BRENDA BREWER:

Good day everyone. Welcome. This is Brenda speaking. This is the ATRT 3 Plenary Call #37 on the 13th of November 2019 at 21:00 UTC. The members attending the call today include Daniel, Cheryl, Pat, Leon, Jacques, and Vanda. Observer Jim Prendergast has joined. Attending from ICANN Org is Negar and Brenda. Technical Writer Bernie Turcotte. Apologies from Wolfgang and Jennifer. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking. And Pat and Cheryl, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Pat, you were prepared because I wasn't sure I was going to be here. So, I'm waiting for you my friend.

PAT KANE:

Oh, okay. I'm happy to jump in and roll. So, thanks everyone for coming. We've got a full Agenda today. We are going to make a little bit of an executive prerogative decision here on changing the agenda a little bit. So, we're going to substitute a couple of items after Number 3 today where we're going to talk about Section 4, and then we're going to put together a little proposal around what to do around prioritization and reviews for consideration by the group.

So, as we always do let's start off by any SOI Updates from anybody in the room? Indicate by raising a hand in the Participant Window or typing into the group chat. Okay, I see that we don't have any in that particular place so let's roll to Number 2. Action Items for review, we

EN

don't have Jennifer. Is anybody going to pick that up? Negar, are you going to pick that up for Jennifer today?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Hi everyone. Yes, Pat. Thank you very much. I will take that up today. Hope everyone has had a chance to recover from the meeting in Montreal. So, a quick update. We sent a request to the Meetings Team for face-to-face meeting prior to ICANN67 in Cancun dating 4th to 6th of March. Unfortunately, as we suspected, the Meetings Team is not able to support three days of face-to-face prior to an ICANN Meeting. They can only support up to two days as they do contracting a year in advance, so the dates are already solid on their end and they're not able to extend it.

So, the option for a fully-supported face-to-face meeting prior to Cancun is either to do it for two days prior to the meeting, so March 5th and 6th, or alternatively having one day that is not supported with audio requirements and at a completely different location, which would require everyone to change hotel rooms and venue all together, which I would imagine is not quite feasible for everyone. So, let me pause there and see if you have any questions about that before talking about the other items.

PAT KANE: So, Negar, this is Pat. Thank you very much for that update. So, if we were to be in a position to try and meet in another facility, is it out of the possibility in terms of hotel availability to stay in the same hotel where we're staying for the event and then bus to someplace to else or

pack train to someplace else? I hear what you're saying in terms of not having facilities on the ground due to contracting, but do we not have space availability at the venue for the night before [inaudible]?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thanks Pat. So, what we have received from the Meetings Team is that we will not be able to have meetings in any of the hotels that have been contracted for the ICANN Meeting because those are all being set up. So, we would have to find a different location altogether for the meeting understanding that remote participation for at least one day will not be quite as easily achievable, as well as the fact that we don't even know what the hotel availabilities are given the time of the year and the spring break vacationing that's taking place in Cancun unfortunately.

So, the Meetings Team is not guaranteeing anything at all. If the Review Team chooses to look further into the 4th of March option, then we would have to start looking at different hotels and contacting them, not knowing whether something is feasible or possible to book or not.

PAT KANE: So, let me try to translate what I think you're saying, is that if we wanted to a meeting on the 4th, it's going to be up to our Review Team to figure out where our own hotel rooms are and where we go and have a place to meet, and then we could have Brenda operate the Zoom Room and we'd work the Zoom Room while those of us are together in Cancun. Is that fair?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:	Yeah, I think that's a fair assessment. Again, keep in mind please that audio equipment and microphones that people would typically speak into so that everything would be recorded and audible to those that are remote, are going to be something that's not going to be quite as feasible and possible to do as well. So, there are quite a few more challenges than just location of the meeting.

PAT KANE:	This is Pat again. I totally understand what you're saying from the standpoint of we are not going to get any support from ICANN Staff on the 4th. And so, anything that we do, we will have to carry out on our own, whether it be through our own ear buds with microphones on our own laptops in corners of the room, so we don't bleed over into other people's laptops, but I think I get the direness of the situation. So, that's something that we would have to consider, weighing that against meeting in early February to do something like that. So, Cheryl, I see that your hand is up. Please.

LEON SANCHEZ:	This is Leon. Can I…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Yeah, thanks, Pat. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Leon is in the que as well. I really think that the offsite option is very unattractive and it's unattractive from a remote participation and the challenges of just getting the supporting done anyway. It may be that we take advantage

of one or two days pre-Cancun onsite anyway, which is perhaps a backup, a belt and braces approach to any final fine-tuning we may need to be doing at that stage.

So, my suggestion now, Pat, is that we look to the group and see how they feel about the 7th, 8th, and 9th of February. I gather, Bernie can confirm, that we can still squeeze in enough of the document development prior to that date to make that a worthwhile option. I would like to see how many people may or may not be able to make that lump of time. And obviously I'm going to suggest that we do that in an ICANN office, which is as convenient for having the infrastructure already there as possible. But, again, we'd need Staff to confirm that that is the way forward. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Leon, you were going to say something?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Pat. Thank you very much. This is Leon. Just to respectfully request that the group also takes into account when making the decision that the proposed dates you put the ICANN Meeting in Cancun will overlap with the Board Workshop, hence making it very difficult for me to fully participate. So, I would appreciate if that would be taken into account as well. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Leon. This is Pat. No, we certainly are very aware that you've got multiple commitments to your time and we'll try to

EN

make certain that we do the best in trying to map when you are available and to when we can use your participation the greatest. But it sounds like we're going to have to expect some conflicts at that point in time and we'll do the best that we can. Of course, if we'd meet earlier then we will have your full attention which is always beneficial. Jacques, please go ahead.

JACQUES BLANC: Yes, just trying something, guys, we're talking about doing it before ICANN. What about doing it after? Is there some kind of no-go that I'm not aware about?

PAT KANE: So, Tola and Daniel, I'm going to swing and let Negar take a look at that before we jump back into que. So, Negar, will you please?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Pat. Yes, I'd be happy to. So, meeting locations, Jacques, are contracted about a year in advance and they are contracted for two days before official start date of their ICANN Meeting and they end on the last day of the ICANN Meeting. The Meetings Team is not able to support any meetings outside of minus two days plus the duration of the ICANN Meeting, and most definitely nothing after an ICANN Meeting.

