
Brenda Brewer:

Thank you Cheryl. Good day everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary #28 on 4 September 2019 at 21:00 UTC. Members attending the call today are Cheryl, Maarten, Sebastien, Wolfgang, Daniel, Jaap, Vanda, and someone just joined. KC just joined, thank you. And observers joining us; Herb Waye, Chantelle Doerksen, Everton Rodrigues. From ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical Writer Bernie has joined. Apologies from Pat, and Osvaldo will be delayed today.

And today's meeting is recorded, and I want to remind you to state your name before speaking. And Cheryl, I'll turn the call over to you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Sorry. It took me a moment to come off mute. My apologies. Too many buttons and too many screens in front of me today, ladies and gentlemen. And it is with regret, while I'm in not one but two calls at once, of course that Pat is unable to Co-Chair with me today. So, forgive me if I have a slight lag as you've got half my brain operating with you here, at least for the next half hour.

First of all, if I can ask for any Statement of Interest updates? And I'm not seeing anyone's hand raised in the Zoom room nor anybody trying to get my attention, and please do jump in and get my attention if I'm not looking at hands as well as everything else today. I'm going to ask Jennifer if there's any Action Items to review, new and closed.

Jennifer Bryce:

Thanks, this is Jennifer. So just very quickly, we had an Action Item to send an email to the SOs/ACs Leaders to note that the ATRT3 Review Team are going to be in Montreal and to request a thirty minute slot on their agendas. And so, we have done that. Those emails have been sent to the SOs/ACs and we've had quite a good response so far.

A number have come back to say that, as we expected, they're working on their agendas at this time and they will find times to accommodate where possible. So as those confirmations come in, we will send the calendar invites and the room information to everybody on the list so that everybody has that information.

Other than that, I have no other Action Items to report on. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Excellent Jennifer. Cheryl for the record. Thanks for that. As we look at today's Agenda then, I would just ask if there is any comments on the Agenda and most particularly if there's any foreshadowing of any other business, noting we will be calling for any other business at the end of the call again? Again, not seeing anyone's hand raised in the room and noting that Wolfgang needs to leave just short of the top of the hour again. Let's adopt this Agenda and get underway.

So, with that, we're already at Item 3 so we're powering through this, people. Excellent. Good on us. Let's look at the Survey Status Update and to that I believe I am returning to Jennifer and I think, Jennifer, you're going to note that there has been a couple of little tiny glitches and tell us what's happening about those. Thank you.

Jennifer Bryce:

Thanks. Yes, Jennifer again. So as some of you may have seen there was some chatter from various groups, particularly At-Large, who were having some problems accessing the Survey, and so it seemed there was a corrupted link somewhere along the way in various emails. So, we have informed the relevant Staff members to refer back to the original announcement links as well as the SOs/ACs Digest links, so if you do encounter people who are having issues, the links are on the Wiki Page and I'll pop that into the chat in just a second.

And I also wanted to note that we've also posted today a Word document of this Survey because we had some feedback that it'd be useful to have a Word document version that groups can use particularly if they want to upload into a Google doc or it might help with facilitating a group response. So, we've done that and it's on the same Wiki Page and I will again pop that into the chat.

So, as I said on the Leadership Call on Monday, there's still responses coming in so hopefully it hasn't affected too many people but, as I said, if you do encounter people with problems please let us know and we'll do what we can. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl for the record. Thanks Jennifer and that is greatly appreciated. I know those within the At-Large Community that I've had contact with, and they do tend to copy me on a number of their emails which I believe that they mainly passed on to you, that it's been appreciated, as has the effort to make sure that everyone knows that there is the Word

document regarding all the questions so that groups that are doing, an ACs/SOs response or a Constituency SGC or of course RALO response, etcetera, can also use that Word document in particular. Thanks for popping that in the link space in the chat as well. That has been appreciated. So, just a positive feedback for our fabulous Staff who are assisting us in this ATRT3 effort in general and the Survey at the moment in particular.

Moving now, unless there's any questions regarding the Survey and I'm not seeing anyone's hand up, again yell out to me if I miss anybody. We're now moving on to Agenda Item Number 4 which is important because we really do need to get to the main event for today and that is a short amount of time for any of the Work Parties to bring up anything to Plenary attention. I'm aware that the Board Work Party wishes to take a couple of minutes for this and I think the GAC one does as well. Neither Mark in Community or Daniel and KC in Reviews indicated that they were going to need time for today's call because their work is very much pending on the incoming information from the Survey. But let's go, and we're not dealing with IRP and Work Stream 2 today at all.

So, if we can go to perhaps Sebastien first, I believe you'd be dealing with the update?

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I wanted to call your attention on where we are with regarding Board affairs for this ATRT3. We have taken the opportunity to use the template set up by Bernie and in doing so we are being... Maybe it's better if we have the

link to this page that I will talk about. I guess here it's better. You have the link.

We have split the different issue or topics and 3.1 is dealing with ATRT2 Recommendation and then there is the second part is where we talk about other topics that we think need to be reviewed in depth and we may wish to have some recommendation. And the third part is that we think that without doing an in depth review or work we think now with the document we received and the state of the work that we will not have any specific recommendation.

