

---

BRENDA BREWER:

Good day everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the ATRT3 Plenary #35 on the 30<sup>th</sup> of October, 2019 at 1100 UTC. Members attending the call today include Cheryl, Pat, Sebastien, Demi, Ramet, Jacques, Jaap. From ICANN Org attending is Jennifer, Negar, Brenda. Technical Writer, Bernie, has joined the call. We do have observers, Everton, Herb and I did mention Demi is on the call. We have apologies from Vanda, Osvaldo and Adetola. Today's meeting is being recorded, I'd like to remind you to state your name before speaking, and Cheryl and Pat, I'm happy to turn the call over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

I muted myself instead of unmuting myself. Thanks very much for that, Brenda. I'll just get us started and then let Pat do the lion's share. With noting from Sebastien's chat that apparently KC said during our Leadership Team Call that she would be an apology for today's meeting, let's make sure we note that as an apology for today from KC. Then, we'll ask if there is any Statement of Interest Updates?

Not hearing anyone trying to get our attention and not seeing anyone's hand raise, I'll just confirm what I did at the Leadership Team Meeting on Monday and let you know that the Local Internet Society Chapter has reaffirmed me as Vice-Chair, International and Honorary Treasurer, it isn't so much as change of status as a lack of escape from current status but that's probably worthy of noting as Annual General Meeting come and go. With that, I guess we should move on to the any new and closed Action Items that are worthy of us paying particular attention?

---

*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.*

---

Obviously, this is to include that's on our agenda tonight? Jennifer, is there anything that has our interest to peak on this topic?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks Cheryl, this is Jennifer. Just a couple items from this week that I wanted to highlight. First of all, the messaging of Singapore, the blog was posted on Monday, shared the link into the email list, so hopefully you've all had a chance to look at that and share with your respective networks. Secondly, the Workplan was updated on the Leadership call on Monday, again I shared that to the list and asked anybody to raise any concerns or questions they had about the proposed updates.

I have not seen any comments but do raise your hand or type in the chat if you have any questions about that. As I mentioned on the email, the updates were just to the percentages to reflect the work that was completed in Singapore. Other than that, I don't have anything else to highlight, so I'll hand it back over to your Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much Jennifer, I appreciate all that. Following our Leadership Team Meeting as well, the percentages are starting to look towards the home stretch, which is as it should be at this end of the project. Now that Jaap and I suspect he's not alone, has not as yet had time to look at the updated workplan but think of all that time on the plane you've got to studied it in detail. It's a little light reading for everybody.

---

With that, if there is anybody who has Any Other Business that they would like to let us know about now, we will call for Any Other Business before we get to that part of the agenda again but if you want to foreshadow something, please do so now. Again, not seeing anybody's hand raised or hearing anybody trying to get our attention, we'll down to the nitty gritty of today's agenda.

Today's agenda is similar to other agendas as you all know. Looking at Work Party items that any of the Work Parties wish to bring to our attention. We'll be digging into two particular areas, catching up on specific outstanding items of the Draft Report, in particular Section 3 and Section 7 and we'll be exploring the thrill packed and exciting world further of Accountability Indicators and this is very much a preview for Montreal and review of our first section that we have already gone over in a Singapore meeting. Our Any Other Business for today will be looking at our Montreal agenda and a matter of getting into complete Doodle poles, so that we know who will be not only attending but if you're not, what time zone and time will be in as well. With that, let's get on with it.

I'm unaware of any particular update from any of the Work Parties, obviously having just met as a Plenary, we've pretty much talked a whole of things through recently but if there is anyone who wishes to update us on anything between now the Singapore meeting, pop your hand up and the floor will be yours. Sounds like we're just going to coast through on that, which is fine and then we can always come back to it if someone has had a thought later.

---

With that, let's now dig into agenda Item #4 which is one of the substantive pieces of work for today and that is going to take us to our ATRT3 Draft Report, which I think is still Version 4 or it might be 4.3, Bernie will correct me I'm sure and we're going to dig into Section 3 and Section 7. Bernie, am I correct, is it 4.3?

**BERNIE TURCOTTE:** 4.3 is not released yet, I'm still working on it. For this type of discussion, we'll go back to 4.0.

**CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:** Okay, 4.0 it is and there we go, like magic, it appears. Okay Bernie, I hope you had a sip of water because it's all over to you for a while.

**BERNIE TURCOTTE:** Excellent. Pat had noted Items 3.2.11, 4.4.13 and 4.14 and Sebastien had noted 3.2.1.10, which is the first one in the lists, so let's go to 3.2.1.10. We had a bunch of comments here, the Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities. You'll remember this touched on a number of things we discussed in the PDP Section 7 also. We have implemented, we had KC challenging that and then if we go down a bit on Effectiveness, there are no effective statistics, that's been transferred to CCWG Accountability, don't think that was for that comment.

