
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, and of course members still of our viewing public. Coming back now after a much needed, I think, lunch break and we're looking forward to bringing the rest of our agenda with some slight modifications to a timely close this afternoon before people start traveling back to wherever they came from, and before they repack their bags to go to whatever city starting with the letter M we're holding ICANN 66 in. With that, [inaudible].

PAT KANE: No, no, it just made me think of Sesame Street. "Brought to you by the letter M."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We can do Sesame Street. Just to remind you all what we're up to, as we stopped for lunch, we decided that the review draft of executive summary, etc., will be done offline and looked at later, which means we're diving back in now to the first point of the afternoon session which is the messaging coming out of the face-to-face meeting and then preparation for ATRT-3 presentation and strategy for our ICANN 66 meeting in, yes, it's written, Montreal.

So, with that, that will be our worthy work between now and our mid-afternoon break. Just so you know what will also be coming, we've got a piece of any other business. We will take a short review of the mentions of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team #3 in the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. So, that will be a piece of any other

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.

business. If any of the rest of you have a piece of any other business, then do feel free to pop it into the chat and we will do our best to accommodate you, time permitting, to go over those things. Is there any other administrivia, Pat, that we needed to do before we get started?

PAT KANE: Yeah. Thanks, Cheryl. Just to confirm the Monday meeting of next week for the leadership and then take a look at an early agenda for that so we can hold that meeting and get prepared for the following October 30th.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And just on that, what we might do, Jennifer, while we're filibustering just a tiny bit, is have primary objective ... Because we've pretty much populated our agenda for the 30th through today yesterday and the day before. But we will probably take our update of the work plan, which was going to be a block of time today, we might make that the worthy work of the leadership team then rather than trying to do it as a committee as a whole. So, we'll just reiterate that again later when we go onto next steps as well.

We are now looking at the messaging come out of our face-to-face meeting. I'm going to open it up to Bernie, but do we have a document? Are we going to work on a scratch pad? What's the plan?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, actually, I started writing some points down for messaging but messaging coming out of here is going to depend on what we're going

to want to do in Montreal. So, I might suggest that we flip those around, we decide what we want to do and get out of Montreal and then I'll finish my drafting of a proposal for the messaging coming out of here. How does that sound?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We are nothing if not flexible, so shall we do it and does anyone object? Excellent. Let's make it so. Well, we're meeting in our face-to-face meeting in Montreal and obviously there's a whole lot of finishing-off material that we will be doing at that stage. We'll have a little more drafting done, a little more text to look at, [inaudible] other objectives that we'll be looking at as well.

But we also have a couple of opportunities to interact with parts of the community. Jennifer, am I correct that you and Negar have sent iCals out to the list? So everybody should have those interactions in their calendars. If you're in Montreal, you're of course more than welcome to come along to any one of those but we would be surprised and astonished if you weren't in the room if we were meeting with your own component part of ICANN. So, we would expect, as we have done previous interactions, to let the people who are appointed to the ATRT from a particular part of ATRT, to take the lead with any interaction that's going on in Montreal.

We also have a session, do we not? Can we tell us what that is? Thanks, Jennifer. Over to you.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks. So, I just posted in the chat in the Zoom room the link to all the various engagements that the review team has scheduled with community groups, including the Board caucus group which is on the 6th of November. And then there's a 90-minute engagement session scheduled specifically just for the ATRT-3 Review Team to engage with the community as a whole. That is on the Thursday, 7th of November, at 1:30 PM local time in Montreal. And excuse me because I don't know what that is UTC but you should all have that information in your calendars. I'm happy to answer any questions about that particular session if anyone has any.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Great, thanks, Jennifer. Am I going to assume that out of today, yesterday and the day before, we'll also be putting out – will we have time to put out a little blog update? It would be nice if we could because it's in keeping with previous face-to-face meetings. It might be necessarily brief but it would be perhaps a good idea to also mention some of these times in the Montreal meeting in that which I think will be a bit of preparation for the outreach and engagement as well and we'll need to address that relatively soon, probably today before everyone gets on airplanes and goes home.

With that, our presentation strategy when we spoke about outreach and engagement with the community during the Montreal meeting, it really was limited to how we can take some of the key issues that we highlighted or discovered in our meeting face-to-face over the last few days, and whilst they weren't being firmly written recommendation form, introduce them to the communities that we're interacting with

and see perhaps what the reactions are, as well as try and socialize them. So, have we got popular selection of them? Do we have a short list of them? Where do we want to head with this? The floor is over to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

That was my key question. When we were drafting the original intent of Montreal, we were unsure we were going to show up with recommendations done. We've progressed fairly well, so now it's a good time to readjust accordingly.

If we think that it's worthy to do the highlights and holidays as drafts that are being written, then certainly I would start with the five we started with yesterday because that's where the focus was and start having a discussion and considerations around those.

Let's not forget that, although people have been involved in the multi-stakeholder thing, the interests around prioritization seems to be extremely strong, so if we just mention that, I think that's going to set off a lot of discussions in the community.

So, just sticking to a general overview of what we've done, some of our findings relative to ATRT-2, a short introduction. Short introduction of the survey and then dive into our five points and leave some time for Q&A. I think we've got this thing pretty much covered for most of the things. I don't know if you think that's a good approach but most of these presentations, if I go back to the schedule, are for 30 minutes so that's even tight for that. We might cut down the introduction a lot for the 30-minute presentation. For the GAC, we've got a little bit more

than half-an-hour. With the Board caucus group, we have an hour. And on our engagement session, we've got an-hour-and-a-half.

So, if we build a presentation – a full presentation – like I was talking about a couple of minutes ago, I think And then we do a discussion on each of the five points as we walk through it for the engagement, we've probably got a 90-minute covered and we just use that presentation but slim it down to 20 minutes plus 10 minutes of questions or 15/15 depending on what we like. But what I'll do is I'll draft up a slide deck and we'll just decide if the big slide deck works, and once the big slide deck works, we can just chop it down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. My question, I guess, back to that – first of all, [inaudible] is that something that everybody is comfortable with as a way forward? Did some of you have a different concept? Vanda, over to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm not sure if we can address to GAC a little more point to allow them to not only overview something, because they are falling quite close ... Go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. In the case of the GAC, I understand our point. We can address the general presentation to focus on some of the GAC points a bit more and I think that will increase the value. That's easy to do. Good point. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That wouldn't be applicable to any of the other engagement interactions I don't think. What's your general feeling for those of you from the GNSO, from the ALAC? What's your feeling there? Do we need to customize or take it more general within? The GAC [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. In my opinion, GAC is more peculiar. For instance, the ALAC, in my opinion, would like to see all those five points covered because it is in most discussions around those points are important. So, to reduce the [inaudible] general idea because they are aware about that.

But because we're going to have maybe people from the ATLAS sitting around, maybe you have the explanation of the five points that you'll be talking around could be a good idea for the ALAC. That's my point of view. I do believe they are quite informed about what we are doing here, and for that reason, we could give more time for questions because time for questions, in my opinion, is what we expected for the audience.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Good point. Maybe I didn't make it clear. But really I think in the ... We have a general layout of the presentation but I think really the strategy of the presentation is to tease out information to help confirm our direction of the travel, to finish writing the document for public consultation, so that there are no surprises on either side. If we get a really bad reaction on one point, then that's something that we can

regroup during the week or at the next plenary and figure out. But really the objective is to present without being – we’re thinking about this in this context when we’re talking about our draft recommendations or thinkings on the five key points, and yes, the objective is to let people talk and gather that input. That’s my thinking, at least.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. You’re happy with that, then, Vanda? Yes? Oh, good, okay. Anyone else want to make a case for any specific care and [inaudible] o any of the entities we’re interacting with? The GAC [being clear]. The general principles being covered now. Okay, back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We’ll also have that meeting with the Board caucus on Wednesday afternoon right after lunch. Are we going to want to tailor that presentation?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Personal perspective, the likelihood of the Board caucus necessarily being available or in the room when we do our general outreach and engagement session is probably fairly small. It’s a very, very busy meeting. So, I wouldn’t want to tailor it to such an extent that we’re assuming that everyone is going to be in the 90-minute session. I certainly want to hit

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, it’s before the 90-minute session.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, but I don't think they'll necessarily see the [inaudible] 90-minute session is what I'm saying. More than welcome but I don't think it can be a [inaudible]. What do you think, Martin? I see you nodding here.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think you're right. It's a busy week. But I think for specifically that session, if you have any homework for us, we'll make sure we are specifically prepared for that as well, as well as we can. We're preparing a briefing for the caucus group after this session, so people will be generally up to date and look forward to a fruitful discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, do you have some thoughts on that? There might be more discourse opportunity, perhaps.

PAT KANE: Well, things running through my mind is that we certainly call the Board out as one of our four topics and I think that they would ... If I were sitting in their seat, I would be curious as to where we were on the recommendations that we're going to make or some of the suggestions that we're going to make. It might be helpful to take temperature in terms of how we put together tone, not necessarily what we do in terms of the recommendations and suggestions because I think we're on a path for those already. But it might be good to capture some tone in the process and give them a preview of where we are and let them ask questions.

I think that the GAC certainly being ... I like, Vanda, how you term that as peculiar in terms of their relationship. I think the Board would be the same thing. There's reviews and it doesn't [bare] itself out very much except for a general discussion that we're going to have later in the week. But I think to be prepared for here are some of the highlights of recommendations that we intend to make or are in the process of making might be good.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Maarten, will the Board have seen the results of our survey by that point?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: That is the intent. Yes, very much so. So, we've been holding back because of discussions, occupying them with [inaudible], but yes, we are preparing a full briefing so we'll be fully up to speed.