Because at that point in time, all of the resources are geared towards undoing the whole venue and packing everything up and shipping them back to various locations that are supposed to. So, if attached to an

ICANN Meeting, the real only feasible option that we have is just two days prior to the ICANN Meeting start date. Anything before that and anything after that is not quite feasible.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, clear. That does it. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Negar, for that. Tola?

TOLA SOGBESAN: Yes, this is Tola for transpire and everybody. There are three things I want to quickly talk about. First is the most important thing for us is to get Bernie to get document ready for the first draft to be ready for public comments and that's supposed to be mid-December. We need to be sure we are close together to put out for public comment. That's first thing.

The second thing is to ensure that public comment and the Staff response, we end by February 6th in line we are to have [inaudible]. That is only when meeting on the 7th or 8th of February becomes feasible. If those two conditions are not met, meeting on the fourth week of February becomes abstract. Now, that leaves us two possibilities. One, in my opinion, one possibility is to move support meeting for fourth week of February to Cancun, and I propose another meeting after Cancun. Meaning the meeting must go to old first week of February can be transferred to Cancun where we expect Bernie to have perfected the document.

He did mention to us in Montreal that we'd need at best four weeks to have a clean document, or to have two weeks of vigorous work for him to have a good document available. So, if we take that into consideration, if first week of February is becoming a bit difficult, I suggest we meet in Cancun with the caveat that we meet after, before we submit our reports made much tighter. Meaning that, once we're done in Cancun, could be a few days to mark [inaudible] deadline, we would now meet to finalize everything we've done. If that is feasible, that is what I'll propose. Thank you.

PAT KANE:　　　　　　Okay, so before I come to you, Daniel, Tola let me get clear. One, you wanted to take about the draft document and getting that out, that's going to be a topic that we're going to follow on here shortly. And the second one was taking a look at early February. And was your third point talking about after Cancun?

TOLA SOGBESAN:　　　　Yes.

PAT KANE:　　　　　　Alright, so let's get through the que and I'll come back, and we'll have conversations about those. Alright, Daniel please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:　　　Thank you very much. Daniel, for the record, speaking. If I look at the document and also respective opinions that have been highlighted

regarding to the status of the meeting to be held, I say that having the 4th to 6th of March is not practical or so much viable with respect to the appropriate support that we shall need.

So, I would suggest that if we can be able to confirm with the Staff, then we can hold the meeting from 7th to 9th. I think that is more viable and appropriate whereas to be able to do our work. And it provides us with convenience in refining the work we are doing on our respective deliveries. I think that would be the best decision that we can come in as the team. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Alright, Daniel, thank you very much for that. Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. I'm just going to repeat some of the points I made in my email on this. You know, working backwards, end of March, the only way… Based on a lot of experience, producing a final report to get published requires a minimum of three weeks. So, basically we come out of Cancun and it's all hands on deck for Staff to meet that end of March deadline. So, there is nothing after Cancun. If we're not done by the end of Cancun, we're probably not going to have a report out for the end of the March.

The second thing, I think Negar confirmed the realities. It is March break in that area of the world, meaning Cancun, and everything is booked up. So, going wide either before or after is just not going to work. And I have been at some of these improvised one or two day meetings that

are offsite. I can tell you from personal experience, it's usually a disaster.

So, the idea of… I looked at the calendar very specifically. The idea of 7, 8, 9 February could work. I think we can get a decent analysis of the public comments done in time before that meeting, so everyone can read them and then we could have a productive meeting. And by the time we hit Cancun, we book the two days prior to the Cancun Meeting, and we finalize that document. That would seem very workable to me. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi, Michael Karanicolas for the record. I cannot argue against any of the logistical concerns about timelines that people are mentioning but I just wanted to add in, on a personal note, my ability to contribute or feed into the process in early February is going to be very, very limited for personal reasons. And so, if we're meeting then, I won't be able to do a whole lot. Definitely won't be able to come there in person and kind of doubtful if I'll be able to patch in remotely. But more optimistic about early March. But that's just me and I thought I would add that. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Michael. I appreciate that and I totally understand. Daniel, is that an old hand or a new hand?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Sorry, old hand. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Alright, thank you, Daniel. So, let me see if I can pull together that last string of comments. So, if we do something in February, which is probably the earliest that we can do something based upon getting comments back, on the 6th, 7th, or 8th we may not have summarized comments back from ICANN Staff. We may have to rely upon our own assessment of the comments because we will have them and we will have seen them, even if we don't have back comments from ICANN Staff. So, I think that's possibly, that's probably doable. And I totally understand about ad hoc type meetings, Bernie, but I was just trying to throw out some ideas as to how we can best meet our dates and meet our obligations.

As far as the draft document, again Tola you brought that up, we're going to talk about here in a couple of minutes, but December 15th is the date that we're kind of targeting to get that out, which means we have to have something done by the 30th of November so that Staff can process and get it posted, so we've got a very short timeline between now and then.

So, I think what it comes down to is from a team perspective, if we think we need more dates and we need to have a meeting where we don't have to rely upon people lugging around equipment, we're going to have to look at an ICANN office in early February, which is likely to be Brussels, in my opinion, in terms of what's available and how most of us

EN

can get to a single site. Bernie, you had something else to add to that or do we want to start talking about making some decisions as to what we do so we can get things rolling on this?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I just wanted to add in, I have said I think we can get a fairly good analysis of comments in the group's hands before they meet on 7, 8, 9 February. So, it won't be for the group to make up its own mind on the comments from only raw comments.

PAT KANE: Okay, thank you very much for that, Bernie. Hey, Michael, I've got a question for you. At one point in time do you kind of become out of pocket in terms of your personal reasons that are going on? When should we expect the gap to be to where you're probably not going to be able to engage very much?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi, Michael Karanicolas for the record. That's sort of out of my hands. My first child is due at the end of January, so I was going to say you'll have to ask my wife when I'll be out of term but it's also out of her hands. So, it's all up in the air. It's due near the end of January and I'm expecting that it's going to black out for a little while after that while I wrap my head around how to take care of a human being.

But, hopefully, by like mid-February, yes, and Cheryl says she'll be awake 22 hours a day. So, I think certainly I can learn from these ICANN Meetings about how to stay awake at different times of the clock. It's

been great prep work. But, yes, I'm hoping by mid-February that I'll be back to a relatively robust schedule.

