
YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hello everyone. Good day. Welcome to the ATRT3 plenary call number52 on the 13th of March 2020 at 20:00 UTC.

Members attending the call, we have Cheryl, Daniel, Demi, León, Sébastien, Vanda and Wolfgang, and I think our observers here, we have Everton and Jaap. I'm not sure if you're an observer or a member. You might be a member. If I got that wrong, my apologies. And we have our technical writer, Bernie as well. From staff, we have myself, Yvette Guigneaux and we have Pamela Smith and Negar Farzinnia. We have apologies from Jennifer Bryce and Brenda Brewer.

We'd like to remind you that today's call is being recorded and to please state your name before speaking. Okay, Cheryl, I think that about does it for me. I turn the call back over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Yvette. I appreciate that. And believe me, Jaap is definitely a member. A more than essential member, in fact, that we definitely need amongst the ranks of we who are.

Thank you, everybody. [inaudible] has just joined as well. Five minutes early for everything, but that doesn't seem fashionable sometimes. Okay, let's get going.

Pat will be with us. He's needing to get a change of place. He's relocating to become home office bound. [Verisign are in a health situation.]

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.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I cannot follow Cheryl.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yeah, me neither. I think your audio is breaking, Cheryl.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, I think we've lost Cheryl. Did we have her dialed in, Yvette?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I think at this point she was probably just on computer. We can dial her in, that's not a problem.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Why don't we try that, please.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do apologize [inaudible] Internet [inaudible]. Apologies. If you can call me, please, Yvette, call me on my landline. My Internet's clearly too unstable. You know what the story is, Yvette, you've suffered with me through the week.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I'm doing that right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I apologize for dropping out there.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: We're dialing you in, just give me a minute.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I will fix this audio problem. My apologies. Living in a third-world emerging economy [inaudible] connection [inaudible].

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Your landline should be ringing right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] packet drop.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You're probably losing 50% of your packets at this point, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. Thank you, Yvette.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Welcome.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's a whole lot of fun. Okay, so clearly, I'm going to be working under difficulties, but there you go. Let's roll back to where I was on the agenda, mentioning that Pat will be joining shortly. Obviously, if someone can help me manage the queue as I continually drop in and out of the Zoom room, that will be of help.

First of all, the agenda is fairly stable at the moment. It's a basic agenda, but the primary part today is first to get back into accountability indicators. And can I just say, it is almost driving me to destruction to hear my audio through my headset coming in through some bizarre and peculiar garbled rate. But anyway, let's get on to any SOI updates. If there are any, let us know now.

Can you please move to—I believe the accountability indicators is our primary work on the first agenda item. Bernie did send out an updated version and an explanation of the few things that he has changed less than 24 hours ago, so I'll be relying on him to take us through that until Pat comes and saves me, and I try and find a better way of connecting to this meeting.

The only other thing that we're going to do today is go back and start looking at our drafting document, and hopefully, I will have sorted out my gremlins by then as well, or Pat will have come and saved me.

So with little further to do, the first thing—if my memory serves—on the agenda was the status of the—and it wasn't requesting an extension. We decided it was stating the fact that we are going to be late due to force majeure. Basically, we'll get back to you when the date

ticks by and tell you where we are up to. Pat and I have not completed drafting though, you're going to have to leave us another few days with that. Little has changed since our last discussion, nor do we actually need to inform the board of this fact during the ICANN week. So we'll give them five minutes to [inaudible] and in the next few days, we'll have that out to you before our next regular and scheduled call. Hopefully, we will be able to put some fine tuning on the draft during our leadership team meeting on Monday.

So tick that off the agenda. I don't believe that there is any outstanding or updated action items, but Negar, jump in now if there's any, please.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thanks, Cheryl. No other action items. That was the only one. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Great. All right, well, my connection's been stable for four and a half seconds, so let's jump into the final report. Bernie, I thought we'd just be looking at the AIs to start with, but if we're doing final report, that's fine to me. Over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

No, we'll be doing accountability indicators first since it's fresh in everyone's mind. And as I said in my email, hopefully, we'll walk our way through this.

All right. Let's load up the accountability indicator document, please, Yvette. There we go.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yvette, if you can just move to the other document, the AI one. Right. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Let's go down to the first comment, please. As I noted, I've included comments on everything. All right. Is there information on where the data came from? I thought we could use a bit more specification here, so I've included the following: either the source of the data is obvious and publicly available, such as the budget, or the accountability indicator text provides a link to the source of the data. So we're very clear, it has to be obvious where the data is coming from, and that data has to be publicly available, or you have to give a pointer to it. I hope that's okay for everyone.

Not seeing anything. All right, the next bunch of yellow, I have taken in Sébastien's comment about—I see Sébastien. Please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to suggest two words I had on the text. Like that, I don't have to speak. If you don't want, I take it away, but I was suggesting that need to provide, to add that in this text. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. I didn't quite get what you were suggesting, so if you can write it directly in the document as a comment, I'll be glad to look at it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It is in the document here. If you can scroll a little bit down the text, please, you can see.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, "Needs to." Sorry. I didn't see that. Okay, sure. No problem. Thank you, Sébastien. All right, now the next batch, as per Sébastien's request, I've tried to clear up the language. So I've trimmed down the language and tried to keep it simple. I hope that's okay.

All right, I'm not seeing anything. Let's go down to the next comment, please. As mentioned in the e-mail, I've updated everything in this, including kept up to date and the graphics as of 10 March. Well, over 10, 11 and 12 March. So everything is now done. The critical date is as of 10 March 2020. Graphic is updated. Next comment, please.

Yeah, I had originally said this one was the same as the other one, but that was before we developed this assessment system. Didn't make sense anymore, so I just threw in the assessment of this one. So it's not crucial because there's no information on the objective because there's no objective. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information up to date? No. We're looking at the last entry being for ICANN65, so we're missing ICANN66. I don't think that should rattle anyone. Next comment, please.

If they're just updated for the graphic, Yvette, let's skip over those because we will have about 47 of those. All right, 1.1.2.3.1, Sébastien pointed out that I had not clear on if it was crucial. He reminded us that any translation activity in ICANN is crucial. I accepted that and changed it to yes but added a comment under the goal for the objective.

So if we go back up just a bit, just to put everyone in the frame of mind of what we're looking at here in the graphic that's associated with this, you basically see that black bar with the dots is the objective. it has not changed for years.

If we go back down to my comment on the goal, basically, what I say is, is the accountability indicator—yes. Some reason, I'm seeing the header and the footer. And basically, the comment on the objective is “Maintaining the same objective year after year while continually and significantly surpassing it is not a very useful objective.” So basically, I think that covers it, that if you just have this flatline objective that you keep beating, there's no point in using that. Any questions, thoughts? No? Okay, next comment, please.

On this one, as per Sébastien's comment, “Why does ICANN use two different definitions for regions? The standard five ICANN regions and the eight GSE regions. this can lead to confusion and difficulty in bringing information together.”

There is a section 1.2.2. for engagement and community metrics timeline, but it only has a comment. The work is promising to deliver something. It's not clear why this is labeled as an accountability indicator as it only promises one. So just pointing out that there's

something which is technically an accountability indicator which is not all right, next comment, please. And if you have comments, just shout or raise your hand, I'll try to spot you. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Bernie, I think, regarding this second bullet of note, personally, I would have taken the following way, is to call that 1.2.2, and saying there is no graphics, no comments, and not just a footnote on the previous graphic, because it is supposed to be another graphic and we don't see it, of course, because they are working on it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I understand your point. I can split it up and I will do that. Okay, agreed. 1.2.2, separate entry. We will now go to 48 with that. I was trying to avoid changing my numbers.

Back up so we look at the graphic, please, Yvette. Thank you. Ah, yes, the great policy advice development, number of teleconferences and working hours. Okay, and as we discussed with Sébastien—if we go down to the comment—what we've got here is a note for 2019-07, entry as above, all SO/ACs, when we click on the green portion, we get 215 meetings, and the blue gives 281 hours. Can we get rid of those headers? They just muffle up everything. Please.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

I'm not even sure how those got in there, to be honest with you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just click anywhere in the text and it'll go away.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Wonderful. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. It's temperamental. So if you use that to calculate the average per call, as was pointed out by Sébastien, 281 times 60 divided by 215 gives you 78.5 minutes per call, which is much less than the 90—approximated—that the average line shows for this date. It is necessary to explain how the average is calculated and why there's such a variance. I think that should cover the point you were trying to make, Sébastien. Very well done, because I had not caught that. Okay, next comment, please.

Let's look at the graphic just to make sure which one we're dealing with. Oh, the total e-mail exchanges. Okay. Is what is being measured clear? Not clear. What does this include? Staff meeting announcement and reminders, etc. So we're not really clear what these e-mails actually include, if they just include the working group stuff or all the announcements, etc. I thought it was important to note this, because having looked at e-mail queues for groups, sometimes the administrative announcements can take up quite a bit of space. All right, next one.

This one is total number of council resolutions. Oh, yes, our favorite one. What do we have here? Is what is being measured clear? No. What does "advice activities" include? So it's resolutions and advice activities.

I'm unclear on what "advice activities" includes. And then we have a note, even if there was an objective, would measuring the number of council resolutions and advice activities be crucial to evolving policy development and governance processes, structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive? This seems to presume that the productivity of SO/ACs should be measured by the number of council resolutions and advice activities. If this is the case, this would be very troubling to the ATRT3.

So trying to follow up on Sébastien's comment on this and the registry to explain our thoughts on that. I hope that sort of captures what you're saying, Sébastien. I see Vanda's hand. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I believe there's some actions from the councils that are quite relevant for the governance of the organization as a whole but is not clear in that measurement. So in my view, could be an important indicator, but because some of them, it's about [the defense] of the organization and to make points that are not clear and how they have been [dealing] through the [council area, the legal staff] and so on, so it's something that in my point of view is important, normally is some reference in many organizational reports end of the year. But the way it's there means nothing because we don't know the focus, what means. This is just not accountability. Well, maybe accountability, but not transparency about what they have done, why it is important, they should grow, they should not grow. There is a lot of information that we cannot extract from those.

