PATRICK KANE: Good morning, and thank you. Welcome to the third day of our first face-to-face meeting, April 5th. Just to recap a little bit about yesterday, after having spent Wednesday going through and identifying the different priorities, we ended up doing triage on the priorities and taking a look and building those into teams by the end of the day.

Those teams at the end of the day got together and started to refine the goals and objectives in a smart format, and after an evening of reflection, does anybody want to weight in on modifications or changes or questions about where we are on those smart goals at this point in time? No hands in Adobe chat. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you. I think we need to capture somewhere what we have decided yesterday about columns and what we do and not do with t hem into the Google doc to keep that as a reminder, because we agree on something, but I don't see that we have put it on the Google doc. And for other people who are not here and for the future, it would be better if we can take a summary of what we decide about the columns yesterday when we were talking about the metrics. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. And I think that where we ended up with once we started to go to the rows of the matrix and build out the teams, I think I made a comment and probably opened up more discussion amongst the group this morning, is that each individual team would take those

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

EN

examples of columns and determine which columns were appropriate for each team. That was a suggestion that we did not make a determination as a team that that was what we're going to do, so let's go ahead and open that up for conversation. I think it's going to be, do we have consistent columns or do we leave it up to the individual work parties to determine the columns that they will address as part of their review? Is that a fair assessment? And Sébastien has indicated yes, so I open up the floor and the Adobe chat room for any conversation on that particular topic.

KC CLAFFY: Can we put the columns up? And can we also put the list of who's in which working groups up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's actually already in the Google doc, so if you open up the Google doc, you'll find the work party, the volunteers, and then the notes so far. So staff has received the notes. As staff is receiving the notes you've contributed, that's where it's going in.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Everybody should have edit access.

PATRICK KANE: A recap of the columns that we discussed yesterday were transparency, accountability, diversity. We moved SSR from a row to a column

yesterday, and then we had an other that we had nothing to [inaudible] specifically for other as of yet.

KC CLAFFY: We probably won't know this until we get in and try to do it, but I'm struggling conceptually [inaudible] to separate transparency from something like SSR, because transparency seems more like a means to an end and SSR seems more like an end, although even SSR's a means, I guess.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. KC, from my perspective, that's exactly why each of the work parties now need to look at what does or doesn't work out of this particular approach of the column. You may very well define that just accountability and transparency are all you need, and they will do as catch-alls, or you may in fact put something in in addition. So I guess the decision on how much consistency between the work party practices is how you manage your data set is something that we also need to decide upon.

I'm not wedded to overall consistency, but I would like a few key features, such as the words transparency and accountability being core. So my comfort would be in having some core aspects that are unified across them, and then specifics that are adjusted to suit your own.

PATRICK KANE: And I know Michael's not in the Adobe chat this morning, but I think [as often as] Michael has focused on the lack of the words transparency being used in some of the priorities, that he would be supportive of having a transparency and accountability column required for each of the review teams. Yes, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, yesterday we also talked about effectiveness and efficiency. And I think these are important factors. Anything we consider should take that into account as well.

PATRICK KANE: So Maarten, if I may ask, did you think that effectiveness and efficiency should be mandatory columns, or do you think those should be left up to the individual team?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think it makes sense that any recommendation should reflect on the effectiveness and efficiency. Yes.

PATRICK KANE: So then the recommendation from Maarten is to make efficiency and effectiveness mandatory columns for each of the four work parties. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: It's not so much an objection as a remark, is efficiency is going to cry for KPIs to measure it. Or am I wrong here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It will cry for measurement. Whether or not it's the performance indicator, key or otherwise, is questionable. But measurements, yes, but that's why we're using SMART anyway. And I think that fits with the SMART profile that was used in ATRT2 as well as what we've established we are using for ATRT3. And it still allows other columns to fit as well, but it felt to me like accountability, transparency, effectiveness and efficiency, which may in fact be split in one column, they may not need to be two columns, so it could be [inaudible] and then whatever works for you could be a way forward.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If I may add to that, I very much agree that it could range from a qualitative statement to a quantitative when applicable. I'm not trying to have that predefined. But I'm thinking ahead of the future as well. If you come with recommendations, it would be good to have a perspective on these issues, how much impact will it have, and also in a way how much will it cost against what will it bring.

PATRICK KANE: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you. Either we try to do it now, and either we'll leave to the working group and we will take all that together and see if there [is consistency,] if not, if we try to do it now and adding columns, I will struggle to have the column diversity in each and every. And I know that it will be contentious, but I think for ICANN, it's so important that if we don't leave it as a column, therefore I have doubt that we will fulfill.

I know that our title – and it's why I was not complaining about having accountability and transparency, because it's the name of our group. But if we add other columns, therefore I will strongly recommend, if not more, to have also diversity as a column.

But if we leave to the working group to decide additional column after the two first ones, I am okay with that not to discuss it here. That's the two ways of doing it today. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. I think that what we're working towards, really, is mandatory columns, and if we believe that diversity should be a mandatory column to be addressed, there may not necessarily be something that falls into the diversity column as an answer or a recommendation, but certainly, I'm open to leaving the five columns we have up here as mandatory columns to be addressed or considered according to the recommendations.

Okay. So then for the record, we will have five mandatory columns to be addressed on each of the recommendations by each of the four work parties, and they are transparency, accountability, diversity, effectiveness and efficiency. Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Pat. Providing that for example I think we may struggle to have diversity as a checkmark system if we're going to continue thinking like matrixes in each of the work parties, so it's going to be okay for some of these to be null. And if it's going to be okay for some of these to be null, it concerns me greatly that transparency or accountability would end up null. Just saying. That worries me a little bit. And not having looked in detail about each work party and whether or not diversity will fit in with each work party's role – KC said sure, yeah, but I think that was a, "Just move on because I'm going to scream otherwise."

So I'm trying to channel you a little bit here, but I would be fearful that if we have to justify KC's work party having nothing in diversity, that then some other work party can say, "And we're going to have nothing in transparency." So it's either mandatory or it's not. And if it's not, it can be used, but if it is and it ends up null, I've just got it on the table. How you deal with it is your choice, people.

PATRICK KANE: And I think to your point, if we're going to have a mandatory column, you're right, we have to have a mandatory answer that says there was nothing addressed on one of the columns for this reason.

EN

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We can just say it's mandatory. It means for me that you need to put something writing there, so like there is nothing specifically related to that.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. But I don't think the answer can just be not applicable. I think that if we're going to say that we're going to have an answer that says this was not applicable, there has to be a justification as to why it was not applicable as opposed to just saying N/A. Yes, KC.

KC CLAFFY: And I would argue that only transparency and accountability are mandatory. And efficiency and effectiveness are part of accountability. And I'm not sure where diversity goes, but I guess I defer to leave it to the committee, to the subgroup.

And then I think that we can have this argument in the plenary when we come back. But I assume, just to drill down a little bit because I'm trying to simulate [the next] few weeks in my head, in the review team that I'm a part of, the diversity metric is going to be – [are the composition of the review teams diverse?] Have they followed some process in order to make sure to try and have more diversity than there was ten years ago, or something measurable? We'll look at that. [inaudible]. Yeah, we'll try definitely.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, KC. I'm sensing a diverse set of opinions on what columns should be mandatory and what should be suggested. Would it be

acceptable to the group to put together a Doodle poll between now and the next plenary to indicate our preference for each of these five columns to be mandatory or to be optional?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, supporting with the Doodle poll concept, what we could do, I believe – and I'm not an expert in Doodle polling, but it seems to me that Doodle polling could almost have a matrix and ask each of us to fill in yay or nay by selecting the box. So if we ask people to select the box that must be attended to, the mandatory column, we will be able to get that polling done fairly well. I assume it could be set up a bit like a vote rather than – otherwise, if we're going to poll it, it would be good for every one of the members to have an opinion.

So, of these five columns, which, any, or all? Please select any or all that you believe needs to be mandatory in terms of how we analyze the work for your group. Something like that. So I think polling through Doodle would be fine. But I'd like to see it so it is very concrete and obvious to people who aren't in this room looking at that spreadsheet, for want of a better word, exactly what we're asking them to do.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So when you mentioned matrix as opposed to just the columns, are you suggesting that we have a poll that has mandatory or optional by work party?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. In fact, I was actually trying to get at that everybody would agree what would be mandatory or not. So not with a horizontal, but a single line of "Click what has to be mandatory in your opinion." And for me, I would be clicking obviously transparency and accountability, and I will work on the others and decide what I want to click. But it would just be that one line [along,] and then we will have consistency between the work parties.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, KC.

KC CLAFFY: I submit the proposition that the reason we have these other three that are not T&A is that we have a history of not doing very well with A. And I think we have a lot of T. We have, again, hundreds and hundreds of pages of T. But A, we're struggling with. And I really believe the other three are sub-aspects of A, of accountability.

So it would be fine with me to require those be addressed in the accountability section. I think if we raise these to three additional sections ,we're going to get charges of mission creep and diversion. Let's just do the charge, and if we think efficiency, diversity and effectiveness are part of the [inaudible], which I do, we're covered. But I don't think we should do something that's going to draw potential accusations of mission creep here. I think we need to get accountability right, and we haven't gotten it right yet.

PATRICK KANE:	Thank you, KC. And I'm sitting here thinking through scenarios in my head of when efficiency or effectiveness would not be tied to transparency. Because we could have transparency and achieve transparency on something, but the end result of what we're trying to achieve was not effective in terms of what we wanted it to be. Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. Got it. Sébastien.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Yeah. Two points. The first one is about process. I'm not sure, because we face a difficulty that the first or the second [inaudible] let's do a poll. Because it's not a way we will find a consensus, and I don't feel comfortable with the fact that we open a poll when we disagree on something or when we have trouble to find an agreement.
	And my second point, whatever the reason, I think the choice must be not to add the different columns but must be to – either we have two mandatory column, and that's what is in our title, transparency and accountability. Either we have more – and we can have that leave to each working group. Therefore, what KC says, I am okay with that if it's a consensus we can find, but I really don't want to enter to competition between other columns voting system. Thank you.
PATRICK KANE:	Thank you, Sébastien. Maarten?
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Yeah. In a way, I agree with Sébastien, especially [to use] Doodle polls to decide on things, but just to inform this question, because the votes,

depending on what people think when they vote, and they may have very different ideas. So I think it's very useful to prepare the ground for discussion but not to make decisions.

On the accountability and the transparency, it's clear, but [when I roll in] also the efficiency and effectiveness is in a way learning from my personal experience when looking at CCT as well. If these aspects are not clearly addressed, it's much more difficult and there's much more to do to come to a proper prioritization and costing and things like that than if these things had been considered from the outset. That helps to come up with more effective advice.

And I also think it's not only [inaudible] accountability as KC suggests, but in a way, for transparency, there's effectiveness too. You can strive for transparency that theoretically works very well but is very costly and adds relatively little and things like that. So I think the considerations matter for all aspects, also across transparency and accountability. So just making these points that otherwise, I think if you don't address it, it will bite us in the back once we have advice delivered to the board.

PATRICK KANE: Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sébastien, and thanks, Maarten. Whether the poll is determinative or not, it would be an opportunity for [someone's thinking to be recorded,] and I personally think that's not a bad exercise to go through. So I'm perfectly happy to run that.

But I'm certainly not wedded to the idea. If not after discussion and calling for agreement, when and how do we make the determination? I'm hearing we can't do it now because we haven't had enough time to influence each other, I'm hearing we can't do it by poll because of some other reasons. I'm hearing, well, then in which case, when do we establish what is going to be core for every working party and what is going to be discretionary for working parties? Or is everything going to be the same for each working party?

So there's a couple of decisions, which from my point of view, I think, would be wisely made here while the majority of you are together, and we do have others that are on the remote participation and therefore would count as being together anyway. I'll note that staff will have taken a roll call, and I think we've got two members that are not present by my reckoning at least. So we can in fact have a majority come up with a couple of decision [inaudible] post haste, I would hope.

You're all able to talk and influence. See if you can come to some decisions sooner rather than later.

PATRICK KANE: Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah, I tend to support Cheryl here, and I would remind the members of the conversation we had during the first, maybe the second call which was, what will be a consensus? Is the consensus the majority? Is it more than the majority? Two thirds? Three fourths? So I think now could be a

good time, even if it takes a bit of time, to test how we find the consensus between us, because that's a fundamental decision, and if we can agree around the table and the virtual table over a consensus, I think we will know better how we will work in the future and maybe now is the time to do it.

PATRICK KANE: Vanda? Thanks, Jacques.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, we are trying to establish the terms of reference, so we need to put clearly what will be analyzed when we split. So I tend to support the idea of Cheryl to make it quite clear now, because terms of reference, even a living document, we need to start with something more stronger to make progress, because if it's too open and not well-defined, you're going to lose time in the first month until we establish some good framework. So in my point of view, we need to make it very clear [which] all groups will do correctly, and the same thing, because we cannot give them the decision what to do just because we need a framework to work with to make sure we'll progress easily. Our time frame is really short. So I'm not comfortable to make it completely open. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. KC.

EN

KC CLAFFY: Okay, now I'm even more strongly convinced from what Cheryl and Vanda said that we should just have to [inaudible] mandatory. It's not, Maarten, that I don't think effectiveness and efficiency are unimportant, but they're not part of the original charge, and I think we have to stick to the original charge.

I think that effectiveness and efficiency are pretty much part of the charge of [inaudible] because that's all about evaluating the impact of – I think effectiveness might even be a word there – of the reviewee. And I think that's the point at which we can start reflecting on the problem that we face now with [inaudible] explicitly up there.

But I'm worried that you're just expanding the scope beyond what frankly any of us are capable of doing, of estimating the cost effectiveness and efficiency of proposed recommendations, that's way beyond the expertise of the folks in the room. And of course, ICANN would have to be much more transparent about the financial situation, where things are being paid for hat in order for us to be able to gauge, and we'd have to figure out how something [might cost.] That just – it explodes the mission here.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, KC. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I hear you, and I'm not assuming that we are the ones who are going to cost everything beforehand. It's just to have that consideration, and also we are to invite the expertise in the room that we missed, right? So

EN

we are free to do that, because at some point, these things will need to be considered, and we can say, "Well, that's not up to us, we leave it to others to do that." But I don't think that that would be helpful either.

So if t here's information we need, let's ask for that information. [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: We could, but that was not envisioned, is my understanding. People can argue with me here because I wasn't there when these words were written. That was not part of – now it feels to me because we're halfway through the game and it looks like, "Oh wow, the review's just put something on the table that looks undoable by the ICANN side. Let's change the rules of the game in the middle to reduce the chances of that happening."

I think the whole point of [F] is to revisit and reflect on what the rules of the game were so that we can change the nature of the reviews next time around. So I'm concerned about trying to do that in the middle. Which is not to say that there isn't a problem that needs addressing, but it just feels like we're muddying the waters a bit.

PATRICK KANE: So F is assessing and improving the independent review process. Is that what you're referring towards?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Independent review process is not the component parts of ICANN. That would be organizational reviews.

KC CLAFFY: Independent review is a synonym for periodic [reviews that's over there.] It's not two different exercises that are being referred to.

PATRICK KANE: I think it's two different exercises, because this is capitalized –

KC CLAFFY: So what's periodic reviews? Is that the SOs and ACs? Oh, so periodic is everything. Okay.

PATRICK KANE: Before you leave, we'll make sure that everybody understands. Okay, so where do we think we are? Daniel?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we tease out some firmer opinion? This looks to me like A and T are pretty settled there. Nobody is arguing against A and T. Now, whether A and T are the only one –

KC CLAFFY: The other three are definitely in my work party. I believe they belong there. I'm not in the rest of the work party so you guys can have it up, but my impression would be they don't belong there, it's too much

work, we're going to have enough trouble getting done what we have been assigned to do.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This, in my opinion, does not mean that we will not as a term of reference take a view on that aspects. Even if it's not completely done, I understand as term of reference that we'll touch those things during the work. So maybe we are going to detail too much, and for me, terms of reference makes information about what is the aspects and the framework that we'll touch during our work. It's not supposed to completely define that, because we are not working yet. We are design what we should touch during our work. So if we do not put things that we will touch, then we are not supposed to touch. And for the outside reading, maybe looks weak work that we have done, we will do, because it's too narrow for why you were sitting here, why you were doing one year of work if it's too narrow? We need to think about the framework we should touch to give recommendations supported to the community.

So it's my opinion that we should keep those things as a way of [inaudible] during the work. If its outcome will be recommendation or not is the outcome of our work, not the framework that we are working now that's the terms of reference.

That's my opinion about term of reference and the work we are doing and try to finish it here. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think this is as very good discussion. It also shows why it's good to still talk about it, because for all clarity, we may have different pictures in our mind. Some of us may have pictures that we need to come with every recommendation with costing and implementation plan, etc. And I think that that will not be expected. It's just a consideration, which while may be a call to their statement and beyond that, but it's a starting point that will help guide whatever is needed to come to after the recommendations are accepted to implementation. And in that way, I think it makes sense to take that into account, and let's not expect to be perfectly costing out everything. That's not the suggestion nor the expectation, that's not what we are setting out to do.

PATRICK KANE: Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: I think our work is – some point of view of kind of auditoring of what ICANN's doing in accountability and transparency. And of course, as a result of this checking and this auditing, we can propose some amendments or some new ways to go forward.

I think we are not revising the structure or proposing changes in the structure. We are not a review team to review the institution or the way the institution works. But I suppose our main objective is first to audit what it was we have been doing all this time and propose ways to make it better in transparency and also in accountability, is my point. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Wolfgang? Microphone, please.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I agree with Demi 100%.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. Jaap? Microphone, please.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Honestly, I'm a bit confused how this'll work [out in practice,] so I cannot imagine how this is going to look like. I'm probably [too pragmatic] for it. So I don't know.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. And Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: One thing I can say that I'm just excited with the work, everything that is going on. The discussion's a little bit [inaudible] different opinions, and

[inaudible] ask the question. Once we've got the process, do we have a chance of going back and revisit where we are and make amends? If we're to go back and make amendments, how is it going to affect our limited term scope of one year?

One thing that is good to be [on the path,] but what about in case we discover that we are losing our track at one point? Because based on yesterday's discussion, we came with those four. Me, I look at those as [variable,] and [inaudible] variables, there are two things. There's an independent and a dependent variable.

If we're going to carry out an analysis of each of those, come up with the recommendations of [inaudible] our scope of work, then I think [inaudible]. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: So if I may address that specific item, we have a year, and we have a budget. But we've also talked about our terms of reference, and thus the framework for how we work is malleable. So it's a living document that we're working towards. I think that when we do make changes, we're going to have to assess. We've not talked about this, so this is, again, me swimming right after I've eaten. We're going to have to address what the impact is of any of those modifications of the team and we have to determine whether we want to stay the path, stay the course, or make a modification that may result in us having to do more work in the short period of time that we do have.

So we have some guardrails that are pretty bright, so while I'm saying that, yes, we have room for change, we've got to assess the impact of that before we say, "Let's make the change." Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Based on that, I think that you just simply hit the road and split up.

PATRICK KANE: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think, again, what it's about is to have a good understanding of the outcomes [inaudible] and however we get there, as long as that's clearly considered, and not just the analysis. Then I think we're good.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Yes, Sébastien.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, I don't know where we will end up, but I want to stress that from my point of view, of course, accountability and transparency are mandatory, and for the board, for the review and for the community, the question of diversity is absolutely key in our organization.

For the GAC, it's a little bit different because they're [self-organized I will say,] but for the three other, it's absolutely mandatory that we say

something on what is going on and how it could be evolved in the future for each of those three categories.