PAT KANE: Okay. So, just from an experience standpoint, on our first one my wife started [inaudible] so it could be anytime from end of December that you're unavailable. So, just understand. We'll try to plan around that. And maybe as comments come in, we can get feedback from you during a feeding session or something like that. Because they don't move much but they do need a lot of feeding. Alright, Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. Can you hear me okay? Because I am in a strange place, a market in Montreal and not very easy.

PAT KANE: You're coming across fine, Sébastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, great. Thank you very much. First of all, I have no problem with dates, where, and how we organize the work. I understand the different points of view and I have no such trouble. I just wanted to ask for the third time the same question, because we have two or three Staff who will be in meetings the day after and I wanted just to know where they are meeting. It would be one element in our decision not to move them too quickly to another place of the world. Especially if they have to return after two countries.

Therefore, I would like just that we try to see what is the best place where we can meet, taking into account the people who are coming, because maybe it's better in Washington, maybe it's better to Los Angeles, maybe it's better… There is no more offices in Turkey. But just let's be open to other places, because the date as I understand, 7th to 9th, there is not too much choice because there's a due date to deliver the report from Staff from the comments on the 6th. Then we can meet on the 7th and they have their retreat just after. And yes sir, my question was where is the Staff have their retreat, just to know.

And my second point is that I agree with the one who said that whatever we do in February it will be good to have the two days before Cancun to have a finalized document and be ready for the discussion with the Community during Cancun. And yes, I know if we do that we will not have Leon too much time, but I think the rest of the group needs to meet.

And my last point, and sorry to be a little bit long, it's of course, totally out of our, even out of thinking, but I want to think about that, is that as I said during the public forum, there are too much things coming to the Community for comment end of December. That means that we have collectively problems with all those five very important topics which are coming. And I know that there is no possibility to move anything because of Bylaw but why if one was to move, why is it not ATRT3? I know that I will have pushback but at least I wanted this point of view put on the table. Thank you very much.

EN

PAT KANE:	Thank you very much for that, Sébastien. And this is Pat. And you made that point very clear, and I think that we've tried to think through that. And Cheryl, you're going to have to help me out on this one, but is there a process for us to go back to ICANN and basically say, because of these conflicts we want an extension?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Nope.
PAT KANE:	It doesn't seem like there is [inaudible].
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Nope. Nope. And Nope again. And everyone ATRT I've been involved with has asked this question because they've all had to press at the end. And what they've had to do is, in fact, limit their scope of work to fit the time available if it's a problem. And we've already started under that presumption. Others can move, but not us.
PAT KANE:	So, Sébastien, I guess that what we should do, then, is start paying those other people to move their dates out. Brian's got his dates, and I think that his gig is up in December anyway, so that may be difficult. But we can certainly talk to the people that are running those Review Teams. I just saw that SSR2 got 250 thousand dollars added to their budget, so they're not going to be ready. But there are others of course, yes. So, we'll probably have to have conversations with those people to

see what they can do to help us out, but it sounds as though it's not an option for us to change our delivery date for the ATRT3 Report. As far as the Staff Retreat, Negar, where are you guys going to be?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We are actually meeting in our offices that are in Los Angeles, but there is just the two of us and a large Review Team on ATRT3 so while I truly appreciate Sébastien's concern, I think we should worry about Visa situation for most of the Review Team Members and work around that for the best location. Jennifer and I will make our way back our retreat somehow. We've become quite handy at traveling back and forth, so we should be okay.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Negar, for that. That's very, very helpful and much appreciated. So, you're thinking exactly like I was in terms of the two things we should be concerned about is availability of a large portion of our team and the ability for people to travel and get a Visa to wherever we're going to be. And I think that that, in terms of where we've talked about that we can make that happen, would be Brussels on that 7, 8, 9 date. I think that Michael's the only one who has currently indicated that he is absolutely not going to be available, but is there anybody else who is not available for 7, 8, 9? Either remotely or being able to travel? Yes, Tola.

TOLA SOGBESAN:	Yeah, in Montreal Osvaldo did mention that for the same reason Michael, sorry this is Tola, for the same reason Michael is not going to be available, he's expecting his daughter's first child first and second week, and for that purpose is not going to be available. I don't know if Jacques is on the call. Jacques, I remember Jacques did mention as well that any meeting [inaudible] but a little bit challenging for him. [inaudible] Osvaldo and Jacques. Then I think… Who else? Wolf. Wolf did mention as well that he's not going to be available for two of those dates. So, we need to [inaudible]. Thank you.

PAT KANE:	Alright, this is Pat. Tola, thank you very much but since we have Jacques and Osvaldo online now, Jacques and Osvaldo, if you could either write into the chat, raise your hand, or give me a thumbs up or a thumbs down, on your availability on February 7, 8, 9, either for an in-person meeting in someplace where we can all get Visas or most of us get Visas or being available remotely for a Session. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC:	Yeah, it's Jacques for the record. So, first week was perfect, week of the 15th was perfect, and this is precisely the date where we have a security event at the business. So, as this is weekend I will do my upmost best to be there, but I have no guarantees for these precise 7 to 9 February dates. February, pretty available, I mean, I'll do my upmost best to be there. It's not the easiest but it might not be for anybody, so whatever.

PAT KANE: Thank you for that, Jacques. And if you do make it, I'll bring the very best Texas wine I possibly can.

JACQUES BLANC: I'll take you up on that, mate.

PAT KANE: Okay. Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Hello, this is Osvaldo. Can you hear me?

PAT KANE: Yes, I can hear you very well.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Oh, hello. Sorry I'm so late. I think I can make it the dates. Where would the meeting take place?

PAT KANE: I think we're circling around Brussels right now. I've not heard a lot of other conversations as to a location. But that's the one that's been the most prominent. It may be because I keep saying it the most, but it's been the one that's come up the most.

OSVALDO NOVOA:	Okay, I think I can do it. I can make it those dates.
PAT KANE:	Fantastic. KC, your hand is up.
KIMBERLY CLAFFY:	Yes, sorry. I probably can't do 7, 8, 9 of February. There's another conference at Yale.
PAT KANE:	Okay. Is there any time in that timeframe that you could do?
KIMBERLY CLAFFY:	Depends on what time zone it's in.
PAT KANE:	I'm sorry, what?
KIMBERLY CLAFFY:	It depends on what time zone it's in because that meeting will probably be 9 to 5 on the East Coast time zone so if it's in Brussels then I can work through, work in between the meeting. So, yeah, I'm sure there'll be some of that I can join remotely.