And it's that part we need to work on or be sure that you agree on that to allow us not to work too much on those parts, and they are all in the part of 3.2.2. And some of them are in fact not taking care of by, in this part because they're taken care in other parts of the document. For example, when we talk about Finance and when we talk about Strategy, but there are a few items that we will leave outside of the index work if you agree. As a part, we think, in relation to the ATRT2 we want to have some in depth full on. It's also about completion and we have still some work to do in that direction. That's where we are.

The other part I wanted to raise is that I, as maybe you know, some of you know, I was without internet since one and a half day and I struggled today to find a way to go onto internet and it's okay now. I have found a solution, but I didn't have time to go back to the list of requests we had to Staff and therefore I am not able to say that we get every answer we wish, we wanted to have, but I will try to do that in the next few days and then come back if there are any missing information we think is still important to us.

I guess that's a report I can give to you and the Plenary members. Thank you very much Cheryl and all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Sebastien. Just asking, Bernie, the link that Sebastien put into chat, is that one that's just being used by the Work Party or is that going to be the same template as we look at in the next section?

Bernard Turcotte: No, that's the one they're using for the Work Party.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so there will be other material in that template if people look at it. Just so we don't panic other people who are working. That one is a tactual form work of the Work Party that will then be transplanted after I guess some polishing or whatever by the Work Party and by you, Bernie, into the master template. And that master template is probably the link that Jennifer will be displaying. So, if you see a slight anomaly between what you've seen in the link Sebastien has shared and the report template one, don't panic people. I think that's okay. Have I got that correct then, Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte: Sounds right to me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Okay. Vanda, if you would like to say anything about GAC, please do so.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay, thank you. This is Vanda for the record. We are working in that template, especially focused on the ATRT resume that Bernie sent to us. Maarten has given some feedback on that and the suggestions what they expected and Jack and myself need to change what we have done because this week I have been working in the Strategic Plan of my foundation and was not able to exchange with the hand so much.

But I'm working my side and Jack's probably working his side because that was the way we decided to do, but not in the general Google doc. We decide to put into a different document. When finished, we'll post. Not in the middle to not confuse everybody and mostly because for Leo, it's more easy to have a Word document, not Google doc. Thank you. I guess it's just that and I hope we have more closed section for the next weeks. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Vanda. Cheryl for the record. And we appreciate the additional efforts that Work Party on GAC is going through to quite reasonably compensate for the access limitations that some of us around the world still have in regards to accessing our preferred collaboration tool of choice, and it's certainly my preferred collaboration tool of choice, the Google docs. But that is not the case for everyone around the place, including one of the Co-penholders, Co-Leads of your Work Party. So, thank you to you and your small team and

also to Bernie to be going that little extra mile of working by Word and then bringing it back into the template. Have I missed anything there Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte: No, sounds good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Right-o. Well in that case, we are now getting to the lion's share of today's work or part one of the lion's share of today's work. We are going to take not too large a block of time but a significant bit of time looking through the approach to the recommendations and how we're going to be working. We're going to be looking at it very briefly and Bernie's going to I think take us through this. Then the supporting the please move on in the template business, one of the limitations of Zoom, the specific criteria that we need to address as we need to decide what is or is not going to be a recommendation as we move forward and also cover up, I think even more briefly, any of the approach to the work on sections that are not specifically covered by the Work Parties.

And that section of this Agenda Item was raised in particular by Sebastien and Osvaldo from the Board Work Party perspective where they, and I believe the GAC but not limited to the GAC Work Party, have some intersection points with some of the pieces of work between that have a bridge across more than one Work Party. And yes, it's going to be made much easier because Jennifer had the intelligence and good sense to get the slides out beforehand. So, let's now have a look at

these slides and the report template and I'm going to hand it over to you, Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte:

Thank you. Alright. So, we will take a quick run through the slides we did last week in case you missed it. Alright, thank you. So, each section will have this layout. Issue, under it an introduction, under that information gathering relevant to ATRT2, and analysis of those recommendations and their implementation and if there's any follow on, results of the Survey and any other information we wish to log in there.

After that it's an analysis with the information identification of issues, and after that recommendations to address the issues. Next slide please. Did we miss our subjects, is that...? Yeah, we probably missed Slide 2, right? Okay. Probably the biggest change, if you haven't been following this, is that we've chopped this up along the lines of what we did for the Survey. It seemed to work well for everyone to be able to understand how to categorize this versus the requirements that are in the Bylaws for an ATRT and the things that we've added.

So, running through this. Section 1 Executive Summary, 2 Review and Background, 3 Issue 1 Board Issue 2 GAC, which matches up very nicely with some of the teams Work Parties we already had. Issue 3 Public Input, which is number 5. Section 6 Issue 4 Acceptance of ICANN Decisions. Section 7 Issue 5 Policy Development Process. Section 8 Issue 6 Assessment of Independent Review Process. We've already done that. That text is approved. We've got one in the can.

