

MONTREAL – ATRT3 Review Team Meeting with Board Caucus Group
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 13:30 to 14:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

PAT KANE: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the ATRT3 discussion with the Board Caucus Group.

Vanda?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, we're starting.

PAT KANE: So what I'd like to do is introduce some of the team. And I'd like to have the team go through and probably introduce themselves as we go through for those that are here at the table.

So, Adetola, if we could start with you and introduce yourself, and we'll work our way around.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: This is Adetola here from the BC.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis coming from SSAC.

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.

-
- UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off mic) from GAC.
- JACQUES BLANC: Jacques Blanc from Registrar Stakeholder Group, GNSO.
- VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda Scartezini from the ALAC RALO, ALAC region.
- PAT KANE: Pat Kane, co-chair, Registry Stakeholder Group, GNSO.
- CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, other co-chair, At Large, advisory committee appointee.
- LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez, ICANN board.
- SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet, ALAC EURALO.
- DEMI GETSCHKO: Demi Getschko, ccNSO.
- DANIEL KHAUKA NANGHAKA: Daniel Nanghaka, ALAC.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra, ICANN board.

BECKY BARR: Becky Burr, ICANN board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain, ICANN board.

AVRI DORIA: Avri Doria, ICANN board.

PAT KANE: So we'd like to take you through the presentation that we've been working through with the community the last couple of days.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: An expedited version of it. We're starting half way through the slide deck, because we're just jumping in in the middle. So you just assume knowledge.

PAT KANE: Thank you for the direction, Cheryl. This is Pat.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfectly happy to direct.

PAT KANE:

So as every review team has the obligation to do, is to go back and look at the previous review team's recommendations and how they were implemented and how effective were those implementations. What we wanted to share here at this point is that we did receive a paper from the -- or report from the ICANN support staff that had been published or had been completed in October 2018 that indicated that 100% of the ATRT2 recommendations were actually implemented.

As we went through that assessment, what we identified was that 53% of the ATRT2 recommendations, in our assessment, were completely implemented. 29% were partially implemented. And 18%, in our assessment, were not -- not implemented at all.

Now, we recognize that this was six years ago. We were under a different regime, under the Affirmation of Commitments, and we're under a different environment today.

But we also recognize that there were several items -- I think five is the number -- that were implemented in some other manner from what the recommendation was. And what we decided to do as a team was to evaluate the specific implementation -- or the specific recommendation, no matter how prescriptive that recommendation was.

So when we take a look at the 18% that were not implemented, we didn't dig deep into the whys of why they were not implemented, but we do recognize that there are conditions, given over six years and some of the change and what we're working on as a community, there are reasons for those 18%.

Next slide.

Talk about the survey results. When we conducted the survey, we conducted two surveys. One was for individual respondents and one was for structures. The structures had an opportunity to provide additional input and additional comments to the questions. And of the structures, 15 of the 17 that we sent the survey to responded. And for the individuals, we had 88 separate individuals respond, of which 50 answered all of the questions.

Next slide, please.

In that survey, the strongest responses were around prioritization, specific and organizational reviews, diversity of board members, and the public comment process, and support for board decisions.

Next slide.

So given that there was strong support for the board decisions, we did not include it as an issue for ATRT3. ATRT3 did identify several GNSO policy development concerns that we decided to include based upon our assessment of the ATRT2 recommendations. So the list of priorities that we've identified for ATRT3 are: Prioritization, specific and organizational reviews, diversity of board members, PDPs, and the public comment process.

So one of the things we're also continuing to take a look at are the accountability indicators. We have just started our review and assessment of these. So at this point in time, we don't have anything to report in that particular area. But it's an area that what we're finding in

our discussions with the -- with the separate structures that we've reported out to so far is there's not a lot of awareness around the accountability indicators or where they are on the Web site.

Next slide, please.

So prioritization.

In the survey, it was overwhelming from both individuals and structures that prioritization is something that we should take a look at. It's not a surprise. It's a conversation we're having within the evolution of the multistakeholder model effort that Brian Cote is leading, as well as the discussion that we had. Several of us got together on Monday afternoon in terms of prioritization and reviews.

Next slide.

This is a slide that we've had in there for a while. But now that we've got the information and we've had the document received from ICANN board, we will go back and take a look at that and include that as part of our further deliberations around prioritization.