PAT KANE:	Okay, great. Thank you very much. Sébastien, is that an old hand, new hand?
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	It's a new hand. Thank you. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Yeah, I know that we were talking about the question of Visas, and I know that you are pushing for Brussels and I have no problem to go, I can even go working to Brussels and it's good, three days only. But as I said from the jump, I am not sure that the people who will be coming will get any trouble to go to any place in U.S. I have the impression that the one who will get trouble with the Visa are not coming therefore I don't think it's an element that will be so important to note. It's an important topic but I don't think we are concerned directly by that. Thank you.
PAT KANE:	Alright, Sébastien. Thank you very much for that input. So, Negar, I'm going to give you an assignment.
NEGAR FARZINNIA:	Go ahead, Pat. I'm all ears.
PAT KANE:	We need a Doodle Poll.
NEGAR FARZINNIA:	Okay.

PAT KANE: That concludes within 48 hours, that indicates whether it's Los Angeles or whether it's Brussels, whether people can attend, and if people believe they will have Visa issues on either one.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So, Pat, if I may, I'll add a caveat to that. We already have Meetings Team looking into putting together a cost assessment for various locations. The Los Angeles office is not available during those dates. The Meetings Team is looking into assemble in Brussels at the moment. The D.C. office also has meetings during parts of those dates. So, as far as office locations are concerned, L.A. and D.C. are partly booked during those dates and are not an option, but Brussels and Istanbul seem to be available and the Meetings Team is costing those out.

PAT KANE: Okay, and if I remember correctly, this is Pat, if I remember correctly, the Istanbul Meeting Room is small, correct?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: The Istanbul Meeting is large enough to fit the Review Team and two support Staff Members. We checked with the Meetings Team. So, in terms of size, it would be comparable to the Brussels office.

PAT KANE: Okay, so then on the Doodle Poll, let's include Istanbul and Brussels.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay, that sounds great. We'll take care of it and send out the Doodle Poll today.

PAT KANE: But what I would also like for us to do is to get a security assessment of Istanbul.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, I can make sure our Security Team puts together a note and sends it out to us so that we can share with the Review Team in terms of the safety of the region.

PAT KANE: Very good. Thank you so much. Sébastien, your hand is raised?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted exactly to take the same point of view. I have no problem, once again, but I think for… I heard that some people could have some trouble with the security, and not too much our own security but the fact that you will not be covered by your company and that's something I am not sure that even the Security Team of ICANN will answer this question. Therefore, we need to ask this question also, because if it's your company who is not covering you, ICANN will not do anything on that, and we have to take that into account. Your security is important but also insurance is important. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Absolutely Sébastien. This is Pat. Thank you very much for that because that's completely accurate. So, I know that I will be going through my own company assessment as to what my availability is to travel to that region because in the past, we've put bans on travel on company employees to certain regions. So, that's very accurate in describing what some of the issues are there.

Alright, so we have the Doodle Poll, we got the Action Item, I don't think we have anything more for that particular topic. So, we're going to look at 7, 8, 9 in Brussels or Istanbul, have a Doodle Poll up with a 48 hour deadline, and we will make an assessment by the end of day Friday. Any concerns or issues with that please indicate in the Participant Window or chat. Cheryl, is that a question for me, do I have a preference for Brussels?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Actually, it was a statement. I think there's a good reason for you to have a preference for Brussels.

PAT KANE: Okay, alright.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My insurance people will be equally unimpressed if I go to Istanbul but yours is a company issue. Mine is a cost one.

PAT KANE:	So, thank you for that. Jacques, your hand is up?
JACQUES BLANC:	Yeah, just to clear it very quickly, Jacques for the record, we would meet both in February and in Cancun, right, to be able to finish the work?
PAT KANE:	Yeah, my assumption right now is Cancun is a given.
JACQUES BLANC:	Got that. Thanks.
PAT KANE:	Are there any concerns from the group with that, that we would essentially be having two meetings within three weeks? We're all good with that? Or should I say is nobody adversarial to that? I got a thumbs up from Sébastien. Looks good from the group. Thank you all very much.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	I'm okay, too.
PAT KANE:	Excellent, Vanda, thank you. Alright, so that portion is done. [inaudible] skip this because assuming there [inaudible] Work Parties to generally [inaudible] unless anybody has something really [inaudible] their Work

Parties, please go ahead and raise your hand [inaudible]. Sébastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but it's not to answer your question. But I think the Work Party is not working anymore. And therefore, I have nothing to report from the Work Party. So, this time I have nothing to report from myself alone, but I think we need to review in one day when we want, when you want, with Madam Chair says that could be a good way to counsel this part of the meeting because we won't have so much to report on those groups. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Very good, Sébastien. This is Pat. Thank you very much for that. So, if I may declare consensus of the group that we are moving from Work Parties to Plenary only and we will now retire the Work Party. So, unless I see a thumbs down or a red x in the Participant Window, we'll declare that that is consensus from the group. Thank you very much, we have consensus.

So, the next topic that we were going to cover, we're going to inject that, it wasn't on the Agenda that was sent out, we're going to do some work in Section 4 of the document and Bernie's going to lead us through this particular section. Cheryl, if you will, I'm going to grab a glass of water. If you will cover the que, and before we do that Michael, your hand is raised.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, just one small thing. I think that the Community Subgroup, well, not I think, the Community Subgroup is very deeply in arears in terms of certain recommendations that we were supposed to get to that were kind of half-finished, that obviously I take responsibility for. But just as we move from Subteam towards Plenary, could I potentially suggest that that kind of half-finished work be moved over to the Plenary level, just to make sure that the work and kind of half-done recommendations or suggestions or whatever you want to call them, would be revisited to hopefully find a place for some of the underlying ideas in the report. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael, absolutely. Cheryl here for the record. Off you go, Pat. You can get your water. That is exactly what should be happening. It's essential to scoop all of that up and I know that Bernie would be more than keen to work directly with the remanence of any Work Party work that needs to be brought on. So, reach out to Bernie to look at the sections that you need to insert things in, and it'll just be a matter of then it comes through Plenary directly without that pre-filtering in discussion. Okay? And now I have Sébastien. Sébastien, over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was just to be sure that you still need our output as the Leader of the Subgroup to help all those things to move and if we still have a Monday meeting with those leaders. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. As I stated in our Leadership Team Meeting on Monday, it's certainly my view, and no one argued against it, that the Leadership Team from the various Work Parties should continue on as a Leadership Team as that they can therefore act as shepherds for aspects of our developing final documentation.

