
JENNIFER BRYCE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. This is Jennifer Bryce speaking from ICANN Org. We're about to get going with the ATRT3 face-to-face meeting in Singapore. Today is the 20th of October, and it's day one of our three days of meetings.

o we'll go around the table and do a roll call, but before we do that, so that I don't forget, I will just note that Avri Doria has joined us online, and we also for the moment have Sara Caplis, ICANN Org, who's helping with the audio.

But let's go around the table. TO my left, please.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org.

LARISA GURNICK: Larisa Gurnick, ICANN Org.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bernard Turcotte, technical writer.

PAT KANE: Pat Kane, co-chair.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, co-chair.

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.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda Scartezini.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman.

JENNIFER BRYCE: And I don't think Herb has a mic, so Herb Wayne is here as well. And he brought maple cookies, which are also here. So with that, thank you, everybody. I'm going to hand it over to our co-chairs, Pat and Cheryl. Thank you. Michael Karanicolas, León Sanchez have just joined the room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good morning from Singapore, and hopefully the little gremlins that were trying to slow down our start on time have disappeared. We were aware that there was some static on the line. Thank you, Sara, very much for trying to sort that out.

If you are on the phone bridge or the Zoom room, which hopefully I will actually join in the fullness of time once my computer decides to start doing what it's meant to do, please do let us know in chat and staff will keep an eye on chat to see whether or not we're having any audio or technical difficulties.

For those of you who are not in the room, we are obviously going to have a few more people come and join us. We don't have a full contingent here in the room just yet, and they'll be added to the attendees list as they come in.

With that, today's agenda is going to start off with – that was your welcome, by the way – looking at our agenda over the next couple of days.

You had a reading list, and Pat and I prepared a small 20-question quiz to distribute it. It's alright. We haven't, but heavens above, it is tempting to do that one day just to see whether or not – of course, you've all read everything in the reading list. We will assume that is the case.

But there was a reading list which was distributed for those of you who may not remember it, because you read it so long ago. Your preparatory materials included the ICANN budget and strategic plan, the Nominating Committee review recommendations, the accountability indicators assessment report, the status report on ITI and ODI initiatives, the status report on quality/continuous improvement at ICANN. That one doesn't take long to read, people. Oh, was that my outside voice? And board decisions on the CCT review recommendations, which of course is burned into some people's memories and didn't need to be reread at all.

So that was the preparatory material. Today, our agenda is going to look next, after touching some of those documents, diving into completing our conclusions on ATRT2 recommendations. We will then take a short

break, and our break, even though we stated five minutes late, will be running on time from now on. So everybody who is attending remotely is not unconvinced, or is inconvenienced as little as we can possibly manage.

We'll then be continuing on with our ATRT2 recommendations, diving into the accountability indicators report in detail, and then the thrill-packed and exciting world of the ICANN strategic plan and budget. Notice the [inaudible] review recommendations. And that of course doesn't necessarily mean merely one review, it means reviews, plural. So that'll be an interesting conversation, and hopefully we'll still have stomachs for lunch.

As we follow that, we'll be moving through on where we may go, how we develop as a review team, operating under the new guidelines which we all agreed we would operate under even though it is in a beta testing mode, so we need to make sure we are clear on what is now required to make a recommendation from a review team because that is going to drive whether or not we are in a position to make suggestions or recommendations as a result of our analysis.

Then there is the – simple doddle, this should only take five minutes to look at the prioritization list of suggestions and recommendations – haha, hehe, hoho, might take more than five minutes – and then identify as we probably go through any overarching themes and meta recommendations that we may be getting towards.

A survival break will then occur at around 15:30 which is 00:30 UTC, and I suspect that many of you in the remote participation will probably be

disappearing at that point, but more power to you if you can stick with us. We'll then continue on with our recommendations work, go and have a much needed dinner at an Italian restaurant, fixed menu, fixed price, at the venue in case you're concerned about going out high on the hog, we're not.

Then of course, we have tomorrow which starts again at 08:00. I'm going to suggest that we look now very briefly at what we'll be doing tomorrow, which is of course completing our work, really making sure that we look at our recommendations on any of our priority listing, and this is where of course we may be starting to draft and edit and refine our thinking, and those of you in the listening audience as well as the contributory discussion will find tomorrow possibly the most detailed day of our work, to the point where if we are not finished at 18:00 local time, we will continue. We will perhaps have some sort of meal break, we'll bring meal in, or maybe not; lock the doors and make sure we stay here in as much discomfort as possible until we get the job done. That's another alternative. No, apparently, I'm not allowed to do that. Never mind. Pat's far too kind to let that happen. But we will be working on, if we have to, to get that job done.

And then on Monday, we'll be finalizing recommendations and suggestions as far as we can, designing our primary messages to come out, and looking at what we will be sharing with the community as ATRT3 presentations and our strategy for ICANN 66 in Montréal. The workplan will then be updated and people will jump onto planes and go home.

So those of you who have managed to get through all of that in remote participation, I've done it many times with other meetings, it is a very demanding task and we will do our very best to make sure that if your hand goes up, we see it. You are an integral part to our team. Just because we don't have you in the room doesn't mean your voice is not heard or valued, but if we fail in any way, please feel free to ping and private message via the Zoom room any of our fabulous staff, and they will make sure we pick up on something. So could be that a document is covering the hands or something, we don't see it.

With that, what have I missed? Pat? Okay. Well, I've had enough talking. Let's dive right in, shall we?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Sorry to interrupt, I just wanted to note that KC Claffy has joined us as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, if we're going to continue on with the roll call, we'll also recognize Tola who's arrived during the same time period. Okay. Let's then – who is going to take us through the background material? Is that you? Oh, sorry, Sébastien, I didn't see the [elephant.]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Can we have the list of the people who are supposed to be here in person and the ones we know that they will not come? Just as a matter of transparency of our working group, because I think it could be an important information. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Staff can put that together, I'm sure. There are some people who may be delayed with their travel or simply may not have managed to do their 40 hours or so travel in a healthy way. I think it is also a part of the standard record of any of our meetings that we have our attendance records published. Correct me if I'm wrong. But for the sake of transparency during this meeting, we'll put together and publish in the Zoom room as a link, and that just means we've pre-prepared it for the Wiki. Probably by the morning tea break, [inaudible]. Is that satisfactory, Sébastien? Thank you.

Okay, in which case let's dive into the documents. I'm looking to you – am I – Bernard. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just for some clarifications. We said we would go through the conclusions, so that's what you want us to do, madam chair?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So some minor clarifications here. let's go to the bottom of [3.2.1.1] please in the document. Page five. So maybe we should address this [up front, do it once] and just be done with it. Under effectiveness, we've been using not applicable. KC is significantly

objecting to that and wants to say lack sufficient information to assess instead. It's up to the group. I don't really care.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Floor is open.

PAT KANE: So Bernie, I think that's fine because not applicable [[isn't really exactly] what it is we're saying. [It is just] that we don't have enough information or it's too soon or too early. So I'm fine with that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Great, so we'll make that change generally, and we'll remove the not applicable assessment. I'll review those to see if it actually works everywhere.

We've got a conclusion that's been edited here, even if it was closed. The recommendation has been partly implemented given constraints on the board described above, the review team provides no follow-up recommendation as opposed to implemented as much as possible. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. So I don't know if we want to – we're not seeing the edits there. On the top, you need to show those, I think. Or maybe they're just showing up on mine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please go ahead.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I just wanted to highlight that on the recommendations that pertain to ATRT2 evaluation, there are a few of the recommendations that after speaking with some of our subject matter experts at ICANN Org, they would like to arrange a meeting with [inaudible] provide clarification on a couple of them. If feasible, [inaudible] after the Singapore meeting, [I'm] happy to join maybe one of the plenary calls [inaudible].

Sorry, I'm going to repeat that. I don't know if the remote people heard this. On some of the ATRT2 recommendations, or the evaluation that was done on the ATRT2 recommendations, some subject matter experts from ICANN Org would like to schedule a meeting with the review team and maybe ask some clarifying questions or provide some clarification to the review team if need be. That may or may not impact the evaluation that the review team has done, and we are thinking about doing that after the Singapore meeting at the plenary call if feasible for the review team.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat and then Sébastien.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. I spoke with Theresa when we were in Lisbon at the ICANN Studienkreis and Theresa indicated that there would be a document that was forthcoming with that. I think it would be much better for us to have documented where current ICANN Org believes

that we have gotten something wrong in terms of our implementation and effectiveness categorization. So if we could have a document in support of that ahead of time that we could review before we had that discussion, that would be really helpful.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

If I may. Thank you. We were acutlaly kind of thinking the meeting and discussion could take place so that we make sure we understand the review team's intent clearly before we put a document together, so it's a little bit of a reversal [of what you just said.]

PAT KANE:

If I may, Sébastien. I think that the issue is with ICANN Org not agreeing with or wanting some further clarification on what we've written, and I think what we've written has been fairly clear in terms of how we categorize this, at least that's what we've been trying to do with all of the ATRT2 discussions we've had to date. So it would be helpful to have specific items that would either augment the original document that came from ICANN Org in terms of what your status was or how you categorized whether ATRT2 was complete or not so that we can weigh that in terms of our adjustments, if any. Because at the end of the day, it's still going to be this room, this group, this team that's going to determine what the statuses are, and we're happy to entertain that, but like I said, it would be helpful to have some specific understanding of where the concerns or issues are or where the original document on ATRT2 implementation didn't have – additional information that would help us to decide what was done or what wasn't done. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. It'll be a little bit [inaudible] than Pat. If we don't get [here during this discussion,] what we will use for, or why we will spend three days or one day now to review the Work Stream 2 issue if we don't have the input of the one who may have done that since long time? We are volunteers and we have done our part of the job. If it was not done, I will say either we get it straight on or we don't want. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, are you wanting to follow up? Okay. Floor is open. There's a thumbs up to that comment from Sébastien by Pat, just for the record. Anyone else wish to make a comment on this?

So what have we heard? We've heard that there is a desire and willingness to have a document developed which may act as in some way clarification from the Org. Am I correct in that, Pat?

PAT KANE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That we also have on the table that there is a desire to have prep com, a small discussion with the subject matter experts to assist in the

preparation of the document. I think we can take that as a request and consider that in our planning, which we will move to perhaps next – or not next, but if we can have that as a discussion point at the where to from here, stakeholder that’s something that has to be finalized before this meeting ends, please, ladies and gentlemen. So rather than hijack our agenda this morning, we’ll contemplate all of this and come back, and I certainly am – trying to be polite.

There's been a hell of a lot of time between these recommendations and this vastly delayed review team, so forgive us if we don't find ourselves in wholesale empathy and support with, "Oops, sorry, wasn't it clear?" Type requests.

However, we're both volunteer but paraprofessional and we will do our very best to make sure that we get all of the information, perhaps not in a timely manner and perhaps not in the right order, that we can to assure the community that we have accessed as much material as we can get, and the accuracy of that material is fully transparent.

If nothing else, that exercise has led to better transparency, so that's not a bad thing. If you can imagine, [if] this document is a desirable document, then the public probably should have had access to a similarly obvious set of documentation. I see Tola. Over to you.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Thank you. I just wanted to know [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In terms of the request regarding the document? At the end of this meeting, we'll decide whether or not we'll take plenary time to have a prep com before they develop a document, or we suggest please just send us the document that was discussed [inaudible]. But we're not making that decision now, but we've responded and it's on an agenda for later in the meeting. Please go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi. KC has her hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. KC, over to you.

KC CLAFFY: I'm not sure I'm completely following, so I'm going to try to summarize it in a sentence, and tell me if I get this right. I've put this on the chat, but I think not that many people are there. ICANN Org wants to have a meeting with us to update information that they gave us in the implementation report?

PAT KANE: KC, that is correct.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Thank you.

PAT KANE: And I think that was generated based upon looking at the current implementation categorization and effectiveness categorization that we have had inside the document to date, and in disagreeing with that, they wanted to provide further information about why we should do something or say something different is my understanding.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you. Just as a point of clarification, in some cases there is information that has happened in the implementation because the work that we're talking about in some cases is ongoing. So I think there's probably several instances in some cases. It's ongoing work that may not have been fully reflected in a briefing materials because time has gone by. In other cases, it's ICANN Org's understanding of the intent of the recommendation where there might be a difference in interpretation, and in other cases, it may be just information that people feel you as a review team might want to know to make sure that there is a clear understanding of what has and has not been done and to what extent. So it was all intended in terms of having a dialog first to amplify these points, and then we'd be happy to follow up with a written document, but we understand your concerns about timing, so we'll work with whatever works for you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Larisa. Back to you, KC:

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, no, I've dropped my hand. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I have Pat, Maarten, and then Vanda.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Laris, a for that. So if this is an update on the activities that have occurred since that report came out, which I think was April is when we got the initial report, or May, that of course would be helpful and welcome, but it was not described to me in exactly that categorization initially. It was that there were some concerns about some of the categorization and they wanted to add additional information.

And you did say something specific that caught my attention today, and that is the intent of the ATRT2 recommendations. I think that's not really ICANN Org's – not business, but it really goes back to what the ATRT2 team had in terms of what their intentions were, not the interpretation of ICANN Org as to what the recommendation's intended to be in ATRT2. And that's always a little hard to assess because after four, five years, six years, people forget as to why they did things, but it really has to go back to the ATRT2 team, I think, to get the actual intention of what those items were.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thank you, Cheryl. Also in terms of the intent – and I saw the message or the document Jennifer shared a couple of days ago – the board is committed to continuous improvement, and I see that has happened all the time. I'm now on the board for three years, and I saw how much attention we paid to it and how this has led to many elements that help us to assess which skills we need, how we can improve them, how we can inform the NomCom, etc.