Section 9 Issue 7 Assessment of Relevant ATRT2 Recommendations, that's going to be shorter because as we talked about a few minutes ago, the ATRT2 dissection of recommendations is done in the various other segments where they belong, so that one will be a general comment on ATRT2 from the general processing of that.

Number 10 Issue 8 Assessment of Periodic Reviews. Item 11 Issue 9 Accountability Indicators, you will remember that's one we've added so the Accountability Indicators are sort of part of that whole Dashboard thing which allows us to understand ICANN and how they're doing and where they're going and so we agreed to add that one in July.

Issue 12, we added in August I believe, is... Sorry. Item 12 Issue 10 Prioritization, Rationalization of Activities, Policies, and recommendations. And as Cheryl mentioned earlier, all the stuff around budgets and prioritization as strategy has been moved to Issue 12. Finally, 13 Prioritization and Interdependencies of the recommendations that we'll be making. You will remember, or rather you'll see as we go through the slides, that is one of the requirements we have relative to making recommendations. Thank you.

Let's go back to slide 4 please. Alright, from the Terms and Reference. In keeping with the Guidelines for Review Teams to develop and follow a clear process when documenting constructive recommendations, the ATRT3 has been adopting a system that is fact-based analysis, clear articulation of noted problem areas, supporting documentation and resulting recommendations system that follows the S.M.A.R.T framework; Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-Bound. So, basically, we cannot simply pull these out of the air. There's

a lot of homework before we get to a recommendation. Next slide please.

To help assess whether proposed recommendations are consistent with this guidance, we will be, whenever possible and practical, testing the recommendations against these. There are a set of questions. The slide deck is on the Wiki. I'm not going to take the time to go through those. Next slide please. That's more of the requirements so it gives you a flavor that there is really a large pre-takeoff checklist. Next slide please.

And finally, it closes off there. So that's just before we think about making a recommendation. Next slide please. Now, the thing... Sorry, my audio went off for a second there. Once we've decided to make a recommendation, then they are subject to the Operating Standards for specific reviews, which were approved in June 2019. And these were incorporated into the ATRT3 Terms of Reference. Next slide please.

So, what we've got in here, definition of desired outcomes including metrics used to measure whether the recommendation's goals are achieved. Initial identification of potential problems in attaining the data or developing the metric, suggested timeframe in which the measures should be performed, definition of current baselines of the issue and initial benchmark defined success or failure, data retained by ICANN, I'm still uncertain what that means. Industry metric sources, Community input, surveys or studies, and consensus on recommendations.

So, once we've decided to make a recommendation, we've got yet another checklist of stuff that we've got to make sure meet up. And as I

was mentioning last week, this is probably a really good thing because as we've noticed as we've gone through checking the implementation of ATRT2, there is obviously some areas where there are discrepancies between what ICANN considers it did a good job in implementing things and what we consider would be required to actually say you've implemented something and I think this will take that, if you will, possibility of misunderstandings or missed common understandings away and provide us all a base for that.

That's my slide. That sort of talks to what we're heading into and I'll be glad to take any questions on this if there any at this point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl for the record. Thanks Bernie. As I popped into the chat, as you can see from this there are lots of requirements so don't lose touch with these slides. I'm not suggesting that Pat and I are going to suddenly expect us all to be able to quote them or have some sort of pop quiz type thing going on, but as we move forward to ruminate on the data and decide amongst ourselves and try to come to some sort of consensus on any possible recommendations out of ATRT3, these are the tests that we will be putting our aspiring recommendations up against.

And this is unique, it has not happened before. No other Review Team has utilized these criteria, but it is where we are now in the brave new world as we move forward with our new Guidelines which we all agreed we would do our best to try and run with. Sebastien, over to you.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you Cheryl. If we can go back to page, I guess it's 2. Here., I think may I understand why we don't have for certain Issue 11? That's my first question and my second is more a suggestion that if you can find a trick to have the number of the section equal to the number of the issue it will be great, it will be easier to follow and not to have two different elements to take here. But that we can take that off of least to together. But my question of 13, why is that issue relevant?

Bernard Turcotte: May I take that, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please do.

Bernard Turcotte: Alright. 13 is not an issue. It's looking at all the recommendations we'll be making versus issues and then doing the prioritization between those recommendations. So, if you will, it's mechanical process after we've finished doing the recommendations in the issue sections. Does that make sense Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah, thank you.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay, thank you very much. Any other questions? And yes, the numbering thing I think we can probably work out something. I agree.

It's been bothering me too since I've been working on it but didn't change it.

Sebastien Bachollet:

If I have a small suggestion is that you name 0, 0, and 0 at the beginning and that you are 1 for 1 but if you find something else maybe but that's my suggestion.

Bernard Turcotte:

Alright, thank you. I'm sure we'll work on something. Alright. If there are no other questions, we'll proceed with the next section. Don't take that slide away because that's where... Alright. So, nothing else. So, on our Agenda the next thing which was brought up by Sebastien at the Leadership Meeting on Monday was how do we match this up versus the Work Parties and who's going to do the work and how are we going to address this.