In conclusion, this is obviously a major recommendation, which has met with some success, however it's impossible to be able to decide if further action is required without having some formal information

---

showing exactly what is being done and how affective it is as such ATRT3 should consider making a suggestion or a recommendation along those lines. I know that Sebastien was going to work on this from our discussion in the Leadership call. Sebastien, do you have some words for us? And no, we didn't expect that you would have that written up yet.

SEBASSTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. No, I don't have, it's one of the duties of my today work, as this call is the first one this morning, I will try to do that afterwards. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, so I would suggest Madam Chair, that since Sebastien is going to be taking a crack on that one, that we move -- we let him do that and we can look at in Montreal, if that's acceptable? I get a green pic from Cheryl, thank you.

Brenda, our fearless driver, if we could go to 3.2.4.11 please. One of the many survey questions. Are you satisfied with the financial information that is provided to you by ICANN? We had some okay results. I would you rate the usability? Worked pretty good, we had some comments from the At-Large. What's interesting, somewhat dissatisfied comments from the RSIG on financial information provided by ICANN typically included requests for greater context and are justification [inaudible] registrar group would appreciate greater detail and transparency from ICANN.

---

The analysis responses to the first questions were similar in both groups and consolidated results are 59 percent satisfied. Let's remember that on this 4.0, I had not integrated the SSAC responses, there were not massive changes in percentages but there were some percentages. Producing a net of 38 percent satisfied or very satisfied which shows weak support for the satisfaction of users. Individual responses 61 to 11, 50 percent useful or very useful which is a strong result. A consolidated satisfaction of 59 percent is acceptable but 21 percent of somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied is a concern.

ATRT2 recommendation 12.1 and 12.4 were directly related to this topic, 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 affectively with only the requirement in a few hours would go a long way to increasing transparency and accountability to the process. Additionally, the CWG Accountability Work Stream 2 made some recommendations which are related to this in its transparency section. Also, the comments provided by the respondents include some good suggestion, as such ATRT3 should make some suggestions with respect to the issue raised by the responses to this question.

If we go back up to the top of that question, I think I had inserted a comment from our Singapore meeting. That seems pretty straightforward, questions, comments, issues? Not seeing anything, I'm suggesting that we put this one to bed Madam Chair? Thank you, Madam Chair.

---

Moving on to our next one, which was brought up by Pat was, point 13, 3.2.4.14.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just one moment. Sebastien's hand is up. Over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. My question was more -- I don't see anything specific here we need to act but before deciding to put it to bed I would like to be sure that it's not a conjunction of different element 3. Something, that have put that in front of us and that we need to argue with different others? That was my far memory of what's happened with this discussion here. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'm sorry, Sebastien, I'm missed some of that, I was trying to concentrate on it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay, no worries, Bernie. I prefer you say that you don't understand what I say. My recollection but maybe I'm wrong but it was a conjunction of different points, 3.2.something and the other, that who bring this to the table, it's not this specific point here but it's one with the other who may be of interest for overview of this specific type of discussion. Once again, it's my memory.

---

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Yeah, I think those 3.something's that you're mentioning were the ones for recommendation 12.1 and 12.4 and when we get to actually making a suggestion on this, we can certainly lay out the links that this is really, as you put it, a conjunction of many things, which is requiring us to make a suggestion. And Sebastien gives me a green pic. Alright, I finally understood that properly, thank you, Sebastien.

Alright, let's give it a shot for 3.2.4.13 please, Brenda. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the ICANN Org website should be better organized to facilitate searching? That was really simple. We'll consider making a suggestion with respect to this. I believe what we were waiting on, if I am correct, before putting this one to bed, is the information on -- if we go down two, if we go down to 15 I think, sorry there it is, 14. Are you aware of ICANN's Open Data Mechanisms, including the Information Transparency Initiative and the Open Data Initiative or ICANN's Transparency Policy's more generally? And so, we had asked for some data on that and probably, if memory serves, we're still waiting on that, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Yes, that's correct. We're still waiting on the information. I followed up with the SME's this week to get dates from them, given that I'm not sure at this point we'll get ahead of Montreal but if that's going to be the case then I would like to know when we're going to get it. As soon as I have that I will let you know. Thank you.



---

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Alright. Given the response here, what I'm going to say is, the information is not going to change the fact that we're probably going to make a suggestion, given the response rate of 100 percent. We can mark this item as we will certainly be making a suggestion and when we get the information then that can help inform us to what kind of suggestion we can make for that. Does that make sense to everyone? Cheryl gives me a thumbs up, which I learned from my work in emojis, is actually quite vulgar in certain cultures but in ours, it seems to be okay. Excellent, thank you, I'll take it on as that and that should cover actually both 4.11 was done, as far as I'm concerned because we just talked about it. Those close those off. Pat, you were taking notes on those, is that okay?

