
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 Review Work Party meeting #3 on the 8th of October, 2019, at 16:00 UTC.

The members attending the call today are KC and Sebastien. Observer Sophie Hey has joined. Attending from ICANN org is Jennifer, Negar and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie Turcotte has joined. We do have apologies from Daniel and Cheryl.

Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking.

KC, I'll turn the call over to you. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: Thank you. Today we're restricting the focus to just – well, I want to talk a little about Section 9 – Section 10, Issue 8: assessment of reviews. Part of the reason I think this leaks into other sections is that I'm not comfortable with some of the decisions that I guess were made while I was out on how we actually assess the previous reviews. But we can talk about that later or at some other meeting. I'm pretty confused about the use of the category Not Applicable. I don't know if that's going to leak into Section 10, but we'll go back and talk about that at some other point.

Now we're going to review Section 10. I read this draft a few weeks ago and I was confused about how the assessments came to be. I looked in the [show-your-work] spreadsheet and I still didn't get it, so I thought others on the call could help me interpret this – for example, 10.2.1.1. I

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.

don't see how the review team can assure that this recommendation was implemented when some of those reviews aren't even done yet.

[JENNIFER]: KC, I see that Bernie has his hand up.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, I'm supposed to do this. Bernie, yes. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. I had originally put up my hand to say I spoke to Pat and he gives his apologies too for not joining the call. So if we could add that, please, Brenda.

As to the implementation, I think we've been over the process several times. I don't know if it's worth going over it again. I really think that, given that we haven't finished the conclusions on this section, probably the best thing to do if you disagree with these is to comment on them in the document. We will get to that and then review them as a plenary. Maybe we can review the implementation [and] effectiveness.

KC CLAFFY: That's what I did weeks ago but then was told that we should be discussing those in the review party – set up a call or discuss it in the review working group.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Well, you can discuss what comments you want to make as a review working party and then include them in the document, or you can make them as individuals. That's fine either way, but I think the understanding was that, since you've been away for a while, maybe some other people in the working party could help walk you through this. Unfortunately, we don't have a lot of attendants here, which is basically two members of the review team.

So we can walk through them. I can tell you what I know of it and why this came to, but, as I said, the conclusions for Section 10 are, as far as I know, all in draft mode. So they can be reviewed. So, if it's useful for you, while we've got this airtime, we can walk through them. If not, then please put your comments right in the Google Doc. That's probably the best thing, as we said earlier.

KC CLAFFY:

Okay. I did that earlier and I'm happy to do that again on the new version of the Google Doc, if that's the most efficient way to proceed.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Yeah. I think, as Cheryl said last week, that is really the basis for our work going forward. For people don't have the access to Google Docs, we said they can send us their comments in a Word document if that's what they want to do. We'll reenter them in the Google Doc so we can concentrate our comments on the Google Doc. But if people have access, we prefer that they put them directly into the Google Doc. Then, when we go through it at the plenary, we'll go through that document.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So that's what I should do now?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah. I really think that is one of the best things. And you've got a hand from Sebastien.

KC CLAFFY: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Maybe what we can do here, if it's possibly, is go to the Google Doc where you put your comments because, if we want to discuss something, [that's] the best way to go through your comments. Or we do something totally different during this call. But if we want to be efficient, I think it would be better to discuss it. Then you will take, after this discussion, the part you want to still [want] to be taken into account by the plenary to a new Google Doc because you have already done a lot of work. I think we need to use this work for something. At least that's my proposal for today because we are the only members of the group participating here. If we want to do something useful, maybe that's a way to go. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Thank you, Sebastien. I would agree with that, although I don't think it's necessary for ICANN folks to dig it up because the main comments with

this particular section were: for pretty much every recommendation, I didn't see evidence that it was implemented. So I'm wanting at least some URL that represents how this implemented or some explanation from who decided that it was implemented and how they decided it. Again, I did look at the spreadsheet and I couldn't get this out of the spreadsheet.

I'm also not comfortable with the use this "not applicable" for recommendations that weren't implemented or that we couldn't figure out how effective they were because I think that's defeating the purpose of the point of the review. So that may be a bigger issue that we need to talk about in plenary, but I'm wanting to know if anybody else on the review sub-team or the call has any concern with that taxonomy that Bernard said was already agreed upon in the plenary and I missed it. Again, if there's not enough people here on the call, I can take it to the list. But I did take it to the list and I was told to take it to this review party. I just, again, need to know what process you want me to follow. I'll follow it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You have Bernard's hand raised.

