
BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 Review Team plenary call number four on February 27th 2019 at 21:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jacques Blanc, Sébastien Bachollet, Osvaldo Novoa, Daniel Nanghaka, Maarten Botterman, Jaap Akkerhuis, Vanda Scartezini, Demi Getschko, Erica Varlese, Adetola Sogbesan, Geoff Huston, Michael Karanicolas, Pat Kane.

Observers joining us today are Chokri, John Fanning, Yang Hunyu, Herb Wayne, Avri Doria and – I apologise for this, I'm going to say Bachar Bong has joined. We do have apologies from Ramet Khalili.

From ICANN org, Jean-Baptiste Dereoulez and Brenda Brewer. And I apologize if I've missed anyone that may have just joined. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Pat and I were flipping coins and we thought he might start off, but I'll jump in and he can take over for agenda item two. I [inaudible] couple of microphones open. If you've got your microphone open, it may bring in background noise. Please mute your microphones. If you don't, Brenda and I will start [pinging at you] on the private chat. Brenda might want to do that already.

So let's get going. Today, we are going to have the dipping into the preparation for our terms of reference and workplan, and we'll also then be discussing the face-to-face meetings, both the one you know

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.

about in Los Angeles, and the ones [planned] for the future. We're going to have a little word about transparency, we're going to discuss the informal meeting, an hour of our time for those of us who are in Kobe and for those who may be wanting to join us remotely.

[inaudible] results from a Doodle, but as usual, we've got three choices to make, not just one. Any Other Business, and of course, the review of action items. Before we go through the option for any SOI updates, is there anyone who has a measure of Any Other Business that they'd like to flag now?

Not seeing anyone's hand come up, and not hearing any voices, let's then very briefly note that anyone who has an update to their statement of interest, it'll be the practice of this review team that we operate under continuous disclosure, as many groups in ICANN in fact do, and so at the beginning of each of our calls, we will take a moment to see if anyone needs to update their statement of interest, and if anyone does need to do that now, please let us know. You can always of course just pop it into the chat if you don't want to take the time to make a report, but it is good practice to make sure that we are under continuous disclosure for updating our statements of interest.

With that, I suspect I have filibustered and managed to stumble through agenda item number one, and Pat will be all organized, and most important, it looks like Maarten's finally got his microphone working, which means we'll be able to hear from him. And I'm going to hand it over to you, Pat, for the next slide and the very exciting delving into terms of reference which I trust everyone has looked at the exemplary and representative text in the draft. Over to you, my friend.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. As Cheryl has said, the terms of reference that were sent out by staff earlier today is full of representative language and it's just a template, and this is not actually our first cut at our own terms of reference. But some of the things in there that we do want to walk through is – we'll go to in a couple more slides.

In terms of the terms of reference, the things that we have to get done is we need to define our scope through the development of specific objectives. These objectives will cover the specific areas that we want to address, and of course, this will produce the number of recommendations that the team will agree upon and put forth to the community.

We want to make certain that we agree upon definitions, and as we go through this, every time we have a question about a definition, I think it's vitally important that we come to agreement on what that is and whether it's a definition that we create for ourselves through ATRT3 or whether we use from a previous review team – I'm open to either/or, I think the team – but we should come together and say, "This is how we define this specific term."

Agree upon deliverables, an initial draft, do we want one or two? And I guess you can't have two initial drafts, so let me call them interim drafts, and a final draft, I guess we will have a final deliverable of the product, and what kind of form of recommendations do we want to put into place.

Develop a timeline so that we can manage the work, you'll see later on – or if you've already looked at the slides – there is an updated representative timeline that I've tried to get closer to some of the dates that we have and know today. Agree upon a work process. I have a slide that we'll walk through and kind of do a starting point, at least work through the terms of reference. And I want everybody to pile on, ask questions or do whatever they need to through that process.

We need to submit to ICANN board for review and suggestions within 60 days, so if we have as a date for our first meeting, which we do of course, April 3rd through 5th, that means that we need to, by June 3rd, be able to get something to the ICANN board for review, which kind of fits in nicely that we can get it to them ahead of the ICANN meeting in Marrakech, which I think is 23th through the 27th, and then make adjustments as appropriate in terms of terms of reference. Questions, comments, concerns?

Okay, great. Next slide then. So in the bylaws themselves, there are some specific areas for us to take a look at. Section 4.6(c)(2) talks about some areas. Now, ofc on the very first one, it says these are areas that we may assess but we're not limited to these particular areas.

So just to walk through and talk from the letter A, taking a look really at the board governance and the effectiveness of the board governance. Do we select board members properly? Do we have the right balance? Do we want to continue to take a look at gender and geography diversity, or do we need to add a diversity of skillsets in terms of specific things that the ICANN board should take a look at?

One of the questions that we've had in the past is, should there continue to be a single board? Is there an inherent conflict between the fiduciary responsibility of the board and the management and the leadership of the ICANN community? So those are the kinds of things I think would fall under A.

Under B, taking a look at the role of the GAC, taking a look at the effectiveness of the GAC. Does the GAC participate at an appropriate level? Take a look at that.

Under C, assessing the processes to how we receive public input. Does the 42-day review period work effectively enough? Do we have working groups that aren't necessarily staffed well enough to come up with a community solution? Those types of things.

D, assessing the extent to which ICANN decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community. Well, I'm certain we can find every decision is not supported by somebody in the community, but what level of support are we looking for?

And then the policy development process itself, cross-community deliberations. Are the working groups that we have appropriate? There's a new function or a new feature that the board is using which is a caucus. Is that something that becomes interesting in the future? Etc. And then taking a look at the independent review process. Questions on that page? Great, next slide.