PAT KANE:

Yeah, I think so. I just remember taking notes that we were going to follow up on those items and they were in there, so I just wanted to bring it up.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Alright, great. I have a couple points while we're in here. First of all, it's a general point, we don't have to go to specific section. As I said earlier in the call, I'm working on cleaning out this Version 4.0 as we agreed in Singapore, the next full version will be 5.0. I'm doing pretty good. I've got a little bit of clean up left on section 12, which I hope to do after this call and then I've got Section 3 and it will be done. I am really focusing on trying to get an updated, fully inclusive, all singing and dancing version ready for Montreal by the end of my business today. I will try,

---

regardless of anything, I will send whatever I have by my end of day here, out to the list and put it on the Google Drive so that everyone at least gets a chance to have a look at before we sit down in Montreal.

One of the things that we did not discuss and hit me as I was writing recommendations or drafts of recommendations based on our work, was that we did discuss this earlier on but did not get back to it until now because of recommendations. But my point for discussion is the following, for those ATRT2 recommendations that were not implemented or were majorly not implemented, do we feel if we're going to make a recommendation, a follow on suggestion or recommendation, mostly about recommendations, do we feel that we are bound by the new Operation Procedures to justify that recommendation in exactly the same way as we would have for new recommendations which the Operation Procedures raise because in our opinion, the original recommendation was not implemented?

I'd like some thoughts on that because it might help me when I'm writing up some stuff and it might help us when we get to working on it. I don't know if I explained that properly. If you have questions, I'll be glad to take them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's start the queue, we've got Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. It's an interesting question because I think that when we have previous work on any topic and that we are bringing that

---

to the -- into ATRT3 recommendation, I don't think we have to go back to the whole work was done by the other teams before us on specific topic and we have to take them as face value information and therefore I guess it will decrease the need for us to dig into a lot of details on why we are doing this recommendation.

Therefore, I agree that if we use previous inputs we can say that those inputs are coming with a lot of information in their comment at the time it was done and we will not redo all that and it must be taken into account in the evaluation of the comments we are as ATRT3 doing today. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Sebastien. Any thoughts from anybody else? I'm going to put my Co-Chair on the spot, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No, I'm not really bubbling with thoughts on this one I'm afraid. Let's contrucate on this a little bit. There is pluses and minuses and I guess I'm concerned about opening up the opportunity to try and make something that wasn't implemented, implementable, ext., etc., Yeah, that's me stepping side wards I'm afraid rather than being forthcoming. Try your luck with Pat, see if he's more articulate.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Pat?

---

PAT KANE: So, I think it really should be a lower standard in terms of making a recommendation because the recommendation was based upon a different process and if we can measure it affectively to say that it wasn't done, then we ought carry forward as a recommendation but the work was done in ATRT2 to get to the details of making that. My belief is that, it shouldn't have to carry the same weight or the same work as current standards require because the work was done in a different group, we're just saying you didn't do what you were supposed to do, so we recommend you go do it. But the metric ought to be clear as to why we think this wasn't done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My hesitation too, Bernie, is not everything that wasn't done, needs to be done either because it's a very different time and place and space, etc., etc., and I guess that was my primary requirement for wiggle room.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: If I'm distilling what I'm hearing is, according to the new Operating Procedures, if there are things we can easily fill out then we should certainly include that, that includes possibly restating the original recommendation and making sure that if we're asking of it in a new recommendation ATRT3, that we're only asking for the things that make sense in our current context six years on. But that's the type of feeling I'm getting.

What I'm taking away is no, probably doesn't require the full work up that new Operating Procedures have, let's see what we can do and let's be careful and make sure that we're asking for things that make sense in

our current context, is that a good distillation of what we've got here? Cheryl gives me a green tick. I like your green ticks and Pat Kane too and Sebastien. Alright, we'll take that as generic marching orders and of course, we will be reviewing specific recommendations anyways individually while we're in Montreal. We'll be able to catch some of those but it helps me form my drafting as I'm going forward because there are a few of them, you will remember that were clearly noted as not done and should be done. That's excellent.

Let's go down to Section 7 please. We're talking about the Policy Development Section here and our first ATRT2 recommendation is to enhance GNSO Policy Development Processes and Mythologies to better meet community needs and be more suitable for address complex problems. Let's go down to the implementation result at the bottom there. Partially implemented for a lot of reasons.

Then we have effectiveness and partially affective. In our conclusion we had, given the success and effectiveness of GNSO Policy Development effort can be strengthened by non-bias focus and consensus oriented leadership, the experience negotiation facilitation and the recognition that ICANN over the last six years has sought volunteer leaders from within the community with these skills as opposed to developing them from within the community as recommended in ATRT2.

Accounting for the nuances of our community, the ATRT3 will be making recommendations to further develop working group leaders in our community. Given the competition for resources to not only implementations and working group outcomes but to actually facilitate policy development is high within ICANN community and that the

---

---

technology for remote and distributed team facilitation has evolved over the past six years.

