BRENDA BREWER:	Good day everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary Call #33 on the 9th of October, 2019. Today's call is at 11:00 UTC. Members attending include Cheryl, Demi, Jacques, Sebastien, Vanda, and Tola. Observers joining today are Everton, Herb, and Sophie. Attending from ICANN org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer, Bernie, has joined the call. And we do have apologies from Jaap, Wolfgang, Maarten, Pat and [inaudible].
	Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking. And I just received an apology from Ramet, and I'd like to turn the call over to Cheryl, thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you very much, Brenda. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I think there was a probable apology also sent from Daniel because he's out of country at the moment in an area that has very likely low bandwidth or communications availability. So I think we should probably -- because that's why he couldn't be in the reviews call yesterday. So let's note his apologies as well.
	And with that, hopefully some of the other work party -- oh, Daniel has joined us, there you go. Obviously, you managed to find yourself an internet connection. Welcome, Daniel. There I was apologizing for you.
	Okay, and hopefully some other work party leaders will join us as well but I'm sure we only had very minor, if any, updates to happen tonight

with the lion's share today's agenda getting deeply dived into the survey results in the sections as listed in our agenda under section five.

Now, for today's thrill packed and exciting adventure, Pat sent his apologies, his regrets because he is in transit back from a meeting which a number of you have been involved with I'm sure, student [inaudible], but with him in transit, you'll just going to have to put up with me. And of course, Bernie, and our fabulous staff who are going to be supporting us through a number of the other action items.

So let's ask first of all, that is you're welcome. Has anyone got a statement of interest update? And if so, let us know now. Just reminding you all, we operate under a rule of continuous disclosure with our statements of interest. Not seeing anyone in the Zoom Room, and not hearing anyone trying to get any attention for this small item. We will move on quickly and see whether or not Jennifer can bring us up to speed with any of the action items for review. Some of them will be new, some of them will be proposed. Amongst today's action items, however, we'll be discussing a few questions listed as A, B, and C in the agenda. And just for anyone's edification, if there's any other business that you wish to flag, please just put a note in the chat. And we will of course, call for any other business again as we get to that part of the agenda as well.

And we note, thank you very much Daniel that you're squeezing your seat to your lunchtime. So you're taking a break and joining the ATRT3, cool, but you may of course we recognize you need to leave before the end of our call because you probably don't have a lunch two hours.

EN

Okay, with that, I believe, Jennifer, agenda item number 2, action items over to you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Cheryl. Hello, everyone. This is Jennifer. So we had a question on the leadership call on Monday about per diem and whether or not review team members should expect to receive this for Singapore and Montreal. I have some information. I wish I had more to share with you at this point. But basically, yes, all review team members should expect to receive per diem funds for both those meetings.

I understand that some of you have been paid already for one if not both and others are in the situation where they have not received those funds. So we have asked for some more specific information and from the travel team as to the dates that you should expect those. And once I have that I will share with you; apologies that I don't have it for this call. But that's that. Sebastien, is your hand raised to do this?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please, if I can.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Yeah, after we discussed that I received the mail; quite a strange mail because there is no reference to -- except

ATRT3 -- to which travel we are talking about. And I think this is good to confirm that your ATRT3 Sebastian [inaudible] has been sent to our finance department for processing on 02/08. I don't know but even in US language, I don't think that it's something nearby October or September or whatever. Therefore [inaudible] travel I received yesterday [inaudible] what you are talking about, but the data are quite wrong. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you. And yes, Cheryl has raised this as well as quite confusing. I know it's not a face to face meeting for February next year. It will be in regards to Singapore and Montreal. So I'm not sure what that date means, but again, we'll follow up and get some more detail because as you said, it doesn't actually specify which ATRT3 meeting that is for.

So that's per diem. And again, sorry I don't have more clear information on that. But with that, I'm just going to move on to the next item, which is the ATRT2 implementation. We had a request to link the transcripts from the meetings during which each of the ATRT2 recommendations were discussed. There's about three or four different meetings that the review team discussed those recommendations. I just wanted to note that that links have been added to the Google Sheet, which is the same Google Sheet that we have been using for several months now. At the very last column you'll see the link there, so if anybody would like to go back and reference the discussion that the review team members had on each of those ATRT2 recommendations, it should be very easy to do. The transcripts and the Zoom recordings are all on the wiki pages.

So that is at B. And I'm seeing no hands or questions, so I'm going to move on now to see which is the Montreal engagement sessions. If you recall, a while back we took an action item to reach out to SOs and ACs for any time on their agenda that they may have to meet with the ATRT3 review team; that obviously happened. And you will have seen several calendar invites coming your way for those sessions throughout the week in Montreal.

I would like to just draw your attention to the wiki page where all those engagement sessions live as well as on your calendars. Observers should have those invites as well. Obviously, remote participation is available. All those engagements will be open. So really, this is just to remind you to keep a lookout in your calendar, we might have one or two more coming in, in the next few days when the schedules get finalized. So please, please look out for those.

And with that, that's all the action items that I have to review for the moment. I'm happy to answer any questions or take any comments. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Thank you very much for that, Jennifer. And I do mean thank you very much, particularly for what I know is a quite heroic effort that went into making sure that the ease of reference for linking all of the transcripts and recordings to the Google Sheets was done in such a prompt manner. I know it was a not an easy task, and of course, we do appreciate the fact that you've made everyone else's life a great deal easier, even though it was a

considerable time, effort, and energy from yourself. But thank you very much again for that.

With that, I think the next one goes back to you as well, which is any logistic updates regarding Singapore. Obviously, not per diem and yes, I did wonder how we were getting such advanced warning on a meeting which wasn't even planned for next year. It is so much for efficiency and effectiveness and detail orientation and there are so double checking before you approach the end on things. But all of that aside, over to you, but anything to do with our face to face meeting.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. This is Jennifer again. So I wanted to remind everybody first of all who is attending the meeting in person that the meeting will be at the Swiss Hotel, which is the same hotel where we will be staying. So not too far to go; as Vanda said, we're going to be living in that hotel for three days. We will update the calendar invites, the room is going to be called the Indiana Room. It's on the level four of the hotel. But like I said, we'll update with all information for that. Observers are very welcome to join. As usual, the remote participation information will be included in the invite as well.

If you are not attending in person and you're an observer, you're very welcome to get in touch with me and just let me know when you expect to attend just so I can help facilitate your participation. You don't have to do that. Of course, you're welcome to join at anytime. But you're welcome to get in touch with me if you would like to do that.

And then for the review team members who are participating remotely, like I said, we're going to try and set up sessions with you on the 19th just a few minutes of your time, so that we can test the connectivity. We need to get the availability of the AV tech on the 19th first and so we're working towards that but we will hopefully get those sessions scheduled just so we can help make everything go as smoothly as possible.

I have nothing else on Singapore other than looking forward to seeing some of you there. And I did just receive a question about breakfast. Yes, we will be getting breakfast in the hotel. It will be in the hotel restaurant and we will send information about the times for that as well. But you should have breakfast before you attend the meeting, basically. Alright, and I'm happy to answer any questions on Singapore but for now that's all I have. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again. And it would certainly be helpful if those of you are not able to attend face to face and who are going to be participating remotely could make sure you take the opportunity for that preflight check and to make sure that the logistics and checking of connections, which our communication staff are offering to you are -- it's going to be very helpful if we don't have to do any problem solving on the day. So if you can do that on the 19th, that would be fantastic. Okay, with that, I didn't see anyone else's hand raised on any of those matters. Thank you very much again, Jennifer, for all of that.