Therefore, if it's understood that it is under the umbrella of accountability, I have no problem with that, but I want just to stress again that it's one important point from the ATRT3 to take into account. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, pat. So what I'm hearing so far is obviously accountability and transparency, no one's arguing about that. Hopefully not. There is an opportunity to ensure that under those primary headings, that the matters of effectiveness, efficiency and diversity are dealt with as expected subheadings, or as primary headings in their own right. So that seems to be the choice.

There doesn't seem to be a downside. I haven't heard an argument that's convinced me that there is a downside to having them dealt with as a subset of accountability. Or if you've got an argument against that, then bring it forward now, would be my suggestion. And then have it considered and dealt with.

But it seems to me that it's only a matter of, is it a standalone level one title, or is it a subtitle of a mandatory title? And if it's a topic that's getting dealt with, surely that's the endgame that you're after. So I'm

EN

not seeing the choice as a terrible either/or. Rather, whether this wrapping is one way or the other.

I think you're close, so unless you can argue for why it isn't going to be dealt with one way or the other, then, I don't know, flip a coin, but deal with it.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Wolfgang?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I don't see anybody who disagrees with diversity. The problem is we do not have really a perfect working definition. And so that means diversity has so many aspects that we should be careful not to go too deep, because it depends also from the concrete circumstances. It changes from time to time. So I was six years in the NomCom, and have to take into consideration that in the bylaws, we have only condition or a rule when it comes to geographic diversity. All other is more or less open for discussion. And I don't know whether we have a mandate to define what diversity means in total for ICANN. So that means I fully agree, as Sébastien has said, [inaudible] for the whole organization and [inaudible] what we do propose, so it gets very complex in the absence of an agreed definition what diversity means, beyond the geographical diversity which is in the bylaws.

PATRICK KANE: Maarten, is your hand up?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Of course, you're right, Cheryl. The main topics, whatever we say or do, is accountability and transparency. So it's not on the same level of any other columns. And it's also getting a heated discussion, which just means that people are in it for real, which hi appreciate.

Let's take it for what it is, it's for both accountability and transparency. There's important aspects that we need to consider. And we've learned from reviews so far that we also need to consider it's not only about the more transparent the better. It's about how it works out, what the impact is in the end. And as long as we consider that to make it now official subsets of accountability may miss out on [inaudible] official subset of transparency.

So we can just say if you would agree that, yes, we understand it's important, have you also considered the impact in that way? Then I think we're good enough ,and it doesn't need to be main columns or something like that.

PATRICK KANE: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Wolfgang, two points. The first one, you are jumping the gun with the conclusion, and the second is that we have a better definition with the Work Stream 2 subgroup on diversity. And I am not asking that we redefine diversity, I am just asking that we look at what is the

EN

current state of art in diversity with the organization. And we may end up with some proposal or a suggestion for the future.

I don't see how it could be so difficult to have such analyze and discussion. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Well, again, I agree that we need to have a whole point that we have discussed here in this term of reference. So I don't see difficulty to put in columns or just as a statement that we'll touch all those things, because in the outcome of a kind of metrics that what we're going to have really adds something to put metrics in our term of reference, or will we explain that we'll work with those aspects in view? So for me, as a term of reference, of course the two ones are the main points that we are here for, but those – and beyond those – will come out during the analysis of our task. If you have a chance to see those metrics over there, we have a point like reach out, information ,and then analyze and then propose.

So for me, it's no matter if it's the metrics or a statement, we need to touch all the points that we need to analyze after we reach out data about those lines that we are working for. So I don't see that need to define if a column A, B, C or D. We need to have more large view about analysis of each point that we'll touch with.

So I don't know what really we can get from metrics itself. It's just the meaning of what we'll touch during analysis part of our work. So it is in that format or there'll be restatement, I don't care, but I believe all those should be addressed during our work after the term of reference. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. KC?

KC CLAFFY: I only want to say something if we're not done yet. So I'm trying to, again, simulate what the work party that I'm in is going to talk about in this context. And Maarten, I need you to [beam] in here for a second. So we're supposed to evaluate the reviews and the effectiveness of the review process. And you want this group to talk about efficiency and effectiveness.

But let's take CCT. I'm just going to drill down. You're all in my work party for the next 60 seconds. And I'm going to submit that I've read this report. There's a ton of recommendations in there. It is pretty clear to me that there are more recommendations in there than there is available budget for ICANN to execute on all of them. And even the high-priority ones.

However, the set of recommendations covers things that according to the CCT review team, ICANN said it was going to do as part of the new gTLD round. Establish metrics of abuse and be transparent, accountable

EN

about it. And ICANN didn't do it yet. So CCT is more or less saying, "Make sure you do this before there's a second round."

And what I hear you saying is, well, they didn't consider the effectiveness and the efficiency of those recommendations, because if they had, they wouldn't have asked for all that work, even though from the CCT's perspective, that was already on ICANN's plate. They just didn't execute it before, which is why CCT had to go off and commission a study and try to understand what is the status of the things that ICANN had already [commenced.]

So what do you want the work party to say about that example as part of efficiency and effectiveness of the reviews, rather than what the CCT's charge was, which was the accountability in the process of executing the need [inaudible] help me with that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: What I'm not trying to do here is to get anything off the chart or to delay or make impossible. And I'm not arguing specific CCT recommendations. But I say if beforehand we think of impact and what's important, these arguments that you bring up are important arguments that should be on the table. And I think with that, we would do ourselves and the community, and with that, even the board, a service by saying about what, in the end, the impact is, what we expect in terms of effectiveness and efficiency of measures.

[inaudible] we as ATRT3. So it shows that we've considered, not only the purity of the intentions but also the impact of what we propose, and so

in that way, we preempt that [inaudible] consider that for us. We gift that with our considerations.

So it's really about making clear that we consider that it's not only the analysis but also what happens with it, what the impact is of what we come with.

KC CLAFFY: And you're saying if CCT had done that, the set of recommendations would be different?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think they may have [inaudible] clearly in the light of things that now are going to be looked upon. So in that way, that could have helped decision making about this to progress faster and better.

KC CLAFFY: Did that not come up in the public comment process?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I guess not, but this is also one of the reasons why I think recognizing that this is not their failure. It's our total failure as a community in the way to come up with a clear picture that we can acct upon. So this is also why I think there was the invite to talk with the CCT team in Marrakech face-to-face to work it out. We're not saying they've done it wrong or anyone else has done it wrong, we say you need to do something with it. And it would have helped if this could be recognized

EN

earlier, in the public comment period, in the marching orders, or by the CCT itself. So I think if we can take these faults alone in the way we present our analysis and our recommendations, that would be useful to the community as a whole as well.

PATRICK KANE: I think Jacques was first. Or was I? Oh. So I think the CCT was surprised at the end when the recommendations came out the way that they did, and I think that they were doing a review under a different set of – yes, that they didn't know about until the very end, and so I think that it's kind of hard to say that the community wasn't clear or the review team wasn't clear, because it was a different game in the end in terms of what 37 recommendations should have looked like or what it was expected to look like and the communication wasn't clear, I don't think. At least [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: I just don't understand, Pat, why was there [some surprise?] I don't know the whole narrative.

PATRICK KANE: So Jonathan Zuck, when he went to the microphone in Kobe, talked about the surprise in terms of responses that he got from the ICANN board as to what was there.

So they put together 37 recommendations based upon what they thought the process was, not what the received perception or what may

EN

have been the expectation by the board as they reviewed that document.

So I think it's kind of unfair to say that the community failed or the review team failed in getting to that 37 recommendations that they made because they didn't package them in a way that they were consumable or expected to be consumable by the board. So I think that. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: So a couple of things. We are an audit process, so from what I remember, making progress is partly – we considered SMART already. Maybe we can consider PDCA, plan, do, check, act. If we plan and do in one way, we check and it doesn't work out, then we can always come back one step, recheck and then act, and then go on PDC again.

What I'm trying to say is as much as this matrix seems reassuring, I feel it might be a bit of a constraint if you try to make everything fit in before we start working. And there I second Vanda. So what I do, we are accountability and transparency review team, and this should cover diversity, effectiveness, and efficiency as much as we will encounter them going on working.

And if I might refer to a previous work which was done in 2017 by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, one of their sub-tags – and I have it here, because search engines are my friend – one of their category tags is diversity.

So this should be finding that, yes, we can work on diversity and effectiveness, and efficiency without trying to be constrained and to have to look at them if we feel it's not useful to do so. So I would second and say, "Okay, let's start transparency and accountability, and we will find that diversity, effectiveness and efficiency should fall into place considering the topics."

PATRICK KANE: So I would ask the room if we can get rough consensus around Jacques' position that he just put out. Anybody opposed to that specific so we can decide whether we have consensus or rough consensus?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I'm looking at the Adobe room, and we have other members in there, and I'm not seeing any crosses coming up.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. So just because we've been on this one for about an hour now, can we declare consensus on that position that Jacques just put together, or rough consensus? Because it seems to me that we are at least rough consensus, and I've not heard any dissenting, so do we have consensus? Okay, so we have consensus. Alright.

So it's 10:00, and we're going to have a break at 10:10, because we're going to have Brian Cute come on at 10:30. We're going to break at 10:10, Brian Cute will be on at 10:30 to have the conversation we talked about yesterday. And we do want to get to a workplan today. So what I'd like to do for the next ten minutes until we break is to have the

groups get back together and take a look at the recommendations as you've written them, and try to identify resources that may be required to achieve that between now and when we actually finish the report, because I want that to fit into the workplan.

Now, it's going to change over time, of course, but if we're going to start to identify those throughout so we can put the workplan together, not just for the next 60 days but for beyond in terms of interviews, in terms of people that we need to make available to us, other resources such as surveys or other items that we would like to do so that we can start to map that out from both a timeline and a budget process, that would be helpful. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I'm sorry, Pat, but we spent the last hour discussion a question I asked at the beginning, but we didn't answer your question. And we need to do it formally, the second reading of our work of yesterday. And I know after, we can go to the discussion you are suggesting, but as a process matter, I think it's important that we say, "Okay, after a night, we agree that we will follow with that." Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's the question Pat posed at the outset of today, at least that's the one I heard, when he asked, were any of the work parties wishing to make any changes or updates? I thought that was the question [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	And at that moment, I asked my question, and we didn't have the opportunity to answer this question. It's why I think it's a good process to come back to that. Sorry.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Nothing to be sorry about, Sébastien. We will pose the question again, and you've got three of those ten minutes to either respond or not, and if we need to take all ten, we will do so.
PATRICK KANE:	Alright, so again, the question was – and thank you, Sébastien, for the reminder – is there any updates, changes or modifications or questions that came out of the more detailed writing of the objectives and goals we established yesterday that we need to discuss as teams or as an entire review team?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	For the record, I'm seeing shaking of hands in the negative from the GAC group. I'm seeing shaking of head in the negative from the review team group.
PATRICK KANE:	How about the communities group? Which was Osvaldo and – that's Jaap. That's right.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:	There's problem there, because only Daniel and I are here. The rest are either [inaudible] or in their planes in the sky.

PATRICK KANE:	It's Jaap, Osvaldo, Daniel and Erica.

JENNIFER BRYCE:	And Michael as well, he's online.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:	So it's difficult to us.

PATRICK KANE:	You've got four of five. Is there anything you're concerned about, or you want to defer to when you can have Oswaldo available as well?

JAAP AKKERHUIS:	Yeah, [inaudible] it would be very preliminary to make [inaudible] without having any reaction from [inaudible]. That's what I'm saying.

PATRICK KANE:	Yeah, but right now, we're addressing the question I asked at the beginning, which was, do any of the groups have anything they wanted to update, have a further discussion on in terms of the priorities and the detailed writing of the priorities and objectives and goals from yesterday? And we've got no on the board, we've got no on reviews, we've got I think a deferment on –

JAAP AKKERHUIS: For the time being, it's no for community.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, so you have no changes, but you reserve the right to make changes in the future.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Got it.

KC CLAFFY: I should say Maarten has definitely [inaudible] some thinking about how the heck I would do – I'm going to call it E&E for the review team. So [we'll both think.]

PATRICK KANE: So you're saying not at this time.

KC CLAFFY: Not at this time.

PATRICK KANE:	But that it should be a topic at at least the next plenary or maybe the one after that?
KC CLAFFY:	I assume that it's going to come up in the resources we need, which is we're going to need ICANN to go off and give us cost estimates of all the recommendations and all previous reviews.
PATRICK KANE:	Yes.
KC CLAFFY:	So there will be some indications of that.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	That is the same I believe for all groups.
PATRICK KANE:	The only group we haven't specifically heard from yet is the board group, so we've got the GAC said no but defers, reviews is now a "We're going to think about it and get back in one of the other plenaries at some point." The community group is saying when we get together, we're reserving the right to have a future conversation. And now if I could turn to the board group to see if there's anything. Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I talked with my colleagues this morning, some of them at least, and we are happy with what's on the Google doc. Just to be clear for everybody, yesterday, I had our summary, what will be our base to work, but I didn't delete the previous inception of the work. But it's not to be taken into account in the future. Therefore, I think my answer is it's okay with us, and now if I stop that and I take my own role, I would like very much that we have one Google doc with just the result of the work of yesterday to be worked on, and not full of colors and numbers, and maybe a renumbering of all. That could be very helpful for the future. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. So what you're asking for is to take just that work where we are on the four work teams with the further detailed priorities, goals and objectives, and put that into a single document as opposed to into the multiple exercise documents which is where they are today. I think that's fair. Staff, can we do that, please? Thank you ladies.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, happy to. For historical purposes, we'll keep the exercise document, but we'll separate it out.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Negar. Yes, Cheryl. I thought you were saying "pick me." Alright, so we've got five minutes left, and so if we can real quickly before we take a break, at least start the process of identifying what

resources we think we need or our teams. [inaudible] continue beyond the Brian Cute conversation we're going to have at 10:30, but if we can start that process, or start to at least think about that process, that would be helpful at this point in time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Sébastien. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think we already agree that there is some work to be done and data collected about ATRT2 metrics. We also agree that we need to have – where we are with Work Stream 2 on ICANN accountability. For the rest, I have no yet idea for the subgroup on board, and for the other one, I am [inaudible] what we can ask for, I guess we need a little bit more work and at that moment, we will be able to come back and say we would like to have this type of information or this work done by others. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So in the few minutes left – I'm thinking we're getting to a point where we're not going to get any of the small work group done, but that's okay. By the end of another session today, we certainly want to be in a condition where the work parties know what their next steps are, so start thinking at least about what next steps and what resources may be. KC?

KC CLAFFY: I'm working my way through the ATRT2 report, and I have just hit the page about the review of the review. That's what my work party is, and it said reliance on volunteers for doing functions that should be carried out by professionals is not a good model for a review [inaudible] such an important task. For example, reviewing other review teams' output is a lot of work for volunteers.

And then it also says the board should ensure strict coordination of the review team so as to have all reviews completed before the next ATRT begins. So that did not happen, maybe because of the SSR2 pause, and everything was supposed to be done so that ATRT3 was supposed to be also evaluating SSR2 outputs, [inaudible] output, and then we're kind of just off the rails because of the SSR2 thing, or why are we not following that?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Because according to bylaws, ATRT3 had to star.t I think that was guiding the start of ATRT.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. So yes, I'm not sure if everyone in this room remembers, but last year, ICANN Org published a document for public comment which was looking at the timeline of ATRT3 review and when it could start, and one suggestion was perhaps we could delay the start of ATRT3 for various reasons, one of which was that, and the feedback received from the community was against pushing the review out any further and starting it as soon as it was possible to do. And I want to note that SSR is

not the only review that's left. RDS is still ongoing as well. It's not finalized.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: They have put out their draft, they're getting ready to publish the final report, but they're not completed yet. So that's also ongoing.

KC CLAFFY: Presumably, these things will finish while we're in play, so we will be expecting – yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: And I'd like to know that we have a raised hand in the room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I was just about to [inaudible]. Yes, Larisa, go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much. To KC's question also, that was the requirement under the AOC. Under the AOC, ATRT was charged to review the outcomes of all the other reviews. But once their reviews were formulated as specific reviews under the new bylaws, and because of that comment, KC, that you observed, the challenge in doing that, there was a decision to eliminate that requirement form ATRT mandate. So

that's another reason why that's no longer part of the bylaws, to review how the implementation of all the other reviews has taken place.

So there was definitely a change. One of the elements that changed from AOC times to bylaws times is that factor, also the timeframe was extended to five years and various other things changed in the way AOC reviews became specific reviews. But that's one prominent item that got changed. I hope that helps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not only does it help, it helps because you saved me saying it. Thanks for this, Larisa. I certainly appreciate it. We are 10 past the hour, ladies and gentlemen. We had a 15-minute break that we are generously going to extend no further than 10:25-ish. But please be back in from having coffee and getting up and stretching your legs before 10:30, because at 10:30, so that's the 10:25-ish reference, we will have Brian Cute queued up and ready to go. Hopefully even via video, and we have our half-hour with him. So off you go, stretch your legs, get a liquid refreshment if that is your want, and do be back in your seat or in the remote participation room by a tad before 30 minutes past the hour. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brian, are you already on the full mic?

BRIAN CUTE: Can you hear me now?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes, we can hear you. Can you hear us?

BRIAN CUTE: This is Brian dialing on.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, Brian. We can hear you very well. Can you hear us?

BRIAN CUTE: I can. Sorry about that. the audio on the laptop is being problematic.

JENNIFER BRYCE: No problem. So now you just need to start your webcam whenever you're ready.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Make sure you comb your hair.

BRIAN CUTE: Well, it's too late for that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. We're just getting ready, I think.

BRIAN CUTE: Great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got about 45 seconds, Brian. I'm looking longingly at your smiling face.

BRIAN CUTE: Must be late in the day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not for me. Can we move the flipchart?

BRIAN CUTE: I'm not [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Can I say good morning?

BRIAN CUTE: Good morning, Maarten. Sorry. How are you?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Pretty good, surviving so far. They haven't thrown me out yet.

BRIAN CUTE:	Give it time.
PATRICK KANE:	Be careful though.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Hi, Brian. How are you?
BRIAN CUTE:	Hey, Vanda. How are you? Good to hear you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay, well, we're at half past the hour now, ladies and gentlemen, so is the recording running, Brenda? It looks like there's a red line up there.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Yeah, you're good to go, Cheryl.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you, Brenda. Just confirming that everything you say will be taken down, and of course, held against you, Brian. Right, ladies and gentlemen, surprise visitor. No, we told them you were coming, Brian. Brian Cute, as you know, has been given a new piece of work to do with the evolution of the ICANN governance model, and he's going to talk to us about that, we're going to talk to him about possible use of this

whole thing being one of our case studies, and most importantly, of course, he comes superbly qualified to be put into our clutches because he has the, dare I say, honor to be the chair – the sole chair, didn't share the job like Pat and I are doing – of both ATRT1 and ATRT2.

So I've mentioned as we did our preamble yesterday late in the day and again this morning that this won't be the last time we interact with you, Brian, we trust. This'll be the first time we interact with you, and that we're working on not being duplicative in our work but complementary, and most importantly, that because you are who you are to the other ATRTs, we're trusting you'll be a resource we can grab into, at future the work party looking at other reviews can sink their teeth into you in the nicest possible way and get the information on the review teams that you've run in the past.

So with that, Pat, unless you've got something to say, and seeing as you're leaving the seat, I guess that's not the case – Pat's leaving the room now, Brian. And I guess it's all over to you.

