
BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 review work party meeting number one on the 5th of June 2019 at 16:30 UTC.

The members attending the call today at this time are Daniel, KC, and Sébastien. From ICANN Org, we have Jennifer and Brenda. And apologies from Vanda.

Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to state your name before speaking and also mute your line when you're not speaking. And Daniel, I'll turn the call over to you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much for that. I'd like to welcome everyone to this first meeting of the review work party, and I'll be cochairing this meeting together with KC on the call. KC, before we proceed, is there anything that you'd like to share, or we can start off the meeting immediately?

KC CLAFFY: No, I'm good. Let's go.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. This being the very first meeting that we're holding, I'm going to refer back to our task breakdown of the respective Google doc that we're working from for the review work party. I'll paste the link right into the chat. I'll paste the link also, those who are already there, on the agenda can also click directly onto the Google doc.

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.

So if we go straight, I'll start by updating the respective timeline that we have. So far, we have approximately 33% covered. But [the main briefing about] the objectives of the working group is that after the LA meeting, we came up with five objectives which we named as tasks, and the first task was to come up with a qualitative assessment, which is the utility, effectiveness and efficiency of the previous reviews.

Second task was quantitative assessment of the previous review reports and the action item that came out at the Los Angeles meeting was that this task two has to be outsourced to an external party.

Task three was to review the CCWG Accountability outputs related to accountability and transparency.

Task four – which also acts as objective number four – was to analyze the issues of the ongoing reviews, challenges with objectivity, efficiency, effectiveness, and its respective impacts.

And then objective number five was to come up with a request for a systemic review of ICANN bylaws impact and bylaws from the different respective processes.

But despite all that we've come up with the tasks, we've had to go and dive straight away into the breakdown of the respective tasks, the first task being the qualitative assessment that [is for the] effectiveness and efficiency of the previous reviews.

We looked at the ATRT report as the first action item, and in these action items, we will be making an assessment about ICANN implemented issue [recommendation] of the ATRT2.

As we proceed with that respective action item, there are key questions that came up regarding to the ATRT report. And during this meeting, we shall be vetting out which sections we shall work on as the review work party, and then the others that we shall be able to recommend to the other various parties.

[I'll wait on the same page] for those who are on the call right now as I proceed. Sébastien, I see your hand's up. You have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Daniel. It seems that we are running a marathon and you are already 39 kilometers ahead of me. And it's my fault, of course, because I don't run as quick as you. But I was thinking that we will first start with the terms of reference, but you maybe already have done that in previous call, but as it's the first one – and I want to be sure that that's a done deal or not, because here you are going into some details, and that's good, but I am lost in translation totally.

KC CLAFFY:

Maybe it's useful if the host – or I forget who's displaying right now, but you could just display the current terms of reference. I'd have to go dig up the URL. And we could zoom down to the part of it that is about the reviews work party and just make sure we're all on the same page about the terms of reference there.

What is it now, June? Two months ago, we were in LA together, Sébastien, and I thought we have kind of gotten some consensus on the piece of the terms of reference that was about this review work party.

And when I look at the terms of reference there now, I think that part is more or less the same. But I don't trust my memory, so maybe one of you guys could tell me how much it has changed. So we're not on the right URL right now, and I don't know if Daniel or –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But, sorry, I –

KC CLAFFY: Jennifer just posted the terms of reference. Thank you, Jennifer. Sorry, Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. But there is no page where the terms of reference from this work party is somewhere. It's not on the general terms of reference. Just because in the other group I am working on, we are not yet finished with the terms of reference, because the discussion with the other working party made me think that we need to make some additional point to be accurate.

But if you think that what came out from Los Angeles is okay and don't need to be revisit, that's okay. It just, as it's the first call, would have been useful to start by the beginning and where we are in each point of the document, like the term of reference, and then the requests to the staff to gather information, and then to where you are, I guess.

And then once again, it's not out of criticism, it's just for me to understand where we are, and I see that you are going very fast, and that's good. No problem.

