BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. I'd like to welcome to the ATRT3 GAC work party meeting number three on the 1st of October 2019 at 11:00 UTC.

Members joining the call today are Vanda, Liu, Pat, Jacques, Cheryl, and Sébastien. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie has joined. We have apologies from Maarten.

Today's call is being recoded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record, and I guess we're turning the call over to Bernie first. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Brenda. Alright. Vanda, you don't want me to go through the base of the report, right?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. Really, no. Go just to the ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, good.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, [inaudible] at the least.

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.

EN

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, okay. Alright. Let's go to section 4.3, Brenda, please. Sorry, 4.2.3. Yes. So basically, we have gone through the ATRT2 stuff. We have gone through the survey stuff and agreed to the conclusions.

What I did was go through all of that and see where we had the need to make some recommendations, and I thought I would write that out, and that's the text we have in front of us in blue.

Sorry, that's the information that we got from the meeting in the GAC, which we said we would add to here, which is now added, so let's go over it since it's the first time we've got it officially.

Okay. Where and how do you believe the GAC accountability, etc., all the questions. And a little lower. From the interview, we took notes, [annex, ah, will it be in the annex or not, so the reports?] That's the first question. I would agree that the notes should be in an annex unless there is strong recommendation from people here that they really want to see it in the text.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hi. Well, that's my suggestion, that I don't believe that notes that has no connection, one to the other, should be in the text. I believe that notes should be there just to give context what we have done, and this is just annex for anyone to take a look at that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Absolutely agree with you, Vanda. So if anyone has a disagreement, speak up now or forever hold your piece, as they say. Going once, going

twice, sold. So Vanda, yes, we have agreement on this. Let's go down a bit.

Now we've got the results in this table. Some of the issues – right, so communique language, second level of transparency, accountability on the process [item so let's close the] loop, and then we have under transparency items clarification of consensus that shall be better defined, GNSO GAC process, could start using example of GAC board process, need to adjust the process to fit into the GNSO. Link of process with the board URL there. And under accountability, we have credentials as a diplomat.

Under general issues, one week after ICANN 65, we had a call to finalize our agreement and added the following notes. And I agree again, in my opinion this sentence should not be included just for you as reference. I think that's a pretty good idea. Capacity building about business model of domain industry, talk with our own representatives on GAC to get more feedback, not consensus advice – I guess that should be a strawman poll indication to sense of direction GAC is taking related to any policy issues.

On community, keeping close relationship between community members and GAC members for the same country, agree on community group issues, and important to reassure that no country can represent other in GAC or any other organization. So I think those are all good points. I'll go through that and adjust the language so that there are a few edits I would do. It won't change the sense, but it'll –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just to make it clear for all of you that was not there, that was a meeting that we had on 5 of July and just Jacques, myself and Bernie, and I do believe that is just my notes on that, and certainly needs some adjustment and maybe some other [inaudible] Jacques has made any other notes, because that was my notes on this meeting for 5 of July. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. So Jacques, if you want to add anything, let me know. Jacques, over to you.

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah, Vanda, it's not so much about – I'm fine with what you say, it's just a few clarification. What do you mean about capacity building about business model of domain industry? What's capacity building in your mind?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, that's something that the one point that the GNSO has raised in the GAC, in my notes during the interviews inside the 65 is about to explain better to the GAC how is the [most] general understanding about how is the business, how they work, because this sometimes looks like lack of understanding from GAC side about the industry model, how they sell, many models that registrar for instance has to address to the people, to their clients, and how this works, because sometimes GNSO raise the point that they understand that looks like people from the GAC is looking to then like, you know, some people

from another world, and maybe this, like a webinars, if they are really doing this, but maybe not exactly addressing in a correct language to be understood correctly by the GAC. That's what I heard. I put these notes in during this call. We just think about it could be a good idea to have those webinar more clearly explained business models in most simple language.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay. So if I hear you correctly, this could be a change by lack of education about business model of domain industry, and its impacts on the Internet. Would that be more like it?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, could be. As I said, that was my notes –

JACQUES BLANC: Sure.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: But that is it. That's the impact that the relationship could be improved in the effectiveness of relationship between GNSO and the GAC could be improved if the understanding of the model, from both sides, the business model, the GNSO really do not understand especially in registrars that are more business than really the registries. They need to understand better how does the GAC [behave or] what they can do, what they cannot do, why they are making this or that suggestion in the communique.