As BC, it's an invitation by the ATRT team so we would stand ready to engage with the ATRT team from a brief [inaudible]. Let's put it to those words.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay because that helps, because if they will have been given that material and the briefing that includes that material, then we can not have to focus on that and drive to the most important bits which then we can have an exchange on. Okay, I think that's the point. I think that sort of covers it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So, what I'm taking away from this is a) build a general slide deck for the engagement session that covers the whole thing, gives a good presentation of the backgrounds, on [inaudible] info in front, and then goes into the five key topics and allows for goodly amount of discussion. Use that deck to create a shorter deck for a 15-20 minute presentation to SOs and ACs but allow for 10-15 minutes of questions on those, and in the cutting down of that bigger deck, don't cut down on the five points because that's what's of interest.

For the GAC, we will adjust by focusing on some of the GAC ATRT-2 and survey questions, so that we give them an idea of where we landed on those and try to get some discussion going around that.

And for the Board caucus meeting on Wednesday afternoon, again we'll tailor that general presentation slightly, focusing this time on the Board section three – well, currently section three. We may end up readjusting. But focus on that and the key messaging and the key points and see what kind of discussion we can get going. Is that generally what we've got?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It appears to be the case. I'm getting nothing but nods around the table. Last call for comments. If not, we'll call that. Sold. Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. So, then we go back to our initial first point which was the messaging come out of here. So, now that we've updated our strategy for Montreal to include discussing some draft recommendations or suggestions or discussions – key points, at least – and see how the community reacts, then we're probably in a position to prepare something about, coming out of here as people I'm certain follow us and are going to be curious. So, it's good to have the same message as we go out.

So, basically, something along the lines of 10 members of the ATRT-3 met in Singapore including several participants by remote participation. We met for three days.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That by definition means we say X number met – 10 in Singapore, the rest by remote participation, [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. Just to cover where we were, when we were, how long we were there. While in Singapore, the ATRT-3 completed its assessment of the implementation and effectiveness of the ATRT-2 recommendations and drafted some follow-on recommendations after considering those. It completed its analysis of the survey results and identified draft recommendations and suggestions from those, is awaiting information from the Board regarding prioritization and ATRT-3, so ATRT-3 can complete its consideration of this topic. We're waiting information on

ODI and ITI initiatives to complete our consideration of the website and Wiki usability. And we're looking forward to ICANN 66 in Montreal, where the ATRT-3 will take advantage of that meeting to hold a plenary meeting of the ATRT-3 and present to several SOs and ACs its update on where it is and engage with the community on its thinking prior to publishing its draft report for public consultation. It will also have a public engagement session on 7 November, blah-blah-blah, where it will do an official presentation and seek input from the community.

That's sort of what I was thinking. I'll be glad to take some direction. This is just the skeleton, seeing what we're trying to do here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. Can I just suggest that's a very, very bulky skeleton? I can't imagine building a very reasonable body of a whole of it. Thank you very much for that, Bernie. I kind of feel like we just put that into print and actually we need to cut it down for the blog. That's good. Comments, clarifications, questions? We've pulled out one or two key points there. Thank heavens [inaudible] the meeting is finished. Go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

The one thing I didn't throw in there – and that's the thing I'm wrestling with myself on – do we want to identify the five key topics and place that out there for people to think about? It's a two-edged sword. It really is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is. Let's see what the table thinks about that. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think it's always better if the people can come prepared to a meeting, therefore they don't discover everything at the meeting. We are supposed to have issue paper 15 working days in advance to be discussed at any meetings. Therefore, we will not be complying with that. But if we don't publish anything in the topic we want to discuss with them, we will be not transparent and not very accountable if we do that. Therefore, I think we need to publish it. I know that there are some reasons not to publish it, but I refuse that. They are less important than the ones to push to have them.

What we will need, for example, for the question of prioritization is that our goal is to try to focus the discussion, all the discussion going on in every place in ICANN about this topic in our work, and for the other ... Yeah, it's better if we give them some advice about the discussion we will have with them.

The other point, I think it could be useful – I know it could be the next topic or the topic on [inaudible] but when we will plan to publish the draft report for the comments because it's also something ... We are just getting them to give us input before we produce the report. That's also something we need to tell them, what is our intention. It's not just a final place to discuss a point. It's a place to come to finalize. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat?

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. I would agree with Sebastien but for a slightly different reason and that is we're kind of moving towards few recommendations and lots of suggestions which I think is a little bit different than what we've seen in the past for review teams. So, I think it would be good to get a feel for how the community sees that and really where our priorities are, and so I think talking about the five topics that we talked about yesterday would be very helpful in saying, "Here's where the recommendations are going to come from. Everything else will end up being suggestion." In a general statement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To that end, we probably need to make sure everyone understands why recommendations are different than they've ever been before, just so we add that into the slide decks. I'm sure it would have ended up in there but I just want to make sure it's written down somewhere. Go ahead, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Speaking like a [inaudible] ATRT group member, I think this is—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] day ever.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Up to the 7th of November. This is the last opportunity to really engage with the community and I think we also want to display exemplary behavior in that, in the way we engage. So, I can see that even on top of the report that we would share, we put up a very thoughtful note which highlights what we would really like to get feedback on and fewer recommendations, that's one thing. When the report will come out for public consultation, that's another thing.

But I can also see that some of the highlight of thinking, particularly if we really buy into it, like maybe we should go to a major review and constant improvement, that this is the best place to test it.

We know from the past that many companies tend to [inaudible] big news just before Christmas so people read it under the Christmas tree, but that shouldn't be our attitude I think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But do note the timing of our meeting, Maarten. Just before Christmas. We can't do anything about that. But I certainly hear what you're saying. Go ahead, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: One point I think that is going to be critical and I would like to check at this point. I know Montreal is going to be horrific for the board members and we were planning to have a Friday meeting and that didn't work out at some point. No? Well, we were trying to get an earlier meeting, weren't we?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got a face-to-face on Monday, then we've got a block of time with the Board.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Anyway, my question is I think it's going to be critical that we get at least Martin or Leon in our face-to-face meeting in Montreal as we hold a plenary as we're finalizing some stuff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, [off mic] problem.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Why am I looking at faces looking at me with confusion at the other end of the table? Please help us understand. We've got our meeting over lunch with Board caucus members. [inaudible]. That's there. That's set. That's happening. Oh, sorry! It wasn't in reaction to that, okay. Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So, I was talking about our face-to-face meeting on Friday, the 1st of November.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's not now able to happen. Is that what I have confirmation of? Because that's not what I'm ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, the ATRT-3 face-to-face meeting like this, not with the Board.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood what you're saying. Go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: The face-to-face meeting on the 1st of November is absolutely happening. Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, I'm turning up for it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So, my question is are we having one of Martin or Leon for that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah! That's very difficult with ... Yeah. On November ... For example, Avri, she's not in a working group meeting in the afternoon is likely to drop in. There's sort of a flexibility that's required on that particular day, I think, because of your triple bookings and things but ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We may not expect them but we may hit a couple of points and we may want to ensure that we have someone, at least for part of the day, so we can check a few things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, or access to maybe. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Can we have calendar invites so that we actually have them in our schedule? I will try as much as possible to make myself available and to be with you in as many face-to-face meetings with whomever we need to meet but there will be of course some colliding meetings for us. But know you can [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think the critical one is not when we're presenting the other ones but when we're having our face-to-face on Friday, just to make sure we have some access to you if we need to. Yes, okay. Staff is signaling that calendar invites will be sent. Excellent. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: From my perspective, at the very least, you need to know what room to find us in should you need to. We all know how to raise a good mushroom but perhaps we should let the Board know where the mushroom farm is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I believe that the invite has gone to Martin before and Leon as a replacement [inaudible] with all the information with room and everything included.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We also recognize that the role that Martin used to have is vastly different than the one he has now and that his time is even more difficult to get, especially at an ICANN meeting with all of the other meetings that are going on. That's kind of the point, wasn't it? Yeah.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: But he's got a special spot in his heart for us anyways. Well, at least for you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm not even going to catch that one. Please. Enough frivolity. Thank you. Next we've got our messaging sketched out. We still need to flesh out that messaging. When are we doing that? How are we doing that? Are we putting this up on a collaborative document? What is the logistics of this now?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That was my next point. Really, we can work on drafting it later today and put it up on a Google Doc and people can have a go at it and then we'll try and finalize that by the end of the week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Reaction from the table? Is that how you want to proceed? Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We need time for ... My people, for instance, in my group is not most of the time attending, so I need to have some time to explain some points to them because maybe for us it's all clear, but for others not following the discussion, it's quite difficult to understand some points. So, as soon as possible because it takes two days to arrive back from my country. Anyway, [inaudible] the others will take some time. But [inaudible] time that we need to be in Montreal [inaudible]. We need your work anyway as soon as possible, [inaudible]. That's it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: But, just to be clear, we're just talking about the messaging, right?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That's all we're getting out, getting some comments on, and once we get general agreement then we can use that and publish that for the universe.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think Vanda's point, however ... Vanda's point is that messaging documentation – and that goes to what Sebastien was saying earlier – needs to be available as soon as practical. That's just the slide deck associated with the agendas for each of the interactions, engagement session, so that people have access to that, then so be it.