KC CLAFFY:

No, I hear you. I agree. We should put up what we believe are the terms that we're operating under, and I'm going to go – and I'll be honest, it may be that we didn't think these things through enough, that's why I haven't changed them. But let me just post them into the chat room, cutting and pasting from the URL that Jennifer just sent.

So objectives are, one, assess ATRT2, and then the next couple are honestly, I find, pretty comprehensive. And I think one of the versions of these documents says we're going to need outside help to do the quantitative assessment, like walk through each of these other reports, and try to figure out, okay, what of these recommendations has really been done?

I've done a first pass over ATRT2, the report, and indeed, the ATRT2 report itself did a review of many of the review teams that came before, like SSR1 – no, not SSR1 because it didn't exist then. Yeah, it did, actually. ATRT2 did actually review SSR1 recommendations, so that would have been in, I forget, a couple years after SSR1 happened. And then obviously, it reviewed ATRT zero – ATRT1's recommendations.

So some of that is in the appendix to this 280-page document that is the ATRT2 report that Daniel and I have gone through a little bit. But that's a far cry from quantitative and qualitative assessments written down. So I will admit I am a little wary of these terms of reference, not

because I think they're ill-conceived, but because it's all a huge amount of work and we're going to need some outside help to execute on it, I think.

But continuing to go through at a high level, so assessment of ATRT2, assessment of the previous reviews, assessment of the other review – so like the organization reviews that have gone through, and how those recommendations have been handled, RSSAC, SSAC, those just happened last year, NomCom, GNSO, ccNSO, At-Large, ASO.

And then a higher-level bullet, which is analyze issues with ongoing reviews, and I think we did talk a bit about this in LA. So I think I'm still fine with that, in fact I think we'll be getting feedback from the whole team, not just this work party on that topic. And then the last one is investigate the possibility of [proposed] systemic review of [inaudible] noisy.

Okay, so that's it. That's all the terms of reference that we're operating on. And I will say, just going back to the first one because I think Daniel's drilled down on that, in order for us to really assess ATRT2's recommendations, we're going to have to interact with the other work parties, because the way ATRT2 is written, you have a set of recommendations that are directed at the board, a set of recommendations that are directed at the GAC, a set of recommendations directed at the community, and all of those, I feel, the way those recommendations were all written, they come under the sort of jurisdiction of the other work parties. So it would be at least duplicative effort to have us t registry to do those independently, and I

think it's worse than that because I don't think we're in as good a position to assess those recommendation implementations.

So part of what I think Daniel wants to get accomplished today is, one, a recognition that part of that work will have to be delegated to other work parties, even if Daniel and I are joining those other work parties, just for the purposes of having that conversation with the people that are thinking about the other constituencies, the board, the GAC and the community, and I think the other thing Daniel wanted to get done today was just getting on the table of what else he thinks is going to be needed, what sort of questions do we need to be asking other folks inside ICANN and in the community. And he also has a list of questions he's already asked that were still waiting for answers to. Dan, did I leave anything out for the high-level intro?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: No, you're doing great. That was great, KC. Yeah. [Is that to react to – Sébastien's hand is up.]

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, Sébastien, now that this terms of reference for our work party – my understanding of the part of the terms of reference that is relevant to this work party is on the Zoom window now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I can ...

KC CLAFFY: Yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, KC, and thank you, Daniel. Thank you for your update or reassessment of what it was in the TOR. I have the following feedback: the first one is I think when I see the second bullet point, ATRT, I don't know what it is. Is it ATRT1, 2, 3, or all of them?

And after your explanation, I will put outside of the specific review, I will put outside ATRT for the reason you raise – you're on the line – is that we are ATRT3, and ATRT1 and 2 must have done something even if it's not similar but split into different arena who can be taken care by the other work party. Therefore, I suggest that ATRT must deal in one single place, and maybe it's a first bullet point with adding, if needed, ATRT1 if it's a need.

