you very much. Thank you for participating in this call. The goal of this call is to have a discussion of where we are with the Board Work Party, and see what are the documents we are working on, and how we can enhance the work for the future days. We have, in fact, two documents. The one which was on the Google Doc historically, where we had all the information, is still up to date, and we have a new document where we have a set-up by Bernie. Bernie added all the information about ATRT2, and I tried to add the other information we had on our previous document.

If we can maybe go to have the possibility to see the two documents? I will try to find it. Okay. That's the new document, it's version 1.6 of the template set up by Bernie. May I suggest that, Bernie, you go through the way you set it up? How you want us to add information? What are the main issues we have? And the others will be able to ask you questions about this document. Just for your information, I don't know if somebody else has added information, but once again, Bernie set the document,

---

*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.*

---

added the ATRT2 information, and I tried to add the others. Bernie, please, if you can?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes, I'll be glad to, thank you. For those that attended the plenary, you will not be surprised, this is the template we were talking about, except this one's filled out for the board. What we've got here is the introduction. That's the text from the bylaws requiring us to assess and improve board governance, etc. Sébastien added in section 3.12, which was the terms of reference that you had been working on for the Board Work Party. If we go down just a bit, please, Brenda. Okay, thank you. We have ... Let me see where we are ... Okay. ATRT2, a little further down. Basically, still going through 3.12. ATRT2 metrics 3.13, recommendations. Continue down.

3.13 is the interesting one, after our discussions, after our first study of almost all of the items of the terms of reference. The information-gathering will be in five parts. We reviewed the relevant ATRT2 recommendations and analysis, a short report on all the other issues, an in-depth report analysis of the issues where recommendations must be delivered by ATRT3, survey, and other information. We're compacting this down, if you will, to ATRT2, results in the survey, and then anything else major, as we discussed at the plenary this week, and we'll go over it again. Basically, making recommendations under the new requirements for specific reviews is more onerous than it was in the past.

Maybe, before diving into ATRT2, which, I guess, will be the bulk of this meeting, let's go to section 3.4, please, Brenda, and we'll go over the

---

requirements in case someone missed that part from the plenary this week. Oops, a little bit up. There we go, a little bit more. Nope, sorry. 3.4, yes. We have identification of the issue, and then for each of the recommendations, we need: a definition of the desired outcomes, including metrics used to measure whether the recommendation's goals are achieved, initial identification of potential problems in attaining the data for developing the metric, suggested timeframe in which the measures should be performed, definition of current baselines of the issue, and initial benchmarks that define success or failure. Data retained by ICANN, I'm still not sure what that means. Industry metric sources, community input, survey or studies, and consensus on each recommendation.

No, I don't want to restart my machine right now, thank you, Windows. What we said at the plenary was this was welcome in many ways because it would avoid the mismatch of interpretation relative to what is implemented, and how well it is implemented. I think everyone can see that, however, what it does mean is there's quite a lot more work to be done when making a recommendation. Here, we haven't gone through the text where all the considerations we should have in mind before making a recommendation.

Anyways, if you're further interested in this, I had a slide deck during the plenary, and I believe it's been put up. Yes, Jennifer has done that, she's a mind reader, thank you. You can have a look at that and we can take it from there. Now, before we head into the ATRT2 recommendation section of this report, are there any questions? Alright, Brenda, take us up please.

BRENDA BREWER:                   Where do you want to go, Bernie? I'm sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:               Keep going up, until we start the ATRT2 recommendations. It should be right before we left off.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:           3.2.1.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:               Yes.

BRENDA BREWER:                   Oh, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:               See, it was the test.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:           Yes, thank you, [my friend].