So I think we're in a totally different situation than eight years ago where lots of progress has been made, and the document highlights some of these issues very well. So I have continuous feeling we can continue to improve, but big steps have been made, and probably beyond what the ATRT2 would expect at that point in time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. In general, I agree, but we need to understand that work is all the time in the going process, but this does not mean that it's done. And our position is to analyze if it's done or needs more effort for that. So it is not done. We recognize everybody is making effort to make it done, but it's not yet. So our job is to make clear that it's not yet, and needs to make some effort to conclude. That is my point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Vanda. I think what we've heard is there is a willingness for the discourse. The how, when and why is yet to be determined. We do recognize that where ATRT2 was and the organization it was reviewing is in an entirely different time zone. It's a Mesolithic in the generation of development of ICANN. We're post-IANA transition, post-Work Stream 1 and 2, all sorts of things. We have different bylaws, different all sorts of things. And we certainly have different intentions, and I certainly want to thank Maarten for his continued input on the willingness of continuous improvement and improved transparency as well as accountability from the ICANN board.

But I think it behooves me to at least note for the record here what we're seeing is a failure to communicate in the past, so we're hopefully going to see nothing but better in the future, so that's a good thing. What we're sort of struggling with right now is a little lack of information or communication being available in a clear, very concise and very accessible manner at a time which would have made all our jobs easier. But there you go, it didn't happen. Let's see how we can make it better. So that seems like willingness on all sides, and we'll decide the where, when and how at the end of this meeting. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this before I go to Jennifer? I've got KC and then Jennifer. KC, over to you.

KC CLAFFY: I'm trying to think this through real time in my head, which is probably dangerous. So I'll maybe revisit all of this tomorrow, but I did spend about eight hours inside the ATRT3 document reviewing ATRT2 recommendations, so I've got them really pretty fresh in my head.

One of them is the 11.4, the board should prepare a complete implementation report to be ready by review kickoff. This report should be submitted for public consultation and relevant benchmarks and metrics must be incorporated in the report.

So the problem is if we get an update halfway through the year, at least it's going to have implications for whether that recommendation was implemented. And from the ones that are rattling around in my head, I think it propagates to other recommendations.

So yes, I definitely think we should consider this, but I think we have to consider how to write about this in the report, because this is a pretty relevant thing that's happening to the review process.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, KC. Can I just suggest that it's not even halfway through the year, it's six years later and halfway through the year. So let's be generous, it's five and a quarter years late.

However, we can only get better. Did I see your hand go up, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

It was just on behalf of KC, so all good. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. Bernie, we've had a little hijacking of the agenda the last 15 minutes, but I guess we can call that settling in. So let's get back to the document. Over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Absolutely. So back to that conclusion which KC has edited. As far as I'm concerned, there is no change to the end of it. we have a lot of work to do, so let's just carry on if that's fine with everyone.

Okay, let's go to 3.2.1.2, conclusion. And I'll remind everyone about our color coding. Green is no recommendation or suggestion, yellow is unclear if it's a recommendation or a suggestion, blue is a suggestion, and pinkish [coral] should probably be a recommendation. Those are suggestions as how we should code them. As we go through them, please feel free to speak up if we should change what's being suggested here.

Alright, conclusion on 3.2.1.2, only part of the material used or training is published, for example in 2015 only part one of the developing high impact [board.] ATRT3 should consider making a suggestion or recommendation that the board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement efforts or if those measures exist to allow future ATRTs to evaluate them.

So, are we okay with the conclusion? Okay. Are we okay with coding it as probably a recommendation? Because this was fairly strong. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. For this single conclusion and with the changes, why it was not written future, because I was still hoping to have [inaudible] and

that we would have been able to do it. It seems that time [passing, adding future] is not a bad idea.

Second point, I would like not to end up with an ATRT3 list of “You should measure, you should measure,” because sometimes, measuring takes more time than doing the work. And I really want us to be realistic and just to pick the one who are more important for the future of ICANN than to follow if they have bought the right number of pens or if they have done the good choice for all the hotel where we are going.

There are some specific where how we do the multi-stakeholder work, that’s important for me. But I would like to avoid to have for everything, saying, “Hey, you need to have metrics such that we will be able to measure,” and at the end of the day, nobody takes care of the measure, and even nobody take care of the action taken following those measures. It’s my concern here, but it’s my concern all along this document.

Therefore, I would like to avoid – or if it’s metrics, it’s a suggestion, except if we are really thinking that it’s a very important one. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sébastien. What we might do is if I could just ask to take a note and pop that in the parking area as a point that we need to come back to when we get to our prioritization discussion, because it would be very germane at that point in time. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, just again to point out the document Jennifer just shared. Obviously, you could say it's late, etc., and before this was written, the same time it's reference to public records. It's all online somewhere as well. and I will think the most concrete thing we do is we do have this 360 which we do every second year for a couple of years now, and it really helps board members to learn where to improve individually.

It feeds into the training program that is really aimed at continuous education and improvement. And yes, I recognize that it's not easy to find the information in one place, etc., but that's why indeed the suggestion, if one more effort, that we don't just focus on what we can't easily find but that we also think together what we really need to happen. Two different things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. Thank you very much, Maarten. Of course, transparency, you can drown people in information. You can be so utterly transparent that there is so much material that it's obfuscated. It's a skill that I've seen work in local government for example when you're trying to get very large developments through.

Just as an aside, my husband served as a local government councilor for about a decade, and the larger the job, the more paper – and I am talking measured in feet depths of paper – tended to be associated with it. And that of course is the opposite of effectiveness when you're talking about transparency. Transparency, absolutely, but you almost need a team of people to go through it to find where the devil is in the details.

We must look also at effectiveness as we do any of these. Back to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. I'll note the following, following up on Sébastien's point. I think we could put this one as blue – and I'm suggesting we do that as a suggestion – given that we've got a whole section on accountability indicators which should touch on that anyways. So if everyone's okay, we'll move this one to blue and then pick it up in accountability indicators.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And can I ask, is [future] also getting a [tick?] I thought Sébastien indicated that future may as well go in, so I think we'll resolve that [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: León, please.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. So I'm the new guy here and I risk going out of line with what I'm going to say, but these recommendations, it seems a little bit ambiguous to me. Maybe fleshing in a little bit of detail of what we mean about effectiveness, not just leaving it so open ended, could help the board actually do these efforts of improving the effectiveness.

For example, I see some comments below in the implementation that of course are in regard to diverse culture and knowledge levels, the training by fiscal year, the composition, etc.

So that definitely provides some guidance to the board as to the concerns that the community sees that we need to improve, but maybe factoring in just two or three things to the recommendation saying as an example, this and that would be definitely helpful for the board ICANN.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, León. I think we'll make a note of that and see if we can get a small drafting team if need be. And perhaps some of the people who are online might put some proposed text in as a suggestion mode to assist us in taking that pathway. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I was thinking that it will be the phase of our next part of the work, because it's not here that we would put some in-depth information but what we think about the effectiveness of the board. Its if we decide that it's an important topic. First we will have to decide if it's a suggestion or a recommendation, and if we decide it's one or the other, we will have to write, and in that part, we will have to explain what as ATRT3 we think is effectiveness we are looking for from the board. Therefore, you take the right train, but you are already ahead of us. Just step back and we will come to you soon, León.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But we appreciate the willingness. That's good. Bring the train back to the station. Thank you, Sébastien. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. I was going to say the same thing as Sébastien. Let's not forget these are not suggestions or recommendations, they're conclusions, trying to indicate if we're going to go there. And if we're going to go there, then we're going to have to draft them intelligently. Alright? Okay, let's move to our next conclusion, which is on page seven.

There's been some edits from KC, same comment as before, doesn't change the recommendation. We have enough work, let's move on, unless there's an argument.

Okay, the next one is a little bit longer, so let's just remember what we're talking about here. The board should continue supporting cross-community engagement aimed at developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation. Develop complementary mechanisms whereby the supporting organization and the advisory committees can consult with the board on matters including but not limited to policy implementation and administrative matters on which the board makes decisions. Alright.

So conclusion, I'm going to read this one out, make sure we're all okay. There is no meaningful metric to show any particular improvement of the wider ICANN community, understanding the difference between policy development and implementation of policy, as was called for by

this recommendation. ATRT3 does not recognize any appreciate the considerable –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Does.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Pardon me?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: You said does not.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, sorry. Let's fix that right now. Does [not] recognize and appreciate the considerable work already done in the GNSO regarding non-PDP and cross-community working group processes. However, this is not an example of ongoing and board-facilitated cross-community engagement.

This being said, it does not properly implement what was in the recommendation. As such, ATRT3 will be suggesting that ICANN Org develop a framework for policy implementation which will allow the community to understand, follow, and to some level participate in the implementation process.

Additionally, with regards to SO/ACs, consulting with the board, ATRT3 will be recommending that the agenda and the materials, those available at the time of publication for all types of board meetings, be

published 14 days in advance of the meeting unless there are exceptional circumstances.

In such exceptional circumstances, a notice explaining the reason for the delay when the agenda and material would be available would be posted 14 days prior to the meeting of the board.

Going through the accountability indicators, we did find some information relative to full board meetings and the minutes and timing of the development which has been meeting the requirements that are there, so this needs to be updated a little bit. I'll throw it back to you, manager.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, manager. Just for the record and to be really clear, I've highlighted the word "Not" Bernie which you put in in line four where it currently reads, "ATRT3 does not recognize and appreciate." In fact, it should go back to ATRT3 does recognize and appreciate. The does not is later on. But what was read to the record was "Does not." So we were simply making sure that the auditory record reflected the written record and we've now reversed the written record, and I think we're okay. Just one word makes a big difference, of course. So I think we're okay now with that. The floor is open on any comments, however. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

One thing in [here,] it's about the 14 days. If it's [inaudible] 40 days in advance, it may be not possible to say when it will be published 14 days

in advance, and we are putting the board in an awkward position. If they don't do something 14 days in advance, they will not be able to work. Therefore, if I – and it could happen that they need to wait ICANN Org to three days more to have the report done, but they want still to have it at the board meeting. Therefore if we may suggest that the agenda and materials – explaining the reason could be but not need to be. If not, we are putting the board in an awkward position. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. I agree with Sébastien, and being chair of the BMC, there's some subjects and discussions that may turn to be urgent at some point, so when there are urgent matters that need to go to the board that have come through committees, then we might not be able to meet that threshold of 14 days notice, and we might not even be aware that there will be something coming up within the 14-day threshold. So just for you to take it into account would be great. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just to remember that most of those documents need to be translated for majority of community. The time is important, but it's not

enforced because there is no way to enforce that. But in time to be translated, it should be my suggestion. In time to be translated.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Vanda. Of course, the translation policy is – to say underdeveloped is I think an overstatement regarding board materials, and perhaps one day in our not too distant future, that'll be a conversation we'll be having. But at the moment, it works in English and there are exceptional documentations going out for public comment which go into the UN language and other languages from time to time.

It seems to me – and remember, this is also the conclusions working out what we may or may not say, but if we work out that we are going to say something on this matter, we might want to make a file, note or comment on the side of this document, Pat, highlighting that yellow part.

There's an opportunity to use the type of language that is not uncommon in these things where the words “wherever possible” or “with occasional exceptions,” and then the occasional exceptions is footnoted and asterisked, and then the rationale explained in a public and transparent way why it is an exceptional circumstance is part of the reporting. That's the type of thing that we may be able to have our cake and eat it too on if we decide to make a recommendation or a suggestion.

So let's just capture that as almost a parking lot piece, but I don't see this as a deal breaker, I see this as an opportunity to just get the desirability of good advanced notice and the flexibility of how things

simply happen in a governance issue from time to time. But let's make sure that however she is writ, it's writ in a way that the community understands and the expectations are clearly set, and wherever possible, adhered to as opposed to, "Oh, well it's all very exceptional."

So that rationale part is probably critical, and I'm suspicious that Michael and his work party might want to have a think about wording if we go down that pathway, which we might do. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. This had to be adjusted before we started it anyway, so I think there's a bunch of good suggestions. From the discussion, I'm getting a sense that if we have to tag this, we should tag it blue for potential suggestion when we go through the second time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Nothing with the] proceeding of the meeting, but just as a matter of how we move this microphone. Please, if you have to move it, move it

before you open the mic than after, because it is very difficult and I get for the people on the other side of the line, it must be hurting [inaudible]. Please, it's difficult, but move it when you start [inaudible], please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Can I suggest, there's a thing called projecting your voice. You don't actually have to move the microphones. They're very good tools and equipment. In fact, I could probably come all the way back here and simply project my voice. And Pat turned me off.

Okay, no, that is an extremely important point. Thank you, Sébastien. And can I just say, as someone who normally wears a headset for these things, it really can be painful. So we will do our best to make you're if they're going to be moved, they're going to be moved while they're on mute. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, ma'am. Alright, on to recommendation five, the board should review redaction standards for board documents, document information disclosure policy, DIDP, and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy, institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted materials to determine if redactions are still required, and if not, ensure reductions are removed.

Alright, if we go to our conclusion here, ATRT3 believes the efforts made in response to the recommendation regarding review redaction standards for board documents, document information disclosure policy

and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy, institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted materials to determine if redactions are still required, and if not, ensure they are removed.

That's not been implemented, nor is effective. As such, ATRT3 suggests this be rectified by completing the implementation of a single redaction policy as well as the adoption and adherence to its active processes in support of the requirements of the recommendation.

It's put in as blue as a suggestion. Alright. I think when there was a discussion, just to catch León up on this, there was a discussion that there are several elements regarding redaction, but the point of the recommendation was to bring everything together. Correct, Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. I think that the point is not as much about having a single page where all the different policies are linked as it is about – it's not about the accessibility of finding the policies, it's about having a single and internally consistent policy that is also in line with the DIDP recommendations.