Therefore, there is specific reviews, except ATRT, they are the organizational reviews, all of them, and the CCWG on accountability, who is not a review. I think it could be more line, more focused on – I know that the bullet point two and four, some parts are similar, SSR1, SSR2. Why we are talking about SSR1? We may not have to, because it was already done by ATRT2. Therefore, what we need is to build on what has happened in ATRT1, ATRT2, and not redo the work. That's my impression reading after a long time this again. And I totally agree with you that it could be useful to put as a sub-bullet point, the first one, that there will be work to be done with GAC work party, board work party and with the community work party, because it will show that there are links here with taking that into account. And if you go to the sub-bullet

point, of course, we will have to work also with the community work party.

I hope I am not going in the wrong direction.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Sébastien, for that respective input. [inaudible] reaction is probably – I think I suggest that the second task, which is qualitative and quantitative assessment of effectiveness of the previous reviews, since we are going to be assigning it to an external party to work on that, I don't know whether I should be able to include it. But also, looking at objective number four, which is to analyze the issues with ongoing reviews, I think that is a point whereby we shall be able to come to when we go step by step working on the respective objectives.

I'm seeing Tola's hand up. Tola, is there something that you'd like to add? You have the floor.

ABDELTOLA SOGBESAN:

Okay. I was going to toe the line of Sébastien in that I've been looking at objective two and four, and a bit conflicting to me. I got a bit of clarity when the introduction was made, however, I remember when our very first meeting, it was stated explicitly, and I think it was even reflected in the terms, objective that was given to us [inaudible]. ATRT1 is totally out of scope, because ATRT2 had already considered it.

I think [we're reminded] not to even go near ATRT1 because some of the things that were contained must have been by dealt with by two. if we toe the line, it therefore implies anything one, SSR1, RDS1 and

ATRT1 would have been considered by ATRT2, in which case if we begin to now look at qualitative and quantitative assessment of the effectiveness, at this point in time, when recommendations for two have already been implemented, I think we'd just be going backwards rather than looking at objective four.

In my opinion, I would think objective two and four can be merged without us going back to any review that was one at all. Thank you. Over to you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Yeah. Thank you very much, Tola, for that insight. I'm going to ask that – could you think that it would be good that – I think based on the feedback that we're having on the call, is that we get rid of objective number two. Would that be a good idea such that we can get consensus of removing that objective and we can be able to proceed? What do the other members think?

KC CLAFFY:

I don't think we should remove it, but I take the point that we could shorten it a bit and maybe not have it be qualitative and quantitative but just say review effectiveness of previous specific reviews. I think it's fine if we take ATRT out, but I don't think we should ignore what the history was with SSR1, RDS1, because I think it needs to inform the higher-level assessment that we're going to be expected to do in number five, that is, what we had decided in LA is that we need a kind of retrospective on what's happened over the last [inaudible] years or

so, not just the previous rounds of reviews but the review system in general. That's my thought.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. Thanks, KC. Let's hear from Sébastien. Sébastien, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. Daniel, you are jumping too quick again to cut something. But I would be more comfortable, I will say, if we write the TOR in the reverse manner, in saying ATRT2 assessment and implementation of recommendation. Specific reviews, quantitative and qualitative assessment, and analyze issue because we are talking about the same reviews.

And the third point is about organizational reviews. It will be, I will say – and sorry for that word – less engineer and more oriented by topic. In terms of reference, I think what's important is what we'll be talking about, and then what we will do about what we are talking about. It's why I suggest that we reverse the sentence and we add together the point two and three to allow – because we are talking about the same reviews. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Sébastien, do you want to make the changes in the Google doc? [That would] make you happy? It'd be easier if I could look at what you're suggesting.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, KC, it's not to make me happy. I am not unhappy. I just try to find a way to be more – but I can try. Okay.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Then I suggest that you go ahead, because it will take me some time, 10-15 minutes, but go ahead with the course of the discussion, and I will try to come back with something a little bit later if you agree.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Great. Okay, Daniel, do you wanna go back –

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Tola, is that an addition or something? Let's hear from Tola, and then we can be able to proceed.