So in terms of section three and four of section 4.6, the accountability and transparency review team will assess the extent to which prior accountability and transfer review recommendations have been

implemented. That's taking a look at ATRT1 and ATRT2 and take a look at what has not been addressed, and to a certain extent, the effectiveness of what has been addressed. Was the implementation in line with the intent of the recommendation on both ATRT1 and 2?

Now, having Cheryl on this team as a member of ATRT1 is very helpful, but we may have to go back and have conversations and interviews with other ATRT review team members from one and two to kind of assess that as well.

And the last one from the bylaws itself is taking a look at, do we have the right reviews? Do we need to have an SSR2 review in the future, or SSR review in the future? Do we need to add additional reviews into the future? So that's something that we can consider, not necessarily that we need to. So these are all topics that we can draw from. Questions? Okay. Next slide, please.

One of the things that I'd like to take a look at, and again this is up to the team to consider through this, and we'll consider how we get through that in the workplan, but when we hear Cherine and we hear Göran talk about the future of ICANN, there's five trends that they focus on. And as we look at these five trends in addressing what ICANN might look like in the future years, how can we help inform the next ATRT review in terms of what we can put in place to improve accountability and transparency into these areas?

So we hear Cherine and Göran talk about addressing the increased number of security and stability issues that we see today. What does that mean from a standpoint of spam, phishing? Are those within limits?

Are those out of bounds? How do we look at command and control? How do we look at malware distribution in terms of DNS abuse? What are the things that we should put in place there? Is SSAC appropriately addressing those areas in an accountable and transparent manner? Etc.

We hear Göran talk about the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. What should it look like to get more things done faster? I think that there's some dissatisfaction from some of the community about what that looks like. So how can we put things in place for the future that have accountability and transparency as those things change?

The evolution of the Internet's set of unique identifiers. Is it just domain names? Is it just IP addresses? Is it just the IETF items that we track within the IANA function? Are there other things? We've invited into the community visual object architecture, we have people taking a look within the community on other types of technologies, and competitive technologies to the DNS. So what would that look like?

Increasing international regulation on content and privacy. What is that going to look like? Should ICANN be a part of that? Should we put some controls in place to measure or give gates or recommend gates that say this is something we should look at given some types of events?

And then last, and certainly not least in my mind, the long-term stable funding of ICANN. Does ICANN have enough money to do the job that we want them to do today and tomorrow? And what should those financial structures look like?

Something else for the future of ICANN in terms of ICANN Org and staff engagement, and advisory or standards bodies. We have ICANN

members that – this is particularly important as a contracted party for me, ICANN is involved in the development of RFCs within the IETF, and in the contracts that we have with registry operators and registrar operators, there are obligations to work towards those RFCs. So, is that something that's a transparent or is that something that's an accountable process where ICANN is putting more obligations on the contracted parties within the community?

What is the role of ICANN org and staff in technical advisory committees? SSAC and RSSAC. Is L-root really off limits from the community? Because quite frankly, nobody has a relationship with any root server operator. There's informal guidelines bodies, and then driving additional community obligations outside the normal standards process.

And then the last one that came up through some other discussions last spring is, should ATRT3 consider undertaking a discussion on how to streamline specific reviews in a more effective and impactful manner? That's one that doesn't jump off the page for me, but it might for others.

Questions on that page? Alright. I'm not managing chat. If anyone else is, Jean-Baptiste, I don't know if you are or not, but I'm not reading through the chat right now while I'm talking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm fine with chat, don't worry.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [Me too.]

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [Sorry to interrupt.]

PATRICK KANE: Next slide. So, how best to take and look and address community input? Do we want to take community input? Do we want to do that as part of putting out our initial draft? Do we want to take input from the community ahead of time? We know that we're going to submit the terms of reference by the board, but we probably should have it reviewed by the community. And how best to gather that input? Do we want a typical comment period that we put out for everyone? Do we want some kind of shortened comment period? 42 days seems like a long comment period. Or do we want to have face-to-face discussions in Marrakech?

And when Cheryl and I talked about this one on Monday, I found this really appealing, because if we're able to deliver something in early June that talks about the objectives, it might be interesting for us as a team to engage with the different ACs and the different SOs to see what works, what doesn't work, where they think we should take a look. And then how do we address that input when it is received? Do we choose on our own what we want to do, or do we think we owe each of those

SOs and ACs an explanation as to why we selected or why we've rejected certain suggestions from the community? Next slide, please.

Alright. So before we jump into deliverables and definitions, those are all suggestions for us to take a look at how we obtain the areas that we want to look at or the items that we want to look at to create recommendations. There is a ton there, and certainly, we're not going to be able to address all of that in a year. So when we get to the workplan slide, I'll have some suggestions or at least a starting point where we can have a conversation as to how we want to work through all of that to create what we think are the most impactful items for recommendations, either areas – I'm sorry, yes.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, just wanted to mention that there is a hand raised from Cheryl.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you so much. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's alright, Pat, and believe me, Jean-Baptiste, I'm pretty capable of jumping in if he doesn't notice me. [Don't worry about that.] I was more than happy to wait for you to finish your sentence, Pat.

Just wanted to – now I've got the microphone – bring some other information to the table which neither Pat nor I were aware of, at least I certainly wasn't, when we had our discussions on Monday about all of

this. And that was something that came up in the MSSl pre-ICANN 64 briefing today that some of you may well have attended.

And if you did, you will have noticed during the slide that [Lars] spoke to, and Jean-Baptiste is going to be [inaudible] He's already done it, with extreme efficiency. Thank you. That listed on the PowerPoint slide – of course, you know my views on the community believing [anything that's ever printed] on a PowerPoint slide is probably the gospel truth and how I feel about that, but anyway, it was printed on a PowerPoint slide that one of the things we would be looking at is the organizational standards, the operational standards for specific reviews.