Specific reviews. We are very aware and very conscious in terms of how we think about reviews of the process that concluded the CCTRT recommendation discussion from the board back to the CCTRT review team. It's the first I am, of course, that we've seen that some were accepted, some were pending, some were identified for other areas. And we're trying to take a look and make certain that when we think about reviews, how do we bring that into play.

That, along with the change in the operating standards, to where we have a higher bar, higher threshold for actually making recommendations in terms of additional data, time frames, different information, and, of course, consensus requirement, we're considering that as well.

Next slide.

So around specific reviews -- and you'll see the same thing when we talk about organization reviews -- there is some dissatisfaction around the effectiveness of the reviews. And both individuals and structures responded that we should be taking a look at the review process, both specific, and in the next slide, you'll see the same thing here for the organizational reviews.

Next slide.

So when we talked about reviews, the review team has consensus around reviews are an issue. And I think that's really important to note. Because we don't have consensus on what the recommendation should be. We're still under deliberations. There's still a lot of conversation around that. And we're not at a point where we have consensus.

But the areas that we're focused on in terms of helping define the problem are these items here. Or at least some of these items.

Lack of coordination and overlap between reviews sometimes conflicting recommendations. Too many reviews. Reviews have to compete for ICANN's resources. A lack of time to get things done and a lack of resources to get things done within the review teams. Failure to

properly implement some recommendations and report on this. And difficulty to have a system -- I'm sorry -- a systemic and holistic view.

I would add one other item that came in the slides previous to this in terms of when we did an assessment around the ATRT2 recommendations, there was some questions around the intent, what was the inept of the recommendation. And as we go back and take a look and have conversations with ATRT2 members, several of them have different ideas about what the intent was within the ATRT2, because it has been six years and has been a different regime. So we recognize that that's an issue as well.

Next slide.

So when we think about recommendation -- and this is kind of a -- the conversation -- one of the conversations we'd like to have and get feedback from the caucus specifically -- is, when we take a look at the reviews and what we should do, we're deliberating whether we're going to have reviews as they are today, maybe a picket fence on some of the reviews, are we going to combine reviews into a single organizational review or a single specific review or one single review across all of the - - all of the community.

And then one that's come up on several discussions, which came up on Monday afternoon, was this thought around a continuous process. I've heard from not just other members of the ATRT3, but from input in the hallways, why not do something in three days? Why not have a -- one day where you get everybody in a room, you figure out what the problems are. The next day, you prioritize what you heard on the first

day, and the third day, you figure out what the solutions are for those things that you prioritize, and then kick stuff out and start actually working on it.

So it could be that. It could be collapsed. But there's all kinds of things that are still under consideration from the review team. It's like I said, I want to emphasize, because it's really important for the members of the team, because just some of the words here indicate reduction, is that we don't have consensus on the team today.

So I'd like to ask the caucus at this point in time how they think.

Cheryl would like to have one word.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Only one. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record.

I just wanted to add that, of course, at least some of our review team are also very fond of the concept of having reviews done totally external to ICANN, in other words, having a, you know, higher KPMG-type approach, in other words, have an external, at arm's length, no relationship at all.

Now, that doesn't have, obviously, carriage in any particular weight at the moment. We're still discussing all of this. But we are looking at the full spectrum of opportunities here. So I think it's important that we do make sure we characterize everyone's opinion and we are looking at a complete set of possibilities. But, yes, the conversation is still happening.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Okay. Hi, this is Chris.

So this, to me, looks like three different -- two different sorts of things. I just want to make sure I've understood it correctly.

The first bullet point seems to me -- seems to be based on the principle that the existing reviews would remain pretty much the same as they are or -- and then there would be this additional thing that would independently assess implementation on the recommendations. And the second and third appear to be a complete change to the way that we do things.

Is that basically a fair assessment?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, Chris, I -- Cheryl, for the record.

I think what's important is to read this "situations include," and these are all very open to interpretation.

For example, let me suggest that in our deliberations, that first bullet point covers that extreme, a single permanent entity in ICANN to coordinate reviews, would very easily couple with, and that coordination would work with an external third party.

I mean, it's not purely reductive here. That's what we're discussing.

There are just a selection -- we could have filled several more with options. This is just conversation starters.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Okay. So on that basis, just responding personally to these particular points, my immediate response would be that the third one is -- looks really complicated because it involves slamming together two different types -- your number three -- two different types of review.