And now we move to our agenda item number four, which is any brief update. We already budgeted a couple of minutes here for any updates from any of the work parties. I'm aware, for example, that the review work party held a brief meeting of about 30 minutes, if the transcript is a true and accurate record of yesterday-ish or 20 in the last 24 hours anyway. But I don't think there's been any other work party meetings between now and our last call. So if any of the work parties want to do any update on the public record if they'd like to do so now, please raise your hand and step forward. Looks like a yes. Yes, Sebastien. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, just to confirm, as it is recorded -- Sebastien Bachollet speaking -- that in the Board working parties there is no specific update as we are going through the document and the plenary, so we know a specific discussion for the moment. We will see I guess, after Singapore, how we relaunch the group if still needed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl for the record. Yes, if needs be I think the same can be said for all of the work parties but noting of course, that the work parties is such as community like reviews and your own. And GAC are all keenly looking at the survey results at this time as well to integrate those bits of data into your deliberations.

Alright, well with that, I believe we're up to what is to be the lion's share of today's call. For those of you who are going to be looking at it on a separate screen or a different tab will be working with and please

correct me if I'm wrong here, Bernie, but we're working with version 4.0 of the report template for today's call. And I think you said it was going to be page 19. So the bottom of page 18, top of page 19 is we will be starting. And that is what you see on your screen. Thank you very much, Brenda. And with that, Bernie, I hope you've had a big sip of water because it's all over to you now.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, ma'am. Yeah, so contrary to earlier, we had completed 3243 and now we're on to 3244. You'll remember that 3243 was that discussion just to get us back in sync. Maybe we'll go back up. Sorry, Brenda, just to have a look for a second. Just to remind someone since it's relevant to this next point. A little bit, there we go.

Alright, so do you consider diversity amongst board members satisfactory, and we saw with individuals was close to tied. And that it was two to one on structures being dissatisfied. We rated the consolidated by what was most dissatisfaction, and it was gender followed by geographical and a little bit further stakeholder group or constituency. So that's where we left it off after the comments.

Alright, let's go to our next item. Thank you very much, Brenda. Threw a bit of a curveball there, I told her I'd start on 3243, yeah, 3244 and I decided to go back to it anyway. So thank you for putting up with me there. How satisfied are you with the nominating committee's selection of directors for the ICANN Board?

Now, it's interesting that in the context of the previous answer, where there was a two to one dissatisfaction from structures about the

diversity on the board that we get 70% of structures that are satisfied or very satisfied with the NomComs jobs. So that's pretty good and we end up with consolidated a 68% versus 17%. But we'll get to that in a few minutes. However there were some comments and as is our usual habit, we're going to read them because I Bernie some edits on the survey respondents please. Okay, will look at that.

So the comments. At-Large EURALO varied satisfied. The ICANN nominating committee is doing an excellent job in its section to address board balance.

GNSO BC, dissatisfied, as described BC comment in June 2019 on Multi-stakeholder Model Evolution. One factor that fuels in GNSO disputes is the limited number of GNSO seats on the board, which are only two of the 15 seats, considering that gTLDs are responsible for 98% of ICANN revenue and for most of ICANN policy work two seats seems like an insufficient representation for the GNSO. One way to get around this would be to give two of the eight NomCom seats to the GNSO. This would still allow the NomCom to name six of the 15 board members while giving more room to accommodate the many stakeholders of the GNSO. A potential working model would be at each of these GNSO Stakeholder Groups would get one board seat registrars, registries, commercial and non-commercials.

The BC suggests that the waited voting would be removed the structure of the GNSO Policy Council be returned to his former state and that the balance of representation on board is better considered so that all stakeholders feel properly represented, and thus more willing to engage

in a more productive manner knowing that their voice would ultimately have a clear carrier on the board.

I don't know why we're getting into GNSO Policy Council here, but anyways, that was the comment.

GNSO RrSG. No opinion, is the RrSG understanding that the Registries Stakeholder Group, understanding that the NOmCom is encouraged or perhaps instructed to seek out candidates outside of the domain industry. As mentioned previously, the RrSG believes that board members would benefit from a stronger understanding of our industry. Therefore, we believe this discrepancy should be reconciled to ensure that the NomCom are identifying candidates with the right skills to serve successfully on the board.

RSSAC, somewhat dissatisfied, the ICANN Board could benefit from directors with more technical abilities. Generally, the ICANN Board could benefit from a higher level of technical expertise. Bit of an edit there, I'll have a look at that.

Alright, our analysis consolidated results of 68% of respondents that are satisfied or very satisfied versus 17 that are somewhat dissatisfied -- Sorry, I lost the audio. Producing a 51% that are satisfied, which is a very good result overall. The GNSO BC comment is more about representation on a board and voting structure GNSO than the NomCom.

The RrSG recommendation at board members should have greater understanding of the domain name industries noted. The understanding that ICANN should sit up represent all types of users.

Alright, we'll park it there for a sec. Thoughts, questions, comments? Not seeing any.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sebastien.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh, sorry. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. Yeah, I think it's a comment made by the Registry Constituency. I think it could be useful to underline and to seek what is a reality on the following sentence. The second line of their comments and [inaudible] perhaps instruct -- I think we need to find out if it's encouraged or instructed. And if it is one or the other, by whom? And how it is done? Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you, Sebastien. Anybody else? Alright, so let's move on to the conclusion then. Given the nature of the Stakeholder Community and ICANN one should consider the consolidated net of 51% satisfaction is very good. One should also consider the upcoming changes that will be implemented in the NomCom following the acceptance of the recommendations from its review ATRT3 will not be making any recommendations or suggestions regarding this issue.

And then we have a comment from Sebastien on this one, which if we can scoot over just a bit to have a read Brenda. Oh, and I see I have some hands. Alright. I will read Sebastien's comment and then we'll get to the hands. I have the impression that this is a short term view. And my response was for talking about it today, alright. Since I read it as his comment, I'll go with Sebastien first please, and then we'll take Jacques.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. The way I say that is that I have the impression that some of the comments are made about the last selection and not the original view. I feel very strongly that the selection made by the NomCom when it end up with having five members of the board, including the one from the NomCom from the same country, that's the maximum for one region and it's the first time in ICANN that all five are coming from the same country. It bothers me that we say that it's okay, they do well with diversity. I feel quite the reverse on that specific issue. And therefore it's why I think that, yes, the last NomCom selection seems to be quite well in that direction, but not some of the previous one. It's why I write that it's a short term view for my [inaudible], thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: Yes, Jacques for the record. So, I might be getting back a bit on the KPIs but when I see 51% satisfaction, which means 49% dissatisfaction, that

means pretty much one for one to me, if you take my meaning. So I'm not at ease with the fact that we consider that 51% satisfaction is very good. In this case, could we elaborate a bit more, or could somebody who's more versed in ICANN ins and out than I am, explain to me why the nature of the stakeholder community justifies 51% satisfaction only in my mind being very good. And over that, I realized that, you know, we didn't yet look at what kind of percentage positive or negative we consider as good, very good or average.

And last but not least, I understand that if we say that the percentage is too low, it would, it might trigger a recommendation or suggestion but that's another debate altogether. But you know, guys, I'm not very sure of 51% satisfaction being very good. So I'd be, I'd like to hear, you know, what's the nature of the stakeholder community has to do with this kind of affirmation?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Jacques, maybe I can take that. You'll note that it says net 51% and that's what we've used throughout here. The satisfaction and for good, you can go back up a bit Brenda to the table on this section. Thank you. Alright, so as we said, we're the, we have 63% of individuals that are satisfied or very satisfied 19% that don't have an opinion, and 18% that are somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

On the structures, we have 70% that are very satisfied or satisfied; we have 15% that have no opinion; and 16% that are somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied; and the consolidated as usual 75% structure and 25% individual. So, we are, you know, when we say a net 51%, basically

is the 68 minus 17, but I mean overall, we do have from structures a 70% rating of support and 63% from individuals. Does that help at all, Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: Yes. Okay, so yeah, Jacques again. Yes, it does Bernie. And thanks for note for that. But in this case, I mean, you know, looking at this from my tree, I feel we should elaborate. Because, you know, when you said net 51, I didn't understand it the way you explained it. My deep feeling is we should elaborate a bit more or we will have that kind of natural feeling and say, "Hey, 51 is not a lot all and all."