BRIAN CUTE: [inaudible].Well, thank you, Cheryl, for that wonderful [entre.] And just hello to everyone in the room, and to say at the top, I'm just very happy to be here. the work that you're doing is near and dear to my heart, as you might imagine, and absolutely, to the extent that I can be a resource, I'm at your disposal. I note two things just in listening in a little bit already. I think Cheryl hit an important point in one of your earlier sessions this week that ICANN is in a very different place today from where it was when the first ATRT assembled and set up to charter our

work with really a blank canvas. It's in a very different place today, so while the work of the ATRT1 and ATRT2 are near and dear to my heart, I do think that you're in a new frame. I'm happy to be a resource, and I know that you'll chart your own course as you see fit, which is the way it should be.

With that, I think, Cheryl, I've got 30 minutes, right? So I want to leave plenty of time for discussion. Is five to ten minutes enough, too much, of a little bit of background on the work I'm doing?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, correct, and yes, Brian.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Great. So I think some of you may have been at the session on Thursday in Kobe that was about evolving the multi-stakeholder model. For those of you who weren't, I'll give you a little bit of a backdrop. The work that I've been engaged to do is to facilitate the conversation with the community about under the strategic plan, strategic objective number two.

Strategic objective number two in the strategic plan is, how do we evolve the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model? That work obviously, the strategic plan developments [as has been mentioned] was work in consultation with the board and the community and the staff, and at the ICANN Barcelona meeting, Cherine, the chair of ICANN, in taking that work and moving it forward, engaged the community, the

AC, the SOs, in a discussion about the elements of each of the five strategic objectives.

And with respect to governance, he began to ask some very focused questions about the effectiveness and the efficiency of the multi-stakeholder model, with a view of moving the work of strategic objectives forward.

I think it's fair to say that Cherine and the board recognized that in moving the work forward on the strategic objective number two, it was going to be important to have someone who could act as an independent and neutral facilitator of a critical conversation that has to happen to evolve and deliver the work of strategic objective number two.

I was asked to play that role, I think in large part because of my prior work as chair of ATRT1 and ATRT2, and in drawing on that, one of the things I found really compelling about that exercise was that as a chair, you have to manage things with some neutrality and objectivity, and that was something I hoped that I did well enough in those two roles.

But what I also found compelling about those exercises was that for me, I had always come from a point of view of a registry operator, a registrar, one of the stakeholder groups, and that's how I always approach things with respect to ICANN questions, but the ATRT exercise really forced me to put myself in the middle of the circle between the board, the community, and the organization, and to be neutral and independent. And I found that to be a really worthwhile exercise.

So with some of that experience that I hope to bring to bear having been – the board asking Göran to engage me to play this role, let me describe a little bit in detail for those of you who may not have been in the Kobe session what this conversation about governance is so far.

Really, what it is is two things: developing an issues list, having the community in conversation with respect to all the other work that's going on, but in conversation, identifying the issues that are specific challenges to the effectiveness and the efficiency of how the model works, how we get our work done writ large, and develop that list of issues so that it is clearly articulating the nature of the challenges, the nature of the issue, that we as a community in conversation identify that list, prioritize that list, and then take that list of issues that support strategic objective number two, and map them into a workplan.

The list of issues is really the first deliverable, and then the second is a workplan, with the issues that the community identifies and agrees on, to then map those issues into a workplan, that becomes part of the operational plan at the end of the year. And this is where this ties back into the work of strategic plan.

So the second phase of this work will take the issues that we've developed between now and Marrakech, map them into a workplan, we will take for example an issue one and identify the group or groups that are responsible or should be responsible to take that issue on, ask them when within the timeframe of the strategic plan, the five-year plan, they will deliver an approach, a methodology, a solution to this particular issue that is challenging the effectiveness and efficiency of the multi-stakeholder model.

We will then map with them what resources will they need to get that work done by the date that they select. And with that data, by the end of the year in that workplan as filled out, that can become part of the operational plan that supports the five-year strategic plan, and that data will also allow ICANN Org to put costing in around those activities, and noting that having a fully costed plan is a priority within the framework of a strategic plan. Those are the two deliverables, an issues list and a workplan.

So in Kobe, we had the first session, and it was a very good session. The energy in the room was terrific. I had taken the discussion points from Barcelona on this topic, gone through the transcripts and pulled out issues that had been identified in Barcelona as issues that challenge the effectiveness and efficiency of the multi-stakeholder model, and we used that as a starting point, and I invited the community attendees to weigh in: is there some specificity around this issue?

And issues for example are around inclusivity, representativeness, the timing of decision-making, that everything takes so long. These are examples of the issues that were identified in Barcelona, so we used that as a starting point and then asked the community members to put a little more specificity on that issue, give us an example of what that problem is, and then also the opportunity to begin to think about prioritization.

The session was terrific, and in my role as the facilitator and leading this process, I've already documented those inputs and begun to map them to the next iteration of the issues list.

From here, the process itself, I'll be publishing on the ICANN site, we'll have a dedicated site to [evolving] the multi-stakeholder model. I'll be publishing a blog which updates the work coming out of Kobe, I'll be identifying going forward the work that will take place. There will be a public comment process launched on this issue. I intend to have at least two webinars between now and Marrakech to help [inaudible] the work forward. And all of that will be published shortly.

One of the primary considerations that I have going through this work – and I've shared this with Cheryl and with Pat, and I know that you've reflected it in your own conversations so far, is that this is really critical work, it supports the strategic plan, it needs to be done under the bylaws, it addresses a topic that has been a longstanding pain point for the community, Org and board, and at the same time, it should not be duplicative of any of the work that's going on.

For me in Kobe, in putting out some prime considerations among them that I put on the board were ATRT3, PDP 3.0, and Work Stream 2 that the issues that we developed in this work to support the strategic plan should not duplicate or collide with the work that's being done in other areas like ATRT3.

So part of what I will be doing – and have started with Cheryl and Pat and happy to work with ATRT3 as you deem appropriate – is to have that coordination as an ongoing dynamic. While you're scoping your work right now and the community is scoping the issues list, let's work thoughtfully in a way that makes sure that there's complementarity to our work and not collision to our work, and I've always been an optimist and I believe that we can do that, we can do that thoughtfully and well.

So I thin kw that, I'll stop there – I've thrown a lot at you – and open up for Q&A. Cheryl, let me ask before we go to [inaudible], are there any aspects of the work to date that I should have touched on that I didn't in your view?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I don't think so, Brian. I think one of the things we'll want to try and make sure is that as our group will need to keep a watching brief on what you're publishing, we might be so bold as to ask you to push some of that to us rather than have us be expected to watch with bated breath for every report you make, every blog you post. Of course, I shall be reading everything you ever write, Brian, because you know I would, but I do think it might be a little bit appreciated by our very busy work party if we could get a push from time to time. So to that end, we will be still meeting weekly, and there may be an opportunity in a number of our plenaries then for an update to be tabled. So anything you feel we need to have our attention drawn to or vice versa, we could use that opportunity.

That's off the top of my head, of course. I'm assuming that Pat's not saying no next to me.

PATRICK KANE: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, he tells me no, he's not saying no. So with that ,I've got in the queue already KC – and just so you know, I'm going to ask each of you

as you make your intervention what work party it is you're involved with – I also see Wolfgang in the queue – just so Brian knows where you're coming from in terms of interest as well. Who was first, Wolfgang or KC? Okay, KC, over to you.

KC CLAFFY:

Hi, Brian. Thanks for coming to talk to us, I really appreciate it. I admit to be really curious of why you're not on ATRT3. Have you learned from experience? This morning at breakfast, Jacques turned to me and said, "Do you know what the definition of insanity is? It's doing the same thing over and over again expecting a different result." And I think maybe you decided not to be insane anymore. That worries me.

Okay, but that's not actually my question, although it bears on my question, which is I question the premise of trying to avoid replication. First of all, partly because when I listen to what you said your charge was, it sounds super overlapping with the charge of my work, the work party that I'm on the subteam that I'm on in this group, which is going to be reviews of the reviews with an eye towards improving the efficiency, effectiveness, accountability of the review process at ICANN writ large.

So, one, I don't understand how we could not duplicate some thinking and process in that space, and two, I'm having an academic background doing science where replication is how you know you have more trust in a result. So if two independent groups were to come up with the same recommendations or criticisms of a process, that would give it more weight, I would think. So I guess I understand the whole – especially since we just spent the last hour that you blessedly missed talking about

EN

effectiveness and efficiency as guiding principles in this whole process – the impulse, the thought behind not wanting to duplicate results. But I'm not sure it's actually the right guideline here. So I'd love your thoughts on that.

BRIAN CUTE: That's a great question, KC, and I think I'll start the response this way: at a high level, I actually agree with you, I don't think overlap is something to be feared or avoided. I think as ATRT3 right now is scoping out this work and evolving the MSM is the community is scoping out its issues, there's going to be some general overlap that we can identify. Not to be feared and not just kneejerk avoided.

I think what's important for me, for example one of the things the community has identified as an issue is the efficient use of resources or the lack therefor, the fact that many folks in the community feel that there are too many Work Streams that they have to assign folks from their respective SO or AC to all these different Work Streams and that really stretches their resources thin.

So from the point of view of effective or efficient use of resources, and that can be community resources, ICANN Org resources, even board Org resources, I think there is value in having a clear understanding of where there are areas of overlap, identifying where if that work were to move forward toward recommendations, board deliverables that are being taken on, to be clear that we're not being inefficient in the use of resources. I think that's probably one area where we'd want to be thoughtful.

And to answer your first question, there were a few folks who asked me if I was interested in being the chair of ATRT3, and the real answer is that I just didn't think that was sensible. Each of these review teams is different. I had already done it twice. I genuinely believe in the concept of new blood and new leadership, and as Cheryl said, ICANN's in a completely different place. So you all need to do it the way you see fit. But thanks. I'm not nuts, I don't think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Brain, thank you very much for offering advice and that you remain a resource in the coming year. We will have more questions if we are deeper in the process. On the other hand, I think everybody knows that ICANN is now a different beast than it was under ATRT 1 and 2.

I have t wo concrete questions. Number one is, efficiency, effectiveness is actually an issue. Did you develop certain concrete criteria for the measurement of efficiency? I think everybody agrees there has to be more efficiency.

You mentioned already as outcome from the Barcelona meeting inclusiveness and time, but do you have already developed a certain mechanism or scheme where you can measure this efficiency and effectiveness?

And my second question is also about the procedures under ATRT 1 and 2. How was your interaction with the community organized? With the

SOs, ACs, and particularly with the board? Because the board is the main target. Did you do interviews, did you invite the whole board for consultation or a hearing? So I think these are the two questions. Criteria for the measurement of efficiency, and interaction between ATRT team and the board and the community. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: Thanks, Wolfgang, and good to hear from you. The first question, no is the answer. And the reason why is pretty straight forward. My role here is to be an independent, neutral facilitator. My role is not to be proposing solutions. My role is to engage the community, and frankly, I'm observing Org and the board as well in this discussion or in this conversation to engage the community to identify the issues, to be clear about them, map them into a workplan, and in that flow and that sequence, solutions or measurements or whatever the mechanisms are to make things more efficient and effective, are the byproducts of the work.

And as someone who's playing the role of facilitator, I have to be scrupulously neutral, and I'm doing my very best to be. I certainly think there's room for me in that context as the community conversation develops, to ask some questions to push some folks a little bit to articulate what they really want to say. But I don't view it as my role to be offering solutions, approaches or metrics in this conversation.

And the second question was – sorry, I lost it in the moment.

EN

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: It was the interaction between the ATRT 1 and 2 team and the board and the community, Interviews, consultations, hearings.

BRIAN CUTE: Well, Cheryl remembers this well. What we chose to do was that we chose at each physical ICANN meeting to literally do a meeting with all of the parties in question, so all the ACs, all the SOs, the GAC, the board. We met with the CEO. We just made that part of what we did and we used those sessions as opportunities to get their input, to reflect back the work that we were doing, and so it was a lot of physical work. I thought it was very fruitful, and I also think that we were creating things out of whole cloth. ATRT1, as I said, we didn't have a roadmap on how to devise the work. We really just as a group figured out this is how we think we should go about it.

Review team work has been done for quite some time now. You can see some repeated processes and some improvements in terms of information management, and I really think at this stage of the game, there may be more effective or efficient ways to kind of get the feedback or information flow back and forth.

We certainly covered a lot of miles walking the corridors, doing it that way, and I think there may be some better ways to do that more efficiently.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Brian. I've got two more in the queue, and that will probably fill out our time. I've got Jacques and then I've got Vanda. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: Good morning, Brian. Just a question so I can figure out better what we will be looking at nearly at the end. What were your expectations – and when I say your, it was not your personal expectation, the expectations of the group – by delivering such a remarkable number of recommendations to the board, knowing that they would probably not be able to act on such a – once more – remarkable number?

Did you just not think about it, "That's what we found so we say it?" Were you trying to deliver some kind of work or direction, or things to do for the future? Do you think there's a limit to the number of recommendations that can be efficiently delivered in this game?

BRIAN CUTE: Great question. Here's what happened as best I can recall, and Cheryl, feel free to jump in. ATRT1, I don't believe that we had a mindset of we should limit the number of recommendations. Remember, ATRT1 was the very first review team exercise. We had a blank canvas. It was a different point in time, in terms of ICANN being accountable and transparent. The organization's come a long way from then.

And I think that particular team felt an opportunity and an obligation to make recommendations that they thought could help ICANN begin down the path of becoming more accountable and transparent. I don't remember a mindset of necessarily limiting the number, and I think to be frank too, an issue that's presented itself now is that we didn't really think in terms of the cost of implementation, which is now becoming a

much more critical issue with all of recommendations in front of the board and the organization.

I think where it came into play, Jacques, was in ATRT2 when we sat down to charter our work. I recall that our primary task was to review ICANN's implementations of recommendations coming out of ATRT1, and also other review teams.

And when we sat down to charter our work as you're doing now, it became immediately apparent in the context of the review, wow, this is a lot of work, these are a lot of recommendations. Just the work that the review team number two had to do working with the staff – and I think that's the first time the lightbulb went on, and I recall in our scoping discussions that in ATRT2, there were a number of new members of the committee who had joined, and they were really eager to be a part of it, and they also were really eager to take on new issues of accountability and transparency, make new recommendations, not just review the former recommendations.

And I remember we had some conversations that, not tense, but clearly, there was a tension that, wow, if we offer another 20, 30 on top of these old ones, this is going to start getting really heavy.

That's my recollection, so that issue really only came into view during ATRT2, and I think the current state of affairs speaks for itself. But that's my recollection.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Brian. And we've got Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Hi, Brian. Nice to see you. I heard that you are working as a facilitator, so my question is, how is the best way to use you as facilitator to enhance how our work with the community during Marrakech for instance that I believe will make it more useful for us and more focused on the adding value for this work you have done with the community and [our get out] from some really clear statements from the community, because sometimes, work directly with the community individually may not reach the outcome that we expect from our work. Since the timeframe is almost the same for you and us, that's my question, how can we use, can we have you as a facilitator for our work in communicating with the community and ask questions to add value to our work? Thank you.
BRIAN CUTE:	Sure. Well, within the context of the conversation that's begun on evolving the multi-stakeholder model, I've been very explicit in Kobe in referencing the work of ATRT3 and PDP 3.0 and Work Stream 2, and I will continue. From a communications perspective, I will be repeating that again and again, and we will have to do checks along the way to make sure that we're not creating unnecessary duplication of resources or collisions, if you will.
	So just in terms of repeating and repeating again, also having the coordination that we're talking about right now, to Cheryl's point, more than happy to push the work that's being done in evolving MSM to ATRT3, but even being more dynamic and interactive along the way as

you scope your work and the community scopes its work. So I think that's one way that I can assist.

Just the other two points I'll add as a facilitator, the first job is to be a good listener. That's something I've had some good practice with, and listening carefully, and as I said, I'm listening not just to the community, I'm listening to Org, and I'm listening to board, and what people are saying, and the language that they're using. It tells an awful lot.

The other thing that I look for in the facilitation role is energy. The energy of the group can tell you a lot as well. The energy in Kobe thankfully was really great. Everyone was, as I could feel, very connected to this conversation, very eager to make the contribution to it, and I think what was underlying that in listening is that the pain points that people are talking about in terms of the model and how things aren't efficient and effective as they can be, are being repeated again and again across the community. It's not unique to one AC or So.

If you listen, in almost every session, a form of the pain point is being put on the table. So when you have a group, when you have a community that is feeling the same pain, that is articulating the same pain, you have a dynamic that is optimal for opening the door to the type of facilitating work that I've just begun with the community. So listening, language that people use, the energy that's being presented to you, I think all those things are the things that can either deliver focused work that creates a commonly supported output, or can be a challenge in the work that you're doing. I hope that was helpful.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Brian, thank you for that. Pat, do you want to say anything to Brain at this point? No? Well, Pat doesn't want to talk to you, Brian. That's very sad. No, he's smiling. It's just a shame we can't have the two-way video. And I'll also note for the record that in the observers room, there was disappointment that you weren't being videoed out into their room as well, just into ours. So you're clearly desirable from a viewer's perspective.

Brian, as you can hear, there's an awful lot of goodwill for us to work closely together, and I'm confident that we will be doing so very productively. I want to thank you for your time today. I think both groups, your work that you're facilitating for the community and our group as it begins, have got some, dare we say, interesting and exciting times ahead, and some seriously large lumps of work to try and digest and get our way through. But it is with a great deal of goodwill, I think, between the two efforts that will find as much complementarity as we possibly can.

I want to particularly thank you for coming in today at a very early stage of our scoping, because I think it will help our thinking and reassure the work parties that they'll be able to reach out to you and that they know you're genuine in your efforts to assist us.

We'll be looking forward to working with you in Marrakech, and we may find some complementarity if we're looking at our schedule of who's speaking to whom and when we may be able to co-advertise and

co-message or co-brand some of our thought s as well. That seems to go back to what Vanda's point was.

Ladies and gentlemen, are we all happy, satisfied and thankful for Brian and his sanity of not sitting here? Brian, we're going to do a vote of thanks in the usual round of applause for you, and then we're going to say feel free to hang around, but we'll be turning off your smiling face so we can get some bandwidth back. Thanks, Brian.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And with that, ladies and gentlemen, someone's going to [inaudible] and turn Brian off. Thank you. He's disappeared, but I'm sure he's actually still here. We're a couple of minutes past our desirable time, but that's okay, because we have still got a bit of work to do which I'm sure will fill in the time even though it's minus six or seven minutes now.

In the agenda, just so the observers know, the agenda at this point was saying that we'd be starting our discussion through 12:30 middle of the day break, our lunch and break here in Los Angeles, that we would be looking at the parking lot items.

We're not ready to do that yet. We've got another session that's also looking at parking lot a little bit later that we can do, so what Pat and I would like you to do is now get back to where we almost were before

we had our morning break, and with that, start taking your work party terms of reference and work planning up to the next level.

So I'm going to hand you back over to Pat, and we're going to run then through to – what shall we say? Shall we give them until the 12:20 mark, do you think? 12:20 so we can gather together and compare and contrast thoughts for about ten minutes before we have our middle of day break. What's that mean for the observers and those on the remote participation schedule is that it will not be terribly audio-friendly. We can apologize for that. Those of you who are in the remote participation space, we'll try and make sure that your work party is miced up, but we would ask you to just try and choose the work party that you'll be joining. It would be a bit of a mess if we were trying to have two work parties miced up.

So that should mean that the observers will be able to listen to at least whichever work party has the remote participants engaged in. Have I made sense, Pat? Are we as one?