So, I'm not sure that we've agreed to that, but it has been said, and community may ask, if we choose not to do it, why we didn't do it. We certainly now need to consider that that has been voluntold to us to at least take under advisement as yet another piece of work we can do in the extremely small amount of time we have. So there we go. The upload's in progress, it's just one line. It's a reference point, but because it's been published, we should deal with it one way or the other. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So, Jean-Baptiste, this is unfamiliar to me, the slide.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, Patrick –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Don't worry, [inaudible] back to the workplan, and we will ask Jean-Baptiste to send us the slides from the presentation I referred to.-

PATRICK KANE: Okay, great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because it is simply something that has been thrown on our table, therefore we need to deal with it. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Alright. Thank you, Cheryl. Alright, so from a deliverable standpoint and definitions, the two dates that stand out the most right now in terms of what the scheduler will look like, I think, is June 3rd is when our terms of reference workplan timeline need to be submitted for feedback. I think that if we get started now and we're productive on April 3rd and through 5th, that we should be able to get way out ahead of this, hopefully, and then we're roughly putting in place April 5th of 2020 for the final draft. Maybe we can bring it in some so that we can have our final conversation really in – where are we at next spring, Cancun?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, that's correct.

PATRICK KANE: Right. Also take a look at how we want to format our recommendations. Do we want to use the ATRT2 format or something else? Or what do we want to take a look at?

Now, talked about definitions earlier. I think it's really important, again, that we agree upon definitions so we have the same reference port online when we have these conversations, and what do we want to do? Do we want to start with those that were used in ATRT2 – I can't even say that half the time – for consistency, or do we want to create new ones given that this will be the first accountability and transparency review that we've done under the new bylaws? And then have some repository on the Wiki page to where we could store those and be able to reference those quickly? Next slide.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Patrick, I just wanted to mention a few things.

PATRICK KANE: Oh, sure.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Chat, Maarten was saying that it's very [important to make sure] we include operational principles, a guide to the way we work. [inaudible] current way of interaction. [inaudible] clarity.

Vanda is saying that we can analyze [inaudible] format after we have a clear term of reference.

PATRICK KANE:

Absolutely. Alright. So the workplan to get to a terms of reference deliverable, what I think we ought to start initially – and here I'm hoping to get a lot of feedback – is that we as the 17 or 18 of us that are a part of this team, as we start to think through areas and topics that we believe are worthy of review and taking a look at. What I'd like to do over time – and I don't exactly have a specific number of days that we do that, but kind of work through that and do a triage on these topics based upon perceived resources required to do the review, perceived time available. Do we need entities that are external to ICANN to get information from and take a look also with the potential cost of review for all of these items are?

After that, go through and rank order the topics, what do we think are the most meaningful and most beneficial to the community, that when we get into LA on the 3rd to the 5th, we can discuss face-to-face what that rank order was, and we can have a deeper, more fulsome conversation on what we think are behind them.

And then whatever we get to in terms of the number of items on that rank order, do we go to 10, do we go to 20, do we go to 30? Whatever that number is, try to organize those topics in the four or six objectives that make sense, and then create work parties around those objectives. And what I'm hoping by having work parties is that of the 18 of us, we break up into teams of three or four based upon our skillsets, based upon our interests, and actually take each of those work parties and drive out issues within those areas that we can talk about as a team, probably in Marrakech, as what we want those recommendations, what

we think recommendations should look like coming out of those specific objectives. Cheryl and I would probably end up being de facto members of all those groups. I think that Cheryl would take some and I might take others. But I think that that might be a way for us to get smaller groups to try to generate some preliminary discussion so that we can have a lot of thoughts when we get together the second time and figure out what good looks like, if you will.

Kind of take a look at what that would be in terms of reference in terms of what we want to put there, but then look at it as a workplan ongoing beyond the submission of the terms of reference.

Questions there? Cheryl's a fan. Okay. Very good. Thanks, Daniel. Alright, so let's go to the next slide.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Patrick, before we move to the next slide, can we just [inaudible] for Brenda to ask a question regarding an unknown number, please?

PATRICK KANE: Oh, sure.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. I'm just wondering, is this KC's line that is dialed in, ending in 6420? She can't reply. They tell me there's no microphone but they are dialed in. I'm sending an e-mail so hopefully I can figure out who the participant is. I disconnected it. just for the record, I did disconnect it. It dialed back in. So I believe they do want to

be part of the call, I just need to identify who it is. Apologies for the interruption, and thank you.

PATRICK KANE: No worries. Thanks, Brenda. I appreciate it. Anything else, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry about that, but thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Next slide, please. So I've updated the representative timeline to put a little more detail in here and take a look at really what that 60-day window would be, which is 44 workdays. I had to force feed it into the Microsoft project to get a June 3rd deliverable, but I think still, what this shows is still a lot of work to get done in the year. And I'm happy to take feedback on that. If anybody wants to put tasks into there, [inaudible] in terms of different meetings that we want to try to wrap around, catch up with each other when we are at those meetings, particular, whatever you guys would like to add or even recreate with this timeline. Questions? Happy to make you smile, Cheryl.

Alright, so that, I think in a nutshell, is what we're talking about in terms of getting to the terms of reference. Now, one of the things I wanted to call out that's in the representative text within the template terms of reference, which is the next slide, when we take a look at the decision-making process itself.