ATRT3 recognizes that ATRT2 recommendations to fund a greater face to face meetings has occurred however, the development of tools and regional hubs with exceptional communication services have not yet been made available. ATRT3 will be making recommendations to provide for a short-range travel options to permanent ICANN operated micro hubs, that greater facilitate participation effectiveness and global meetings, while reducing the amount but not the quality of volunteer participation and input.

Alright, I remember and this relates to the point that we looked at upstairs that Sebastien said he was going to work on. I remember we had some rather involved discussion around these things and this point comes up in some of the other PDP points here. I'm wondering if there are any further thoughts on this as to where we want to head because I've got to work on these? I haven't finished these, I've started working on them, some of them are okay.

This part on participation comes up several places and I haven't had time to plow through the notes in detail to see where we had landed but I seem to remember that we were -- it was rather a very, very, very soft landing and we had decided we had some thoughts on and Sebastien could use some thought in the writing he's going to do in his section up in 3, which in some ways very similar to this. I'm wondering if there are any further thoughts on this? Jacques.

---

JACQUES BLANC:

I am not so sure about the first conclusion about making recommendation to develop working group leaders in our community and I will pass on this one. On the second one, it seems to me, we would be addressing ICANN deep infrastructure, so it would be addressing ICANN infrastructure so ICANN budgets, ICANN working staff and so on, by recommending and let's remember what recommending implies here, micro hubs, meaning more places that ICANN would manage one way or another and that's the one way or another, where the teachers and the devils are. So, we could more easily reduce the travelling side.

My first assessment would be, on number two, I would really switch from recommendation to suggestion. Maybe we could suggest and it would take a bit of work because we might have to study where in worldwide would be those micro hubs, based on the community, based on the activities and so on. But I don't see how we could recommend such an infrastructure change in the time we have, given the parameters for recommendation that we've been given.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Jacques.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

First of all, we all know that they will attempt to have micro hubs for participation to some people in various countries at the ICANN face to face meeting. I think if something needs to be re-studied, re put on the blackboard, it could be this issue. I know that there are other in the community pushing for that but I am for one completely opposed to

---

saying that we can today change a face to face meeting to any type of online meeting. It's from my point of view, the victory of the one who have the right tools and the right language and it's very difficult, even if you see the people with the video, you don't get body language as well as if you are in face to face meeting.

With those type of meetings, you -- one, very, very, very important point disappears its corridor discussion and the ability to meet people once and a while during these meetings. Therefore, I really strongly disagree. I know they are very, very good argument to say that we need to stop all the travel because for climate change but I am not sure that we are the one start this way of thinking and of doing because we are -- I considered doing something very, very important issue, where we need to involve at the right level, all the people. That's my first input on that discussion.

The second one is that we have to be careful. I have the impression that we are starting to create and I don't know if it's volunteers or paid volunteers, it's the limit of this discussion, to join and help for developing of CCWG or PDP work. The bother here, it's quite difficult from my point of view, do we need to pay a little of any working group or PDP because its very tough one or not and if not, we take people who have time and even more time and resources elsewhere to do this type of work?

The line between Staff and end user or sorry end user participate discussion with no payment, it's a long range of different status and I'm not sure we will need to push a new type of status here. I hope that it's



---

clear and if not, I will be available to answer any questions. Thank you very much.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Pat.

PAT KANE: As the author of this conclusion, Sebastien it was not an intent to make this be a recommendation for paid leadership, it was really more a recommendation to invest in [inaudible] because if we rely upon seeking volunteers that have these skills, I think it's going to be difficult to continue to find leadership that we want to be able lead the different work groups and PDP's, etc. It was really more double down on the education of people who want to volunteer because I think we missed the mark in terms of what ATRT2 was recommending along those lines.

Now, as far as the second part, where we have talk about the micro hubs. We already have engagement centers or at least people in areas and given that participating barriers continue to grow in terms of money, in terms of Visa issues where people can't get into certain countries, if we make it easier for remote participation and develop that, it's got to start somewhere and I don't disagree that there is great value in face to face.

I think when we talked about this in Singapore, the one thing that I brought up was, limited participation is better than no participation for some people. If we don't develop the tools, we're never going to get to a point where we can actually global at these meetings and give people

---

opportunities from around the global. While Montreal is only 4000 people, when we end up in other places, we end up 1200 people and so that was the suggestion here.

But in terms of where we are on this, if we can't get to a consensus in saying that we're going the direction of what the recommendation should be, I would say that at this point and time we should soften considerably this conclusion to be more of a suggestion the way Jacques has pointed out and not be so specific or precise in terms of what we say we're going to suggest at this point and time and just leave it up for suggestion itself. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Pat. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I think we agree on the intent, now we have to see how we write that. I'm not sure that we need to soften something but we need to -- I will say, we need to start with reaffirming the face to face meeting, it's still the best way to conduct a lot of our business, interaction and not the only one of course, using mail and Wiki and so on. But we would like very much that we come back to test hubs to participate to some activities and how it could be done.