PATRICK KANE: I believe that you have, so thank you very much, Cheryl. A couple things we want to do in this next session between now and 12:20. First of all, we talked about getting together and taking a look at the resources that we think we will require between now and completion of the document, and second, if Negar or Jennifer, you guys could pull up the Excel spreadsheet workplan, kind of take a look at the workplan as we have it. Do we have copies of that that we can hand out? Maybe one for each work team would be helpful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's [inaudible] as well, but we'll have [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Yeah, just so you can write on it, because it is four pages long. So if we can get – yes, Negar. Yes, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: So I've put the workplan for the purposes of this exercise into a Google doc, so I'll share the link into the Adobe chat room so everybody can see on their screen. Obviously, that'll be editable as well, but we will print out copies for each work [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Thank you so much. And then if we could take a look at that and try to insert some tasks into that as to how each work team thinks it'll be working through between now and the end of the terms of the reference and beyond in terms of where we go from there. So between now and 12:20, Cheryl and I will be here for reference, so begin.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if you want to start making some sidebar notes on resources that might become obvious as you're going through your work [chart –] so some of you might go, "We are going to need ICANN to provide us with ..." So start making that list of "We are going to need ICANN to

provide us with ...," because that means we can get on to those requests as early as possible. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The community is not working, but everything else should.

PATRICK KANE: Board, GAC, reviews, and we're not doing community right now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: So if we do have community, [inaudible] for the community, so again –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC:	That's the case, and what are the lessons learned from how the case [inaudible]?
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	[inaudible].
JACQUES BLANC:	Yeah, and IGO is also ongoing.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	[inaudible] ongoing scope is, but we could also analyze a little bit how the process was done, and was it effective or not? It was transparent or not? So those examples can guide us [of an idea of] how they are going well or not. Because [inaudible] very good examples on the coordination of the DNS mission of ICANN, and the GAC demand for more considerations on that.
	So it was interesting aspect of GAC input to be analyzed, because we can also, [yeah,] there is a communique about many things, but those are particular on this coordination of the DNS aspect, because there is a lot of – that is interesting.
JACQUES BLANC:	[inaudible.] What is the GAC's recommendation, what is the GAC's advice, what is the [inaudible]? What are the advice from [inaudible] government [inaudible]? So the Amazon case, that's why it gives us the opportunity to paint a more differentiated picture.

So on the one hand, [it's GAC board], and on the other hand, it's individual governments to the board and –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: And outside –

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Those three area. So the more [inaudible] related question that'd be answered [inaudible] answers we can get. And I know [inaudible] a lot of attention to make it transparent process.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Two-character code, how we build [inaudible] very clear, it's helpful [inaudible] transparency has helped the process. The two-character codes process, how that has been [dealt] within the GAC and between the GAC and the board is a very clear example where enhanced transparency and clear reference to the record has helped to debug the discussion into a fruitful discussion to progress. So that would be a case study too. I very much appreciate [inaudible] a couple of case studies to see how does it work.

JACQUES BLANC: That's another question, because we identified in yesterday's discussion that there is improvement. So [inaudible] should we have a paragraph or a chapter which says, okay, these are the elements where it was bad in the past and good now? And [inaudible] further enhanced. So that we say these are one, two, three elements which have really improved since ATRT2.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think there if you look to the two-character code process, including the Helsinki communique and the improvement in commitment towards a more [codified] process afterwards has really made a difference. So I think that's where you can have a very good case study to demonstrate where a more accountable and transparent was of working has helped. And I don't know how [it could have] helped [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Now we have everybody working [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [This is the active working group. Must be the leadership.]

JACQUES BLANC: Maybe another aspect would be if we look at history and what has happened, even brief history is, was there any change that we can perceive between ATRT2 and ATRT3 in this relationship? And mostly, we

would take between, before transition, and after transition, meaning has this interaction changed in any way, been more important, less important, different since ICANN has been transitioning to something other?

So how is this input different? Does it count more, less, differently?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: An objective observation is that the formal role of US government has changed, because we don't have a contract with the US government anymore, which in a way makes this work more difficult because we cannot point at this big brother. But it forces us to look at the empowered community which takes much less [inaudible] than the US government did.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The GAC has no one to blame.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. In the past, it was. If they don't reach good points, they can say, well, whatever they decide is done, but nowadays, without the presence [inaudible] strong of the United States, maybe it's more multi-stakeholder model for them. Yeah. So there is no [inaudible] that United States demanded something [inaudible]. No, it's not that.

[inaudible] in charge that if you don't reach your goal, you can blame them. So that is the same in any [inaudible] meeting that if you do not belong in the core group, so if you don't reach anything, it's for them to do that.

So in this sense, it's not a positive sense in the multi-stakeholder model that [inaudible]. So without United States, this needs to be [facing –]

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: More accountable.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, facing more accountable.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: That's interesting.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [That's the one point that I can hear and see and talk with the other colleagues in the GAC] now with new members of the GAC, because it was very clear during the election of [inaudible] what is the name of the Egyptian girl? Manal during –

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Recorded for posterity now, your mic's up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So we discussed a lot during the election because it's a lot of [inaudible] around, and I was involved [inaudible] it was interesting to discuss with the GAC members how they feel they needed to put their position more clear because there is no other to do for that.

JACQUES BLANC: No one to turn to.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. That is a very interesting way that I saw a very good improvement on [inaudible]. After the [inaudible] not that they are different, but the feeling is different.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I like that idea that came up with [inaudible] formulating questions [inaudible]. And of course, ATRT2, [that's what we're going to get,] will be good guidance there, but I can see that there's a couple of case studies that you want to have fleshed out by Org. They will not respond within a week, so the earlier we can ask for it, the better it is. They will do their work really well, so they will take time.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I do believe that we need to reach out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's completely against the way governments work.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. They –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was [forced] by governance measure, but it happened the way it happened the way it did because of the lack of reaction before. It was five years. So it was five years before that it hasn't been taken into account by the community before, so it [lapsed.] Okay, yeah, even that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: At the time, no countries are taking into account that this thing will come and [will impact that.] Because of the economic aspect of that, relationship among countries, relationship – commerce issues with Europe, and a lot of different things that they didn't pay attention that will come and impact them immediately.

So I could see in Brazil that we could vote data protection regulation that was sleeping for ten years over there, and was approved quickly

because they saw finally the economic impact of not being under something that was in compliance with the GDPR, so most of the countries need to run to do that, not because they need to change the way they do things but they just ignored, they need to do things. And that's what's interesting to see.

Around our region, I made a lot of webinars in our region about the GDPR and together with [Canadians] group over there. So I was quite involved in the GDPR issue, not only – I have nothing to do with legal aspect, but because we have a huge association of software, [I'm director] on that, so it was important to address [those things.]

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm seeing that even GAC discussions inside about the GDPR have helped counter it to go further into this [situation.] So with GAC helping GAC to do – yeah, it's GAC helping GAC [inaudible] compliance [inaudible] that they can help. [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible]. I believe all the understanding of what [inaudible]. Because [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible] role and effectiveness.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Assess and measure the effectiveness.

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible] affecting the role of GAC [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] how they perform , what is their mission.

JACQUES BLANC: What is the mission?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] based on the mission, [inaudible]

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible] we will have at some point to decide why GAC [must have] interaction with the board [inaudible]

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible]. He's in this group, so –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Liu. Okay. So –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: So if I read this one for example is assessing the role. Assessing the role is, okay, what is the role and why do we have this mission? What is the mission, and why do we have a mission of GAC interaction with the board? Meaning, what is the mission of GAC interaction the board, and why should GAC interact with the board? Do I go wrong, or was that [inaudible]? It will be broader than that, but –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] basically to capture what is the mission, capture what is the mission on interaction of the board, interaction of the community, so it's like [three. We start with] assessing the role, and the other side, the effectiveness of that interaction. [inaudible] the measurement of effectiveness in the other side. And then we can have all those divisions of this title, the scope, into this two sides of the tree, and then we can assess how we'll discover that, how we'll analyze that, and how we'll develop the report. So in my opinion, we can design a long tree that will cover all aspects.

JACQUES BLANC: If I follow this tree, this tree would have three main trunks. First would be assessing the role, second would be assessing effectiveness, third would be making recommendation for improvement. So then you would have assessing the role of GAC interaction with the board, assessing the role GAC interaction with the broader ICANN community, effectiveness of GAC interaction with the board, effectiveness of GAC interaction with the broader community. And then input of recommendation for improvement.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible]

JACQUES BLANC: Reminds me of my young year when I was working economy or [philosophy,] first discuss the terms.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [Now you sound like a lawyer.]

JACQUES BLANC: Four years [inaudible] something. But first thing is, what are we talking about? As long as you don't know what you're talking about, it's useless [to bother] talking. It's a good thought, but it's hard figuring this by the mic [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah, we will probably have to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: So first is [assessing] the role. All of this is assessing. So we assess the role, the effectiveness, and we make recommendations. These are the three –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[inaudible].
JACQUES BLANC:	We look like we mean business.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	That moment when you were all looking really good.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Okay, so you can [inaudible] in all my LinkedIn, everything.
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Was that your ad, Cheryl? "Under my leadership, these people are really working."
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I can post you [inaudible].
JACQUES BLANC:	So assess role, effectiveness, and recommendation for improvement. These are the three things. Role, effectiveness, and recommendation, and the [inaudible] assessment. So [inaudible] for improvement.
	So we assess the role of GAC interaction with the board, GAC-board, then it's GAC broader ICANN community, and that's all for the role. Same thing for effectiveness.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] GAC input on public policy aspect.

JACQUES BLANC: That's the third one. That's where we recommend for improvement. But it's here in fact, so there's only two parts in each assessment. We assess the role of GAC cross board, GAC cross-community.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible] community.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The same thing here.

JACQUES BLANC: The same thing here for only two branches. Yeah, absolutely. And then it's recommendation for improvement on –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah, so in a nutshell, we make sure that ICANN respects its own bylaws, which is what you explained me, because following input on the public policy aspects of the [inaudible] coordination and –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: Yes, and now that we've put this this way, what's going to be interesting is how this assessment of role and effectiveness impact the recommendations, because both are linked. If it doesn't communicate well, if it doesn't hear well, if it doesn't respond well, you cannot have the right input.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: Looks okay at the moment?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] work on it. [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC:	Yeah, absolutely. That's ours. G2 is back with us. Yeah, so that's more GDPR is more an example like the one we had on dot-amazon. Where did we put this one? Dot-africa, so this goes – yeah, so what happens on dot-africa, dot-amazon, and that's the same example of let's study these communications so we see what did go well and what did not. Okay, so this goes to the same bucket.
	This was the Helsinki communique –
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Yeah, it's the same.
JACQUES BLANC:	It's the same, it goes under the same roof. Okay, so there for example we've got three topics that we can study and assess, how did the communication clearly go?
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	[inaudible] another level –
JACQUES BLANC:	Yeah, it's part of the concept for the [inaudible] you know.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	[inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: Well, once we have this, maybe we can go back to that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

JACQUES BLANC: Where [do we find the contention line on that?] And my suggestion would be let's stop there for the moment. Let's not go to analyze [inaudible]. Let's look at that and see how we can discover. Do you agree with that, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's always good to think ahead by [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: Oh, yeah.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, we need to –

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So the [focus] should be on [discovery] at this stage. I fully agree.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] focus on that, and discover the content, and how we're going to discover is like that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible] there's a lot of factual information about how the GAC functions and interacts at hand, so it's really asking the right questions.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] Liu, you are our basic research on that. You're going to need to answer our questions in the first place as a representative of the GAC.

JACQUES BLANC: Another thing is we are talking of GAC interaction with the board and the broader [inaudible] community, so we're going from GAC to board community. At some point, we'll have to go back. What's the feedback? What kind of – the board takes the GAC advice and so on. How is it received, treated, responded to? And I'm sure we can have the information here. In the boarder ICANN community, how is it received, treated and responded to? And there we'll have a challenge because the broader ICANN community is basically a lot of people. So we might have to make some choices here at some point.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: What we have in hand is ask for an ALAC group in some way, technical group, if they have some, because the mission is the technical aspect of coordination of the DNS.

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible] registrar stakeholder group, obviously, [inaudible] talk to Brian [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The groups.

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: That will be there. CC, Demi is over there. So we can have assessment to those.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And again, I would recommend the early identification of case studies like NGO, of two-character codes, like ... That's what helps really understand functioning of the GAC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Jacques, [inaudible] about GAC interaction, interaction with the board and with the wider community as different subjects but also how that feeds back into the GAC.

JACQUES BLANC: [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The first movements will certainly assess information. So to assess information, we have both ability to interview members, to assess all the last GAC communique, maybe the one in the part before that, and we have [inaudible] that we could analyze how the board reacted to those communique, and what has happened when they have better reaction, bad reaction. So there is a lot of examples that we could – and [release the year] that we have the issuing Helsinki communique and the board reaction, we have two cases to analyze that was the dot-amazon and dot-africa, how was the communique, the response, the reaction of the community. There is a lot of things that we can assess as data to analyze afterwards.

                           So even the IGO, the GDPR, the [inaudible] was a good example too. Let me put here because I guess we forgot [inaudible] big reactions. So we need to pay attention to those reactions like Brian said that shows the energy, because there is a pain inside the group for some reason.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think the group cares because [inaudible] board GAC. I think the two-character [inaudible] a good example of what affected board-GAC communication. I think the IGO protection is a good example of GAC community interaction developing as well.

JACQUES BLANC: And I think GDPR is good example of GAC-community noncommunication overall, because there was clearly a lack of communication somewhere or nobody to realize what was coming our way.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I thought the GAC was directly participating in the EPDP. We had a couple of GAC members.

JACQUES BLANC: No, EPDP I've got no doubt. I'm talking previous to EPDP, because EPDP was a forced way to walk, no choice [inaudible] go forward.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Both are interesting, both before and during is interesting. So how the interaction worked in the EPDP, because I know there have been very active GAC members in the EPDP, how did that work back to the GAC? Did that interaction also work well?

                         This is a challenge for GAC too because GAC members can't represent other GAC members.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, that is the main problem with the GAC itself, even for the position inside the board, because as we discussed yesterday, the GAC inside the board [is] a resource for the board to consider GAC aspects, but Manal

or any other that was sitting there does not represent GAC point of view in general.

JACQUES BLANC: So, what's very interesting and what you're both saying is in order for GAC to be able to interact – I'm sorry, we're even going a bit further – with whoever, board or ICANN community, it has got to reach a position. And it's a critical phase.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It codifies that in the communique.

JACQUES BLANC: So as long as GAC has not been able to reach a position and no one representative can speak for the other, so everybody's going to be there and participate there, there is no possible communication. So that's a critical element here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. And the communication must be done by [written types, agreed] in some way, and they have levels of agreement.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, so we're going somewhere here. So, shall we try and put this in a comprehensive manner so we don't forget what we'll be doing?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] Let's try.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, let's try. We're going to do a bit of writing, Liu.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC: Okay.

PATRICK KANE: It's 12:20. We said we'd get back at 12:20, so wrap up where you are if you can in the next couple of minutes, and then we'll do a couple of items before we break for lunch.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, folks. We're not done, we're just ready for a small, brief conversation, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Yes. Alright, so everyone identified at least an initial set of resources, requests, etc. After lunch, we'll talk about that initially so we can get it captured in the action items [of the day] with staff. We'll get it into the notes. So everyone will go through each work group. Did the community team get a chance to meet?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [No.]

PATRICK KANE: No? Okay. Alright. So we'll go through board, GAC and reviews and we'll capture that after lunch. And then did anybody get a chance to update the workplan itself? Okay.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Okay, good.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We just worked with our group on the GAC, and we included Liu because we respond to Liu with some questions. And what we have done is put in the piece of paper here the things that we are doing,

what is our task, understanding the task, so subdividing the tasks, and then put what is the discovery process that we need to reach. That's done.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Sébastien, anything you want to say before we break?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I put in the Google docs the result of our work.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. Alright, so it's 12:30. We have one hour for lunch. It's outside. We will start, again, promptly at 1:30. Thanks very much.

Thank you very much. So we're back, it's 1:30. I think at the 12:30 mark, we talked about getting back together at 1:30 and reviewing or discussing resources required or needed, and make certain that we got those captured into the action items in moving forward. So if we could go through each of the groups and have some conversations about that. And seeing the groups we've got in the room, who would like to go first between reviews and GAC? Alright, so we'll start with reviews, please. Thank you, KC. Yes, please.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Mic.

KC CLAFFY: I don't have a clear idea of when we're going to need [inaudible] so we just took a whack at this. So we divided up into six tasks, and you'll see a bunch of text underneath it which says "all to delete," just for somebody else to delete it if they want to look at it first.

So the way we divided that up is the first task is qualitative assessment of previous reviews, and we included attributes like utility, effectiveness and efficiency in here. We broke this up into five different areas, the biggest one being the canonical one in the charter, which is ATRT2 assessment.

So the first big action item there, ICANN already knows about, because that was talked about before this meeting, which is a report on the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations, al though here we do ask an additional ask of creating a google doc that's a table so the work party can go sort of populate certain columns. So we want columns to be – actually, I just realized we're missing some stuff here. So I think what we need is columns that ICANN could fit in on percent implemented, what ICANN thought the intended effect, and what ICANN thinks how well it will achieve the intended effect.

And then the work party can go and review that and put in our own comments about that, and then if necessary, if we think it's important, we come up with some follow-up recommendation for any g aps that are there.

EN

Okay, so then the sub-bullets there pretty much talk about process, and that's all on the work party, except for possibly helping us set up interviews with ICANN staff once we read the report and realize we might need them.

B under that is really just work party taking what we can find publicly available [about] SSR review since that's another review to look at, which is a little bit in the ATRT2 document, like a page. The SSR1 recommendations weren't actually fully implemented by then, it was still in process, so that's kind of incomplete, but SSR2 has recently done a very complete assessment of those recommendations, so we can read that. I'll ask the SSR2 to share it, we can read it, and then consult with the chair, with the leadership of that committee.

Next is RDS. Same thing. I don't have much insight into that except I can read the public draft report. Negar said the final one isn't ready yet, but we can just probably use the draft for this purpose, I think, and then talk to the chair.

D is big, and that's the one where I really wasn't sure how much we could take on, because there's a lot of organizational reviews, and to the extent that we want to look at history a little bit and see if – like for SSAC, I happen to know because I'm on it that we had two reviews, and certainly, they weren't actually done by the same external organization, I believe, and the second review, one of their jobs was to go look at the first review set of recommendations. Indeed, SSAC was also asked to do the same thing, evaluate how many of t hem we took into advisement and how many we implemented.

EN

But that's a tremendous amount of work to go do that same process for each of these six organizational reviews, so that's where I put that "may require ICANN staff to order external consultant report." I really don't have a good feel. Maybe I'd really like to know what other people think, because other people may have spent more time reading. I think I've only ever read either RSSAC and SSAC's reviews, because that's my corner of the universe.

So we put in that we'd interview leadership of the organizational review teams and interview leadership of the organizations that were being reviewed on how they were received and whether they were feasible and effective. We have a little bit of laundry aired from the RSSAC review because it's clear they were not too happy with the process of the review this most recent time. But other than that, I don't know. And SSAC is undergoing its digestion of these reviews that came from the SSAC review, and that's all I know. And then I put in in this dangling issue about lack of [supervision] of the review team members that I think [pervades] a lot of this stuff.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, yes, go.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I want to add an important comment here. I think one of your items [inaudible] eliminated item D, because bylaws specify with respect to

element four of the scopes that accountability and transparency review may recommend to the board determination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by this section 4.6. And section 4.6 only talks about specific reviews. So this review team doesn't need to review the organizational reviews, but only the specific reviews. [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it is a different bylaw article, but of course, what we've got on the walls again is still optional with the exception of the one that we have to do. But that said, in the parking lot is still a conversation about the overall review process, and that would be where this section D would come back into play if indeed – and I think there was a reasonable amount of public input when the staff paper came out late last year looking at the reviews, the complexity of the reviews, how many reviews were running at the one time, be they specific reviews or organizational reviews, and the insanity that is that system.