So I don't know how to address that, but in my opinion, the idea behind it is important, but the way it's done is not. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think you've said something very good there, so I will try to remember it. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. The issue here, I think, that Vanda's brought up, could be analyzed a little bit more deeply by an example that says we understand why this analysis is attempted but it's simply a piece of fluff. It's [inaudible] relevancy for all the reasons that Vanda just outlined.

Let me give you an example from the GNSO council. Within a single e-mail, there may be zero resolutions or information beyond basic administration such as someone replacing someone in proxy at an upcoming meeting, or a deadline for a piece of administration of material needing to be in advance of an upcoming council meeting, or it may be an agenda which will obviously have some governance material in it, or it may contain seven, eight or nine specific resolutions, either upcoming or approved by a recent meeting.

So unless you analyze the content, you are not getting useful information. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right. I think I got the gist of it, took a few notes. We'll be playing with that one. Thank you very much for that, everyone. All right, let's drive this to the next one, Yvette, please.

All right, healthy, stable Internet. Oh, yes. Overall performance. Right. Okay, this is the GDD stuff. After our last chat on this, I ended up checking all the links in the reports and doing a bit of a deeper dive on these things, and it became obvious that it was a little bit more complex than it looked on the surface.

So, is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Overall, not clear, and these are the reasons why. The first graphic, which is the graphic we have up there, is all departments. Yes, the objective of the service level commitment is listed, but not included on the bars. One has to assume that this is because the results are all 100%, but in other accountability indicators, when this is the case, the objective line is still included. As such, it would be good to have some consistency with respect to that.

If we go back up to the graph, you'll see that we have our little black mark on top of the graphs which shows the objective, and usually, even if it's 100%, that bar is across the top there and we can see it. So we're just saying, if you're going to have that, might as well include it even if it's 100%, because most of the other accountability indicators do include that. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Bernard. It seems that we have this information for overall performance for all departments, but if you take GDD operation for

example, or new gTLD, you have some quarter where it's not 100, and there is no—

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm not finished, Sébastien. Let me finish.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, but that's why we have trouble here, because here, I don't know how they can be 100% if the subgroups are not 100%. It's two elements. But I'll let you finish and I will come back when you finish the presentation. Sorry for that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No problem. But yes, I absolutely agree with you and that's why I redid this one. All right, let's go back down to the comment, please, Yvette. Okay, so that was the first one, which was all the parts. Now, GDD operations. Neither of the two graphs has an objective. If we go back up to the graph for a second, you'll notice that there are all those boxes on top which are the three departments.

If you click on those, you get the two graphs for each one. Why don't you click on one of them? That'd be great. The second one. Oh, sorry, I'm lying to you. That's just a copy paste. Anyway, so if you click on each of the boxes, you get those two graphs for each of the things. Let's go back down.

All right, so for GDD operations, neither of the two graphs has an objective, and for global support center, neither of the two graphs has

an objective, but are all 100%—so your previous note—and on new gTLDs, neither of the two graphs has an objective.

So it's interesting that none of the three really list objectives, and I think that's sort of important. Go down a bit, please. [inaudible]. A lot of objectives for GDD operations has five different metrics which are combined to produce the two graphs without explanation as to how this is done. So basically, there's a lot of data. There is a truckload of data, but we have no idea how they're compressing it to get into this form and provide these results.

Is what is being measured clear? I see your hand, Sébastien. I'll get to you when I've finished this block. Is what is being measured clear? Similarly to objectives, it's unclear how the data from the various metrics are combined to produce the results shown in the graphics. The all department graphs shows for fiscal year 18, fourth quarter, as an overall performance and an overall customer satisfaction as both being 100%, yet the GDD customer satisfaction, the GSE customer satisfaction and the new gTLD customer satisfaction data for that same period all show results well below 100%. How can the combined result for this period in all departments show 100%? Which I hope is the point Sébastien was trying to make. So this is the clearest example I could find when looking at the data.

Is there information on where the data comes from? It's not clear. What is presented is the statistical analysis of the data for each section. So if you click on the reports and you go look at them, the thing we actually get pointed to is a statistical analysis. It's not the data. An example of this is the global support customer service performance metrics

dashboard. Under metrics one, number of days to last response, where we are presented with months, average number of days to last response and percentage within service level, less than seven days, where that percentage for November 2019 was at 85% with no understanding on the volume of requests or the statistical distribution of the data.

So a lot of information, but how they get from all that information to what they're showing us on the accountability indicator is completely unclear. Sébastien, over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. And well done. Just one proposal. It's in first one in yellow, all department, GDD, GSE and new gTLD, I think GSE is the same thing as the other. I don't know why you have put that there 100%, because the second graph is not 100%, and it's exactly what you explained in the following text. Therefore, I suggest that you put the same comments in GDD, GSE and new gTLD. I hope it's clear.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I think I know what you're saying. I'll take a note and have a look at that. 21.12. Okay. Next one, please, Yvette. That's just updated. Oh, yeah, we need to look what it is. ICANN interaction with the technical and public safety communities. We have presentations and the like, and that evaluation hasn't changed.

Here, we've got the great project plan, and I was stymied by my technology, so that explains why the graphic looks horrible. It's one of the few I had a really hard time copying over. I've highlighted it in

yellow so that I can take another crack at it a little later. Next one, please.

Okay, here we go. So no, a project plan is not an accountability indicator, especially one that was completed prior to the accountability indicator being published in June 2019. And you can't really see it from the graphic, but the completion date that was in that project plan was for February 2019.

Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? No. Given the goal of completing the project was achieved prior to the publication of the accountability indicator in June 2019, it cannot be considered a goal.

Is there information on the goal? No. Is what's being measured clear? No, because it's a project plan. We don't get any updates. Given the goal of completing the project was achieved prior to the publication of the accountability indicator, it's unclear what is being measured by this. There's nothing to measure because technically, the project is done. Any questions or comments on that one? No? Okay, let's go on. We're doing really well today.

Internet technology health indicators. Another project plan. Project plan is not an accountability indicator, especially one that was completed when the accountability indicator was being published. So this one, the end date is June 2019 and it was published in June 2019. Is there a goal or objective? Same thing. Is there information? No. Is what's being measured clear? No. Very similar to the previous one. All right, let's go.

2.3, support the evolution of the domain name marketplace. This is the GDD thing. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? No. So basically, there is a goal, yes. Is there information on how the goal is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? No. The graph does not present any progress on a monthly or quarterly basis. As such, nothing is being measured. So I don't think that anything is being measured.

Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? Not clear. And there's an important comment here. As of January 2020, the end date for the project was changed from May 2020—there's something that's missing here. Anyways, so the end date of the project was changed in-between January and March. We currently have an end date that I think is September 2020, and there is no note anywhere. Oh, it's right below it. What am I talking about?

The end date published originally was September 2019. In January 2020, this was changed from September 2019 to May 2020 but no explanation or justification is provided. Should published objectives of an accountability indicator be allowed to be changed without any explanation? So I think that's the critical part that we're talking about here. They just slid in this change and not even an explanation or a note that it was changed. If we hadn't been taking copies of the accountability indicators that I was referring to, it would have been very easy to miss. So I need to do some editing on 23 126.

Okay. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bernie, it's not the only one I would like to say that, but I think it could be useful if you keep the first image you take. Like that, it shows the evolution. Like that, we're not just talking, saying that we have seen that but we will show it in the report.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good point. I have those copies. So, "Include original image." Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And as I have, for the same point, I would like to say that in other graphics, when the graphic change a lot, for example, when in the last one you have the four quarters for financial purposes and now we have just one, it could be also useful to keep the old one to show the differences, and that will help to explain our feedback. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you. I think we're done here, Yvette. Let's move on. All right, so funding fiscal year 19, ICANN operations total. So reading this, obviously, I forgot to note that they forgot to change the title. As we look at the bottom, we're talking about fiscal year 20 Q1, and yet on top, they are still referring to funding fiscal year 19, which was in the previous one. So let me take a note on that. 3.1.1.1., change title of graph.

Okay, let's go down to the comment.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hey Bernie, sorry to interrupt, we do have a question in the chat from Daniel.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, sorry. Can we—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I dealt with it, I hope.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Thank you very much, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's my job.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Can we go back up to the graph of that one, see if we've got the same problem? Baseline operations. Yes, this, so they've done the same thing on that one. 3.1.2.1., [inaudible]. Okay, that's the same thing. If there's no comment, next graphic, please.

Funds under management. Okay, we don't seem to have that problem there. And no comments. That was the same. Number of stakeholder groups submitting comments. Do we have a comment there? Yes. There we go.

Is what is being measured clear? No. There is no definition as to what is a group. So if we go back up to the graph a bit, the second one, I think—we don't have the definition. Percentage of groups participating annually in the planning process. There's no definition anywhere of what is a group, so there's no idea how we're getting this information. "In those two ones, I suggest to have—the two images, the graphs you have captured." Yes, I noted that, Sébastien. I will do that.

all right, so we don't know what is a group. So I think we should have an idea, because otherwise, it's very hard to understand what is being measured here, especially in the next graph where they're measuring those that participate and those that don't participate in percentages, which is fine. Interesting, but I don't know if it's critical. All right, next graph, please.

Oh, yes, the deadline for publishing the annual audited financial statement. Big red line there. Let's go down to the comment. I've got that it's not clear that it's crucial to achieving the goal. Given this is a mandatory requirement, it could be bundled with all the other mandatory requirements, such as ethics, into one accountability indicator reporting if there is a problem in meeting all the mandatory timing requirements.

So basically, we've got five or six accountability indicators that all they're showing is, "Yes, we've published this in time. Yes, we've responded in time." And all those things are required. Some of these other things that we're looking at are the posting of IRP materials. That's mandated in the bylaws. The board training, that's mandated under California law. You have to report on it. The financial statements

of the corporation, that's mandated by California law. You have to report on it.