So inside this process that should be done between GAC and GNSO, an effort to make both sides understand the other side behavior, it's quite relevant from the improvement of this effectiveness in my opinion.

JACQUES BLANC: Just a question for Bernie. How are we going to play this? Do we edit this on the fly so to speak, or do we follow the notes that we'll get out of this two-hour workshop and then do our edits?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I will take a crack at editing this stuff, and I think we'll make much better progress if you wait for my edits and then you can critique them online.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, got that, and I close my mouth for now.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright.

LIU YUE: Excuse me.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Liu, please.

LIU YUE:	To my knowledge, I think most the GAC members who attend ICANN meeting frequently, they know what the industry do, but [I think the GAC get large very fast.] So a lot of GAC members don't attend any ICANN meeting. So maybe the new members and also they don't know much about the DNS industry and also what the GNSO do. And also, I think some countries, [seems that the] GAC members, some countries, they change the GAC members maybe two years or three years or so. When the representative from the country change, someone needs some time to what the GNSO do.

And I know that ICANN and also GAC may have some session before the formal meeting of each GAC meeting, we will have some session to introduce the ICANN and GAC, and also, ICANN also works with the region team and give the capacity building on the GAC representative since as I know that in AP region, ICANN also has [formed] such session in the AP region GAC representatives to let them know what the DNS development.

So I think maybe this capacity building about the business model, just like Jacques and Vanda said, it's better to be written maybe through transparence between GAC and GNSO, epically RySG and RrSG to learn from each other.

And also, as I know that the RrSG and RySG, they don't have all registry and registrar included in that group, so maybe we need to encourage GAC members to have more communication with their local registry and the registrar in their own countries. That's all. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Liu. I think that was a good point. I think that we're talking about some sort of onboarding process as Vanda mentioned, some sort of – maybe not a webinar but some training online. That could be a very basic and multilingual, might really assist on that. Sébastien, you've been waiting patiently.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Bernie. Yeah, first of all, I don't think that – and I agree with other comments, we can't say that the GAC members don't know about domain industry. My guess, a lot of them know. A few of them who need to be informed or we need to [inaudible] for some capacity building.

The second point is that there is no one business model. There are business models, both on the registry and registrar side, and we can't say that there's just one.

My proposal is to say that we need to be larger than the question of GAC domain industry but each component of ICANN needs to know better the other part to understand them better and to interact with them. Therefore, I think we need o take this idea of capacity building or knowledge of the other – I would say outside the GAC-GNSO relationship but more generally about each constituency with the other within ICANN. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Sébastien. I was actually thinking along the same lines, that if we're going to produce something along the lines of some

introductory training, onboarding training for all the SOs and ACs, that it could be useful for everyone. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I remember that during our conversation, Liu has raised a point about the metrics, that I believe is not included in that, and I don't remember exactly why we do not include this idea if you remember the idea to have a more clear point about metrics or measuring the GAC progress or something like that.

So if any one of you remember better, I believe could speak about that. Maybe Liu itself, because that was his idea. I believe it's on the questions up in these blue notes, but it's not clear translated into the agreement that we have done in that time. So, can you remember that, Liu?

LIU YUE: Yeah. Do you mean the idea we discussed about the KPI of the GAC decision making process?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, [you raised I believe] if Brenda can go a little up and maybe it's the last question we talked during GAC a little bit in the questions above.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: There we go. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. The six, it's recommended to use a further implemented action that a key performance indicator to evaluate GAC action with the board and other community. So it's a kind of metrics that we're talking about, but after that, I have no clear notes in my own notes about if we agree with some points, or Liu, if you came back with some feedback from inside the GAC. That's my point here. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. Liu, anything to add to that?

LIU YUE: Yeah. I remember that this idea is discussed [inaudible] between I think this [inaudible] and also I and Vanda agreed [with this,] and we think maybe we need some quantity measurement on the further interaction between GAC and the board, and also, since we know that there is a [inaudible] between GAC and the board, but also we don't know what the further action and also the feedback from the board to the GAC communique, the recommendation. So even the GAC recommendation is further implemented, and maybe rejected, and we're also in further discussion between GAC and the board. So there is maybe six recommendation from the GAC and maybe three is resolved and the two in discussion, one is rejected. Maybe like this.