So I wouldn't remove that just yet. Maybe put it in square brackets or whatever until you – but the commitment is not a bylaw-driven one to do so, but it may very well be an ATRT3 decision to do so.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, [and it is good] to distinct the two explicitly.

KC CLAFFY: That board over there, Negar, it says something about independent review process. Does that include the organizational reviews? That does not include – I keep forgetting that definition. Okay.

EN

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah, the independent review process, KC, refers to the IRP. It's a whole different [process] that has nothing to do with the reviews as we know them.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, that's right, that's the adjudication – okay. I'll get that eventually. Alright. So moving on, task two. And this was more or less trying to extract some ability to do quantitative assessments of previous review reports. This, I think, would be pretty straight forward to outsource, but it would be great if we could.

So things like how many recommendations did each subsequent periodic review team consider implemented as a function of the previous review? So like did RDS2 come out and say how many of the RDS1 it considered implemented? Same with SSR2 and ATRT2 versus ATRT1.

And then you could do – you could or you could not – decide to do the same thing with respect to the organizational review. I'm squirmy about this one myself, because I think certainly, I know in some cases, like RSSAC, we know might not have considered implementing some of those recommendations to be a success because it didn't agree with some of them, so quantitative metrics are always hard in this space, but we put that in there for the sake of having some quantitative metrics. Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. And having spent an awful lot of my time in these other reviews and still cochairing the NomCom review process for NomCom too, I would like to do a little bit of depth and color here, so very much not in my chair capacity, but just to contribute to that.

One of the functions of an independent reviewer, external examiner in this process is when they get to a second or third run, their mandate is to include looking at the implementation of the previous review. So the metrics in fact should be there because it should be in those reports.

So that would be a reasonably easy discovery process, should you wish to do that. So that's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For specifically the Org reviews. I'm literally only speaking about the org reviews now. And now I think that was where your thought was about how complex that might be. But the other thing is from the second ALAC review, so at the end of the second GNSO review and before the second At-Large review happened, the nature of how the review process for parts of the organization was evolved. And at that point, recommendations that were not agreed with by the community they were recommended to are managed differently, and again, there is now paperwork, which is nice and simple to find, easily discovered, that articulates if the independent examiner said 13 things needed to happen and only 10 of them were, there is a clear link to say these three

didn't happen because ... and there would be a rationale in terms of feasibility are why.

So again, from a discovery point of view, not as complicated as it would look like at first blush. So that should be taken as positive information.

KC CLAFFY: Task three, review CCT accountability [inaudible]. So there is a Work Stream 1 document that was I guess published before the transition, but not all implemented before the transition. Is that right? Okay, so we put in an action here that ICANN could help us do this writing and assessment of the implementation status, just like the ATRT2, with links to documents that represent whatever was implemented there.

And then I guess we could fold that into maybe Negar would say this is not a 4.6 review, this is still outside the scope of that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I'm sorry, say that again.

KC CLAFFY: Work Stream 1 is not under the auspices of this thing that you said Org reviews weren't under, but I heard a lot yesterday that we should be considering both Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. So Work Stream 1's there, which came out years ago so presumably those were implemented or decided not to be. I don't know, Cheryl, do you know if you have the same kind of justification or reasoning for things that weren't accepted on WS1?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Again, the only things that were carried over from Work Stream 1, nothing was not accepted. There was a longevity of the – in fact, IRP, the thing you keep having that little fuzzy moment about, and that lived beyond Work Stream 1 and through the IANA transition, and continued as a piece of work throughout much of the life of Work Stream 2, and in fact still has some work that is being done but is very in a polishing and review. But it's the Work Stream 2 recommendations that are yet to be implemented.

KC CLAFFY: That's the next thing. Work Stream 2 is the next thing on the list here, task four. And that, we folded into the ongoing review since I still consider that to be ongoing. And then we put as a goal here articulate the challenges with objectivity, efficiency, effectiveness, impacts. Trying to address some of the concerns that we heard.

So we have Work Stream 1, CCT, RDS2 and SSR2 to to the extent that there were issues there that we can evaluate, even though it's not done yet. And so we didn't have any ICANN requests under these yet, maybe because we haven't thought about it. But that's what that is, and these would be basically reviewing the report – especially for Work Stream 2, we would only look at the ones that we think are under the scope of ATRT, accountability and transparency stuff.

Okay, so that's it for that one, and then I just mentioned that one of our goals, sub goal, whatever [means] would be to find common challenges

in these processes and address the primary concern, which is that, are these resulting in a measurable impact within the timeframe?

Task five is an overall [last thing,] and this came out of our discussions yesterday, which is a systemic review of ICANN, including the current state of the bylaws and the impact of those bylaws on the process. So Brian talked a little bit about this. We'll be careful not to have a collision and keep him in the loop on how we're thinking about this, because it does certainly imply some [description of the] evolution of the multi-stakeholder model, but more specifically with regards to the bylaws as worded.

Can anybody else in the work party add to what I've said? Okay, that's it.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, KC. Vanda on the GAC?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. We divided our work first of all understanding the task we should use, so we divide the main task into one to three, the first one, assessing the role of interaction of GAC and board and GAC and GAC and community and GAC. The second, assessing the effectiveness of that interaction, of GAC, board, GAC, and GAC, community, GAC. And then the third one, recommendation to improvement. That is about ICANN's consideration of GAC's input on the public policy aspect of the technical coordination of the DNS. So proceeding the work, we will focus [inaudible] where to assess things.

EN

So the first one is interview with GAC and board members, talk with Liu, Maarten first and then with others. Previous ATRT2 documents related to this, communiques to this board, responses to the communique, [and cases too.] So we'll [release] the dot-africa, dot-amazon, IGO protection, GDPR, [what brought] EPDP, and what is going on in EPDP. And two-characters case.

So there is the tasks we need to do now. We are just, I guess, Jacques, Wolfgang, Liu, and myself, so Maarten as a resource, and we did not divide the work among us. So we probably need to do that, but not now. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. And the last group to take a look at this is the board group. Sébastien, will you be speaking for them?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. First of all, sorry to be joining you late. I was not able to hear the feedback from the others. I will try to catch up later on that.

We have work on the basis of the document we have done yesterday evening, and after the discussion today, in the title "board effectiveness," we have added "and efficiency," and we think we have to work around criteria, time, inclusiveness, diversity about the board, and we would like to review the ATRT2 recommendation regarding the board.

For the Work Stream 2 on ICANN accountability, we would like really to avoid any duplication, and we think that an interview with co-chairs, whoever will be in Marrakech, will be useful [inaudible] Tijani, and Matthieu could be useful.

We are questioning if there are some possibility, if it exists, and if we can have some possibility to have self-assessment of the board or some document like that which could be useful, because I don't think that there is a board review as such. And if anyone thinks about other inputs, personally, I was thinking if there are some studies made at some university that could be useful and so on. That's about this third part.

About board composition, I call that the last review of the board. In fact, it's the last big change of the board. It was, I guess, in 2002, and the evolution of the composition of the board. I know that there is a document existing with the evolution of the composition of the board, therefore it could be useful if we can share it.

And regarding election process, we would like to have the documentation on each election process and GNSO association, [ASO,] At-Large, NomCom. We didn't put it, but maybe as it is another question was ask, do we need to go to IETF, GAC and SSAC and RSSASC, who are the four liaisons to the board? For the moment, we didn't include that into our proposal task.

The question about elected versus nominated member, I think if we talk about the evolution of the composition of the board, this question will be answered.

Sorry, I didn't ask you how long time I have. I need to know how much time I have to finish my presentation, just to be on time with you. Sorry.

PATRICK KANE: We did not set a closing time for this section, we just wanted to cover those items that were identified as needs.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. But if you think that I am too long, just tell me please.

Next item was finance, and we are asking if there's any such process as the prioritization of expenses and what are the finance processes about the long-term financial stability of the organization.

Regarding strategy, the description of the process, how the implementation is done, and can we set up or get feedback from the last strategic plan?

After, we talk about transparency, and then we would like to have a big picture of the organization, the relationship between the board and the empowered community, where does the staff fit and all the SO and ACs. I am sure that there is already something existing from the Work Stream 2 who can help us eventually if it needs to be announced, but at least the basis for the work.

A question was raised, is there any annual report as it was done when ICANN was under the purview of the US Department of Commerce?

Next point was the ATRT2 metrics, but I will not go into detail here, as we know it's one of the topics we need to work. And the last was board appeal mechanism, and we wanted to know where we are with the IRP, and the board changed – the committee of the board, again, I don't remember if it's reconsideration or something like that that splits the board governance committee into two different committees, how it is organized, what is the responsibility of the two parts of this ex-board governance committee.

I am done. Thank you very much, and happy to answer any question, but if my colleagues from the group have additional points, if I missed something or I was wrong in saying something, please do so. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to say, excellent summing up. I think some of these questions will be very easy to answer, like the board does the board self-evaluation every second year, and board members [of the cadence] as well. And it's good to put it on the [exploration] list. So I think it's a very clear picture. But it doe show how difficult it is for me to provide also input to all the groups when the work is ongoing, so please continue to draw from me when useful and necessary.

PATRICK KANE: I know we don't have a section from the community team yet, but one of the things that I think we need to make sure is that some of the documentation we're asking for may require NDA, and so since we've been asked to take a look at the NDA and sign that to make certain that we can get all of the documentation we're asking for, I would encourage

you to take a look at that and respond. I know I haven't done that yet, but anybody else who – okay, great. Thank you. So [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: But it's okay if we cannot sign any NDA, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's absolutely okay if you cannot sign the NDA. That should have been made clear when the information was out, and I just want to reconfirm that. If you cannot sign the NDA, then of course the access to the document, if they're require an NDA, will be – you won't be able to see it. And you will have an opportunity, if the document requires an NDA, and you have not signed an NDA, to consider signing an NDA if you're highly motivated to see the document.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So the next step, I think, [is to] take some of those tasks and activities, and I think the review team said you have updated spreadsheet with tasks. Ish. Again, another working document. Yes, the Google doc.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Yeah. And so what is the next step with bringing that up? Is that something that we'll do, Negar? Or is that something that staff will take a look at and do?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We will, as we discussed this morning, once everyone's input is in, we're going to separate those sections into a whole separate Google doc, so [inaudible] record of the exercises. We'll keep a copy of it in there, and then we'll remove a cleaned-out version into a whole separate Google doc for future work. So staff will do the cleanup and separation of the document, and with more content coming in, we'll make sure [we slot it in.]

PATRICK KANE: Thank you very much.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I think my Google doc's not working very well in this computer. I sent to Jennifer the [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Sandra. Just to confirm, I've put your information already in there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just coming back to the NDAs, if you have an NDA and you are willing to sing it, then hard copy, even if you wanted it printed out, we can do it

here and you can execute it. I've certainly done and handed mine in, Vanda's done hers, others have. We're not going to take a roll call on that, but it appears to me that there's an opportunity while you're here to close that piece of work off if you were intending to do it. We know a few people are not, and that's okay too.

But yeah, staff can certainly assist you via a print during afternoon tea for example, and you may read it online and decide whether you do or don't wish to print a hard copy and execute it. But they're certainly collecting them while they're here. [Anything else on that then?]

PATRICK KANE: I don't believe so. Alright, so the next section we have is to take a look at items that are in the parking lot and may require further discussion.

I know that we've been keeping kind of a loose parking lot instead of effectively using the flipboard that we had, so Cheryl, you've got them collected. If we can go through those one by one and have a conversation on those parking lot items. And someone could move to the flipboard itself and write as you speak.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is indeed a circus. We're going to be playing tag team with Pat who's going to be operating the flipboard without the safety net.

Now, [inaudible] several questions or issues in the parking lot now. in fact, very few that I've noted. So to that end, if you think of something that should be on a parking lot or you thought was mentioned to be on

the parking lot, it just means Pat and I haven't captured it. So bring it up now.

The couple of things – and it is only a couple of things – one of the things that we need to discuss is the matter that came out of the reviews work that KC was mentioning earlier.

Thank you. That is the CEO and president just dropping in, for the record, to say goodbye, wish us all well for the last part of our work. So he's off to do good ICANN business in Europe, and mentioned that anyone who thought they were going to go downtown tonight will find themselves in gridlock thanks to apparently a high-ranking official who needs an awful lot of cavalcade involved.

That, I think, covers that off-mic silence.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it is a parking lot, because that traffic is going to be a parking lot. But no, it's not a parking lot issue. Coming back to what was raised in the reviews question, and here, Wolfgang, we're going to probably call on you in a minute based on the conversation we had earlier today at the beginning of the day with you and Pat.

They noted that it may be useful to discuss as an item out of the parking lot how as a group ATRT may wish to address the overall aspects of reviews and their effect on ICANN and the ICANN community, and its

EN

resources, be they human or otherwise. We have the reference point and the public input that came in from the public comment opportunities for late last year looking at reviews, bot specific and organizational as is sometimes termed periodic. And it was recognized that there's this sort of end-to-end monstrosity of reviews barely ending before the next cycle of reviews start.

So there was a body of work was put out for consideration, that has got public comments back in, that data, the public comments is discoverable, and some of the public comments suggested that perhaps this ATRT could look at the issue of reviews.

Now, it is possible, and is at least thinking from one of us, which I'm going to [inaudible] bring you up to speed on now, but should you wish to take this on as a job – and KC's group's already fleshed out some of the work to start with, so the terms of reference are already penciled in somewhere. That might make it easier, should you wish to do this work – and I personally hope you do – that it is amongst the options something you might be able to make recommendations on that the community would then follow up on later. So not suggesting that you as a review team would come up with the answers, but you may in fact be able to come up with a recommendation that shows in what way the ICANN community may wish to pursue future.

So with that preamble, that's one of the parking lot issues, and we'll go to Wolfgang momentarily just to capture the second parking lot issue that I've got listed here. it is the matter of developing – and it was only parked here because we know we had to do it and we don't want to lose it – and that was developing the questions out of our work that

you've done so far today, and developing the questions for use with community engagement, possible community survey, and community interactions that we'd be looking at with Marrakech and going forward.

So those are two things that were scribbled down on my sheet of paper. Is there anything that has come to mind or that we have overlooked that you want to add into the parking lot now before we fill these out a bit more? Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: I was just thinking, we're going to start working, and we're going to discover useful things or things we miss or things we haven't thought of. Could it be that by just noting this item, we could sort of, I don't know, develop a toolbox that could be used for the next ATRT saying, this is what we have found useful?

So it's not too big work, just do it along the way. You find a useful source of information, a useful tool, a useful manner of processing, whatever. We take a note and at the end of the review if we feel it's worth it, we say, "Okay, it's a sort of toolbox for future review."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So that's going to be a long-standing activity throughout our process if I understand what you said correctly, the intention to develop a set of processes, principles, ideas and suggestions that may make a future review team's role easier, more efficient, etc. Is that correct?

JACQUES BLANC:	Yeah, that's correct, and the idea is from the fact that being new once more, I have the feeling of starting from scratch almost as far as tools are concerned, and maybe we are trying to reinvent a wheel that has already been rolling in ATRT1 and 2. So maybe that's sort of legacy here.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I hear what you're saying, and recognizing of course what we said is our role is different because ICANN is more different now with our work than ever before. It's a good idea to use this as an excuse to do that. Maarten.
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Maybe it's next in the operational procedures or in combination with that, because that's another thing we haven't talked about yet [inaudible] but that's importance guidance of based on experience as well. So let's not forget that. I don't know where it's on the list, otherwise it should be on the parking lot.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you, Maarten. That's a beautiful catch. We did indicate that we would contribute to the development as we went through by acting as almost a beta tester for the draft operating procedures that are closed for public comment but the public comments have yet to be reviewed, discussed and incorporated into a final version. We did indicate when we started that work that we would take it as reference material by the time we were beginning our work, and I believe that was the third meeting, if not the fourth. I'm thinking the

third meeting. [You agree. Just so you're all] clear on what happened, the very first kickoff meeting, still very much draft reference material. The second or third, I'm thinking third meeting, you've agreed that in fact, at this stage in that document, we would use it as guidance and guidelines, and so where possible, we would beta test what goes on in that, and the suggestion from you then is that such a toolbox could in fact be an adjunct document developed to complement the other work, which is to final improvement suggestions about the draft procedures, however they are, by the time we get to the end.

Have I captured what you intended correctly? Thank you. And have you got that [it'll serve as beta?] Okay. So we're comfortable with [inaudible] – do you want to read us through what you've got there now while people think if there's another one?

PATRICK KANE: All four of them or just the last two? Okay. So I've got – how may ATRT choose to address reviews in terms of timing? I think that was what we were talking about, basically when one ends, it seems like the next one begins and you don't really have an opportunity to implement what has been suggested to be implemented. Reviewing reviews. Questions there, anyone?

KC CLAFFY: How is it different from effectiveness and all the things that are already inside F group? Is it?

PATRICK KANE: When we talked about this, I thought we talked about with what you're doing is specifically to the review and the outcomes and the recommendations.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, and this is meta.

PATRICK KANE: And this is going to be more like spacing in-between. The second one is developing the questions for community engagement/survey. And the third and fourth are kind of the same. Two might be blended together, which is establish a toolbox for future review to complement the improvements to the draft procedures that we will be serving sort of as a beta test opportunity.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I don't know if it's in the parking lot or if it must be on the truck already, but the list of the organization that we want to meet either by phone or physically in Marrakech, SO/ACs, the chairs, the president and so on and so forth, and the second starting list of questions that we want to raise for each and every group who we meet will be good.

PATRICK KANE: So to your second one, that's what this one's intended to be.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, therefore it's much broader than the community, because [I'm] thinking for example if we met with reviewers of the SO and ACs, it's not really the community, but if it's intended to be included, it's okay with me. Just not to miss something, because when we talk about community, we used to talk about AC and SOs, but if we want to talk with university people, with people from the faculty or whatever, if we want to talk with X reviewer of SO and AC, it's outside of the community from my point of view.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, so let me just add that this may be targeted questions to specific people or entities.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And Pat, that then resonates to something I now remember we discussed in our early work a couple of days ago, so it's a piece of work, although not part of our assessment, it's rather something that we need to develop for our own toolbox. So not unrelated to the developing of questions issue, and that is the developing of resource material for use in outreach and engagement so that we have a set of PowerPoint slides which we can use, all 19 of them, [nine or one.] So, is there anything else that's fallen through the cracks as a topic? As Sébastien's indicating, yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Just to be – [I've put two ideas in the same sentence. The other,] we may need to develop the list of the special targeted people we want to meet, organization. The question is, [one,] the list of people. The organization is another point. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: So also to address the first part of the question before, we are formulating a letter and it'll go out shortly to – it's gone. So the letter's gone out to get the meetings in Marrakech of the SOs and ACs, but yes, develop a list and identify times for – where was that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: While you're writing that, Pat, of course, some of that listing will come out of the work party work, because it'll be the work parties that will identify the types of groups they want. So I'd almost think that we as a committee as a whole might need to develop that. But we need to make sure that we have clearly and transparently captured for public review as well as our own edification, so it would be discussed or reported in a plenary and then captured on a Wiki or a document that these are the entities that are being approached by us/the work party. But then we'd have the questions resource to use.

PATRICK KANE: Right. And then to complete that and then to actually send the letters or notices or some kind of contact to them to get that meeting established. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To that end then, it's not just questions, it's also – mind blank. I was going to say administration letter, but introduction letter or whatever. We'll have a pro forma that we need to work with as well.