Cheryl, you wanted to say some introductory words here?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Bernie. Yeah, look. This is a short, Cheryl for the record by the way, a short but important discussion because it is our intention to make sure that we are careful with our how in our how and [inaudible] but remembering, of course, even the Work Party products are still subject to interaction and agreement and discussion and rumination amongst the Plenary which is why we have these regular feedback activities in all our weekly Plenary calls.

And just before I hand back to you, Bernie, to continue this on, I've got to suggest, Sebastien, you've known me a very, very long time and you know I have some interesting quirks as Bernie certainly knows, about numbering right down to odd and even numbers. Imagine, if you will, how jarring I find this mismatch between the general framing numbering and the numbering that follows in the text. It's like drawing nails across a blackboard in the old days to me. But anyway, it will be fixed. I have every faith in the fact that it will be fixed. Back to you Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte:

Thank you Cheryl. Vanda, you have your hand up.

Vanda Scartezini:

Okay, Vanda for the record. About the 13, I do believe that we are going to have two priorities. One priority for each group and then once discussing the recommendation we're going to have the whole Review Team at the final recommendation and priorities for that. So, I'm right with this understanding?

Bernard Turcotte:

I believe so, Vanda. I mean people can have especially in the Board and GAC, Issue 1 and Issue 2, there's a matchup to what's in the Bylaws so the groups can certainly do their prioritization. But let's not forget that regardless of the results of that prioritization, what we're being asked to do is as an ATRT to look at all the recommendations and come up with first the sectioning off into, if you will, the absolutely must get done and

the would be nice to do, and then in the absolutely must get done still again order those so that there is a priority in those.

So, generally, yes, I'm agreeing with you and then we will have the whole team go over that so that our finished work product is a consensus as to as the other points are on recommendations relative to what our group decided. Does that make sense for you, Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini:

Yes, thank you. I'm muting because there is noise in my room. Thank you.

Bernard Turcotte:

Okay, no problem. Thank you. Alright so moving on I think after talking about this a bit, as we've said, there's a natural match on Issue 1 and Issue 2 so I think those groups can keep working on that. On Issue 1, as Sebastien quite correctly noted, there are some of the things that were technically the Board's before but have been moved down to some of the other issues where they seem to fit better. So, I think for Issue 1 and Issue 2 and, you know, those are the two groups that have done a fair amount of work already, and so we're doing okay.

I think what's being proposed for Issue 3 to Issue 10 is that we tackle those as a Plenary and that so there will be a text drafted and we'll just bang away at it and hopefully use the list also to get some things done. And really using the experience of the Transition and Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. I think that's why you got me here also is to get

that process going where everyone feels they're involved, and the worst thing is to really get that wheel turning.

So, we'll be writing some draft and then basically people start shooting at it and sometimes we completely restructure it, but that's what we're proposing is that we get that moving. We've already got that moving with the ATRT2 Recommendations. They're starting to go into all the issue categories. We're including the results that are in the Evaluation Spreadsheet and we're throwing in some conclusions.

As we discussed last week, if there is a problem with an ATRT2 Recommendation that was not implemented properly, we feel we've already got a leg up on considering making a recommendation because it was made by ATRT2 and if it wasn't implemented, then that initial section of considering if we have what it takes to make a recommendation, is sort of bypassed because that recommendation was made, it was agreed to be implemented, and it wasn't implemented so we've already got part of the way there, if you will.

So that's my presentation. I'll be glad to take questions. Vanda, your hand is still up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Bernie, Cheryl here. Vanda said she was muting because she had noise in her room, so I note she's dropped her hand now. It's probably an old hand. Sebastien, over to you.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Yes, thank you very much and thank you for yours, Bernie. I would like to suggest that maybe just to have some people from our group involved, we may suggest that Issue 3 to Issue 10 we find one Leader to work with you in each of these items. I think it will be good if some of us are involved in that work. Even in the work that you are doing backstage. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl here. Sebastien, Pat and I are working very closely with Bernie on all the templating, along with the rest of the Staff. So, I think there is overall input and of course Pat and I are specifically in each and every one of the Work Party groups, although we are sharing now the load of attending the various Work Party meetings, since we have been intending to go to, for example, your Work Party meetings because of the time that they're running in my 24 hour schedule of a day and me going to things like the GAC ones.

But we will be directing, of course, with each of the Work Party Leads and, of course, we will be bringing this back in at regular intervals in the weekly Leadership Team so... Welcome Osvaldo, just to note that you're here. So, note your offer but I think at the moment we've got a handle on it from an overall perspective. So, let's take that offer and if needs be, we will come back to it but Bernie I'm sure you'll let us know if we need to do that.

Or, of course, if we need to do something else like have a three or four or six hour block of time as has been done in other drafting exercises in other Review Teams and Cross Community Work Group formats where

penholders are brought together for several days of virtual meetings to bludgeon a final frameworks into report documentation. So, there's a bunch of ways we can skin the cat. What we've got to make sure is that our cat is appropriately skinned, mounted, and the fur turned into slippers in a timely fashion and in a way that meets our objectives. Hope I haven't horrified people with my metaphor there. Over to you, Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte:

Thank you. Just to go back to Sebastien's point. I think it's a little early. I think once we start digging in to material and I think you'll already have been reviewing sections, we will get a feeling. And usually what happens is there is, at least in my experience, there is quite an organic, if you will, coalition of people who have an interest in a specific topic and once we get into the nitty gritty of looking at section... If we go to the next slide please, slide 3.