For example, I am sure that it would have been a good idea to decrease the [inaudible] we have about Visa in Canada to organize a hub and only one, I don't think we need two but one hub in Africa, where we could gather the people from Africa who will not get the Visa to Canada and

---

to try to find the best way to have them participating, it will not be equal to be on stage in Montreal but it will be a very good way.

It's not done, it's a little bit too late to organize it but just to take one example of what I think we agree and agree as not just a suggestion but if even a recommendation that we need to work on this because if not, the other recommendation will be, we just go to country where nobody have any trouble with Visa and that we will not find any, we will not find any. Therefore, we need to find other ways to solve this problem and this discussion here could be one part of the equation. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC:

I concur completely with Sebastien about the importance of meeting face to face to get real results. We are still animals, somewhere we still need to see each other, feel each other and work is so much better. I had missed [inaudible], and I have to say that I do concur also to say that if we can suggest and leave work for the future ATRT's or other SO's or AC's but I think a hub at least on every continent would be a suggestion because advisors or going to come and go with international, geopolitics and if we really want to be global as a community, we cannot go over these barriers and we have to have at least micro hub in each continent.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I feel we're getting deep in the weeds in terms of implementation planning and I'd like to encourage us to not necessarily go down that degree and detail. Perhaps we can park this at this point and Bernie, come back to it for further discussion if needs be?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah, what I'm taking out of this so far is, a reaffirmation of that face to face meetings are still very important. That given the general discussion is more along the lines of suggestion and that we should keep pursuing the notion of alternate methods to ensure participation. Just to make sure we're all on the same page here, Brenda if we could down to 7.2.1.4 please, nope not the one I'm looking for. Hold on a second. 7.2.1.3, in the same vein, I don't want to restart the discussion, just to bring this back into our collective memories so we can think about it before we hit Montreal.

Recommendation 10.3 from ATRT2, the board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need for ensuring more global participation in GNSO policy development processes, as well as other GNSO processes. The focus should be on the viability and methodology of having the opportunity for equitable and substantive and robust participation from and representing all ICANN communities with an interest in gTLD policy and in particular, those represented within the GNSO under represented geographical regions, non-English speaking linguistic groups, those with non-western cultural traditions and those with a vital interest in gTLD policy issues but who lack the financial support of industry players. I think everyone sees some of the links there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Bernie. Just to remind us all that of course, this was written in a time when the model for GNSO PDP's was in its -- the iteration it currently is in and that there are plans for reviewing all of that. This may become mute as even a possibility, depending on the choices that may or may not be mad out of the work of the efficiencies and effectiveness work being done in the GNSO Council on Policy Development Process 3.0. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I believe that you've put it in the past Cheryl, is that current the GNSO is looking at the menu and has to make the selections of what the 3.0 will actually imply for the community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: On that list are very, very much some that will affect this remarkable, that's why.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, exactly. We've got that information. Thanks for that discussion, I think as a minimum it brought it back to us. Some of the major other things? As I've been working, I think I've done some surgery to Section 10 Reviews as was discussed in Singapore. One of the last points I have, if we can go down to Section 13. If we can down to one of Michael's comments in the margin please, it's about half way down. You'll remember that we through in these questions, such as, does your structure have a transparency policy?

---

Because we were doing a survey which went specifically to SO's and AC's and their component parts based on Michael's request and we've gotten responses. In looking at these responses, I'm sorry Michael's not here but I think we need to talk about this and we will certainly talk about it in Montreal and he said he will be there. I just want to bring this up so we don't forget it and have some time to think about it when we do discuss it in Montreal.

Michael is saying that we should have a recommendation to SO's and AC's and I'm thinking that that is actually beyond our remit. If we look at the things we decided to look at, we've added a few other things but I think these making recommendations for SO's and AC's in an ATRT3 context, I think actually goes beyond what we can do. Now, we've asked these questions, maybe we can make a suggestion but I'm thinking that going for a recommendation maybe too much and I thought I would ask the question and see how our plenary feels about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Bernie. Just to remind those of you who were part of the Work Stream 1 and 2 efforts, particularly to bring anyone who wasn't part of it up to a base understanding, when we did the work with the community on accountability of the AC's and SO's, there was significant pushback from some of the AC's and SO's regarding being -- any efforts for harmonization, any efforts for accountability between them, I would suspect the same criticisms would be probably leveled regarding transparency as well.