So, I would still be very keen to have what was the Work Party Leads and then the Leadership Team still continue on. There is not only the administration, there is also the insurance that the aspects of the work each party had is properly and reasonably taken into account as the final document development goes on. Thank you. Is there anyone else on the que? I'm not seeing anyone, in which case, Bernie if you're ready to take us through the tier for the revamped Section 4, I'll have it over to you. Thank you very much, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. You'll remember that in Montreal we discussed and basically agreed, as far as I remember, that it was good to have all this ATRT2 Recommendations and the survey results in those sections, but that we would not carry that through into our final report. And for me, that means that we won't carry that through in our Public Consultation Document. Woah, Brenda, back up, back up. Thank you. Right there is fine. Thank you.

So, basically, what I did is took Section 4 as one of the least contentious areas and redid the whole section based on a slim fast diet to make it easier and putting the results of the ATRT2 full analysis into an appendix and putting the full results and considerations of the survey also in an

appendix and replacing them with tables, and then carrying through into discussion of issues and suggestions and recommendations.

So, going back to the top of this section, please Brenda, you'll notice that nothing has changed. Right here, thank you. So, it's the same introduction, we have information gathering, relevant ATRT2 Recommendations. We've kept the prologue in there to help people understand that the GAC is a special entity and requires special considerations when looking at those recommendations.

So, what I've done after that, if we go into the summary of analysis, I thought how best we could scrunch this down and the only thing I could see was basically build a table with the ATRT2 Recommendation, our ATRT3 Implementation Assessment, our ATRT3 Effectiveness Assessment, and then a note if we're saying that we're thinking there should be a suggestion or a recommendation. So, basically this is the result of our discussion so far segmented into a table I haven't included the text that says there is an annex if you want to go see the details, that will go in there. So, for ATRT2 is that okay or I'm willing to take comments because that's all there would be in this section at this point. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda for the record. What I do believe that may be another column, in the case for instance 6.1.A that was partially implemented, not effective, and no suggestion, no recommendation. I do believe that could be interesting to have another column sending back to read something about that. Because that is explanation, why we are not

EN

suggesting or recommending. But in a table like that it looks nude, looks like why we did nothing because they didn't implement, it's not effective, and we haven't done nothing. So, in my point is not to allow people to keep a question points before they read everything.

So, my point is to have another column with a link to the pages, annex 1 or whatever in there just recommending for the reader that there is some explanation and they should go there to read there before they start to question that. So, it's when we have those double issues like that, I do believe we need another column saying go to… Or another asterisk in the end of the table sending them to another page or explaining that they can read more details in another point of the report. Things like that. Not to leave so crude and so unclear for the reasons. Just my point.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Vanda. Would this requirement be met if in Column 1 under the first one, 6.1.A, we would have under that 6.1.A where I have room anyways, a reference to where you can find the detailed analysis of that recommendation?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, but think that the people normally to go directly to the table where it is more easy to see yes or no.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Just embedding the link. Yeah, okay. We can do that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Anyway, if there is some point that is more detailed, just put the asterisk over there and repeat the asterisk to get here, so the people can find out where the information related to this point is and make it easy to not jump directly to this point without any further explanation.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Right, when I'm taking from the comments from the asterisks for those, a special one and put in some hyperlinks on all of them so people can jump to them quickly. Alright. Thank you, Vanda. Michael?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi, Michael Karanicolas for the record. Yeah, I very much sympathize with the goal of keeping as simple and as straightforward as possible, particularly because as I see it this is a summary tabling you want to keep it clean, but I think is important to flag prominently areas where our assessment of implementation differs from ICANN's own assessment of implementation.

To me, and I've said this previously and I still believe that one of the most shocking finds that we've had are these cases where ICANN is checking the box and saying, "Yeah, we did it." And we're going over their work and finding like no, they didn't. That is a really major finding. Color-coding the boxes to show this point of attack would be one great

way to do it. Yeah, color-coding, my suggestion was to do another column, but color coding would also potentially be the way to do that or yeah, either would be good but I think it's important to draw attention to that. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, let's not forget that we've got a whole section dealing just with that, which is Section 9, that will be addressing that. And in the summary that we'll be posting to here, the explanation text is not done. I mean, it's fairly simple to note in there that ICANN assessed everything as done. So, I don't think it's a question that we have to pick off each one individually, but you know, the issue is we can certainly note that, and we will be taking it in detail in Section 9. So, there we go. But if you don't feel that's enough, then we certainly can look at color-coding. Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No, that's a point. If ICANN… I realize that there were a lot of areas of discrepancy, I didn't realize until you said it just now that all of the areas that we're saying they're not implemented fall into that category. So, that's a fair point.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, thank you very much. Alright, so I've taken the points. Anybody else at this point? Not seeing any other hands. Let's go down. So, there will be some… Sorry mouth not working well. There will some text

explaining the context of this. I just haven't had time to write it. I wanted to see how we were going to do.

Now, the next section is summary of results of survey, and basically what… I played with this for a while, and I came up with this, and let's just walk through it. So, basically I'm providing the survey question, I'm providing our analysis of the results. So, we get a clear picture of what was answered, etcetera. Again, here we would do the same thing as we are proposing in the previous section in that we would hyperlink, and the ATRT3 Suggestion or Recommendation following from that. So, let's go to the floor on this one and see if we've got questions or comments.

And you'll note that in this one, we only had four survey questions. And if you go down a bit, Brenda, just so people can see the full length of this, thank you. So, basically that's what it would look like. We would have the hyperlinks and if we need to we can also throw in some asterisk for that. Alright, not seeing anything. Going once, oh, thank you Cheryl. Thumbs up. Alright, so we'll carry on with the same recommendations I noted from the Plenary on the previous section to this section. Great. Let's go the next section please, Brenda.