Once we start getting into the analysis of the information identification of issues, I think that's where it'll be interesting to look at that possibility, Sebastien. So, any other questions? Not seeing any. Back to you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much Bernie. Cheryl for the record. And I hope you all appreciate that we are absolutely able to come back and visit all of this again at various points in time. But that we certainly wanted to make sure that we took the time in today's call so that as we're starting to get to this drafting stage from all of the Work Parties and activities, but also the contemplation of what recommendations may or may not be made

by ATRT3, that the time taken in today's call to make sure we all had a good and clear understanding has been well worthwhile. And I also would appreciate the fact that we do have some observers in today's call. And I hope that they appreciate this particular review as well.

So, with that then going back to our previously advertised Agenda, we're going to now dive in to our Work Plan and timeline. Now this was the issue along with in fact the previous issue, that Pat had planned to orchestrate and lead, so unlike the last one however, I find myself slightly less on top of who was going to be doing what with the Work Plan.

But I believe we will be probably going to Jennifer at this point but correct me if I'm wrong Jennifer, and that we're displaying the Work Plan and looking at where we are and then with Bernie and you, thank you for that link, we will have a drill through and discussion on timeline as well as Work Plan. So, with that, if you want to read the fine print and follow through yourselves, please open the link but I'm sure that we will now be looking at the - thank you very much, it just loaded on my screen - the ATRT3 Draft Work Plan and I'll be handing it over to you Jennifer, I believe, and thank you Brenda for scrolling us through as required.

Jennifer Bryce:

Great, thank you. This is Jennifer. So, as you can see on your screen, Brenda has kindly displayed the Work Plan which, if you recall, the Review Team adopted back in June with the Terms of Reference and so this is the tool that the Review Team, along with other things, uses to

report on its milestones and progress. And so, if you recall a few weeks ago we circulated some fact sheets to the team for review prior to posting to the Wiki. The information for those fact sheets comes from the milestones that the Review Team reports in the Work Plan here. So, it's important just as a reminder that we keep looking and updating the Work Plan as appropriate.

So, on the call today I wanted to just go through some of the items that I believe we can update based on the progress and also take a look at where we might need to adjust the Work Plan based on the presentation that Bernie just gave and the discussion with regards to the approach to the work.

So, I will start with just recapping that the Work Plan is broken down into a number of different sections. We've obviously completed 100 percent of Assemble Review Team, so that's great. On the Plan Review, currently we're at 75 percent. These are mostly administrative items which I believe that we can update to 100 percent. So, I will just make some suggestions and please raise your hand or indicate no in the chat or in the app display window if you don't agree.

But I believe that now the template refining on recommendations is currently, this is line 14, it's currently at zero percent. I believe that we can update this to 100 percent as complete. The next item define structure of subgroups report is related to that, and I believe we can also update that one to 100 percent. We are complete on lots of these items until we go down to receive response from Board on the Terms of Reference and Work Plan. Obviously, that has not happened yet. The

date for that is passed. We put the 19th of July. I believe that that is anticipated in the coming week.

So, at the moment obviously we can leave that one as zero and leave the Review Team update Terms of Reference and Work Plan as appropriate based on feedback at zero as well since we can't do anything. We don't have the feedback yet. So, that's two items I suggest updating to 100 percent. I see no red crosses or hands raised and so I'll make a comment in that and any comments on this Google document, just by the way, will be sent. I will send this link around after the call to everybody so those who are not on the call will be able to see the proposals and have a chance to make some suggestions.

So, research and studies, moving on down to Row 28, which is 100 percent complete at the moment. 29 identify briefing and data sources needed, we said that we would do that by the 27th of June which was Marrakech. It's currently at 50 percent. I think that that is 100 percent at this point. And as well as the one underneath it, the Review Team determine requirements for independent experts and develop statement of work if necessary. So, I suggest updating both of those as well. Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet:

Yeah, please. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I'm not sure that we are yet 100 percent on the data sources needed. I think as I said during my presentation with the Board, I still need to work out and I have the impression that some of the other groups are still working on the data

they received and I'm not sure that we have all and I would like to suggest that we do 75 percent. Thank you.

Jennifer Bryce: Okay, Maarten?

Maarten Botterman: Yeah, just to answer on the Board response to Terms of Reference and Work Plan, I think you can expect that momentarily. In general, we are, the Board is very positive about the ATRT work, so this is likely to be confirmed very shortly.