BERNARD TURCOTTE:               The board, alright. The first ATRT2 recommendation which is relevant is recommendation one from ATRT2.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Bernie. I think it's important ... The organization of this document, the global document ... You set up different ... I think it will be better if you tell us.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I understand what you're saying, I skipped over that. Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Going back to ... I was focused on this being a GAC Board Work Party presentation. The overall setting-up of the document follows the structure of the survey document. What is required of ATRT3? Issue one is the board, issue two is the GAC, issue three is public input, issue four, etc. We've got all these issues, including the two issues we added, which are the ICANN accountability indicators and the prioritization of work. We have a similar section for each of those, and then we'll be filling those out to get to a final report. As I said, please have a look at the PowerPoint that was presented at the plenary this week, and the document templates are in a folder in the Google Doc space, and they're available in both Google Docs and Word documents. Before I attempt to dig in again, any questions? Sébastien.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Bernie. It's important, what Bernie just explained here, because when we work out what was the part of ATRT2 that might be relevant for our Board Party work, it's now split into different places. I still don't know, but it's not the topic of our discussion today. It must be a discussion with a co-Chair, and with the plenary. I still don't know how we will work with the part who are not in a ... How I would say, sir? Who are not Board, GAC, reviewers, and community, because they are much more a part of this document. One thing I am sure that's a [part name here board], the issue on the number three in the table of contents, it's for us. Maybe there will be other parts we will need to look at, but the first thing and main thing we have to do is this part. This part is therefore why it's important that we go in-depth into this part. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sébastien, quite correct. I believe we'll be talking about our work and our scheduling at the plenary next week. The leadership call on Monday will be going over that, and see, at least in part, how we address that.

Alright, recommendation one. We never quite ended up getting an implementation status, or an effectiveness status. I'm trying to schedule a talk with Demi, so maybe we can get there and see if we can put some more meat on that bone. This is useful, in a way, because it shows you the layout of how we'll be looking at each recommendation. There's implementation, there's effectiveness, and there's conclusion, and what we want to do with that.

---

What's interesting, I think, to a certain extent, is that if the implementation was well done, and it's complete and it's effective, then I think the conclusion is, yes, it was done, and there's nothing more to be done about this. I think, on the other hand, if, as a group, we come up with a conclusion that no, this is not completely implemented, or no, that was not implemented, then I think we're already in a good position to consider making an additional recommendation, because the ATRT2 recommendation wasn't followed on properly. That's the layout of where we're going to go. Any questions before we move on to the next one? Not seeing anything. Let's go to recommendation ... Oh, sorry, Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, just one point. I think, definitely, if you can have a talk with Demi will be great. My personal point of view is that recommendation one and recommendation two are on the same basis, therefore the same type of element, and when we look at one, we look at two. Or here, as we have looked at two, from my point of view we can say this one was the same for one. But please, go ahead with Demi if you disagree with that comment with some other point of view on the recommendation one. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright, thank you for that, Sébastien. Demi has responded to me, and I'll be talking to him tomorrow afternoon. Excellent, thank you Demi. Alright, 3.2.1.2, the board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the

---

materials used for training to gauge the level of improvement. Can we go down a bit Brenda, please, on implementation?

You'll find here what we've got is essentially what was in that ATRT2 spreadsheet. The following indicators have been developed and published: the achievement of globally diverse culture and knowledge levels, board with per-region distribution of board members, achievement of global knowledge development programs, board with three elements, board training by fiscal year, board composition, and board training sessions. Regarding the measures, the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement efforts, there is no specific information, only some data about training; implementation assessment not implemented. Regarding the publication of materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement, some information available, implementation assessment partially implemented.

If we can go down a bit, please, for effectiveness. Brenda? Can people hear me? Yes? Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, we can hear you, Bernie, no problem.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Brenda, we're having a problem with ...

BRENDA BREWER: I'm sorry, Bernie. Please repeat.



---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Can you go down a bit, please? We're now at effectiveness, thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: Sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No problem. As it is non- or partially-implemented, it's not possible to gauge effectiveness. Effectiveness assessment not applicable. Pat had a comment when we were going through those; "What remains to be implemented? The online tools don't contain training from a leadership perspective." We're going to have to work through this and come to a conclusion, and decide, if it was only partially implemented, what remains to be done, and do we want to generate a recommendation from that? Is it important enough? Does it meet the criteria we talked about this week? Are we going to do the homework to get a recommendation in good order on this subject? I think maybe what I'll do, since this is all new, we'll just run through this series [item now] to get the team into the mood for what we're doing here, and then I'll hand it back over to Sébastien. Is that okay?