KC CLAFFY: Bernard, go. Sorry. I'm watching hands now.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. "Not applicable" is only used, just to be clear, not about implementation but only for effectiveness. In certain cases, what you

will find is that some people assessed that the implementation was done or partially done but couldn't give an assessment of effectiveness because there was no way to assess that. So that's what they used under effectiveness if there was no way to judge if it was effective or not. So "not applicable" is not used for implementation. It's only used for effectiveness.

KC CLAFFY: Thank you. My point was that I don't agree with using the word to mean we cannot evaluate the effectiveness. That's a really different meaning of the word.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: And that can be part of your comments going in.

KC CLAFFY: As I said, I sent this to the list already and it's in the Google Doc. So if you want me to just go do that all over again, I will go do that all over again.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, this is our current version. I think that's what Cheryl asked last week, specifically for Section 10, as probably the best use of everyone's time here instead of rehashing the things. So you put it in Suggest Mode or in comments in the documents, then, when we get to this, we'll plow through those with your comments.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. What did the leadership want us to do with this call today?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I believe the idea of the leadership was to get a sense of your work party relative to your concerns, but with only two people on here, we're not going to do that. That's the problem. I think maybe part of the problem was the short notice for that. So the intent, as far as I can remember or understand it, is that you had some significant concerns. The leadership was saying, "Okay, fine. Why don't you validate those with your work party? If it's a comment from the whole work party, then that will be how the plenary will look at it versus a comment from just KC."

KC CLAFFY: Okay. But since we don't have a quorum from the work party, should we change the approach there and I just put it in as a comment from KC? Or, if Sebastien agrees, then I put it in as a comment from the work party?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, which you don't really have a work party meeting. We're just two people. If you and Sebastien agree, then you can put them in as joint comments. Sure, that's fine. You have a hand from Sebastien.

It's just my point of view and how I deal with that. Just to give you my thought on that. You can do whatever you want. If you put comments in each and every [piece] where you think it's useful, then we will discuss it and hopefully change some of them. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Great. Thank you, Sebastien. That's helpful. Bernard?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. I believe Sebastien was using the word "comment," but he meant recommendations. Am I correct, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, definitely. Sorry about that. Yes.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. This is one discussion we had while you were away in detail, which we mentioned on the last couple of calls. The threshold for making a recommendation has gone significantly higher, and there is a lot of work to make a recommendation. One of the things that was agreed to was that we're not going to try and make recommendations about everything because we will never get through it, specifically given our timeline now, which says we will publish [for] public consultation in mid-December. That basically means we have the Singapore meeting. We wrap that up and we have maybe one or two meetings after that to address the few things. We've got to get writing – I've got to get writing – to produce a draft.

What we said, as Sebastien said, is we're going to focus on making recommendations for high-value targets or the low-hanging fruit – however you want to do that – because it's going to be a lot of work.

Also, what we said is, given that it's going to be that difficult to make recommendations – and bearing in mind also the recent decisions regarding the CCT review, where a number of recommendations the Board said they just weren't going to do, we basically, when we discussed this, said we're going to focus on the high-value targets. But we added also, three or four weeks ago, the notion of doing suggestions, which basically the Board can do what it wants with. But we're not tied to producing all the material that is required for a recommendation with those suggestions.

So that's a little bit of background. I don't know if that helps to fill in what Sebastien was saying. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY:

It helps a lot because I think now I've discovered the point of tension here. I don't believe any of my suggested changes in this section would induce any new recommendations. I don't think they have necessarily any implications for other sections. But our charge was to do two things. In addition to the recommendations, it was to evaluate the implementation of the previous recommendations. So what I'm concerned about is we do that as precisely and as accurately and defensively as possible. If I go look at the assessment in this section and I can't find the data that backs up the assessment, that's a red flag for me. I understand we're doing the light touch, but when I find data that

contradicts the assessment and I only spend five minutes doing it, it seems to me we should reevaluate how we do this assessment in this section. Again, looking at them right now, it's not clear to me there's any ramification on recommendations later, except in the macroscopic sense of, are the reviews working and how we can improve the reviews? But we're making those recommendations anyway, so I don't see any edits/suggestions I make here [creating] any new work for Bernard or anybody else on the team, just improving the accuracy of our assessments here.