The second one, to me, makes perfect sense, because you have -- you're drawing a distinction between structural reviews and other -- other reviews. So, to me, it makes sense if you're going to simplify, have one review for specifics and one review for organizational, that makes sense. Whereas, I think the third one is a bit more challenging.

The first one, just on the surface, looks to me like adding an extra layer of complexity to what is already an existingly complex situation. And I'm not entirely sure what, if anything, we achieve by doing that.

But that's without knowing any of the background. It's just on the face of it. And that's my --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Chris. That's very useful input.

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet.

Yeah, I wanted to emphasize that one thing that is very important is that there will be -- or we are suggesting that there are ongoing inside each entity an (indiscernible) process, announcement process who need to be carried out by them and in addition or apart from the review themselves.

And it says that the work we will have to do at the review level will be less important today, because some work will have been done inside the organization already or ongoing on an ongoing process.

And the second, I wanted to say that, yes, what you say, Chris, it's very interesting and very useful to our deliberation, from my point of view.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I'd like to ask you a question, Sebastien.

To be clear, what you were talking about in your first point was, in effect, introducing a continuous improvement program so that the reviews themselves were not used as a crutch for improvement, but that there was continuous improvement, and then the reviews were more lightweight, effectively, because of the continuous improvement program.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sebastien speaking.

I like when you rephrase my sentence and you did better than me, as usual, Chris. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That wasn't why I did. But thank you very much. I understand. Thank you.

PAT KANE: So this is Pat. Two other items that I would throw out that we're discussing as well is, we have found that the time binding or the one-year requirement that we have in place for the ATRT has been successful in helping us around the control of scope and taking a look. And considering that for other review teams, we think, is probably a good recommendation or a good suggestion that we would have.

And the other item is that we have discussed a review not just as a review team producing a set of recommendations or suggestions, but also going beyond, through the implementation. We talked a little bit about this on Monday in that if we -- it's okay for us to make a bunch of recommendations and then, in comparing them to other recommendations and other work that's being generated by the community, to prioritize those and at some point in time have a deliberate retirement of those recommendations as well and stay through or somebody from the review team or a collection of people from the review team would stay through until -- as a shepherd, thank you, Cheryl, as ensuring that the intend is understood, that the recommendation is completed, or the recommendation is retired.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We're doing that now, aren't we, with the RDS one and where there's effectively this implementation? So the equivalent of a PDP Implementation Review Team, sort of shepherds from the reviews.

We certainly are on the WHOIS one, because I know that that exists.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. If you're doing it with the RDS, yes, that's the type of --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's what you mean.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Implementation teams, if I may, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record.

Implementation teams can also become extremely bloated things as well. And I think the term that we -- pardon, but I'm in a number of them, I should know. And, you know, 27 of your best friends helping you along a pathway is not quite what we had in mind here.

The term "shepherd" might be a smaller number. Sheep herders don't need to be larger than the flock they're herding. That's just my bias.

Lito.

LITO IBARRA: I can imagine there are many more things behind these three options that you're discussing or willing to discuss. But regarding the first alternative or the first option, a single permanent entity, I would like to

know if you're considering or willing to consider the prioritization of the cross review's recommendations within this single entity. Or have you given any thought to that?

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

You hang up first. No, you hang up first.

PAT KANE:

So I think the answer is, we still have some thinking to do, since Cheryl and I -- neither Cheryl nor I wanted to grab ahold of that one.

But when we think about it being a new structure, how does that new structure work, is it a new structure, how do you staff it, how long does it live, and those kind of things. So while it's an early conversation -- and, again, we have -- we don't have consensus in the review team -- it's one of the items that, if we're in a continuous process to improve, it could be a way for us to generate discrete pieces of work that can be done quickly, in an agile fashion, and deliver something that's meaningful to the community in a fast fashion.

One of the things we've talked about in terms of like -- I talked to Brian Cote about the process that we go through. You can have -- and Jacques said this at the microphone on Monday. You can have fast, you can have cheap, and you can have good. Pick two.

And that's kind of the thinking there in terms of some things need to go fast. Some things have to be quality. And some things just need to do something new and make it a little bit incrementally better.

So --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Avri. I think we have Avri, and then we've got Leon. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. Yeah, I've got a couple questions.

When I look at the bottom two, in some sense, they almost remind me of ATRT1 and 2, where we had ATRT reviewing all the other reviews. And in 2, we said, gee, we don't have the skills and we don't have the technical knowledge that all of them have. It's better that they do it.