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, yes, but if we go back down to the analysis section, please, Brenda. I think we lay it out very clearly when we say the consolidated results of 68% of respondents that are satisfied or very satisfied versus the 17% that are somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, produces a net of 51%.

And we're using this same mechanics all the way through the analysis of the surveys. So if we want to specify some more in the conclusion, I think we can fix that, that's not a problem, but I think the details about our arriving at that number are clear in the analysis, but I'll take your point on that. That maybe we can fix that up in the conclusion a bit, will that make sense, Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: So yeah. And that have been my last word on this one. So in this case, and maybe some detail we could say one should consider the analyzed consolidated net of 51%, and then you push the people back up, and that I fully understand it could be better [inaudible].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you, Jacques, for that. Any other points? I saw Vanda's hand there for a sec, but it's gone. Hey, Vanda, over to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: In some way I agree with Jacques that for an external reader, this is not, you know, comfortable for -- you know, they say 51 is not, even 17, even six for me, even 68, in my opinion is not very good. It's is good but it's not very good. Very good something over 75 or something like that. Because the impression that is when you say very good is the majority is very good. And the majority you can see in the survey is good. They considered good, not very good. So --

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I have to agree with you, Vanda. And I'll rework this conclusion on 3244.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you very much.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to agree with Jacques. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Noted. Alright, good comments, that's why we do this. And, you know, when I'm writing these there, there are literally pages and pages. So sometimes, yeah, they do slip up. So good comment, we'll fix.

Let's move on to the next session. Brenda, please; 3245, do you feel the NomCom as currently constituted is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy in? Alright, and we'll remember that this was a question that we got from Michael and glad to see Michael on the call.

Alright, where did we end up with this one? Individuals, 54 to 46 close to tied, and again on the structures two to one against basically.

So let's have a read at our comments. At-Large EURALO: no; yes, for members of the ICANN Board selected by the NomCom; no, for the At-Large members selected by the NomCom. Often the person's liked it has not been adequately briefed about what to expect and a pre appointment meeting with the At-Large leadership team would probably help clear this misunderstanding prior to the person taking on this position.

At-Large NARALO: no, not all the people that are sent to the NomCom have the experience to do a good [inaudible]. SO/ACs should be more

careful as to the people that the select to the NomCom. As I said, we basically just copy the comments in and we don't edit them.

ccNSO -- I see Vanda's hand up. Is that a new hand, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, yes. Just a quick comment that as part of the reveal of NomCom. But is just to remember that one point that we have raised there and in these recommendations over there is to have a better selection for the members, even for the At-Large members that are sitting inside NomCom, because it's their job to help the selection with the knowledge. If you send someone to this group of NomCom with no deeply knowledge about how is the dynamics inside At-Large, ALAC and their RALOs.   So, those people cannot help to select a better representative because they do not really help the overall group of NomCom with the comments that justify better selection. It's just that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: And that's very interesting. And will remember that in the GAC section, we talked about a suggestion that said that liaisons to the GAC might benefit from a list of desirable qualities or suggested attributes that would make for a good liaison to the GAC. And maybe what we're getting out of this here as Vanda said is something along those lines, but let's finish this and get to the end of that.

ccNSO either the number of NomCom members needs to be lowered for over represented communities GNSO or At-Large or the number of

members from other underrepresented so ACs needs to be increased for the sake of efficiency, financial. And otherwise, the first solution is preferred.

GAC, did not say if they were happy or not. GAC answered, the GAC has a dedicated Working Group addressing NomCom matters and based on recent discussions with the NomCom leadership, [inaudible] ICANN64, Kobe, Japan meeting. The GAC has been able to establish and share specific and formally recommended criteria for NomCom consideration in the future selection of perspective ICANN Leaders. See example 6 August 2018, letter from Manal Ismail to Zahid Jamil. The GAC hopes to continue that effort in the years to come as the GAC discussions about the NomCom representation continue.

RSSAC. No, we believe the kind of code community should carry more weight in the nominating committee in order to add technical component to the diversity matrix. Alright, let's go down to the analysis.

Individual responses and consolidated responses are essentially split on this question, 54, yes to 46, no; produces an end of 8%, Yes, which is extremely low structures at 64%; No, versus 36%. Yes, producing a net 28%. No, which is also very low.

Conclusion, given the individual and consolidated response are essentially split the 72% satisfaction rate with the NomCom in the previous question and the fact that the NomCom is in the process of implementing the recommendations, which are the results of its review.

It would seem in advisable for ATRT3 to make recommendations or suggestions regarding NomCom based on the results of this question.

Now we have comments. We have Michael that commented, this seems inadequate to me a 50/50 split, an indication of substantial dissatisfaction. And it looks like -- can we hit the Show More on that comment please Brenda, for Michael's? Brenda, the bottom there, show more of the comment. The lower, there we go, that's it, okay. I think saying we're just going to pass the buck here is on satisfactory. This is a draft let's discuss at the meeting.

Alright. So basically, if we -- lets drop down a bit, Brenda. I want to see the analysis here. Sorry, go back up, wrong direction in my phone.

Yeah. For me, yeah, it's split. It is their dissatisfaction? Yes, I'll get to you in a sec, Brenda. Sorry Vanda. And but also we have to be careful to understand that the NomCom is a very tight balancing act. And also we've received a paper from the empowered community regarding an analysis of the impact of a selection by the ccNSO for its members to the board, which may have significant knock on effects with the balancing that Sebastien was talking about before. And is something that I am told the NomCom always has to deal with every year when it's looking at these things. So [inaudible] a very delicate mechanism -- sorry dropped out there for a second. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, Vanda for the record. I do believe that we can have some time later on in our work to reveal the final draft of the recommendations approved by the Board from NomCom. And maybe we could really

recommend or suggest some ideas that could help in particular points that we are seeing here in our survey.

So most of the recommendations in the NomCom is into this line of balance and help things to be more adequate and to have all those comments that we have done here. But a review of this later on when we have the full board [inaudible] and etc., we could review that work and maybe make some comments on those conclusions related to NomCom. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Over to you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi, yeah, there was a sentence in the middle that you didn't read out in the comment, and that was that there were substantive recommendations that people have given. I don't want to -- without going too much into this, I think the much more valuable thing that the survey gives us, much more than percentages of the 50 people in the ICANN community that we surveyed, I think that what's a much more valuable response that we got back are these substantive recommendations saying here's how things could be done better.

And there's a couple of those with regard to the NomCom, and I think that at the very least it's worth discussing it and not necessarily just brushing those off. I don't have very strong feelings about at the moment about whether we should accept them or not. I think that it's worth a discussion [inaudible] through though. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Michael. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Yeah, I agree with Michael; we need to take the comments into account, it was the reason of my own comments about the wellbeing that it was taking into account.

But I think what it's also important and maybe to remind us, it's that, yes, we can say that there is something going on in one part of the community, but the reason why we need to discuss that here is that we are supposed and I hope that we will be able to have a systemic view or global view of the organization putting all the pieces together. And it's where we might want to have some at least suggestions on that issue. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Bernie. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record specifically taking off ATRT3 hat and putting on her leadership team of the nominating committee review working groups past, and implementation Working Group current. And now I'm going to remind the ATRT3 that as of now, and also noted in the document, there are some 27 recommendations after extensive interaction with the ICANN Community.

