

---

**BRENDA BREWER:** Welcome to ATRT3 review work party meeting number two on the 1st of October 2019 at 19:00 UTC. Members attending the call today are Daniel, KC, Sébastien, and Cheryl has joined.

We have attending from ICANN Org Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie is on the call. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to Daniel. Thank you.

**DANIEL NANGHAKA:** Thank you very much for that introduction, and I welcome you all to the second review work party meeting. KC and I have been holding at least a series of previous meetings trying to discuss the way forward and how we are going to be able to conduct our reviews, but also a brief highlight of what transpired.

There was a change to the scoping on the requirements of the reviews work party, and following all this, a substantial amount of work has been done regarding to the review of the recommendations of the ATRT2 report that came in.

Following the previous works that transpired, a spreadsheet was created whereby each of the individual team members of the ATRT3 team were given different sections of the recommendations such that they could be able to analyze and critique the level of implementation of the respective document.

---

*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.*

---

Following a series of discussions together with the review work party leader, that is KC and I, KC happened to conduct a scoping of the first draft of the report, which she is going to be able to lead us through the different respective mockups of the document that was shared initially on the list.

So I'd like to hand over to KC such that we can go through the different documents. Is there any questions from the members of the call Who'd like to have clarifications?

Okay. Seeing no response, let me hand over to KC, the coleader of the work party.

KC CLAFFY: I'm sorry for not totally understanding the process here, but which part of the document? Because I have comments throughout the document. Do you want me to focus only on a certain section of the document today?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: KC, I think for the moment right now, let's go through the document from where it probably starts, because it'll give us a clear understanding where there is need for clarifications and discussions. We could probably proceed and we get at least a clear understanding. KC, please.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Again, I sort of came back in from being a bit out of the loop for a while, and I just thought it better for context to read the whole

---

document as it stood, the URL that was sent out, and try to map the text that I see in the document and the spreadsheet that was used to do assessment of whether the previous recommendations were implemented and effective, and so I did that.

I had a bunch of comments on the document that I've put in a Google doc. I wasn't sure that's even the right way for me to do it, but Daniel said that's the best way to proceed at that time. So I had actually a bunch of confusion about how the assessments were done, because the text that I saw in the Google doc didn't match the Google spreadsheet, or at least I don't understand how we got from the cells of the spreadsheet to so and so recommendation was implemented or implemented as much as it could be.

So the first place I had an issue with it was in section 3.2 of the Google doc. I guess it's the same, because I have not read this 3.9 version that just came out or that I just saw, and I'll go read that, but I think 3.2 of the version 2.7, which is on [inaudible] the same as 3.2 of the current version.

The recommendation here was the board should develop [objective] measures for determining quality of board members and the success of board improvement efforts and analyze findings over time.

So the implementation text says here that they have not done the analysis that's mentioned in the recommendation, and yet the last sentence is it was implemented. And the sentence before says, implemented as much as it could be implemented. That seems inconsistent with me, so I don't know if it's just a writing issue and

---

Bernard's going to fix it, but I think it's saying the opposite of what the assessment is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I butt in, please? Because first of all, I'm in two calls at once, and Daniel should know that [inaudible]. But aside from that, that's not what I'm seeing on the screen. So just to help my [inaudible] operation, it would be really helpful if you show on your screen what KC is referring to. Otherwise, I have to open another computer and another screen and open up the document she marked up individually, which to be honest I'm already in two screens and two computers now, I would prefer not to.

So can we just get to [inaudible] markup is on screen? Because what's being talked about is in fact not what I'm seeing. Thank you. Back to you, KC.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry, I'm doing the screen share today. I had to leave that on my screen, I was sharing the document that KC was talking about which is the Google document version 3.9 section 3.2 recommendation 1.

---

KC CLAFFY: It is the section that I'm talking about, but I don't know if what Cheryl was referring to is that she wants to see my comments on that section, which were in a previous version.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We've also got –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] which is probably why I was finding it difficult when I'm in fact also in two calls. So yeah, that would be it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So what we should be displaying is I didn't touch the comments you've put in the Google doc, KC. Second, we just got in Daniel's e-mail a few minutes ago, your marked up version in PDF, which is maybe something we should go through which has comments on most of the sections.