I don't think each separate one deserves an accountability indicator. Now, you may disagree with me, but after playing with this for hours and hours, it just didn't make sense to me. It made sense to say, "Okay, those things are important." Let's all agree those things are very important. But we don't need separate accountability indicators for those. We should probably be able to combine all those things which are mandatory requirements for dates things have to be done, and just have a look at it in one, is what I'm proposing.

I'm not seeing any argument with that. All right, thank you very much for that. Let's go down to our next graphic, please. All right, percentage staff voluntary turnover trialing 12-month trend. Let's go down to the comment. Is what is being measured clear? Not clear. There's no definition of what is voluntary termination of a full-time staff member. Yes, we can have an argument that it seems clear, but we have definitions for everything. It'd be good to have a definition for this, I would think. Note: should this not include all staff turnover instead of only voluntary? As was pointed out by Sébastien when he was reading that.

Not seeing any questions, let's—Sorry. I fell off there. As usual, about every half hour or 45 minutes, I go away for a few seconds. But I can hear now, so I've come back.

All right, not updated as it is current. So basically, we still have the fiscal year 19 Q4 graphic and that hasn't change. Let's go down to the

comment. I think there is one on this one. Okay, so, is what is being measured clear? No. There's no definition of what is the security operation. We measure them really well, but then we have no idea what that is. And I think it's important on the up to date—is the information—no. Oh my, there's a mistake there. I have to clean that up. Okay. The up to date data line got killed.

Okay, so as of March 2020, the last quarterly update was fiscal year 19 Q4, making it seven months behind being kept up to date. That's because fiscal year 19 Q4 is April, May, June. 30 days after the end of the next quarter would be 30 days after fiscal year 20 Q1, would be from August 1st. From August 1st to March 1st, we've got seven months. So as we stated at the beginning of our document, there is really very little value in an accountability indicator based on quarters if you're not going to update it on a regular fashion, and we said that we thought it was reasonable to say that 30 days after the period closes—whatever that is, whether it's a month or a quarter—that it should be updated. Next graph, please.

Risk management. Fiscal year 20 Q1, and basically, not much has changed. Added Sébastien's comment that it's very useful to compare results by quarter. Next graph, please.

[inaudible] Ensure structured coordination of ICANN's technical resources. ICANN digital services availability, even though it's 100% as you can see up there, we've got the little black line, and we've got a whole bunch of boxes to do stuff. All right, let's go down a bit on the assessment.

Is the accountability indicator crucial? No. Given this is significantly out of date with the last update being in March 2019. Oh, yeah, if we go back up, you'll see in the title, again, as of the end of March 2019. So I think the data from what I could see and compared to what I have stored in my files versus what they're presenting, the data was updated but they forgot to change the title. Next graph.

Universal acceptance, and we're at fiscal year 20 Q1, we seem to be good. Let's go down. Is there a comment on this one? No, we've maintained our evaluation as it was. The next one is DNSSEC, and no date in the title, and our last call in fiscal year 20 Q1. I know there's a comment here. Is there information on how the goal is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? Not clear, see the note below. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. And the information here is, [inaudible] "link, please visit here" is the text accompanying the graphic, links to DNS.icann.org. Once on that page, there is a bullet referring to DNSSEC infrastructure for ICANN-managed domains and a few TLDs, which is not linked to anything. So basically, we're told to go to this link, we go there, and it sort of dead ends. So not very useful. Next comment there, please, which is a note.

So Jaap provided us a comment as promised. ATRT3 is somewhat puzzled at the DNSSEC status ICANN domain name portfolio graphics. It looks like all ICANN's domain names are signed unless they are in the category explained in the best practice document from the IETF. However, it doesn't say anything about the domain names actually used for services provided by ICANN. A lot of services are outsourced to various third parties, an arbitrary example such as ICANN.zoom.us, is

used a lot but is an unsigned domain. So it might be clear what is measured, but whether this is really useful is debatable.

Thank you for that, Jaap. I've still got a little bit of editing to do there. I will do that, but basically, we've got some very valid comments on that .Any questions? Not seeing anything, next graph, please. IPv6 adoption, we've got a similar situation here. Is there a goal or objective which the data provided can be assessed? Not clear. The objective is stated in the text below the graph as our target is to have all services accessible over both IPv4 and IPv6, but the progress towards this is not shown on the graphics.

Is what is being measured clear? Not clear, see the note below, and our note is, "Similar observations can be made about the use of IPv6 as were made for DNSSEC. The graphic is only limited to externally facing services used by ICANN Organization and community, but managed by ICANN Organization, but doesn't take the services provided by third parties into account. This can be illustrated again by looking at services provided by ICANN.zoom.us.

So again, they might give nice numbers, but in reality, the situation is not as rosy as it seems. Again, thank you, Jaap. Very nice. Not seeing any comments, let's move on. Next graphic, please.

I decided to take a bit of a harder line on the information security segment, because you will note that the last entry on that is fiscal year 18. It's explained why it is, but—so let's have a look at my comments here.

Assessment. Is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? No. Providing information that is 18 months out of date as of March 2020 on IT security is not useful. Basically, we're given this accountability indicator, it's 18 months out of date, and that's an accountability indicator? I just don't see that as being realistic.

Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? No. There was an objective, but the note accompanying the graphic states that this system of measurement is no longer in use. As such, that objective is no longer valid. So there was an objective. They're going to change it because they're changing the system, so we have no idea what it is. So no.

Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? Yes, but no longer valid. Is what is being measured clear? Yes, but no longer valid. Is there information on where the data comes from? No. Is the information being kept up to date? No, with an explanation. As of 10 March 2020, the last annual entry was for fiscal year 2018 with a note that ICANN is transitioning from CIS to NIST CSF for managing its approach to information security. A CIS 20 score was not produced during that transition period. The charts will be updated using NIST in fiscal year 21.

So basically, we're getting an accountability indicator when the last input showing is fiscal year 18 and a promise that we'll get something for fiscal year 21. I just don't see the use of that. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. I understood they moved the facility to survey those issues to NIST, and will depend on the time and the project inside the NIST where I have been worked so many years ago. So I do believe that the whole thing is not valid as general. Independent what we are doing and talking and writing here, the new survey will come from another point of view or information. So I believe we don't need to pay attention that, just add that it's necessary to wait for the NIST report.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I fully agree. Thank you, Vanda. All right, next graphic, please. We're doing really well today, folks. Develop a globally diverse culture of knowledge. Achievement of globally—and we've got ICANN public meeting participation and then broken down by some regions. Do we have a comment on that one? No, it's the same evaluation. Okay. Next graphic.

ICANN Learn. Let's go down to the comment. Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Yes, but there's a note. Maintaining the same objective year after year while continually and significantly surpassing it is not a very useful objective. Let's go back up to the graphic to have a look at that, and basically, you'll see that there was a time when it was a little bit closer, but for the last four quarters, basically, the objective is about the halfway mark, if not below that. Just not much use if you're setting a goal that you're going to completely blow out of the water all the time. All right, next graphic, please.

“Reaching the first measure makes no sense, keep such goal.” Yes, I agree, Vanda. Years of service. Okay. So we've got zero to three years, three to five, five to ten, ten to 15, and then we've got it by region. Comments? No. We haven't changed our assessment of that.

Talent development courses offered, and a breakdown by the type of—

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Please, Bernie, before you go to the next one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sure. Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If we can come back to the year of service, global fiscal year 20, I know that it's my concern since the beginning, they decide to use the word “organization” for staff, but I think here, we need to know what we are talking about. And I know that Göran is talking about organization when he's talking about staff, but some of us are talking about the ICANN Organization as a whole. Therefore, I don't know how they want to put that, but it must be clear that it's about people working for ICANN. It's even not the whole organization, I guess, it's people in the payroll, I imagine. But even though—I am not sure, is it one paid by ICANN? Therefore, we need to have more detail about what we are talking about.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. I'll take a note on that one.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess it's partly written later on, but I think in the title, if it's written here, it's intern, temporary staff, contractor are exclude. Therefore, it's just the one, I guess, on the payroll. It's totally misleading from my point of view. But once again, I am biased because I don't like ICANN staff using the word "organization." It's in your hands, not in mine anymore. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I've been noting this discussion of Sébastien since, I guess, Work Stream 1, and definitely a lot in Work Stream 2. All right, let's go back to our talent development courses offered, and there's a comment. Is it critical to achieving? I've got a no there. The number of courses offered is not a useful indicator versus the objective, as there is no indication of how many participants take these courses and what is the success rate. Showing the number of participants which completed the various courses would provide some useful information.

And then we've got another comment later down. The second graphic breakdown by category is of limited use given it is only for one quarter. Providing an additional graphic showing this breakdown for all quarters listed in the previous graphic would be more useful. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I think about how they can measure the course, because there is no grades. The only success to be measured is it is complete and you

have done all the questions and complete it. If you learn or not learn, it's almost impossible to see besides the answer of some questions.

So it's just that, it's complete or not complete. If you do not complete the course, you cannot get the star or something like that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I absolutely agree with you, Vanda. I think what we're saying here is how many people take the courses, how many people fail to complete the course. There's some numbers, but just listing the number of courses is not really useful.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I agree. But I don't see how—they need to measure it better, but some explanation that just measure—maybe explain better to help the organization to make it better, not to just say that is not working and has no value. It's something that I would like to raise here. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you very much. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Couldn't agree more with Vanda on this point exactly, but I'd also seek—and I know an awful lot about ICANN Learn, by the way—a little more dissection, because to complete a course means you have certainly completed the course, but in some of the courses, there are questions which are progressive, and until you get them right, you don't

progress on. So that's a very particular type of learning and success associated with that. Others are more informational, and so there are some courses which are much more passive, and by simply going through them and maybe—or maybe not—actually reading what's on the screen as opposed to just clicking “next,” you have, or have not, absorbed materials.