That the ICANN Board has approved to be implemented affecting nominating committee and have a nominating committee works, including in these areas that we've asked these questions about. And it is now assuming that the detailed implementation plan and prioritization and costing document is in the hands of the ICANN Board. And the expectation of the ICANN Board will around the Montreal making approval or otherwise all of those that we would be not, I believe, very smart to not be in absolute concert with what is going be done out of that existing organizational review process.

So I'm assuming that if I did a pop quiz on all of you, with the exception event, very few of you would have a full working knowledge of exactly what all of those 27 recommendations are, and what they mean, and where they have an excess with our works.

Perhaps between now and making conclusions into final texts and any possible proposals for recommendations. You can all take time to read that public set of documents so that we are in no way duplicating the existing and budgeted for work.

And also, just to remind you, the very high bar putting my ATRT3 head back on now. Very high bar of what it takes to make a recommendation, as opposed to a suggestion please tell us. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright, thank you, Cheryl. Your hand is still up. Maybe what I'm going to ask is our concerned with staff. And why don't we distribute to the ATRT3 list the recommendations or the report from the NomCom

review, and we can feed that into, -- oh, here's the detailed implementation plan.

Jennifer, you are so effective, thank you. And we can have a read of that and decide if we want to review that conclusion on 3254. That would seem to be a good way forward unless there's any significant objections. Going once going, twice. Done. Alright, so we'll have a read of that and I'll take a note on that.

Alright, let's get into our next segment 3246. Please indicate your satisfaction with the accountability of the board under the new accountability mechanisms such as the empowered community.

So that's a bit of a weird one; 47% are set of individuals are satisfied or very satisfied; 24% had no opinion; and 29% were somewhat dissatisfied or very satisfied.

On the structures we have 38% that are satisfied. We have 38% that have no opinion, and we have 23% that are somewhat dissatisfied.

I think the comments are interesting on this one. At-Large. Again, a mixed bag, At-large views are ranged from satisfied to somewhat dissatisfied. On the one hand, the board attempts to react quickly to community disapproval, but doesn't behave like an uncountable body at the outset. The true mechanisms available to the empowered community have not yet been brought to bear so it's difficult to measure their effectiveness and holding the board accountable. And I think we'll see that theme repeated as we go through.

Let's go down the next page please Brenda. At-Large or RALO, somewhat dissatisfied. On the one hand, the board's attempts to react quickly to community disapproval doesn't behave like an accountable body at the outset remains to be seen whether the board will bow to vested interests within ICANN Community or still be able to make decisions in the public interest.

GNSO IPC, it's difficult to assess the accountability of the board under the new accountability mechanisms as the situation has not yet arisen where they have been tested.

GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group, the question seems premature because not all the new accountability mechanisms have been implemented. In other words, they have not been tested or used. For example, the independent review process implementation oversight team and the GNSO Drafting Team to further develop guidelines and principles for the GNSO roles and obligations as decisional participant in the empowered community are still ongoing three years after the completion of the INS stewardship transition.

Alright, and on the analysis, if we can bring that a bit Brenda please. Alright. The consolidated response of 40% satisfied or very satisfied versus 24% somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied produces a net of 16% satisfied or very satisfied, which is very weak and is representative of both the individual and structure responses. It seems that as the comments indicate, several respondents were trying to respond based on the use of these powers, some of which have not been used.

Conclusion.   ATRT3 are not making recommendations or suggestions with respect to this question, and we have a comment from Sebastien. The balance between board staff and EC must be evaluated regularly. Maybe ATRT3 can start this process.

So basically, this question did not really produce anything significant. I don't think we want to go playing into the balance of the EC because as many commenters know that it's really in its infancy, and even the GNSO hasn't finish the mechanisms for using [AUDIO BREAK]

So, as I was saying, I think I agree with Sebastien comment. To the extent maybe one of the things we want to check is how satisfied the current empowered community as it is, is satisfied with this relation with the board and vice versa, meaning how the board is satisfied with its relation with the empowered community as it is, and then we can see. So but then we could be other text with respect to this survey question, I don't really think there's a lot we can do. So any questions, comments on this one?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie -- sorry, Cheryl here. It is so hard to find me to put my hand up and down because of where I've got the chat over the top of the pod where the people are trying to keep an eye on the hands and things I apologize to just jumping in. I think we can inquire, if that's the will of the ATRT, we can inquire directly to the empower community. It is an entity that we can interact with. So perhaps we might just want to make a side note there not necessarily an action item yet, but a potential action item to inquiries to the degree of satisfaction or

otherwise directly, just don't want to lose that that opportunity having had a rise in the comments, that's all. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright. So I guess the question to the group, should we at least get an initial sense from the empowered community and vice versa, maybe from the board relationship with the EC? Maybe we can have a meeting with EC. I think that's currently difficult, Sebastien, given the people that are on there. I think they would, from my discussions I've been having with them they might appreciate a question or a few questions in reply to very easily would probably be the best thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I think we can give them a written inquiry and they can do their own round [inaudible] through their own mailing list and respond to our read clarifying questions.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that all, for heaven's sake, it's five questions and do the same for the board. But anyway, let's take that approach to begin with.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: So any objections to talking and to sending? It will be ideal, okay.

Yes, it would be ideal, Tola, to meet them but unfortunately, I think, given the realities of our timeline, that's just not going to happen. So maybe as Cheryl has suggested, we'll start with some questions sent to them see if we can get responses quickly. So we can consider them when we're in Singapore. Would that be okay for everyone? Okay.

Alright, so I'll take it as there's no significant objection, then we'll move on and we'll take care of that this week certainly.

Alright, our next question 3247. Rate the mechanisms ensuring the board's transparency. So we have 43% of individuals that are rated as very effective or effective, 20% that have no opinion, and 37% someone in effective or ineffective. On structures, we've got 54% effective. We've got 31% with no opinion, and 15% as somewhat ineffective.

And then we had a companion question, do you think mechanisms for ensuring the board's transparency need to be improved? And that was a question for individual respondents only. And there we got an 80/20 rating 80%, yes, improvements.

Now, as noted in our discussions last week with Martin was here, on the individual responses, you know, it helps give us an idea, but it's certainly not a significant sample when you consider the ICANN Community.

On the structures though, we certainly we've got a vast majority of the structures and their components that responded. And so I think that's a more clear indication, but let's go to the comments.

GNSO IPC, we note that the board needs to balance the need to have full and frank discussions while also providing rationales for their

decisions. While there have been improvements in board transparency over the years, there's still issues with the late publication of board and board committee agendas, minutes of the board and board committee meetings that are also often published weeks after the meeting was held. Board correspondence is published on an apparently ad hoc basis on the correspondent's page, with some letters being posted within days, while, other letters may not be posted for weeks. I think that's an interesting comment.

GNSO RrSG, so are saying somewhat ineffective. RrSG suggests that the schedule of board meetings should be posted in advance, and the agenda for those meetings should be published as far ahead of the meetings as possible. At the very least publishing the agendas ahead of the meeting should be standard operating procedures, knowing what the board will be discussing and when would be very useful to the community and would significantly enhance the overall transparency of the board's deliberations. We also suggest that ICANN org work on improving the website where board information is posted to make an easier to find content about board discussions and resolutions.

Alright, analysis. Individual responses of 43% satisfied or very satisfied versus 37% somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied producing a net of 6% satisfied or very satisfied is extremely low.