Alright, the other information hasn't been touched. This is what we got out of the ICANN65 interviews, so it's the section after that please. Alright, analysis of information and identification of issues. Alright, so what I've done here, this is fairly close to what we had prior. So, on those ATRT2 Recommendations or on those survey results where we noted we would have a suggestion or recommendation, I come back here. So, basically we say ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1.D, but now we list what that recommendation was.

EN

If we go down a bit, and that's the way it was in the… You'll remember when we looked in Montreal, and I throw in the conclusions relative to that as part of the analysis. And then we go down through all of those, 6.1, 6.6 with the conclusion. Alright, on surveys, if we back up just a bit, so again, I have the question. What I do here is I reintroduce the analysis and the conclusion. So, again, this is just the identification of issues section where we're putting the things together as we did in our analysis of the various points. So, that's this section. Willing to take questions, comments, suggestions. Alright. Well, if you do think of something, please let me know.

Alright, we'll move onto the next section, please Brenda. Alright, suggestions with respect to issues. So, basically this remains exactly as it was, so we're linking from that previous section 4.3 where we explained what the issue is and what our conclusion was, making a suggestion or a recommendation, and here we list ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1.D and then we number the suggestions as they were. I'm not going to go through these because we've gone through them and discussed them. There is one point in purple there where we will get back to that. So, basically it lists the suggestions that…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's just Bernie's usual headset break. He'll be back momentarily. Are you back now, Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I dropped off.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You did. You got to the suggestions that.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, okay. So, we have done this for the ATRT2 Recommendations and then we do somewhat the same thing for the survey questions. If we go down a bit, please Brenda. And there we list the suggestions and we can keep going down. And recommendations, in this case there were none. I see KC, you're up.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Sorry, I can't get my mute button to work. I wasn't on the call Monday and I don't think this is the right time to talk about it necessarily, but I'm still confused what's a strong suggestion, how does that differ from a recommendation? So, we can flag it for discussion later. I don't know when is a good time to talk about it.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'll pass that over to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's take that on notice and finish this part of the Agenda. It really does come into a couple of discussion points, not the least of which is as we look into our recommendations and prioritization in general. But we do of course remember and perhaps you weren't online at the time, KC, but Maarten when he was a member of the team, showed us that

suggestions will be treated, and strong suggestions will be treated in exactly the same way by the ICANN Board as recommendations. The terminology as far as we're concerned is simply a matter of what does or does not fit easily with the new guidelines and negating issues with the guidelines.

And of course, we are beta testing the guidelines, so if indeed we find it cumbersome, difficult, or irrelevant to require groups to in the future work with those guidelines, we can make that statement as an additional comment later on when we review that part of our voluntary work. But let's move on with this Agenda and make sure we kick that up in our next, if not today, certainly online and in a following meeting as we come to those agreements. It is a nomenclature we've used for quite some time now. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. Well, actually I'm done. I've got what I need from this. So, what I'll be doing is… The hyperlinks won't get put in now because we don't know where they're actually going to end up in the document, but I'll use this methodology to deal with the other sections and hopefully have that full ready for our meeting next week. Thank you. Back over to you Pat and Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Bernie. And just looking for any final questions on what you've taken us through. Just so I'm very clear, as I understand this Bernie, the treatment that you've given the Government Advisory Committee work, in other words this Section 4 that we've just gone

through, it is the plan to treat our other sections from our other Work Parties, etcetera, with a similar slimming down approach, moving of course any material into a greater degree of appendixes. But to have this general look and feel applied throughout the document. Am I correct in that so everyone understands that's the case? Green tick from Bernie, fantastic. Alright, Pat, you should've had plenty of time for several glasses of water by now and therefore I believe it's back over to you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So, one of the other items that we decided to throw into the Agenda today that's not on the Agenda is a conversation and some possible alternative approaches to priorities and to reviews. I think one of the things that was clear in Montreal was that we really don't have probably anywhere near consensus on what we want to do with reviews, and we certainly haven't had any conversations yet on recommendations around prioritization.

So, if I could throw out some thoughts that we can kick around today, and I am going to apologize that I do have a hard stop on the half hour today. But if we would take a look at where we are in terms of thinking about priorities, perhaps what we should do as a Review Team is come together on consensus around throwing the review process to the Community, given that there's other Work Streams that are talking about prioritization that would put together our requirements and considerations as part of a recommendation to be included in a Community discussion around prioritization such that we would not actually put together a specific prescribed solution around priorities, but

EN

putting together the things that we've come across on what we think are important, what we think are requirements, what do we think are considerations, and build a recommendation based upon that.

Because if not, I think we're going to struggle to get to a consensus based recommendation and if that's our number one priority, prioritization, I think that constitutes a failure on what we're trying to do here. So, let's talk about some review items in a second, but at first blush, any thoughts around that, any input on that, what do we think? Yes, Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat. I just… Maybe it could be the end of our conversation, but I really think that we really need to spend some time on discussing that specific issue, taking into account the input we get from Montreal Meeting. We need to see where we are with that because I am not sure where we are collectively on that and after that, we may anyhow have that taken being care of the by implementation.

I am not sure that we can show to any other group. It's our task. The review is really our task. We are the only group who can say we stopped one review and we start another one. Therefore, we can't divide our responsibility. Not saying that we will build a single solution, but we will put [inaudible] may we can be in the, as we have done during the Montreal Meeting, different maybe two solutions. But I think we need to go ahead with that. We can't just decide now we will not do more. Once again, we are in charge. It's the only place where we can do that. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Yes, thank you Sébastien. I very much appreciate where you're coming from because yes, it is our task and it is what we kind of signed up for. But we've got three weeks and I think that I would prefer that we deliver a recommendation as opposed to do something that says we have divergence. And so, I think right now… You know, Cheryl's put this into the group chat, that we have about 20 minutes to discuss and we should if we think we have specific areas and directions that we want to go to. And that certainly, it wouldn't be the end of the conversation, it's going to have to continue. But I think that either we consider this as a direction, which I think helps us make our dates and helps us do something that I think is actionable, but I do understand, and I do appreciate your points. So, thank you Sébastien. Cheryl, your hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Pat. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And here I'm speaking as a member of the ATRT Team appointed by the At-Large Advisory Committee along with Sébastien, Daniel, and Vanda. And so, each of us have our own opinions, this is one of mine. Can I just say that I am supportive of your approach here, Pat. But I don't see it as an abrogation of our responsibilities to make a recommendation that says, "We have clear and compelling evidence from opinion and just looking at the way things run, that something has to be done. And therefore, we recommend that in doing something, it is done as a matter of urgency, a priority, and that in some way, shape, or form…", and it may be that part of our group becomes part of this solution.