So a little more dissection, a little more detail would be very valuable here. That's in no way a criticism of the ICANN Learn process. It's a request to have more data points and greater analytical. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes, Cheryl. And Just to be clear, we're on staff training courses, and you were talking about ICANN Learn, which was a couple of graphs above.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

My apologies. My brain is obviously slower than your screen is. But the same, I believe, is probably to be told here. There are informational courses, which means you turn up and hear about sexual harassment and you all leave again, and there are things such as the rendering of lifesaving procedures and first aid which would be achieved particular goals. So regardless of the context, I think the points are still [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right. Thank you very much. Noted. We'll see if we can do a few updates to that. Next graphic, please. Globally diverse culture, distribution of board members. This one, similarly to some of the other ones, still has the distribution of board members for fiscal year 19, so

we'll have to make sure that that is updated. Any comments with that?
Okay, we've got a few comments here.

Is the information being kept up to date? Not clear. The main label identifies—okay, so we've got that listed. It is up to date for the names but not the dates and the title of some board members, as Sébastien has pointed out. Sébastien, your hand is up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much. I know that you have trouble to get graphic to your document, but may I suggest that you take a graphic with some name of board member, and not this one where there is no board member at all? Because it isn't sure what we are talking about. But if you take, for example, North America, Becky Burr, it's 2016 and 2019, and in fact, it must be 2022, I guess, if I'm not mistaken.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I found a new way. I can do that, so I've taken a note and I'll be glad to do that, Sébastien. Good point.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Next graphic, please. Board training, and we will note that we have board composition fiscal year 19 on this one again. They seem to be only updating it on an annual basis, because we have fiscal year 19

and fiscal year 19 Q1 to Q4 on the bottom graph. All right, let's go down to comments.

Is it crucial to achieving the goal? Not clear, given this is a mandatory requirement. So this is the same text. This is mandatory. If you're going to really report on it once a year saying that you made it, let's just have one accountability indicator. And you seemed to support that comment earlier, so I'll not go into details here. Anything else lower? Yes.

Is the information being kept up to date? Not clear as of 10 March. Board training by fiscal year is up to date, the last annual entry is fiscal year 19. Board composition fiscal year 19 is out of date given that we are mid fiscal year 20, but could be explained by only updating this annually. Board training sessions fiscal year 19, again, could be explained by being only annual.

Notes. Value as an accountability indicator is very limited if it is only updated annually. There is no graphic below the title "board composition." I guess they meant to have one, but they didn't do that. Next graphic, please.

Nominating Committee.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sorry, Bernie, on the previous one, it came to my mind—and sometime quite low—that this graphic about board training, we may reference to what we have said in the document, in the full report, about these specific topics. We need to make some cross reference, because we are talking about the same thing. Here, it's about data, but we say also, if I

remember well, that list of the course given to the board, or training, was not up to date. Therefore, we need to do something with [these two parts] of the document, just to show that we're not just talking about one topic in two places without knowing that we are doing so. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Very good point. I've taken a note. I'll be doing that. All right. Thank you, Sébastien. All right, Nominating Committee. Any comments below that? No, it's the same thing. Right, next graphic. Section four. We're getting there, folks.

Promote ICANN's role and multi stakeholder approach, government and IGO engagement and participation in ICANN. We've got the various types of governments in the little boxes up there and the engagement participation graph, and I guess there was no engagement participation in 19 Q4 or 20 Q1. Let's go down, are there any comments here? There's a note. Okay.

In engagement overview graphic, the title "overview engagement and participation in ICANN for fiscal year 18-19," yet only shows data for fiscal year 19 and 20. Forgot to update the title. Same for the three other graphics. Additionally, the graphic shows no data for fiscal year 19 Q4 and fiscal year 20 Q1, yet the graphics for intergovernmental and international organizations, national governments and regional government organizations all show data for those two quarters. So obviously a bit of a sloppy job of updating that one. Okay. Next graphic, please.

GAC membership versus participation in the various ICANNs and where people come from in public meetings. All right, keep going down. Do we have a comment on this one? No, same assessment as we did before.

Cumulative participation in Internet governance ecosystem, fiscal year 18 to 19. So we probably have a title problem there too, and we go to fiscal year 20 Q1. So a bit of a title problem. Let's see if we caught that in our notes below. No. Okay, so I'll add a note on that one. So that'll be 4.3.1.2.6. Okay, got that, let's go look at the next graphic.

Number of regional and national IGF initiatives. We don't have a date, and seems to be by fiscal year, fiscal year 19 being the last one completed. Any comments in the text? No. Okay, we're clean. Next graphic, please.

Ah, yes, percentage of Contractual Compliance service level targets that were met. We have our target and everything. Do we have any comments here? Yes. Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Yes. Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. ICANN Contractual Compliance performance reports—we have the link—provides a wealth of very detailed information, but no information on how all of this data is combined to create the objectives of the four subcategories.

Is what is being measured clear? No. The ICANN Contractual Compliance performance report provides a wealth of detailed information—so it's the same scenario we had over in GDD where there is a wealth of information, numbers and requirements just about everywhere, but there's absolutely no information on raw numbers and about how this

all gets munched together so we can get that graphic that they show us, and I think it's important to point that out. All right, not seeing any hands, let's go to the next graphic, please.

Accountability indicators. Public considerations for board resolutions. Fiscal year 20 Q1. Any comments on that one? Oh, okay. Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Not clear. The target is mentioned but not included on the bars. One has to assume that this is because the results are always 100%, but in other—we basically made that point before. If you're going to include the bar, be consistent about it.

Is there information on how the goal or objective is defined? No. Is what is being measured clear? No. There is no definition of what a public interest consideration from board resolutions is. And that is a longstanding discussion which we will not get into here. All right. Next graphic, please.

Completed reviews, implementation progress status. You'll notice that you can't read it very well, but if you look at the dates on those bars, some of them are pretty old, and so we'll comment on that. Let's go down to the comments, please.

all right. no objective, no objective, no information—Is what is being measured clear? Yes. ATRT3 notes that similarly to accountability indicator 1.3—number of council resolutions and advice activities—measuring the volume of recommendations produced by a review team is not a useful measure of accountability and transparency. So basically,

those blue bars we were looking at in the previous graphic measures the number of recommendations made by a review team.

Then, is the information being kept up to date? On completed reviews, the last entry is CCT 2012-11, yet the individual entries for CCT fiscal year 19 Q3 and RDS fiscal year 20 Q1 show that these are completed, so the graph needs to be updated. ATRT3 and SSR2 individual entries have a last update of fiscal year 20 Q1, making these one month behind being kept up to date. Any questions or comments here? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I don't remember, but ATRT2, the number of recommendations was not something like 46 or 47?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 46.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And here, we have only 12.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, we used our own way of counting them. if you only count them at one level, you can count them as 12. If you count them individually—if you remember going through the GAC ones, we've got—I think it's 6.1 or something like that, A through H, and that one is probably considered—yeah, many were a subset. So I do not want to get into an argument whether it was a separate recommendation or an individual

recommendation, but you're quite right, there is, again, two very distinct systems of looking at this.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have no problem with that, but maybe we need to put somewhere that we are not counting the same thing or doing the same mathematics. Just to be clear that when somebody reads—if like me, they say, “Oh, 47 or 46, and 12, what is the mismatch?” Still, we are right, they are not completed all, even if we talk about 12, but it’s maybe some information or point we need to add somewhere. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think the point is we’re counting the same thing but counting it differently. It’s the same as counting [a herd of something versus counting the gender within the herd.]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Agree, Cheryl.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I've taken a note. I'll be writing something about that. Good point. All right. Next graphic, please. Ethics. This is [inaudible] where we've got the target bar across the top even if it's 100%. All right. Comments, please.

Is this crucial? We've got the same comment here, these types of indicators could be bundled when it's just a requirement. If it's a real formal requirement and we're just measuring 100% all the time, there's no point having all of these separate things.

All right. Thank you very much, Wolfgang. Anything else on that one, Yvette? No. Okay. Next graphic. Board decision making materials, published versus redacted, and we go to fiscal year 19, so we seem to be doing it by year. And then I think we've got a second graph on this one. And it gave me real trouble getting this in there.

Board decision making materials published by deadline. We've got a target that's always 100% except for that little old fiscal year 17 Q4 entry. All right, let's go down, see if there are any comments. Okay, we've got that standard comment there. If it's a requirement to publish—so let's bundle these. They're not adding a lot of value. They're very important, but we can all cram them into one. Next graphic, please.

Documentary information disclosure policy, DIDP. Fiscal year 20 Q1. Let us go down to the comments. I'm fairly sure there is one. Yes. Is the accountability indicator crucial to achieving the goal? All right. Given this is a mandatory requirement—so we're making the same thing, it could be bundled. Is there a goal or objective against which the data provided can be assessed? Not clear. The objective is defined in the text accompanying the graphic, but this is inconsistent with most of the accountability indicators which have an objective and clearly indicated on the graphic as a target line, which is not the case here. So we're just pointing out that the text defines it, but when you look at the graphic,

there's not that little bar that says it's our target. So maybe that graphic needs to be rejigged.

We've got in the notes some information. Providing information on the satisfaction of those requesting information via the DIDP process would be more useful. It would also be more useful to provide information on the types of responses provided, such as information not available but detailed information provided why it's not, information publicly available but no indication as to where it is, information publicly available with a pointer to it, information provided as requested but redacted, information provided as requested.

So I was doing my best to channel Michael, who we are wishing the best of luck with parenthood, and I thought I should include those. Is that okay with everyone? All right, I'm not seeing any questions, so let's have a look at the next graph, please. Thank you, Cheryl.

Accountability. That's a big one for us, I guess. The note there says, "Not updated as it is current and it stops at fiscal year 19 Q4." So let's go down, and you can guess that we will have that standard comment that this should be bundled. And then, is what is being measured clear? No. No information is provided on how the posting information for IRP and reconsideration request is amalgamated to provide a score. No information is provided as to what is being measured to produce the degree of compliance with the annual acknowledgement by ICANN Organization of the anonymous employee hotline policy.

So yeah, okay, but there are a lot of different things in an IRP that need to get posted at different times, and are we simply saying, "Is it always

100%? How are we calculating these things? I think we could use a little bit more information here.” Is that okay for everyone? But the big thing here is let’s amalgamate these things, let’s bundle them. They're always 100%, ICANN is always working at meeting those really formal requirements. Let’s not have separate accountability indicators for each of those. At least we bundled three of them here in one. Next graphic, please.