I don't believe we're putting out a document as such, so I think we can sort of be slippery-slidey, timey-wimey with the 15 days, 14 days in advance story, because what we're doing is interacting with and providing material to inspire and encourage interaction and conversation as opposed to putting draft out for considered reading and response from a group. And with certainly no decisions being required of any of the groups we're looking at or working with. But the sooner we can get something in the agendas that those groups access, the better.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Especially for GAC because they have some special preparation and the information that we're going to [inaudible] and what will be expected. So, one, it's a kind of message that Manal needs to give for all those [inaudible] establish among them. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. So, how do we want to best approach this, then, in terms of timeline and time-binding? Bernie, are we going to aim for what?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I'm going to think for a minute here. I'm trying to arrange things. The way I understand the priority right now entering this discussion is messaging first, second slides, third work on the document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At this stage, because of where we are coming up to ICANN 66, my response to that is yes. Does anyone else got a different approach? I'm seeing people nod yes. For the record, there's a lot of yes nodding going on. Not a lot of no nodding and nobody jumping up and down saying, "You're wrong, woman."

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, no nodding.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No nodding.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No no-nodding.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no, no. Okay. I think that's—

=

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So it shall be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So it shall be. Make it so. Right. Okay. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have trouble to understand why everything falls onto your shoulder. You are just one person, and if everything needs to be done by you, you are the bottleneck. It's trouble. I don't offer anything but I came to this ATRT, I didn't so that you will be here. That's all. I was prepared to work. Not maybe as well, not maybe with as good English as you have but I was prepared to work. The problem is that I am coming back to Singapore and flying immediately back to Montreal, spending the weekend in Paris but you will say the same. You will have to fly back and it's a long trip for other people.

But why we don't share the load? We are members of a team and we are supposed to also do some part of the job.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please, go ahead, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, I think there's a couple of reasons. And we are sharing the load. It's just like ... I'm not producing final documents. I'm generating drafts the way we started with the main document. I'm just used to this pace before an ICANN meeting. I've got other things to do, and if I felt that I couldn't deliver on some of those things, then I would tell you and we'll work out a strategy. But right now, given what I'm used to and the frameworks and what I've done in the past, I think I can deliver the work that you need in the time that you need it. But as I said, I'm not delivering you a final product. The work still has to be done that I am expecting the group to review and then we'll have a closing cycle and then we'll have our draft slides.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is your hand still up, Sebastien? No, yes? No, okay. Well, that seems to have brought us to the close on at least part of our strategy for ICANN 66. I guess one of the things we should find out, however, is how many people are going to be there because this is not a funded exercise. If you are going to be there, we would like to know that you are going to be there. So, it would be a wise move, of course, if somehow staff could accumulate that knowledge. How would you like us to go about that? Do you want to pop a little Doodle out? What do you want us to do, dear?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I will ask Brenda. She might already have that information in her amazing wisdom, but if not, I think in the in the past Doodle polls have worked quite well so we can certainly do that. But she may already have the information, so I'll check with her first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, we'll wait until Brenda tells us what we need to do and then we'll do it. That seems a very wise move as far as I'm concerned. That's good. Just around the table today, is there anybody who is here that is not going to be in the Montreal meeting? It looks like at least current company. No visa disasters have occurred. You guys are actually being allowed into the country now. You've organized the visa issues which is good. Michael, you got the time off to go to Canada for this year?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I will be in Montreal but I will be leaving on the 4th, I believe. So, I will only be at the first half of the meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, for some of, not all of, our interactions. Can I just double check, because I've not committed them to memory, does that mean Michael is going to be around with any interactions we do with the GNSO? That's an important thing to note.

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, the GNSO is on the 3rd of November, so it sounds like you're going to be there, Michael, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. I have no idea what day of the week it is now, let alone what it will be on the 3rd of November. Okay. Right. That's some of the logistics we have. Is everybody around this table going to be there for our meeting on the 1st? Some of you – for example, KC isn't on now. We know you'll be in the building. Enough from Maarten. Thank you, sir. No. But I do note KC is no longer in the room but I am aware that she is going to be involved, I would assume, with the SSR work that's going on in parallel.

So, we may have people that are part of our team that will be in Montreal but will not be available on the 1st because they're otherwise occupied. KC is one of them. If there's anyone else, we need to find out about that. So, as Brenda is making whatever magic it is happen, we need to ask are you going to be in Montreal and are you going to be

available in the face-to-face meeting and any or all of these engagement sessions? Because it could be a patchwork. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I will try to [inaudible] ATRT-3 but there is North American School of Internet Governance going on. The first is the day in French, therefore I will assume that Olivier Crepin-LeBlond will be taking everything I could have say, but if not, I may have to escape for one hour to do [inaudible]. For [inaudible], I plan to be at ATRT-3 all day but I still remain to be confirmed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfectly reasonable. Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] for me. Louis is saying that he'll be there. That's great. I'm engaging in the organization of the ATLAS III so I have some moments that I have to [inaudible] our agenda to make sure that it fits and it's possible to be at least GAC is on [six], so on [six] it's okay for the ... But the beginning of the ATLAS will be the problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. And just to be clear, I believe you'll be okay for the face-to-face on the 1st. It's during the engagement sessions that there may be some clashes. I think that's going to affect a number of people. I think, [inaudible], you're also in the nest egg as well, so note the similar situation to Sebastien's. We're flexible and none of us are irreplaceable,

at least not last time I checked. So, that looks like we've got some logistics sorted.

We're going to have our focus on presentation which is inspiration to get conversation going. We're going to make sure people know what we've done, what we're contemplating and when they can expect to see reports and documentation to respond and react to – subject to file changes, as may be the case. Usual [inaudible].

We're going to tailor, specifically for the GAC and to a lesser extent, to suit the Board caucus interaction, assuming that the Board caucus have already had a more detailed briefing so we won't have to take them from the basics. We can take them from a set of prior knowledge assumptions. Have we missed anything there in the summation of where we are up to? Okay, because half my brain was in something else. I wanted to make sure I hadn't missed anything. Yes, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. One point. And once again, it may be even the next point or it will be on Monday. But when we expect to have the report ready ... I know that you will have to write it but maybe it's good if we have [inaudible] on that. From my point of view, why ask these questions now. There are consequences. One of the reasons is that we talked together about prioritization. If you look at the situation of the comments, [inaudible] November and December, it's just crazy for the community. Just crazy.

Therefore, as we are concerned with the prioritization, I think we need to have that in mind and maybe take into account the fact that EPDP,

subsequent procedures, I don't know which one other will publish something and we will ask the community to comment on all that. If we didn't get any comments because people are concentrating on one or the other, we will not get what we need because we need the comments. And if we get [inaudible] somewhere else.

Therefore, I would like us to be cautious of what are the different ... What is the time for the community about comments for the next three months, and decide if it's worth to publish it in November or December or maybe I would push the bottom as far as I can. Maybe to ask three months' delay at the end of our work to be able to be publishing [inaudible] for comment at a time where the community is able to do the work. It's not because we need more time. It's because we take into account the situation of the community. And when I look the possible comment open before the end of the year, it's just crazy. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Let me see if I've heard you correctly, Sebastien. There's a couple of things. Of course, I cannot help but make the observation that if we had effective forecasting, which I think was something ATRT-1 asked for, ATRT-2 asked for, ATRT-3 would have benefitted from, if we had effective forecasting of what public comments were going to be coming down the pipeline, it's a complicated art form – we know that – but we don't know what we don't know. But you're also making the observation that at this particular time of year there are many demands likely to be on the public comment collection.

We have got until April, of course, as our 12-month date, not the 31st of December which it has been on previous ATRTs. So, we do have it until April. We have, at this stage, stated that it would be December and a specific [inaudible] December date, if memory serves – 12th? Middle of December anyway, which was our aspirational date for publication. We had not, to my knowledge, discussed or decided how long such public commentary would be, but when we were going to have that conversation, undoubtedly, we would take into account the time of year and the demands upon the community and the importance of our work in our own mind.

And there are minimum times that we need to follow, but to be honest, we can be quite sensible and generous in our design. But we do need to recognize that, in some parts of the world, offices shut down for 72 hours. In other parts of the world, we're getting into the seasonal celebration of huge importances. And may I just remind you that happens in the Asia-Pacific region. You do. You've got Thailand, Vietnam, all sorts of places have their major seasonal you go home to be with your family for many days, not shut the office for a couple times. We're not snowbound. It's summertime and it's the height of summer in many of these countries. So, yes, all of that needs to be taken into consideration.

Hopefully, I've captured all of that [inaudible]. You want to make sure that we have looked at and thought about that. You also raised the issue of potential for extension to our work, and if we were any other review team, it would be a different conversation but we're bylaw bound and I'm not sure that we can do a thing about that, nor do I think we'd necessarily benefit by it.

Bernie, before we open the floor for discussing what Sebastien put forward to us.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

In workstreams, we ran public consultations over the holidays. Some people actually liked it because they had some time off and they could focus on it. So, it's a bit of both. Yes, there are disadvantages. Yes, there are advantages. As Cheryl was saying, we've got the advantage, given April we had already tuned the schedule to be very tight so that there was some loose at the end. I mean, we can leave it open another week or two if we want or extend it after we see what kind of responses we get from publishing. But such is life, and as Cheryl points out, we have a hard deadline so this is the way it's worked out.