So is this kind of unwinding it?

And if not, how do we deal with the specificity of knowledge that one needs in either kind of specific or organizational review, where you understand the bottom-up notion of that organization and we're not using a uniform, homogenized form of organization. So I'm interested in how you dealt with these issues.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I suspect Pat will want to jump in on this one, because.

We've used terminology such as "the essential elements" when we've talked about this. So the essential elements from the various other specific reviews would need to be attended to in almost a work track-like environment. And those work tracks should and could call on appropriate expertise both within and outside of the community to facilitate their processes.

Did I get everything right, Pat?

PAT KANE: You're good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm good, he tells me.
Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl.

So looking at the first bullet, I would encourage us to think about at least two items, one of them cost, and how this entity would -- constituted by whom, how many, et cetera, et cetera. 'Cause that might have a budgetary impact, of course.

And also, to the issue of independence. If it's going to be a standing body within ICANN, I could see many in the community not really attributing independence to the structure. So that could be just

another issue to think about when we -- when we say "independently assess implementation of recommendations."

Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: May I ask a question? And, again, stressing that this is based purely on looking at these slides.

But what problem is number 1 trying to solve?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, one of the -- Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record.

One of the problems that it's trying to solve is the disconnect between one review process stopping, a gap of years, implementation, perhaps, or perhaps not, being continued to track the opportunity for things to be retired if they need to be retired during the process. Not saying we'll fix or look at that in the next time gap.

So it's to facilitate a continuity of program rather than a -- jumps, puddle-jumping, which is what's happening at the moment.

Pat, what else have we got in there from our previous discussions?

PAT KANE: So this is Pat.

So I think one of the conversations that we've also had is, is this single permanent entity volunteer-based or is it contracted out? Is it -- is it a

third party that comes in and actually runs through a process? And whether it be an ISO process or a break-it process or something of that nature, how do we make certain that we are, again, doing things in a -- doing the routine routinely, that we're evaluating ourselves, moving forward on items, and spitting out in that process the things that are impactful today and the discrete piece of work that we can achieve in a cost-effective manner so that we're addressing the biggest items with the most meaningful impact to the community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And continually reviewing the priorities.

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you.

I think it's -- to try to answer your question, Chris, it's -- raises the question of holistic or systemic view of all of these reviews. And it's one way to try to solve this issue to have one body who can have an overall global view on the situation.

Just because I think it's -- I heard people -- at least one -- who say, hey, maybe it's time to have a second board. And I was a little bit struck by that.

But I think, this discussion came on various occasions, then why not to put it on the table today, because such things could be viewed as -- I am

not saying that it will or it is or it's our intention. But I think it's better to put it on the table for this discussion.

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we might move to the next slide.

But just following on from that, some of the thinking has been looking at what's happening in quality systems in other industries as well and just trying to see if there are some best of breed possibilities. It's not just that we're working in our own little puddle there.

Sorry, Becky, go ahead.

BECKY BARR: I just want to sort of put a marker down, because we've been sort of talking about this bigger prioritization and implementation and effectiveness -- effective recommendations and stuff. And I just -- we should -- we should connect that back to all of the other implementation stuff that's going on and think about how it's affected.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely.

Do you want to take this, then?

PAT KANE: Sure. Thank you, Cheryl. This is Pat.

So on the diversity on the board question, so is in response to the survey question "Do you consider diversity amongst board members satisfactory?" 48% of the individuals and almost 70% of the structures responded no.

In a companion question regarding which diversity elements were missing, we got responses around individual respondents talking about geographical representation, certainly constituency representation. But we also received feedback talking about technical representation on the board and business representation in terms of within the industry itself of registry or registrar background.

Next slide.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say, if you're reading it, maybe I should --

PAT KANE: Please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Given that the bylaws, obviously, as you well know, talk about how the voting board members are selected, and knowing that the work is progressing and we're moving into the implementation phase of the nominating -- recent Nominating Committee review process, we don't think that at this stage the ATRT is going to be in any rightful position to start making comments, suggestions, and recommendations that may interfere with these existing processes. So one thing, however, we are

very aware of is that to facilitate diversity. And here, we're saying diversity, not any particular diversity, but diversity, including gender.