ABDELTOLA SOGBESAN: Alright. Thank you, Daniel. I was going in line with what [Brenda has] said before, looking at objective two much as [don't want us to go] near one, but I'm so interested in the qualitative and quantitative assessment of effectiveness. It's very instructive. The [inaudible] qualitative and quantitative assessment of effectiveness. That word, effectiveness, is very important, and I already know after this last suggestion, if we're

able to [merge] that and ensure we don't lose that word, effectiveness in however we coin it. That's what I just want to add. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Tola, for that. I think we have an action point [inaudible]. The action point is for Sébastien to be able to make the respective changes into the Google doc. But also, that is going to be like an action point that's going to be progressed from Sébastien. I'm going to proceed that let's look at [inaudible] discussions have been, and discussion of the implementation. Review work party's discussion of the recommendations in ATRT2.

There were some questions that were asked [and at least] feedback was given on the discussion thread, but allow me to share that based on some valuable input that [inaudible] working on – [I think we could have gone really so fast] on drafting a quick document regarding the respective responses that are coming in. Let me just simply share that one-pager that came out from the first discussion regarding to the ATRT2 and then the board. I've pasted the link in the chat.

So that outcome came in after discussion on the thread of the discussion one. I hope I'm not losing anyone. If I'm not clear, please feel free to ask me to clarify more. Tola, is that an old hand? Okay. it seems it was an old hand.

So one of the key action points that came in regarding from that first discussion point was that Maarten was to consult with the board on whether [inaudible] board convened a special [inaudible] expertise to discuss options for improving board accountability with regard to

restructuring of the [inaudible] and I'm going to request for staff, for Jennifer, to be able to follow up with that action point in the document.

Jennifer, is that okay with you?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, Daniel. Sure. I note in your document that the action point was for Maarten, but staff, we're working on this, and with our colleagues and talking with them on how best to – it may be useful to get a briefing perhaps from perhaps a board accountability mechanisms committee. that might help to answer some of these questions. But anyway, we acknowledge the request. It's in progress, and certainly, we'll get back to you and keep you posted. Thanks.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Okay. Switch back to the reviews work party document [such that we] got through the extracts of the ATRT2 recommendations, such that we can see which [actions] we can be able to send to the [inaudible] work parties and the questions that came out from that.

Brenda, who's controlling the screen? Brenda or Jennifer. Brenda, could you please change the screen to the reviews work party Google document? It's the first tab.

BRENDA BREWER:

I'm sorry, to which document?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: The reviews work party Google doc, because that's where the extracts of the ATRT2 review recommendations are. Yes, perfect. That one.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda, it's the other tab. That's right. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Right. Yeah. So if you can proceed to – I think it's page 10. [inaudible] from the accountability and transparency [Work Stream.] So if you scroll down – after extracting some key questions that came in from the discussion – stop there – and this [inaudible] to the first discussion that came in, whether the ICANN board responded in a timely manner, and all [this is discussion thread number one.]

And then from there, there was an issue that came up in the second thread. There are three outstanding threads that is regarding to the EPDP, and there was a requested interview with the EPDP previous chair, Kurt, which was also sent to the community work party after a discussion on the thread. Is there any action points that the team thinks that we can be able to jointly collaborate together with the community work party on how we can be able to progress through this since the EPDP issue can both be discussed under the reviews work party and the community work party? Is there any input on this?

I'm going to assume that the silence means no input. Or is there anything that needs to be clarified regarding discussions [inaudible] EPDP that came up in discussion thread, I think number one or number two?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Daniel, if I may, I wanted to clarify, please, if this request, given that it was shared with the community work party for consideration, if this is still a request that you would like ICANN Org to help with in terms of setting up a discussion with Janis and Kurt, the previous EPDP chair? Is this something that still – you would like us to move forward with? Daniel, did you hear my question?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Sorry, my microphone was on mute. I said yes, that is something that we'd like to proceed, but also, we have Sébastien's hand up. Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Daniel, maybe you can explain to me why you want something about EPDP be dealing with in this work party, because it's not a review, and therefore I really think that it must be –we have already a lot on our plate for the review. Then why adding EPDP with a policy development process, not a review at all? Therefore I really think that we need to take that out of our scope and to send it to community work party or who else you want, but not here anymore. We can't hear you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Sorry. Previously, we had [inaudible] discussion to the community, and that was something that we have to hear in the [joint] call that we shall be able to have [the whole community] about why we sent this recommendation to the community. I think that works best [inaudible]

I'm just open for options [item] on the ATRT2 report. So I'm going to take this as an [agreement] that the EPDP discussion will be – this is something that you'd want to add on to the EPDP discussion?