And if we coalesce – and let me say, if we coalesce and we finish early and we can get it in one week early for the beginning of December, we certainly will. We're not managing ourselves to the schedule because we said the 12th. But there is a lot of work to be done between now and then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

Sorry. I put something in the chat to see if that might be useful. Cheryl, you made a comment about having information for forecasting. There actually is something that's out there. I don't know if you were Well,

it may or may not be but it attempts to do what I think you asked for which is to show what's coming up in public comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I think that is what's in response to previous requests, and of course a number of things. If we did a comparison, that would be fascinating to compare what the forecasting document predicted and what actually happened. That would be a very, very interesting study, but thank you for that. Sebastien, back to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's my main point is that we have in October [inaudible] new gTLD auction proceeds will be open. It will be November, hopefully. You have new gTLD subsequent procedures which was supposed to be in November. We have ATRT-3 supposed to be in November. It will be December but it's almost the same. We have EPDP in December. We have ... It's just going on and on. I understand that you say there are bylaws but we are exactly at the point where because of the load, we will not do a good job. That's why I put that today on the table. Then, yes, you will tell me we can – that's [inaudible] and we need to finish. And we will finish. But we will not give a good service to the community with all those comments open almost at the same time and it will be just crazy.

Even if we have people doing each part and not the same people doing all of that, one moment [inaudible] take a decision and they will have to know and they will have to work on all of that at the same time almost. It's just ... In ICANN [inaudible]. And when we are discussing about

prioritization, maybe we can try to find a way, even if we [inaudible] the bylaws, to do something to have the community to participate better in our work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sebastien. Let's hope that the community that sees our work of such magnitude and importance as I trust they probably did with ATRT-1 and even ATRT-2, that they do take the time as many did to make the comments to our already well-advertised schedule. You put that on the table. Is anybody willing to pick it up, hold it, nurture it and make it so or an attempt to do so? The floor is open. Sorry, Pat, that shouldn't be in response to that question, should it? I should have gone to you first.

PAT KANE:

Well, I took my tent down when you said nurture. No. I definitely see the point that Sebastien is making from the standpoint of we have a lot of very dense material that we're asking the community to weigh in on at the same time and what we want is quality feedback. I think it might be a good exercise for us while we're in Montreal to have conversations with the other leaders of those work programs and work groups that are going to deliver something that's just as dense and see if we can't slot something – engineer a slotting approach. But I do believe that it's probably harder for us to move ours because we do have the one-year mandate. But I think it's worthy of having a conversation and I would be happy to take that on, to have those conversations along with some staff support maybe to see what we can do in terms of slotting the

public comment periods, such as they're starting in a cadence to where we can best use the community to get good responses to all the things we're asking of them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Negar? And then back to you, Bernie, after Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just something I wanted to point out, given that the report right now is estimated to publish early December. The holiday period is going to impact the duration in that the public comment period is going to be extended to account for that holiday timeframe, so that the community has the number of days that they ordinarily get, plus probably a bit more time just because holiday season varies for different community groups. So, we will account for that and we are more than happy to consult with you to ensure you are aware of the actual dates.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Negar. And I think that goes to the point that Bernie made that, in other cross-community working groups when we've run public comments over major vacation periods there's been a group of people who have actually found it as much as a benefit as otherwise, but it is a mixed bag and we need to recognize it's a mixed bag and some people in the management of their time, when they're running the entity input as opposed to their own personal relationship with an organization ...

So, if I'm putting it in from my XYZ Corporation or as the secretariat of QRX Public Trustees Board or whatever it is, that's vastly different than if I happen to be the chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee and I am seeking to get wide input from the rank and file of the membership to feed into the process. You see what I mean? But that's perhaps we're talking in Montreal may help. So, a degree of not only can things shuffle to make more space and room for us because we deserve it – we all believe that – but also to prime up those we think might need to be prepared. And maybe we can help them in some way with material to get an early start on things. Pat?

PAT KANE:

So, thank you, Negar. But in response to that, I'm not certain that really solves the problem we're talking about here because we're moving everybody. We're time-shifting everybody to the right by N number of days and it's probably associated not so much with the Judeo Christian holidays but more the shutdown of the ICANN factory for [inaudible], essentially, because we have a shutdown where everybody from ICANN goes home and the rest of the DNS industry continues to work. I'm sorry, that was a little editorial. I sincerely apologize.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You don't have to apologize.

PAT KANE:

So, I think while that's good to keep in mind, I think it's still important to have a conversation with the specific heavy-lifted groups because when

you take a look at subsequent procedures or auction proceeds or SSR-2, we're talking about really, really big documents. It's not like asking about how to do the root rules for Chinese IDNs. While important, not as heavy a lift. I'm going to make sure that I'm not offending the entire country of China at this point in time.

So, I think there's things that we should talk about there and have a result at the end of the meeting. Sebastien, do you think that will be helpful? I got a nod from Sebastien, so thank you much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

So, is it Maarten before Bernie or Bernie before Maarten? Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Okay. Again, as ATRT-3 group member, I think this is a very sensible discussion and if we can engage for the right [inaudible]. So, taking into account the [inaudible], if you take into account also [inaudible] to the community, that's great. Obviously, we cannot – may not – be able to facilitate everybody who wants to read all the documents, including the Chinese script, but we can ... This makes [inaudible] sense.

We also want to be exemplary, and if one of our recommendations is in line with maybe we should limit the time of reviews as such, then it's good to show that we can keep within our limit and show that.

The fact that it will be Christmas we already knew when we started the clock in April last year.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Solstices haven't shifted for a very, very long time. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Currently, the question of the early days, it's a small [inaudible] what I say. My trouble is EPDP, auction proceeds, new gTLD, and whatever else – and ATRT-3. It's too much. We talk about prioritization. We came at the moment where there was no at all [inaudible] prioritization. Therefore, I don't know what to do. Nobody is responsible [inaudible] say something. The Board is not in charge. The community can't come to closure what we do. We'll leave the community [inaudible] and maybe others comment at almost the same time. I just put that on the table after I am very thankful to Pat saying that we will discuss with the others at the Montreal meeting. It's a good way to go. Anyhow, it's better to have a discussion with others, not to decide by ourselves.

But I would like us to try to find some escape mode, I will say, of the bylaws, because if we are stuck, we may get into trouble. Maybe we are the ones who need to change something. But the question, the fact that we will discuss that with the others in Montreal is a good step forward. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, and then Bernie, and then Tola.

PAT KANE: So, the one thing that I would add is that, with the exception of the Auction Proceeds Working Group, I've got a team member on all the ones that we're talking about. So, from that standpoint, I'm able to get

at least a picture when I get home in terms of what we're up against, so that we'll be prepared when we get into Montreal to have those conversations directly. But I should have a good feel where things really are and where delivery is going to be possible or probable or improbably and then we can go from there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you to reply.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: One of the reasons I bring that, it's not because we have this list. It's because I was at the [inaudible] meeting and they told us it will be published [inaudible] and after two, three, four meetings, I said, "Oh, they will be published all at the same time." But I appreciate that you will [inaudible]. It will be great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. What this brings to mind for me is our discussion that we had on public comments and best practice of being clear as to what our expectations are for the people who want to comment and maybe we can take that to heart as another thing instead of dumping a 150-page document on people. We work really hard on a short version. We work really hard on saying these are the things you probably want to look at. These are the things we really want your comments on. And if you want

to comment on the rest, fine. We'll love that, too. But basically have a comment on ATRT-3 101 possibility so that we can make it as easy as possible for people to get the core input we need.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, if I may, what I would have described in a past life as the must-have, could-have, should-have type approach to things. Terrific. Is anyone discomforted by that or can we try and do that? Excellent. Tola?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Yeah, thanks. That's exactly the point I wanted to make. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Scary. Pat?

PAT KANE: Yeah. The only thing that I would make to that is, in the paranoid community that we live in – I know. Just because they're not after you doesn't mean they're not after you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just because I think they are, doesn't mean they're not.

PAT KANE: That's right. We want to be careful, too, to not give an impression that ... Yeah. Don't look here because these are not the droids you're looking for.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't see that. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [off mic].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say if [Liu] is talking to you, then you need to take it to [Liu]. [Liu] has raised issues with you, you now need to raise them with us because I'm looking at chat and I'm not seeing anything.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, because sometimes people mistake on that. The question is, furthermore, whether the suggestions will be accepted by the Board resolution and [will] take further implementation. The question is going to be ... Consequences will be implementation of the recommendations of suggestions as Board resolution and the [inaudible] should be implemented or not. That's the question from you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we try that again, Vanda? Because I was really trying very hard to understand.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, from Chinese to Portuguese.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, from Chinese to Portuguese to Australian. Once more from the top, Vanda, slowly and more [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, that's not me reading that. The question is clearly that we make suggestions and send to the Board, to the [inaudible] on the community and then the Board accept or not those [inaudible] of recommendations. The question is [inaudible] on implementation of those things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is what happens. Next question. Right. This is the what happens next after the final report and the what happens next after the final report, as in after the public comment and our final report then is transmitted to the ICANN Board and he is absolutely correct. It may or may not be accepted in part or in full, depending on the prioritizations and attitudes of the Board at the time, and that's okay. We'll fight those battles or otherwise when we get to them.

But, of course, the implementation aspects are also going to be tempered by our own work in prioritization because, also, as we put anything into a capital R Recommendation, we are also going to be answering the question that we ask ourselves about what is the consequence if this does or does not get implemented, and if it gets implemented, when? How long could it be delayed if it was needed to be? All of those gating questions will come into line. And that hopefully, as we put that material into our final report that goes to the Board will be material they will also take into consideration. But this is one of the

reasons we've constantly said we'd like to take a light touch on a number of things. This should not be 100.