In scope complaints and out of scope complaints, which end in fiscal year 19 Q4, not updated, as that is what is currently as an accountability indicator as of 10 March 2020. And then we've got some subgraphs for out of scope submissions, and we've got some text, and under the assessment—all right, we've got some comments. Is what is being measured clear? Yes. In the graphic, out of scope submissions by type, it is unclear what is the subject of most of the out of scope complaints, which is between ccTLD issues and Compliance. Clicking on the bar itself only provides a number.

Is the information being kept up to date? No. As of 10 March 2020, the last quarterly update was for fiscal year 19 Q4, making it seven months behind being kept up to date.

Notes. The data is important, but it is unclear how to make it a valid accountability indicator by adding an objective. some possibilities include tracking response times to complaints versus an objective, similar to what is done in GDD, tracking complainants’ satisfaction with the process.

As an informational indicator as opposed to an accountability indicator, the following suggestions would make this more valuable: having in-scope complaints by status and in scope complaints by department only available for the latest quarter is of limited value. Providing this for all quarters, including a total for all quarters, would be of greater value. A similar comment for graphics related to out of scope submissions.

Is there any information on the satisfaction of complainants with respect to complaints office generally and relative to specific complaints? Is there any information on how many in scope submissions do not result in any specific actions being taken? It would be interesting from a community perspective as an informational indicator to be able to track on a monthly basis in one graphic all the complaints made to all the complaint mechanisms in ICANN.

All right, that's my proposal to you after looking at this. I'm not seeing any hands. All right. Next graphic, please. We're getting there, folks. Section five.

5.3, program support for community participation, fellows. Do I have a comment on that one? Revised yes after due consideration. I will note the following on NextGen participants: except for ICANN59, the objective seems to be met all the time. Anyways, we shall see. It's an interesting thing. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. The fellowship program is supposed to use all the amount of money available and invite all the members qualified. So it's normally exceed a lot the number of qualified and they need to select it. So the

goal is really get 100%. So I believe that there is no other way to measure participation. Could be more important to reach other points, like how many stay, how many go up into the ICANN community. Those are measures that matter.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. I think I agree, but I think it's a bit of a fake target in a way. Let's hear what Sébastien has to say.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I would like to suggest an evolution in this graphic to be more easy to read. If you take each region—and here it's the five regions and that's good—for example, if you click on Latin America and Caribbean, there is no one single NextGen participant. And if we want to go a little bit into detail, we may need to know when the meetings were organized in Latin America and Caribbean.

And the same for other region. I think if the total can show the region where the ICANN meeting is organized, with the same color of the region, it will help to understand better what we are targeting and what we are looking for. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I like that suggestion, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am happy that you like this suggestion, Bernie. It's not often. I have to be very happy myself. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We're all happy. Excellent. It's Friday afternoon. It's Friday late for you, I certainly appreciate that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Saturday morning here, team.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So it's early. Folks, we're done. I think there were a few really good suggestions. There are a few minor fixes. I will work on those. I will remind everyone that significant comments on the accountability indicators document are due by midnight Sunday UTC. So if you have things you want to get in there—but the things we discussed today, I've noted those and I'll be attempting to integrate them, and I think we're really close on this one. So thank you to everyone. Madam chair, if it's okay with you, I've been speaking for well over an hour and a half.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go grab a quick drink of water, my friend.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll be back in two minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Thanks, Bernie, and thanks, everyone. This particular section of the document, I'm delighted with. For something that was a bit of a battle to get into and for us all to get into the analysis, I think we're getting it in pretty damn good shape. So, well done all around. I must say, for our record, and as somebody who's worked in the quality industry for many years in my distant past, to have something as core as an accountability indicator analyzed by a group and hear the words so often in that analysis that include, "This has been a rather sloppy update," does worry me. The forward facing, public facing accountability indicators are one of those things that one really ought to triple check. And indeed, if one is publishing such things, or indeed even recording them, it ought to be on one's internal audit system. So the words, "This has been sloppily updated," really ought never be heard.

So with my moaning and groaning in general about this now on the record, I think what we've got together at this point in time will contribute to a positive set of recommendations/suggestions that can only assist ICANN's accountability. And it is a huge job, don't get me wrong. If it was easy, everybody would be doing it.

So Yvette, if we could just pop back to our agenda now, please. Sébastien, go ahead whilst we're switching.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Cheryl, taking into account your inputs—and thank you for your feedback—I just wanted to add one point. During the ICANN virtual Cancun meeting, when the session about open data was on, I asked a question about those accountability indicators and the possible link, if

any, with open data, and the COO tell that she will look at that. Maybe it could be useful to come back to her and see if there's something that can be helpful on what we're doing. At the same time, we don't want to add some work for us, but just to be sure if it could be useful. And it's Susanna Bennett who answered my question, therefore, she's the one we may wish to contact and to have follow on discussion.

Maybe it could be to invite her to 10-15 minutes in one of our next calls. But all that is in your hands, Cheryl. Just a suggestion. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sébastien. And yes, it's a very good suggestion. One of the notes I made during our thrill packed and exciting virtual experience—and I was in that call as well—was that with the open data initiative now, we should at least reference it within our documentation. I will allow a cautionary note, and I think inviting Susanna before we let the ink dry on our work is a very good thing. Whether it's going to be next week or a little later, I'm unsure, but we will certainly put that on our to do list. So Negar, if you could make that follow up with Susanna to see what we can schedule one of the action items out of today's meeting, it would be greatly appreciated.

The mere publication of open data—and of course, there's open data and open data, and not all data is open data yet—is an aspect of accountability and can be useful in accountability indicators, but is part of a toolkit. So we would probably want to make a cautionary but positive note to that sort of effect.

Okay. So thank you for that, Sébastien. We'll follow up. With the agenda, we are now going to be diving into our updated sections of the final report. I have not looked at my e-mail to see when this was shared in terms of dating. Bernie is undoubtedly going to help me here, but that means that we go back to our other document.

We will also just make a note that I do have a piece of Any Other Business for today, and that's to do with the cadence, time rotation and duration of our following meetings, so we will be wrapping our formal agenda and going to Any Other Business at least ten minutes before the top of the next hour—no, we're already at quarter to the next hour. The following hour, because it's a three-hour call today. So just a little before we are scheduled to close the meeting, we will be wrapping up any of this work so we can move to what I think is essential Any Other Business to planning and administration.

Okay. Bernie, are you back and are you rested?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes and yes. The document was shared less than two hours before this call. Sorry about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which is why I missed it, because I was unconscious literally until ten minutes before this call started. Over to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Excellent. What's good is you wake up very fast, obviously. Okay, as indicated in the e-mail, the introduction/executive summary is not done, so we will go right away to section one, board. If it's gray text, Yvette, it's not for us today.

There's a comment in the margin there. I have moved the finance stuff from prioritization back up to this section as it did not really fit in the final version of prioritization. So when working our way through this— oh, Pat's here. Just in time. We just finished accountability indicators. It went very well, and we're just starting on the draft of the final report. Welcome, Pat.

So as I was saying, after plowing through this, it seemed to make a lot more sense to move the finance stuff back up from prioritization to here, and I did so.

You'll remember that our last discussion on the format of the final report was to shorten it significantly. I have attempted to do that, and we'll take our time going through the board section because it sort of presents our approach on what the other sections are going to look like.

Basically, as noted last time, we're trying to keep the numbering standard as Sébastien had requested. 1.1 is the standard requirement per the bylaws. 1.2, information assessed related to the board. The last time, we were saying information assessed. We wanted to be more specific, so in each section, I keep repeating this ad nauseum, but we're very clear about what we're referring to when we're talking about information assessed.

1.2.1, ATRT3 assessment of ICANN Org's implementation of ATRT2 recommendations related to the board—see Annex A recommendations 1, 5, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 10.5 and 12.1 to 12.5, which are the finance ones.

Basically, we've moved all the text about the ATRT2 recommendations into Annex A. I'm not going to show that to you. You know what it looks like. So we plowed that all in there.

ATRT3 survey results related to the board, see Annex B, survey questions 1 to 14. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just to suggest that in 1.2.1., it may be a good place to say that we are talking into granularity of the ATRT2 recommendations. As staff is talking about 12, we are talking about 40-something. This may be a good place to say that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, yes, that point that we made. Okay. Good point. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, noted. And then 1.2.3, other material related to the board. So what I did is I plowed through all our requests and everything that we looked at, and I have basically included everything in there and made a reference in a footnote.

1.2.3.1, ATRT2 implementation executive summary October 2018, ICANN's accountability indicators, One World Trust report, ICANN board review working group final report 2010, draft onboarding program, ICANN66, ICANN58 leadership program feedback. Next page, please.

Audit committee training feedback, summary of board trainings, information on board 360-degree self-evaluation, chair's blog, key takeaways from the board's 3650 evaluation, information on composition of the board, NomCom presentation to the ATRT3 24 July 2019, selection process, board and NomCom, information on DIDP, ICANN open data program update December 2019, Accountability And Transparency Review Team open data program update, Accountability And Transparency Review Team information transparency initiative update, meeting our commitments to accountability and transparency, an information transparency initiative update blog post, the draft fiscal year 19 operating plan, the ICANN draft fiscal year 20 operating plan, the ICANN current financial information website, and the draft fiscal year 21 to 25 operating and financial plan.

So basically, all the elements that we looked at when we were considering the board stuff, and they each have a footnote and they've each been double checked. So that's our approach for information assessed. Are we okay with this? All right, not seeing any big red Xes or screams, let's go on, please.

All right, analysis of information and identification of issues related to the board. The summary of ATRT3's assessment of the implementation of the 15 ATRT2 recommendations related to the board can be found in

the following table below. Basically, I've taken the core of the information from our evaluation and just reduced it to this table. So implemented, partially implemented and not implemented, and under effectiveness are categories of effective, partially effective, not effective, not applicable, or insufficient information.