Also, we need some maybe like – for the feedback time, and if board is feedback [inaudible] it is difficult for GAC to make their decision and for the further interaction between GAC and the board. Maybe like this. And how about Jacques' idea on that?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Jacques? Alright, let's put a pin in that one. I think I got most of what Liu is saying. If I remember well Maarten's notes on some of these things that recently the process between the board and GAC has improved further with tighter calls after GAC advice is produced at the end of an ICANN meeting. There's a call with the GAC leadership and then issues are issues are discussed and identified and there's a follow-up call after that. Let's understand what Liu is saying and then we'll try to write up something with that. Anything else on these things?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Not from my side. I believe that it was what we got from those questions and the feedback.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, correct. Alright.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Let's drop down to the next section. Alright, we'll go to four or five. What I did was go through all of the ATRT2 and survey questions and try to identify the recommendations. We don't have that text in here, do we? Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We don't have yet any points here. the only point is in this area that we discussed just from the notes that gives us an idea about the recommendations should be.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, okay. I had posted in the group's chat. Probably what's going to make this a lot easier is I'm going to send the file to Brenda right now, and will be able to display that. Okay. Save that, let's produce it as a PDF. So excuse me while I get some mechanics done here, it'll take just a minute. Brenda, do you want it by e-mail or in the Skype chat?

BRENDA BREWER: I think Skype will be faster, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think so too. I'll send it to you via Skype in about 45 seconds. Alright, it's produced as a PDF. Let's bring that up and send it to Brenda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [Brenda can get this, it's 12:00 PM.]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, sent.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, those are these points that is [4.2.1.5.]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I'll be coming up in a minute, Brenda will upload it, and – oh, wow, you are so fast, Brenda. Let's go to section 4.4 please. I haven't finished cleaning this up.

Alright. Suggestions with respect to issues. Okay, this is what I was talking about going over. ATRT2 recommendation 6.1(d), 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 once the mechanism has been agreed upon. Overall, this recommendation is implemented and effective, however the effectiveness is directly related to the quality of the liaisons that are appointed to the GAC. As such, ATRT3 is suggesting that the GAC publish a list of recommended qualities or requirements for liaisons to assist SOs and ACs to select the best candidates. That's what I got out of that. Does that make sense?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And as I say, these are just my observations, they're suggestions for either suggestions or recommendations that we will make.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, that one I remember that we discussed in our further – [some] meetings that we had, and certainly, this is something that is quite

important for the liaisons, because the quality, I remember we talk ALAC quality of liaisons, that was good one, and some of members from the GNSO talking about that they changed the liaison or something. There is a very good point, because [there were that can make suggestion] what they expected to have from a liaison from each community could be a very clear alternative for selected people to be the liaison.

So in ALAC, we have formal GAC meeting, so maybe not so easy for other communities to have formal GAC meetings, but anyway, it's something that I believe GAC could help to identify the best profile to deal with that. That's a good idea, Bernard. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. I'm going through my document now. I think we really want to be one section up in 4.3, please, Brenda. Alright, that's what I did, I didn't highlight it properly. This'll probably make it easier. Back up just a bit more. There we go. Analysis of information.

The numbering is screwed up. Oh, I remember, that actually refers to the proper point. Okay. So this is the segment where I went through all the ATRT2 recommendations and their analyses and conclusions and went through all of the survey questions, their analysis and conclusions, and tried to tease out what could be areas for suggestions or recommendations. So the first one was [42.15,] ATRT2 recommendation 6.1(d), we sort of did that one. We drafted a recommendation, we talked about that one a minute ago.

EN

Next one. 42.19. ATRT2 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 and effectiveness that early engagement brings.

Basically, that could be one of the things that this work party decides they want to make a suggestion regarding that. I'm just going to run through all of them and then we can beat up on the different ones separately.

42.2.14, survey GAC accountability. So that's from the survey. ATRT3 will consider making recommendations or suggestion based on the responses to this question as well as its evaluation of the relevant ATRT2 recommendations.

You'll remember that in the survey, one of the first questions was GAC accountability, and there was a very strong desire by the Respondents to see GAC accountability improve. Now, exactly what that means, I think we have to figure out.