KC CLAFFY: What's the question? I understand Sébastien's question, and again, I'll confess – I thought this was talked about in LA. So my understanding was that that communication with Kurt, the EPDP interview kind of thing, was going to be a joint thing with reviews and the community work party. Is that what you just said, Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, because that was the discussion that we [inaudible] to the community work party.

KC CLAFFY: Right. So maybe, Sébastien, the answer is that we're not leading it but we're going to be participating in the interview with Kurt.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, but I have no problem that everybody will participate to any discussion, but I think here really that we need to stick with our objective. And even in the TOR, we don't talk about EPDP.

I know it's something that came out during the LA meeting, but the goal now is to just know what we need to do, and as you say rightly at the beginning, KC, we will not have time to do everything. And frankly, EPDP, I don't see what us as a work party, and even the ATRT3, will say about that. It's not yet done, it's still under discussion with phase two, but it's why I consider that it must be outside of our scope completely in this work party. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Sébastien, for that. So I think let's get a consensus that we shall not [be able to handle this] as part of our work of the reviews work party. Do we all agree with that? So [inaudible]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I didn't get [inaudible] what you said.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: [inaudible] I'm going to proceed to the next item.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am sorry, Daniel, it was not –

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Such that we can be able to discuss [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I couldn't understand what you say. It was not ...

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Sorry. What I'm saying is that based on the feedback that we're having on the call, the issue of the EPDP shall not be discussed by this work party, but we shall wait for clarifications from the community work party. So the silence will mean consensus that this issue be left alone, and then we proceed to the next question on the document. Is that okay, Sébastien, or is that more clear? Great, thank you very much, Sébastien, for that input.

So still on page 11, there is a question that is, does the board ensure in its budget that sufficient resources are allocated for review teams to fulfill their mandates? This is a question that the review team would have to pose to the board. Would we consider this question as part of the reviews work party, or we can be able to forward this question to another group such that they can be able to handle it?

[inaudible] discussion for that. Sébastien. You agree? What do you agree to?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

It was the previous question. You asked me a question, I answer. And sorry, I am not so quickly to put it out. And by the way, what document you are talking about? I don't have the link [inaudible] document. I am completely lost now. I spent time to do what was requested, but what is the document you are talking about? Where is the link?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

We are looking at the reviews work party document that is currently on the screen. Probably, Brenda, you can scroll down to that question. Scroll down a bit. Yes, that's the question. So, this is the question that if you look at the question that has been highlighted, does the board ensure that its budget – that sufficient resources are allocated for reviews? So we need to identify where we shall be able to ask this question, whether this question will go to staff, or we shall forward this question to one of the review work parties that can be able to handle this. In case it is not within the scope of the reviews work party, then we shall send it respectively to the work party that will be able to handle this. Is there any reaction to this question? In case there is no reaction to this question, then the reviews work party will consider this question for the board. Is there any reactions to the question?

Okay, I'm taking silence for agreement that the reviews work party will forward this question for the board. Then let us proceed to the next question. Could you please scroll down? Brenda. So still, in reaction to the ATRT recommendations in reference to the CCT, has the board addressed the IRT review team recommendations in clear and [unambiguous] manner? I think this question still goes to staff such that they can be able to give us a respective answer regarding the review team. And since we are looking at the review of the reviews, this question will go to staff such that we can be able to get clarification to that. Jennifer, does that sound good, or any member of the team would like to agree on that or disagree on that, or provide different remarks regarding to the question?