Not that they don't want to be accountable and transparent but that they see that they need to be accountable for example, to their member, not to other parts of the entity, of ICANN as an entity. So, what we fell back on, at the encouragement of the undertaking of good practices model and I think that probably where we should stay in the environs of with any sort of suggestions and recommendations here as well.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, I can confirm, I went back to look at the SO and AC Accountability Recommendations of Work Stream 2, we do have a number of recommendations on or best practices that are suggested to SO's and AC's on transparency. We do not on conflict of interest, which the other recommendation Michael is asking for. Alright, Cheryl, your hand is still up? Okay, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I think it's an important discussion we need to have. I'm not sure that saying that it's outside out scope will solve the issue and I think ATRT is the only place where we can have a review of what is happening at the broad level and not just in one silo. I really think that at the end of the day, yes each leadership group need to be accountable to their own constituency but those SO and AC need to be accountable to the whole organization because if one failed to deliver, they have to deliver for the overall organization, ICANN as whole, we will be in trouble, therefore we need a strong GAC, we need a strong end user voice, we need a strong registry and registrar and so on and so forth.

---

---

Therefore this is a way to be accountable to the others, it's quite important in my point of view. I will come back, I was hoping also to write something on this issue, if there is one point, I think we are not as whole, good on transparency, it's the way we elect, select our leaders and there's work to be done in that direction and I would like to come back with at least one suggestion on what to do with that because I think it will be more and more important in the future, where we will need a clear way and transparent way to select our leaders. When I say our, it's really cross boarder within ICANN and I'm not targeting any subgroup or any type of election but all in one. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Sebastien. Alright, as I said, I'm not trying to resolve this, certainly not with Michael away but wanted to bring it up so we are aware that we should come to a landing on this one.

Now, I guess my final point as I'm working towards getting us to Version 5.0 is, on Structures Section 10. Basically, coming out of Singapore, there was a general agreement around the table that we should probably collapse all specific reviews into one, just keeping the applicable parts and have a review mechanism so that whenever we do that review that combines all the useful parts of the specific reviews, that we also review the scope and make sure that it's still applicable because as we've seen, things change.

We then also said that we should probably collapse all organizational reviews into a single review and that we should ensure that there is support for a continuous improvement to SO's and AC's. Similarly to



---

what we were talking about for the specific reviews, that the scope of that single SO and AC Organizational Review should be reviewed on a continuous basis so that every time we start it up there is lessons learned and we look at the environment and see which parts are no longer need and if there are new parts that are also needed.

PAT KANE:

Thanks, Bernie. On the second aspect, I don't think we said collapse the Organizational Reviews into a single review, I think what we had said was, let's have the Organizational Review as we think about it from a broader perspective. Be focused on the interactions or what I had referred to as the white space in between the structures and move the organizational reviews into the structures themselves, it's their responsibility to clean up their own house. And then a process that looked at the interactions of the structures and the behavior of the structures within the community as opposed to what [inaudible] organization itself. It's a little bit different then the way you had stated just there.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Good point, I was over simplifying, thank you for the reminder, Pat.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Quite strange, I guess difference of understanding, language it's important. My understanding was we are not using the word collapse but put all in one single and collapsing could be one word but it's more -  
- at least when we use in French, when we collapse it's not always a

---

good point but here it will be a positive way of thinking that, that we will put in one single basket. We add to that, that we will do few things and those few things are almost also important, that's the one with the idea about constant progress and constant evolution and that must be done within the structure as they are at the moment we are talking. We also add that even if we have one single review, we will as needed and when needed, setup sub group or work party to take into account one specific issue.

Just to take an example, we know that RSSAC is going through a big change in organization and review was done, etc., now we are in three, five years, seven years and we think it's a good time to get into more detail of why it's happening or how things happen in RSSAC, what they had done five years ago but also what they have done during the five years and we decide to have a sub group who take that into account. But it's a short time review for specific purposes and then we close that and we include that in the bigger picture.

I would like very much that we don't just talk about putting together the SO and AC Review but we talk to that as a systemic review of ICANN. When I talk about ICANN you know I talk about all ICANN, board, staff, SO's and AC's and eventually some outside interaction. That's one point, that's about the Organizational Review, we are talking about the specific review and doing the same, to collapse all them but we need there and maybe both of them we need to write a plan to go from the current situation to the future situation.