Third, I sent out a few minutes ago version 3.9, and in there, I explained that if things are in highlight yellow, they haven't been finalized.

Pat commented yesterday that KC keeps saying she doesn't understand the process, and what we've been doing is as we go through various chunks of this, we close it. We did, for your information, about a month and a half or two while you were absent on the Google spreadsheet which generated the assessments of ATRT2 and closed that down.

---

Then after closing that down, we moved to the survey results when the document got longer. Well, I should back up. The assessments for the ATRT2 implementations were copied from the Google doc spreadsheet into the document. That's what we've got there, including the assessments.

And then as we worked with various groups through those ATRT2 recommendations in the various subgroups, we generated some conclusions for some of them and finalized those.

Then we moved on to the survey results where we started working on them last week, and the ones we went through, noted the comments and closed those down.

Now, the version 3.9 which was sent today highlights in yellow all the sections which are not finalized, and also has color coded conclusions with respect to if they seem to say there will be no suggestion or recommendation, if there will be a suggestion, if there will be a recommendation, or if it's unclear at least to me if it's a suggestion or a recommendation that's coming.

What we will be doing on the call this week, which is tomorrow, we will be using this version 3.9 to finish going over the survey results for sections 3.10 and 12, which are the final ones we need to do. But 3 is a long one, so that will take us some time. We're also going to try to approve section 6 and 9, section 6 because it's very short, and as far as we can see, there will be no recommendation 6 and 9 on ATRT2 is not dealing with any specific ATRT2 recommendation but about the

---

reporting on implementation. And that text has been worked and we're trying to see if we can close that down.

Now, what you will also see in version 3.9 is that I've basically said that there is nothing in section 10, which is the reviews section, which is closed off, nor have we done, as I said, the survey results. So those all have a bit of highlight sallow on all of them.

So that's where we are, and I should also note saw you had some comments on sections 1 and 2. Those are completely open, those are placeholders right now and we will definitely have to go through those once we get a little further in the document.

So that's what I can tell you as to the process up until now, where we are, and which explains where 3.9 is at. And I'll turn it back over to you. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Someone has to tell me what the process is going forward, because I'm more confused than I was ten minutes go. What do you want me to do today?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. If I can. I'm not sure that I will put some light or some more obscurity, but I guess we are in a difficult situation here, because part of

---

the group and leadership team and Bernard saying that we already closed things, and you are right, I will say in principle, but we all in this group are driving a car and we are not driving at the same speed.

And it seems that there are some people – KC and maybe myself in some other part of the document – we are late, and we still would like to give some input on something that some other consider to be closed.

If I take the example of the first topic we were discussing – and I know quite well because it's in the board part – yes, there were no comments on what was written before KC give the comment. And when I say no comments, it's not totally right because I disagree with what is written, but I say it before and when it was discussed. Not really discussed. Nobody say something again then it gets through.

If you remember, I said that we need to say the same thing as the second recommendation, and it's not what we have done.

Now, why I leave this part going away, it's for KC that -I consider that it's not so important in the overall document and I need to spend energy and time on that one, and I think that we have enough to do in other part. But I get that it's important that we hear KC giving her inputs on the different part of the document, even if you consider that it's already closed, because if not, we will not hear one point of view with some of the member of the group, and it will come one day or another and I think it would be wrong in how we manage the process.

And at the same time, I understand that we need to go ahead, but it's not too late from my point of view to hear her and her inputs on that,



---

and I hope that we will be able to do it. And if not, I will not be able to explain more what is the current process today. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Sébastien. We have Cheryl who would like to say something. Cheryl? Is that your hand up in the chat? Okay. I think we can proceed the discussion. But based on that, I think we need to look at the discussions closely, and the reviews closely such that we are aligned with what is already happening. At least I know it may not be too late, but at least we can still add in something into the document such that we can be able to match the backup that has been done.

So probably, KC, would you like to proceed?