Assuming that there is no reaction, Jennifer, I think that you should take that as an action point to answer whether the board answered the [IRT]

review team recommendations in a clear and unambiguous manner. Is that clear, Jennifer,

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, Daniel. So number 11.6 in the document is what I have taken as an action item for staff to answer.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Proceeding to question in 12.2, [noncompetitive] environment. The question comes, are expected increases in the income of ICANN reflected in the priority of activities and pricing of services? And [inaudible] is a question that the review team can be able to submit to staff. Is that clear? Sébastien, you have your hand up. Please proceed. Sébastien, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. Can we come back to the CCT and address AOC, affirmation of commitment?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes. Sure. Please. You can go back to that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: What is AOC? What does it mean in this sentence?

KC CLAFFY: Guys, I think I can answer that. I think there's some context missing here. I think what Daniel is doing is starting to walk through so we're in our terms of reference item one, which is evaluate the ATRT2 implementation, and one of the things in there is one of the things in the ATRT2 document was the board should address all of the AOC.

Now, AOC is a historic term now. That's about the affirmation of commitment stuff. Review team recommendations in a clear and unambiguous manner. The CCT reference is maybe a typo in there, because my point was when I circled this in the ATRT2 report, I said, "Does this apply to the CCT recommendations?" So to some extent, this throws us down into what used to be bullet four of the terms of reference, which is the issues with ongoing specific reviews, the CCT review where we saw a bit of tension about the way that the board responded to the recommendations in the CCT report.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's exactly my point. We have already the answer. The answer is no. Then we have to make some work with the CCT chair, CCT review chair, and maybe even if it's still written affirmation of commitment, we need to update that and what is the current situation, because I am sorry but I will say that if I am lost on that acronym, I can tell you that nobody will understand.

KC CLAFFY: Right. These are just notes for this communication. I'll edit the document right now, and I want to make sure we put a link to the original document that all this stuff is from. So we're well into the

weeds here. I don't know if this is the right time for us to be going down and doing this, although I think we do need to eventually, or Daniel should pop back up into let's make sure that ICANN staff understands if there's outstanding things we need for them, they understand them, and also, to the extent that we need to now spin off joint meetings with each of the other work parties, we try to get those on the agenda to schedule them now.

Otherwise, I'm happy to keep going through these notes, but it might be that Daniel and I should clean them up a little more first.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I can.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, please, Sébastien. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I have the impression that once again, you are ahead of us definitely, but if we are here, it's why? It's to tease you on something, it's to tell you what we think? What is the goal? What do you want from us? I have the impression that I'm an elephant in the porcelain shop, and not maybe the best way to interact with you. What you need from us, from Tola and me who are the ones who have less work on that issue than you, Daniel and KC?

KC CLAFFY: Do either of you operate on any of the other review teams?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I am the leader of the board one.

KC CLAFFY: Right. So I think that's the most valuable thing you could do for us, is go on a separate call maybe or on your own, go through the ATRT2 document, and we can send you the version that we've marked up, and highlight all the recommendations that are related to the board that you think the board should be evaluating. And we'd like all of the other work parties to do the same thing, and then the ones that are left that are not under the jurisdiction of another work party, those are what are left in our work party to do.

So we don't need to use the rest of this call. We can give people five minutes back. But that would be the homework I'd like each of you, to the extent that you're on other work parties, could you be the liaison to the other work parties and convince those guys to take on some of this ATRT2 report evaluation? Does it make sense?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, totally, KC. Yes, it makes sense. What I suggest is that maybe staff can write an action item saying that ATRT2 document underlined by this work party must be sent to the full group and with a request from each work party to have a look and take the underlined part [who they will deal with.] And maybe it's not the right English, but that's what you were suggesting, and I think it's a very good idea.

We need to have that at the next plenary session saying, hey, guys, we have done that at the review working party and we want you to do that in the next two weeks or one week or two months, whatever.

KC CLAFFY: That would be wonderful.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Sébastien, for that. I think what we should do, I think let us set an action point for probably in the next two weeks such that we can be able to get feedback regarding this respective document, because this is a big document, and [inaudible] should be added on this?