Jennifer Bryce: Okay, thanks Maarten. So, I just took in Sebastien's comment for consideration. I just put that in the Work Plan just to update to 75 percent as opposed to 100 percent. So, let's move down then to the Work Parties. And here this is where we might need to rework the Work Plan a little bit to reflect the discussions that we've had today but I do want to dive into them a little bit and see what we can update at the moment. So, I guess the first Work Party Board, there's a lot of dates here. Expected completion date on the Work Plan execution, expected completion date 23rd of August. That date has passed so I wonder if, Sebastien or Osvaldo, you can help us to determine what of this we can update. Particularly the Work Plan execution section which is Rows 43 through to 46? Sebastien, please.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. Thank you very much Jennifer. I guess I will say we are in the Work Plan execution for review, analyze, and summarize relevant

documentation may be a little more but let's say 50 percent. Investigation on the identified objectives, I guess it's some of the same. We didn't have yet interviews. I don't know if we need some of them as the one where requested in our list of inputs are the ones, I think are another part of the document, not in the block part anymore, and maybe are not the ones we want to make in the recommendations therefore maybe it's a little bit less needed, but I would suggest also half done.

And for the last draft summary notes on key findings, I don't know. Bernie has done a lot with the ATRT2. I have done a few but not yet a summary not really of key findings therefore I will say 25 percent here. Suggestions. It could be a little more or a little bit less but it's around that I think. We can work out. Thank you.

Jennifer Bryce:

Thank you Sebastien. Does anybody have any objections to those suggestions, or shall we move on? Okay, so the next section I just want to quickly highlight. The next session is prepare draft report section. I don't think we need to go into each of these items in detail at the moment. I do want to highlight though that the date for that is the 13th of September so we might want to consider adjusting some of these dates or how they fit into the wider Work Plan which at the moment has the draft report set to publish on the 30th of October which is right after the Singapore Meeting but prior to the Montreal Meeting.

So, we'll come back to those dates, but we can move on I think to the Work Party, the GAC Work Party, which starts on line 57. And I will hand

over for some help from Vanda. I don't see Leo on the call but others in the GAC Work Party to help update lines 65 through to 68 in the same way that we just did. Vanda?

Vanda Scartezini: Jennifer, I'm here.

Jennifer Bryce: Okay, please. Go ahead.

Vanda Scartezini: No, I do believe that we need to change this work execution, the review, analyze any relevant documentation is done. Interviews are done. Draft summary notes for the key findings are done. Approve of finds among us, it's quite different kind of approach because I do believe that approve finds is just a small part of the improvement. So, approval work that we agreed during the interviews is done.

Approve all the ATRT documentation that we have reviewed is another thing. It's almost done but not yet because we are writing the reporter and the resume of each recommendation for ATRT. So, I don't know exactly what to do that because it's... Maybe we are almost approved all the things that we got from ATRT2. In the reviews what is missing is the Survey because we haven't done it yet. So, I do believe that the finds is 75 percent.

Assembling draft recommendation using the designed review template, we are starting, so 25 is okay because we had that final date for due

everything to 9 of September and we decide is not exactly when we have all the recommendation because we need also the Survey feedback and so on. So, we agreed to discuss those points in the Singapore Meeting. So, I do believe that it's better to change the date and keep those on 50 percent because we have those organized inside the template, but it's not approved in general.

So that's my perception of those items because since we start using and discussing the template, those lines are for me with different meanings. So, it's not exactly the same way we did, I personally did, before because the template itself changed the way we are working. So, the times and the percentage, it changed. But anyway, to not extend my opinion only here, I will exchange ideas with my group and change those and send back and put in the Google doc after we agree with some numbers. Thank you.

Jennifer Bryce:

Thank you Vanda. That sounds good. Let's move on then to Reviews and Community Work Parties. So, this is where I think maybe we should have a quick discussion about how to incorporate some of the new approaches to work. Whether or not the team has any thoughts on that right now or we can discuss perhaps on the Leadership Call. But we do have the same breakout here for reviews in terms of review and analyzing the documentation, conduct investigations of objectives, conduct relevant interviews and draft summary notes of key findings, at the moment for the reviews Work Party are sitting at 50 percent with the completion date expected of the 2nd of August. And the same for the Community's Work Plan, so I see KC and I don't know if Daniel's on

the call, yeah, Daniel is on the call. Oh, Cheryl. Sorry I missed your hand. Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl for the record. My hand only just came up but yes, Michael is on the call and of course both KC and Daniel are on the call so if you want to take just very briefly some input from them. But while I think that would be excellent, one of the things that I think might be worthwhile however is that if we can take some of this now offline and perhaps prepare it for discussion with the Leadership Team and at a future call, that might be worthwhile because we can perhaps restructure the order of things so that there's a greater harmonization between the report template and this Work Plan. And I would think, Jennifer, you and Bernie would need to work closely on that but let's do see what feedback. Oh, I see Bernie's hand is up so he's going to jump in now. But, yeah, seeing as we got the others on the call, if they've got some adjustments to the percentage is great. Over to you Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte:

It would be better if I unmuted. Yes, I think that's probably a better idea is to, Jennifer if you're okay with it, you and I will sit down and do a first pass at this and then we can bring it back to the Leadership and the group and see how we finalize it but I think that trying to do this in a big open group like this where there's a lot of nitty gritty is not a good use of the Plenary's time. Are you okay with that Jennifer?

Jennifer Bryce: That sounds good to me. I'm happy to do that but I do want to just quickly ask Daniel and KC and Michael if they have any updates. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just jump in if you want to any of you three. Daniel, I notice your mic's open. Over to you.