KC CLAFFY:

I don't know if I would like to proceed. I want other people to say if I'm doing the right thing at this point. To be honest, my interpretation of Cheryl's comments yesterday was that the next appropriate time to review these comments from the document that I made that were maybe these comments from the document that I made that were maybe in this category of closed that I did not understand was Singapore. So I don't want to be speaking out of turn if I go over these now and it's not the right process, because I still don't understand what he process is between here and Singapore. But I want to do the right thing here. So someone tell me what that is.

---

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. [It's not something] that is worth to consider here. Let me open up to – Bernard, could you please guide us here, The fact that you already have a draft document and you have these insights that have to be added into the discussion document, and the fact that the first draft of the report had to go through the plenary, is there a way that –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Daniel, can you hear me, or not?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Oh, Cheryl, we can hear you now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am now in the Zoom room twice trying to be heard. It was double muted. I was responding, I did try and speak, and I was about to disconnect and reconnect again.

Okay. Alright. I assume Pat's not here and I'm the only one. Extraordinarily frustrating, so my apologies for that. Good, I can finally be heard, Bernie's telling me. Thank you.

Not everything is going to be discussed again in Singapore, but none of the critical things that we are going to be doing in Singapore would build on our discussions from looking at the survey and reviewing the text that we've gone through.

It's an iterative process, and I hope that that's clear now, KC. I'm most concerned that I keep hearing from Sébastien that we're somehow

---

trying to rush this process or not hear everyone's voice. We're going to enormous lengths to make sure that we do the opposite of that. So I certainly want that on the record, and I want to make sure that that is demonstrable and clearly understood. It is unfortunate that some of the markup from the beginning and earlier on in the document, we simply just haven't got to them yet. So there is an out of ordering which may be adding to the confusion.

But I also am aware that there has been very few review party calls that have been with other than the leaders of the calls. Certainly, this is one of the rare ones where Pat and I have been able to be invited. We usually hear that you have had a call, not that there is a call, and that was also something that probably didn't help us understand what we needed to devote to your work in terms of our plenaries each week.

So we've got a little bit of time between now and Singapore. We've got a bunch of big blocks of data that we'll be analyzing in the plenaries in Singapore, and in some of those plenaries, the markup that KC has done will also come into play, because parts of the work are being done there.

I guess we could work to try and find a timely and effective way through this, but after Singapore, we will have near complete drafting being done in the next block of time.

And just to remind you all that no one voice is the one that [flies.] All of the markup language needs to be discussed or agreed before it would make it into any end document. And of course, that is what happened when the plenary went through all of the ATRT review pieces, for

---

example, I reviewed, I think, four or five ATRT recommendations. I formed an opinion based on my analysis, and then that analysis was subject to peer review and discussion, and it's the results of that that have gone into the document. So there might also be a little bit of a disconnect there as well.

Hopefully, that's helped, and other than that, we are now going to be taking this call back to you. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. That was helpful. I do hear Bernard saying that a lot of his text is closed, so I'm still not sure what is the best use of this call today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Unfortunately, neither am I at this point. [This all] seems to be an exact repeat of what] we did in the leadership team meeting. But –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: If I may.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. What I'm seeing now, KC, is really the best way forward I would recommend. There is a version 3.9 in Google Docs and there's a Word version there too, and there's a PDF. So everything that's highlighted in

---

Yellow is not closed. So maybe what I would suggest as the best use of your time and everybody else's time is that you either, preferably on the Google doc or on the Word doc, go through the things that are highlighted in yellow which are open. If you've got comments, make them in the doc or prepare yourself for when we will be going over them to make those comments, and then you will be part of that process for finalizing those items.

I think that's the simplest thing. I don't want to keep it complicated. I think that actually working with various things which are essentially closed and trying to reopen them, we will give that a shot if we have time. Certainly, we'll go over that in Singapore if we have time.

But right now, also part of what's driving this is we need to have a document out for public comment December 10th. And you start chopping up the time and basically we've got to come out of Singapore with a very clear idea of what our recommendations will be. So what we're doing right now is trying to tackle all the things that are left open which we haven't gone through, which is why I coded the document in highlight yellow so that we're clear on what all those items are. So we need to get a first pass through everything.