I'd like to not see it actually get terribly [inaudible] into double figures on recommendations. There will not be any shortage of suggestions back but the suggestions don't come along with implementation timeline expectation. They might be treated more or less friendly and more or less important, but they're not capital R Recommendations to be associated implementation requirements that are once a Board accepts those recommendations normally expected to be seen. That was a long sentence without even one of my commas. Someone want to turn that into English so it can be understood by anyone? [inaudible] listening to me know what I was saying then because I think I rambled on far too long. Vanda, go on.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. Just continue to translation. Maybe Bernie could respond for that quickly because he could not follow. Is the [inaudible] in the suggestion and recommendations in the process aspect?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Bernie, Canadian nod English, please. Nodding Australian.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Well, I think we're a little bit in unexplored territory because we don't know what kind of an approach the Board is going to take to our suggestions, whether it's going to attract them the same way, it's going to attract recommendations or not and maybe we can actually make a

suggestion on that because the point is, in the past, ATRTs have only made recommendations. So, that's why I'm saying we're a little bit in uncharted territories.

So, that's why I'm saying maybe there will be a suggestion along with that for the Board to at least track the suggestions and decide if they're going to do something with that.

Now, this being said, we've got I think from our discussion on the two reviews model some very strong arguments for very quick implementation because we're not looking at massive costs and technically looking at very quick massive benefits, and also producing some benefits avoiding starting on a new review cycle and just clogging up the calendar in budgets and various other things. So, I think there's a really good point on that.

Depending on where we land for prioritization, exactly the same scenario. I mean, this is now. This needs to get done. I don't think prioritization is going to be a very expensive thing to do but it's a very important thing to do.

So, after that, I think the reality is that it's going to go into the pipeline and they will be judged as to what can be done and it'll also depend on the final mechanic that we end up with for prioritization and what the community wants to do with them. So, it's a little bit vague but I don't think there's anything more that can be said.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, just my point of view. This is not a [inaudible] that some groups – very important, the GAC – can implement themselves. The suggestions we have done, if it's independent of budget or something.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Obviously, if they are not things that are required of the organization, the group can. But if we look at our laundry list of suggestions, they're mostly for the organization and the Board. There are a few here or there for other things. And yes, where we can, we should take advantage of that or, rather, I should say, the community elements that can, should.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien's hand is up and then to you, Maarten. No, over to you, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to say that if there are any suggestions for the [inaudible], we will treat at least as advice and come back with a considered response. So, we will not ignore any of the suggestions. We may not put them all into action but we will not ignore them. We'll take them seriously and come back with a considered response.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I feel the need to raise ... In the context of what we've discovered about the challenges and implementation of the recommendations that we've seen with previous processes, both in terms of recommendations not being followed, and much more troublingly in my opinion, recommendations being checked off as followed that weren't actually followed, what are we hoping to achieve by pushing this sort of softer standard of suggestions rather than recommendations? Isn't it going to be just more difficult to track implementation and to try to push for impact if we're pushing towards a softer standard?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, from my point of view, depends on the group. The group we are talking about is more professional groups and more straightforward. We can say do that. For other groups, like GAC, it's more acceptable for them if you suggest them to think about and ask for to implement by themselves.

So, it's a kind of diplomatic approach. Maybe for all other groups, some [demanding] action may be what's better. I was talking about the GAC because it has been some time. That is quite interesting for them, receive suggestion and, okay, we agree. Let's ask for implementation. So, they feel more comfortable and it's more certainly [inaudible] through the group solution because they will look for solutions by themselves. They feel like they are in charge by themselves to do so. That's my reading.

But maybe for the ALAC or for the non-commercial group, or even for SSAC, some people prefer users to receive some kind of order and just do that. That is something to participate on that.

For the business community, maybe it's more also interesting to have some suggestions for them to take action.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I feel like the GAC, to a certain degree, is a special case insofar as the GAC does not like to be ... I accept that the GAC very much does not like being told what to do. Well, the GAC are a group of representatives of sovereign countries and I think that there is an underlying tension that has existed since the birth of ICANN regarding sovereign countries that are in a multi-stakeholder process as opposed to sitting above it.

I think the fact that they have their own sovereignty ... They're sovereign but they're not in control of the process is a tension that's always existed and is a bit of a special case.

But, more broadly, in the context of ongoing struggles to push for the good faith adoption of recommendations that have come in prior processes, when I look at that, the conclusion that I would draw is not that we should be taking a softer approach. And that's why it seems a little curious to me to have all these kinds of suggestions and to be embracing this kind of ... I don't know. I guess I just don't really track the

rationale behind not pushing more to the recommendation side and would like to chat about that a bit.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat?

PAT KANE: So, I understand what you're saying, but if I turn it the other way around, what we're doing is we're actually creating a more prioritized list and saying here's the recommendations that you better go do and you better report them accurately – we talked about this a little bit earlier in terms of getting a report that everything is 100% done when the facts are you're never going to have 100% done and we picked it apart through our own evaluation. So, if you were to become more targeted, more focused, on the recommendations – and maybe the recommendation that we make is that they're closer to actually binding and that the suggestions are while you're in that section of code, I want you to go write and fix these particular items while you're in there. Maybe that's how you look at it.

I see what you're saying but I don't see it as a lesser standard. I see it as here's things that we really think are good ideas but we're not going to dig into them so much because we think these are actually the most compelling things we could come up with. And if you throw a layer on top of that that says we want recording and recorder every this, there's an evaluation from an [inaudible] group of us – I'm not going to actually advocate that [I continue to work] but maybe there's something we do

from that standpoint for those to make them harder to ignore. Because I get what you're saying.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. I mean, we take it all seriously. As the Board, we would, and [inaudible]. But that makes the point it's also not only the Board, it's also the community. Where do you want them to focus their attention? And it's also for us, because as the ATRT-3 group, on the recommendations we want to be very precise and want to [inaudible] this would make it fulfilled. And you may not be able to do that for all suggestions as well. You might take too much on your report. And I'm not trying to stop or decide anything. It's just my thinking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. I certainly understand Michael's point. But let's not forget also what we've been talking about, this prioritization thing. Obviously, I think some of our work will end up there. For me, that's creating a whole different environment for tracking and implementing the recommendations, because to a certain extent, what happened in the past, it went into the black box, it said, "Ticked, yes, will implement

them, we'll get back to you," and there were implementation reports and we've had discussions about these things.

But now what we're talking about and what we spent the last few days talking about is not only a mechanism for the community to make prioritization. It's a mechanism to responsabilize the community, for the community to manage a budget for the implementation and for the community to make the decisions and follow through with responsibilities.

So, I think it's going to be a completely different environment whereby if the community decides that these are things that are going to get implemented and it's responsible for tracking them, then we're no longer in the "let's wait and see what's in the implementation report" mode and I think that's going to be a shift of paradigm for how we're going to work and this is what we're trying to do as a group.

So, absolutely right on what you're saying, and if this was business as usual, I would have the same concerns. But I think that what we're trying to do is change the environment and we've said that's what we're going to go for. We're just waiting to see how we're going to attack that and if we do that.

I think we understand that where ICANN is right now, there is really very little choice for going there. So, we're going to go there one way or another, and if we go there, I'm saying that view, that concern that you got, I think should be really different in that environment. At least that's my hope.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, back to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Totally agree. What I will ask is do you have any slides about innovation we are proposing for the community? So, that's the message I would like to see us to propose something new, something different, from the other group and allow them to take responsibility for their priorities and how [inaudible] any person in the world. You have some budgets, you have some obligations, and you have some priorities for the light things or not so light things. So, it's ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was still listening to Vanda, but yes, back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Don't give me that. Yes. I think that's the point we're going to try and make in presenting those things, so great idea on the slide. I think that's ... What I wanted to say is let's go back just a bit. I'll put on my Fossils Club membership hat, t-shirt and sweatshirt. I got the full collection.

The reality is, for those of us who have been around for a while in some of these major pieces of work, let's remember just a bit back. Working with the Board, we didn't have two board members spending three days with us and those things. What would happen, I remember the paradigm that was used is we would finish the work and then we would throw it over the wall. Then, if they had questions, they would throw a rock with a paper over the wall and say, "These are our questions." But let's just remember workstream 1 not that long ago.

I think we've seen a significant change of that and this is a pursuing of that change. In the implementation of recommendations and the prioritization, we're saying we're taking down the wall, basically. We're going to be working as a part of the organization. We're going to be making the decisions on the things. We're going to be implementing them. We're going to be getting the implementation reports and we're going to have the responsibility to see what's going on.

Now, of course it's going to be interesting on the other side because our contractor for implementing is going to be ICANN and if things start slipping, then that's going to be another discussion. But let's not go there right now.

The idea is that we're letting the community become in charge. So, it's important to see where we've come from and where we're trying to go and I think the context is important.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're not looking over the comforted, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I'll say this. I don't want to sidetrack things. I feel more ... I think I feel more that I understand the rationale than I did previously. The idea of prioritization I can kind of see and the idea of essentially scaling back in the hopes that a smaller number of recommendations are taken more seriously than a phone book full stuff. I understand that.