So each decision that we make needs to have attached to it one of these categories. Do we have full consensus? Do we have consensus? Do we have strong support but significant opposition? Divergence, minority view, or no consensus. So I want everybody to think through, I would like everybody to think through those definitions, and if we think they're the right definitions, do we think we need to modify those definitions or augment those definitions? I think that that would be helpful, because when we make recommendations, we're going to attach one of these designations to each one of those recommendations, and we really ought to carry in the terms of reference the right definitions for what we're trying to achieve or what we think for our work, so please think through those, and if you want to make modifications, we should. And let's talk about that.

Any questions there? Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Pat. And here I just want to remind people who perhaps have not been deeply engaged and involved in policy development processes within the GNSO or indeed engaged in more recent cross-community working groups, the one on the IANA transfer and also the Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 of the ICANN organizational accountability work, which I know several of you were particularly engaged, but just in case some of you haven't been, these definitions are the bog standard ones that are used and are recommended to use within the GNSO, they are well-understood therefore by a very large number within the community, and they have also been adopted for use in a number of

other areas, including the work that the ALAC does internally, and certainly for the cross-community working groups I named earlier.

The matter of consensus, however, is not clearly understood when we talk about what it means in the GAC, and therefore we need to be crystal clear, as Pat's saying, and up front on what our definitions are and if we're going to modify them, and I would encourage us to only do that if we absolutely positively have to, otherwise we'll just, in my view at least, perhaps be more confusing than clarifying. But we do need to be really crystal clear on this.

Now, the other thing that is worthwhile considering is good practice in other parts of the organization have been that the chair or co-chairs or leadership of a particular process or team have worked with their members to establish with their members what the belief is on these levels of consensus, but that it is up to the chairs to establish what levels of consensus are and report that back.

Now, obviously, smart people report it back to the review team or working party or group first and then try and perhaps even do better, take strong support to consensus perhaps, or consensus to even full consensus, which is sort of a utopian dream, I suppose. But we do also need to note that the matter of minority views was brought up by at least, I think, two of the public comments that came in on the operational procedures for specific reviews. So the community is very interested in these matters of establishing what level of consensus exists and how minority views will not only be established as a measure of consensus but how the minority views will be articulated and represented in any sort of reporting. So it does take some thinking, and

there is no problem at all if we want to discuss this further, but I would encourage you to think about if we're going to make change, how we articulate why we are making that change and how we ensure that any change does not create any confusion. Thanks, Pat.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. So that's the slides that I've prepared in terms of taking a look at the terms of reference, and if there are no objections to what's there, I would ask that we take a first step by really having our first task by collecting our own personal views of what the topics or the areas that we should take a look at, and pull those together by March 11th, which would be the Monday that we're at ICANN. If there's no objections to that, I'd like to throw that assignment out to at least get the ball rolling. Any objections? Yes, Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yes, I've got no objection from what you just said. I just wanted to go back briefly of the definitions we have here. I cannot agree more with Cheryl. Just one thing we will have to do here is qualify some general terms that we think we do know but have got no strong significance. For example, a small minority. What is small? A strong support, what is strong? Okay? Do we go by the majority of numbers? I think we will have to quantify that at some point, so if we want to be crystal clear, we know what small or strong or minority – what we're looking at.

PATRICK KANE:

So Jacques, I think that's absolutely correct and when we are bound at 18, we ought to be able to do that pretty clearly and come to some kind of agreement as to what – I mean, full consensus, that's easy, right? 18. But whatever number we think consensus should be or minority view, I think you're exactly right, but we ought to be able to do that fairly easily with only 128 people. And I'd be happy to take any suggestions as to what that percentage or what that number of people should be. Cheryl, you had your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I was typing hoping to not take the microphone again. But now I have. I think what Jacques said is very important, and I liked the fact that I was typing "crystal clear" when he was saying "crystal clear." But I believe what we can do here is put in example text with each one of these definitions which would go along the lines of a consensus, a small minority disagrees but most agree, and then a following sentence that says, for the purposes of ATRT3, a small minority shall be less than on equal to certain number, close brackets or end sentence. And if we do that, then we're just being clear in what we're articulating and what measurements we're using. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Alright, well, I'm done with that section then. So on to the face-to-face meetings. Sorry, Sébastien? [inaudible]. Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much. I don't think I was the first one, I guess [Jean-Baptiste] was before me, but nevertheless, [inaudible]. I don't see anywhere a place where we have a way of working with the second [reading,] and I think it's absolutely necessary that we take into account that we have a second reading. No decision may be taken at the first reading.

There are a lot of reasons for that, but one of them, I would like to share with you. You are not really helping an international organization here with the way you are speaking fast. You have prepared the meeting and you know what you are talking about, but the people at the other side of the line may not, and you have to take that into account. I have no problem to understand you, but I think it will be a good [inaudible] if you can think that you are speaking to foreigners or not English speakers first language. And it will be very much appreciated. Thank you very much.

PATRICK KANE:

Sébastien, thank you very much for the constructive comment. I will endeavor to slow down and pause more in-between my statements. I do have a tendency to run away with my speaking, so I am more than happy to have a hand raised now and then that says, "Pat, please slow down," and I would really appreciate that. So, thank you for that, Sébastien.

Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Thank you, Patrick. I just wanted to go back to what was said in the chat. So first, there was a comment from Michael saying [inaudible] to which you and Vanda have replied. Vanda has replied, "Yes, those are [inaudible] we will have." You said, "I think so." Then Vanda added, "Michael, you can agree with the [inaudible]." Michael added that "[inaudible] definitions are fine, but it's a question of to what degree [inaudible] agreement," and the nu added, "One of the biggest challenges have been [inaudible] PDP based on previous experience breaking down the decision makes it faster to draw conclusions and recommendations, [inaudible] definitions creating meaningful decisions." [inaudible] definitions. Okay from Osvaldo for the proposal. Daniel asking whether the list of topics are listed or are they open. No objections from Erika who thinks it would be good practice for the group, and yeah, did you want to go back on these comments, Pat?