And then once we've got a first pass through everything and their conclusions, then we can start having an idea of where there are going to be recommendations and suggestions to be made. Some of the conclusions are quite leading as far as a recommendation or a suggestion, but as we discussed – and I don't remember if you were on that call, KC – the requirements for recommendations are significantly increased with the new rules for reviews, and those are included, the

---

shorthand for all that is required is in the recommendation sections of each of the points.

So making a recommendation is going to be a lot of work, a recommendation, because there's a lot of things to fill in. And before you get to that, if you read the documents, the burden of proof to generate a recommendation is also nonnegligible, so we're going to have to go from what we have to documenting everything that we need to make a recommendation and then building the recommendation with all the required parts of it, which is going to be a fair amount of time.

So when we were looking at chopping all of this up and getting to a version for public comment on December 10th when we reorganize the schedule, this is how it fell out, and one of the things that we decided was that we would not spend an inordinate amount of time on ATRT2 recommendations and that we would do a light assessment of those, I believe, is what we were talking about, in part because there has been a sea change given the transition and the upcoming implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations. There are over 100 recommendations in Work Stream 2, some of which touch on some of this stuff.

So plowing that all together, we get back to what I was suggesting is – KC, if you want to focus your efforts right now on the things that are in highlight yellow, we will welcome your input and we will have discussions on that, and we will come to decisions and then we'll finalize all those items. And if we have time – it's unfortunate you won't be coming to Singapore, but if we have any leftover time when we finish

---

going through everything, then let's have a look at your marked-up documents and maybe we can address some of those other questions. I think that's the best way forward I can think of, but I'm certainly open to other suggestions. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Just from Pat and my perspective, we're trying to balance continued progress of the whole group and make sure that the work party input is properly integrated. So anything you and Daniel can do to make sure that the work that all of your team has done is properly integrated, obviously, we want to focus on.

But rather than the nuances of certain checks, especially on an earlier draft, if we can focus on, as Bernie is saying, the yellow bits, recognize that the reason we've gone through the light touch approach which was agreed on because the whole of the working group is that some of these recommendations could never be made anymore. We need to recognize that and make sure that all future [inaudible] recommendations are appropriately, effectively, transparently and accurately dealt with and reported on by the organization. So we've got to be forward thinking in that.

So you will see in our discussion an awful lot of what we would like to, under normal circumstances, have had as a recommendation from ATRT3 just not make the bar to be a recommendation and become a suggest, in some cases a strongly suggest.

So as you're going through, KC, in a forward thinking approach that's just a pure audit one, [inaudible] obviously, but particularly, think where

---

we can, based on that new criteria that recommendations need to meet and that we [inaudible] we would work with – as the beta testers, by the way, which is [not fun,] – we might [not] be able to make a capital R Recommendation on something, and if we can highlight that out as a different color or something, a slightly [inaudible] markup, that’s going to be extremely valuable, and we’ll probably need to make it a “suggest” or “strong suggest” because it does need to be picked up. It shouldn’t occur again because of what we can observe, but we can't make it a capital R Recommendation because it’s just not coming through some of the criteria.

And if we color code those differently, I think we’ll also be able to have an ore powerful end product, and that’s definitely what we want to try and get out of this – I'm assuming everybody agrees on this call – a more powerful end product. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY:

Hi. Okay. I don’t see any yellow in the document, Bernard. I'm looking at the one that you just sent out, so maybe you could say which sections are actually yellow, or indeed maybe a mail should go out to the list on which sections to comment on.

I definitely never saw any kind of “We’re closing this text, everyone put in their current concerns if you have any concerns about it.” But I'm definitely hearing now –



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We haven't made any consensus calls, KC. Don't think of this as the same as a small party working up a document and throwing it over the fence to be read and then a call for comments. That's not [inaudible] progressing. There's still an iteration. There are [full texts] which are not as vital to wordsmith. [inaudible] that really have to be wordsmithed, and that's where the [inaudible] document is going to be. If we can then go back and go through and get eyes [inaudible] later, then fine, but it's only after all of that happens that we have a draft document, and it's post-draft document that we would be looking at in any consensus call.