Green tick from Sébastien. 32.13, recommendation three. If we could bring that up a bit, Brenda, thank you. The board should conduct qualitative, quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of board candidate pools change over time, and should regularly assess directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards. Implementation; this is broadly implemented by the BGC. There are

---

annual skill surveys, which are forwarded to the NomCom to help it identify any skill gaps in the current board. It is not known whether the SOs and ACs are informed about the skill survey, so that SOs and ACs can take this into consideration when they select board directors. There are assessments of the directors' compensation, but so far there was no review of the work of the compensation committee and its recommendations. Implementation assessment is implemented.

Effectiveness, with respect to the board, should conduct qualitative, quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of board candidate pools change over time. Since this could not be implemented, given the candidate selection is not the responsibility of the board, it is impossible to assess its effectiveness. With respect to should regularly assess directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards, although this was implemented, there is no information available to allow for assessment of its effectiveness. Can we go down a bit, please, Brenda? Effectiveness assessment not applicable, and basically we're going to have to come to a conclusion on that one.

Next one, recommendation four. The board should continue supporting cross-community engagement aimed at developing and understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation to develop complementary mechanisms whereby the supporting organizations and advisory committees can consult with the board on matters including, but not limited to, policy implementation and administrative matters on which the board makes decisions.

Alright, if we go down a bit on implementation and effectiveness. The solution was to form a GNSO Working Group to develop a set of principles

---

that would underpin any GNSO policy implementation-related discussions. The recommendations from the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group were accepted by ICANN Board in 2015. The ICANN bylaws and GNSO operating procedures have been updated accordingly to operationalize the recommendations.

Implementation assessment is implemented, but we have a question; this is good for the GNSO, but what happens to SOs and ACs as far as effectiveness? As for effectiveness with the information available, the implementation appears to have been effective, at the very least in part because this led to the adoption of the GNSO ePDP procedures, which have clearly been used. However, it's difficult to determine the level of effectiveness, since there aren't clear measures or metrics to refer to. Effectiveness assessment is effective with a question mark, so we're going to have to go through that, and we're going to have to understand that the GNSO has done its homework on this, but the recommendation itself was about all the SOs and ACs.

Alright, moving down to recommendation five. Thank you, Brenda. The board should review redaction standards for board documents, document information disclosure policy, and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy, institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted materials to determine if redactions are still required, and if not, ensure that redactions are removed. Now, this was evaluated by ... I see Sébastien's hand, please go ahead.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Finish your sentence, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I was going to simply say this was evaluated by Michael Karanicolas, who was leading the transparency group in Work Stream 2, and led the recommendations on transparency which touch on this. They don't touch about creating a single published redaction policy, but certainly those recommendations in Work Stream 2 have over 20 recommendations which are aimed at the documentary information disclosure policy. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Bernie. I wanted to suggest you read the recommendation and the conclusion on implementation, and assessment effectiveness. And also, my second remark here is that we need, obviously, to rewrite that, as nobody will understand who is 'I', even if you and us know who it was. I think it's important that we figure out a more impersonal answer to this question, but the conclusion, I guess, will be the same for all of us. If it's not, it's important that we discuss that quite quickly. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Exactly, thank you. Alright, I'll speed this up. Implementation assessment is not implemented. Next page, please. There is no single policy, effectiveness is not applicable, since it's not implemented. We're going to have to consider that. Sébastien, your hand is up?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I forgot to put it down, sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No problem. Recommendation ...