So from that perspective, perhaps it might be good to add the word "unified" rather than just saying a single redaction policy. It should say unified redaction policy to kind of clarify that, because that harmonization, I think, is an important aspect. Thanks.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Bernie and Mike. So if I'm understanding well, this is a recommendation about having a process that is predictable and publicly known as to what elements are to be redacted in which documents and how long will they remain redacted, and if at some point they will be of course thinking of redaction. Is that right? So that everyone knows what the process is and what we expect from different documentation and its redaction.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Predictability is part of that, but it's also a substantive recommendation insofar as it does speak to the grounds on which information redaction should take place.

So I think that distinction comes to the core of the implementation gap that we've seen insofar as the current structure, is to say, "Well, people need to understand it, so we'll just take all our redaction policies and put them in one spot, and now you can understand it." But that doesn't impact – so that accessibility, part of it has been addressed, but the substantive part of it, of why is material being redacted, has not been addressed, so that gap is important.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

So it's also the rationale and justification as to why it's being redacted and not just an arbitrary decision that has no justification or grounds? Good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to rationale. Sébastien? Oh, right, Vanda. Can I just point out that this was a matter that ATRT1 delved into? So whilst we're dealing with ATRT2 five years later than ATRT1, this was a substantive issue in ATRT1, so this is something that still needs to be worked on and addressed. So again, opportunity here. We're getting closer, but we're not to the finish line yet. So I think the term "unified" is important, the rationale is important, and the clarity on the why a redaction occurs and the expectations of the rationale is going to be a public thing is very important, but the timeliness cannot be forgotten either. That's where there might need to be a board/community small committee to delve into this in particular detail.

For example, we get to get to that part of our conversation, but there's an opportunity to do something here. So gold star for that one. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, ma'am. Recommendation 9.1, proposed bylaws change recommended by the ATRT2 to impose a requirement on the ICANN board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN's advisory committees.

The conclusion that we have, the board advice registry is a good step forward, meeting the intent of this recommendation. The value of including this in the bylaws is probably arguable and may not be worth pursuing. Setting minimum times for the board to respond to advice from SO/ACs is challenging as implementing some advice requires time and resources which are usually not specified in the advice provided and

often require ICANN to undertake an appropriate evaluation to produce an implementation plan.

This being said, the recommendation required ICANN board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN's advisory committees, which the board advice webpage does using the board's advice register phases and descriptions.

A suggestion for improvement would be that ICANN implement a minimum time to provide an initial assessment of recommendations made to the board by the SO/ACs. Back to you, ma'am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yes, thanks. Just only to point out that the first occurrence of where this was really coming was the CCT, basically, and we've tried to be very explicit about our rationale in response. That doesn't mean we think we're there already. I think we're scratching the surface of how to get there and we're aware of that and we're seeking that with the CCT team, but also outside of that, I think the discussion that we have launched now on prioritization and budgeting is a crucial one there. It doesn't mean we have all the answers. I think we're getting clearer on the questions.

I think we find agreement that there is questions and that there's not a single community opinion too, because that would help us too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The impossible dream. Over to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Maarten, it's interesting, because when we talk about prioritization within this room, we're talking about prioritization of ICANN Org work or recommendations that come out of reviews and review teams and cross-community working groups, etc.

But what dawned on me just now is this is really a prioritization of board work when we talk about a response to advisory committees within a certain period of time. I don't think we've talked about that specifically. So maybe that's something that we should consider in any of our prioritization discussions, and I don't know if the work that the board is doing right now touches upon prioritizing your own work or not.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Two things there. One is what was already said in the document, that's why I didn't repeat it, but the response register that we've started to use originally for GAC and also for other – that helps us to keep track of suggestions made or recommendations made and helps us also to be sure that we can respond in time and it keeps us on the [mettle] and we're very aware of that. That helps us to also let more things slip unnoticed.

It sometimes takes longer to have responses than other times, so that's one thing. And prioritization of work in a way is also the recent

[recurrence of our blog that we now do any of the – where we] prioritize our work next to our support of activities that are there, our fiduciary duties, also specific actions to improve to answer to things where improvement is needed to the board operational priorities. And maybe that should be mentioned here too. And again, that is also public record.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Pat. Good morning. Just for the record, that's Wolfgang making an entrance, and Daniel. It's like I haven't missed Daniel. I won't miss Daniel. Okay. Have a seat just on the left-hand side. Okay, back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Just to be clear, Maarten, the only improvement suggested here is as you mentioned, sometimes it takes longer to respond or not, and there should be just a minimum time. If you cannot give a response in the minimum time, at least say you're working on it or what is an expected time for it to come. That's all that's being suggested.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Alright. Let's go to our next recommendation, recommendation 9.2, review ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms through a community-comprise group.

Conclusion, this recommendation has been transferred to the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2, but the recommendations of that team have not yet been implemented. Minor edits by KC. I'm not going to argue about this, we have work to do, unless there is some discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Everyone comfortable with those minor edits? Let's move on.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Recommendation 9.3, review the office of the ombudsman, the role within ICANN and whether the duties and scope of the ombudsman should be expanded or changed in line with suggestions from ATRT2. Alright, going to our conclusion.

This recommendation has been implemented by transferring it to the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2. The recommendations of that team haven't yet been implemented. Alright, same deal as the last one. Going once, going twice.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's not [too much what we write here or not write here,] I am still in a strange situation with what is done already by the office of the ombudsman, and that's maybe not official because it's not somewhere,

and that's a good thing the office has done, definitely, and I can list some of them.

There is what is happening in the discussion between board with [main] caucus and the Work Stream 2 implementation team, and there is what we are writing here. I'm not sure that even if it's the same people around the table for part of that, if we are really aligned.

I really think that we need to write that it was transferred to Work Stream 2 and we are waiting for the implementation by the staff of the Work Stream 2 recommendations. Whatever we want to write, it's the situation where we are, and I don't know – it's not implemented, and even the things implemented that are not [reported] to us officially, then why we will say it's partially implemented? Even if we know that it's partially implemented.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Alright, recommendation 9.5, conduct a review of the anonymous hotline policy and process –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I will do it now and I will try to be [calm.] We are here to have exchange among the member of this group. If we don't leave time for people to think about what somebody is saying and we just go to the next item – I know we don't have time, but please, colleagues, it's now

your time, and if you have something to say, you need to say it. If we don't, we lose the opportunity to have collective work. And it's not just for this topic. I don't care, we can go to the next one. But it's the general purpose of these three days of work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And of course, Sébastien, if people don't disagree, they don't need to say they don't disagree. So perhaps everyone agrees with exactly what you said.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, but it is perfectly possible. As far as i know, we're not a group of shrinking violets who are hesitant in making our points at any time. And of course, there is always the chat that says we need to go back, but I'm looking at hands, I'm looking at chat and I'm looking around the room, and I didn't see anyone aghast with what your statements were heading towards. So I think it's okay, we've all noted that. No one feels violently opposed to it. So if anyone feels that they're inhibited, please, I promise we'll be kind, just speak up. You're more than welcome to do so. And if need be, we will go back from time to time, but not for long. We do need to proceed forward, but we are not rushing through either. Tola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you. I'm in-between the two positions. Of course, I understand there's no point repeating what is obvious. If somebody says I agree with it, there's no point in saying, Bernie, I agree with what you said. However, I want to recognize that not everybody is a native English speaker, so sometimes if Bernie makes presentation or anybody for that matter makes presentation, we'll probably need to give room for those that we interpret whatever they've heard in English into their mother language and think back again.

So probably give some few seconds or one minute for some people to think and reflect on what they've heard. [They likely] have a comment. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tola. I'll go to Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Very quickly, yes, I agree with all the sentiments here, and indeed, if something needs to be asked, raise your hands first even if you can't find the words yet. In this one, I've totally understood your recommendation, that's why I didn't react. And if you would have wanted an update of where we are [inaudible] ask for it and we'll give that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And at this stage, thank you very much, Maarten, but we don't need that update just yet. But we now know that there would be one if we asked for it. Can I also remind everybody that one of the tools in Zoom

is the thumbs up, the thumbs down and the green tick and the red X? And feel free to use those as well. We will note those to the record, and of course, why we put all these things out in advance and why we work in a visual sense as well as an auditory sense, so we're reading as well as listening, is to try and assist those of us who have difficulty with the language and interpretation issues, and also sometimes it's a matter of the complexity of what is being dealt with at the time.

We are, I believe, not being unfair or unreasonable. If anyone believes differently, let Pat and I know and we will make sure we address it in some other way, shape or form.

With that, looking around the room, I think we are okay to go back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. [inaudible] support of industry players. I'm not speaking loudly enough? Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's unusual, [for Bernie to not be loud enough.] That, we need to note for the record.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. I actually need a microphone for this one. Okay. Conclusion, this is obviously a major recommendation which has met with some success. However, it is impossible to be able to decide if further action is

required without having some formal information showing exactly what is being done and how effective it is.

As such, ATRT3 should consider making a suggestion or recommendation along these lines. Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, it may also be worth pointing out that I think these programs are currently being cut. CROP I think has been on the chopping block. So that might be something when we talk about the success of the program, the fact that it's already swinging in the opposite direction seems relevant to bear in mind. Yeah, mission accomplished. Well done, everybody. Exactly right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I agree with you, Michael, but my problem is that I don't see CROP as one of the program to answer this question. That's one of my problems since the beginning of this work, because CROP is to allow some leader of regional group to go to make outreach, and it's not to facilitate an equitable participation from my point of view as such, therefore it's why I really think that this recommendation needs to be reviewed, because what is equitable participation? Is it to have more young, more women, more something? We as a group need to work on that, and maybe to have a report with better information on what was done by the ICANN community, ICANN Org and ICANN board, and that will be helpful.

But yet, from my point of view, it's not sufficiently put in place, but [inaudible] to say that, except my experience, I don't know. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Michael and Sébastien. So as I understand this, there is a lack of information on the different activities that both the board and the organization are trying to make in order to foster this participation and to provide support for those that do not have that kind of support from industry players.

I know that there are some metrics going on on different programs, so again, maybe trying to do the next phase, provide a little bit more guidance as to what kind of information is expected or needed to try to assess the success of these programs and the areas of opportunity that we as community can think of that need further support and this fostering of participation would also be very helpful, I guess.

And of course, trying to line up this with all the prioritization exercises that we're going through in the different arenas that we're playing at this moment, so just to try to feed into the work of this group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael, and then Sébastien.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Yeah, I just wanted to add that in terms of the – this is not a broadly structured diversity recommendation, so this is not about bringing in folks from the global south or equitable women – I mean obviously, these programs should be administered in a way that promotes participation from the global south and gender equity in participants [inaudible], but that’s not the specific purpose of this recommendation.

It says it pretty clearly it’s to promote participation of ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players. So what that says to me is that it’s meant to be targeted away from representatives of Facebook and Amazon and what have you and towards groups like a lot of nonprofit folks, like At-Large folks who are individual participants, that kind of stuff.

And viewed from that perspective, I also think that that's interesting that they're painting CROP and the – what was the other one that they said, the NextGen and the leadership training things? Whatever was mentioned, because those programs I don’t think differentiate. I think those programs are designed to apply broadly to all stakeholder groups across the community.

So from that perspective, paining that as a solution to that fundamental imbalance is problematic. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, Tola, then Vanda.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. First of all, León, if I don't know that they're apple, I will never ask you to eat apples. Therefore, you can ask us to say what we want but at the same time, we hope that the one who makes those measures will be able to say, "Oh, that's something [inaudible] ATRT3." Please don't ask us to ask the right question to get us the answer.

And the second point, my feeling is that we need to put this recommendation back to the drawing board and don't spend here too much time on discussing it, maybe a small team to rewrite or write what's implementation and so on on that issue will be a good way to go. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. I believe we're taking a note of that, and unless anyone objects to it, it sounds like a good way forward. I have Tola, Vanda, and then Maarten.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you. I'm just reacting to what Michael mentioned about being concerned about a fair distribution, and my attention is drawn to the way the recommendation was crafted. [inaudible] must facilitate the equitable – I'm not a lawyer, you're a lawyer. You know better, when you put some words, it's implied that you want that particular word to be – it has a specific meaning. And I'm wondering why the word "equitable" is introduced in that recommendation. And that would probably answer what you've raised in terms of being fair and just to everybody without [minding any] preference of anybody else.

So imply that gender, race, global south, whatever it is, that must be equitable. That's the point I wanted to clarify. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right to reply, Michael, and then Vanda.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Just quickly, we don't know if lawyers wrote this or not. We don't know the care with which it would – that's the problem, is we don't know the care with which it was written. When I see the word "equitable," what it means to me is I'm promoting balance among ICANN's different stakeholder groups, not necessarily equitable insofar as reflecting gender and regional diversity, although those are also obviously underlying values that should be informing everything that ICANN does.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, we've got Vanda, Maarten, and then Daniel.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I do believe that we all agree with that, I don't think there is much discussion on that. There is needed for many alternatives to be more balanced between the huge – even inside the industry, there is some times in some regions very good industry guys that need some support.

So there is not for the At-Large or government or ... It's the kind of – have a different view, and those that cannot be really supported should be in some way balanced with those big guys that have their own

support. So I believe it's clear on that, and I'm with Sébastien that we should not spend much time discussing stuff that we already agreed on. That is the meaning of that and how to implement is another issue. But the conclusion for me is clear. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, just also to make very clear whatever information we give here is to be information not to tell you, not to take a recommendation or whatever. For sure, this is an area that has our fullest interest as well, and any more clear guidance is always appreciated and for sure will be responded to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Maarten. And of course, this is a recommendation of ATRT2, it's simply being reviewed by ATRT3. Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think CROP is just one of the examples that can be used, but there are other programs that are affected. So if you look at the measure of effectiveness of no available statistics, I think we could recommend to [inaudible] and implement more metrics to be able to show the progress of the program, and then from there, we can have a diverse opinion on it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Daniel, and you may not have been in the room at the time when Sébastien – I believe it was you – that mentioned one can spend so much time measuring things, gathering metrics that one actually then fails to get the rest of the work done. So we do need to find a fine point here and we need to be very cognizant of that.