PATRICK KANE: I'm sorry?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Did you want to jump back on those comments?

PATRICK KANE: So, which ones –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure that we missed any of those in particular. ANd of course, the other thing that we need to consider is the chat can – and in my

view, should – form part of our meeting record. So it would be obvious that anything that’s in chat is going to be taken down and recorded as well, and there may indeed be a copy from a chat item that ends up in notes or even as an action item. But Jean-Baptiste, are you suggesting we have not dealt with everything that was raised?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, my simple question was whether Pat wanted to add some more clarification on the questions that were a result of his presentation.

PATRICK KANE: Yeah, and I'm just trying to figure out which questions specifically were you referring to, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry. No worries. There's the one from Michael, I was wondering whether we wanted to [inaudible] does agree mean not actively objecting?

PATRICK KANE: So yes, that’s kind of where I'm going when we say we agree. Again, does it generally cover what we’re trying to achieve? And if no one wants to do something different or object to where we’re going, then yes, I would say that that’s agreement, but I do agree with Michael that silence does not necessarily mean agreement, but it’s hard to determine that unless we’re not silent.

So I think that that will be the ask that I have with all of this, and it's that we actively engage. And if something doesn't really work, let's get it on the table and talk about it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Pat. And then my second question was [whether there was a] collective agreement on the action item, and if yes, if you could just repeat that again so that I can just write it down, and also whether the definition of strong, small can be noted in an ai as well.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. So the two action items, I believe, that I addressed were, could we each provide personal feelings on what the topics are or what the areas of review should be by March 11th, and the second one was for the designations on slide 13, is there a numerical number that we believe each of those should be defined by? Full consensus would clearly be 18, but what is consensus? What do we believe consensus should be from a numerical standpoint?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you. And I see that Maarten has his hand raised.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible] just my thinking on that. I do like the [inaudible] approach there, the rough consensus, which basically means that everybody's been heard, and that there's no more major discussion about it, that

there's consensus, people generally agree. Otherwise, [inaudible] minority, majority, but consensus [inaudible] people generally agree on.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. So, would you want for us to include the term “rough consensus?”

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We could do, as long as it's clear that consensus means there is no headcounts, just general agreement. Yeah, I think [inaudible] rough consensus. That doesn't necessarily mean everybody is perfectly happy.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Maarten. So then if we have other clarifying verbiage for each of those designations, that would be helpful as well if some would like to recommend additional clarifying verbiage. But to Cheryl's point, we should be very clear as to what that is. So, Sébastien, I saw that you had written in the chat that I'm missing your point about second reading. Can you help me understand then what it is that I'm not understanding, please?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Patrick. I didn't see a clear action that we will take that into account, and that it will be [the behavior of this] working group. [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, perhaps I can help.

PATRICK KANE: Please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. I believe what Sébastien's referring to is the good practice that happened in many of the pieces of work some of us have done in the past of not having any decision on a single reading of any text or any item. So as I've put into the chat, when for example we had text in these terms of references that are ours, that we are taking ownership of and we have our draft text, to transition that into agreed text would take a first, where we would then get even more comments perhaps, and then a second – which may or may not be particularly different to the first – reading. That, I believe, is what Sébastien was referring to, that I personally believe is a good principle. It doesn't mean that you have to do it on conference calls. You can do it on list. you can have deadlines attached to Google docs. There are lots of ways of doing it. But it does give the surety that if someone for example is unable to make a single meeting, they're not missing out on contributing to decision-making processes. That's, I believe, what he is referring to. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. And if that's the case, then I completely agree with that process. Okay, do we have any other questions or concerns with this section of today's discussion?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Next slide by the look of it then.]

PATRICK KANE: Alrighty.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Pat, there is a hand raised from Daniel.

PATRICK KANE: Oh, yes. Daniel. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Previously when you mentioned about the members of the team suggested topics, are these specific topics or they're open topics? If they're specific, could they be listed somewhere whereby one could be able to raise the topics? Thank you, Patrick.

PATRICK KANE: So Daniel, you're asking for a place for us to list these topics; correct?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: That's right. Or if the topics are already identified, [therefore] listed.

PATRICK KANE: No, there's nothing listed, there's nothing identified right now. It's a completely open slate. So we can raise or suggest topics of any nature as long as they fit within the areas that we've got a remit for.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you. That's fine with me.

PATRICK KANE: So that leads to another action item, Jean-Baptiste, in that we need a document set up for the receipt of suggestions.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alright. On that, Pat, would it be easier if review team members sent the suggestions and we compiled the documents, or would you prefer that for example a Google doc is set up?

PATRICK KANE: Cheryl, what's worked best in the past for you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat, for the question. It does depend on the team members. There are some work parties and teams and groups where some of the participants are unable to access Google docs for various reasons. Even when that is the case, it's become common practice to use Google docs and go through the additional effort of creating PDFs regularly from them and taking from individuals who cannot access or use Google docs their input.

The advantage of a Google doc over putting things in via either e-mail or having a penholder do it is that people, once they are an editor or a commenter on the doc, do get a prompt to say, “Daniel has just made a comment on section 6.5 of the document.” And so it [primes you to pop in and go,] “Oh, Daniel, I’m sorry, I don’t agree with that at all.” And make that comment, or whatever.