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Can I say something, please?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Tola? Yes, please go ahead.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay, sorry I didn't raise my hand before speaking. I want to clarify this last point. Is it appropriate – I'm sorry, I'm taking us back to the previous one. I think that that was recommendation four. I thought Sébastien was saying something about it. That aspect, I was not involved in, ATRT2. Is it appropriate [inaudible] to leave [personalized] statement in the write-up? Is it appropriate to leave it, as I was not involved in ATRT2? Does it make sense?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: From what I can understand of your comment, I'm sorry, your audio is quite low, and as I get on in age my hearing is not as good, but I think the point that Sébastien was making is, we're going to have to review those evaluations in this group, and make sure that they match what we believe is actually the case. Let's hear from Maarten for this, I see his hand up. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much. Just checking, I don't recognize the policy redaction process as such, but I do know that all our documents are checked by Legal before they are published. Is that awareness present, and does that help? [inaudible] to follow up, and make sure with Legal [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Having deep personal knowledge of this, I will take the question. I think what Michael is referring to is, no, there is absolutely an understanding that Legal goes through all the documents and makes decisions and recommendations on redaction. I think what Michael was pointing to was a more global policy on redaction, which seems to be missing. It's got a whole bunch of little parts, different things are redacted in different ways in different areas, and he was trying, I think, to match up to the requirements of the recommendations in saying that there should be a global policy. At least, that's my understanding of it. I hope that helps, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, I hear you. It's [DPP's] part, it's not whether it's checked by Legal, is what you say.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. Sébastien?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, it's to try to answer again to Tola. Yes, we need to rewrite this part, and maybe other parts, to be a non-personal answer. It must be a collective answer, therefore the fact that there is 'I' ... We know today who is 'I', but in a few months and a few years, we will not know. Therefore, it's 'us', and we will rewrite this answer if we still agree with this answer, and that's the role of this discussion, and maybe we will have to reopen this discussion in another call. With this, we will rewrite this, and the 'I' will disappear and be more something like 'the group', 'the whatever'. ATRT Work Stream 2 take over this decision if it's the case, and we'll see how we write these recommendation implementation comments. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, exactly, thank you Sébastien. Alright, no more hands. Recommendation 9.1, proposed bylaws change, recommended by the ATRT2, to impose a requirement on the ICANN board to acknowledge advice arising from ICANN's advisory committees. I believe we were still waiting for input on that to finalize it. I believe that we've got a recommendation register, and an advice register, that Maarten has been talking about, so that is in place. Is it required in the bylaws? That's a good question to check. Maarten, thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No, you're exactly right. For ALAC, SSAC and RSSAC, it's implemented in a register. A similar register is separately arranged for GAC, and I don't know about the bylaw change, either.

---

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** I've combed through the bylaws, and I don't remember seeing that. I think that it's one of those where we can say that there were tools involved. It wasn't felt necessary to have a bylaws change, which is a big thing now, let's remember, with the Empowered Community.

**MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:** If it has happened, it hasn't happened since Abu Dhabi. It must have happened when the new bylaws came into force. It has not happened since.

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** Yes, and I was there when they were drafting the new bylaws, and I don't remember seeing that. I don't think it's there, and as we have always said, the context has changed significantly since these recommendations were made in 2013, if I remember correctly. We will have to complete the evaluation of this.

Recommendation 9.2, review ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms through a community-comprised group. The answer to this one is that was the point of Work Stream 2, and recommendations from Work Stream 2 are not yet approved by the board. We have the meeting later today to go over the draft implementation report with the Work Stream 2 implementation team, and supposedly we will be on our way to hopefully having the Work Stream 2 recommendations approved by the board in Montreal. I don't think I'm revealing any secrets, here. Let's hope that we're aiming for that.



---

Effectiveness, partially implemented. Because the recommendations are not approved yet, there's no point to judge effectiveness. Basically, awaiting the results of the implementation report. Any questions on this one, 9.2?

Alright, let's move on to 9.3, please. Review of the office of the ombudsman role within ICANN, and whether duties and scope of the ombudsman should be expanded or changed, in line with the suggestions from ATRT2. Essentially, the answer to this one is exactly the same answer as to the previous one. Work Stream 2 had an ombudsman component, which was led by our fearless leader Sébastien, and did make recommendations, and we're waiting for those recommendations to be approved, and therefore effectiveness is not a thing. I think that the conclusion is, we're going to have to wait a little bit. I mean, we're not finalizing this report tomorrow morning. If the recommendations get approved, then we'll probably be able to put this recommendation to bed, with effectiveness not applicable, because we won't know how things are done.