42.2.34, survey GAC board. Our conclusion on that one is it would seem that structures had been following the recent evolution of GAC board relationship more closely than individual members of the community. There have been significant improvements as presented in the GAC

comment which would align with structures, very strong net of 62% being satisfied or very satisfied. ATRT3 should consider making suggestions asking the board and GAC to better communicate the recent improvements in their relationships.

So you'll remember that although we have a net 62% for the structures approving of the relation of the GAC board, that was not the case for individual Respondents, and the conclusion we came to there was that really, it sounds like it's just a question of ensuring there is a better communication about how well the relationship is evolving. Any questions on that one?

Okay, survey GAC SO/ACs. Overall, it would seem that SO/AC interactions are rated very positively by the SO and ACs. This being said, the [RSIG] concerns are noted and follow on suggestions or recommendations from ATRT3's assessment of the ATRT2 recommendations relevant to this could help improve the situation.

So overall, we had some very good relationships noted by the structures, which is SO/ACs and their components, but there was that one dissonant comment made by the RSIG that they felt they did not get enough time and did not see things coming from the GAC and that this was troubling them and that we should look at that.

GNSO RSIG. The comment is right there. Sorry. Lost my sound there for a sec. So you can read that. And that's related to ATRT2 recommendation 6.1(h), also related to policy development, so could punt this to that section given that this is about overall satisfaction of SOs and ACs about their interactions with the GAC, which has got a

EN

good score. If we do so, we could modify the conclusion of 42.2.44 to say this and be considered in the PDP section.

So basically, what I'm saying here is under that one, yes, we've got this negative comment from the RSIG, but the overall results of SO/ACs are that they are satisfied with their relationship with the GAC, and as such, the things that are being brought up seem to be more about the PDP. And we have a section on PDP, and we will be talking about the interaction of the GAC with the GNSO on PDPs.

I have a hand from Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, just to raise these points that during our interview of the –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Vanda, I see your mic but I'm not seeing you for some reason.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I can hear you okay, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, probably just Bernie.

BRENDA BREWER: I believe so. I can hear you as well, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you. Well, Bernie, you back?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Brenda, is it just me that's not hearing Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, just you.

LIU YUE: Yes, I can hear you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, I'll restart my audio.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. So what I intend to remember here is that during our interview to the registries and registrars, and the people from the registry said this specifically, that they were not satisfied because there is no process in general, and because of that, sometimes they need to implement some points from the communique and they need to wait until the next meeting in the general face-to-face meeting to really get the feedback. And this has significant impact on their business, because they need to move and there is no clear idea how they can move and they need feedback from the GAC in some points, and get only those in the next face-to-face.

That was a point raised during our interview with the GNSO. So the registry made this point. So I do believe that [they have to still hear] the same points, that that person in particular raise again that there is a need to have a better process to allow them to get feedback between meetings. That's what we got from that interview, and I believe it's not so clear into the notes, but could be, because it was that. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: Yes. I just wanted to enhance the point that maybe we should give a particular attention to the RSIG issue, because if we remember, one of the points that we have to audit about the GAC is how the GAC contributes and takes into account all which concerns the DNS. And we might note that registries are a major player in the DNS system. They hold part of the DNS system being who they are and doing what they do into the Internet infrastructure. So maybe this point should be studied with particular care.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Jacques. So those out of going through all of the survey questions, Vanda and Jacques, your hands are still up. I'll go to you if you keep them up. Alright, clear. Thank you. So those are all the points that I could find that might generate recommendations, and what I did was then go through those and look at making some suggestions. So those are draft text, we looked at 44.11, 44.12. Let's go down a bit.

Significant progress has been made with respect to GAC-board relations since the publication of ATRT2, especially in the last two years. The survey questions asking individuals and structures the following question, "In your view, are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the board?" Produced mixed net results of 62% of structures being satisfied or very satisfied versus 7% for individual respondents. As such, ATRT3 is suggesting that the board and GAC work on communicating this better to individual members of the community.

So you will remember these are suggestions. We don't have to go through the work and all the requirements for a recommendation. So those are the two things that I have come up with as suggestion based on the issues and the previous section.