PATRICK KANE: And then on the community engagement items, I've also put the blog since we're going to be putting a blog that's – post at least this event that we'll put out to the community as to what we've done and where we are in the process.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are we now back to coming back to each of these points if there aren't any more points on the parking lot? We can add them in, the parking lot won't be closed until September or October. [inaudible] by the way, because things will go, "Oh, we need to do that" on our way through.

But if we can come back to the matter of reviewing the reviews, which include the periodicity of the reviews, the resourcing of the reviews, the relevance of the reviews, and here we're talking all reviews, I want to come back to Wolfgang because of what he was suggesting this morning and that what we needed to capture. You had a thought bubble, remember? Say again? Yes, the review issue.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I'm not member of the review team here, but a discussion we had yesterday and also this morning on the breakfast table, as you know, we've just discussed it, we have to take int consideration that the whole

system of reviews was introduced step by step over the last 10-15 years in ICANN, before the new bylaws are there.

So they are the result of a historical development, [and so far,] we have to use this opportunity not only to think about how the existing review mechanism can be improved but whether the whole system is still relevant. And we should propose probably a more radical change and to say there is no need to have 10 reviews when finally the whole ICANN becomes a victim of a permanent review, and the idea was to take the reality of today that we have two main groups which are defined in the bylaws, one is ICANN board, the other one is the ICANN community with the various SOs and ACs, and then we have ICANN Org which operates more or less under the board.

And probably a new structure for the review could be that we have, let's say, two main review processes, one review for the board including ICANN.org, and one review for the community including, let's say, individual [staff] reviews for the SOs and ACs.

So this would streamline the whole review process to a more manageable size and insofar my recommendation to the review team is not to think about how to enhance, improve the existing review system but to think more radical and to say we should really have a new way based on the new bylaws.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: KC.

KC CLAFFY:	Oh my god, I'm tired, I forgot what I was going to say. I don't know who put it on, but a sticky note got into the reviews work party that says systemic review of ICANN. And then when I asked Daniel what that meant, he kind of said that. Okay, sorry, I'm getting tired. I'm not saying [it should necessarily be in our work party] if somebody else wants to take it, but I think the intent was that it was covered by the systemic review.
	I admit that's a very daunting bullet.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, KC. And it seems to me, Pat, that what we might have here is an opportunity to create a question for our community engagement and ask our ICANN community for their smart thinking on this. So as you're engaging in Marrakech for example or in other opportunities, have a question that draws out their thinking on systemic reviewing the review situation, systemic reviews in ICANN, a better way forward. Give us no more than 75 words. Doesn't matter what it is. Pose a question and see what you can draw out from the community.
	It may be then at the end of that data capture exercise that there is a tendency towards some advice that you'd have a high level of confidence the community may then support later on. And that doesn't take you down that rabbit hole of trying to come up with building a better model, it's saying to the community, "What is possible? What are you thinking? Does change even need to happen? Are you happy with what some people think is overwhelmingly impractical ongoing reviews?"

So it doesn't matter whether you put out a null hypothesis, a hypothesis, a question, a challenge point, but how about you put out something that draws the responsibility for input into that thinking from the community itself?

KC CLAFFY: I'm just curious, what is the closest that the community has to that so far? I understand we're in a new world because of these transitions. Let's say since the transition, although maybe even before the transition, this review fatigue was already starting. Do we have any basis to draw on, or just hearsay at meetings?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I ask you to clarify a little bit more?

KC CLAFFY: I'm imagining – okay, Sébastien's going to clarify more.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't know how he's going to clarify your question, but go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think it's important to recognize that there is a comment period. I don't know if it's closed already, but who went about the question of the calendar for all the reviews, therefore we need to take that into account, because in fact, the question we are posing could be more radical than what it was in the document. But as a basis for our group, we need first to review and maybe ask where it is with a summary of the comment that maybe we need to go on that, because it's exactly one point already posed to the community, now that if we add something more radical, we need to do with knowledge of what is already happening a few months ago or few weeks ago.

KC CLAFFY: I hear what Sébastien is saying, but the answer to my question is that's the closest we have. [inaudible] What's the closest we have to something written down? Some public comment period that covered this exact issue, this review fatigue, and he's saying that's the closest we have. I think that's correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. And indeed, that is the closest we have in terms of formal data capture, but prior to that, yes, we have heard this from the various parts of the organization. More on the organizational reviews and the effect of organizational reviews, or on the fact that organizational reviews were running along in parallel and taking the same human resources and bandwidth from community work when the specific reviews were required by the bylaws in the periodic way they are.

So volunteers were being spread too thinly is something we've heard. There's a whole bunch of stuff, but the most recent capture point is indeed that. And Negar, you'll be able to tell us where we are up to in that, won't you?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes. I wanted to partly answer KC's question about how we heard about volunteer fatigue, and the timeline that this effort started. At one of the ICANN meetings, I want to say it was October of 2017 meeting, and possibly the March 2018 meeting where this issue came up, we had a lot of community members come up to the mic at various sessions, not just public forums, talking about the number of reviews that are running concurrently. At the time, we had 10 or 11 reviews running at the same time.

We still do to a large degree. CCT finally wrapped up and got to implementation phase, and some of the organizational reviews wrapped up, but at some point, we had 10 or 11 reviews running at the same time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Right, they were at various phases of the review, but it was still work that ICANN Org and the community had to undertake to move them along and get to the next phase, etc. So there were a lot of comments from the community talking about volunteer fatigue. There are a lot of

people that happen to be involved in the work of the reviews, not just as review team members, but all the supporting work that goes into it, answering public comments, etc.

So subsequent to those conversations, ICANN Org published a document for public comment in May 2018 – and I'm happy to share the link with everyone – to talk about long-term options to adjust timeline of reviews. There was one on short-term options, that was wrapped up and finished [inaudible] ATRT3. There was one on long-term options to adjust timeline of reviews, and we received a lot of community feedback on that.

And it's important to note that the paper wasn't just about the duration of the reviews or the cadence of the reviews, it was about everything. What scope elements did they take into account? Do we limit the duration of the reviews all to one year much like ATRT is? So on and so forth.

So there's a lot of elements that go into it, we got a lot of feedback from the community.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, ICANN Org wrote that document and put it out for public comment. Like I said, we'll share the link with everyone so you can see all the supporting material. It also makes references to community feedback that we received during the ICANN meetings.

KC CLAFFY: Just to clarify, the Org reviews are still part of the bylaws, they still have to be repeated?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, Org reviews are part of the bylaws. They're not as detailed out in the current bylaws as specific reviews are, but Org reviews are also mandated to be reviewed every five years. And currently, the next cycle of organizational reviews is due to start June of 2021 with the next cycle being GNSO again if I'm not mistaken. That's also on a five-year cycle for them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But what has also been a complaint – and it is a complaint, not even an observation – from the organizational review perspective is the fact that in the last cycle, the second cycle of the organizational reviews – this is not specific reviews, organizational reviews – without exception, I believe, the implementation of any recommendation from the first review that was to be implemented had not had 12 months or more of implementation when the next review cycle happened, and in some cases, implementation of recommendations had not even occurred when the next review cycle started. And that is clearly a system that's not very robust.

EN

NEGAR FARZINNIA: There are seven Org reviews. One of them, even though we don't conduct it, there's still work to be done, so there's a total of four specific reviews and seven Org reviews.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's what this discussion's all about. I personally would be suggesting you think seriously about using – this is resource material, you've got some data, the discovery data that you got there, but asking questions of the community in the engagement, because they've recently gone through this thinking with their responses to the public comment. So you may draw out in your engagement some clever thinking. Who knows.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes. I'll put two links in the chat room. One is the long-term options for adjusting the timeline of reviews, the public comment with all the information, and one is actually a table that shows the timeline of all the reviews, all 11 that we're talking about with respect to the cycle they're in.

KC CLAFFY: Am I hearing that this thing is being pulled out of the parking lot or assumed to be in the reviews work party?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The discussion now is to establish exactly that, and then if it gets pulled out of the parking lot, does it go to the reviews work party, or does it go to the plenary? That's also a possibility.

KC CLAFFY: Right. I guess I'm struggling because it feels like a symptom of the larger problem of these reviews not being effective, and one reaction – and of course, the transition happened in a bit of a rush so there was just like, "Okay, let's put some reviews in and let's put a Band-Aid on this and solve it later," but indeed, what we seem to be confronting here is a bunch of feedback that these reviews, any particular one of them might not be as effective as was expected.

So it feels premature to talk about timing when – it feels like rearranging deck chairs to talk about timing when we have fundamental problems with execution.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: KC, strikes me that maybe the word "timing" doesn't need to necessarily be a lynchpin here, that such an analysis, a review of reviews could not limit itself to timing. It would be an aspect that you may or may not wish to look at.

All of these reviews were not in fact a product of transition, however. Far from it. Many of them were required to move from the JPA, the joint project agreement, into the affirmation of commitment world. So it predates by some seven or more years the transition work.

So there's a whole lot of reasons why things got put together the way they did. Organizational development, may I just say from a personal point of view, is often benefited by internal and/or external audits. And I don't think we should lose sight of that, but the effectiveness and efficiency of that process is something you could well choose to look at. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. KC, the question you asked is in fact when in a rush, the decision was taken to put all the reviews in the bylaws, therefore we have all the reviews that were on the affirmation of commitment were put on the bylaws just to be sure that we will not lose anything.

And the timing was that for staff when it was clear that there were too much reviews going on in parallel, it was to discuss about the timing, but we are the review team to do the in-depth work. Therefore, what we will get from the contracted parties about the timing is one, the question we will ask the community is another point, and the reflection we will have ourselves is a third point, and it's really our job now. Don't have to say that it will be done by somebody else. It's us to say we need to scrap those reviews to replace by those or whatever we can suggest to do about reviews. It's really our task. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so I'm not saying it's necessarily out of the parking lot, but I'm saying it's sort of sitting around the exit of the parking lot. It seems to warrant more consideration. So let's do that, consider it more later on.

But you've formulated some further thinking on it, and that's a good thing. Next.

KC CLAFFY: I want to ask one final question for folks to think about as I simulate this in my head. What's the most successful review that we've head in the community?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The one you will do.

KC CLAFFY: Already that's happened. I'm the new kid in town. I'm looking for a role model here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I hear why you're asking the question. I'm finding it a difficult question to answer though, because it would be a different answer whether or not we are looking at an organizational review, because I can answer the question form that perspective, one of the specific reviews, I can answer the question from that perspective, and they're very different. And in both cases, my answer from an organizational review would be limited to probably two of the organizational reviews run in the second cycle, and I can tell you that the point of intersection into why they were successful was they happened to run with the same independent examiner who happened to be very good at what they did with ICANN.

So I can answer that part of that question if that's worthy of answering. But if you want me to answer the question based on my experience with specific reviews, I think we need to recognize that each of the specific reviews have taken place in very different environments, so how one would measure success is going to temper the answer.

I could argue a point that the very first ATRT ever run was hugely successful because it's created through enormous tension and a great deal of difficult work a set of precedents that allowed the following specific reviews to run successfully. So I could argue that way, for example.

But it really depends what you're after. Okay, radio silence.

PATRICK KANE: Walking back to my seat, for those not in the room. So, [inaudible] parking lot discussion. The next item that we had was to take a look at the schedule going forward. Options for face-to-face meetings and other administrative items.

So if we can, let's move to talking about the Marrakech meeting. So the room for us that's available is on the 23rd, which is Sunday, and so to do that, we have to make certain that we arrive, for those who are going to be there, on the evening of the 22nd so we can get a full day in. So just keep that in mind.

Anybody who is going to have travel from the travel team will need to make certain that they make those arrangements to arrive on the 22nd so that we can begin early on Sunday the 23rd.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So just in preparation, knowing that many of you have either put in your travel request with your constituency travel support already or will be doing so by Monday, staff have already, I believe, sent off or contacted constituency travel, so they will be aware that your arrival date will now be 22 June, not 23 as it probably was in whatever ledger you got from wherever you're being funded to travel from – not by us, wherever you are already going to Marrakech from, but they've also been told that of course our budget, the ATRT budget will pay the extra night of accommodation for you to be there for that day early, the day zero meeting.

So accommodation from arrival until your ordinarily expected arrival date will be covered out of our budget. Pat and I've also asked staff to let constituency travel know – but that's up to you, by the way, to make sure you now reorganize your flight to match that, please – that if anyone is a designated team lead/penhold, whatever we want to call them, in any of the work parties, we see you as being pretty critical to be in Marrakech. So if by chance, as we know for example Daniel is not a supported traveler to Marrakech under anybody else's budget line items, if you're a lead, then we will include you on an ATRT budget for that.

Luckily, it's in Africa and it's a cheap quote this time. So if we were meeting in Sydney, it might be entirely different. That's not true, we'd do our best to make sure you're there anyway.

And we've reached out to – have we not? We reached out to Erica.

JENNIFER BRYCE: We will do after this announcement here to the team, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we're about to reach out to Erica to see if as a lead she's covered, and if not, she will be told she will need to get a letter to make sure she gets covered if she wants and can attend. Are you all happy with that? Okay.

PATRICK KANE: It's my understanding that has to be done by Monday. So if that's going to happen, that's got to happen quickly, and just letting people know that you'll be there or you're coming, [you need extra day.] Yes, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Pat. So constituency travel provided us already with the list of those who have been funding by SOs and ACs, but there obviously are some people who are funded in other means, so I wondered if I could quickly get some information, because according to the sheet that I've got here, Vanda, Pat, you're not funded through ICANN, Liu, Erica, Daniel as discussed, and Tola. And Wolfgang. So I was looking at the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: So the people that I mentioned, could you confirm if we need to get constituency travel to fund you or if you'll be funding another way?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Looks like a yes from Vanda. I'll let Pat speak for himself in a minute. Maybe he's not allowed to come, I don't know. But we will need to check with Liu because it may be that his ministry is funding him and that's why it's not showing up in constituency travel.

PATRICK KANE: I will be there, and I do not require funding.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. That was helpful.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, so the schedule going forward after this, we will have our regular cadence starting again next Wednesday. In terms of the plenary meeting, we'll pick that up again, and next week we're at 11:00 UTC.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, I believe so.

PATRICK KANE: Next Wednesday 11:00 UTC and we'll pick up that normal cadence. What other administrative items do we have?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got a couple.

PATRICK KANE: Then I will pass the baton to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Why thank you kind sir. Other things in terms of administrivia and meeting-type activities, those of you who have said yes to sharing leadership in the work parties, just in case you thought it was a doddle, guess what? As leaders in a work party, there's this little additional meeting you need to turn up to every week now, which is called the leadership team meeting.

So up until now, it's just been staff and Pat and I, but form now on, now we've got leaders in the work party, then the leaders of the work party need to be represented. Don't particularly care if both of you can turn up. I would suggest you talk with each other and work out that one of you turn up, but the aim of – and it is a 60-minute call, it currently runs only at – help me, 20:00 UTC, 21:00 UTC? Negar is checking. On a Monday, so it's in preparation of each week's plenary meeting. The aim of such a meeting would be to get a regular update of your work party activities and to find out what in the upcoming agenda needs to be dedicated to your work party, how much time we need to allocate to that.

So it's not going to be a huge impost. If by chance neither of you can turn up, it's probably something that on a Skype channel – and you'll be added to a leadership team Skype channel now – you can put five bullet points together and say "Work party GAC has done this, that and the other. we really would like help with the following, and we reckon we'll need 15 minutes on the call." That will do. But be aware that there are now regular leadership team calls, and as now part of the leadership team, you need to be able to, as frequently as possible, turn up to there as well.

What else was there regarding that? Working on I believe something Sébastien has said earlier, perhaps yesterday, perhaps the day before, the question of having separate e-mail lists for the work party. We are a small group. Pat and I would like to strongly recommend that you all as work parties just use the list so that gives the whole of the plenary a feel of what's going on.

Obviously, you can e-mail, Skype, Slack, do whatever, send up smoke signals privately to each other, that's fine, but it would be wise to try and keep the group updated with any official updates that you're making. That said, as someone wants to argue to the contrary, then happy to talk about that now, but it's always easier if people have at least seen what's going on. Otherwise when we get to our plenary meeting, we're going to explain it all anyway and just being able to refer them back to the e-mail you sent at 8:07 something or other on the following day can often be a helpful thing indeed.

With the option of using other informal and more real-time knowing that many of you are in very different time zones, so synchronous

interaction might be a little more difficult. More than happy – and staff can help you set up a subgroup Skype, Slack channel or whatever else the flavor of the month. But if you do so, please include Pat and I, and at least one staff member on it so we've got an idea of what is going on.

Beyond that, Pat, have I forgotten anything?

PATRICK KANE: I don't believe so. So it's 3:00 now, 2:45. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just a request, because the year fills up quickly, what is our thinking on next face-to-face meetings?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [We're getting to that.]

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Excellent. Thank you. And please note, I would hate to see that this [is always during] board meeting.

PATRICK KANE: So on Wednesday, we actually did talk about putting a Doodle poll together on availability post-Marrakech, in either July, August or September, first couple weeks of September so we could capture when people were best available. We were also going to take a look at doing a little bit of research on where, to include China, Singapore, Brussels and

Istanbul in terms of the places that we might take a look at. And Uruguay.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's the next one.

PATRICK KANE: That's the next one. Hold on, Maarten. Alright, so we would schedule one face-to-face for that point in time, and then I would assume we'd have another one prior to the October, the Montréal meeting, possibly, to finish up [what a] final document would look like in terms of being able to publish it and begin the review process within the community before we submit it to the board a year from now.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Possibly.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [And the bitter end.]

PATRICK KANE: Correct. Thank you, Maarten. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Just for clarification, do you mean extra meeting before Montréal, or the day before the Montréal meeting in Montréal?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can certainly help there. The likelihood of the Meetings team being able to accommodate us on a day zero event in Montréal would need to be locked in very early on, and it is very likely that it won't even happen even if we try now, because there are so many other things happening immediately before the Montréal meeting. So the resources, the pure room resources are already extensively booked for things that are happening at that venue. So there may not be any opportunity. If you want to have a one-day, day zero event, which Maarten will remind you will be blocking him out from his board commitments, will have to be decided very early on, and it would still be quite likely to not be a possibility, and we've already discussed why doing things immediately after is extraordinarily difficult and most unlikely.

So it would need to be segregated. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you very much. So to substantiate the comments you just made, because of the availability of the Meetings team and all the other ongoing meetings, namely board meetings and other stuff, the Doodle poll that they're going to be issuing for July, August and September are going to clear out all of those other ongoing events.

So right now, we are looking at the Meetings team, what they can support, is the last two weeks of August and two weeks in the middle of September, leaving out the first week of September, and I believe the third or fourth week of September because there's board workshop stuff going on, and leaving the two weeks in the middle of that which we'll include in the Doodle poll.

We hadn't considered July, but if you're interested in that, we can also look at July in the Doodle poll and see what availability options there are in terms of support and go from there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: The Doodle poll will be up next week, is that correct?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That's correct.

PATRICK KANE: So have the Doodle poll up next week, we should be able to have a decision on where we are by the plenary next Wednesday, or actually, I know that we have some folks – Sébastien, will you be able to address the Doodle poll between now and then Wednesday?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Except if it's during my flight, I will be able to do everything you need me to do.

PATRICK KANE: Very good, thank you, because I know that you will be in flight on Wednesday. So we'll have that. So we should be able to make a determination by Wednesday if everyone addresses the Doodle poll by that point in time, except for ...