I've heard amongst this discussion one concern that I don't believe we've clarified, and that's the validity of using CROP as an exemplar here. Perhaps we should just note that, that we might need to look for other examples or look at that text. Sébastien certainly felt that it wasn't the ideal example. Others of you have used it as an example, but it certainly is not, as you pointed out, Daniel, the only example. So let's perhaps look at that text as we move into more final documentation. So that's a "come back to it." And if we've made those notes – and I'm sure the fabulous staff – their fingers are flying down there, so lots of notes are being made. Back to you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, just to make clear, for some group, CROP is a good one and can be used as rationale for the recommendation, besides other information. It's not the only issue to do that, but it is important for our [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Tola, go ahead.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you. My attention is drawn to this statement [inaudible] and no available statistics. [inaudible] and if this team have not seen available statistics in line with what [inaudible] said, and [there are statistics somewhere,] then they should be provided to us.

So we may not have access to anybody's – for example, León [made statement that a lot of things the board has done that we may not be aware of, but he's sure,] and if you have those types of statistics, then [let us have it.] Then we have it and we can make informed decisions. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which is all about the T in the transparency, what we're trying to do. Is it not, Tola? Go ahead, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Exactly. If any of your questions are something that we'll come back to and say, "Oh, by the way, we've done it, here's the proof," then it's still useful, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And we may not have those answers for every question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Who else? We can live in hope. Thank you for that. I think then just before we move on, we might note the suggestion as well that if we're going to be making – I've used too many suggestions now – a suggestion or recommendation that the use of a small team might be a good way forward in terms of drafting that was something that we've put on the table, and is probably well and truly worthy of considering. Before we close, is there, on this point, any more? We are obviously going to be looping back to this one.

Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, ma'am. Alright, and that's it for the ATRT2 segment of this. In the survey results, we did them a few weeks ago, there is one left where Michael, I brought up a point on 3.2.4.5.4, which is quite a bit down. Sorry, 2.5.

Now, what I'm going to suggest here, Michael, if you're okay with it, is we're going to come back to the diversity question because of the results of the survey on diversity for the board, and we're going to have – I think that's part and parcel of it. We've also got the recommendations from the NomCom review and we can deal with that as a block I think would be more efficient.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, I think it makes sense to deal with this in a broader NomCom discussion.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Everyone else okay with that? Alright, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jennifer,

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. On the survey, I just wanted to note that the SSAC have provided a response to that now and I shared that with the list this morning. Obviously, you won't have had time to look at it, but they have responded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we know what we're going to be doing over the morning tea break, don't we? So much for the break. However, we might have an opportunity to have a group look at some of this work now. If we look at what we're going to be doing after the break, we were going to go through and complete some of these conclusions for the remaining ATRT2 recommendations, which – don't whisper at me, talk at me.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [There's a lot of them.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There is a lot of them to do, so is there a good place to start and do, say, 15 minutes' worth of work now? Can you make a suggestion for a 15-minute block of work, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: If we finish the board survey, there's a couple of minor points, and then that'll give you a slot until the coffee break.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect. Let's do that, but before we do, Jennifer, did you want to get attention again?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Oh, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, then Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Quick question. I'm looking through the online document and the page doesn't look the same as here. Where are the changes? Because the online document has ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm making the changes as we go in the online document.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay, thank you. That helps. I'm less worried now.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For the record, because he didn't have his mic on, Bernie was just saying the online document is being changed in real time. Okay, Mike on, and back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. The next point we should bring up is 3.2.4.7.4, and we're talking page 28. Our conclusion in red. So as I mentioned earlier, we did find results about the board meetings, which contradicts this a bit, so we will be adjusting that one. I'm just saying that the information has come to light.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, what about 3.2.4.8.4?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We did that last time. It's not highlighted in yellow. We did all the conclusions from the survey at our last meeting, if you remember well. Just some of them had some highlights left over to deal with.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They've all been resolved?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: They've all been resolved.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Which was the point of highlighting them, just to make sure we all agree and we don't lose track of these things. And we're done with the board ones and we're into the GAC segment. I don't know, given you were asking for 15 minutes and we've really got half an hour, do you want to start the GAC for 15 minutes and then give you 15 minutes before the tea break or vice versa?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The break is at [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's correct, the break is at 9:45 local time.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I thought it was at 10:00. So 9:45, so you've got your 15 minutes now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So we'll start the GAC for 15 minutes?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Your choice. We can do the GAC or we can do your breakout session for 15 minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, let's move through with the GAC. I think that's going to be [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, let's GAC. Page 38, recommendation 6.1(a). This one is yellow, there have been some edits. The GAC is a special entity in ICANN, and the government representatives have many requirements placed on them from their governments which constrain their interactions.

As such, this recommendation has been implemented as much as it can be implemented, and is also effected as it can be for the GAC. If there is a desire for further improvement, this would first require that there be some effective measurements of the processes we believe need improvement to be able to confirm that improvements are required and would be effective.

We've run through this with the GAC group, and that was accepted, so unless there are statements

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just wanting to question, have we considered KC's comment on this one in terms of picking something up in the conclusion section?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I'm accepting her comment. Unless I state otherwise, we'll accept her edits.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so I think that's important for everyone – the listening audience – to understand that there are a number of comments here which are not showing as resolved. We'll bring them out if there is some contention. If they are not highlighted and brought out for contention, one can safely assume that they will be resolved. If not word perfect, in a manner that reflects the intent of the comment. Okay? Just wanted to make that clear. Back to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. 4.2.1.3, recommendation 6.1(b). Publishing agendas for GAC meetings, conference calls, etc., on the GAC website seven days in advance of the meetings and publishing meeting minutes on the GAC website within seven days after each meeting or conference call.

Conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. As such, no further action is required or is respected as recommendation. Going once, going twice, sold. Alright. Recommendation 6.1(c), updating and improving the GAC website to more accurately describe GAC activities, including intersessional activities as well as publishing all relevant GAC transcripts, positions and correspondence.

Conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Sold.

6.1(d), element 4.2.1.5. Considering whether and how to open GAC conference calls to other stakeholders to observe and participate as appropriate. This could possibly be accomplished through the participation of liaisons and from other ACs and SOs to the GAC once the mechanism has been agreed upon and implemented.

Conclusion –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to remember that we will do into the report a very clear statement about how the GAC is function for the community to understand better what is the problem they face to put everybody inside one call and make it really effective.

This is something that will need to be very clear as a rationale, that to understand why we're not suggesting what the ATRT2 recommended, because it's almost impossible to do that and to do that through the [liaisons is become more and more effective.]

So the problem maybe the person into the liaison, but not the idea of liaison that is not in some way, in some groups, working. So there is just to make it clear.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm going to go to you in a moment, Maarten. Just on that, what I'm hearing is that we will recognize and explain perhaps in an appendix rather than body text the unique aspects of the Government Advisory Committee and the undertakings and improvements they have made in response to the intent of the ATRT2 recommendations. The recommendations have still not been implemented and therefore they had not been able to be as they were writ, but we will recognize that gap and explain that gap so that our document captures that and gives a new level set. That's, I think, what you were saying. Correct me if I'm wrong. Thank you, Vanda.

Okay, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. I appreciate that, and also appreciate the clear recognition of the character of how governments work and the enormous value of GAC to us having more than 170 countries being willing to talk with us. But my substantial point is more on liaisons. Liaisons are a good thing in general because they can help bridge the gap both ways. What we recognize in the board ourselves is that we'll work on getting more clarity on the role and mandate of liaisons in different circumstances to make that more explicit.

I can see something in this spirit may be useful to consider as a recommendation somewhere as well. Maybe not necessarily here, but more in general.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, just to make sure we have captured that into our parking lot please. I have Sébastien and then Wolfgang.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. First of all, we need to be careful about the same word not doing the same thing. Liaison to the board is one-way. Here we are talking usually about a two-way liaison. A one-way liaison adding to the other way liaison and they're working as a team. Therefore, it's a little bit different.

For example, in the board, you have somebody who is doing both sides from the SSAC to the board and reverse. Here we have two person. That's important.

The second point is that I like we still to say that GAC is different from the other, but we are talking about open communication, open meeting. We are not asking that they open the mic to everybody. Therefore, I think we need to be careful in what we say. We may suggest to the GAC that they can have open meetings, and only the liaison will have an open mic. That's different what we are saying here.

We are really just saying how we decrease not the fact that the government are government and the GAC is the GAC, but there are differences in the way all the community are treated within the organization. We can't at the same time ask for a single contract with everybody, with all the registry will be the same, all the registrar will be the same and we say, "Oh, relation between one group and another must be different." Here we need to find a way to have something that

is quite similar. And it will not impede the work of the GAC, I'm sure.
thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you. Two comments. One on the liaisons. I think what Vanda said is important. It's not the system of liaisons which creates problems, it's the very special individual. And so far probably it would be good to have criteria for the nomination of liaisons through the various constituencies.

I know the case of Yrjö Lansipuro is the liaison to the GAC from the At-Large Advisory Committee. He's a former governmental representative. He understands how governments work, and so this is quite an effective example. So that means if we probably define two or three criteria which would be then helpful for the constituencies to nominate liaisons.

My second point is more of a general nature if it comes to the GAC. I also am fully in line with the conclusion that the GAC is a special body and so they have a special nature. However, what I see since years is that the – while Maarten is right saying ICANN can be proud that 150+ governments are engaged in this, but the GAC representative represents always a special ministry in their own government. And we all know that many governments, different ministries have different approaches. It became extremely clear in the case of the WHOIS and all

this so that if the government were represented only by the law enforcement agency of that country, it was a different position than people representing probably the data protection office in their country.

And I think what we can expect from the government – and this is what I read under effective measurement, that we expect governments consult at home and come with [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Yeah, more a general position so that the conflicts within government are managed before they arrive to the GAC meaning and say this is the position of the government and not the position of a single ministry. And very often, the ministry of interior has a different approach to the ministry of economics or the foreign ministry.

I have no clear idea where this could be added, but I think this is the point as a recommendation to the GAC that they are aware that this is followed by the community and it can create a problem, and as we have seen from the WHOIS debate, it is important. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Time check. I just want to go briefly to Bernie, and then if I can ask for very brief interventions from Sébastien and Tola. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. We've been discussing different things and we didn't get to the conclusion as such, so I'll just read it out. Overall, this recommendation is implemented and effective. The effectiveness is directly related to the quality of the liaisons that are appointed to the GAC. ATRT3 may wish to consider suggesting that the GAC publish a list of suggested qualities or requirements for liaisons to assist SOs and ACs to select the best candidates for this. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Sébastien, and then Tola.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I agree with that, and you have to know or to remember that there is no liaisons to the GAC without the agreement of the GAC. Then if something is wrong, it's wrong from both sides. Therefore, I think we can give them the – they know what they do when they choose a liaison. Therefore, I don't know why we are spending this discussion, because it's an agreement between one group and the GAC, and so be it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Yeah, I was going to say – and earlier we said maybe we don't speak out [inaudible] but I'm going to say what I was about to say was what Wolfgang has said.

Anyway, in addition to that, just to appreciate the fact that GAC is a bit different, we're dealing with some countries that [inaudible] fiscal block and they bring it to ICANN as well. So we have some countries [that are some countries,] and to that extent, a liaison from an SO and AC that is coming in [inaudible] when they are reporting back to the organization, [those are the] kind of challenges they would be having.

A business perspective in nongovernmental NPOC or NCUC for example, that is not happy with the government, will definitely not report according to what is happening at the GAC, but there'll be conflict.

So just to wrap up, I agree with Sébastien that it is the liaison that is the challenge now, so I don't know what recommendation we're going to make to ensure that the liaison understands what is expected of them. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to put a pin in that right now. We're going to come back and start with Pat after the break. The break will start at 10:00 AM local Singapore time, and that will be a 02:00 UTC, so there will now be – probably about 13 minutes break. Thank you one and all. We shall return shortly.

Pat, thank you. Go ahead.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. The one thing I wanted to point out here is that when we put together even suggested qualities or requirements, the liaison positions are always volunteer and I want to make certain that we don't make it so rigid that it ends up being an opportunity for people to blame a relationship on someone not meeting criteria that are set by the GAC in terms of what the liaisons should be.

I know that you have to have some understanding of what goes on on the GAC to be effective in that area, and somebody made the point earlier that the GAC approves liaisons, but let's make sure it is suggested criteria and not a hard and fast set of criteria that we use here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Pat. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, but why we need to do that? Why ATRT3 need to put some guidelines? We can ask the GAC to put guidelines, but don't do – and even if we don't say nothing, they will manage.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Putting myself in the queue now. Just to follow on from what you said, Sébastien, the opportunity is to recommend the continuous improvement and changes that we are already seeing from the Government Advisory Committee. So we recognize their efforts, we endorse what they're doing, and we say, as you focus in the future, here

are some key points and objectives that we believe the community would appreciate if you could achieve.

But in terms of liaison, there is one other thing that we may perhaps suggest. I suppose it's the old training officer coming out in me. There's all sorts of things old coming out of me at this stage of my life, but this happens to be the training officer.