I am still not entirely convinced, but I'm also ... If I'm the only one who feels this way, then there isn't a whole lot of ... I understand the

rationale for why we're doing what we're doing better than I did and I'm glad we had this conversation. And time will tell.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. Part of this is this business of us also beta testing, just in case there wasn't enough for us to do in 12 months. We are also beta testing these operational procedure guidelines which is where much of this is born out of as well, in terms of the gating of what makes a recommendation versus not a recommendation. And it may be as a result of our experience that there will be strong suggestions or recommendations in an entirely separate forum about modification to that as well. So, a lot of it is the great unknown, but that's [inaudible] can better as well. That's fine. So, you're not as discomforted as you were but you're still withholding. You still got some concerns and you need to make sure that they continue to be looked at. Is that correct?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I'm a bit skeptical but I do not object to our chosen course.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Healthy skepticism not a bad thing. Go Pat.

PAT KANE: And I think we should remain skeptical because basically we've got one review team to where much of the community, to include the review team, got surprised with how their recommendations were treated, CCTRT. We're still going through previous reviews like every other

review team has that has a number other than one, has gone through and said, “Has this been done?” And we’re arguing over that in every single review that looks backwards to the previous review.

I think that, as you talk through this, this might be our opportunity as part of the beta test, to layer on our own interpretation of that beta test and requirements on top of it to try to make them more binding, if we will. I think that could be something that’s really challenging for the community that we should probably take on. I don’t know. But I share your skepticism given how we went through ATRT-2. Is it done, is it not done? And some of them we flat-out not done, right? So, I think it’s healthy to have that and I think we can take advantage of it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not only not done but claims to have been done, when action wasn’t taken.

PAT KANE: Exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That’s very troubling. Right. But I think that we share concerns about that and to ensure that what we come out with at the end of the day is taken seriously. We’ll look for opportunities to do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if I may, the compelling argument, the rationale, the fact-based evidence where it is available, etc., the new gating mechanisms are [inaudible] to consider. If we consider them, we're going to record them, so there will be a very different set of supporting evidence that goes with something called a capital R Recommendation out of this experiment that we're working in that is unique in the history to date.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Pioneer].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Why not? Okay. Now, let me just play with time, if only I could. Time Lord I am not. We have some 25 minutes to break. We have a piece of any other business which could certainly fit in that block which unless anyone objects – I'm looking at the table – might be a good idea for us to do or do you have any suggestions, Pat, to do otherwise?

PAT KANE: I have no other suggestions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. That's just what I want to hear from you. In that case, Jennifer, Sebastien, since you [inaudible] however many [inaudible] to display up. You don't have to take all the time, Sebastien, but time is yours for any other business.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I am in another meeting also, as it is the ALAC meeting and I am ALAC member. For the quorum, I have to be there, and there is nobody else from Europe. I have double reason to be there but they will manage without me.

Okay. What I have done is I have take all the comments made during the comment period for the multi-stakeholder improvement and I have taken the sentence where each comments come to talk about the ATRT-3. There is [inaudible] two pages.

I think the best way for me to ... Somebody else with better English can read it, if you wish. If not, I'll read it. Each time you have the name of the organization, you have the number of times you put something linked with ATRT-3. If we scroll down, you will see that there are some groups who never talk about – where they don't talk at all about us. The GNSO, the registry/registrar, GAC, and one specific group. I think it's useful to have that as an input for our work. You want me to read them? Yeah. Okay.

Then, let's start at the beginning. [inaudible] prioritization of work in At-Large discussion on this issue. It was [inaudible] with a solution. Will need to go beyond—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Slow down.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You need to translate. I am sorry. My French is too bad. It was a joke. But you're perfectly right. Do it right. Will need to go beyond then the

processes offered as potential solution, [inaudible] ICANN's planning process and as yet [inaudible] ATRT-3 review.

In other places, the [inaudible] for specific review and potential new approaches to process and [inaudible] coming from the ATRT-3 and the GNSO, PDP 3.0 processes may provide some relief.

And in the [four], role and responsibility and holistic view of ICANN, ALAC aid there is no question that after the massive change in ICANN structure there is a need for [inaudible] review of ICANN and [inaudible] and the PTI. Presumably, this will be covered by the ATRT-3 processes.

Next is BC, Business Constituency of the GNSO. Two comments. The BC also appreciates the recognition in the current public comment of therefore being carried out as well by the community, particularly within the policy development, policy PDP 3.0 and the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 3, ATRT-3, initiative and there is a clear potential for solutions to be arrived at from those vectors.

Second comment. As far as financial resources are concerned, the BC believes that the strategic plan for fiscal year 2021-2024 and its financial objective should be the forum for this issue to be better addressed, together with the work of ATRT-3 and the Internet work plan proposal within the PDP 3.0 [inaudible].

I don't remember why I write MES. I need to check with the one who wrote that. Maybe it will come back. I will tell you later.

Issue five, representation, inclusivity, recruitment, and demographics. I will skip one part. We note that the existing solution, GNSO PDP 3.0, the

CCWG Accountability work stream 2 recommendation in ATRT-3 [inaudible] recommendation could potentially address this issue. [inaudible].

And we have a comment made by the facilitator of the work himself, Brian Cute. It was noted that it is difficult to state whether they are sure that ATRT-3 and PDP 3.0 references in public comment would solve the problem.

And later on, it was stated that asking us to evaluate the process, that it's not yet completed. ATRT-3 PDP 3.0 is a real barrier in responding to the requests for comment. It is impossible to know and that makes it hard to respond to who should take on the work. I recognize the difficulty and suggested that one could ask certain question when considering potential solutions, even if the work is not completed, such as is a potential solution fit for purpose for only one stakeholder group or broader community work. Using the issue of prioritization of the work as an example, I note that some comments have stated that the community should take the lead.

I also noted that, given the Board and Org role in the planning process, it is difficult to assume a solution to prioritization could be developed [inaudible]. The suggestion being that multiple entities could be engaged to develop a solution.

I had a conversation with [inaudible] who served as technical writer to the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 3, ATRT-3. Given the fact that ATRT-3 work is underway and that ATRT-3 may develop recommendation to the ICANN Board on issues that are raised in

evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, I have [inaudible] to remain abreast of ATRT-3 parallel, developing [inaudible] to ensure that there is notification of work between the evolving ICANN [MSM] work plan and ATRT-3 recommendation.

The conversation covered ATRT-3 developing work and the survey that ATRT-3 put out to the community that addressed issues that have been raised in evolving ICANN multi-stakeholder model. ATRT-3 work is going and will be taken into account in the evolving ICANN multi-stakeholder plan, work plan. And I will add vice-versa. But that's my own, Sebastien, comment.

IPC GNSO. One comment. If issues are going to be referred to community tracks, they need to be clear, actionable, and measurable items and the relationship between existing workstream should be clear and [inaudible] used the financial resources proposed in evolving multi-stakeholder model to be its own issue and the strategic plan for fiscal year 2020-2025 along with the work of ATRT-3 and the PDP initiative.

Thank you. I have read all the comments I have found in the different comments about evolution of the multi-stakeholder model who made any reference to ATRT. My impression is that there are some who are just saying that it's good that it's going on but there are some who are more in depths and who need to be taken into account by us. For example, the third ALAC comment about [full-scale] review of ICANN, it's something we can take into account in our work as it is part of our [inaudible] which review [we will do in the future].

In a certain way, it has confirmed what we have discussed together the first day. I will stop here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you for that, Sebastien. So, if you scroll up to that example, the third comment from ALAC, which I don't think is that one. It's number four listed, then.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, sorry. It's item number four but it's the third comment. [inaudible] sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's okay. It is, specifically, there is no question that after the massive changes in ICANN structured there is a need for a wholesale review of ICANN and its various SOs and SCs – although it probably may have meant ACs but this is how it's written so this is what it says – and the PTI. Presumably, this will be covered by the ATRT-3 process.

It seems to me, personal opinion, that like many of these comments, they're presumptive without facts based on what we may or may not be doing. They are iterations. They're, dare I say, taking our name in vain. But they're not quite input for us. They're not instructional, necessarily, to us. There's assumptions about what SubPro 3.0 may or may not do. There seems to be assumptions about what we may or may not do.

So, I guess my question is, observing that clearly there is interest in what we are doing and great hope and desire to see us do some things

in some areas, what do we do with this material that has been pushed into Brian's specific work space? Do we ask Brian for an analysis of this, and therefore take that as particular pieces of preferred input? What would you be hoping that we could do? I put that to the table. You've got in front of you, ladies and gentlemen. What would you like to do now, knowing clearly everything we say and do is very interesting? We think so, but others do as well. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Cheryl. I just want to say that this coming from the ALAC seems to be very much aligned with Pat's suggestion about [inaudible] the white spaces and doing or going through this overall review of the organization. So, we – not we, but the team – needs to definitely take into account [these comments] as I really think they are of true value for the final document and the outcome that you produce.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. If I can, am I hearing from that an indication that to make sure that we check through this in any other material that comes to pass, because this is not a completed process, so this would be a watching brief. And again, I guess I'm also asking do we wish Brian to somehow see this through some sort of filter for us? Should we be using this as a way to ensure we've covered all our bases? What is it that we can do to make the most of this material that is clearly on other people's agendas to be talked about?

As you presented, we will go to Vanda, and then Pat, and then back to you, Sebastien.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. For me, those are expectations from the community. [inaudible] on those, not only for us, for others. And we should have this when we are discussing and writing our report, just take a look on the expectation. Are we covering this expectation or not? So, for me, it's just that. Look for some [inaudible] that is putting in front of you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A little like a sanity check. Just double check, have we missed anything? Okay. Pat?