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, again, another addition to the comments that are being made. As we discussed yesterday, we have put a request to the Meetings team to look at the cost associated with conducting a face-to-face meeting in China, so at that, we are expecting to have that information within the next week and a half that we will then share with the review team.

In a short while I believe you're also going to be looking at just the cost associated with holding face-to-face meetings at other ICANN locations other than North America, so you have an idea of the seating availability and the general cost associated with holding meetings there, and then of course, we will be sending out the Doodle poll we just talked about

next week for availability of the review team to hold its next face-to-face meeting.

PATRICK KANE: So I'd like to get at least a hold the date set so that we don't have the calendar fill up before we actually determine where we're going to be so that we can make certain that the majority of us can attend, and then we can worry about where we're going at some following time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Correct.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct, and the results of the Doodle poll is going to allow us to do a hold the date invite.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I know that it's [inaudible] but I would like very much to try to find why some of the people are not coming to meetings, and how we can embark them to the work, because the other one [inaudible] that's great, when we're here, that's great. [But it seems that one or

two are nowhere.] At least it's my impression, and how we can drag them to work with us, will be great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, one of the advantages, of course, of getting the work party started is that it opens up the opportunity for people to work asynchronously and on particular projects that are work party-based that won't be just tethered to our plenary meeting cycle and the cadence of that. And I think that's possibly sometimes the issue with attendance there.

I believe we do publish our attendance records in all our meetings, so that's a constantly updated data file which is publicly accessible. So I'd encourage everybody to look at their own records and those of others, and have a chat with anybody that they feel isn't carrying their weight. And if needs be, we'll have a chat, won't we? Well, not with each other, but with them.

PATRICK KANE: Of course. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Sorry. Going back to the previous topic very quickly, I know Cheryl you expressed concerns about meeting prior to the Montréal meeting at the location. There is a deadline by which to submit requests, so two days before the meeting starts, we will – if we submit the request before that deadline, we should be able to hold meetings in Montréal before the official meeting starts, so we can also do a

placeholder for now before the Montréal meeting begins, understanding that Maarten and others may have some conflicts until we finalize the plan of all the face-to-face meeting and then remove the ones that are not necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for this. I'm pleasantly surprised that that opportunity is even available, seeing as I know activities that would like to have been planned before the Montréal meeting had started have been pushed to running during the Montréal meeting because of lack of space. But there you go. Just saying.

So I'm wondering what the feeling of the room is then, Pat. Do we take up the opportunity of putting in a day zero placeholder pre-Montréal and hang on to it tooth and nail if we possibly can?

PATRICK KANE: I would be supportive of that, at least as a placeholder.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: We will evaluate the board on that particular day.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: All the things you do to make sure I'm not there. It's amazing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: But unless there are any objections, I think that's what we should go ahead and do.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have no objection, but we will be quite busy in At-Large prior to the meeting and during the meeting, therefore I will, as we have an At-Large summit and it's maybe not the best time for us to be involved in some activity before. But if it's the will of the group, I will try to do my best to be there. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, KC.

KC CLAFFY: I guess I should mention or remind folks I'm actually primarily on the SSR2 team, so I'm totally overloaded. It was a mistake to let Cheryl make me co-chair, because I cannot go to Marrakech, which means, obviously, [he's] got to get funding to go to Marrakech. And I'm happy to do the participation, it just won't be at the meeting himself, so Sébastien can come hunt me down. And Sébastien, you could be co-chair of this working group if you want.

Geoff Huston is the other of the three SSAC representatives to this group, and he does tend to go to the ICANN meetings, so I think he'll be in Marrakech.

JACQUES BLANC: I'm going to ask a question which is part of the budget question, and in the strong hope I'm not alone in this case so this will be profitable for you all. When I know that [I'm to assist] to ICANN meetings, I take my hotel but even more my flight very much in advance. That means I have my flight for Marrakech, and I do have my flight for Montréal, so they cost the less as possible for my company.

So in this case, if I have to move my flights – and I would gladly do so to be here at ATRT, and I'm willing to do so, is there any way if there's a cost attached to it – and [in one case, there is,] and the cost is not minor – that it's being taken in charge.

PATRICK KANE: I think that's something that we'd have to take a look at to see what policy is from a travel perspective, so if we could take that as a question and talk about that sometime later this week or maybe the next week, that would be helpful. And Negar's shaking her head positively.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We'll take that as an action item to note it for discussion in the next week or two.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] I don't believe [this needs to be] a full review team discussion. I think we need to know what the numbers are and talk to staff, and copy Pat and/or I in, and we'll support you as much as we possibly can with getting an answer that's going to be suitable, providing it's not equivalent to a whole new airfare.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. [We'll know it as such then,] we'll wait for you to let us know, Jacques, what the cost difference is, and then we'll check with an e-mail to the leadership group and have a discussion at that point in time.

PATRICK KANE: So, Pat, looking at where we are now in terms of time coming up to 3:00, and what we have left to do, we've got to the point in fact where we're confirming plenary calls, we're identifying subteams as needed, we've done all of that, identified as many of the future face-to-face meetings at least time – we're planning how we can time-[bind] them between now and the end of the calendar year. I guess we might also add to the Doodle poll for simplicity's sake any opportunities to meet before the end of the calendar year but after the Montréal meeting. There may be a space there. I don't know. Let's see what Meetings come up with.

What I'm saying is let's be flexible, let's ask Meetings the question, is there another fortnight somewhere that is another option that we can all at least have in our Doodle poll? And again, for the beginning of the 2020 calendar year.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So Cheryl, to summarize, you mean sometime late November, early December time frame, possibly?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It depends, but it seems to me that when there's blackout bands that are coming out, if we get just two fewer options to get everybody together, then we need to look at more options, and the people who can give us the best idea on the blackout band [inaudible] our meeting, so if we're going to ask the question to the end of the calendar year, let's ask the question to 12 months down the track, where on Earth can we fit in any face-to-face meeting?

That's not to say we will be holding face-to-face meetings in those bands, it's to be saying where we can look at the options without getting pushback and problems. Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. The last week of November, the IGF in Berlin needs to be taken into account, not because all of us will be participating but maybe it could be a good time to be in Europe to have this meeting, because

some of us will be in Berlin. At least you know that the 25th to the 29, the IGF is going on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. Thank you for that, Sébastien. And Negar and I were sort of looking at each other. We assumed that Meetings is aware of other major meetings around the world and that we would expect staff will be having the conversation with them that looks for cost-effective opportunities where people may already be on site where we can hold in those spaces. That's fine.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, so I don't think we have anything let on future meetings or at the present time, so I think one of the last things I'd like to take a look at before we either have a break or maybe even end for the day because it seems like we're getting to the end of the agenda items is to actually pull up the sample or the current terms of reference document that we have so we can take a last look at that.

So if we can get that on one of the screens in front of us, that would be helpful, Jennifer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And while that's happening, Jennifer, I'm just wondering, first of all I just wanted to draw into attention some comments from Michael. I guess that's what Jennifer was about to do, was she?

JENNIFER BRYCE:	Yeah. So Michael says he's going to be at IGF, it's likely, and yeah he's just checking on the meeting in Marrakech. So for the record, the team had initially been discussing meeting after the Marrakech meeting, but that now will be the day zero meeting per the information from the Meetings team that post-meeting will not be possible.
	On the terms of reference, I've again put that in a Google doc for ease of reference at this time, so the link is in the Adobe Connect.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks for this, Jennifer, but I think what – and it might just need to be a shared screen then – Pat was trying to do was do a little workshop exercise on it, if I'm channeling you correctly.
PATRICK KANE:	We're going to watch Pat dance.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay. Reverend Pat wants to get out front with a microphone yet again.
PATRICK KANE:	We could do it that way.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	So I think that's what he was asking for [inaudible]. What we might do, Pat, as we do things on the fly, and indeed we do, is maybe if we can take our break early and then come back to that, and then final

summation, and that should still get us out a little early on. We've got one additional item to put on the agenda at the very end, so that will be taken care of, I believe. But beyond that, if we take a 15-, no more than 20-minute break now, I'm assuming coffee's out there and some form of cookie is ready for us, and that way – so let's call ourselves back into order after 3:30. Instead of breaking at 3:30, let's get back to work on the dot at 15:30 locally. That's 30 minutes past the hour for those on remote participation, wherever you are in the world, unless you're in a time zone on the half-hour, then everything I've said the whole three days makes no sense at all.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda, can you start the recording again, please? If it's not already going.

BRENDA BREWER: The recording is going.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Brenda. We're just trying to reconstruct the room which seems to have come apart as we were preparing.

PATRICK KANE: Did you say deconstructs or reconstruct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You were doing the deconstruction, Pat. Over to you, pat.

PATRICK KANE: Thanks everybody coming back. We'll wrap up here quickly, but one of the things we wanted to go through is the actual terms of reference document, and we have it on both [inaudible]. Okay, so I just saw this side of the room is [inaudible].

So if we could scroll down to the objectives section, please. So in the terms of reference document which is on the Wiki in a Google doc?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Right now it's on the Wiki just as a PDF, but this is a Google doc.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, so we'll have this as a Google doc. What I'd like to have each team do is under the section that's "objectives," go in and by work party, put in the objectives that we worked through that are in the other Google doc, right?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry, can you say that again?

PATRICK KANE: I know. Sometimes I get lost myself, Jennifer. I apologize. But if we go through and put in the objectives by work party in this particular section which we've already got – I know they're already duplicated in the other Google doc that we did today, but to put them in the overall terms of reference. And then where below on that would have definitions? If

there is a term that we're using in our objectives for each of the work parties that needs an agreed upon definition, let's put in a definition from the work party, but we may have to have another conversation so that as we are on as a whole team, we can agree upon definitions so that we're working from the same starting point with precision around the word that we're using. Okay?

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, should staff take an action item then to take what's in the Google doc and put it in here for each of the Work Streams?

PATRICK KANE: Yeah, that will be helpful. That would be great. If we're going to have more modification, then at some point in time I guess the teams would do that, but if we're at a good point with our objectives, then let's have staff do that, if we could, please.

But then it would be up to each of the work parties as they go through identified definitions that they get in there the ones that they think we need to have a shared understanding of in terms of the definition of the terms.

KC CLAFFY: Can we by whatever mechanism get one of them done while we're here so that we have a template for what they look like?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, great idea. Who's going to be able to live edit?

PATRICK KANE: That's a great idea.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So just while we get set up to run through this [inaudible] development which was KC's suggestion and an excellent proposal, catching up with some of my Skype back channel that's been going on today, I just wanted to note that Avri Doria in response to a question I answered to KC [inaudible] ATRT2 was in fact a pretty successful review team, and I think that's very valid, I was just limiting my answer without going through, but of course, she points out the implementation aspect is yet to be determined, and the other thing that I think she also mentioned which is worthwhile recognizing – well, two things, actually.

One is of course the last GNSO review, which is the second cycle, she would argue is developed because of the development of some of the good techniques developed by MSSI at that stage, it actually affected that cycle of the GNSO as well. I did refer to it being – I thought between GNSO and ALAC, but in fact, her modification of that is it affected the GNSO last cycle organizational review in such a way that that was a good review as well. This is Avri Doria, so she's a board member and ATRT2 member, and ex-chair of GNSO and ... and ... and.

And of course, she also mentioned [it's been nice] following us all, which is the last thing [inaudible] in the observer room. And so say hi,

Avri. She is in fact listening. She was part of our audience. Our listening audience was happy with us. Thanks, Avri.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. So who's got control of the document in terms of putting –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Everyone does, but who's going to put in some objectives from their work party so we can get an example? And I'll take a look at it the same way. Are we going to have someone from the GAC team? Okay, so we'll move to the board team, or the reviews team.

Okay, so KC has control. While KC's doing that, one of the things KC's also pointed out was that we probably have not captured anywhere the actual scope element of the independent review process. She says that since she was unaware of what that was or how that fit in – so if we could put in the action items, Jennifer, that we need to [inaudible] place within a work party, item F, which is assessing and improving the independent review process and develop objectives for that, that would be helpful. Thank you. Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: In the last interaction of the work of the board, we had IRP with a question mark, but I can leave the question mark out, if you wish.

PATRICK KANE: No, I think having the question mark is exactly what we're talking about from the standpoint of what's there. So, are you questioning whether it's yours?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We had it on the board list, because it's one of the appeal mechanisms to the board. In fact, it's board appeal mechanisms [inaudible] for the need of the community, we had IRP, question mark, and board, organization, again for consideration, question mark. That's two points. Just to say it's somewhere.

PATRICK KANE: So it's captured somewhere. Thank you very much, Sébastien. I have this distinct need to start playing the Jeopardy music right now.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: If I may make a suggestion, KC, the Google doc you guys filled out earlier with your sub-items that you're looking at, I believe – and if I'm not mistaken, the high-level scope items and then the sub-items you have decided on, those are the items that need to go in here to form your overall scope.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Jennifer, if you could scroll up please, above objectives, we will find that those areas are already here.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And where do you want us to do? Because I can cut and paste where, in objective one through three, aim?

PATRICK KANE: So I thought that what we would have is here we take the work party objectives and do this section by work party.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'll make a try if you'll allow me.

PATRICK KANE: Please do. Alex Trebek.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, is it what you were looking for?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, that is what I was looking for. So essentially, what we'll do is we have our group board, and then these are objectives, and as we put these in here, we will continue to detail these out or modify these as we get closer to the final document. Is that helpful?

Yes, so this is going to end up being a more detailed-out objective at some point, but just saying board effectiveness, no, that's not – alright, the anonymous moose. Loud.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: You were the jackal. Yes, you were. I can tell where you are, KC, in the document. Okay, can we scroll down or move it up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For those of us not in the room, I'm not sure what [inaudible] Pat was just trying to make the projection on the wall [an interactive] touchscreen. So boy do you have some big-scale touchscreens over at Verisign these days. Okay, Pat, back to you. [No touching the screen.]

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. I'll stop touching everything.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Perhaps you're a bit behind technology here, maybe that's what it is.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. So, what is an ifrit? The anonymous ifrit was putting – are you – yes, I think – oh, now I see anonymous liger.

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's a supernatural creature in some middle eastern stories.

PATRICK KANE: Sounds like a Wampus Cat.

JENNIFER BRYCE: That's a fact for the day.

PATRICK KANE: So while we're doing that, the question I have is under definitions, do we also want to put acronyms used in that section? Thank you for the assignment, KC, I appreciate that. Yeah, happy to do that. And then Negar, if you could help me on the deliverables and timeframes. Is that where we'll put the major milestones? Because we won't put the whole schedule in there, will we?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct. I suggest we stick with the publication of terms of reference and workplan, the date the draft report is going to be published when subteams are going to finish their findings and work, and then the date of final report. Just he major milestones.

PATRICK KANE: Probably also put in the face-to-face meetings that we have scheduled when they are scheduled. That would be helpful too, I think.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:	Just keep in mind that if we include face-to-face meetings, as they are not finalized yet, this document will keep being updated. Is that okay? The document is a live document anyway.

PATRICK KANE:	So I'll take your suggestion and I'll put them in, because that's really what your suggestion was, was don't do it. Yes Sébastien.

JENNIFER BRYCE:	[inaudible] which will be updated.

PATRICK KANE:	Oh, you refer to the workplan from here. Yes, great. Thank you, Jennifer. Yes Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	One of my question is, is it a place where we will work? Because I am in trouble if we repeat things that we have already wrote somewhere else, and then we will have a few places and we will start to be lost in translation.

PATRICK KANE:	Yes, I believe that this is our new normal, this is our working document, so this is where we would record modifications from here on out, so all the work product, the [interim] work product that we developed over the last three days needs to find its way into this terms of reference document.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess I would have preferred to have – because it's a long document, then I would have preferred to have the document for each working party in their own place with a link [to the web,] because if we are all on the same document and we have 30 pages, it will be quite difficult to work with, and if somebody makes a mistake, then [it's for everything.] [If it's that we] import a final document, it's another story, but here, she's writing again something, and it's why I just cut and paste. But if it's to write here, if the group is to work on this place, I think it will be difficult.

PATRICK KANE: I thought the beauty of a shared tool like this was so that we could have one source of truth in one location. If that's not the case and we think that we have problems with this tool, then let's use something else, but I thought we were driving towards one source of truth. Jaap. Okay, thank you. Yes, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Are you okay with me inserting dates from the current workplan from the milestones into the terms of reference document as we're adding stuff into?

PATRICK KANE: Yes. I am fine with that. Google docs has its own versioning process, so we can go back. So if we have a deletion at some point in time, we can revert back to an old document that still exists.

So I think we get the hang of this. KC, we okay? We good?

KC CLAFFY: I'm a little worried about what Sébastien was saying, but I also think that, yeah, it would help me if I had them all in the same place. In fact, if they were all on one piece of paper so that I can see.

Even as I was going through ATRT2 report, the first appendix is about the GNSO evaluation, which seems to me to be in community, the community work party, so there's definitely going to be overlap, which I think this exercise would help to elucidate maybe. Is that what you're after, Sébastien? Just to figure out where the overlap is through this exercise?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My question is really if we have to work in this little frame with everything already organized, there is too much before and too much after. I would have preferred to have our own place to work and then to import here or to put a link. And to answer your question, it could be one single point, but here, we will have everything, the date, and then at one moment to find where we are supposed to work will be difficult where we have to go to scroll down ten page and then, ah yes, it's here.

KC CLAFFY: I do assume each work party will have its own whatever it is, whether it's Google doc or whatever we decide is going to work for us. And then we'll cut and paste everything from this matrix into our Google doc. But I guess you're saying we should be doing that now and we should be

EN

drafting the segment that we think is our contribution to the terms of reference before we throw it in here as if it's a final draft?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: In fact, I was questioning – I have done the cut and paste, and we have a place we work, and here we get [cut and paste.] But you were retyping everything. It's why I was struggling why you have to retype if it's somewhere else.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I can explain that, because the format that you had was much more short, sweet, objective, and mine was having a whole bunch of action items interspersed in. So I wasn't rewriting, I was just trying to call out what I considered to be the objectives, that Negar was saying. It's in there, it's in a bullet, it's just then I put a bunch of sub-stuff in there. I don't think it's going to end up in the TOR.

So I didn't mean to be rewriting, and I'm happy to take this out into another document and have everybody else edit it.

PATRICK KANE: So the concern that I've got is that if we are going to try to stay away from duplicative work, if we're in one document, we can see that so we have a single source of truth. And I think that we've already seen that there are issues when multiple documents are floating around that are in different states that one person's working on something and then another group is working on something else, because Cheryl and I probably aren't going to work in the work team documents, but we're

probably going to do some work in updating the terms of reference around those items in terms of definitions, in terms of other points that point back to the goals.

Now, I'm happy if the team wants to make a decision to do something different, but I just think that in one location, if the tool is designed to handle more than 18 people, which is what we have, I think we ought to use the tool the way it's supposed to be used, and keep it in one source.

Now, if that's a link to someplace else, fine, I think that works as well, but I would prefer us to see us have one place where we work from so that we're all in line, or at least caught up with where everybody else is at a certain point in time. But I'm happy to do whatever the group would like to do.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, then we will use that. Maybe we can have some help to organize it. I just put some letter with smaller letters, but I think somebody have to take care of the layout, of the organization, and maybe what it will be useful is then we have a place in this document for each working group and with the numbering, and like that, we know that we are looking for something, it's here and not somewhere else. And if it's moved from one place to another, we'll still be able to find it and so on. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I totally agree with Sébastien. That is, for me, I don't want to stay ten minutes to find out where we need to add something or look for something, because it takes a lot of time during the day. So if we are

not, in your day by day work, using those tools, then we need to open, we need to find out and use some spare minutes to do the work and lose them just looking for. So I agree with Sébastien that we need to have sections.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. A couple of things. I am quite confident, because I look at versions a lot in this, that if anything changed since the last time you looked in the document in this format, it will show you what has changed, who's changed it, and take you to where it was changed very easily. So I'm not too concerned. I've certainly handled documents in the 300-page long, not 30-page long, level, with multiple authors in excess of 12, plus staff, and we managed to muddle through.