So there is no "You'd missed a consensus call" because there isn't a consensus call. Just to be clear on that.

KC CLAFFY: Got it. Okay. I do have Bernard saying this text is closed. Maybe we'll have time to go look at your comments if we have time but these are not a priority. So I'm definitely getting mixed messages from Bernard and Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Part of it is because some of us feel like we're being dragged backwards. That's why, KC. And I understand your frustration. I hope you understand ours, that you and Daniel are one of four work parties, so there's a lot of people who – unfortunately Sébastien can attest to – signed up to each of your work parties that simply are not joining and are not contributing. But they are coming to plenary.

---

So they're having their say, even though they're sitting in your work party, during plenary. And we have to recognize that that's okay. But we also have to manage their inputs via that pathway as well. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY:

Okay. So again, the issues I have are not wordsmithing. The issues I have are when there's a recommendation that we've assessed as implemented and I can't find any evidence in this spreadsheet that it's actually been implemented. And sometimes it even says in the text it has not been implemented. So I think there's definitely some issues that have to be reviewed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. [inaudible] implemented. The different classes of implemented in the document are allocated in the document. There's the use of the term implementation by the Org and in the report of October 2018. At least two thirds of those, even though all of them were listed as implemented, are probably partially or implemented but ineffectively implemented by our analysis.

The remainder are a mix of not implemented at all - [inaudible] bloody ridiculous reactions – and, oh, well, yeah, absolutely, it's probably as good as it can be. But it would never be this way based under the new criteria.

So we use the terminology. Our own “implemented” is vastly different to ICANN Org’s reporting on implemented. So we need to be very clear on that as well.

---

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Agreed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] to make sure that that's clear to the reader. Bernie, can you make a side note on that? Because when they come across [inaudible] non-English speakers as well.

KC CLAFFY: I'm sorry, I think that is clear to the reader. I didn't mean to imply that it wasn't clear. I'm not trying talking about ICANN Org's assessment of implemented, I'm talking about the review team's assessment not matching the analysis text. But again, I don't want to use this call for something that's inappropriate.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I just noticed that the Google Doc version didn't carry the colors through. If you look at the PDF that's in the Wiki, it did carry it through. I'll look to see if we can fix that for the Google Doc after this call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, we are appending the working doc as well. It's becoming an appendix, isn't it?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: The working doc, question mark.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry. Please remember I'm being called on another call to respond there too. The documents that we use are spreadsheets for our analysis. We spent – was it three, four weeks? Analyzing all of this.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Six weeks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: After everyone did their individual homework. That document where all of our comments and everything else, and all that is going to be, in raw form, in the appendix, correct?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That is correct, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Can I also then suggest that on that appendix, you would link the [inaudible] recording of the deliberations on each of those calls? And that would also help anyone who, like KC, is looking for an evidential base for everything.

KC CLAFFY: That would be great.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, great. Yes, so the PDF that was attached to the e-mail I sent for 3.9, you will see the colors. I'll try to beat on Google Docs to see if I can get it into – obviously the text transferred, the colors did not. [It's bulking.] I think when we get to some larger documents with some of the options, it's trickier.

So yeah, I think this is where we are right now. So best use of everyone's time, I think, is on this version 3.9, make your comments on things that are open. Don't use the Google doc now, I'll post an update on that to see if we can get the color coding in. But you can certainly see it in the PDF that was sent and the PDF has been posted to the Wiki also if you need that link.

And then we will finish plowing through the things that we need to finish plowing through, and those things are open and we'll go through everyone's comments on those and try an finalize them before we hit Singapore. Does that make sense?

KC CLAFFY: So now I see in the PDF you've got red, yellow, blue, green. You only want comments on the yellow text? Sometimes the yellow is just a question. You mean everything in the section that has the yellow?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You'll see there are two yellows. There's one yellow that is sort of a creamy, softer yellow, and then there's the official highlight, bright, scream at you yellow. The bright, highlight, scream at you yellow is the indication that a section is not closed.