Important note: there have already been some changes in the ombudsman's office. Even if the recommendations have not been approved by the board, there is now gender balance in the office of the ombudsman, so things are definitely moving Any questions on this one? Alright, let's move onto the next one, please, Brenda.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say that I guess, in one version of the spreadsheet about ATRT2, I wrote something about what was already done by the office of

---

ombudsmen, without waiting for any decision about implementation, or Work Stream 2. I think in this document, it could be useful to take it. For example, we talk about, I will say, gender balance within the office, and it's exactly what is done now. There are two, and it's male and female, and there are other things that they already have set up. Therefore, I think, for our understanding, it will be interesting to have that. I wrote to the ombudsman about this question, and I didn't get any answer. I will ask him again, because I think it will be useful to have his assessment of what [they have] done, for our knowledge. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Excellent, thank you Sébastien. Alright, recommendation [9.5,] conduct a review of the anonymous hotline policy and process, implement any proposed modification to policy, and publish a report on the results to the community. This review was conducted. Work Stream 2 made further recommendations on this topic, and therefore it's implemented. Effectiveness; I believe we can dig up the Work Stream 2 text, but in Work Stream 2 there was a basic assessment of this, which was not in our spreadsheet. The Work Stream 2 assessment was that the review that was conducted by a third party was very good, and done very professionally. I think once we finish walking our way through this one, we'll be at the conclusion that this was done, and there's not much more to be done with it.

That sort of concludes that section, I believe. A short report on the other areas, board effectiveness ... Yes, we should add a chapeau to explain ...

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe I can take over here?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That would be great, thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Bernie. One point I want to raise again, we already discussed it, but as you see we have some of the ATRT2 recommendations. We were listing some recommendations on 10.-something, 11.-something, and 12.-something. 10 are now in what I think is PDP part, or it's linked with PDP, therefore it's in another part of the document. Even if it's talking about the board, for example the 10.1 is talking about GNSO plus board, and the 11 are dealing with the reviews. The board is very often in charge of part, and it's in another part of the document. The 12, it's an issue about prioritization, and it's about finance, budget and so on, and so forth. It's another part of this document.

Therefore, maybe we will have, as a Board Work Party, to dig another part. I still, once again, don't know how we will organize that. Pat and Cheryl will help us, I guess, to decide. But here, it's really as Bernie has done from the spreadsheet about the answer on ATRT2. I have done the same with the work we have done on our Google Doc we worked on since the beginning. Therefore, I just cut and paste, here. I have done it in two parts, as Bernie explained; a short report on all the other items, the items not linked with ATRT2, and that's the 3.2.2, and I guess the 3.2.3 will be an in-depth report and analysis on the issue, where recommendation must be delivered by ATRT3. Therefore, it's why you will see this very

---

short discussion on each item. Therefore, it's board effectiveness and efficiency.

I have really tried to summarize this as a short report; the information we gather, the point of view we have on that, and the different themes we wanted to work on. Maybe we need to complete some part, and then some issues. We have board effectiveness and efficiency on the 32.21. It's something that, in fact, we will use ATRT2 recommendation mainly. If there's something missing we will add it here. And then, there's board composition still to be worked on, and I will come back on that. Then we have 32.23, finance, 32.24, evolution of budget process in the past few years. I guess it's a typo. I need to put that back to finance, I guess, because it must be strategy's the next one. And then the ATRT2 metrics, and the board appeal mechanism.

What I will say now is, it's very important for our work. I suggest that we try to summarize all those issues, finance, strategy, ATRT2 metrics, and the board appeal mechanism, quickly, and really if we see something that we want to make a recommendation ... I don't see any for the moment, but if somebody sees that, raise it quite quickly, and if there is no recommendation from this part, just put the information we gather and nothing else. We'll concentrate on the two issues, the 32.21 on board effectiveness, and the 32.22 on board composition.

If we go down, I talk about all those issues. If we go to 32.3, a little bit further down, Brenda, a little bit more... Here. It's exactly what I told you. I suggest 32.31 for ATRT2 recommendation, and 32.32 for board composition. Then, after we go back to the same organization of the document, like the other sub-group or review team, the results of surveys

---

and other information. I hope it is clear and useful. I am ready to answer questions. Bernie, go ahead please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Just to remember, on board appeals mechanism, I believe we dealt with under issue six. I had submitted text, it's been approved. I think we've actually closed that one down. As far as board finance there were several ATRT2 recommendations, and they can now be found in issue 10 in the report, under prioritization of our work. As Sébastien was mentioning earlier, there will be areas where this group can participate on some of the other issues, and I think this is one of them. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Bernie. May I ask you to put that ... Because it's in our term of reference, therefore we need to say that we have handled it in one way or another. Then, if you can add that, go to look at the other part of the document, or where it's already put [on bed] would be great. Like that, we can close this [source] document. We need to keep them here, from my point of view, as it was our [tour], but nothing else, I guess. Are you okay, Bernie, to do that? Okay, thank you. Green tick.