Some of the things can be advantaged by putting comments in as well on the side if you've made a radical change or you're suggesting a change that is quite radical, like "This whole thing needs to be ditched, I don't want this section to be here at all," whatever, then rather than just make that edit, then that's the sort of thing you'd put in as suggest mode.

There's ways around this. My personal care factor is relatively low on it, as long as the work gets done. And it comes back to being a unified document. the advantage of using a template is this is going to go to a board, and the board is going to find it easier to read in a certain format, and so it might be advantageous to keeping in the restraint of a template. And I see a board member shaking his head in the affirmative on that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I'm a board member, but I'm also a rookie in Google docs. Just pointing out that, yes, it's a powerful tool and it has these functions. Maybe I don't know whether there's any way of organizing a kind of one- or two-hour session to teach how to best use this, whether we can organize it in some way, shape or form.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, perfectly possible. If you want it, we will make it so.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: That will save a lot of time later on, I think.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you for proposing that. At least I am with you on that, and I would like really that we take care of us as a low a level possible where we are not where we're going to be [inaudible]. I don't know Google, I don't use Google. I have to do that for ICANN sometimes, okay, but it's not my tool or my working, and then I have no knowledge and then we get some trouble with how to get there, and it's not easy. Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: If you're afraid that you're going to destroy the main document or make other errors, maybe the best thing to start to do is just insert a hyperlink to your own document so that you can work with your own way in your

EN

own document and later – it's very easy to find your document and later just incorporate the text if you're done with that paragraph. [inaudible]

I've never done any big [inaudible] document, but I learned that it's actually pretty intuitive to do stuff like suggest mode, comment mode and things like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for this. Yeah, and indeed, that little linky thing at the top, and this is simply repeating what Pat indicated earlier, and that is, put in a link to your document if you wish. Are you just waving at me? Okay, that's fine.

Put in a link to – I couldn't see behind the chair, thank you for that. Put in a link to the section in your document if that works. All of that is absolutely possible. But the single source of truth is still desirable, at least in some people's view. Over to you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. [inaudible] online collaboration tools. [inaudible] And personally, [inaudible] one document, then the Google doc becomes the best tool to work with. But I don't dispute the fact that [inaudible] what is comfortable for them.

for example, if I'm taking notes, there is another tool which hi use which extracts to wherever I want in a document form. But please, in case you think that there's any other, better tool, please recommend it [inaudible] look at it for consideration. But I think for the moment, Google [inaudible] because on the word go, [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that, Daniel. And of course, following on from the hyperlink reminder and from the suggestion that one can use your own personal tool remember, that what's gonna be going in here in the main is not going to be the product of a single mind.

Well I sincerely hope not, because you're a work party not a work person. So you should be doing your own note, stick in sand if needs be, and bringing that to the work party to agree on a consensus outcome. And then how the work party records that, again, care factor relatively low providing it also gets recorded in the right place in a single source of truth as well, unless people can really convince everybody else that that in itself is not a good idea. And I'm not hearing that as the majority view yet. So I'm not at all concerned that we're aiming to disadvantage anybody, and anybody who is wishing to be advantaged by getting skilled in this tool, we have absolutely no problem in finding someone to do that. Certainly won't be Pat or I because it's not my personal tool of choice either, just for the record, but then again neither are Wikis and neither are many of the things that we force ourselves to use during our ICANN work.

Staff, is there any other template issues that you're aware of that you found in other review team at all? Is there something we're not aware o here?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Not as far as I can tell Cheryl. We've had these templates used in Google doc format for various other review teams as well and haven't had any

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so how much further do you want to take this templatization exercise?

KC CLAFFY: I've my take on this, and I think at this point I have to – except for that thing perhaps that I forgot, IRP, which maybe we could talk about for a few minutes if we're done with everything else. But I finished my cut of sort of trying to extract what looks like objective-y things from the other google doc into this google doc, and now I just want the party to look at it and edit it either here or in other Google Docs or an email or whatever works.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay so you've got them here now, and I've got to say we are talking five bullet points here, people. It could be time well spent to at least make a first reaction if you're willing and able to do so, unless someone objects otherwise. Maybe we can we can do that for you because then your work party can feel better equipped to move on to the next step. And what we'll also do – and I had a word earlier on the IRP question. The IRP process is chaired and has been charged throughout Work Stream 1 and 2 by David McAuley and David's got a very slick set of presentations and presentation skills. We would have no problem if it is your wish to ask him to present at one of our plenaries. It's going to

take 15 or 20 minutes and we can Q&A him and what the law of the land is. It's undoubtedly changed since I've had a last update. So if that is your will, apparently Pat knows where very works, so we can we can probably get him to do that regardless of the of the time and day of the call. So if you'd like us to do that, that might help frame that next piece of work regarding IRP, then that way we can we can make sure it's picked up in the post haste rather than in due course which might be later on.

KC CLAFFY: David McCauley you say his name? Okay, I don't know him. But I would love that.

PATRICK KANE: He's on my team.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, perfect.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So let's open a queue. We have the template exercise with the following objectives of the review working team – and I'm happy to read them to the record while you're all thinking about them and reading them yourself. Point number one, assessment of implementation of ATRT2 recommendations. Bullet point number two, qualitative and quantitative assessment of effectiveness of previous specific reviews

EN

refers to section 4.6 of the bylaws on reviews and gives the specific [i.e.-s] of SSR1, RDS1, and ATRT.

Bullet point number three, qualitative and quantitative assessment of effectiveness of previous organizational reviews. i.e., RSSAC, SSAC, NomCom, GNSO, ccNSO, At-Large and the ASO. I'll go in there and tidy up how some of that's written, because ccNSO needs to be lowercase but it doesn't matter.

Bullet point number four is analyze issues with ongoing reviews focusing on common challenges with objectivity, efficiency, effectiveness, measurable impacts, for example CCWG accountability work stream 2, CCT – RT I'm assuming – RDS2, SSR2. And number five, investigate and potentially propose systemic review of ICANN focusing on the impact of current bylaws on ability to achieve mission.

I just realized as you read it – like debugging code when you read it out loud – there is a missing thing of use everything in bullet 1 through 4 to do what's actually in the bylaws. So we have to add that objective somehow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The additional edit is going to be made to the objectives now in real time, and we will look at that as a modification. But while we're doing that, let's open a queue on any comments or otherwise we've got a little bit of silence, which we don't, because Maarten's going to save us. Maarten, go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to catch, where would we look at operational procedures as well, would [inaudible] review Work Stream or would we do it separately? This could actually be a thing [Pat would be leading] to look at that and interaction with how we operate. But it needs to be somewhere.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat's writing it down. Once he writes it down on his piece of paper it will be so. Very good catch, Maarten, thanks for that. It may very well be best to be a planetary-wide exercise, and certainly we can do that because there is that [pan] view that is required. So if we can catch that, ladies, and we've also got it written by Pat, so it will be made. With any other thoughts – so the queue is open. Otherwise, we're waiting for a live edit, and another song. Jaap's going to take care of the song? No? Okay.

There we are, we have a song going. Thank you for that musical interlude. Now remember our deadline is 60 days after our first meeting day in Los Angeles, so we effectively started the clock on all the time-critical stuff on whatever day of the week it was – I believe it was a Wednesday. Wednesday the 4th, am I correct there? 3rd.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: The date we've put down in the work plan is June 5th after the end of this meeting for your deadline to submit to the board.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Even kinder, we gained several days. So June 5th is our 60-day mark. But that's also the clock that runs for the 12 months as well. The pressure is

on us and we do need to make sure that you're all comfortable with what you're doing with getting the material [inaudible] into this template, well in advance of the 60 days so that we can do the usual draft one, draft three, five, seven, 11, however many it takes you all to be happy with it.

Okay how are we going with the edit?

KC CLAFFY: I need help with this sentence about the review operational procedures.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It could be in here, but it could be separate as well. [inaudible]. I think it was [inaudible] to be on a separate [inaudible]. So you don't need to –

KC CLAFFY: I'm off the hook.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's a different nature of the rest up there anyway.

PATRICK KANE: I've put myself on the hook for that to make sure that gets put in the way that we talked about it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In that case, we're not expecting any further edit now to –

KC CLAFFY: The IRP bullet, I know so little about it I'm wondering if it can be considered an ongoing review process, or what is it? I know what it is now, but it's really different from –

PATRICK KANE: So I think that Sébastien's captured it in the board objectives, and I think that he has it as one of his, is what he said, so I think that we'll leave it there and let the board team flesh it out and move it around if we need to, if that's acceptable to the board work party.

And Sébastien's nodded yes. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To clarify that a little bit, remember, it's not a review, it is a process. So it's an independent review process, so it's a review of an issue, it's something hasn't been done in a manner in which the person who has been affected by the decision is happy with, and they are asking for a review of the process that has happened to give the outcome. Usually, one that involves board. [inaudible].

So it's not that it needs to belong under the reviews of reviews, so we can extract that out from it, which you should think is a good thing. That's good. We've made KC happy for the record. That's good. The rest of them are [inaudible].

How much further do you want to take this exercise?

PATRICK KANE: So I think that this is a good start so we can actually see what we're doing in the document to keep it updated. And again if you want to do a hyperlink, do a hyperlink. If you want to do it this way, do it this way. But let's at least be able to get to the work product within here so it's, again, a single source, if we could.

So I would declare that we are far enough along to get an idea about what we're gonna do in that particular section, and if we want to start dropping things down into definitions, I'm certainly happy to go ahead and do that as well. So I think that we're done with that exercise. Okay great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright. So after that exercise, what that has done is pretty much in at least my view, and I suspect yours as well, although [inaudible] glaring at me with what I'm about to say – it pretty much takes us through our declared agenda with a few minor modifications on the fly, which I think we announced to everybody as we went through.

What we have left is I guess we should articulate clearly and painfully the road map through to the draft report. We would like to see that the outcomes of the work parties are brought into a consistent look and feel in terms of report documentation throughout your work rather than doing this awful first drafting, second drafting, wordsmithing nonsense that working teams and review teams often fall into.

And to that end we are strongly recommending that you take the option, as other review team has done and has been very successful in teams I have been involved with, of having what's called a technical writer which of course in this case is anything but technical, but it is an author who works under our jurisdiction who basically makes sure this is all in the right talk using the single style of language, captures everything you want captured in it, is not putting in material that is unique to their thought processes, that is effectively capturing yours. Once you have consensus, or even if you don't have consensus and you have a selection of things you wish to pose in the final documentation and during the drafting, they are there at your assistance to make sure your work is easy to plug back in together and doesn't lose things.

They almost can. To that end, there are a couple of people who have contracted to ICANN for review teams before that we would like staff to reach out to to see what their availabilities and possibilities are. We're going to strongly encourage you that this would be a wise choice to make. Top of the list is at least somebody who has worked with Sébastien and with a number of us before is Bernie Turcotte who's been around since –many of you will know him, he's worked with ccNSO, he's worked with GNSO, he's worked with CCWGs, etc.

He's the type of individual, 5, 10, 15 hours, whatever it is a week, ICANN contracts, he will be with our meetings, he'll make sure everything you say and do was captured the way you want it to be captured, and in a final format that will make your lives easier at the end. Strongly suggest you let us pursue that. The budget is there for that, and he or some other that HR decide upon, not us, would be what we would suggest

that we might do. Is there anything else on the administrivia pile that we need to do in wrap up?

PATRICK KANE: Everything that I've got, we have covered.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantabulous. So that means our roadmap to draft report includes a continuous – you've got your hand up, have you, Jacques? Where's your card? I recognize you now. Go ahead, Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: I was just going through what we have been doing now, and just before, we were talking about efficiency as far as our work is going to be concerned. I went back to the archives and particularly on ATRT2, which [sounds to have been] very successful. And to my great surprise, because I still wonder how they did that. I realized that they had one face to face meeting per month during the review.

                       I've got the dates here. March, April, May, July, August, September, November. Food for thought.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Boy is that gonna blow our budget. However, different times, different day, different space. If you all want Pat and I to have that conversation, we will. I suspect some of us can predict what the answer will be. Thank you for that, Jacques.

On our road map then, having documentation that is continuously developed as a living document and draft. It'd certainly be what we would be recommending you do. Is there anyone who believes where we are now means we can't meet our 60-day requirement? Today's day one, first of all. Anyone who thinks that's gonna be an issue? We don't want to hear in 45 days that somebody thinks it's an issue. That's all. Okay. If you find that it is an issue, please let us know in the plenaries or on the list.

As we move towards Marrakech, there will be a lot more moving parts because you're going to be starting to get capturing of data, you're going to be discovering data, you're going to be getting material. There's going to be a lot more information to manage, and we would like to encourage you to, however you in the work parties, suitcase that together, you also –because we do have transparency as part of our name and so transparency should also be something we do – have that available where it is not subject to non-disclosure, privacy concerns or confidentiality through commercial consequences. We also have that in some way on a Wiki so people who want to watch what we're doing know what we're up to. Obviously, there's going to be things that may never get there, but that's part of our commitment as we take this journey through to drafting.

I would also suggest, as we have discussed before, that we do put out not only blogs from time to time but regular dashboards, for the want of a better word, which give people an idea, the wider community and idea of where we're up to and what we're doing, how far we are along in our percentages of success or otherwise in our various milestones, and whilst we don't have to finalize that now it is something we would

like to consider discussing on the list having at least a first discussion at our next plenary meeting, and then looking towards finalizing by the plenary after that so that we can put that regular output to the community as part of our published plan and therefore be a set of milestones. Because it means that the work parties need to know when they have to have a report back in for the dashboard creation so you can show yourself as 40% finished on something and 75% finished on something else, that that type of thing.

So let's think about that over the next couple of weeks. We've got our co leads which is code for penholder here. Obviously, it doesn't mean you need to write the document. You need to facilitate the writing of the document. What else? Have we missed anything? No?

PATRICK KANE: Not that I'm aware of.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're running to the were here. With that, in terms of [confirmed] decisions reached and action items, Pat and I will stay back after you're all released. You're welcome to stay and listen, but we will simply sit down and go through the AIs as far as our memory banks go and what the girls have captured, and make sure everything's in a form that will be then acted upon and that will be published and you will be able to look at that, and we will make a high level report as a blog for the wider community.

So that's what we'll be doing after you go for a much deserved break. Is there any other business? Noting we have a statement. We are aware of that. With the exception of the [inaudible] of statement business. Please go ahead, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to add to the list – not to be done now, but the earlier we think of work that needs to be done early, we can ask for it to be done. One of the things we discussed in the GAC group is it may be useful to have a couple factual records on how specific processes went, like the two-character codes discussion. The earlier we ask, the earlier we have it to our availability.

So for some of the things we know, let's raise them as early as possible and share them to see how we can accommodate those.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for this, Maarten. Regardless of what the topic is that sage like wisdom which I'm sure most if not all of us will agree with, we probably need to have a place and space for those requests to be put. So if we will also take for what we need to have an action item out of today is to find that place and space. So any work party, as those things come to mind, can put that, "How about we get this as a discovery item" or "We would like to have access to this information," and then we know that the repository that nothing is going to be forgotten about with that. Any other wonderful ideas and brilliant words of wisdom?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Maybe a general repository can be done for all those requests and you can find yours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. We can have a general repository that has just four horizontal spaces in it so it's easy to separate out. I'm sure our talented staff will be able to assist us with that. Is there any other meeting-specific other business before we go to a final piece of information?

This is meeting specific, not your item? Okay. Sorry, we're just trying to finish our business because then we will close.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And I raise my hand and you give me the floor and that's it, no? What you need me to tell me what I will say? [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. In fact, my apologies. I am aware that you have a piece of Any Other Business. I was asking whether this new business now that you've raised your hand for is a meeting-specific one to do with this particular meeting, or not. I was going to clear the floor of Any Other Business, and I'm going to ask if there's any closing remarks. I don't have any. I doubt that Pat does other than saying goodbye, which we'll let him do.

And if there is no other business, then the floor is yours, either for fresh other business or your specific item. Over to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am a little bit concerned that we may be lost with all the documents with all the places where we will work and links we need to have and so on and so forth. I heard Vanda saying that it could be nice to have a repository. I think it could be nice if we have one page where we can log in and find everything we need for the ATRT3, because we will have to work on a developing list of organization, list of people to meet, a list of question and so on and so forth.

Therefore I don't think all will be in one single document, and the easiest to find them will help us very much to do the work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. That's the landing page. [Staff's] looking at me. That's the landing page, which, part of what we would be doing is updating with documents and links from any product of today. So they're saying to me at least, and we'll look at that at our next couple of plenaries to make sure it is meeting the need, see if that's in agreement with everybody.

So that special landing page and you head off to wherever you need to be. Great. I don't think that's a new thing, it's just to make sure that the existing one is effective and is properly linked up with everything. Is that the case? Looking around the table. I'm looking at you too.

Good, in which case let's close the business of this meeting regarding what we had on the agenda, and we have an additional item which is a statement by Sébastien. Over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. As you remember, at the first day of the meeting I was saying that I wanted to discuss with you some issue when the Ombudsman will be there. That's why I didn't talk about that the first day, and then during the last two days, I had some interaction with the ombudsman.

The question is how this working group started and be organized, and the ombudsman told me that he's on the way to finalize his report, and therefore, my suggestion is that we wait for the publication of his report [inaudible] everybody, if you are willing to read it, and we can discuss that after with you. You will have the element, that's what the ombudsman will put on the table. And I think it's best way to start this discussion here with my argument and other arguments.

The ombudsman, I guess, is here for these type of things, therefore I suggest that we do that in a plenary when just after the ombuds publish the documents and you have time to read it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Pat and I would like to thank you all for your time and your energy today and over the last few days. Particularly today, because by day three your batteries are probably pretty darn flat. That is for sure. You've all done fabulously, as have our stalwart audience. Thank you very much for those of you who've been either remote participants or members of the capital A Audience who've stuck with us through one day or other, or throughout the rest of the whole three days. We've you've had a couple of people.

Our fabulous staff. Honestly, ladies, I don't know how you could turn around the document as promptly as you have. That has been terrific, and I know you haven't quite finished yet, but hopefully by finishing a little earlier than planned – excellent, in fact almost an hour earlier than planned, so yay us – we'll actually get you out of the office at a reasonable time instead of after hours.

Pat, you and I would like to – obviously, I hope everyone has safe travels home. Well, I guess you've got something to say.

PATRICK KANE: No, I just wanted to reiterate your thanks to the whole team of participation and really digging in in the last three days, because I think we've accomplished quite a bit in establishing what it is we're going to work on and what the document is going to project. And we still have a long way to go, of course, but I'm feeling very positive about where we are as of today, and I look forward to the additional work and future work product. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And with that, Brenda, when I say fabulous stuff, Pat and I and the rest of the team want to particularly single you out. You've worked all sorts of magic with the audio and Adobe Connect gremlins, and keeping our audio running. And more importantly, being able to update people in both those rooms, almost simultaneously. I think Brenda actually [typed with] both her left and her right hand at the same time. Very interesting. We'll have to watch her work at some point.

But Brenda, thank you so much for all the support you've given us, and with that, you can end the recording. Thank you, one and all. Make sure you take your goods and chattels with you, and safe travels to your next point of call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]