So really, what we have to do now, if we can go back up, Brenda, to the previous section, is – okay, analysis of information, identification of issues. So what I think is the most useful thing to do is you should look at this list versus everything that is in the ATRT2 analysis and conclusions. The survey results, see if I missed any areas where we would like to make suggestions or recommendations, and add them to this section 4.3.

Once we've got that list nailed down, as we saw, I've made suggestion on 6.1(d) and the next one down, please, Brenda. On 6.1(h), I haven't done anything. We need to discuss. Survey of GAC accountability. Again, we have to figure out what we want to say on that given the strong survey results. GAC board interactions, I've made a proposal for a suggestion, and the next one down, we said we have to decide – yes, this is the negative RSIG comment. We have to decide if we want to

tackle this one here in the GAC or if we want to send this down to the PDP section.

So that's my articulation of these things. We are sitting at – basically, there's 14 minutes left, so I don't know how you want to proceed. If you want to go through some of these open items right now and see if we can progress on them or if you want to take them back and think about them and add some text. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I don't know if all colleagues had time to go through this, and maybe I'm working on a table from ATRT2 versus survey, the results that we got. We believe in the survey results. So I do believe that it would be good to give time to our colleagues to go through this and come back with the specific points to discuss, because just reading now, it's not so easy because you need to compare things.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Absolutely. Yes. I agree.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So that is my point, but I'd love to hear from our colleagues. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. And just as information, this version of the document, I'm working right now to publish it sometime today for our

call tomorrow. So everything you're seeing on the screen here right now will be posted in the next few hours. Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah, just maybe – and I say maybe – there is a point that we could treat quickly in the time remaining, and it's that request about GAC accountability. It's a real weird request when you know what GAC is, and once more, we come back to full understanding of the GAC role, because the GAC has no decision power whatsoever in ICANN even if it's composed of representative which are fully empowered in their government.

So GAC is very paradoxical, but how can you be held accountable for actions over which you have no power? Can you be held accountable for advice? That's a question in itself.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, and I think that's a very good point. I was also scratching my head when I saw those survey results. Vanda, you want to address this?

JACQUES BLANC: I believe that we go back to the understanding of the role of GAC and we need to remember that most of people really have this impression that the governments, because a majority of countries have powerful governments, and so they, in some way, in my opinion, talking with many people, especially for instance in my region, in Africa area, what do you see that's the transfer to the GAC the same power they see in their governments, and they expect it because of that some more

accountability and more openness in decision making. And forget that inside our model GAC has no such power.

So I believe we have this difficulty that will remain because of the different kind of feelings that people have related to their own governments. So it's something that is very difficult to translate in words and be kind of the people, not say they are not understanding or something like that. But this feeling in my opinion is clear when you talk individually with people. "They should have done this." So they are not allowed to do that.

So it's quite difficult, and maybe we go back to the point, the explanation about what is the GAC role more in simple words for the general people. I do believe that we'll have. But from the point of what GAC can do is the little things that really they can do.

So that's my view. I don't know what to do with that, but anyway, that's my –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: Yes. I think that maybe the only accountability we could eventually find – and I'm very wary of what I'm going to say – is in participation, because a lot of feedback we've had is the GAC is not participating enough, not enough interviews, not enough meetings and not enough time to talk with the GAC and so on. So maybe if there was one accountability we might want to look at in the overall ICANN-GAC

participation scheme, it would be, is GAC sufficiently participating and cross-working with the other SOs, parties and so on? Maybe.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Thank you, Jacques. I've been listening to the conversation here, and in the closing minutes of this call, I have the following point on that. First, I agree with Vanda. I think from a certain perspective on the individual respondents to this question, it's more a question of education and it goes back to what Sébastien was saying earlier, that really, we should have an introductory training module for each of the SOs and the ACs and that the one from the GAC would help explain what we're trying to say in the introduction text on the GAC above the ATRT2 recommendations, so people explain it.

I think from the individual side, that's really – and it joins up to that other recommendation about the GAC board relationship where the SOs and ACs are quite satisfied but the individuals are not, and that just reinforces that point.

However, I don't think it's the only thing. I think we're facing a few things from the SOs and the ACs and probably they turn around a few things – if I try to remember everything – they probably turn around firstly and mostly what we were talking about as the last point on this list about better mechanisms for the GAC to work with the SOs, but very specifically where in French we say [le bat blesse,] which means "The sock hurts," is the GNSO one we have to talk about.