A suggestion that the support organizations and advisory committees take some responsibility for the diversity story, because right now, what we believe we have seen and heard is that the ACs and the SOs -- or AC, singular, and SOs, put in whoever they like, which is great. And then the diversity gets cleaned up somehow by the Nominating Committee. And the diversity getting cleaned up somehow by the Nominating Committee has real risk associated with it when you look at, for example, the recent paper put out by the ccNSO, which articulates what every -- sorry -- what -- just Stephen, was it?

The empowered community. Because Stephen wrote it, I was -- By the empowered community. Thank you for that, Bernie. Which highlights whatever Nominating Committee I've had anything to do with is well and truly aware of. And that is, depending on what happens out of the support organizations, we may or may not as a Nominating Committee in any year be able to put the most worthy candidate in or back in because of geographics. So if you have too many more North Americans or Europeans brought in, then a returning board member might be limited, et cetera.

So we'd like to see a consideration of the other appointing bodies take some responsibility for diversity and the thinking about diversity as well.

Yes, Chris, you're frowning at me.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I completely understand. And this has been going on for a long time. You and I have had many conversations about this.

Why can't you consider recommending that the current requirement on geographic diversity is -- is amended to not be a requirement, but is instead placed in all of the other -- in the same bucket as all of the other diversities and managed together, rather than having the situation which creates the difficulty which we currently have, which says no more than "X" people on the board from one region, and you must always have someone from a region?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So glad that's being transcribed, Mr. Disspain. We will take that as a friendly amendment.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm just suggesting it's something to look at. I don't know if it would work. But it strikes me if you look at Stephen's paper, the challenge is specifically that, because there can not be more than five. Therefore, you are stuck.

Well, why would geographic diversity be treated in a different way to gender diversity or anything else, is my question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, the review team, I think, will welcome that as fodder for our deliberations. But certainly it's making me smile.

Who do we have next in queue? Or can we move to the next -- Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: One of the questions around this issue of diversity, but not just diversity. I really think that for me -- and then we have already the discussion in different arena. But when we talk about gender, from my point of view, it's reaching some balance, balance at our organizations, leadership bodies will be important. And I will not put it in the same basket as the question of diversity.

And if the diversity today it's geographical, it's because it's -- I will not say it's easy to handle, but the easiest one to handle. And I am not sure if we put all together and saying diversities, and whoever wants to take that into account, that we will be able to find any diversity at the end of the day. That's a risk. Because you -- Chris, you know very well what we can say about diversity of some elected people in the board today, in one single SO or one single AC.

For At Large, for example, there is just one. Then how we achieve diversity? We have a very good guide --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: (Indiscernible) --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: -- that is very diverse in itself, bringing a lot of diversity, sure. But if we want to have some diversity, then we need a second -- at least one second board member coming from this community.

And all that, it's -- it's difficult. But I -- I love that when we bring some new ideas, even if it's to challenge them into the pot for the discussion.

Thank you, Chris.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien. This is Pat. So if we can move on to the next slide, please, and the area we're going to cover is public consultations.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

PAT KANE: Go ahead, please. I'm sorry that I missed you.

AVRI DORIA: That's okay, and it's probably a nonsensical question, but how are you thinking of alternating? And would it be done term by term so you'd never have the continuity that's possible? I'm not saying anyone wants to, but basically have you basically thought through -- and I'm sure you have, I just don't understand it -- how you would have an alternate -- alternation strategy with continuities?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to hand that to Sebastien, because you can imagine I may not be amongst the consensus on this.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. But I don't think that explaining the situation is -- I'm not sure that we are yet there in the thinking. But -- and once again, it depends on how we take the topic. If we take the topic as Chris put it on the table, I have no answer. But if we put it with different type of diversity, and the first one -- first question we can raise is gender balance, and we can say we need to have, in each SO, who are like two people, one man and one woman, and that's already one part of the situation, then this person can be elected three term in a row.

The question is for the other type of diversity, we need to take into account other things in the aggregation of the Board. But it's just one - - one of the possibility we have to think about.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: So other slots would be gendered.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's one way of thinking of it, the slots would be gendered, but then of course then that does put pressure on other sorts of diversities, and if you've got some group that wants more -- there's all sorts of consequences that are here to be thought through, which is why I'm

pulling back slightly from that and more in favor of sharing responsibilities.

Can we move to the next slide, then? Thanks, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Certainly. Thank you, Cheryl. This is Pat.