---

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So everything in that section.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, everything in the heather that's highlighted or the whole thing that's highlighted is open.

KC CLAFFY: So I don't understand. 3.2.4.1, please indicate your satisfaction with the board's performance. That's in yellow. What does that mean you want feedback on?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Let me pop that up.

KC CLAFFY: The first yellow thing in the document. Page 14.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, the first yellow thing in the document is actually on page eight, which is the conclusion to recommendation four. So we've got a draft conclusion there and we'll be going over that one.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So you see that yellow is standard highlight yellow. And if we go down, I'll try to find a softer yellow for you.

KC CLAFFY: Actually, tell me about page 14. Does that header mean everything in that section is to be commented on? All the way up to ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, that's right. Everything under that indent is then covered by that. This being said, responses, the numbers are what they are from the survey.

KC CLAFFY: Sure, of course.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And the comments are what they are. The analysis is what I've done with the numbers, but it's usually fairly straight forward. And the thing to be discussed is usually the conclusion.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So if we go then down to the next one on page 16, how does your structure feel regarding the board's interaction, that's yellow, so everything under that has not been gone through and we will be going through it on tomorrow's call, actually. It's on the list as section three for survey.

KC CLAFFY: Alright. And then one comment, because I really like Cheryl's idea of linking to the mp3, I wonder if you could actually link to the transcript of the call for each of the – I guess it's the spreadsheet cells that discussed a given recommendation assessment. Just link to the transcript where it was discussed and then that would make it really easy to go find that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, that would make it easy, and that would probably take us a couple of weeks to get that done. We don't have the time to do that right now. I don't think there were that many calls on which we discussed. There were probably six or eight, and if the leadership decides that they want us to put the resources into that, then we can look into that. But right now, that's a big ask.

So when we have time, we'll look into that, but right now –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, the only thing – and it is basically a matter of if staff had time to look at the Wiki records – and remember, all of our meetings and agendas, including the recordings [of our meetings] are on the Wiki – is if they [need to] go through the agendas, see which weeks these were



---

on – and that’s not impossible, but they're trying to get a lot of other stuff done – and then do a small grouping of those links to those meetings.

If by chance Jennifer or someone has time to do that, great, but Pat and I will – Brenda, if you can make sure that gets picked up – or [I can't even see if she's] on the call. I'm assuming she is. If we can discuss that at the next leadership team and see what the resulting would be for that, we'll take that on advisement.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks. I just wanted to confirm that we can certainly look into that and discuss it further on Monday. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that, Jennifer. I appreciate it. working off mobile phones because that’s what I've resorted to to try and get audio into this call means I can't actually see who the participants are or anything while I have a chat screen open. So my apologies for not knowing [inaudible] here. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Okay, so KC, that request will be discussed at the Monday meeting in the leadership. In the meantime, I will be working trying to get those colors from the PDF into the Google Doc. I will post something on that hopefully when I get that done, and that’s about it, I guess, unless we've got something else.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Bernard, for that. I can see a couple of action points that have come up. I think we're running out of time. We're left with approximately 12 minutes. Bernard, can you walk us through what are the next action points that the review team has to go through regarding the analysis of the survey results?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, as noted in the agenda, survey results will be going through section 3, 10 which concerns you because it's the reviews, and section 12 on the call tomorrow on Wednesday. So we'll be going through all the survey results and the draft conclusions on those.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: So that is section 3 and section 12 of the survey results, right?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Survey results for sections 3, 10 and 12.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. I think that is fine then. I think we're going to work as the review work party to look at those respective sections and probably I'm going to ask, if possible, we can have a call. KC, when do you think we can be able to schedule the next call such that we discuss the survey results of those respective sections?

---

KC CLAFFY: Before tomorrow at 2:00 PM Pacific?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm not sure.