So in my experience, it does aid in collaboration, but obviously, if we have members of the review team who cannot or will not access Google docs, then we need to compensate for that. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: And Daniel has his hand raised.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Probably I’d like to ask you [inaudible] members if there is anyone who cannot be able to use Google docs, [inaudible] other alternatives that can be able to be suitable for everyone. But at least previously, I’ve seen the Google docs working very well for collaboration, especially in drafting documents. Yeah. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Daniel. So, if there's nothing else, are we ready to move on?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alright, Pat, so we'll have a look at whether a Google doc can be created.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. Alright, so face-to-face meetings. We've decided, again, on April 3rd through 5th in Los Angeles. Has everyone contacted ICANN travel support, or worked with them to make arrangements for travel to LA for that time period?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And while we're waiting for people to respond, hopefully in chat with more yeses than nos, is there anyone who is concerned that they will have visa issues to enter into the United States? Because if that's the case, I fear making anything happen in this short time that we have is going to be an extremely challenging matter. Visa issues usually take a lot longer than the time we have available to fix, but please, if you don't want to let us know in this public forum, if you can drop pat and I a line. We can only do our best to work with Constituency Travel and staff to help you through your visa issues. But it is, as we know, not all countries accept all residents from all other countries, so it's just something we're going to have to deal with. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, thank you, Pat. I just wanted to follow on several comments in the chat about the hotel. So the first question from Maarten, usually, yes, you would be at the same hotel. And if you have not heard from travel support regarding the hotel, please, just bear in mind that right now, they are really busy with ICANN 64. So you should be hearing from them pretty soon. And [inaudible] will follow up as well on that. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Next slide, please. And then we have a deadline by Friday to request a face-to-face meeting for ICANN 65. I think given the discussion about doing face-to-face reviews with each of the SO and ACs, I think it's important that we go ahead and submit for that meeting. Are there any objections to that?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sébastien has his hand raised.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat and Jean-Baptiste. Yeah, I am a little bit confused that I heard at the last meeting that there [was no question to have] meeting with review team during an ICANN meeting, and now we're asking us if we want a meeting during an ICANN meeting. Therefore, I would like to

understand what changed between the last call and now on that issue.
Thank you.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you for the question, Sébastien. I think that what you're referring to is that at the ICANN Kobe meeting, we did not have enough runway ahead of the meeting to be able to ask for a meeting request, and that we were going to meet informally in Kobe, but that we were going to formally meet and get the request in on time for the ICANN meeting in Marrakech. Cheryl, if I'm remembering incorrectly, please correct me. Cheryl's typed in that –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

You see why it's so important the way you are presenting things. I am sure that I have heard that it was for all the ICANN meetings. Of course, for Kobe, it was [inaudible] it was said there's no possibility because at the end of the meeting, they have no facilities and so on and so forth. Therefore, I am happy to hear that, but I was really sure that it was not the case. Therefore, we need to find the best way to communicate, because it's really a problem for me what it's now – not the topic but the way it's [come back.] But therefore, I have no problem with meeting before or after [when we decided to have a meeting,] but I was a little bit surprised. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

And Pat, I just wanted to mention that there is a queue with Maarten and Tola.

PATRICK KANE: Alright. So I don't know who was first, but Maarten, since you're at the top of the list –

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Maarten was.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, just [inaudible] that as you know, always prior to an ICANN meeting, there's a board meeting, and [inaudible] fully committed to ATRT3 and also other commitments to ICANN, so I wouldn't be able to join [inaudible]. I think it's important to use the ICANN meetings to have interaction with the community, but I would strongly recommend to have face-to-face meetings outside of ICANN meetings. I'm sure I'm not the only one [inaudible] So I am for a face-to-face meeting [as a meeting] but against a face-to-face meeting of the ATRT3 [there.]

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Sébastien, if we were, or if I was specifically unclear, I do apologize, but my recollection was that the issue was Kobe only, and so I think it's important for us to meet when it's appropriate, and I do agree with Maarten that having engagement with the community at this time, after we've just posted the terms of reference

for review, that it would be beneficial to chat with the community.
Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael, you've got your hand up. Do you want to go ahead?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. I'm not sure if now is the time to get into this, but I just, in response to that, would briefly say that I support using the ICANN meetings to do our face-to-face meetings, just because for me personally, it's difficult to add additional trips into the three ICANN meetings, so the other commitments are what makes it more difficult for me. I'm not sure if I'm going to make it to LA because it is so close on the heels of this other ICANN meeting, and there's a limited amount of time that I can devote to travel connected to ICANN. So that's my position. Anyway, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks a lot. And I And I suspect [you're not alone] in this. As I pointed out in the chat, the June meeting , of course being very much a policy meeting and therefore the shortest of all the days committed to an ICANN meeting of the three meetings, would be an ideal opportunity to have community interaction, as I think we've all pretty much agreed, or at least nobody seems to be objecting to that, would be ideal at this stage of our work. And we could very much therefore consider having our face-to-face after the ICANN meeting, so the day, or day and a following day, day or two, after the ICANN meeting without huge

impost on our time. That is something that perhaps we can poll, and so perhaps we can, between now and Friday, call for any objections to us meeting with community interaction during the Marrakech meeting, because of course, we will have to get onto everyone's agendas as well. so the sooner we do that, the better, and to have a day or two – that's up to you all as well. Then I would suggest two might be more [inaudible] than one, immediately following the Marrakech meeting where we can probably, because of the small scale, just gather in our hotel conference facilities. Most hotels have a board room or something. We're not 300, we're 20. That includes staff.