PAT KANE: I think this is exactly the same way. I think for most of these comments there's confirmation in where we're going and the things that we're doing. The big one that I worry about is we're going to go and we're going to have [inaudible] PTI. So, that may be one that we want to say, "Hey, Brian, this is not what we're doing." But I think it's really helpful for us to see how our name is being used in other forum so we can say are we completely out of line or are we generally in line? One comment does not make a trend as far as what people think. I was more concerned about what we might see than what we did see because I think this is actually more conformational than it is concerning to me. Are we going down the right road? And a lot of this is the same as we got back from the survey. A lot of this is what we've been talking about. So it makes me feel better about directionally how we're approaching our role.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: First of all, MES is Middle East Space. Sorry about that. I must have spelled it out when I was writing this. My goal was really to be sure that we don't miss something coming from another place where [inaudible] talking about us. I am sure that I took all the comments made. And yes, it's a sanity check – the only one I didn't take into account, but I guess it's because it was published after the ALAC comment but I guess it's a repetition. It may just be the difference is that it was voted for by ALAC and the first one was yet to be ratified but accept that all the items are taken. Maybe with Brian we can have this exchange and saying that we get to know what was in this work done by him about ATRT-3 and we will be happy to [inaudible] further on this discussion.

I don't think we need to something specifically but I thought that it was useful input for our group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Do we then need to track this and update it now with more material as Brian's work continues?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Brian will put a summary of all the comments and maybe he will put a specific comment on ATRT-3. He had written one comment already. Yes, it will be useful to follow what he is doing on that. Then, it's [inaudible]

to stay in contact with him but we are now, and yourself, doing that. It's great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jaap?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I find it a bit hard going off this list because it looks like [inaudible] parts of conversations are quoted here and I'm not sure in what context they happened. So, it makes it difficult to pay too much consequences about these things.

I do think that the ATRT has and will give ample room for people to make comments about what our [inaudible] is to [already guess] what these things are from this list. With a perception of how people see the ATRT work, just [inaudible] comment might just get to never-ending story because we might do [inaudible].

So, what I would suggest ... Well, it's interesting to see these things how they are in the moment but structural we [inaudible] a lot with it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jaap. Back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. If we take from that, that [inaudible] expectation from [these values group] on our work, it's already a lot. If we want to go and read all the comments or wait for Brain's summary, we can do that. I

was, once again, thinking that it could be a useful input for group. Just [inaudible] to say that there are a few groups who are waiting for us. We knew about it but it's a good confirmation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Jaap, did you want to continue? No, yes?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, I'm not saying that people should not take – put attention to what's being said about the work of the ATRT-3 but just to ... But I think that's individual persons around here on the table to do that and not yet another thing to do for the ATRT process which [inaudible] finish on the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thank you. I think we're left now with ... This is a useful extract. We might want to keep the extract up to date as we can just so that we are aware and have as a repository what [inaudible] able to be aware of. That was part of what, I believe, Sebastien identified as what he thought would be useful. I think as Pat and others have said, the majority of what's said here is affirmational to where we're heading and what we're doing, and overall it is a measure for whatever that measure may be – a measure of the interest in our work, and that in itself is not a bad thing at all.

With the couple of minutes we've got left before our break, is there anything else anyone wishes to bring forward as any other business? If not, then I have a piece of trivia for you. Could not help myself. In all my

spare time in the early morning hours, today I was reading my mail that I still get as ... I was once a professional [inaudible] and a retired woman who is now apparently a housewife – mail. And amongst it was something from the quality management and auditing world. It's a small piece of a longer document but I thought some of you may find it amusing.

This was from a set of presentations at a conference just in the last – sorry, Maureen, I can't listen to you and hear myself at the same time. My apologies, Maureen, in my other ear. It's now gone.

A group of quality and compliance professionals have made the following observation in a recent workshop at a recent international conference. And this is a quote. You might find some heart in this team.

“Professionals on a daily basis is that auditors do not” – this is auditors – “do not have the time and the resources to follow-up recommendations and actions. Many organizations operate in complex in technical industries” – gee, you think? “where there are various compliance obligations and other pressures that come out of the woodwork on an almost daily basis.” Does this sound like any organization some of us may know?

“Following up with recommendations requires a number of specialists, management, and coordination approaches and even small follow-up recommendation for actions can be quite difficult without a robust system in place that controls the changes.”

So, I just couldn't help myself. I had to share that with you. From those who will work in the industry, we do not find ourselves alone in what we are facing.

So, with that, we can stop the recording on the top of the half hour and we will take our 15 minutes' worth of tea, coffee, or other type of break and we will come—[audio cuts]

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome back to what will be an abbreviated version of the last part of today's thrill-packed and exciting adventure as we come towards the close of at least the formal around the table for our face-to-face.

The fun and games, however, will continue. There's plenty of work opportunities for you all. No need to fight over it. Line up in an orderly row between now and our Marrakech, Montreal, [inaudible] University meeting.

What we have planned for you all know, you'll be delighted to know, I'm sure, is a quick review of where we are, how we got here, and what we're planning to do in the not-too-distant future. We will also be just making sure that you all know what's going on with what documents and what the expectations on any of you happen to be, whether you're in the leadership team or the membership of a work party. We will be reaffirming that we have our plenary agenda pretty much organized and we will be looking towards the development of our fairly open plan, but nevertheless, publishable agenda for the 1st of November.

Before we move into that, though, is there any other material that anybody coming back from the break wants to bring forward that has anything to do with what we've covered off just today? Yes, Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: This has nothing to do with what we covered just today. I just want to apologize that I'm late. It's so simple. I couldn't sleep since 3:00 in the morning and when I went for the [inaudible], I disappeared. So, thanks, Jennifer, for the wake-up call. Shame on me. I'm very sorry for this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No shame on you looking after your health, my friend. Rest is an important thing that we all should relish when we can get it. So, pushing anyone's body too far is not a wise thing. Your regrets are noted. It's perfectly understandable after the travel and everything else. There are some exceptions, of course. Sorry. Of course you can. Just don't snore or I shall poke you with my stick.

Okay. So, that said, let's now go for a bit of a review on where we are now. Yes, this does mean that we will be punting some of our work into the space that occupies now and traveling to the Montreal meeting for ICANN 66, but that is not a bad thing. We've done a not heroic, but admirable, amount of work as we've gathered this far and I hope you're putting together your closing words, Pat, because I'm going to call on you to make them. Bernie, I think the summation, however, goes to your notes on today which should be brief, I suspect.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Well, I was born in a very small town. No, seriously, folks. So, today we completed our analysis of what we thought should be suggestions and recommendations from all the way through the document which also caused us to reevaluate certain assessments of implementation and the effectiveness for some comments and the conclusion for some of the survey results.

We then looked at creating our messaging for the results of this meeting so that people know that we actually did something besides enjoy good comradeship and looked at how we were going to deal with the presentations and communicating our work to the community at ICANN 66 in Montreal. We will also in that messaging that we will be producing advising them that we aim to publish for public consultation in mid-December and identify the five major topics which we have been talking about and/or are waiting for further information for to complete. This is my summary. Thank you, ma'am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And thank you, Bernie. That's fantastic. Can I ask is there anything that you had – not you, Bernie, the table in general – had hoped to achieve in our three days here together that you feel we haven't achieved or addressed? Pat and I don't want people to go home thinking, "I wish we had only ..." So, if there is a "wish we had only" pile, now is the time to expose it. Is there something that you feel, "Darn, I thought we were going to do this and we didn't." Let us know now. I'm not going to say or forever hold your peace, although I'm sorely tempted to. Is there anything then, not coming from the list? [Jacques] is online and I'm not

noting anything from him. Are there any comments that you want to make? Yes, Maarten, please, go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just thinking out loud in the same spirit we've been thinking about. If you would have a specific team that would highlight where we are right now that we can say is a kind of main intent of this ATRT feedback to the community for its next step of improvement, what would that be? Is there something Because there may be something in it that we feel like this is the key message. And that is not to put away all the others but it's to focus the attention more clarity and follow-up going back to basics, putting responsibility where it needs to be, things like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Almost a tagline type.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Campaign slogan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. And campaign slogan. Pat, how are you for campaign slogans?

PAT KANE: So, I've never been brief when it comes to campaign slogans but I think one of the things that we're focusing on here is that we're the next generation in terms of how we look at review teams and we're taking into account not only just the new operating principles or operating

standards but we're also taking a look at what happened to CCTRT which I think the Board came to a new place in terms of how they are treating and addressing recommendations and I think that we're really going to set the tone, or can set the tone, for the next set of reviews and whether that gets to the iterative process that we talked about yesterday on two radical work streams, one being substantive and one being organizational. I think it really is our opportunity to set that tone as to what the future looks like with reviews.

So, if you had to have a tagline to it or a campaign slogan, it's really ... I'll go back to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This is the New Deal. Or it's the next generation or something of that nature in terms of understanding that we're not looking backward. We're looking forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. I'm going to go to Wolfgang. I'm also wondering ... It's pretty short notice to come up with off the top of your head gems, but some of us may come up with some gems. Perhaps we could open up a little scratch pad and drop things in that may come to us later today or on an airplane or something as well. Off the top of my head was something like accountability and transparency, more than just review. But that's just me. Wolfgang?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAETCHTER: Thank you. I think [inaudible] is a good one and I remember the discussion we had in Los Angeles in April where we said there is probably no need, then we come with 30-plus recommendations but

with just an [inaudible] number and this is very close to the key message.