Structure responses of 50%; 54% satisfied or very satisfied versus 15% somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied producing a net of 39% satisfied or very satisfied, which is good, it's okay I guess. However, the individual question do you think the mechanisms ensuring board transparency need to be improved, which had responses of 80%

requiring improvements to board transparency when coupled with the comments of the IPC and the RrSG are significant.

So what's our draft conclusion here? Chronic tardiness and posting agenda of board, board committee meetings and minutes of these meetings is a failure of transparency. ATRT3 will consider making recommendations for the issues raised in the responses to this question, which could be inspired by ATRT2 recommendation 6.1B that was made for the GAC. And you'll remember, you probably don't, but I do, and Vanda certainly does, that in [AUDIO BREAK].

Sorry about that. As I was saying, 6.1B, the ATRT2 recommendation was that the GAC should do exactly this and that's where we ended up. So, I think we'll have to consider if it's a recommendation or is a suggestion, given the amount of work that is required to make a recommendation. But we might want to step up to the plate on this one, because it is really a very basic requirement. Thoughts, comments, questions? Going once, going twice, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie. Thank you, Bernie. Cheryl here. And here, I'm just contributing, I'm in support of the conclusion, I'll hasten to it. But this has been an issue that has been an issue since ATRT1 met. And so, when we're considering what we're going to be suggesting or recommending, not only would I be inspired by ATRT2 recommendation 6.1B, but I would be solely tempted to point out, we've got the other side of the decade's worth of opportunity here, ladies and gentlemen, and as yet, we're not

seeing enough traction in obvious change in this aspect of transparency to convince the community that sufficient effort is being made.

I'm not saying sufficient effort isn't being attempted; I'm not saying that efforts aren't being made. I'm saying the community is clearly not convinced, and I think there's an important bit of text development that could be made out of that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. Very good words and for those that remember ancient history, when I was on the other side of the fence running the dossier, I got into some very pointed arguments with ICANN about this, because board minutes were being published about year late. That's where, yes? You heard correctly. So, definitely, I think Cheryl's point is good and, you remember Vanda, and so, definitely I think Cheryl's point to this, this has been going on long enough, which is why I think we should make a recommendation and, as Cheryl said, we should bring up the history of this. And basically, asking everyone else to pony up to being on time and publishing things regularly is fine, but it's hard to make that request if you're, the board, is not doing it itself.

Alright. I think we're done with this one, let's move on. Brenda, please, 3248, thank you. How would you rate the importance of the board implementing the transparency recommendations from the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2? So, it sort of comes across very clearly here, there were no comments. Let's go right to the analysis. Consolidated responses of 84%, which rated this a very important or somewhat important, versus 1% for somewhat not important or not

important, producing a net of 83% important or somewhat important is a very strong indication of support. ATRT3 will consider recommending that the board approve and prioritize the implementation of CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 recommendations on transparency. Thoughts, questions, comments? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just a thought, I have the impression we may have to decide what are more important in ATRT3 CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 recommendation and if we start with one plot, we need to go through all and say one who are more important than the other. I know we are in charge of accountability and transparency, but as we touch to other topic, like diversity and so on and so forth, I feel that if we want to answer to this discussion around the 100 recommendation from CCWG Work Stream 2 we will maybe get into some trouble. But, if we want to do that we need to, it's a long work, it will be a long work and a long time and we will need some time for discussion on that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. I get your point and maybe it'll be enough to do a suggestion on this one that, sort of, notes the results of the survey and then that will feed in. Alright. Any other thoughts or questions? Okay. Thank you very much. Next point, Brenda please. "Are you satisfied with the board's decision taking process?" So, not quite split, but close to, on individuals. And structure's, amazingly enough, is about the same thing, producing consolidated of 55 to 45 yes to no. Comments? Sorry, had to cough there.

At-Large, "Any expression of satisfaction in the board's decision taking process is dependent on an ability to uphold the board accountable for its decisions, while a level of transparency is present in the board's decision taking process, i.e.: by way of public forums, open meetings, publication of minutes, and resolutions, as well as access to the records of its various committees, it is important not to conflate transparency with accountability. While transparency is necessary for accountability, in many instances it's certainly not sufficient."

At-Large EURALO, "No, the board's transparency has improved over time. Its accountability gained through explaining the rationale for decisions and providing verifiable feedback on stakeholder input still requires improvement."

GAC, "Yes, there is always room for improvements to decision taking. As a result of implementing a certain ATRT2 recommendations, communications, 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 in consideration of GAC consensus advice. In certain instances where consideration of GAC advice has been deferred, there is communication explaining why that transpires. Separately, the ICANN org staff has established an inventory of GAC advice to assist interested parties in researching and understanding how past advice has been considered and processed."

Michael, "Please note, I just joined by phone." Okay Michael, thank you.

EN

GNSO BC, "No, ICANN's oversight of the internet's unique identifiers involves decisions that affect the business users and registrants. However, the BC believes that the board should be more explicit in acknowledging when there are conflicting priorities of business versus contract parties and we believe that the board's recent decision with respect to GDPR shows that risks and concerns of contract parties are give greater weight than concerns and risk of business users and registrants."

GNSO Registrars Stakeholder Group, "The RrSG believes the board should put more trust in bottom-up policy development process and avoid a repeat of the way in which it handled the protracted IGO protections issues. For example, table 2 Inventory of GAC Advice in a recent letter from the board to GAC, shows there are still 11 open items related to IGO protections." And then there's a website, URL rather.

GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, "No, the process by which the board reaches the decisions is very difficult for the community to follow in many cases. While the addition of the rationale to every published board resolution has been a substantial improvement, it's still often hard to determine the process that went into reaching those decisions in the first place. We aren't even sure if all board decisions are unanimous, minus abstentions. One suggestion is for ICANN to publish how individual board members vote on specific issues. Another might be to publish summaries of the main discussion points covered prior to taking votes. We also suggest that making board governance documents more accessible on the ICANN website could help community members better understand the board's decision-making process."

Analysis: Consolidated response of 55% yes versus 45% no producing a [inaudible] of 10% yes is an extremely weak result. Draft conclusion: This is partially related to the previous point on board transparency and the comments made by the At-Large and registries are well taken. ATRT3 will consider making a recommendation or suggestion to address the issues raised in the responses to this question. Alright, let's throw it open. Thoughts, comments, questions? Going once, going twice, okay. Yes, it is clear, Vanda, thank you.

Next point, please, Brenda. Let's have a bit of a time check here. Alright, we've been at this for almost 75 minutes and we're doing rather not badly. "Are you aware of the training program for board members?" 38 to 62 individuals, 79 to 21 for structures. It's interesting to see that reversed. This is a huge section, huge. Yes, it is indeed. Interesting to see the mirror effect between individual and structure responses here.

Comments: GAC, "Yes, the GAC chair now participates in the board member onboarding process to help new board members understand the role and importance of active government participation in the ICANN processes. Analysis: "What is important is the inversion of responses between individuals and structures."

Conclusion: "Obviously, there is an awareness issue with respect to this topic for individuals in the community. ATRT3 will consider making a suggestion to address this." I don't think there's a lot more we can do about that. The survey results are, sort of, clear that the community members aren't really aware of this. Maybe a suggestion to ICANN that

EN

they publicize this a bit more would be useful. Thoughts, comments? Going once, going twice, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Bernard. My impression is that possibly the structures know, because, I think they have sizable numbers and they have a following a little bit with what they do and how they're doing their work. Therefore, it's quite normal that the structures are aware of that.