And then the text below that, ATRT3 assessed that most of the finance-related recommendations of ATRT2 were implemented and effective. This was not the case for the other ATRT2 recommendations. As such, ATRT3 makes a recommendation regarding the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations in section seven of this report. ATRT3 also makes several suggestions and observations regarding the implementation of these 15 recommendations in Annex A of this report.

So basically, that's going to be the same structure we're going to go through when there are ATRT2 recommendations on the topic. We're going to have the table and then we're going to have a short commentary below. Are we okay with this? All right, looks like we are. Let's go a little bit down. Thank you for the green tick, Daniel.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is that a hand, Vanda, rather than a tick?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to remember that I need to make an address about the board. What I heard during the—with the GAC, the Swiss guy from GAC, but I will write down [here] because it's not related specifically. Just to remember that I put here. Okay? Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you, Vanda. We'll be looking forward to seeing that. With respect to ATRT3's survey, the following results were noteworthy: 100% of responses indicated that the information ICANN makes available on the ICANN.org website should be better organized to facilitate searching for a specific topic. 85% of all responses indicated that it was important or very important that the board implement the transparency recommendations from the CCWG accountability Work Stream 2. 64% of structure responses indicated that they were not satisfied with the diversity amongst board members. 61% of structure responses indicated that they felt that the NomCom as currently constituted was not a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy-in. 40% of structure responses indicated that they were somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the board's interaction with their SO/AC, with most of the dissatisfaction originating from the GNSO and ALAC substructures.

57% of structure responses indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the mechanisms ensuring the board's transparency. However, it is important to note the comments made by the RySG and

the IPC and that 80% of individual responses indicated that these mechanisms needed to be improved. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. In terms of the previous bullet, just to be sure, when you say from the GNSO and ALAC substructure, is it the GNSO global and ALAC substructure, or substructure for both?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Substructures for both.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Then you may need to write it a little bit differently just to be sure that it's for both.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll move substructures before the GNSO. Okay, fine. Yes, I understand the comment.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, no other questions. ATRT3 did not assess any of the results of its survey with respect to the board as requiring recommendations—see Annex B of this report for details—but does make several suggestions and observations regarding the 14 survey questions. ATRT3 notes that

the comments made by respondents, which can be found in Annex B of this report, presents some interesting opinions and suggestions with respect to the board. None of the other inputs raised any issues that required the ATRT3 to make recommendations or suggestions.

I see text from Vanda there. “During ICANN67, Kavouss raised a point. He said it was already asked to the board but never happened. [I do not remember that.]” Okay. Not sure about that. So that’s it with respect to the survey, and then none of the other inputs raised any issues. So that would conclude our assessment of the inputs, and then under recommendations, suggestions and observations, we have recommendations, none, suggestions and observations, please see the relevant sections in Annex A and B. That’s what a section looks like right now, so about two pages on this one. Are we all okay? Is structure holding together, make sense? Are we communicating enough information?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Bernie, yes, I think it is [inaudible] at this stage. Just to be clear about what Vanda’s talking about in the chat, Kavouss—and he asks this of basically any entity that receives any form of written interaction from the Government Advisory Committee, that each point be responded to in writing. The fact that Maarten has agreed to do so is complementary to Maarten and the board’s willingness and desire to be as interactive as possible, but there is no requirement, of course, for the ICANN board to respond in the minutiae to anything or everything that is said within a Government Advisory Committee communique. It is required that they take due consideration to GAC advice that is contained within all

communiqués relevant to any topics they are considering, and of course, there are bylaw-specific requirements as to how they need to deal with explanations if they do not follow Government Advisory Committee advice when they are making a decision. I'm not sure, Vanda, where we need to make a note of that, but if we can find a way to insert it, that's a good thing to do.

I see KC, and then Sébastien.

KC CLAFFY:

I'm not sure we're in the right place to bring this up, but I still didn't get closure on how we're dealing with suggestions, because so many of the public comments said they were confused about the difference between suggestions and recommendations. Is that getting dealt with somewhere else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I believe that we've changed text on all of that and we will be double checking when we get to that section, which is coming up now. So just hold your horses on that, perhaps, a moment. We will see whether or not the rearticulation of what is bleedingly obvious to many people and a mystery to some may become clearer. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. Yeah, it's [the line with] KC's comment. My impression was with the last text we have, we finally get suggestion together to form recommendation. Therefore, we were in a way—I don't know if we were answering the comment, but at least it was a

good way to answer the comment, that in fact, we have at the end of the day only X—I don't remember exactly how many, seven, eight—recommendation, some of them being [inaudible] of what we have called suggestion before. But yes, here in 1.4.2, there is back suggestion and observation, and I also would like to be sure that it's what we meant here. Did we still need to underline that? That's also my question. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, did you want to track back to the overarching part of the document or deal with this now, or what? Yvette, have we lost Bernie?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: No, I was just looking at it. He's still in the room and he's unmuted.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Hello, can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh dear, now he's getting packet loss. That's not good. You sounded like a 98-year-old on their last legs, Bernie. Try again. Yvette, let's see if we can organize a call out to Bernie so we've got dial out as an option. Obviously, the gremlins have found somewhere else to be housed.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rest assured, ladies and gentlemen, that as far as my memory goes, we have gone and retexted in the introductory part of the document to make sure that people are hopefully less confuddled, although my care factor on how confuddled they are at this stage is probably relatively low. But yes, we did do some consolidation in our face-to-face meeting, and that's probably solved a great number of the problems that people were trying to pinpoint in terms of their confusion on the difference between when we were making a vast number of suggestions and very few recommendations. Yes, KC, back to you.

KC CLAFFY: I'm one of the ones who's confused too, so if there's some text I could read, that would help.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, the whole document was sent out a couple of hours ago, so maybe you can pop into it and do a quick scan. Bernie, are you back? And how do you want to deal with this current situation?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Cheryl, Bernie is having Zoom issues. Apparently he's having some internet connection issues, so he's just rebooting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so he's rebooting, but can we also get an audio line out to him?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Yes, we're doing both right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. So as usual, the joys of working virtually are making sure that we're being fully exercised. At least the packet loss gremlins have made it from Australia all the way across to Cancun—actually, he's not in Cancun, he's about two hours south of Cancun, but they've certainly managed to get their way to Mexico and have bypassed taking a small vacation with Yvette to muck up her system as well. So thank you, gremlins. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. I just wanted to point out [inaudible] in the chat [inaudible] question that Vanda raised in the chat, whether we can see how the board is responding to each of the GAC advice in their communique. So I'd just encourage everyone to look at that page. Hopefully, it'll address the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Negar. But of course, the question was very specific in as much as a member from Iran specifically wanted a written response in reply sent formally to the GAC, which is somewhat different to posting something in a perfectly easy to get to—if you go and click on it—link. There was an active versus proactive point, I think, that he was making. But I don't know that we necessarily need to go down that rabbit hole rather than to just note it. But thanks very much for that. We will pop

that link in as part of whatever text and note we put into our final documentation. So let's make sure we continue to capture that.

Do we still have problems with Bernie, before I go to KC?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Yes, we're still working on getting Bernie connected. We're almost there. That's the good news. My apologies for that, folks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem. You're working hard. Go ahead, KC.

KC CLAFFY: Well, I checked the document. I don't see it in there. I see a blank section in there about recommendations, suggestions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, then that means we're getting to it, we haven't gotten to it yet, and we will do shortly.

KC CLAFFY: So, can anybody actually explain the difference? Is it the case that we're still—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, KC, I will try, again. We decided that recommendations that ATRT3 makes, unlike any review team ever before, because we're working

under the new operating guidelines, will need to meet the criteria set out in the new operating guidelines. And so anything—even though it might be important, even though we might feel strongly about it, that does not make that criteria—will need to be called something other than a recommendation. That’s about as simple as I can make the explanation. Is it clear?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Bernie, do we have you?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I know I'm not Bernie. My apologies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I wish you were.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Believe me, I get it right now. Bernie is working on his Zoom room. He's having some Zoom room issues. It kind of keeps crashing on him along with the Internet connection out there. So now we're dialing to him without Zoom. We're working on that right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, seeing as the writer is kind of important to take us through the changes, Pat, do you mind if we take a small hiatus at this point and perhaps jump to the Any Other Business part of our meeting where we can have a brief discussion on the frequency, future and cadence of our ongoing work? Thumbs up from Pat.

Okay, so unlike our previously advertised schedule, we're going to quickly jump to Any Other Business in the middle of our call. The piece of Any Other Business for today was how we all wish to fairly approach the additional workload that we're now going to be committing to as we try and move forward with the completion of our work as far as we can in a non-face-to-face meeting. And obviously, that is our preference, as Sébastien made clear.

Sorry, I'll hold for a moment because I see KC's hand back up. KC, go ahead.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, it's not back up. I'm lowering it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for that. We are moving in with this three-hour call [inaudible]. We also are looking at two calls a week, so our normal scheduled calls and these end-of-week calls, because if we had our next scheduled call on Wednesday, which I believe we are definitely keeping, and then continuing with a three-hour call on the following Friday, we would need to now look at a rotation of call time because we want to

be fair and equitable with the sharing of the pain of late night and early morning calls.

So, is everyone happy for us to switch our next call to a 10:00 UTC time? Because these last couple of calls we've taken on our Fridays have been very late-night calls for Europeans. Is that going to be okay for everybody? Just give us a thumbs up or a green tick. Sébastien, over to you. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. No problem for rotation at all, whatever time it is, but can't we—I'm not sure that we are so efficient with three-hour calls. At least I am not. After two hours, I am almost out of order. I don't know what is your total amount of hours you would like us to do, but if it's six, can't we have three calls of two hours? If it's four, can we have two calls of two hours, maybe two and a half hours? But I feel really tired after two hours of this work. It's not at all for me the same thing as ICANN meeting where sometimes you can dream of something else. But here, we need to be very targeted and just focus on that. It's why I would like to suggest that you take maybe a little bit less hours for each call. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Thanks for this. We can certainly discuss that further. The only problem with doing three calls a week is it gets particularly challenging to schedule in amongst other voluntary work, as well as real world activities that people need to do. But yes, perhaps we may be able to look at a two- or two and a half-hour. Perhaps a five-hour block in a

week will be more productive than a four. Perhaps we can test that out. We've got a couple of weeks to do so.