There is an opportunity of course to support liaisons across the board, and it might be possible for some in-service training to be undertaken to professionalize and facilitate the effectiveness of the liaisons we have, be they bilateral or unilateral. There seems to be another opportunity – that's a word I think I'm going to be using a lot in these next few days. I have Vanda, briefly, and then Maarten, briefly.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Just remember that most of those ideas that the GAC have discussed was discussed with the GAC and agreed previously with the idea that they recognize they need it to improve that. So we're trying to suggest align with the idea they are doing that, but need some guidance on how to do that or sometimes enforce the idea among the other not only the co-chairs and chairs but the whole GAC understand there is something that they need to do so the recommendation can have this facilitation for the governance of the GAC to improve fast what they want to and what we recognize they needed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. We've got Maarten, and I've got KC.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think we're very much on track here. Also what Sébastien said, [we say what we miss] as ATRT, which is the transparency or the clarity of how they do it. We can make the suggestion that it would be good to make it explicit. Training is the second step, but it would already be good to make [inaudible] what we can expect from liaisons or what their [inaudible] are. ANd what I recognize as well is it would be good if it's not only clear to the group who's appointing these liaisons or inviting these liaisons to themselves but also to the full communities.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. KC, over to you.

KC CLAFFY: Hi. When I first read this recommendation, I found myself curious about whether the SSAC has a liaison to the GAC, so I asked the chair of the SSAC because I was embarrassed to say I didn't know myself. His answer was interesting, and I don't know if Maarten can shed any light on this because I don't know the whole history and he didn't know it either, he's only been chair for a couple years.

But I think it comes down to that SSAC hasn't felt like they had the resources to really maintain the bandwidth of the relationship. So I think long ago, they had a liaison to the GAC, but they certainly haven't had it in my memory. And I find it odd. So many security issues, public safety and consumer protection being a theme of the GAC that there isn't a more – I don't know – healthy conversation between those two.

But his answer largely rested on lack of resources. So I don't know if there's anything to say there, but it just struck me as odd. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted, supported by others in the room, and over to you, Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: To add to KC's statement, there's a long tradition in SSAC that they all speak with one voice to the outside, and so having an intermediate liaison [is often seen to represent SSAC,] but something like that is always the individual liaising to the GAC. So that's why there's no official position.

It's actually the other way around as well. People wanting to liaise with SSAC, they're just becoming a full member of SSAC and not a special part. So that's probably more due to the way SSAC operates than anything else.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jaap. I think what's important here is to note that as the Government Advisory Committee is a very unique thing in many ways, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee is unique in its own way as well, and other parts of ICANN advisory committees, and indeed some of the supporting organizations have their own particular uniqueness about them. So there needs to be a fitness for purpose rather than just a block approach to the solutions here.

from a historic perspective however, the use of liaisons with the Government Advisory Committee is relatively new in the scheme of things, so we're learning as we go and there may be a number of ways forward that perhaps with some mutual discussion could be looked at.

But the principles, I think, are quite well founded, and the positive experiences that the Government Advisory Committee has had to date with the few liaisons it has – and none of these liaison roles to my knowledge are identical in form and function, so the liaison relationships the Government Advisory Committee has with the Generic Name Support Organization is different to the liaison role it has with the At-Large Advisory committee, and I would venture could be different with other liaisons if and when they're mutually agreed upon. So this is not a “We're all too different to make it work,” it's “We're all different and we need to recognize it if we're going to try and get something to work” situation.

And with that, Bernie, I think we're back to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

So recommendation 6.1(e), considering how to structure GAC meetings and work intersessionally so that during the three public ICANN meetings a year, the GAC is engaging with the community and not sitting in a room debating itself for closed sessions. I love the editorial nature of that recommendation.

In terms of the conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective as much as can be expected given the

special nature of the GAC. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Any debate? Yes, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Just to clarify for other members that are not following the GAC issue. Even the communique now is open to the public. So it's done. What is not open completely is what we already discussed; the intersectional calls, because in those calls, open to whole public, can be some political aggressive points that demand some problems, and it's something that they need to avoid.

Inside the closed room, it's more easy to take care of that, but with someone jumping into the – and maybe turn off their microphone – can be aggressive point of view and with the consequences in diplomatic relationship. So that's the full question, and I believe that's good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Any more on that? I think there's work in progress, and as successes happen, who knows what further progress can be made? But people have to be comfortable, particularly governments, before what could be considered as fairly radical changes. But we will be giving credit where credit's due, and perhaps a little guidance on what might be desirable. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. 4.2.1.7, recommendation 6.1(f), establishing a routine practice agenda setting calls for the next meeting at the conclusion of the previous meeting.

Conclusion, the recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Looking for anybody in the queue. I don't see that, so Pat, must be your turn.

PAT KANE: Recommendation 6.1(g), providing clarity regarding the role of the leadership of the GAC. Conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Any discussion or comments, questions? None.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 4.2.1.9, recommendation 6.1(h), when deliberating on matters affecting particular entities, to the extent reasonable and practical, give those entities the opportunity to present to the GAC as a whole prior to its deliberations.

Conclusion, overall, the implementation and effectiveness are currently satisfactory. However, ATRT3 may wish to consider suggesting or recommending continuous improvement via an ongoing commitment to

a very proactive and deliberate improvement in effectiveness that early engagement brings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, quick explanation, it's just this comes from the two sides, with the GNSO and the GAC that there is a difficulty for the business side to get read with some recommendations, without this previous agreement and so on. It's something that, going to the suggestion of recommendations, we're going to make a very clear statement about what both sides want to, what they need, because that was from our interviews during the meeting in Marrakech. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Seeing nobody in the queue on that, your turn, [Pat.]

PAT KANE: Recommendation 6.2, this is section 4.2.1.10, ATRT2 recommends that the board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI to facilitate the GAC formally adopting a policy of open meetings to increase transparency in the GAC deliberations and to establish and publish clear criteria for closed sessions.

Conclusion, given the nature of the GAC, this recommendation's been implemented as much as it can be and it is effective as it can be. As

such, no further action's required relative to this recommendation.
Questions, commentary?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. 4.2.1.11, recommendation 6.3. ATRT2 recommends that the board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI to facilitate the GAC developing and publishing rationales for GAC advice at the time advice is provided. Such rationales should be recorded in the GAC register. The register should also include a record of how the ICANN board responded to each item of advice.

Conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Questions, comments? Pat.

PAT KANE: Recommendation 6.4, 4.2.1.12, the board working through the BGRI working group should develop and document a formal process for notifying and requesting GAC advice, see ATRT1 recommendation 10.

Conclusion, recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action with respect to this recommendation. Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just to assist those who were not living and breathing ATRT1, as some of you were, especially those of you who were in the remote participation, I'm sure you've got a right smile on your face for some of it.

ATRT1 spent a heroic amount of time looking at board GAC interaction. One of its primary objectives was this area. There were extensive recommendations made and extensive reactions and responses to those recommendations within of course a very different time and place for ICANN.Org, and of course, there's been a number of changes that have happened to clarify the relationships even during the accountability and transparency Work Stream 1 work, and also during our IANA transition work resulting of course in a couple of bylaws changes. So a huge amount has happened since ATRT1, and I venture to suggest looking at the timing of those things, ATRT2, an awful lot happened post-ATRT2, and what we need to do sometimes is recognize that the in good faith recommendations made, the in very good effort changes made. There might be still a small mismatch, but it is a best effort. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: One editorial note, I think about a year ago we changed BGRI into BGIC, Board GAC Interaction Group as proposal from the honorable gentleman from Iran, and it was [broadly] adopted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Maarten, but just on that, what is written by ATRT2 has to be in the document as she was writ in ATRT2. But what we need to do in anything in our text is note that we are capturing the new terminology,

and when we capture the new terminology, at that point in time we need to add a footnote so that that is very clear, back to where that resolved, why it was resolved and when it happened. [And that means over to] Pat now.

PAT KANE: [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 4.2.1.13, recommendation 6.5, the board should propose and vote on appropriate bylaw changes to formally implement the documented process for board-GAC bylaws, consultation as developed by the BGRI working group as soon as practicable, see ATRT1 recommendation 11. Increase support and resource commitments to the GAC, the ATRT1 recommendation 14.

Conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effected. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Questions, comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Comment from me. It's a minor thing, but I'm unsure why we're saying in the green, the conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective, and I'm happy for that. That statement is fine. I just don't quite understand why effectiveness assessment is then not applicable above.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Copy paste error.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so that's going to change.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Now fixed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now fixed. Righto. Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Real time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So we're just looking at the real time document for the moment. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: I think the comment was that the conclusion in green is fine. The text up above needs to be ... I'm just pointing out that it's not clear, so let's make sure that this is what you intended [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, the effectiveness assessment is correct. It's nonapplicable and we've agreed earlier in the discussion. We'll change that as per KC's note. And in the conclusion is where I made the error, because I copy

pasted from the previous one, and the previous one had an effective rating, this one does not. So we just remove “And is effective.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Daniel, is that covered now? Daniel’s point is covered. He was in the queue, but you picked up on it. Thank you very much. We completed on that one then.

PAT KANE: Tola, did you have something?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Yeah. [inaudible] it’s not applicable. Is that the way you’re referring to the effectiveness? Before the conclusion.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, earlier in the – okay.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: That first line on effectiveness, it says it’s not applicable. That’s what I want clarification on.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, that was our standard terminology up until today. Before you came in, we agreed to change not applicable to a new term, just to say that we could not judge effectiveness.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: I was thinking we're going to change that now when you say real time, so I thought –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, those I'll go through the document and make a global change after.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat?

PAT KANE: Section 4.2.1.14, recommendation 6.6. ATRT2 recommends that the board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI working group to identify and implement initiatives that can remove barriers for participation, including language barriers, and improving understanding of the ICANN model and access to relevant ICANN information for GAC members.

The BGRI working group should consider how the GAC can improve its procedures to ensure a more efficient, transparent and inclusive decision making. The BGRI working group should develop GAC engagement best practices for its members that could include issues such as conflict of interest, transparency and accountability, adequate domestic resource commitments, routine consultation with the local

domain name system stakeholder and interest groups, in an expectation that positions taken within the GAC reflect the fully coordinated domestic government position and are consistent with existing relevant national and international laws.

The conclusion on that is that given the nature of the GAC, this recommendation has been implemented as much as it can be and this is effective as it can be. As such, no further actions required relative to this recommendation.

Commentary, questions, concerns? Yes, Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes. Just a clarification here, that is something that with the [inaudible] of GAC members, there are sometimes many persons entering into the GAC as representatives, and so I don't believe that is completely implemented here because we need to recommend that put some clear process – like a diplomatic process – into accepting someone as GAC representative from each government, because actually, it's not the truth. And sometimes, people are less than shy and express and change things in other interest, not represent their government. So that is something that we got from the interview from the GAC and they need some kind of suggestion on that to be clearly implemented from the GAC part, because sometimes, it's hard to say "You're not the representative of your government" or [inaudible] because it's aggressive for that government. Maybe they have other rules and so on.

So [inaudible] need to put some clear process to accept a member as GAC. If they can go and assist them and whatever, and it's not as a voice

from that government itself. Okay, just to clarify that I do believe we need to still recommend something suggestion at least some – I believe there is another point – I don't remember exactly – in the recommendation that we reinforce that idea. But anyway, we need to have room to make this suggestion. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm going to go to Maarten, and I'll temporarily put myself in the queue as well.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay, two things. One is overall representation sometimes is an issue that is not well recognized, and it seldom leads to problems, but at times, it does. And we don't have clear rules to reestablish, etc.

So that's GAC and beyond. The other thing that is GAC and beyond, I very much agree with what was said here, but in our conclusions, at times we may more often say "Happy with what has been achieved and this is an area that requires continuous improvement." That's true for some areas, not for all. Sometimes it's just done. This is clearly an area where you're never done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that, Maarten. I'm delighted to follow on from that comment being a fan of continuous improvement in general. So now you all understand where my personal perspectives may come from when I choose to display them, and this is one of those times.

What I'm hearing is that the no further action is required is a part of the sentencing that does need to be reviewed and altered, and we may in fact consider making some high-level suggestions or general guidance principles to encourage GAC's own internal work on continuous improvement or similar sorts of political-type words.

It's not our job to redesign the GAC. We're not a GAC review team. We are in fact reviewing the effectiveness of how the GAC works with other parts of the community and vice versa, and specifically the board in particular, but it's not our job to try and review the GAC. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I'll take Maarten's continuous improvement. Here we have a language, "Routine consultation with local domain name system stakeholder and interest groups." I remember 15 or 20 years ago, when there was a discussion about the delegation and redelegation for ccTLDs, and there's a special GAC document on this which has introduced the language of the local Internet community, and the government is obliged to consult with the –

So in some countries, that's perfect, but in some countries, it's very low, and so far, the continuous improvement should make references so that the GAC sticks to its own principles which they have adopted. Their member states [inaudible] recommendation [inaudible] the GAC invitation would be that the GAC [inaudible] effectiveness of its own [instrument] with regard to this point. That means the consultation with local Internet community, because just as an observer, you have good examples and bad examples, and here we introduce best practice. So

that means to organize a push [inaudible] government who ignore what has been on paper, so it would be helpful, so this would be the push for government to know that some other groups look at this point and want to encourage them to be more engaged with their local Internet community. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Wolfgang. And we also need to recognize there's an issue of resource management within various governments and government departments as to how, what, and even if they are able to effectively and productively engage in the various types of ICANN work that we would desire them to.

So giving examples of fine or best practice or good practice, or industry standards or governance standards can, as has happened in the CC community offer opportunity for shopping around through other effective models to find out what a particular government may be able to implement themselves, but it's a very variable group, and that's just the nature of things.

I think then we're back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

4.2.1.15, recommendation 6.7, ATRT2 recommends that the board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI working group to regularize senior officials' meetings by asking the GAC to convene a high-level meeting on a regular basis, preferably at least once every two years. Countries and territories that do not currently have GAC representatives

should also be invited, and a stocktaking after each high-level meeting should occur.

Conclusion, the recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Questions, comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to remember about the previous discussion that the CROP in our region and probably in Africa region use also the opportunity to be in small and low-income countries to invite the government to participate too, so that is one of those results of CROP in our region. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nothing further then? Pat?