So if we can poll that, then we'll be able to fit in with the deadline for 1st of March to put in a meeting request for Marrakech. Obviously, not everyone will be able to make it. That's the nature of being a volunteer. Real life stuff occasionally gets in the way of ICANN work, although [inaudible] some of us. Jean-Baptiste, over to you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Cheryl. I just wanted to follow up on what you said regarding a meeting just after the end of this policy meeting. Unfortunately -and this is mentioned here on the slide – we don't have any possibility to have a face-to-face organized in Marrakech just after the meeting has taken place. It would be before or during, unfortunately.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Jean-Baptiste, did you say anything [inaudible] slide?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Cheryl. Sorry if you can't hear me because of my microphone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. It's been like listening to you from the bottom of the ocean.
[inaudible]. Try again.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alright. Sorry about that, everyone. So, Cheryl, I was just replying to what you said, your suggestion to have a discussion with the community and followed by a meeting after the end of the ICANN meeting. Unfortunately, as mentioned on the slide, [inaudible] guidelines for this meeting we cannot organize any face-to-face meeting after the meeting. It can only be before or during. So I just wanted to make that distinction as it's pretty important. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd like to know why. If it is in a hotel, not the meeting, not the conference center, not actually associated with meeting B, but immediately after meeting B in a convenient location. What has that got to do with the limitations of the meeting, the meeting format which Sébastien can tell you [inaudible] may not be being implemented in the way it was designed?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you for providing more details. From what you'd said, I understood that you meant at the meeting itself. We need to check with Meetings team whether it would be feasible to do that at another

location, and whether there would be available staff to do that meeting.
Thank you.

PATRICK KANE:

Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. So then could we put up a Doodle poll since we have to have this request in on Friday? That would help us determine whether before or during, or after would be the best for us to meet, although I do believe that if we want to take advantage of the SOs and the ACs present to be able to have conversations with them in a formal manner, at least some part of it will have to be during the meeting.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Pat, Sébastien has his hand raised.

PATRICK KANE:

Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, but I think we need to really speak to ICANN. We need to have interaction with the community, and therefore, this interaction or those interactions must be during the meeting. If we have – and [inaudible] find time for that. That's the interaction with the participants of the meeting.

The other question, it's a face-to-face meeting of our group, that's another question. And this second question, of course you can ask if we can have before, during, I think from my point of view, it's impossible to

do a two-day meeting and all our usual activity as SO/AC member or board meeting or board member and so on and so forth, therefore, I think it's too difficult.

If we ask before or after, we have already the answer of our esteemed colleague from the board who says that he will have a board meeting before, and I guess some of us will have other activity before. Therefore, I think the proposal of Cheryl to have it after the end of the meeting in Marrakech in another place could be the best one and the more suitable one to try to have everybody and particularly Maarten. Thank you very much.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Sébastien. So if we want to take advantage of Marrakech, does that mean that the only time we can really get together for what we're doing is before? Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

It's up to the review team, obviously.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I can, the concern Jean-Baptiste is alluding to is the request that ACs and SOs do not have additional [youth service] training and similar days added on to the policy meeting. So that is an entirely different beast to, I believe, what we are suggesting. And I would think that we should consider our request as no different to something like the Nominating Committee meeting after interaction with the community during an

ICANN meeting. So I've got relatively high confidence that this will not be a problem provided it is asked for in the appropriate way. Okay?

PATRICK KANE: Okay. So Jean-Baptiste, in terms of the request, we'll get that sent in by Friday, and we'll figure out when.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alright, Pat, and you still wanted to send a Doodle poll to the review team; correct?

PATRICK KANE: Yes.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alright.

PATRICK KANE: Alright. So I recognize that we're coming up at the end of the 90 minutes, and so there is a section on transparency that I'm not certain we'll get through in five minutes. So, should we put that off to the next meeting? Are there any objections to pushing that off to the next meeting?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: In the chat, fine from Cheryl, fine from [Daniel,] okay from Osvaldo. No hands so far. Alright, fine for Michael and [Daniel] as well. Shall we move to the informal meeting, Patrick?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, please.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you. Would you like me to report on that, pat?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, please, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alright. Sorry about that. So just to mention that based on the Doodle poll, so the result for us that Monday on the 11th of March has six positive replies, but including one with remote participation, and two others on Tuesday are also a possibility. So, it would be your decision also. I just wanted to mention that Pat has offered to [have the review team do this] informal meeting [inaudible] room, so depending on maybe the availability of the room or any other aspects, you will be able to better understand what would be the best date and time for this meeting. Thank you, and Maarten has his hand raised, so does Cheryl. So Maarten first.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay, just [with all the] planning of the face-to-face meeting, we shouldn't forget that for sure, we should apply and try to organize that we have meeting with the community, the face-to-face meeting with the community, doesn't require the full ATRT team, but for sure, a good number to listen to the community. We can [inaudible] we want to interact with the community, we should want to interact with the community, so independent from the face-to-face meeting, let's also make sure that we plan with the other SO/ACs to be on the schedule for that, I guess both for Marrakech and Montréal.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I did put it in chat. I just want to point out that [inaudible] Doodle went out with one-hour blocks over all sorts of days, but apparently nobody had looked at the opening ceremony closing time as the opening ceremony on Monday morning is not slated to finish until 10:15. I think it would behoove us to perhaps consider starting, if you choose the Monday, at 10:30 and run to 11:30, thereby taking at least half of our time in what would be the coffee break anyway, just because I think it's extraordinarily rude to get up and leave an opening ceremony. But perhaps that's just me. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. And I'll take a look at the availability of our room as well with those three times, and I'll send a note out to the mailing list no later than tomorrow on that. Yes, Maarten. Or is that an old hand?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [Yes.]