So Pat, I'm obviously a glutton for punishment, but let's not use me as a baseline. Pat, even if we do have double meetings a week and for a longer duration, we can also consider popping in a ten-minute break in the middle of that time. That's certainly a humane thing to do. We could even take a few minutes break every 45 minutes. That's even more humane and probably fairer for the average human body and mind.

So Pat, I'm going to leave this decision up to you. Over to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. So I do recognize too that the time of day that we've got Sébastien's time zone in is at the very end of his day, and I'm certain that weighs into the tiredness that we get to at the end of three hours. But I'm open to doing what makes sense for the group based upon a certain document we want to get through, an estimated hour and a half or two hours, however we want to do that. But Cheryl, you may be the easiest baseline to take a look at from the standpoint of voluntarism, but I know KC's got a large schedule on voluntarism, as we all do, and it's going to be challenging for all of us. But if we want to be focused on delivering as close to our original delivery date as possible, I think we're going to have to get creative to be efficient and also awake, if you will, and not have our minds be [gelatin at the] end of three hours.

So if we could have the staff put together some kind of poll that would take a look at the weeks on out and kind of take a look and see what the preferences would be for the team, I think that would be helpful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Let's do it this way: we have our leadership team call on Monday at whatever it is, 20:00 or 21:00 UTC. Someone will put it into the chat for everybody. And anyone and everyone is welcome to join that call. Let's look in detail at the possibilities of schedule and cadence and the options for time rotations there, and send it out to the groups as a proposal shortly after that call on Monday. Our call for Wednesday, however, will be—let's be kind and generous—a mere two hours. However, we will take a break at somewhere between the 45- and 55-minute line for about ten minutes. So this is Pat and I being extraordinarily kind and caring to you all, but does mean that we will have to pack even more work into the time that we're going. And by then, we will also be able to clearly establish an agreed pattern and cadence and modify our workplan—or should I say associate our workplan specifically with each of those calls so we can project manage this to the bitter end.

We will rotate, however, for our following call to a 10:00 UTC, so that will be sharing the pain as [we probably are meant] to do. Now, the good news is that Bernie is back in the Zoom room. The bad news is we suspect, with Yvette having done an awful lot of testing with him, that the gremlins will continue to be with us. We do have him audio connected, and that means that we will get additional background noise. But I for one am perfectly happy to hear the birdsong as well as Bernie's dulcet tones. So Bernie, let's test the system.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Do you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We do. You're in a slight echo chamber, but it's better than not having you at all. We've done that, Any Other Business, which means we have this piece of work to run until five minutes before the top of the following hour.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. So we've got [54 minutes.] Okay. Before I was so rudely interrupted by the gremlins, there was a question [inaudible] try going to computer audio and [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Okay. We'll test the other way.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Bernie, are you there? Can you hear us? I see you in the room and you have video. It doesn't say your audio is connected. Hang on, he's letting me know what's going on in Skype. He might be having some Internet issues. Okay, we're getting Bernie set up with audio. Give me one moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, here's the plan that Pat and I are cunningly hatching behind the scenes. If we cannot sort Bernie's gremlins out, take them, put them against the wall and shoot them in the next couple

of minutes, we will declare victory for the day, and we will in fact end up truncating today's meeting with not so much force majeure as force gremlin, and we will circle our wagons back and do more of this work on our Wednesday call for our two-hour meeting. But let's just give it a couple of moments more to see whether or not we can connect the country of Mexico to the rest of the world, effectively.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Let's try one more time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So far so good. Let's go with it while we've got it. Back to you, Bernie.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, Bernie. We're good.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: The packets are flying. All right. Excellent. Sorry about that, folks. It happens. All right, as I was saying, my recollection—but I'll have to go back over my notes—is that when we concluded in Brussels, we had our five or six recommendations which were public input. We had ATRT2 recommendations, accountability indicators, prioritization, and reviews, and that all the rest would be categorized under suggestions and observations and would not be listed under our recommendations and would simply be with Annex A and Annex B where Annex A is the ATRT2 recommendations and Annex B is the survey results with comments and observations. Sébastien's hand is up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Just to be sure if you understood well, we will have some suggestions and observations, but the difference will be that contrary to what we have written in our interim report, we don't ask the board to consider them equal to the recommendations.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That is correct. We specially said this in Brussels. After discussing this for a while, I think you'll remember that we said that after reading the comments from the public comment and adjusting everything, that the suggestions and observations would be just that and that they would not be included in our prioritization of things for the board to look at. At least that's my recollection.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Good. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. All right, any other questions? All right. Yvette, can we drive to section two of the report, please? The GAC. Here we are. Now, we've got our prolog, and I've decided to put it in front of everything. That is probably a debatable decision, but I thought it would just make things simpler.

So in our prolog, we've got the standard thing about the GAC's composed of government representatives who are for the most part participating as official representatives of their respective government.

These representatives are subject to a number of expectations as to how they can interact with the ICANN community and rarely commit their governments to anything. So it's the standard text. It has not changed since the public consultation, we've just included it there.

2.2 is the requirement as per the ICANN bylaws, so nothing special there, and 2.3 is information assessed related to the GAC. So 2.3.1—and yes, we're still working on the formatting—ATRT3 assessment of ICANN Org's implementation of ATRT2 recommendations related to the GAC, see Annex A recommendation 6.1(a) to (h) and 6.2 to 6.9. I can't believe I actually remembered them. I think I dream about these.

2.3.2 is ATRT3 survey results related to the GAC, see Annex B survey questions 15 to 18, and other information is prior interviews of the GAC leadership at ICANN65 and ATRT2 implementation executive summary October 2018, the last such report by ICANN Org. So those are the things that we considered for the GAC.

The analysis of the information as we saw in the previous item is a summary of ATRT3's assessment of the implementation of the 16 ATRT2 recommendations related to the GAC, can be found in the table below. 13 implemented, three partially implemented, zero not implemented. 12 effective, two partially effective, one not effective, and one, insufficient information.

ATRT3 assessed that most of the ATRT2 recommendations related to the GAC have been implemented and are effective, but does make a few follow-on suggestions concerning these. See Annex A recommendation 6.1(d), 6.1(h) and 6.6.

ATRT3 did not assess any of the results of its survey with respect to the GAC as requiring recommendations—see Annex B of this report for details—but does make several suggestions and observations regarding the four survey questions. ATRT3 notes that the comments made by respondents—which can be found in Annex B of this report—present some interesting opinions and suggestions with respect to the GAC. None of the other inputs raised any issues that required the ATRT3 to make recommendations or suggestions.

If we go down to 2.5, recommendations, suggestions, we will see that recommendations related to the GAC, none, suggestions and observations related to the GAC, please see the relevant sections in Annexes A and B. I will pause there for a second, see if there are comments or questions.

Section 3 is a little bit beefier, as you will see. Requirements. The ICANN bylaws one, standard. Information assessed related to public input. ATRT3 assessment of ICANN Org’s implementation of ATRT2 recommendations, standard stuff. 7.1, 7.2, and 8. ATRT3 survey results related to public input, see Annex B questions 19 to 27.

Other information related to public input, ATRT2 implementation executive summary, public comments versus other public input methods posting. I’ve got it in Annex C, but I’ll just leave the footnote and take out annex C. It’s just a page and a half, it’s just not worth it. Presentation by public comment support team to the ATRT3, public comment trends report, 2010-2018, and improvements to public comments recent posting. So that’s the information that was considered here.

Analysis of information, identification of issues related to public input. Basically, we've got the three ATRT2 recommendations, two implemented, one partially implemented, one partially effective, one not effective, and one insufficient information.

ATRT3 assessed that most of the ATRT2 recommendations related to public input have been implemented but does make one suggestion, see Annex A recommendation 8. The ATRT3 survey found that 88% of individuals were in favor of reexamining the concept of public comments.

The public comment trends report 2010-2018—final—provides some interesting data. The total number of public comment proceedings, the total number of public comment proceedings has declined significantly from a high of 77 per year in 2010 and continually decreasing to a low of 48 in 2018.

Translations. The percentage of proceedings translated into languages other than English had fallen from a high of nearly 50% in 2010 to just under 10% in 2013. However, in the years 2015-2016, there was a marked turnaround ascending to about 20%. 2017 shows as return to 10% while 2018 increased again to 21%.

Public comment versus other public input methods. The public comment guidelines for ICANN Org specified what subjects must undertake public comment processes that public comment is the default mechanism when seeking feedback from the ICANN community or general public and that announcements, blog posts, social media

campaigns, regional newsletters and mailing lists will not be used as mechanisms for collecting feedback.

This strongly contrasts with the current reality where most blog posts which are currently very popular on ICANN Org collect feedback information as comments. An example of this is the chair's blog, and overview on the March remoter board workshop.

In a related issue, the ICANN accountability indicators on their main page seek general feedback and then on each goal page ask for feedback on this goal without publishing these inputs or providing any reporting on these or their impact on the accountability indicators.

I will take a break here for a second. Note that staff tried to get access to those comments, or at least a report about those comments and the impact on the accountability indicators, and we could not get anything.

These issues create a significant concern that there exists a major transparency and accountability gap between the highly formalized public comment process and the alternative mechanisms for gathering public input, such as public consultation which have few, if any, rules beyond requiring executive approval.

And yes, you'll remember there is a difference. I had forgotten this. There is a difference between a public comment and a public consultation. They are two very different things.

So these include lack of formal guidelines to identify if topics which do not specifically require public comment process should use the public comment process or an alternative mechanism. The ability of the

community to easily track when alternative mechanisms—specifically consultations—have been used instead of public comment proceedings, the ability of the community to easily find and see the results of alternative mechanisms that have been used. Why are the complete public comment guidelines for the ICANN Organization not made available on the ICANN website instead of an extract? That probably needs rephrasing. Why do blog posts on ICANN.org collect feedback information when the public comment guidelines for the ICANN Organization state that they will not be used as a mechanism for collecting feedback?