PAT KANE: Section 4.2.1.16, recommendation 6.8. ATRT2 recommends that the board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI working group to work with ICANN's global stakeholder engagement group – GSE – to develop guidelines for engaging governments, both current and non-GAC members to ensure coordination and synergy of efforts.

Conclusion, this recommendation's been fully implemented and is effective, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Comments, questions, concerns? Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. 4.2.1.17, recommendation 6.9, the board should instruct the GSE group to develop with community input a baseline and set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement that address the following; A, relationships with the GAC and non-GAC member countries, including the development of a database of contact information for relevant government ministers.

B, tools to summarize and communicate in a more structured manner government involvement in ICANN via the GAC as a way to increase the transparency on how ICANN reacts to GAC advice. Example by using information in the GAC advice register.

C, making ICANN's work relevant for stakeholders in those parts of the world with limited participation, and D, develop and execute for each region of the world a plan to ensure that local enterprises and entrepreneurs fully and on equal terms can make use of ICANN's services including new gTLDs.

Conclusion, this recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. Questions, thoughts, comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just making sure that we've picked up [inaudible] on this which is highlighted. It's just a piece of drafting, but it's a piece of drafting we don't want to lose. So thanks to KC to note that, and this is what will have to be looked at and perhaps modified in some way. So just recognizing that, that's all. Thank you. Anything else? Pat.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sorry, we're into section five, so Pat, 5.2.1.1, over to you. On page 60.

PAT KANE: Section 5.2.1.1, recommendation 7.1, the board should explore mechanisms to improve public comment through adjusted time allotments, forward planning regarding the number of consultations, given anticipated growth and participation and new tools that facilitate participation.

Conclusion, this recommendation has been implemented and is effective, as such no further action is required. Comments, questions, concerns? Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just noting that Sébastien had comments here and I assume we're going to go to Sébastien. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, you are predictive. Thank you very much, Cheryl. This document was meant to give you predictability, and I put my concern. I don't think

that this recommendation was both implemented and effective. Public comment is still public comment where we are not able to [inaudible] answer to the previous comments. It's the time allotment was supposed to be two times, it's now back to one time.

Therefore, what was implemented? Something that was decided by whom, when? First of all, we don't know what was supposed to be implemented and what is implemented. If I take the forward planning regarding the number of consultation, where you have it? Where we are looking for that? I bet you if we had that for the next three months, we will be very happy because we will see that we are in trouble with other things I will come back on when we will touch on.

But no, from my point of view, not done and no progress. The same type of people answer, and when new people come in, for good reason or bad reason, but as the ombudsman has looked after, it may be for good reason, you have a lot of comments who were dismissed. Then what is the improvement? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Michael, did you want to jump in or prepare to jump in there? But Bernie, you seem to want to react.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: The implementation report on this went through what was said, what was done. Secondly, on the comment response point, it was implemented, it was run for a period of time, and it was never used. There was not a single response as a response. There were some entries

that were made, but people were using it not to respond to comments that were made but to put in new comments because they hadn't met the deadline.

So it was in the implementation report, they say that was considered, it was discussed, and then it was removed since it wasn't being used for what it was meant to be. So I think some of the other things, if we look at it, minimum 40-day comment periods were instituted. Let's not forget this was six years ago. There were quite a few things that were implemented relative to this.

Now, is it the conclusion correct? I don't know, I'm just stating that when this was looked at from an implementation point of view, this was what was brought up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right of reply – brief one – thank you, Sébastien. And then Michael.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Bernie, thank you. This revision six years ago must have been under my chairmanship of the board participation working group, therefore, yeah, I know what was. But when [inaudible] when you want to kill your dog ...

If it's not working, then put it away. We need to find a solution and [tool must help] for that. Therefore, even if we say that it was implemented and effective, I think we need to say we need to do improvement and suggest even not recommending some improvement.

I don't want to spend time about implemented or not, but I want to spend time on we need to say something from ATRT3 on that subject. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Whether here or somewhere else in the document perhaps. Let's make a note of that. Do you want right of reply before we go to Michael?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, very quickly. In the survey results, we're going to have to deal with changes to public comment anyway, so we certainly will have the opportunity. I think that in this particular ATRT2 section, the implementation report was taken at face value and said there were all these things made, all these things tried. We walked back on some of them for some good reasons. We're letting this one as is, if you will. And for better deal with the results of the survey.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael, and then KC.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I'm still getting over that expression about dogs. So I feel like this is sort of what you already said insofar as there's two separate questions here. One of them is this sort of procedural question about whether there was an appropriate reaction to the recommendation, and that is important insofar as we assess whether recommendations are being taken seriously and whether the review processes are effective or

whether they're generating a proper response. That's question number one.

And then question number two, which I think is completely separate, is, is this still a problem, or has the problem been solved? Right, yes, and especially when we're talking about a six-year gap. So I don't think it's inconsistent at all to say there was a reasonable response to the recommendation and we are finding that that recommendation has not solved the problem entirely and that further progress is needed. That's where I think we are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Michael. Voice of reason as ever. KC.

KC CLAFFY: A quicker version of what Michael just said, this just seems like a classic case of it was implemented and it wasn't effective.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We might need to tweak the text to reflect that somewhere else in the document, we're looking at the overall effectiveness. And just briefly, I'd also point out that the matter of comment and reply comment was also discussed right back to ATRT1. And then we also did a very extensive analysis with some of the advisory committees and supporting organizations regarding how much time it would take and what effect it would have on the process.

It's a scary amount of time how long this could take. So it's one of those really good ideas, give it a go, and then you think, ah, but ... So there are very particular processes, and they've changed several times since these reports and recommendations were done. So how the GNSO works, how the At-Large Advisory Committee works, how the Government Advisory Committee work, etc., vastly different now than they were then, and we need to, somewhere in our document, pick that up, recognize it and consider it in any suggestions or recommendations going forward. Thank you, and I think that means we're back to – Alright, Maarten, if you insist.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I think this is also a clear example where we are all looking and trying to find the best way where we also never will all agree on what's perfect because 40 days is for some too long, for others too short. And we're willing to adapt when we see clear reasons to do it.

So with that, I think indeed, the reference to the survey is more like, "Okay, does this trigger a real new action or not?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Maarten. This might just be something for the potential consideration in the parking lot, but it strikes me that with something as needing to be agile and potentially dynamic as public comment process, the way it is currently designed, and even however it is in any future point in time, to not have a more reactive and responsive audit and review process attached to it is possibly a disservice because five, six or seven years is, woah, an awful lot goes on and an awful lot of "We're

doing it this way because this is the way it's designed" could be done differently in the interim.

So we might want to think if we make any form of suggestion in the recommendation here that some of the agility aspects that are associated with more continuous processes might need to be looked at. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

On that topic, let's remember we had a presentation from the public consultation team that they had done some of that, but in a limited way, if you will, when we thought about it. But they certainly have been working at it, so it's not like there has been nothing. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oh, no, certainly not nothing, but there is teamwork within the organization and there is bringing the community along with you in regular review and us all going in a hand in glove way forward. And they're not necessarily the same things. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I would like to suggest a change, because we can't say here it's functioning correctly and at the same time saying we will wait for the survey to say that it's not functioning correctly.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

[inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, I don't know where [inaudible] but to put that it's effective, it seems that the public comment process is functioning as it's what's meant to, not correctly. I will scrap "correctly."

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Effectiveness and conclusion are going to get rewritten on this one based on the discussion we've had.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So just on the sidebar, you'll note, "change effectiveness rating to a partial rating to note in the conclusion that we will be looking at this in another point in this section." And whilst that is not prose yet, it's a placeholder for making a change to that conclusion. Pausing to make sure everyone's comfortable with that way forward. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am, I just want to be sure that it's not just changing effectiveness to partially effective but it's also changing is functioning correctly, because it is not. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, I'm going to assume that that is going to get so noted somewhere. Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 5.2.1.2, recommendation 7.2, the board should establish a process under the public comment process where those who commented or replied during the public comment and/or reply comment period can request changes to the synthesis report in cases where they believe the staff incorrectly summarized their comments.

Conclusion, the recommendation has been implemented but was not effective. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation. This is what we talked about earlier where staff had implemented this and it was not used at all for what it was meant to be. Questions, thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It seems to me that our comfort as the review team and the drafters of this eventual document with the almost shorthand language here might need to be reconsidered, and we might need to look at this text for the new reader to perhaps have some clarification. So I think we might want to expand this particular conclusion just a little bit to clarify. I believe I have Sébastien and then Maarten. No? Vanda, then Maarten.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: While I tend to agree with you, the point is if it's not effective, it's implemented not effective, but it's not clear if the previous recommendation was needed. If it is needed and not effective – so they

need to implement in another way. So we need to make some suggestion or recommendation to implement in another way, because if it was not needed, it's another point. So we need to be clear here. It's not clear for me what is the intention of what they implemented since it was not effective.

If people are responding another way, maybe they need to implement in that other way. That's what the community wants to. Something like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. What I heard there is we still need to try and get it right. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I agree, it's true. One thing indeed we may need to be more specific also, there was a recommendation, but as such, it proved to be not relevant or necessary, or not necessary anymore. But I don't mind having recommendations and then try to find a solution, and then come to the conclusion. That happens more often, for instance even for GAC we now have this two-character code where they can check in the machine whether there's a problem with that. And up to today, we know that the system has been used but has not led to complaints that led to action. Still, it's a useful system.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten. Any more on this one then? So we're going to rejig the wording and we would welcome anybody around the table to put

into the suggestion mode if you've got wonderful words of wisdom which you believe would clarify this text, feel free to contribute them. It would be gratefully received, and I believe now it's to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Section 5.2.1.3, recommendation 8. The recommendation states, to support public participation, the board should review the capacity of the language services department versus the community need for the service using key performance indicators and make relevant adjustments, such as improving translation quality and timeliness and interpretation quality. ICANN should implement continuous improvement of translation and interpretation services, including benchmarking of procedures used by international organizations such as the United Nations.

Conclusion, some significant improvements have been implemented to the benefit of the community, but the establishment of effective measurement seems to be an ongoing issue, see section on accountability indicators. ATRT3 will consider making a suggestion with respect to the assessment of this recommendation.

Concerns, comments, questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We should pull out the comments from KC. Do you want to try to address some of those? Maarten, go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please rest assured I'm not trying to [contrary say] something about this here, but at what point would things become micromanagement, and where do we say, "Okay, let's pay attention to sufficient translation?" Because it's not good enough.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. As I've put in the comment, I would like to add that we suggest something in line with the recommendation but going maybe a little bit further, it's to improve the language services production. I know that it's a difficult topic how we translate something. Maybe the idea will be not just to have once again metrics or measurements but to see how we assure that it's a good translation.

There are ways to do that, and I think it's not done. From my last update on the language services, they were not using it, but maybe now they are using it. We need to figure out what is the real situation of this language services today. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wolfgang, then Michael.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: [The way you say here effective measurements, that means what are the criteria?] So in this, if you have always [inaudible] so that we can have relevant [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just in case the audio wasn't brilliant, the point that Wolfgang was making was with relation to some of the metrics or measures which would be relevant here is of course use and cost of such services. I have Michael, and then we'll go back to Sébastien and then Vanda.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. I'm inclined to focus more on assessment than actually seeking to make recommendations on use of translation languages themselves, because if we don't have that data, it's tough to make those recommendations.

This is an issue that comes up a lot in the NCSG, and I always feel a little bit shy going into it because I am an English speaker, so this isn't something that I directly engage with, but at the same time, assessment and finding out if things are doing well shouldn't be that difficult, and it feels like this is not rocket science to see if people are being adequately served.

So in terms of the quality of translation, Sébastien, how is the French translation? You would know that. It seems trivially easy for ICANN to go out to the community people that use these services and ask about the quality and get feedback from that perspective, if it's not done already.

And then beyond that in terms of KPIs – and again, I also agree in terms of that it's challenging to assess the cost aspects of that and the cost-benefit allocation is difficult for us to do, but similarly, you could look at which languages are most in demand ... If you have stuff on the different webpages that's translated into a bunch of different

languages, are we finding that certain languages are really in high demand and that other ones are less in demand?

It feels like this is an area where assessment could be done pretty easily, and if that's not being done, then that's kind of surprising and certainly I think low hanging fruit in terms of a recommendation. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I've got Bernie with the right of reply. Sébastien, and then Vanda, and I'm putting myself in the queue.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just to note that we'll be taking this up in the accountability indicators.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just an example, that is for our region, that is a lot of different also language where people cannot really go to another language, and what I see is less problem the online transmission and translation, but the formal translation of document.

For instance, we are seeing right now that majority of the problems we had in the past with our region, we just figure out now that the translation from Spanish to English is completely different. And we start discussing with Caribbean group, and they said [you are crazy because this is right,] and no, it's not.

So we start to read both sides, but just few of us can do that. And really, it's another thing. So they interpret correctly and the Latin group also interprets correctly, and we can never [inaudible] an agreement because it's impossible. It's completely different statement.

So we review that in the review for the community to make sure that is clear. It's just to remember the problems can be more not in the online things, because people react easily for they listen so they react. But in the statements that are translated, written papers that you never read again, so it's done, and you are using that as clear and logically the same one. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Back to Bernie. I'm still in the queue.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm good now. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm delighted to hear you're good. Just a couple of things, and some of what I've heard, there is a difference between formal and informal use in language services. We need to be aware of the likelihood of minor errors having to be recognized and the desirability of people checking meaning before reacting when such language services are coming into play.

But two things I'd like to pin to the board while we're at this point, and then come back to it when we get to accountability indicators as well.