For example, we have said and I agree with that, that we will need ccTLD review one year after then next launch of the new gTLD program

---

and then after it could join this all together as specific review. That means that we need to have a plan to go from the situation today and our thinking in the future and how we go there. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Sebastien. Alright, if I grab onto Sebastien's idea and match it up to Pat's idea, understand the clean up your own house, white space, to me that sounds like we've got one review every five years that sort of grabs the critical components from the specific reviews we have now and includes the white space sections Pat was talking about. I'm not sure they're really two separate things if we're going to look at them, might as well look at them together, is what I'm understanding from this, does that resonant? Keeping in mind Sebastien's point, there may be a need for some specific and functional views, does that sort of fit the view that we're talking about here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It does but I still think we need to explore this further and not at this meeting. We're not going to give this a one hit and assume it's done. The devil is always in the details with the implementation of these sorts of things.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Yes, more than agree, I'm just trying to get a sense of where we're about and we have to remember that it was KC's point of view that she had gotten from Jeff, that she was talking about.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say and it actually fits very nicely with Jeff's thesis, he of course wasn't talking about a one-year time span but rather a bunch of days to have a deep dive ordered but from time to time to assess what has been happening with the continuous improvement. Its certainly complimentary.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Indeed. Well, this being said, as Cheryl likes to say, this is my highlights and holidays of where I am. I will repeat again, I'm going to try to get version draft of 5.0. there will certainly still be a few points but I will try to get that out to you by end of my day, so we can go through it in Montreal. I think the focus of Montreal will be going over suggestions and recommendations. Thank you, Ma'am, back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Is there any other questions or anything for Bernie or any sage like wisdom to pass on him before he picks up his pen and starts writing yet again another version for us? Nope, alright then.

If we pop back to the agenda now. That's Section 3 and Section 7 done. How much time Bernie might I ask, can we really afford today in accountability indicators? It's a big-ticket item still for me, is this going to be a teaser preview? Because I'm not sure we're going to fit anymore than that into the allocated call time?

---

**BERNIE TURCOTTE:** Really up to you, Ma'am. Maybe what we can do is -- I think what's important is prepare the agenda for Montreal and if we have any time leftover, we can dive into a few things where I've rewritten the accountability indicators.

**CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:** Okay. Pat, are you comfortable if we do it that way? I might hand over to you now and you can work with the team to make sure we're all comfortable with a rough agenda for our Montreal meeting? Obviously, accountability indicators are going to get a goodie there as well and then we get on our planes, in my case in just a few hours' time, I would really like to put my feet at some time before I have to do that. I'll hand over to you and then if we do come back and do accountability and indicators, great.

**PAT KANE:** Thank you, Cheryl. If we could bring up the proposed agenda for Friday. Before we do that, if anybody has not completed the Doodle Pole yet for what availability you have for all the sessions that staff has sent out, that we've got scheduled for different structures, please do so, let's try to do that before Friday if you can.

**JENNIFER BRYCE:** We don't have a document at the moment that's got the agenda in it, so we can just discuss on this call and we can put that in a document.

---

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jennifer. I thought we'd at least have some parameters as to what time the day started and when we had access to the board but okay. The primary objective on Friday, as I've we've got, is really the accountability indicators, that is our reading assignment coming out of Singapore, to get through those and understand those, so that we can go through details on that.

We will go through and some point and time preparation for each of the sessions with particular focus on the caucus, the board caucus group, that we are going to meet with on Wednesday and then for our general session, what we're going to have on Thursday, on the last day of the meeting itself. Those are the main items that I've got listed for us to do and then have some interaction of course with Leon and hopefully Aubrey as well, is coming for a little bit on Friday. Was there anything else that we'd talked about Bernie or Cheryl in terms of what we want on the agenda?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'd also be diving into the report, wouldn't we?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, as I said previously, part of what I'm doing right now is actually writing up the suggestions and the recommendations that we've got and I think that's probably the primary thing that we want to do before the accountability indicators.

PAT KANE: And Bernie, will we have those today?

**BERNIE TURCOTTE:** We should have a good portion of those if not all of them, that's what I said I would do. That I would get a draft version 5.0 out by the end of my day, so that everyone has that and we can talk about it in Montreal.

**PAT KANE:** My apologies, Bernie, I didn't equate the graph of 5.0 with having the recommendations and the suggestions in them, so yes that should be what we focus on.

**CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:** Pat, ideas -- noting Sebastien's hand has been up for a little while, perhaps we should go to him.

**PAT KANE:** Yeah, please Sebastien.

**SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** Thank you, Cheryl, and thank you, Pat. I think we -- I would like very much that we start the meeting with asking the participant if they have any thoughts and feedback after the three days in Singapore. Sometimes it takes a few days to settle the ideas, it would be a good moment to ask about that. In addition to all the items, I fully support, I would like that we take a moment at the end on what our next steps and [inaudible] will be.

---

I know that a lot of that it's in the workplan but if we need, if we agree on having a face to face meeting before the end of our work, I was specifically thinking about after we had a report on the comment of the report for comment. I think it's a good one to take that into discussion and eventually decision to see how we organize our time [inaudible]. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Sebastien. If I go back to your opening comment that you made, in terms of opening up with a question of the team as to get feedback from where we are post Singapore, are you looking for commentary on Singapore and the three days there or are you looking for commentary on where we are in the process and how we view where we are either in the workplan or delivery or the debate, what is it you are looking for specifically?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Good question. I suppose both it could be but my -- it's more about the content and if it was good to go to Singapore or something like that. I had some discussion with [inaudible] the next day and he was thinking that we had to chapel in our work and told him that you may be a first crack on that and I don't know if I need to discuss but I think we will gain to have those feedback, to be able to take that into account in the future evolution of our document and our work.