Any other questions? We have comments from Osvaldo. I think it's quite clear, and I think it's a good idea on how to address our work, therefore thank you very much, Osvaldo. Any other comments? Okay. I don't think we need to ... I suggest that, now you have the knowledge of this document, you go and, if you can make comments, if you have, if you wish, like that we can announce this document. Then we will concentrate, as I said, on the two issues. I guess that the ATRT2 recommendations are

---

already in a good way, but we have some work to do, as Bernie explained, about the board composition. Maybe I will write something and come back to you on how I think we can work on that in the near future, if you agree with this way of doing it. Thank you, Demi. Thank you, Osvaldo. Okay, may I ask if you have any other comments? Before that, Bernie, any other topics you want to raise for our group to be taking care of?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, I think we've covered it quite well. I think we've got a solid work plan. We will start filling that out. I've got a few things I've got to add in, here, and I think this will be a good way to approach it. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you very much. Any other comments, questions? Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, Sébastien, thank you. I just wanted to double-check. We provided some resources last week, and from my perspective, the records that I have, we've delivered all the resources that you had asked for, so please let me know if there's anything outstanding, because I just want to be sure that we're on the same page. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jennifer. Thank you for sending us information. All of that information is on our document, and if you go to the Google folder, I guess, when it was announced with the document attached, an e-mail

---

with an attachment, I put it in this place. Therefore, we have, in the Google folder, I hope, all. If I missed something, please add it. I have still to look if there are any questions remaining. I didn't have time to do that. I will do it in the next few days, and I will come back to you and to the group, if there are additional questions.

I know, for example, that I asked for a very specific document. I know that it exists, because it was done by the chair of the board when I was board member? I don't know why it seems difficult to get it, but it's a [inaudible] of the board members since the beginning of ICANN, and I have it. I don't really need it for myself, but I think if the decision is not to publish it, and to give to the members, so be it. Just, I would like to know if it's a conscious decision, or if it's a hole in the way. As I have it, the work, I will use it as an input, and you will have the result of all those inputs, therefore, it's not really any more needed, but just to check.

I will check if there are other documents that were asking for and we still don't have. Once again, I will do that in the next few days. Thank you for giving us all this information, Jennifer. Yes, Maarten, please go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sorry, which document are you referring to?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am referring to a phrase, I guess it's a term in English. In fact, a document where you have all the board members by seat, and by time, and it was like a calendar with the first board member, the second board member, on board seat, one, two, three, four, etc. The number 15, starting in 2010,

---

for example. It was done by Steve Crocker, the chair at that time. Maybe you don't know about it?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think I've seen that. I don't know where I've seen it, but ... [inaudible]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Once again, it's not a big deal if we don't have it, as I have in another form all of the information. But as it was a question ... If we can.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Any other comments, questions? If not, we are reaching, in four minutes, the top of the hour. I would like to thank you all, and everyone, for your participation. Really, if you can have a look at the document, and put your comments, it will be a great help. May I, before I close this meeting, ask if Pat, as one of our co-chairs, wants to say something? Please, Pat, if you want.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sébastien, no. It's been good listening to what we've got here, but I've got nothing to add during this hour, so thank you.



---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat. I hope it's going in the right direction, and that we will fulfill the work in the dedicated time on that. Okay, thank you very much for your participation, once again, and a good job. I would like, really, more than anything else, to thank staff and to thank Bernie for his help. It's very relevant and will be useful. Your work is very well done, thank you. I'll talk to you on Monday on the leadership team call, and on Wednesday on the plenary session. Thank you very much, have a good day. Bye-bye, take care.

[JENNIFER BRYCE:] Bye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]