Okay, I didn't see who was first. Sebastien?

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: Bernard was first. Sorry. Back to you.

KC CLAFFY: Bernard?

Bernard?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: If I unmute, it'll go a lot better. I like this system. It tells you when you're muted and you're talking to yourself. Listen, as I said, we haven't done a second pass on this, but it's not a question of creating work for Bernard. It's a question that the plenary has gone over them. But it doesn't mean it can't go over them. So, in this section, as we said earlier, please put in your comments. We'll go over them one more time. We can adjust the implementation and effectiveness. As I said, the conclusions are, as far

as I know, in this section all draft. So definitely have a look at those because we've definitely got to come to terms with those before we even think about making recommendations. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Sebastien?

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: I agree with Bernard. Taking his conversation, it's the best way, even if it's additional work for you. It's just you put back your arguments in this version of the draft. Hopefully we will discuss it in any plenary or in Singapore. I agree with you that there are parts that we are not accurate on. How will I say that to be elegant? It's that some people work more than others, and you can see it in the results of the evaluation. Therefore, if you disagree, just say it and we will go through again at the next possible time. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Thank you. Hands just flipped up. Bernard again? Okay, Bernard.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thanks. Just adding on to what Sebastien was saying, probably what would be the best thing is, if you disagree with the assessment of the implementation, the effectiveness, you can propose text in Suggest Mode. I think that, as Sebastien said, given the instructions that were given to the group when these assignments were handed out several months ago was to do a light touch, some people interpreted that – we

had a high degree of variability. Let's put it that way. So maybe that's part of the issue here. But definitely – I will continue saying this – don't only put in a comment that you don't agree with this. If you have some draft text to accompany that, then, by all means, put it in also because that will help the discussion a lot.

KC CLAFFY: Right, although I did that in the other document. But in many cases, with even what's written in the implementation description, I infer that the recommendation was not implemented. Yet the conclusion was that it was implemented. So somehow my draft text is rather small. That's why I think it's going to need discussion of how did you get to these words to the conclusion.

Bernard, your hand is still up again?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh, sorry. I wanted to say that Jennifer took a stab at including the link to the recordings and transcripts, where those ATRT2 recommendations – the assessments – we discussed by the plenary.

KC CLAFFY: That'd be great.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: If you go back to the spreadsheet, you should see those links now. You can go there to listen to the discussion. That might help you also.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, that will help. I've got to find that. Can ...

BERNIE TURCOTTE: And you have a hand from Sebastien.

KC CLAFFY: Sebastien, please?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe I will be happy if somebody can give me the link of the document you made comments on. I suggest—

KC CLAFFY: Well, why don't I make them again? Because I think that version now is sufficiently old that it might be confusing. I don't mind making them again on the latest. But I would like an action for Jennifer or Negar to send me the latest because I don't want to make it on an old version. Send the whole list, the latest Google Doc, [and] the URL and the action that KC will put my comments back in.

Now I'm looking at the spreadsheet.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That was sent with the e-mail last week, which included a PDF copy of the document and the link. But we'll be glad to send it to you again.

KC CLAFFY: You mean Version 4?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That is correct. That's the current version. There's been no change since then. That is the version we'll be discussion on this call this week – well, tomorrow.

KC CLAFFY: Great. The spreadsheet I'm looking at and trying to figure out where I'm going to see – maybe I'm looking at an old ... oh, no. I'm looking at an old one. Can somebody put that spreadsheet—

JENNIFER: KC, if you go into the final column – it's Column I in the spreadsheet – it says the links to team discussions. Then—

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]. Okay. I. Got it. Are there – I see. So it's a link to the page. Oh, but it's not a link. It could be a link.

JENNIFER: It's tricky with Excel because it doesn't let you put more than one link in there, so unfortunately you just have to copy and paste it into your browser.

KC CLAFFY: This is brutal. Okay, I will give that a shot. I can't do it by tomorrow's call but this week. So that's the action: KC is going to go and we'll get the transcripts and try to figure out how some of these assessments were arrived at and then use that to inform my suggestions in the text.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sounds like a plan. All right.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Anything else?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Not from me.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I think we can read the action items and then close up.

JENNIFER: Thanks. I actually only two that one action item that you just read there, KC, since it sounds like you have the links to the latest documents already.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

JENNIFER: Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]