KC CLAFFY: I can do it noon tomorrow at the same time as now, maybe. Actually, I take that back. I cannot do that. But we can do it the week after. Tomorrow afternoon is a plenary call, right? So everybody brings their comments.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, that is correct.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Right, it's plenary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Daniel, do try and make sure that you at least engage – they may not turn up, but you've got to continually engage with the rest of your review work party. It's not just up to you and KC. I know you guys are pulling the weight, just the same as is happening in some of the other work parties, but you've still got to outreach to them. So make sure it's times that you at least apprise the rest of your work party, even if they're not turning up. Okay? Thanks.

---

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you. So for that matter, I'm going to request staff that if they're able to schedule a review work party call for the same time the coming week. KC, are you flexible with that?

KC CLAFFY: I would like to get other people on it. So can we have staff send a Doodle out for next week so we give people some warning?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, that could work, but also, we have Ramet and Sébastien on the call who can also give their respective feedback. Would you like to say something?

KC CLAFFY: Did somebody have their hand up? I can't see.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm not seeing anyone. Yeah, I'm asking for the opinions from Sébastien and Ramet who are currently on the call regarding the next way that you can be able to have the next review work party call.

KC CLAFFY: So again, I think I could do 9:00 AM Pacific tomorrow, which is before the plenary, or we could do next Tuesday 9:00 AM Pacific. And/or we can send a Doodle poll around.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I jump in with a little bit of [inaudible]? Because the plenary is tomorrow, I think you're probably pushing it to shoehorn a meeting that's engaging into that 9:00 AM Pacific time slot.

KC CLAFFY: I agree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Therefore, run with the plenary. Most of the people who are on your list turn up to the plenary, even if they're not turning up to work party meetings. And those that are doing both, that's a bonus. But at least you have all gone through – tomorrow's plenary is one of the first time we're getting into the survey result reviews and discussions that will lead to a conclusion, editing [inaudible] easier and work that is specifically involving your work party's activity, this review process.

So it seems to me like despite the degree of saturation from KC's perspective, not quite understanding what's going on, etc., the timing's [inaudible] right now to try and gather the troops and move forward in a positive manner.

So how about you use the plenary as a springboard to then have a far more focused and effective call afterwards? Daniel, does that make sense to you? Because that's certainly what I'm recommending.

---

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, that makes sense, and also, I can see already the chat is that Ramet says that he's okay if we can do the coming week. So I think that will be much more flexible.

KC CLAFFY: Great.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: So let's have that. Let's have that as the next time we [inaudible] session we can have this call to discuss. But also, meanwhile, we shall start to work on probably – shall exchange e-mails on the survey results such that during the time of the discussions, at least we don't spend so much time on discussing the survey results. I hope that works also.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Great.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Alright. Great. I think we have five minutes. Is there anything else that anyone would like to share on the call before we come to the end of the call?

Okay. Cheryl, is that an old hand?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Daniel, I couldn't even tell you which of the three times I've logged into this room that hand is from. I'm just going to jump in if I need audio right now.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. Thank you very much. I think with that, we've come to the end of the call. Jennifer, did you happen to capture any respective action points from this call?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Daniel. I noted the action for Bernie obviously to update the Google document and send that around to the team, and then I noted the action item to set another call for the coming week for this review team. and I have been multitasking trying to share my screen [inaudible] so apologies if I've missed something, but I hope I captured them. Thanks.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much for that. I think with that, we're coming to the end of this call. Thank you. Let's get to the mailing list and see you also tomorrow during the plenary and the next call. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Daniel. Thanks, KC. Now I've got to turn off more computers than I've ever had to use for a single call. The joys of muting, double muting. At one point, can I just share with you people? The automated Zoom phone bot just simply said, "Thank you. Goodbye." And I went,

---

“Really?” It’s either laugh or scream. Okay, back to my other call. Thanks, everyone. Good to see you getting a plan going together. Well done. Bye.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Everyone, just a final note. I think I figured out what was preventing the Google doc from being created. I'm going to work on that, send another link right now so people can comment in that one. Thank you. Bye.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you, Bernie, for that. We shall look at it also too.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

KC CLAFFY: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**