In my eyes, after the discussion the last three days, the key message is, as Pat said, looking forward in a holistic approach. So, I think this is ... We have to go beyond the silos and to see ICANN as a whole. And in my eyes, there are four key messages which come out from the discussion and probably we can add two or three more.

The first thing is the proposed change with [inaudible] process. The second thing is, in my eyes, the ideas we have around the PDPs, so how we can make the PDPs more effective, although with regard to communication and collaboration between various groups, cross-constituency working group has the idea to bring everybody together and develop a PDP, although as a holistic approach within ICANN and to have timelines or some instrument so that we have quicker results is an important one.

The third thing, I think, the diversity issue was also interesting. What we discussed yesterday to say if there are two nominations from each supporting organization, why not to have a clear message and to say if it's possible to have one male, one female, this could lead also to the issue why At-Large. And I remember there was an idea not to add At-Large Advisory Committee but an At-Large Supporting Organization. This was [inaudible] 203, 204. Why not At-Large should have also two voting directors? I think this will be one of the outcomes of [inaudible]. It's not our business to recommend this but we should be aware that there are discussions on this.

And the fourth is ... So, we did not discuss it specifically with regard to the GAC but I think the OECD is using the terminology [inaudible] government approach, so that we recommend to GAC that the GAC does not represent only its ministry, where they come from, but the whole government and has to be aware. And I think this is an expectation we have from GAC members that, say, represent the whole government and not only one ministry. And I think this terminology which comes from the OECD [hole in government] approach is probably very – an interesting one, as a message to the GAC.

So, I think this is a very four clear messages. Probably there will be a fifth and a sixth but I would not recommend to go beyond ten. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Seven too many. Thank you. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. New deal, holistic view, target five main issues. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see that's been captured in more than one method. So, Maarten, you got a good bit of feedback from an impromptu question. What would you like for us to do next for you? No, is there anyone else who wants to bring anything forward at this stage? That actually generated a great deal of very useful discourse and input, so yay us. Nobody else wishes to come forward? Nobody else online.

Okay. Well, one of the things we might want to make sure everyone is clear on is that obviously the Google Docs that we have both started and opened and the new one with the scratch pad for all these clever ideas, etc., will be open for your comments. Please, do use them between now and our next plenary meeting. The leadership team will be taking up the update of the work plan role on your behalf but that doesn't mean you should not or could not, and indeed I would encourage you to make any sort of comments regarding what we now need to do in terms of updating the work plan, which doesn't seem to be, by my memory, many radical changes at all. But if there is a sanity check to be done, we will do it in our meeting on Monday.

On our plenary, as you've heard, we've actually already packed out the agenda quite extensively, but as Bernie reminded Pat and I at the end of the break, version 4.0 of the report template will now be closed as we integrate all of the notes and material that's happened over these last three days and a new version – shall we get 5? Maybe. Why not? It's a number. It's a good number. It will be published and that of course will be open again for comment, suggestion, etc. And that will be the one that we will be running into the Montreal meeting with. Sebastien, [inaudible]? No? Okay.

There's a Canadian at the table pretending to be another Canadian. Okie-dokie. Yes, Herb?

HERB WAYE:

I don't have a card, so thank you, Michael, for borrowing your card. I can be Michael. Herb Wayne, for the record, the ombudsman.

I want to thank you all because I've been observing the ATRT-3 from the beginning. It's been an incredible learning opportunity for me as ombudsman to watch a review of the accountability and transparency of the organization from beginning to end and as we approach two-thirds of the way through. I've been hovering in your online environment and I've been privileged to be present at two of your face-to-face meetings now and I just want to commend you, those in the room and those online and those who participate at the weekly meetings, with the diversity of this group and the knowledge that's here and the issues that you're dealing with.

I commend you on your civility, your professionalism, your ability to discuss these issues with respect and humor and to attack issues as much as they may be very close to your heart, to be able to do it in a manner that shows your commitment, but at the same time, respects and understands the commitment and the issues that touch everybody else in the room.

So, thank you, again. It's always nice to see you folks face to face and to be able to socialize a little bit and work together. That's what I get out of my job that's important and makes me want to do it. Congratulations to the staff. You run a really good meeting. I'm impressed every time I see you folks doing the work you do. And to the co-chairs and everybody else in the room, just kudos. Keep up the great work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, thank you very much, Herb. I'm sure we all feel quite chuffed with that. [inaudible] by the ombuds. That's very good.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's not a dry eye in the house.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Why you want to keep them weeping? How about you do the closing? I'm sorry, Sebastien's card is back up again. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I know I may be late and it could be [inaudible], but I think that there is ... It takes me some time to analyze the sentence from [chair] saying that there will not be change in the schedule of our work. [inaudible]. But I was wondering if after [inaudible], later after, that we will plan to have any other face-to-face meetings? I think it's something we need to put on the table to discuss. If it's not now, we need to do that quite quickly to be able to organize it. I think and I suggest we need one. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm assuming that the zero day in the March meeting would still be a given. So, that is another face-to-face meeting but I assume you meet a longer one not a zero-day one. All right. Well, we can note that for further discussion but I think we should take as read that there will be a zero day in the March. Cancun, is it? Okay. The

Cancun meeting. So, if you want to make sure you've got that in your calendars now, that would be wise. Pat?

PAT KANE: We will be hosting that at Senor Frogs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It felt like April Fools Day but it is in fact in April is our final final report but our public comment will be going on during December.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Next couple of weeks we've got a couple of things going on. I know that I took a couple of action items on items that will be on the October 30th meeting that we have and we'll confirm that at the leadership meeting. We also have an action item coming out of Monday where each of are supposed to go back and take a look at the accountability indicators report and provide some commentary on that and see what works, what doesn't work, any ideas that we need to drive out of that. We will cover that as well on the October 30th meeting. Then, some of the broader items we will do for the November 1st. So, we'll set those two agendas between now and Monday, review them with the leadership team meeting, and we'll get those sent out as of Monday evening or early Tuesday morning once we're done with that.

So, next Wednesday we do have the plenary meeting. I know we're scheduled for the 21:00 UTC. I'm wondering if, given that that would be Wednesday evening with people then flying out and going to Montreal that we should move that to the 11:00 UTC time slot, take a look at that.

Cheryl, I think you're booked either way in terms of your travel but if we could consider moving it from the evening to morning just because I think that Wednesday night, Thursday morning, other places will end up having people on planes or rushing to get to planes or packing to get to planes. It might be a better opportunity to do it at that particular time slot. So, we can look at that real quickly, put a Doodle poll up for everyone, just kind of say yay or nay. If we don't get near unanimous ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Unanimity.

PAT KANE: I was trying to say that word but that word didn't come out. It's like Bugs Bunny or Elmer Fudd. If we don't get near unanimous agreement to that, we will still conduct it in the evening time slot or the afternoon timeslot for me. Thanks on that.

I think we made a lot of progress. Monday took a long time to get through. Or Sunday, day one. I was thinking day one is Monday. Day one took a lot of time to get through. I thoroughly enjoyed Monday morning, day two morning, because I thought we made a lot of progress on our top two priorities and I think that having five items that we're going to focus on – and I still think of work stream two is probably a subset of the first one on prioritization. That's really going to help us deliver some highly targeted recommendations that we should hold in greater accountability to get them done, as opposed to suggestions, because I think that if we're already going to break them up, we ought to have a higher bar that we call recommendations.

So, that'll be the schedule for the next couple of weeks and we'll have day zero on November 1st in Montreal. We will not have a plenary the next week because many of us will still remain at Montreal but we will pick up our leadership meeting again on November 11th, 11/11. But not at 11:00. Actually, it might be at 11:00!

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It could very well be!

PAT KANE: Exactly. So, thanks, everyone for coming. I think that it was good. It was a long way to come to be in a hotel when we thought we actually were going to be in the ICANN offices. I've got to make that [inaudible] as well.

Everybody, safe travels home and we will see many of you next week, week after next. Next week. See you on the phone at least next week. So, thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just in keeping as we always do, just take a note for the record. We would like to ask two things of you. First of all, if we could just spend for a couple of moments to get a group photograph done so we can have pretty pictures in our blog, because after all, if there's no photos, it didn't happen. We all know that from our NextGeners and our future geners and a baby.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, you haven't. Did you get my best side? Oh, okay! Is that in action or in [inaudible] action? But if we could do a group shot, that would be terrific. I suggest everybody gather behind Pat and I so we could just [inaudible] but that's just me being silly. So, before you disappear, do take the time to do that with us. That would be wonderful. Otherwise, I have to Photoshop you in. Oh, they'll never believe it, Vanda.

Anyway, the other thing is we really do appreciate the staff work. I know you've heard it from a couple of places, but we really, really – including you, Bernie, even you. No, seriously. A joke for the record. He's fabulous, we need him, we love him. But the staff are the machinery oil that makes all of this work. We really do appreciate it. And that includes our meeting staff, so thank you. Getting us in and out of doors, in and out of rooms, all over the place. Very hard to run remote participation without it. You've beat the gremlins back into the holes when they pop their heads up. So, thank you very much to our IT technical support staff

Thank you, indeed, to you all, especially those of you who have been our faithful viewing public. Some of you I think have just been working 24 hours a day in a Zoom room because when you finish with us, you've been going on to do other work often with ICANN and we certainly appreciate you.

So, with that, I think we've got all the thanks done. We wish everyone a safe travel for those of you who are traveling. I guess we can now feel a little sad and say stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]