Daniel Nanghaka: Daniel for the record. Right now, I don't have any respective updates, but I would just like to highlight briefly a communication that I had received earlier on from KC regarding to one of the conversations that we had in ICANN65. Looking at the implementation of the WHOIS, the report had 16 Recommendations and the report from ICANN of which basically listed all of them as fully implemented but then when a closer look came in, the conclusion was that there were only eight that were fully implemented, 7 partially, and 1 was not.

That is coming in from Kathryn Brown who worked with us on the CCT Team Review. That is one of the things that came up from KC. I think this opens up a discussion for how we can best move forward to review the other respective reviews and how far have they gone with the key recommendations. I'd also later on, as I have discussed with KC previously, was that some of the reviews will have to be outsourced to an external party. KC, is there something you would like to add in at this juncture?

KC Claffy:

Yeah, thank you Daniel. Daniel's referring to I was trying to catch up on transcripts from the June meeting. That's how far behind I am. Although I find sometimes when I read these things later, I get a different impression than I have, I don't know, hindsight or whatever. And it was the ATRT Team went and met with all of the other groups including the GAC and the CSG and SSR2 and all that. Well it was with the, I think it was GAC because that's where CCT showed up as Daniel said, one of the CCT Chairs, I think it was Kathryn, or I don't know if she's a Chair or not, but she was vocal in that group.

And she had made some comment in the context of accountability with the reviews that as when CCT went looked at previous reviews, because CCT didn't have an old one, right, that was CCT1. But CCT1 went back and looked at the WHOIS one for the work and they found that their view of how many of the recommendations were actually implemented differed from ICANN's view. Which seems to be a theme because I've watched it with SSR2 and now I've watched it with ATRT and I went back and even the ATRT2 document goes and has an appendices that review all the previous reviews that they could find and talk about the disparity between ICANN's view of the recommendations, I mean obviously ICANN thinks it is or it's trying to implement all the recommendations as it interprets them, and what another independent review party comes along and thinks.

And that seems to me to be a big accountability problem that we have a chronic mismatch there and I think Daniel just mentioned something about having an external party involved in assessing the recommendations implementation before the next round of reviews to deal with this disparity problem. That was just a thought. I mean I don't

know how that's going to feed into what we do when we get the Surveys back and try to write the report, but it seems to be an issue.

Daniel Nanghaka:

Thank you very much KC for that. I think some of this will have to be put forth to Plenary for discussion on how best we can be able to proceed with the other respective reviews, that we have to come in and respect the fact that some issues can be highlighted on how far the recommendations or the implementation of the recommendations have gone forth. I think it better you have your hands up probably at this point. Back to Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thanks to both of you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And KC, I'm unsurprised at your observations and I've been playing in this review space.

KC Claffy:

You were there. For many definitions of there, I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I'm not sitting here shocked and horrified. I can assure you. And so that's the type of thing that I suspect we will be text developing in our final report. But before I just go to Bernard, it seems to me that we have an opportunity here with the preparatory or should I say repertory work that Jennifer and Bernie are going to do now. If as they come towards a final-ish development of the reworking, if they can reach out to the

particular Work Party Leads, we might be able to integrate some of these concerns, comments, and even update some of the percentages as you go.

Bernie, over to you but I would like if Michael wishes to take any sort of input at this stage, if he could indicate by either putting his hand up or in chat. Otherwise, we'll move on. Back to you Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte:

Thank you. I think that's the point we were trying to make with the new requirements for recommendations when we went over that, is that yes, I agree with KC. There is obviously a disparity between what ICANN considers implemented and what independent observers looking at the same information can come up with. And I think if we look at what is being proposed as required for when we are making a recommendation, that goes exactly to the heart of that. And that is for all regular reviews that those requirements apply. And technically if you walk through those requirements, that is exactly what they will address, is this mismatch of what's implemented and how it's implemented and how you measure that it's implemented. Back to you Cheryl. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thanks Bernie. Indeed. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And of course, oh yay, we get to be the guinea pigs for all of this. Aren't we a lucky team? Every possible change that's going to happen in this area of specific and organizational reviews, forward looking and backward coming. Right. So, Jennifer, how are you fixed with this Agenda Item? Do we have anymore that you wished to achieve in this?

Jennifer Bryce:

Thanks, this is Jennifer. No, sorry. I wanted to get those updates at the start of the Work Plan to the admin items so thanks for your help on that and thanks Vanda and Sebastien for the input. So, the Action Items that I've got from this are we will circulate, sorry, I'll get with Bernie and we'll update, make some suggested updates to the Work Plan to better align with the approach to the work going forward and then we'll obviously work with Pat and Cheryl on that before circulating it to the wider team. And we'll make some of these proposed updates where appropriate to the Work Plan and that's very helpful. Thanks a lot for the discussion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And thank you very much for making sure we come back at regular intervals and update this Work Plan. It is vital that we do so. Remembering of course we can in fact make a change to this Work Plan but if and when we do so, it has to go through to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and indeed the Board. This is a Board accepted Work Plan and it says in the book of rules that we are following that changes to it will need to be notified and accepted.