KC CLAFFY: Maybe we're done for today for this.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: We're coming towards the end of the hour. So, [inaudible]? KC, I didn't hear you.

KC CLAFFY: I didn't say anything. I'm okay. I think go back to the agenda.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Sébastien, please go ahead.

KC CLAFFY: If Jennifer could [inaudible] could repost the agenda, what is left on the agenda for us to cover today?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say, KC and Daniel, that I have done what you asked me at the beginning of the call.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, yeah. Why don't we look at that, actually?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay, I'm seeing Sébastien's hand up. Sébastien, you have something to say, or that's an old hand?

KC CLAFFY: Okay, here, Jennifer is going to do it here. Let's go back to the terms of reference, because he edited it, and I'd like to see what he did. Okay. This one looks fine to me.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I didn't clean up the English, and [inaudible] in two brackets because I didn't find how to have it cross-ATRT. I think we need to take it off, but I didn't want to do it without telling you. But I didn't find in Google doc how you can cross letters.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, it's called strikethrough. It's somewhere in there.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe, but I put two brackets like that, you know it was the meaning.

KC CLAFFY: Yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And maybe you need to review it for – I am not sure about the English sentence how it's organized, but somebody will do it anyhow, even if it's not us, and it will be okay.

KC CLAFFY: Again, the only reason I think ATRT1 needs to be mentioned in this report is to the extent that ATRT2 found issues that are related to accountability and transparency with the execution of ATRT1 recommendations, I think we should mention them.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Then you don't leave ATRT, leave ATRT1.

KC CLAFFY: Alright. Fine.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have no problem with that, but ATRT is one through three.

KC CLAFFY: I think it was a typo. I think it should say one.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Sorry.

KC CLAFFY: I thought your point was you don't think even one should be in there.
Okay, fine. We agree.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will make the change for ATRT1 immediately.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Now, Sébastien, you're in the other work party. So what is the process when you change the terms of reference draft?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: For the moment, the process is that we need to be agreeing this work party, and then to put it, but it is already on the [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Okay, so you guys, you and Daniel will take it to the leader call on Monday that I don't generally get to. I'm fine with it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess the question – let’s take 24 hours or 48 hours to be sure that we all agree with that. If we all agree with that, we will strike the previous version. We’re still just on top of that, because I just add a new proposal. But if we agree with that, we will strike the other one.

KC CLAFFY: Fine. Yeah. Okay, we’re at the top of the hour. Should we review actions?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes. Sure. I think we can review the action points. Jennifer, please go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. So I noted the ATRT2 document with the markup that KC and Daniel worked on should be sent to the whole group. Staff can do that with a request for each work party to mark the areas they want to cover in their each respective work parties.

Then I noted a couple of the questions. The EPDP interview with Kurt and Janis will be joint with reviews and community work party, and obviously anyone else welcome to join. And then the question that Daniel noted, had the board addressed AOC review team recommendations in a clear and unambiguous manner for staff to look at?

And KC is going to clean up the document with the questions in it to provide more context. Please let me know if I missed anything. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, that sounds right.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think that's great. Could you be able to schedule [inaudible] action item over two weeks for the other work party is able to review this extract? I hope that is right.

JENNIFER BRYCE: So just to be clear, you said take an action item to add a deadline for two weeks for the other work parties to look at the ATRT2 implementation stuff?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: [inaudible] so we have to identify which work party is to work on which of the respective extracts that came in. Does that make sense?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you. I think [inaudible] looking at the review [inaudible] and then also KC and I, we shall have to go and do at least a cleanup of the document before we can be able to proceed with this. Apart from that, I think [inaudible] end the call, and I'd like to thank all the staff and all the members that have been available on the call respectively. Is there anything else that KC would want to add before the call ends?

KC CLAFFY: No, that's great. Thanks, Daniel. You did a good job.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Take care.] Bye.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: [inaudible]

ABDELTOLA SOGBESAN: Bye, everybody. Daniel, your line is breaking.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]