So on public consultations, in response to the question please rate how effective the current system of public comment consultations is for gathering community input, the individual responses were split down the middle in terms of effective versus not effective, and within structures 75% said effective or very effective and 25% were somewhat or -- ineffective or ineffective.

Next slide.

So in a companion question, do you believe the concept of public comment is currently implemented, should be reexamined? Individual responses overwhelming in favor, and structure responses were 54% in favor.

Next slide.

So one of the things that is here as well is that in the different ways that we're getting information from the Board and from the org and in the community, such as blogs, how do we respond to those particular blogs? So, for example, a few weeks ago, Goran came out with his fiscal year 2020 goals and objectives, which I found very interesting, and it was kind of what was that -- what was the response to all that. We

started having a conversation at ICANN Studienkreis which was interesting, so what's the follow-on and how do we provide feedback to those types of communications from the Board or from the org. And one of the things that we talked about was is a Survey Monkey type device or mechanism the appropriate way in terms of asking questions. Now, surveys can always be skewed based upon how you ask the question, but there's got to be some way in terms of how we provide feedback to those types of communications that the community receives.

Next slide, please.

So I think I covered that, yes. So thank you. All right. I was starting to go, gosh, I'm all right.

So the last area of PDPs, that's still under consideration by ATRT3.

And then in closing, I'm going to let Cheryl talk about what the public consultation process is on our draft report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, good sir. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.

So at the moment we're still on track. We're planning on publishing our draft report for public consultation in the mid-December period with a closing date for that PC around the end of January 2020. We are well aware that there are a number of other important public consultations going on at that time and that will be held in parallel. Auction proceeds, et cetera, et cetera. But as a time-bound one, there's not much we can

do about that. So we just have to apologize for the fact that that's the way it's got to be.

But in order to help mitigate the workload to the community and in line with our own suggestions for what future public consultations should look like, we will be putting out, with our draft report, an augmented executive summary which in particular help groups like the Government Advisory Committee where they can take that document to their individual governments, make clear, plain language, you know, sense out of it and perhaps get back thinking in a timely fashion. But we think that will also be useful to more than just the advisory committees but across ICANN. And that we will also be putting the same list of questions.

So if respondents can only find the time to do some of the questions, all of the questions, or respond to the augmented summary, then that's something worthwhile. If they have the time and ability to respond to the whole of the documentation, that would be more than welcome.

And with that, I think it's any questions from any of you on that. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

It's not on this. I just wanted to get back to the diversity thing for a second. What would be immensely helpful in discussing diversity when you're making suggestions or recommendations is if you could make a clear statement as to who you are considering when you're talking. In other words, when you're talking about the Board, do you mean the Board and the liaisons as well? Because pretty much in our minds it's

the same thing; right? The liaisons may not necessarily vote, but in our minds they are effectively part of the Board.

So it would be useful if you could, in talking about diversity and things like that, to whether or not you specifically just mean board members or whether you would include -- obviously in geographic it's referred to specifically in board members, but in other areas, if we can talk about whether or not you mean the liaisons as well, that would be helpful.

And I'm thinking specifically, because if you look at the liaisons right now, you know, Manal, Merike lifts the female side of the -- If you don't count them, then it's of no effect in the gender calculation.

Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Avri.

AVRI DORIA: And a quick piece to that. Are you also looking at the -- the gender distribution for the other selections that are made or only looking at the Board in terms of this gender distribution issue?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we are.

Sebastien, you wish to -- no? Okay.

Do we have anybody from the floor? I know we're talking to the caucus, Board caucus, but we're happy to have questions from anyone else at this stage.

Have we got one last slide? I think it says questions, doesn't it? Yes, exactly.

So -- go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I didn't want to talk because Chris have done the answer to my question about diversity, but I wanted to come back to the question of the comments.

You, Cherine, have made a blog about the question. We are talking about review here, and it's up in the comment on this blog. And it's why we think that, really, we need to think about how the comments are gathered in this organization, because we have a specific issue with a tool organized for the comments of the community. And here, since few months now, we have request comment in a blog by the CEO. But specifically, one done by something we are supposed to handle; therefore, it's why we would like very much to take that into account in our work. And if you get any answer to this blog, to bring it to our attention.

Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien.

Any -- anything else from anyone on the review team?

Any more questions from our caucus?

I think we can cede back ten minutes of your day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a wrap.

PAT KANE: Thank you all very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]