Part of it is a “build it and they will come” story. You can't measure the uptake in Swahili until you've got Swahili there for your Swahili users to actually use it. So there is this cart before horse. Now, I used Swahili because we haven't had a cry to get that as one of the vital languages, so I was deliberately using an example which was not one that we've adopted, but you see the rationale there, and there may be some documents and some purposes for language purposes where it is worthwhile having in these languages because of the archival nature of what that then means. There's a whole lot of different factors that come into play.

The other thing, since this recommendation was made, we are in very different tool usage territory. We are no longer limited to all human intervention. The example Vanda was giving was an example of the most awful machine translation issues that you could possibly imagine. It really was, this caused incredible problems.

But now, for example, there are the ability to have the running text across with the TTY [fields] being done. Now, that can happen in multiple languages, and that's actually a cheaper option in some ways than some other things.

It depends on the tools, we've got different possibilities. And can I just declare? I have a real thing about the use of the term “key performance indicators” when it doesn't fit to use the term “key performance indicators.”

ATRT2 did. God love your little cotton socks, ATRT2. But I would value the fact that in our document, we keep away from that specific

terminology unless we're talking about giving bonuses for performance of stuff.

Who's next?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Policy development, page 76. Item 7.2.1.1, recommendation 10.1, to enhance GNSO policy development process and methodologies to better meet community needs and be more suitable for addressing complex problems, ICANN should ...

It's a long list. In line with ongoing discussions within the GNSO, the board should develop funded options for professional services to assist GNSO policy development working groups. Such services could include training to enhance working group leaders and participants' ability to address difficult problems and situations, professional facilitation, mediation, negotiation. The GNSO should develop guidelines when such options may be invoked.

B, the board should provide adequate funding for face-to-face meetings to augment e-mail, Wiki and teleconference for GNSO policy development process. Such face-to-face meetings must also accommodate remote participation, and considerations should also be given to using regional ICANN meetings. Moreover, the possibility of meetings added on the start or end of ICANN meetings could also be considered. The GNSO must develop guidelines for when such meetings are required and justified, and who should participate in such meetings.

C, the board should work with the GNSO and the wider ICANN community to develop methodologies and tools to allow the GNSO PDP to utilize volunteer time more effectively, increasing the ability to attract busy community participants into the process and also resulting in quicker policy development.

Conclusion, given that the success and effectiveness of any GNSO policy development effort can be strengthened by nonbiased, focused and consensus-oriented leadership with experience in negotiation facilitation and mediation, 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 development working group leaders in our community.

That should be further develop. Okay, minor edit there. Given the competition for resources to not only implement recommendations and working group outcomes but to actually facilitate policy development is high within the ICANN community and that the technology for remote and distributed team facilitation has evolved over the past six years, ATRT3 recognizes that the ATRT3 recommendations to fund a greater number of 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 short-range travel options to permanent ICANN-operated micro hubs that greater facilitate participation and effectiveness in global meetings while reducing the amount but not quality of volunteer participation and input.

Alright. Questions, comments, thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, we can always dream that online system will work, that micro hub will be set up, but for the moment, we say it didn't happen and we say that we will suggest that we will push in that direction. [No.] Face-to-face meeting is absolutely necessary where we are, how we work.

And I'm sorry, I will be a little blunt and maybe you will not appreciate, but please, listen to the ones who are not speaking or writing English when you take that into account, because yes, when you have no problem with English, it's much better to be online, to be following a text and to listen to somebody and to read the chat.

I am not able to do that. And the other point that we need to take into account is the body language. The body language is something very important in what we are doing as we are people coming from different cultures, places and so on.

Therefore, I don't think that it's yet a solution. The day where we will have all in whatever offices a big screen with everybody in front of us that we will be able to discuss clearly and simply, maybe we will be able to do that. But for the moment, we have even problem to be sure not to talk at the same time. We use tool for that even if we are in the same room, then I think we don't put the horse too much in advance as where we are really in that. And for the moment, I am all for face-to-

face meeting, not because I like traveling, because I like to meet you in person to travel and to walk in the morning, but because it's more efficient on what we have to deliver. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Is there anyone else who wishes to jump in on this? I've got Pat, and I'm going to put myself in the queue.

PAT KANE: Sébastien, I think that you're right in many cases, but when the option is no participation versus some participation, I think we need to kind of extend the group and at least first-time participants can [inaudible]. In a hub scenario, I'll use the Nairobi meeting for example, so in Nairobi, there were many companies that would not send their people to the meeting, one of them being Verisign, and we actually set up in a hotel in Reston, Virginia, for participation for likeminded people.

So while we only had probably 30 people there, we were Nairobi West for how we declared our participation in the ICANN meeting. And we participated in the middle of the night, but we had rooms at the hotel that were available to us all night long, staffed all night long as a micro hub, and we had participation amongst the room, and then we were able to interact across the tools that were available.

So I agree with face-to-face, but having smaller opportunities for smaller teams face-to-face as opposed to 30 people individually on their own computers in their home or their own office, it was a much better

solution. So we had conversations in the room and then projected those across to the broader audience in Nairobi.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Pat. Wolfgang, Michael, and then Sébastien.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you. This is [inaudible] and it's much broader than just face-to-face or online. In the academic world, we have discussions since a decade or longer whether online education can substitute real education, and everybody would agree that it's complementary, so it means you have to have the direct communication with the students, but a lot of things can be done via online education.

But what is the main purpose or what's behind this recommendation is higher level of effectiveness of PDP in the GNSO. And you can have dozens of face-to-face meetings. If the people are unable to agree, if they have no will to agree, then the PDP will go for two, five, ten years without any agreement.

And insofar you know there's a question behind this question, so how we can develop – this is a more theoretical question and I know it's nearly impossible to [integrate] this into recommendation, but how we can enhance the readiness or the development of political will to look for rough consensus in certain PDPs.

So Maarten mentioned the EPDP. The expectation was if you push for them so they will come faster to an agreement, it's some progress. But what I was thinking already before this work started, probably the

ATRT3 could institute a system where we say, okay, if a PDP is started, we need a timeline, let's say for two or three years. If the group is unable to produce within this time period reasonable result, we stop the process and have a break, and then probably we restart it.

But to continue with the PDP over three, five, seven or more years is senseless and it produces also a very negative side effect where it eats away a lot of resources, and then you can have another face-to-face meeting, another face-to-face meeting, and this is a waste of resources if there is no will.

As I said, I do not have any idea how this could be translated in the recommendation, but to link a PDP to a certain time frame and to say if you are unable to agree, then we stop and then we restart probably after a period of two years so that the pressure from the issue gets higher and people are pushed to bring the political will to the table. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Wolfgang, Michael, Sébastien, and Maarten.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: On the question of the regional hubs and the face-to-face meetings for PDPs, we just talked previously in an earlier recommendation about promoting equitable participation and travel resources and all that. I think this is all the same conversation, and I think that in crafting our recommendations, we need to connect these different strands into a single discussion about resourcing travel and engagement and how that

should be done, whether enough is being done, how that should be targeted. I think these all need to be brought together because fundamentally, it's the same question. And we're asking for resources and we need to think carefully as part of that discussion about the type of prioritization that we put on that and how we should structure our recommendations in a way that suits this broader goal. So I do think that these need to be – once we move forward, we need to connect these different strands together.

I wanted to mention on the idea of these additional face-to-faces, the example of the intersessional is potentially something that we should bear in mind where that's been done in previous years. This year as far as I understand it, the NCSG wanted to do it and the CSG did not want to do it, and it ended up being scrapped or its current status is indeterminate as a result of that.

I'm not sure if there's a specific – it's not a really clear picture to draw a lesson out of, but I do think that the challenges in implementing that are useful as we talk about these travel resources, because that seems to be exactly what this kind of recommendation was aiming at.

And finally, on the idea that the PDPs and the timeframes [inaudible] a little outside this issue, but I do want to mention that the problem with these indeterminate time frames and saying "Well, if you drag the process out then there's going to be negative consequences" as a motivator for people to agree is when you're in these PDPs, it's not always the case that everyone wants to get to a conclusion.

So there can be parties around the table that benefit from the PDP just going down in flames or dragging out because they like the status quo and they realize that any changes are not going to be beneficial for them. that's been my experience, pointing at no one constituency in particular as being frustrating to me from that perspective.

So it is worth bearing that in mind and that it's important not to craft recommendation that would play into that tendency.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Michael. I've got Sébastien, Maarten and Bernie, and Daniel, and I really would like that [inaudible] at some point.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I think we can start a discussion about PDP and spend the three days on that issue, how to solve the PDP. And we have to take into account that an internal work of the council of the GNSO is working on what they call PDP 3.0, and you know better than me, but what I learned listening to the preparation of the ICANN meeting is that when we talk about PDP 3.0, it's council work, nothing else. It's important but nothing else.

Okay, I just wanted to come back to the question on how we are efficient for PDPs and I extend that to cross-community working group or to review teams. I think we can find new tools, but not in expense of not having face-to-face meeting.

And the example you took part is it was for an ICANN meeting, and it's a little bit different from my point of view. Even if it's a good experiment,

I would be happy if we offer the same thing, for example we have five people from Africa not able to come to ICANN meeting because of the VISA. I will be happy that ICANN organize a hub with good communication and that they allow to participate to the ATLAS III, but [it's not done,] and therefore, yes, let's try other. It was in Washington you were dealing with, you organized everything and it was a good experiment, but it was yet just an experiment. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think we should really look at this and take it down to what it really is. If we talk about effective support of face-to-face meetings, yes, that's important. But keep in mind that things are changing in terms of we're now more regional present on one end, but technology is also changing. Zoom does offer the possibility for room up to 20 people to see each other's faces, raise your hands and use your facial expressions which some of us tend to do in face-to-face meetings as well. And that's often not used.

And of course, the warning that with this, potentially, it's an enormous resource drain. Volunteer time, one thing, but also staff time, and the travel money. Therefore, we need to be very careful in what the amount you would put into such a thing.

And that doesn't take away the effective support of face-to-face meeting will remain important and how we can improve that. On the

other hand, I very much agree with the suggestions that there's other means to enhance effectiveness and the time frame is a clear example.

And the whole activity we started on improving the multi-stakeholder model is part of that too, because one thing when Michael says there's no interest in any outcome in some places and then the process is blocked, if I hear that, I hear [UN,] right? And this is what we don't want to become. We want to demonstrate that we can deal with our business together. So let's keep the part. Effective support of face-to-face meeting is one thing, effective PDP is another thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten. Daniel, please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm happy that this discussion is taking place. I'll just mention about the previous GNSO RDS working group whereby they stipulated a time frame of two years but ended up pushing the discussions for approximately three years.

And another thing came up when the EPDP started, the RDS got grounded. So I think the one year extra that went into the discussion and the deliberation of the GNSO RDS is a very clear example that if the timelines are not being met, what are the strategies that we could recommend to effectively have at least the work to be enhanced?

I think that still remains a question that has got to be answered. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Daniel. Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I will make a few personal comments here. I've been around a long time at some of these processes, and a few observations that may help in this is everyone signs up, few people do the work. Then those people doing the work, when they're getting near a decision, then a whole bunch of people swoop in and you have to reexplain all the work to them.

So on efficiency – each time, yes – for me, this whole notion of people signing up and not showing up and not participating is at the root of a lot of our problems when we talk about this, and we think that's okay. If there are no consequences for it and then you just swoop in at the end and you get a vote just like everybody else who worked, yeah, it's going to drag things out for a real long time. That's just the reality, but I've discussed this with several people over the years, and everyone sort of throws their arms in the air and they go, "Well, that's the volunteer model."

I'm not so sure. I think that's a key issue we don't talk about that is a fact. The other thing is as Wolfgang mentioned, timelines really help. They have to be realistic, I agree, but you have to work a timeline from a professional point of view. I think this whole notion of people get together and then it's just like you talk about it and then you decide if it's going to be that kind of policy, then there is no timeline on it and

you just get together when there are ICANN meetings if you show up, and that's fine. That's what it's going to be.

In the ccNSO, we've done a few of those, and it's taken four years sometimes, or more, but that was okay. That was not what was expected, there was no special meetings. We had teleconferences, two weeks or months, and then just to keep the flow going and have documents.

Which brings up the next point, is there's a lot of talking at these meetings. Few people write. That is another one of our key problems. People stand up in these meetings and give these long speeches, and then you go, "Okay, well, fine. Write something so that we can look at it and discuss it properly." That's it. The moment you say you're going to write something.

And before Tola [says it,] yes, there is an issue of language and some people will just talk, but we're not asking for prose, we're just asking for people to actually write anything and combine, and I think León will back me up from our Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 experiences on some of those things.

So it's all those things that I think we have some evolved over the years some very bad habits versus our expectations for some of those things, and I think to a certain extent, we're scared of cleaning that up because it might scare some people. That's a personal opinion. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jaap, and then Vanda.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Being around a little bit as well, I noticed that this is not only an ICANN problem. It happens everywhere. You see the same stuff happening in CENTR circles, IETF and god knows what else, the ISOC. Getting people to actually do what they initially commit to is really an uphill battle.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [inaudible] response?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You may indeed. Go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I absolutely agree with Jaap, but this is what we're talking about. If there are no consequences, then of course there's no way you're going to do anything with that. And maybe that is what needs to be looked at.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, Tola, Sébastien.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: My point is clear. I believe that volunteer work in any other place, that is much for social [inaudible]. If you commit, you must be professional and do your work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, [that's what I am.] And if you are not committed – you are not forced to be committed, you decide to commit. So if you decide to commit, go there. If you're not, you're free to go out. So we are done nowadays in the LACRALO [inaudible] difficulties that we have there that we decide that is our group. [inaudible] you have committed until today. It's committed, this is a group, nobody comes back, nobody goes out, and let's go and do the work.

So no new observers can do anything or enter into the group. If you are a member, you are a member. If you're not a member, so sorry, you lose the opportunity. The next time, go alert and join.