I don't think that it's a washing of hands and stepping away exercise that an interactive with the Community process be undertaken, because I don't think that the Review Team is also with blessed overarching sage-like wisdom to come up with the only good ideas. And so, because the Community would need to have buy in to any change, I personally believe Community, the ICANN Community, needs to be part of making any change happen. So, I'm comfortable we can still do our job, do it in a timely fashion, come to a consensus on what general approach that job should taking, maybe even give some limitations and specific highlights, but not actually try and invent it all ourselves. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl, for that. Leon, I would very much like your opinion and thoughts on this.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, everybody.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He's driving.

PAT KANE: Oh, very good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He was driving.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just everybody put in the chat all their opinions.

PAT KANE: Sébastien, your hand is raised.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Pat. I don't want yet to see if we agree or disagree. Once again, I am not sure that I totally agree with what you suggest or Cheryl is suggesting, but before I say that I will need to see something in writing and have some time to comment on it. But I want us to take really into account that I don't see any other structure who could build propositions for solution. I am not saying building the solution, but propositions for solutions. Because if we decide that, okay, we will say that we need Community to do something, and then we will be fronted with well, who in the Community?

And it's exactly where and why we are here. Well, it's one of the reasons where we, ATRT and ATRT3 specifically, is here. We put some proposals and it was discussed. I would like very much to have the feedback we received from the different part of the Community put together and see where we are with received points and what is the point of view of each of the members of this group and go ahead. My feeling, if you ask me, even if you don't ask me, I think that we have three proposals and the third one didn't get too much attraction to have one single review. Therefore, there is a discussion between adding one group who oversights the reviews, the current reviews, and the second

EN

one is to put in place two types of reviews. And I would like to see what are the pros and the cons of those two at least, taking into account the input of other participants from Montreal Meeting. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. I do appreciate that, and I know that this is an idea thrown out that we've talked about amongst Cheryl and myself and Bernie on, and you're just now getting it for the first time, and it would really be helpful for something to be put into writing. And we'll get something sent around that kind of puts it in writing so we can chew on it and have further conversations. But as a direction, I'm liking this more and more in terms of what we get to.

So, Leon, I see that you're in chat and one of the things that we threw out was an idea that we would put together a recommendation around prioritization that called for the Community to resolve for a couple of reasons. One, we've got other organizations and other Work Streams that are producing thoughts around prioritization, and that we would put into a recommendation our requirements and our considerations for a prioritization process, to include the work being done in other areas as a recommendation as opposed to coming up with something very specific around, and something prescriptive, around prioritization.

And Sébastien is on one side, Osvaldo has weighed in on the other side, in terms of liking it. And we're throwing this out as a thought, to where we can get to a consensus point within three weeks, because if where we are need to get something published, we may not be able to get to a consensus on that and then follow on with reviews, which we are

EN

certainly not anywhere close to a consensus on reviews. I was just curious about your thoughts.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Pat. This is Leon. So, I mean I guess you are right in that maybe putting the recommendation that is too prescriptive might not be the best way forward, and I hear Sébastien's thoughts on this as well. And as you mentioned, there are different efforts to try to prioritize or to try to bring order to prioritization in regard to many issues within the Community.

So, maybe the recommendation that we could issue as ATRT3 could be based on criteria or principles that should be or could be taken into account by the different parts in the Community when planning their prioritization, while setting up their prioritization plans. So, maybe a recommendation in this sense, could help to better shape whatever plans the Community comes up to in regard to prioritization.

PAT KANE: Sorry, I was on mute. So, this is Pat again. Thank you, Leon, I appreciate the comments. Is anybody else have anything they would like to weigh in on? Michael, KC? Jacques?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I think I share Sébastien's desire to see something in writing to cogitate on it. It's hard for me to digest exactly what's being proposed here.

EN

PAT KANE: Okay. Alright, so I will take that as an Action Item to work with Bernie and Cheryl and get this sent out so we can chew on it. But we're going to have to have some commentary and discussion online I think ahead of next week. So, we can't really let this thing lie between now and next week, I think. And we really ought to kick around the prioritization topic because the follow on on this proposal is that until we have a prioritization plan from the Community in place, that maybe what we need to do is to put a more thorium on reviews that are kicking out recommendations because there's no way to address them.

And Michael, to your point, I think that one of the things that we have to lead in with this is that for us to have a valid prioritization process on these recommendations, we can't just go wave hands and say, done. There has to be either somebody following through, shepherding the process to completion to the satisfaction of those who recommended, maybe, the recommendation, or that there's a deliberate process to retire something such that we're saying, "We're not going to do it and we're okay with not doing it." Sébastien, your hand is raised.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Sébastien Bachollet speaking. And I am really sorry I was dropped off when Leon started to talk and therefore I don't know what he says, and you have said in between up to now. But I wanted just to underline one thing. Prioritization is one topic, review is another topic, and yes, there is connection between both. But, it's not prioritization, it's not just the reviews and the review is not just a question of prioritization. Therefore, if I can totally agree with you about work on prioritization, I am disagree with just the fact that we will give to somebody else the

EN

review of the reviews. And the fact that we mixed both in one single world, it's something who must be into question. Thank you. I hope it was clear. Sorry.

PAT KANE:	No, thank you very much for that, Sébastien. I think that you've been very clear on what you think our responsibilities are here, and I think that we understand that, and I certainly do appreciate where you're coming from, but I do believe that reviews and prioritization are really related to each other in that the purpose of the reviews is to drive continuous process improvement, at least how we've talked about it. And how can we do that from understanding what the recommendations are and how they get done and prioritize so that we can move on with reviews and generate new items that are the most meaningful and impactful to improving the Community, especially around accountability and transparency. And so, I think they are inextricably intertwined in terms of how we should view them. KC?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY:	This just keeps reminding of my request for a webpage that shows all the recommendations in one place from all reviews, because I don't even know how many there are. Did that one get forwarded up to Staff or what's the status on it?

PAT KANE:	Negar, can you address that one please?