So, nothing is impossible, people. We just need to do our job properly to make it so. Now, we have a little bit more in this and that is of course our discussion regarding the timeline. Bernie, I know you and Staff and Pat, and I and I think some of the Leadership at least discussed this at some length. We, Pat and I, are hardly surprised that we need to make a

few tweaks to our initial and highly aspirational timeline. Bernie, would you like to let us know what we think the current lay of the land is now?

Bernard Turcotte: Sure. Can you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we can.

Bernard Turcotte: The audio got a little wonky there for a sec. Okay, folks, if we look at the overall timeline, we were looking at getting a draft report ready for Montreal and then open for public consultation. I think we're all in the understanding that that's not going to happen. I mean, basically that would mean that we would have a report ready for public consultation in under two months because the ICANN Meeting is in early November so that means early October and we have that face-to-face meeting.

I think the more realistic estimate if we rework the Work Plan and stick to our guns and really get going is late November, early December, we'll have a draft document to send to public comment. At least that's what I'm thinking right now. So, especially given that the Survey will only end September 13th and we've got to spend some time looking at those results. So, I don't think that's any kind of a shock here. So, we're not aiming to go into Montreal with a draft report.

I think what we're going to be going into Montreal with is the results of the Survey, is the results of our analysis of ATRT2, and basically talking

to the Community and gathering further input along those lines to close everything off instead of coming in and saying, well, these are our recommendations. And that's what I'll be working on with Jennifer to rejig this timeline, so it sort of makes sense along those lines. Are there any major concerns with that or questions? Alright, not seeing any. Back to you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much Bernie. Cheryl for the record. And I'm just going to say sounds like a plan. Sounds like a good plan, obviously. And I don't think any of us are incredibly surprised. We had a very aggressive timeline, but we still have plenty of wiggle room in our overall period of time. What we're doing is actually just shuffling along some milestone dates. This will not have an effect on our end time and our rolled up milestones.

And from my personal perspective and I think if we asked Pat, he would agree with me, it actually makes even better sense than our original planning where we have an opportunity to have another interaction with the Community that will be contributing to the development of the recommendations rather than to the socialization of the recommendations during our interactions in Marrakech, sorry. It's another m word. In Montreal. Slightly different temperatures I'm sure. Should make sure I know the difference between the two before I pack. So, in Montreal, and also of course, coming out of the work that will be done in Singapore in our face-to-face so, fantastic.

So, let's go back to our Agenda now. Indeed, Vanda. You and I, we are now temperate clones. I think I'll just stay inside the whole time. I don't think I'll step outside at all except I think I have to get my little go-go cart from the accommodation into the accessibility access to the venue. Anyway, we shall see. I'll have to wear me woollies.

We do in fact have a piece in any other business today, ladies and gentlemen. And I guess it is with regret but no great surprise I suspect, that it happens in most Review Teams that people's real lives and work lives are coming to into make more demands than they had intended or thought that they would do. And that things change. We've seen Erica of course foreshadow her leaving, and whilst an interested party to the work we're doing as a Community member, has had to step down from her seat at the ATRT3 Table.

And Pat and I in the last few hours have regretfully accepted the resignation from Jeff Houston as well. We are unaware if SSAC will wish to appoint another person to his seat or the seat he occupies. We have indicated in our acceptance letter back to him, and of course that was copied to the SSAC Leadership, that anybody that is reappointed will be welcomed, particular skills in the data analysis of anecdotal and qualitative, not quantitative, qualitative data would be a desirable skillset and experience as would obviously contributing to drafting, etcetera.

And with his resignation and apologies for the work induced load level of recent interaction he's had with our meetings and activities, Jeff also noted that he hopes to like Erica, at least contribute as a more than interested Community Member and support and any and all remaining

SSAC Team. So, just to let you all know that that has happened. So, with that I will now call for any other business? And I'm not seeing any, in which case, Jennifer, let's have a look at any Action Items or decisions reached from today.

Jennifer Bryce:

Thank you. This is Jennifer. So very briefly, just the Action Items for Staff to work with Bernie to update the Work Plan based on this discussion today and make the proposals for the timeline as discussed. Other than that, I capture any Action Items but do let me know if I missed something. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thanks very much for that, Jennifer. We did do a lot, but not too many of them we need to firm actions, although we will actually note Maarten's intention to ensure we get some feedback from the Board, which will assist us in our Work Plan percentages as well. So, in closing of today's call I would just ask if Staff can put on... Sorry, now people have decided it's an appropriate time for them to grind coffee beans in my household instead of holding on to it for two more minutes. However, this... I think they heard my growl from the other end of the house and may have stopped. That's very wise indeed.

But, just in closing of today, if we could just put into the chat the time and date for next week's Plenary Call. It will be at the 13:00 time again but just to confirm and tidy that up, that will be terrific if Jennifer can do that, I appreciate that. And with that, I would like to thank all of you for joining us in today's call and we can note that it is indeed the 11:00 not

13, I don't know why I have 13 in my head. 11:00 UTC on the 11th of September, so 11 on 11, is our next meeting and I will ask for the recording to stop and say goodbye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]