My point is it will be the same as the previous one, we can make a recommendation that it's important to put it on somewhere, communication, but there are so many things that ICANN needs to communicate better, to organize better, to allow individuals to find their way. I don't know if we want to take just this one as an example or put it in front, the same as the previous comments I made. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, if I may, Sebastien, I think we're going to get to the questions about improving the clarity of the ICANN website and Wiki and how to get to that. But, I think, you know, making suggestions is rather easy and since we don't have to go through the whole process that is required for recommendation, we've got an easy one to make here. I don't think it's going to raise any hackles and we will be discussing in some of the other questions, the general satisfaction about how ICANN organizes the information. So, I don't think that we're only talking about only doing this one, but the topic will come up and, yes, we can

always say, "Strongly suggest." Yes, that's always a good tool. Alright. Any other questions or comments?

Not seeing any, let's move on. 32411, "Are you satisfied with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN?" Alright, so, here are the numbers and then we have a companion question, "How would you rate the usability of the financial information?" And overall, not bad results.

Let's go to the comments. At-Large, "The office of the CFO provides a great deal of information and has been an excellent process to involve the community in the budget. At the same time, how decisions are made is not always obvious and, ideally, financial information presented to various SOs/ACs should be tailored to that structure group rather than in the form of general overview. Get to brass tacks and it would be an achievement if ICANN's financial data could be included in the ITI ODI framework."

At-Large EURALO, "Somewhat dissatisfied. The office of the CFO provides a great deal of information and has excellent ongoing processes to involve the community in the budget. ICANN has really improved this process over the years. At the same time, how decisions are made and who makes them is seldom obvious and ideally financial information presented to various SOs/ACs should be tailored to that structure group rather than in the form of general overview."

Registrars, "Somewhat dissatisfied. Comments from the Registrars Stakeholder Group on financial information provided by ICANN typically include requests for greater context and/or justification for how the

EN

finances are calculated. The Registrars Stakeholder Group would appreciate greater detail and transparency from ICANN and in their budgets."

Alright. Analysis: "Responses to the first question were similar for both groups and the consolidated results are 59% satisfied or very satisfied versus 21% somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, producing a net of 38% satisfied or very satisfied, which shows weak support for the satisfaction of users. Individual responses to the second question of 61% useful or very useful versus 11% of somewhat not useful or not useful, produces a net of 50% useful or very useful, which is a strong result. Structure responses to the second question of 59% useful or very useful versus 25% somewhat not useful or not useful, produces a net 34% useful or very useful, which is a weaker result.

Conclusion: Consolidated satisfaction of 59% is acceptable, but the 21% somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied is of concern. ATRT2 recommendations 12-1 and 12-4 were directly related to this topic and the effectiveness assessments for both of these recommendations noted that providing information which the average member of the community could understand easily and comment on effectively with only the required. Investing a few hours would go a long way to increasing the transparency and accountability of the process. Additionally, the comments provided by the respondents included some good suggestions, as such, ATRT3 should make some recommendations or suggestions with respect to the issues raised by the responses to this question.

And we have a comment that was made in the Google Doc by Michael, "Maybe note that there are Work Stream 2 recommendations that touch on this [inaudible]" …and I'm not adverse to that, and so, we could note this in the conclusion too unless there are some objections. Okay, any other thoughts, comments, or questions on this? 34111 for Michael's note. Okay, not seeing anything, let's move on. "Have you ever filed a documentary information disclosure policy request with ICANN? Individuals zero, structures zero. Comments: None. Analysis: I don't think there's any point.   Conclusion: The lack of respondent experience with the DIDP means that the survey is generally not helpful in designing recommendations or suggestions for the DIDP." So, this was a change from my original draft conclusion I exchanged with Michael on this. I'm happy with this, that's fine. Questions, thoughts, or comments? There's not a lot we can get out of this, beyond this point. Going once, going twice, done.

Next point.   32413, "Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the ICANN website should be better organized to facilitate searching for a specific topic?" and, that goes back to the discussion we had a few questions ago with Sebas… yeah. So, the responses were 81 to 18 in favor of better access from individuals and 100% from structures. The companion question is, "Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the community Wiki should be better organized to facilitate searching on the Wiki?" And there we have 85-15 and structures again 100%.

Comments: There were none. Analysis: I think it's rather clear. The conclusion: ATRT3 will consider making a recommendation or suggestion with respect to the responses to this question. We have a

note from Michael, if we can drop down a bit so we can read it, "Note that this ties into specific comment we heard repeatedly from the NCSG folks that ICANN should consider hiring a research librarian to help with accessibility challenges."

Yes, we did hear that from the NCSG and CSG. Sorry, but we didn't necessarily hear it from anybody else. And also, I think in considering making recommendations on this, we're going to have to look at the things that are going on and that we discuss in the next question about the Information Transparency Initiative or the Open Data Initiatives, specifically. So, before we go to that next section, questions or comments on this one? Going once, going twice, done.

Alright, 3214, "Are you aware of ICANN's Open Data mechanisms? Including the Information Transparency Initiatives, ITI, or the Open Data Initiatives, ODI, or about ICANN's transparency policy, more generally?" So, two to one split, individuals, yes are aware. And basically, three to on split on structures, but yes, they are aware of those things.

Comments: GAC, "Yes the GAC has been previously briefed about the ITI effort by ICANN org communications staff. Back at ICANN60 the GAC and the At-Large prepared and published a joint statement calling for ICANN org to do a better job at enabling inclusive, informed, and meaningful participation in ICANN. The reply from the board and ICANN org regarding that statement largely relied on the expected benefits that would flow from the ITI project. A copy of that joint statement can be found…" and there's the URL. "The analysis: A consolidated response of 69% yes indicates strong awareness. Conclusion: ATRT3 will

not be making any recommendations or suggestions with respect to the responses to this question."

Alright, do we know the budget involved in these projects? We probably should look into… Yeah, and my comment back to Sebastien, that, "It's unclear. We could attempt to make that assessment without a fair amount of work. Even if we did, would it change the conclusion and what impact it would have, given these are ongoing programs?" So, but I agree with Sebastien that we should probably get an update on where we are with those programs before trying to close the books on that. I see Cheryl has a hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yeah, and I'm in full agreement with that. I think that it maybe, not having a crystal ball fully polished, of use for us to, albeit not necessarily make recommendations or suggestions, but an observation as to where this project is and what tangible effect it's had at this stage of its own implementation on the community. So, it just would flag the importance of when one is saying, "All of this is going to change because of a particular project."

That particular project is properly recorded, audited, communicated, managed, you know, the objectives are actually being met, etc., etc. These might be one of those where we cross-reference a little more heavily to what is being declared by ICANN org on or about this project. But I do know that the joint communique between ALAC and the GAC is several years old now and they're still not seeing any fruits from the labors of this apparent solution [AUDIO BREAK].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Works better if I unmute myself. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETT: Yes, thank you very much. Just for the sake of the transparency, maybe it's good if we show all three replies. But you read your last reply, which we have some things to change. And one of my points was because of efficiency and if we can go asking where we are with the project in the realization, budget spent versus budget budgeted, it will be, I guess, useful and if it's not a recommendation or a suggestion, maybe as Cheryl just said, an observation, at least. But I guess it would useful to have that information and if I can ask, again, can we push the button and show all three replies?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETT: Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Brenda, can you punch that to show all three replies there? Thank you. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to hide those.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETT: No, no, no. I know, but thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright, Cheryl your hand is back up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It wasn't meant to be. My cursor is very sensitive, my apologies.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'm sure you have a very sensitive cursor. Alright. So, I think we should take an action item here to ask the organization to give us an update on those two projects that are mentioned in that question. Hopefully we can get that before we hit Singapore, if possible. Thank you very much, Jennifer. Guess what, folks? We finished the board section. Section three, yea for all of us! Excellent! Now, if we, thank you for the clapping hand, yes, hurray!