Recommendations, suggestions, observations. So here we have a recommendation. Basically, I have copy pasted from our scratch pad the recommendations. I'll just read the top part. To maximize the input from each public comment proceeding, ICANN shall update the requirements per the following: each public comment proceeding shall clearly identify who the intended audience is—general community, technical community, legal experts, etc. This will allow potential respondents to quickly understand if they wish to invest the time to produce comments. This is not meant to prevent anyone from commenting but is rather meant as clarifying who is best suited to comment.

Each public comment proceeding shall provide a clear list of precise key questions in plain language that the public consultation is seeking answers to from its intended audience. Where appropriate and feasible, translations of the summary and key questions shall be included in the public comment proceedings, and responses to public comment proceedings in any of the official ICANN languages shall always be

accepted. There's a bit of a wording issue there, but basically, we have agreed that comments in any of the ICANN languages to public comments shall always be accepted. I'll fix that up. Results of these questions shall be included in the staff report on public comment proceeding.

Cheryl puts in the chat, "Remember when we had socialized these points that they have been well received from the ICANN community in general." Yes. Thank you for that, Cheryl. I'll also note that in the trends report, when looking through that, they were very pleased because now there is no public comment that is published that receives zero comments, and that was a problem in the past.

However, the numbers in many cases are quite low. I think their average now is, across all the public comments in a year, seven responses. So you can imagine that in things where there are a lot of responses—we got certainly quite a few—that means that although there are no comments anymore that receive zero comments, there are some that receive very few.

I think what we're trying to do by these elements in this recommendation is to hopefully try and address that at least in a minimum way.

So the recommendation's not over. We carry on with, "Additionally, with regards to the other types of public input, ICANN shall develop and publish guidelines to assist in determining when a public comment process is required versus alternate mechanisms for gathering input, develop and publish guidelines for how alternative mechanisms for

gathering input should operate, including producing final reports, develop a system similar to and integrated with the public comment tracking system which will show all uses of alternate mechanisms to gather input, including results and analyses of these, publish the complete public comment guidelines for the ICANN Organization, and explain why blog posts collect feedback information when the public comment guidelines for the ICANN Organization say they will not be used as a mechanism to collect feedback.”

So there we go, that’s our recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, ma’am. Over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I had my hand up. Thank you. It strikes me—and it should have struck me before, of course, but there you go. I was obviously hiding—that one of the things we might want to make a small point about here is where we've now recommended that in future, the target audience is clearly articulated, the articulation of the target audience in a public comment process might also lead us to suggesting—or lead us to a point where it can be observed—that if the target audience is narrow or if it is very specific, for example, the ACs and SOs, that seven, eight or ten is not a bad number. It’s a good number.

If it is wide scale audience, then three or four, or even six or seven, responses is kind of sad and maybe we need to look at what went wrong. So there's an additional opportunity that may come out of specificity in the targeting of the intended audience. I hope some of that was clear. My apologies if it wasn't.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I think I can maybe do something with that. All right. Thank you for that, Cheryl. All right, so I'm not going to go through the requirements checklist. We've done that in detail on the scratch pad, so let's go to our next number.

Number four, and given the time, I think this is going to be our last one and it's going to be a quickie. Acceptance of ICANN decisions, ICANN bylaws section 4.6 is the requirement. Information assessed, ATRT3 survey related to the acceptance of ICANN decisions, see Annex B, question 28 and 29.

Analysis of information, "Do you believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the board?" Structure responses were 82% yes versus 18% no, and individual responses were 62% yes versus 38% no.

"Do you generally support the decisions made by the board?" Structure, 83 yes, 0 against, and individual responses were 63 supporting, 22 not supporting.

ATRT3's analysis of the survey responses indicates there is widespread support for decisions made by the board. As such, ATRT3 will not make any recommendations or suggestions concerning this issue.

Recommendations, suggestions, none. There we go, folks, and next time we can lead off with policy, section five. Madam chair, I will hand it back to you at quarter to the hour.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much for that, Bernie. Have a nice big drink of water and congratulate yourself on a heroically well done job today, and indeed in preparation for today under, dare we say, difficult communications and challenges [inaudible] with Zoom and audio.

Just before I go to the next item—which of course is our wrapping up activities and Negar will take us through any action items and decisions we've made in today's call—we will note that we'll be starting from section five at our call on Wednesday, that that call on Wednesday will be at 10:00 UTC, and it'll be scheduled for two hours.

That said, I just wanted to take time on behalf of Pat and I appreciating the additional work that you are all putting into this process. We realize—painfully in some cases—how much easier it would have been for us to have been doing this activity and poising our work as we had planned, but we also recognize that we are all globally now working under extraordinary circumstances.

Pat and I just want to take a moment to recognize each and every one of the review team members who are still actively involved, and in

particular, our amazing staff and people like Yvette, who can just step in and take on the Brenda role and run all sorts of backend issues under these difficult circumstances, really do need a bit of a vote of thanks at this point in time, noting that, of course, they've just come off—as we all have in many cases—a rather heroic schedule of a virtual ICANN meeting as well. And I for one know that I wouldn't know how many packet losses one or two of my meetings were being challenged with unless Yvette for example had worked directly with the fabulous ICANN IT staff empowering me with the data to go and fight my satellite service provider, who I will now have to go and fight again based on today's activities.

So huge kudos to all of you. Pat, do I need to say anything more before we stop being so nice to everybody and get back to normal closing business?

PAT KANE: I don't believe so, Cheryl. You covered it very well. Thank you, everybody.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, and I also want to recognize the fact that Pat's business has been under uber risk management reactivity mode and he's quite the swan, paddling desperately with his feet under water and looking very smooth and cool, organized and contained on top. So it's been a pleasure to work with you in this time as well, Pat. Thanks very much for that. I'm just going to go to Sébastien briefly, and then back to Negar, who

hopefully is ready with any of our decisions made and action items.
Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. Just to be sure that I understood what you start saying that the next call will be, and I thought you said Wednesday at 10:00 AM, or did I get it wrong?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it'll be confirmed when Negar speaks, but that is exactly what I said.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Because what I would like is that we keep the Wednesday where it is already scheduled, because with the other meetings, we are turning around. And you have more than me, I know, but another thing that I already organized my life with this schedule for Wednesday. For Friday, I don't care where it will be, but if we can keep the Wednesday change of hours. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem. I'm sorry you didn't make that clear to me during our little mid- or latter-call Any Other Business. So the proposal is now that we in fact run the Wednesday call as scheduled, but for two hours, and that I'd suggest then, to be fair to all of the Europeans—not just you, Sébastien—that the Friday call is scheduled for the 10:00 AM UTC time. Does that work all right? Excellent for Bernie. Sébastien, if you could

confirm, seeing as you raised the point. Good for Daniel, good for Sébastien. Excellent. Okay.

Monday, Vanda, is the leadership team meeting. It'll be at the normal 20:00 or 21:00, whatever it is, UTC time. So if you're in the leadership team, you have the pleasure of three calls next week. If you're in the review team only, you have the pleasure of two calls next week, Wednesday as scheduled, and Friday at 10:00 AM UTC. Those two plenaries will be at this stage for two hours each, although we may modify that based on Monday's leadership team call. And the leadership team call is of course open to each and any one of you who wish to join, but that is where we will be wrangling out the planning cadence and continuity of our work going forward.

Thank you very much Bernie is reminding us it's 19:15 UTC. There's a reason for it to be 19:15, people. You don't need to worry about it, you just need to turn up if you have to, or if you want to. Negar, you've had plenty of time to get ready now. What have we decided [inaudible] action items?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. Happy to go over them. So the first one is Cheryl and Pat to work on a note about the review timeline and delivery date to share with the leadership first, and then of course, the review team afterward. Bernie has captured a number of changes and edits to the contents of the accountability document based on the input received from everyone, as well as the main report that I'm sure he has a detailed list of.

Action item for staff to contact Susanna Bennett and arrange for a time or her to join one of the plenary calls to discuss accountability indicators and open data initiative, which of course is just to add notes to the final report to that regard.

The last couple of action items pertain to the cadence and rotation of the plenary calls. We will have two plenary calls this week, one on Wednesday at the regularly scheduled time, no changes to that, and we will schedule a call on Friday at 10:00 UTC for two hours.

The review team leadership will discuss the plenary cadence and rotation at the leadership call on Monday as well. Please let me know if I have missed anything.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I believe you've got it all perfect. Thank you very much for that, Negar. I also want to, just as we close, and again on behalf of Pat and I—Pat's now on home duties, his company has decided to have his workforce moved to their home locations and work remotely. You are all living in rapidly changing, and I'm afraid, highly stressful and possibly in some cases quite dangerous environments. I've personally been on self-isolation since the 26th of February, so I very much understand what many of you will be going through now, but please make smart decisions, take care of your hygiene, reduce your risk, and hopefully n to too many of us—as unfortunately one of our directors from one of our activities died suddenly recently—none of us will be needing to deal with too many extreme circumstances resulting in sickness, illness or death.

But with that, KC, you have a word before we close. Go on.

KC CLAFFY:

Just a question, because I think that the next meetings are going to be in the middle of my night. So I think I might not be able to make them, but I'm happy to mark up the document or send some comments. Does Bernie have an estimate of when the document will be filled in? We're only going to go over parts of it in next week's calls.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you for that, KC. We'll be moving through the document from section five onwards. The document as a Google doc is open for direct comments and suggestions in that. If you're not able to do that, then I suggest that they are sent via e-mail to the list so that we can capture them. And the accountability indicator document as part of the document which we ran over today has a close by date for comments which I think was 23:59 Sunday UTC. But Bernie, if you can just confirm all of that, please.

Bernie is doing a green tick, I got it right. Okay. So let's then take ourselves almost at the top of the hour. Thanks, one and all. Thank you, everybody, for the time, the energy, and all the effort you're putting in, and please stay safe, stay healthy. Bye for now.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes. Stay safe. Bye. Enjoy your weekend.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]