PATRICK KANE: Alright. Thank you. So in the brief two minutes that we have remaining, anything on all other business? Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Thank you, Pat. I just wanted to follow up on the presentation that was given on the [inaudible] and Charla Shambley on the budget and [fact sheet.] If you recall, they mentioned that the review team shall identify a finance liaison, and I just wanted to point out that this has not been identified yet. So maybe right now isn't the best time to discuss that, but just wanted to [inaudible] keep that in mind for your decision. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. I guess I would throw it out to say, is there anybody who wants to volunteer for that particular role amongst the group? Think about it, or volunteer now, but let Cheryl or I know if that's something you would like to do as part of this. If not, we could figure out some other method to find somebody, or Cheryl and I could take on the role.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, just as we're leaving, [inaudible] obviously, things like this also need to go to the mailing list, because not every member of the review team is on this call, and we may find there's a willing volunteer who hasn't been able to attend today. But it would be useful to make sure we pop out a brief job description, because the title may not be incredibly clear to anyone who hasn't been ensconced in the new way of budget control that really only came into the ICANN way of doing things in the Work Stream 2 world. So that will help shake out a volunteer, I hope.

And Pat, I think you and I don't have any choice but to be engaged regardless, seeing as I believe it's our responsibility.

PATRICK KANE: Yes. Agreed. Okay, so Cheryl, I will do that. As soon as Jean-Baptiste sends the job description, that I think he's volunteered to do, I will send out a note calling for a volunteer if we can get one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's perfect. Pat, I'm always concerned about valuing our volunteers' time, so how about we do something slightly radical, and we say to everyone who's on the call who needs to sign up now, because the 90 minutes that we have tried to steel from their lives is up, but staff and you and I will stay on the call with whomever else wishes to join, and we will just go through the action items and make sure that we have in fact captured everything and what our next steps are going to be. So to give

permission for everyone to leave if they need to, but welcome them to stay on if they've got another five or so minutes to spare.

The only other thing I would suggest is it's pretty important that you take the time now to also look at the part of the slide deck which is looking at the transparency guiding principles which has been put off to our next meeting, and so do your homework. Your homework assignment includes commentary on consensus and the quantification of the different parts of the consensus listings that we've seen today, and to prepare yourself fully for the discussion on transparency guiding principles.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Michael has his hand raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Michael.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Michael? Michael, we can't hear you, so maybe you want to type your question in the chat?

PATRICK KANE: [inaudible] for Kobe time, you should be able to – although I certainly wasn't able to – select Kobe. My Doodle insisted that I looked at it in local time, so I just had to keep subtracting the appropriate amount of hours. And [inaudible] there will be remote participation because of the

generosity of us being able to use the [Iris] room which Verisign set up. There will be a conference call capability.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, I just want to –

PATRICK KANE: [inaudible] for the record, but also, letting you know that the majority of our members will be probably leaving us now because we've run through our agenda for today, and we're just going to take an extra few minutes to go through with anyone who wishes to stay on the action items and decisions made, which obviously is something that you'd probably be very interested in listening to.

Okay, Jean-Baptiste, do you want to take us through the decisions reached and action items, noting that many action items have been captures as we've gone through today's call in the discussion? I do want to thank staff for the fabulous job they do in capturing all our gibberish and making it into some semblance of readable and understandable language. Over to you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. And thank you again, Pat, for [just repeating] your action items today. So on decisions reached, as we mentioned in the beginning of this call, [Cheryl,] there will be a continuous exposure [for the review team's] statements of interest.

In terms of action items, ICANN Org will share the slide on operating standards from today's [inaudible] ICANN 64 webinar with the review team.

Review team members will provide personal feelings on what the topics are, also areas of review, and this should be done by March 11th.

For the designation on slide 13 of this presentation, is there a numerical number that ATRT3 believes that each [member] should be defined by? What ATRT3 believes consensus should be from a numerical standpoint.

Review team to [inaudible] verbiage for [terms on slide 13.] Then the ICANN Org will look for the [27th] for the receipt of suggestions. We will send out a Doodle [inaudible] whether a face-to-face would be better before, during or after ICANN 65.

ICANN Org to liaise with Meetings team whether a face-to-face meeting at a different location than ICANN 65 venue would be a possibility.

And finally, ICANN Org to send out a brief job description for ATRT3 finance liaison, and then Pat to send out the call for volunteers.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Was that a correct capture of your action items and decisions reached?

PATRICK KANE: I believe it to be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. I believe so too. And obviously, anyone who sees any difference in the notes is more than welcome to update it in the next 12 to 24 hours. The only thing which I've also put into chat is that as most people who are traveling to ICANN 64 are going to be traveling through next week, Pat and I have decided to not hold our usual ATRT3 weekly meeting next week, but we will of course have our hour together in Kobe for those of you who are on site and for those who can join remotely.

We don't believe this will put us behind schedule at all, especially if you respond to your Doodle poll regarding things that we need deadlines for by the end of this week. We should be tracking pretty well based on what we have proposed is done and how it is done out of today's call. Anything else from you, Pat?

PATRICK KANE: No, I'm good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, with that, thank you one and all, thank for the extra [ten] minutes for those you who were able to hang around during that time. There's a couple things that need to go out to the list. I think staff will be doing some of it, and Pat will be doing at least one piece. And other than that, we will also send iCal invitations out for the next meeting in the time after Kobe, and Pat and I will discuss when that should be, because ICANN traditionally tries to not have meetings the week after

an ICANN meeting. So we shall have to contemplate that. It may involve perhaps a small shift, but we'll get back to you on that once we've worked it out with staff.

Thank you one and all. Thank you very much, Pat, for managing today's call so well, and with that, feel free to disconnect and enjoy the rest of your day or evening. Bye for now.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]