Now, if we go back to our agenda, yeah, everyone's excited, trust me, I'm excited. I feel like one of these guys that does the public auctions and that speaks too much. Our next point was to go over section four, results of GAC work party meeting. We did consider some of the suggestions I made, we're working on that. When I tried to integrate some parts of it in this document, that's what caused the several things to go wrong with the Google Doc. And so, we'll be fixing that as we go forward. Maybe I'll take this occasion to ask Vanda for a short update on where we are, but my take is we are doing quite well. Vanda, could you give us a few words, please? [AUDIO BREAK]

VANDA SCARTEZINI:	I, Vanda, for the record. Yes, I believe, as you said, there is not much that we need to comment on that, because the group itself, in my view, is going well, and we make progress in this meeting, and I believe it might, I don't know, my Google Doc was broken and Jennifer sent me back again the information. But in my opinion, we work on the points that we believe were the most important for the GAC. So, not much on that point, but maybe Jacques would like to comment, because there were few of us at meeting, but it was a good one, and, that is, I have nothing really to say about that, but maybe Jacques can take the floor and comment from his side of this meeting. Thank you, Bernie.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Thank you, Vanda. Jacques, any comments?
JACQUES BLANC:	Jacques for the record. So, it appeared that the work we're doing on the GAC document is facilitated a lot, both by Liu Yue and Vanda, because, you know, they know the way it works. At the point we are, I think it would be not a lot of time, but it's a bit early, as far as I see it, to review this now. So, maybe when we will have gone forward again, and shortly after Singapore, a review will be good. At the point we are, no, I don't have more comments than Vanda on this.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Thank you, Jacques. Alright. Section C of point 5, is that going over the draft commentary for section 11. So, let's go back to the report we were on previously, please Brenda, and go to section 11 just to allow

people to understand what we're talking about here, if they haven't followed properly. Should be about 80% of the down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, just a time trick as well, knowing that this is going to take a little lump of time, and you do, of course, we do have less than 30 minutes, if we can squeeze it under 20?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'm planning to let you some time at the end, I'm not planning to exhaust all the time. But I do want people to get a sense of it and get them started and then I'll turn it back to you, if that's okay. I'll take that as a yes. Okay. Yes, so, issue 9, section 11, currently it's called accountability indicators. This was added to the requirements of the ATRT3 review in its plenary in July 2019.

ICANN published the accountability indicators in 2019 and these are based on the 5 Pillars, that's a strategic point which is: evolve further and further globalize ICANN, support a healthy, stable, resilient, unique identifier ecosystem, advance organizational technological and operational excellence, promote ICANN's role as multi stake holder, approach and develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission.

Now, if we drop down, we have a survey on this. We had a couple of questions, "Has your structure looked at the ICANN accountability indicators?", half yes, half no. Basically, it's interesting that half of them, half of the structures were of this, I mean, these are ICANN's

EN

accountability indicators. That's a little troubling to me, and if we go to next question, "Please rate the effectiveness of the accountability indicators as to relate to board performance, as found in section 3.3 of that."

And basically, we sort of have an odd mix of responses, with 42% of individuals finding it effective or very effective, 33% of no opinion and 36% somewhat ineffective or ineffective. However, over on the structure side, for those we have 33% effective and 67% somewhat ineffective, which is sort of a little worrying.

But we can understand that, so, basically, what we decided to do -- someone's got their mic open. Leon, is that you? Leon, we're getting quite a bit of feedback from you. Thank you. So, what we decided to do is go through all these accountability indicators, in a point to try and help ICANN with these, and if we could bring up that document now, please Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER: Sorry, which document, Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: It is the document on accountability indicators. If you don't have it, I apologize. I thought you would have had it, let me go dig that up for you, it'll take a second.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just while they're -- this is Cheryl for the record. Just while they're sorting that out, I think the issues here which we may need to consider, is how greater understanding rank and file in the community or, dare I even suggest, those in control of the ICANN structures, how good their understanding of what in current governance [inaudible] accountability indicators is normally referring to. And what in the unique circumstances of the design and purpose of ICANN, the unusual entity that it is, is still applicable to our entity, and, of course, what ICANN titles of accountability indicators, it's almost three entirely different puddles of possible interpretation and understanding there. Okay, it's up, I can stop filibustering and… or filling in, not filibustering, and back to you Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, as I said, we're not going to go through all because there is a truck-load, you've been sent the document, it's a Google Doc, we would appreciate your comments. I'll just run through some of it and give you an idea about how it's structured. The report comments on the usefulness of each of the accountability indicators vs accountability. Accountability indicators can be found at. Now I tried to include the charts from the accountability indicators into this document, it's just impossible to copy-paste from that site, and maybe we can -- Jennifer, can we look at obtaining those so I can just copy-paste them into the document? That would be great.

And so, please note that these accountability indicators are bundled into the categories used in the current strategic plan, we talked about that, it's useful to note that the ATRT3 asked two questions. We just

EN

went through that, the comments made on each of the accountability indicators are meant as a constructive criticism of these, they often include suggestions for improvements. Each of these has been rated on a scale from 0 to 4 for effectiveness vs accountability where 0 is not effective and 4 is very effective.

Can we drop down a bit, please Brenda? A comment made by a respondent to the ATRT3 survey best sums up the global assessment of these accountability indicators, "One should not confuse transparency and accountability. Transparency is but one requirement of accountability". What I was asking for, sorry, I have a note from Jennifer, is on the accountability indicators website, they have, it's just a series of charts, I cannot copy paste those, can we get the originals so I can throw them into this document please, if possible. Thank you, Jennifer.

Alright, so, it's a rather straight-forward approach to the document, we just go through each one, the numbering matches exactly the numbering on the accountability indicators website. So, the first one, evolving further globalize ICANN, further globalize and regionalize ICANN functions, and then the chart is the number of sessions with simultaneous interpretation of ICANN Public Meeting, so, the comment is good to have the numbers from the ICANN Public Meetings, but surely there's more than just language services to further globalize and regionalize ICANN functions. No reporting on the plans and objectives of regional office and engagement sectors.

Assessment 1. Presenters of sessions with simultaneous interpretation of ICANN Public Meetings. Let's see previous comment that's basically

the same thing. So, going down a bit, bring ICANN to world by creating a balanced and proactive approach to regional engagement with stake holders. ICANN events by stake holder categories, and regions. So, if you look at this graph, the numbers are interesting from a transparency point of view, but there is no objective against which they are measured.

Many sessions were planned for each region, how many were organized by ICANN vs how many were we invited to, and what types were these, what was the participation at these events, is there any kind of satisfaction survey of the participants at those events, what is the media coverage of these, were these recorded, assessment 1, so, it's very nice to know that there have been these sessions, but, from an accountability point of view, what does it tell us? Not much.

I know there is a plan, if you read the entrails of the budget, to actually start tagging some of this information, but, presenting, just presenting the sessions that happened, did not seem to be a great accountability point. Evolve policy of involvement of government in process structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive, that's helpful. Representation of formal membership totals across boarding organizations and advisory committees. So, interesting numbers from a transparency point of view, but given the relative constancy of the numbers, there is limited value in this from an accountability point of view. So, basically, it's a graph that is steady. With this...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, you've got Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, but you can't -- I can't change, but my question is what is assessment 1? I saw that later on you have assessment 0. It is a number you want to put between 1 and 4? Or 0 and 4? To assess what is effectiveness, that's my understanding.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, correct.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes? Okay, thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright, so, sorry, my mic dropped off, with this not the ideal place to show the progress being made, implement in works in two recommendations, the results of various specific reviews and other activities, such as evolving the MSM. Measure of community activity and policy development and engagement. Uncertain of how participation in public comments is a gauge of community activity in policy development and engagement, given the public comments are about more that PDPs.