The second one is the clarity – and that whole issue is wrapped up, is part and parcel of the clarity of the GAC communique. Now, the GAC

communique gets written the way it is because it's a compromise document which has a lot of people going in it, but it needs to be translated at some point or another so that nongovernment people, especially those people in the GNSO, can actually understand what it's saying. And finally, I think there's that concern of trying to more accountable and understanding, and I think this comment has been made, that when the GAC reaches a decision for a communique, the community would really like to know who was in support of it and who was not in support of it, and [inaudible] some of these different opinions.

And I know this is going to be a very big ask if we make that ask of the GAC, but it goes along all the other processes in ICANN if you think about it. When we're developing policies, the nonconforming opinions are presented. If we go back to Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2, there were dissenting opinions that were presented. If we go back to Work Stream 2, and the GAC's position relative to the jurisdiction issue where I think we published 30 pages of transcript and issues brought up to the GAC, and people don't see that. They just see, "Here's the communique," which a lot of people don't understand exactly what it's saying, and B, don't understand, is this like 80-90% of the GAC saying this, or is this 51% of the GAC saying this, and what are some of the issues?

So in my mind, I'll try to articulate this in the document, but there are really these four issues, and the first one is a training issue, and the last three are sort of all bundled together and it's orthogonal to the way everyone else is required to work in the ICANN environment. And that

may be all tided together about the accountability, and maybe that's something we can talk about.

Anyways, that's what I had to say. [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We lost you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I lost audio for a sec. Sorry. I'm back. So that's all I have to say. I think I will try to integrate this in the document before I send it out later today, and our time's almost up so I'll turn it back to Vanda. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. I've put some points that remember that in the bylaws, what is written there is that GAC use the [United Nations] consensus but they don't publish the minority points when they reach consensus. And this is what [United Nations] said about how to reach consensus and how to understand that we have consensus. And it is to publish minority points.

So maybe we should think about that and that could be a suggestion. The other suggestion is certainly what you said, to translate an action after the publication of the communique itself should be translated to bullet points that may be more easily in several language to be understood by the normal people around individuals in general with that. That was some points that I believe we need to discuss about before we make some really recommendations on that. Thank you.

I believe we are done, and thank you very much to your work, Bernie. It's helping a lot. And thank you, everyone. And the floor is open to anyone that wants to add something, Cheryl or Pat or Bernie, Jacques, Liu, the floor is yours. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I don't think we have anything else, Vanda. I'll put in one last comment on understanding GAC positions. I think that as we saw in the survey, we were very pleased that the input that the GAC worked very hard to produce and it was, I would say, probably some of the most effective GAC comments I've seen in my history at ICANN, which is long.

But I think also the changes we're going to consider in public comments and possibly bringing in a survey-type segment to public consultations when there are documents might allow a lot of people who are not native English speakers to understand the issues better if they're framed simply and shortly, and give an opinion on it without having to produce a whole written text on the whole thing after having read 100 or 200 pages of very specific issues.

So that's one thing we should keep in mind when we actually get to that as a plenary. Alright, Cheryl, over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Just on that, Bernie, we probably just as a side note need to recognize as you look at that plain language approach the joint letter and request for simple terminologies and plain language approaches to things that came out of the ALAC and the GAC as a combined piece of

work that's been going on for a couple of years now, and whilst ICANN is making some inroads into its knowledge system and its methodology of how it presents information and then to what reading level, etc., that work is more promise than it is proof at the moment. So that's one of those, "If it does well, it should be useful" issues. So there may be some suggestion or watching brief that could come out of that as well. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. Alright, closing words to you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Thank you. The only thing that I believe we are doing a very good progress in our report, and appreciate all the effort everyone is contribute with this work, and I believe we are fine. I'm glad to see the report going, fill in with very important points.

So let's take a look on the ATRT versus survey and give some points that each one of us understand could be the very important points that will help us to write some suggestions or recommendations to the GAC in our work.

So thank you very much for your time, and see you all tomorrow in the evening here, in the morning for the [next and Thursday for sure. And Liu.] Thank you very much, and thank you especially Bernie for your hard work. Thank you.

LIU YUE: Thank you.

JACQUES BLANC: Bye, everybody. Talk to you tomorrow.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]