---

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien. I'll put together a few probing questions then to kick it off with in terms of getting feedback when we get started in the morning. I'll go ahead and take care of that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That will be great Pat, thank you.

PAT KANE: Sorry, I was just taking a note. Anything else from anybody? Jennifer, if you could take the items that we talked about here, put it into a priority order that we talked about where basically the preview of the 5.0 document, we'll take a look at from a primary standpoint, as looking at recommendations and suggestions will be contained within. Then, stack the other items on the back of it. Bernie, in terms of how many we'll think we'll get through from a preview, how much time do you think we'll need to walk through that in the morning?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sorry, I was typing away, I missed part of that. Can you specify please?

PAT KANE: So sorry, Bernie. What I'd asked was, what do you think you're going to get out, just to give Jennifer a general timeframe within a preview of the 5.0 doc today that has recommendations, suggestions, how much time, so that we can actually look ahead time? How much time do you think we'll need to get through those items come Friday morning? Do we need three hours? Do we need four hours? What's your gut tell you?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I would say that we're going to need -- that will take us to one session after lunch, if we follow our usual thing. I think we're going to need the introduction session in the morning, some of the discussions we were just talking about, then get into the document, coffee break, continue on the document, break for lunch and then wrap it up at the session after lunch is my thinking.

PAT KANE: So, essentially put in place three, one and a half hour sessions to get it done?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sounds about right.

PAT KANE: Okay. That will be the majority of the day, that will be good. Are you okay with that Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yup, that all sounds good. Like I said, I'll put that all in a document along with the usual logistics and should have that to everyone today.

PAT KANE: Great, thank you so much. I think that will be most of the day, once you put the accountability indicators at the end. Cheryl, anything else?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, the logistics are clear as long as registration actually opens on the Thursday for meeting staff, there should be plenty of time for people to pick up their nametags, etc., especially if you're talking about large numbers of people and very large venues, they often do require us to be badge up to get through certain areas, that's all I was concerned about. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Understood, thank you. Yes, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I agree the proposal made by Bernie about the time we need, that means that we will have last session of the afternoon completing time with accountability indicators and how we get -- what's next step and I think it will need a small moment to work with. I wanted to suggest that if it's possible, it's one of my takes of the Singapore meeting, where we always seated in the same chair, if we can find another way accountability indicators.

For example, and I am not saying I have thought about that before talking to you, it's maybe the badest idea I could have but if it could be on blackboard or whiteboard or paperboard, each accountability indicator and what moment we go individually or set group from one to the other and we add our points, with paper we write on the paperboard. I was thinking to find something a little bit less or more body participating then the other part of the meeting and if so, it maybe

---

could be done during the lunch break, there is no specific need for that, accept that we need to wrap up and it will fit well for that last time slot. Sorry for being so obscure but that's my current thinking. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Okay, Yes, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Pat. Going along the lines of Sebastien's thing, what I will say is, we agreed in Singapore that I would restructure the evaluation of this, of these accountability indicators. I've finished section 1 of the five sections but I haven't had time to finish the other ones and that's what we were going to go over today. Maybe in meeting Sebastien halfway and I don't think I will have time to finish them before we get our face to face in Montreal, maybe move the session we had today to preview, the first section is not that big.

I think we should be able to go through it and give everyone a feeling for what I'm proposing for an evaluation of accountability indicators. I certainly think we can do that well within an hour, if not 45 minutes and then that would free up the rest of the time for the other things we're talking about and probably meet all the requirements for everyone.

PAT KANE:

I think that's fine Bernie. Sebastien, I got a green check from Sebastien and a thumbs up from Cheryl. Very good. Considering that we've got about three minutes left, Jennifer if we could swing -- if we have no

---

other business and not seeing any. Jennifer if we could walk through actions confirmed or decisions reached.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I only actually captured the action regarding the agenda, to put that together based on the discussion and circulate to the team today. Obviously, Bernie mentioned he's working on the report too and will get that to the team today but otherwise, I didn't actually capture specific action items.

PAT KANE: Very good.

JENNIFER BRYCE: As usual, let me know if I missed something. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Very good. Thank you, Jennifer. If we have nothing else from anyone, I think we will close for the day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And wish everybody safe travels for those that are doing so.

PAT KANE: Absolutely. See you in Montreal.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jennifer, can you just double check whether they only allow flipchart or just paper or what the situation is with the venue because every venue is different.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I missed your chat message, sorry. I had that noted as well and I will certainly do that and see what we can do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks love. Goodbye everyone.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Waiting for you in Montreal. Thank you. Take care.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**