Only about 20% of public comments in 2018 were PDP related. If we only had PCs that were about PDPs, it would be a start. But what would be useful to know, from an accountability point of view, is how many

comments for each PDP and, more importantly, if the comments were taken on or not. Perhaps presenting an analysis of attendance to PDP meetings, sort of by affiliation, would be the beginning of something more useful.

Assessment 0. So, I don't only want to give a negative view of these, we have been quite critical on some of them, as you can see, when we're giving an assessment 0, but I mean the reality is measure the community activity and policy development and engagement, and we talk about public consultations in general, I -- I'm sorry, it just doesn't seem to fit for -- so let's drop down a bit.

Yes, Vanda in the comments has, "More information about meetings will also be a tool to encourage others to join these meetings. I believe the role is critical and constructive." And the point is to be constructive here. It's good that we've got accountability indicators. Now we've really got to step up to the plate, I think, to make sure those things work.

Let's drop down a bit. Brenda, I think it's section three, short term financial accountability. There we go. Advanced organizational, technological and operational excellence ensure ICANN's long-term financial accountabilities, stability and sustainability. Short term financial accountability. The results are based on a robust and transparent process to generate this, make this a good accountability indicator. Providing for longer period comparison purposes would be useful. Addition, assessment three. Some of these things that we're suggesting are quite good.

Long-term financial accountability. Funds under management reserve fund. Results based on a robust transparent process to generate this. I think this is a very good accountability indicator. Assessment for percentage of the staff voluntary turnover trailing 12-month trend results based on a robust transparent process to generate [inaudible] again for. So, we've got some of these things that are very good and some other of these things where if we go down to 316 here, risk management, unclear what is being reported here and how -- assessment 0. Maybe I just missed it, but please do have a look at it.

We've had a long meeting. My voice is about to drop off. I said I would give Cheryl 10 minutes at the end. We're at 12 minutes from the end. I wanted to give you a feeling for this. When you're looking at this report, you should -- because I wasn't able to integrate the slides that make up the accountability and indicators, you have to look at the report and have a screen open into the accountability indicators.

But we really would like your comments on these because we want to be able to help ICANN with these accountability indicators so that they mean something for people. And as we said at the top of the report, transparency is great but it's not accountability. And if we want to call these things accountability indicators, then we should move in that direction. So with that, almost on my mark -- one minute early, I am going to hand it back to Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Bernie. That's a heroic effort and a huge amount of progress. And I think it's really very valuable for us to have had this

introduction in the accountability indicators. This, of course, is one of those aspects of the work that we did add in, but it is vitally important, I think, that we have an opportunity here to get some fairly important feedback developed. So if you can put onto your mutual homework lists now, as we're starting to emerge from some of the analysis and considerations of the statistics in the general report template, if you can all also budget time now for your individual review. The Google doc, I believe, has been sent out to the list. It is open for comment, for suggestion.

Obviously, not edit. Please do as Bernie has indicated, have the document -- the web based information open at the same time. Although, I know once Jennifer ascertains whether or not she can get access for the snapshots of the indicators -- they're very attractively presented on the site -- that will also help. And thank you very much, Jennifer, to pop that link in. So that's sort of the adjunct, you need to look at that link. Sorry, no, that's the document. We might also post up the web page as well.

And I do want to recognize the work of not only Bernie, but a couple of us in this accountability indicator first take as well. Accountability indicators are a fairly basic tool, a fairly common tool. But as I indicated in my preamble before we loaded up this document for our introduction today, the way ICANN uses the terminology is not a perfect lock and fit with the general pilots used in governance.

Although, I will note a tendency for those things where they rank more highly in our assessments so far, are the ones that are more traditional. It's where they've stepped away from the traditional, but perhaps a

little more work and opportunity exists. With that, let's now see if anyone has any other business. We have no listed Any Other Business for today's call, but would anyone like to bring any other business forward? And I'm not hearing anyone or seeing any hands. Therefore -- and thank you very much Jennifer for putting the links into our chat, let's have a -- Oh, nope. Sorry. Sebastien, over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, just to know, did we get the list -- where we put the list of the participant when they arrive and so on? I guess that they are somewhere, but I didn't find them. If somebody can send it to me, it would be great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll let Jennifer respond to that. Thank you very much. Jennifer, you can respond to that. I believe we weren't publishing that as yet. I think he was still collecting it, but I could be wrong. Over to you, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So, it's just to say on your point, Sebastien, we have collated that data. It's been shared with Pat and Cheryl, but we can share it with the other review team members. We'll do that off list. But if anybody is uncomfortable with us sharing that information, please let us know and we'll happily take your information off. But yeah, we can send it to anyone on request there. And then I'll just jump into the action items that I captured, which I had to start with. I'm going to follow up and get more information on per diem funds for Singapore and Montreal for

you all, and hopefully share that information in the coming days. Staff is going to circulate the list. Any documents related to the NomComm review for your reading that might be useful.

The team considered developing written questions as well for the Board and AC regarding the board transparency mechanisms, so staff can work with Bernie and the leadership on determining where to go with that one. Then, I took an action item for staff to get more information on the budget for the ITI and ODI projects and some information on the status of those projects as well. And I'm going to look into obtaining the relevant charts on the accountability indicators web page to be included in the report document. As usual, please do let me know if I missed anything or I didn't capture anything correctly.

And while I have the microphone, just to bring to your attention, the plenary call on the 16th has been canceled. So you will have received the notification for that. So the next plenary is on the 20th of October, which is in Singapore. The leadership on Monday is scheduled as usual, but please, don't be concerned when you don't see the meeting on your calendar for Wednesday, because the meeting is canceled. All right. And back to you then, Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jennifer. You literally took the words out of my mouth regarding the plenary planning for next week. Thank you so much. Well, I was going to add to the fact that due to some people already, if not starting to consider traveling, certainly considering trying to clear their own real life desks and careers so that they can travel. It does

mean, of course, that you're not getting the time off, team. You've got plenty of homework to do, particularly since we've now introduced accountability indicators. You can spend two hours of your valuable time going through the document and marking up some comments and doing some of analysis. There you are. It's time off that you have when you're not having time off.

For those of us joining us in Singapore, Pat and I want to make sure you travel safe. And do reach out and contact ourselves if there are any concerns during your transition from one country to the next, and sometimes through other lay-bys. Some of you have some long trips to get there, and we appreciate the efforts [inaudible].

The other thing, I just wanted to make sure you had -- before we finish the appointed hour in a moment or two, is if you can -- Also, make sure that when you get the agenda which we'll be going out for the Singapore meeting, if there are any clashes of time, can you please review the agenda. We're now in a position, because we know how far we've come through all of these documents, to slot into our time bound boxes what we think we will do when during Singapore. When you get it, please look as soon as you can and alert us to any issues. Any of you who are not traveling who need to attend remotely, if you have an issue with one of the time bands we've got on the agenda for a topic you need to present at or you are highly motivated to interact with, then let us know as soon as possible.

And other than that, I want to thank everybody who's joined the call tonight -- or tonight for me, the rest of the world, I assume. Thank our fabulous staff. Thank Bernie for talking his socks off, and I hope he rests

his voice for the rest of the day. And hope you all appreciate the huge amount of work we're actually getting done. Sometimes it feels like -- you wonder whether we're progressing. Well I think today's call is one of those examples where we can see exactly how far we're getting. Of course [inaudible]. Thank you one and all and bye for now. We can stop the recording. Thanks, Brenda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you all, bye-bye.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank everyone, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]