EN

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sure, Pat. Last I recall, actually the conversation, there was a conversation that took place on the mailing list from a few Review Team members with available information on that content. I don't believe anything has been forwarded to ICANN Org as an official Action Item. However, one thing that I do want to note, KC, is that the concept of prioritization doesn't just apply to the recommendations from reviews, and of course this Review Team might choose to just look at that part of it, but the concept of prioritization across ICANN world is much broader than that. It includes recommendations or other work that comes from not just reviews but Working Groups, let's say Work Stream 2 and a lot of other items, as well. Just something for the Review Team to consider.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: It's KC. Yeah, I meant to include Work Stream 2. That's what I mean is that there's so many different recommendations coming from different places. I would like to see them all in one place.

PAT KANE: So, KC, this is Pat. Somewhere here in my disaster of an office, I've got a hard copy of that. And it's an 8 ½ by 14 small font and I want to say that there was 17 or 18 pages of…

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: But if it's already out of date, right? Because RDS just came out with a new report with recommendations or does it have all those in it?

EN

PAT KANE: What I'm saying is that it exists and it's big.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Fair enough. Is there a URL for it?

PAT KANE: So, Negar, take this as a new request that we would like to get what [inaudible] calls a "Hubba Bubba Chart", okay?

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Yes, okay. So, then Negar is taking that as a request.

PAT KANE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. And just to note my chat, and note that Leon is saying I am correct, I always like it when Leon says I'm correct, we also need to note that the Board has already stated that they are going to be, and I assume it is not going to be from now on but would have some retrospective information in it as well, a register of recommendations from Review Teams and that that Register is also going to be used as a tracking tool. So, more of a dashboard situation I suspect.

So that as we move forward, certainly from our review on, there will be a greater traceability about what happens and where. So, the Board's already listened to some of our complaints and concerns. Yet to see it,

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Thanks, does Leon have an estimate of when it will be available, or it won't be available until after the review process is over? Oh, Leon is texting.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I? It's Sébastien.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Oh, go ahead.

PAT KANE: Yes, Sébastien. Go ahead please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, I guess I put in the mail during the Montreal Meeting the link to the outpost and then the link to the proposal. For the moment, it's something that the Board put for discussion during the Montreal Meeting, and I think it's blog post and all the [inaudible] consequences need to be taken on by us, ATRT3. So, it's not yet a done deal. It's a proposal from the Board with some explanation, but it must be, from my point of view, at least one of our recommendations because as you see everybody agrees on that. But, it's not yet done, and I don't know

where you get, Pat, your list. Maybe you get it by inside staff of your very capable people, but I am not sure that it's on ICANN anywhere on the ICANN website, this type of list. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much for that, Sébastien. I hear you, and like I've said, I got a hard copy, so I know that it exists, and I don't know that it exists online, and I understand what Lauren wrote but the spreadsheet that I've got has more than just Review Team Recommendations and his blog post was really about Review Team Recommendations, I think. [inaudible], it's got SSAC, it's got RSSAC.

So, it's got all these Community driven recommendations which in a prioritization process, all of that has to be considered in terms of what we do, I think. I would hate to say that RSSAC has got a certain amount of dollars to go spend on implementation of 37 and 38, when that may not be the most meaningful thing to the Community in terms of how the Community prioritizes. So, I think it's more than the Review Team stuff. So, let me see if I can track that down. I think I know where I might have gotten it from but let me see if I can't track that down and if I have to scan it in and send it out I will.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: I mean, this is KC, Pat, that's sort of maybe it's not exactly the point I'm getting at. It seems like it would be accountable and transparent for that information to be up on a website for everybody to see.

PAT KANE: I agree.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Okay.

PAT KANE: I just don't know where it is.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Okay. But that's why I'm asking if the ATRT Leadership can request that the Staff provide that.

PAT KANE: Yes, and we put that to Negar and Negar is going to come back and say yes or no, or yes and here's where it is.

KIMBERLY CLAFFY: Great, thanks.

PAT KANE: Alright. It's getting towards the half hour and Cheryl, I do have to run. Is there, if we want to call it a day now we can close it up, or if you want to continue, I'm going to leave it up to you because you're going have to…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we suggested a 90 minute call today and we should stick to our guns on this. So, let's wrap the call up now and obviously thank everybody who's joined, and it's been an excellent turn up. We do appreciate especially in this first week after an ICANN Meeting that it can be rather heroic to get back onboard with this, but we have so much to do and so little time to do it. Please respond to the Doodles promptly that is coming out, and also remember when we see some [inaudible] text out of today's Action Items to also start that interaction on our list as soon as possible. Negar, can you briefly take us through any Action Items and decisions?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sure, Cheryl. I'd be happy to. I have captured the following Action Items. One, ICANN Staff will continue to look at meeting options for February 7th through 9th. Also reserve March 5th and 6th right prior to ICANN67 in Cancun. A Doodle Poll to be sent out with a 48 hour deadline to enquire whether Visa is required for Istanbul and or Brussels and preference for each location. We will also ask for security report on Istanbul Region in general and share that with the Review Team once available.

The next Action Item is for Pat to work with Bernie and Cheryl and put together a proposal regarding how to handle prioritization and reviews going forward and share that with the Review Team prior to next week's Plenary Call for discussion. Staff is going to look into the Action Request for register to determine whether their information is publicly available and accessible by all, and if not what the timeline is for making it so.

And last but not least, there was a decision made that the Review Team is going to move on working through their Work Parties into the Plenary Discussions for all work going forward with the Review Work Party Leadership Groups maintaining their role as is. Please let me know if I've missed anything.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. No, seems to me like you've captured just about everything. Thank you so much. In fact, I would say you have captured everything. Cheryl for the record. Just for the record, to draw the attention of everyone to the Work Stream 2 Proof Resolutions as linked, as Item 3 in our Agenda, we did not discuss it, but you may follow that hyperlink and look at the Board Material Resolution on that.

And note that next week we will be starting our primary activity to include the work on Report Version 5.0 and continuing our discussion on recommendations and beyond. And also, just to note in today's Agenda there was a reminder on the ATRT3 Engagement Session feedback and notes, please do avail yourself of that over the coming days to put more material in. With that, on the timing, 60 seconds over, thank you one and all, thank you to our fabulous Staff, and do remember, Leadership Team, we will be meeting on Monday. Until next week, bye for now.

PAT KANE: Thanks everyone.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thanks everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]