So we need to be professional in our own commitment. That's what I see around ICANN for 20 years, that is what is making it difficult to do – I have been in United Nations representing my country for many years, and whatever, if you don't agree, sorry about that. So I'm sorry, it's done, because ... That's my position. It's radical, but it is the only way to make things happen timely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: That's interesting. Cheryl already said it's radical before you even concluded, and you made it radical. Okay, I've heard a couple people

say “I've been around 20 years.” I'm the opposite, I'm just around the block, but I've been around somewhere else.

On a serious note, we discussed it in Marrakech, we said something about that. So perhaps we need to take a decision on it. Could be part of the recommendation we're going to be making, to say if you volunteer, [inaudible] what is expected.

In making that suggestion, I'm mindful of two principles, and the principle is in group formation. In group formation, it is almost impossible for 100% of the people to behave in the same way. Of course, we can draw in friends to. We can draw influence from Pareto rule. Pareto rule says 20% of the people will do the job of 80%.

So it's a tested theory, principle over the years that [inaudible]. So 20% of the people will do the job of the rest of the 80% of the people. And that's on one hand. On the other hand, in group dynamics as well, we know that the ideal people who want to do the job, come with the [inaudible] come with the ideas, [inaudible] waiting for everybody to round up, and when you round off the project, then they'll be pointing out errors.

And sometimes, we don't even see the errors that they're going to see, and if we throw them away from the beginning, it means we're probably throwing away the quality assure they're bringing. So it's a big difficulty. [inaudible] for me. I like to also take position – so if you volunteer, you're not active for a particular point of time, you're going to be yanked off. However, suppose one of those who have been

yanked off [inaudible] bring in quality assurance at some point, whether [inaudible].

So for those that had been around for a long time, we can advise[inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right of reply, Bernie, and then Sébastien.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: I hope it's not radical.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, I understand and I agree with what you're saying, but what I was talking to more is people who sign up and don't show up for a couple of months, an then all of a sudden when it's time to call a vote on something, just show up and you have to reexplain everything.

The mechanics of groups review team are the mechanics of groups. Yes, I agree. You will get about 20% doing the work. But the other 80% have to be around to see what is going on, otherwise it's really not very useful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. It's very interesting discussion, and mixed feeling here. Yes, we need to have people engaged and I am asking this question since long time here in this group, [for the engagement of] everyone when you sign up for ATRT, one, two, three, five, seven, it's ATRT and from my point of view, it's one of the more important work that ICANN must fulfill in those days. Therefore, if you put your name, you need to do it in conscience and not just have your name in the team. And I am sorry, but it seems that it was not the case for everybody.

Second point is that when you talk about people talking and not writing, I just want to tell you that when I have to write something in French, it's an [inaudible]. Imagine what it is for me to write something in English. I am more talker than a writer, therefore if you ask me to write, I will try to do it and I am trying to do what you request me to do, but you have to have conscience that when you ask me to read 400 pages in English, I can't. It's too long, too complicated. Sometimes I read one sometimes and I have to read it three times to be sure that I understand, and two other times to be sure I agree or disagree.

Therefore, we have to take into account that if you give me a text in French, I can read it quite easily, quite quickly. If you give me the need to comment it, if I have to comment it in talking, I will do it quite quickly. If you ask me to write it, it will take me two, three, four, five, ten [weeks.]

Therefore, it's where we need to take into account, and I take the Tola point of view about the quality assurance. Maybe it's a very small thing, but I think it's important, and it's not taken very well into account

because usually, those people come in at the end and you say, “But why you don’t tell me two weeks ago?” I don’t tell you that two weeks ago because I just read it and I can't tell you – I just need to read this document yesterday. I just see, I have put comment yesterday night. It’s the moment I was able to finish, and once again, some part of the document, I had to read it a few times. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: On the writing part, yes, we have to understand the environment we’re working on, but as I said, two things. First, we’re not asking people to write prose. If you're going to take the time of the floor to bring up a new idea or criticize an existing idea, then certainly, you can take a few minutes to go on a Google doc, like you’ve done here, and actually write in the comments. That’s what's important.

Some participation in writing as opposed to simply critiquing verbally in a meeting or expounding new ideas and just walking out, and “You guys take the job of doing that.” That’s all I'm trying to avoid. So yes, I sympathize a lot, but I think there's an adjustment that can be made versus the people who really refuse to officially participate. Because for me, just talking is a limited form of participation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Going to Michael. I want to go very briefly to Wolfgang, and I'll remind you all I am still in the queue. Just saying. Go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think that what Sébastien said raises kind of an interesting idea in terms of a recommendation. Again, tying back into something that we were talking about earlier in terms of translation services and whether it's being used effectively. Would there be [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are we back? Great. Okay, Michael, back to you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I was saying that Sébastien's previous intervention raised an interesting idea insofar as, do we want to consider a recommendation about providing targeted language support insofar as if a member in a PDP who does not speak English as their native language wishes to do some drafting, that they could specifically offer translation services on that narrow, indirect way? Responsively. Not to say that it should be ICANN's policy to translate every single draft, because that would obviously be unworkable, but to have an open – either a fund or a resource, or assign kind of a budget to PDPs, something to say if we have a specific request for translation services, particularly in terms of drafting if people want to draft in their native language, that that could be translated into English.

I think that's an interesting idea to facilitate that kind of participation. I understand that ICANN probably spends an astronomical amount of money on translating, and making this recommendation, I wonder how much it would cost them, because I used to get things translated when I

was with my NGO for very cheap, and I bet that ICANN spends literally eight to ten times what I did for the same amount.

So I think it's worth looking into how much this kind of thing would cost, but I wonder if that's worth considering as far as the entire recommendation goes.

The other thing that I wanted to mention in terms of PDPs and this whole idea of the 80% of the people that just show up for the vote, that is why I found the EPDP to be such an intriguing type of model where instead of having this open working group, you say each stakeholder group has one or two people and we create a smaller, eight or ten people that are drawn from the different community groups that creates a more level playing field and allows for more even representation, and I think would also address that potential issue of having people just swarm in for the final vote.

Obviously, doing it that way comes at a cost of the openness of the groups. That's the tradeoff that's there, is between efficacy and ease of engaging, I guess you want to say, and I also would be interested to know because I was not in EPDP myself whether people found that to be an effective model.

But I do think that that's something to look into a little more carefully, is whether that model of limited participation may be something to look to in promoting efficacy.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Michael. Wolfgang, you had a small intervention, and Tola, I'm assuming you –

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I think the point raised by Michael is important, but I want to refer to what Bernard has mentioned. In my eyes, this is a question of accountability of not only the board but the SOs and ACs and members of the PDPs.

So when we discussed in the IANA transition the accountability of the board, we developed some instruments by removing a member of the board from the board if he does not behave accordingly. So this was – I was at this time in the board and we said it's okay, if a board member does not meet the criteria, we should remove him.

And then we introduced the issue of SO and AC accountability, and here we are still in the air, so we do not have instrument to implement accountability on a very concrete level for SOs and ACs. And I think this is an issue. Again, I don't know – because we are looking into the board activities and not SOs and ACs, but just, you know, to put this discussion into context, I think this is an open issue, accountability of SOs and ACs which has to be further discussed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, do go ahead.

PAT KANE:

I was going to try to bring this back to the actual conclusion that we've got in the document that this is written in one very specific view of what we had the conversation that we've had, so when we write this conclusion, maybe we should be broader in what we say and not so specific so that when we get to the recommendation, we can write more detail in the recommendation and make this be more encompassing given the breadth of the conversation that we've had here this morning.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And just as an update for everybody, with seven minutes to our lunch and break, we'll be shifting any conversation about the accountability indicators into the post-lunch agenda and all of the agenda will move down accordingly. We will also, I suspect, probably only get one morsel bite of the cherry of what we're doing here before we take our break.

If I may remind you what this recommendation is all about. It's all about specifically enhancement suggestions for GNSO policy development processes as they were a very long time ago.

There has been not one but now two variations and developments, evolutions – the next one is possibly quite a marked evolution – within the GNSO. And remember, the GNSO council is the manager of the PDP processes. Not us. All we can do is hope that any observations we make are in sync with their decision.

As a result, however, of 10.1 out of ATRT2 and other recommendations relating to policy development, no the least of which is specific to the GNSO but including all of those that were specific to the GNSO, things

like the ability to have the expedited policy development process came to pass.

So we could only run an EPDP because that was capable of being run, and that was a result of implementation of this work that is described. So there is a bunch of well done, hail fellow, well met, type stuff here.

But we also need to recognize that the version one of the GNSO guidelines for policy development was in existence when ATRT2 wrote its recommendations, that it's had a complete overhaul to the current one that is still operational today, plus there have been some implementation changes brought in, and of course, what we've learned out of cross-community working group and EPDP has also changed how things are done quite radically as well.

But we have within the GNSO council, yet to be let loose in the wild, but do please make sure we observe and watch carefully what conversations do or don't happen when we get to the Montreal meeting, a PDP 3.0 as well as the work in the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. And nearly every one of our observations talked here today are in all of that work are germane to what these recommendations and changes are making.

However, if you look at the human cost and real cost of running the EPDP, it is not insignificant. In fact, it's very significant, and it runs in these guidelines of the board making available the ability to travel, to meet face-to-face, to have moderation, facilitators, all of that that has been done with the EPDP as [inaudible] has in fact been able to happen because of where we are now.

Whether that's where we should be in the future is yet to be discussed and determined, but it is also well recognized that how one designs, charters, time binds a specific piece of work in these policy development processes also has to change and in 3.0, there are a number of options to changes which are yet to be determined that they are in the mix to be discussed.

So the GNSO council has a number of alternatives. Some suggestions are absolutely, you would think we had written them, from what I've heard around the table today, things like – actually as they did with the EPDP – signing up for performance, undertaking. “As a capital M Member of this group, I will undertake the following activities, and if I can't keep up with those activities, I will step down to the observer status and someone else can take my seat at the table.”

So the types of solutions that are in progress or discussion are, I'm very confident, going to also come a long way [inaudible]. So we don't need to reinvent these wheels. We do need to make sure when we are making any recommendations or suggestions, that we are fully apprised of an aware of what is likely to happen in these other processes.

Thank you. With that, it is one minute to midday and I'm assuming that we have – how much more to do in this section, Bernie? Can you do a quick appraising?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The proposal is that this is an important matter, we do need to do a lot more homework. We might need a small team, but I would prefer us to still work in plenary at this point, otherwise we're just going to have to get all the plenary up to date anyway, but I think we need to take this and come back to it. I would suggest we'll be really overhauling the text in our space here, but [inaudible] we more importantly need to look at if we make suggestions and recommendations, what type of material we will have access to and what we'll be appending and referring to.

Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may have one minute for Any Other Business at the end of the session, I will be happy. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly. Okay. We can do that after Bernie gives us an idea of what's next. Alright, so ladies and gentlemen, just so we know where we're going to be, we're probably going to take 15 or 20 minutes. When we reconvene at 05:30 UTC, that is 13:30 local Singapore time, so for those in the remote participation, that'll be 05:30 UTC, the first 15 to 20 minutes will be taking us through this next section and then we will continue on with our agenda.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [We have like six more sections to do.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Understood. Okay, so hopefully they won't all take as long as this one. But it's worthwhile, important work. Don't get me wrong. Sébastien, over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I just want to take this opportunity to say two things, or maybe three. The first is that in Singapore, the board launched the new gTLD program in March 2013, and this day five years ago in Los Angeles, I left the board. You don't care, but I care.

My last point was more you will know – and we have already written or said something, but I am very concerned and I was very sad to learn the passing of Tarik, and I think a moment to think about him when we are talking about GAC, interaction with the community, he has done a lot in this direction, and it's why I was thinking of him this morning. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Without any lack of respect as we now go to lunch, I think we've got a lot of work ahead of us, but many of us did take time to memorialize in the blog or send our empathy, sympathy and condolences to his family. And yes, what was it, [I think it was four names put into the new group.] But there was an anniversary today, not just Sébastien's anniversary as he outlined.

Is there anything else anyone wishes to say? Because it's your time now. I'm looking at three minutes past 12:00. KC, over to you.

KC CLAFFY:

I'm just trying to think about the afternoon because I don't think I going to make it past when you guys come back from lunch. I think for the next little bit of the document, I don't have any comments, but my comments are down in the end about the review team work party. So I'm wondering how should we proceed. I don't want to block the group, but I definitely will join tomorrow at the same time from the beginning of the meeting until noon. So maybe as you guys go through it, if you block on things that you don't know what I meant or disagree with what I suggested in the text – because I do think I have a little bit more contentious issues later in the document than I did earlier – we could just punt it to when I'm back or somebody make a note that I have to look at it. Or let me know how I can best contribute.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, KC. We appreciate that it's already been a long day for many of you in remote participation. You're active in the Google doc. If the circumstances arise, we'll make sure that as you've noted, we have already today taken into account your comments that have gone through. We will continue to do that.

We will make a note in the sideline if there is a point of contention or disagreement around the table and we will park it until we come back to it tomorrow or whenever in the agenda. So just when you're ready, have a browse through the Google doc from this point on, and if there's anything there, it should be easy for you to find. Is that helpful?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I think a lot of the recommendations that maybe require discussion are about what should happen to these reviews, like are they effective and how might we want to shape them. I guess that's going to be a broader discussion at some point during this three-day meeting, and I appreciate if I can get into that discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed it is, and it won't be happening this afternoon, so don't worry. [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your voice, like everyone else's, will be heard. Okay, so with that, and now five minutes into your lunch time, we will see you back – we're going to close off the recording now, and you all don't need to have on the record the administrative details of however we get to wherever we're having lunch. So thank you, one and all. We'll be returning at 13:30 local time, which is 05:30 UTC.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]