
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary #38 on the 20th of November 2019 at 11:00 UTC. Members attending the call today include Pat, Cheryl, Demi, Jaap, Jacques, Leon, Liu, Sébastien. We have Observers joining us today including... Oh, excuse me. Daniel has also joined as a member. And we have Observers Jim Prendergast and Sophie Hey. And from ICANN Org we have Negar, Larisa, Lars, and Brenda. Technical Writer Bernie Turcotte has joined. We have apologies from Vanda, Michael, KC, and Jennifer. And today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record. And Cheryl and Pat, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Brenda. Pat, you or me starting? I don't think we flipped a coin, did we?

PAT KANE: Well, since I'm going to cover probably the lion's share today on the ATRT3 Items, why don't you kick us off.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Be my pleasure, thank you.

PAT KANE: On the recommendations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Shall do. Alright then. Well, welcome one and all. And hopefully we will get a goodly amount done today. Let's start off asking is anyone got any Statement of Interest Updates? And if you do, you can type them into the chat space. Not hearing anybody trying to get my attention... Yes, Sébastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I don't think it's a big thing but just to let know everybody that I am now the Chair of EURALO and not anymore an ALAC Member, and that's a change of my situation within ICANN. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that, Sébastien. Not a substantial change in terms of our work, which you're still the Appointee, of course, by ALAC to this Review Team but it is always worthwhile keeping our SOIs absolutely up to date. And good luck with the wonderful work of EURALO. Now let's see. No, no one else is coming up. And with that, let's move on.

I notice... Negar, if you've got any Action Items that need to be... Sorry, I was going to say I noticed Wolfgang's just joined us for the record. And I was going to ask Negar if there's any open or follow up Action Items that need to be noted. Negar, if you're speaking you might be muted.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, hello Cheryl. Thank you. Hello everyone. I was speaking to double mute, so we are back now. The only Action Item that we want to cover to day is the results of the Doodle Poll. We have had a couple of more

people fill in the Doodle Poll so we've had a total of 13 responses, as you can see from the display in the Zoom Room. So, the majority favor Brussels location for the meeting. The Visa issues have remained the same. No additional changes to that. And I believe it's now to let you guys discuss this further if need be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Great, thank you very much. It certainly does seem to be definitive and obviously not everybody in the Review Team responded to the Doodle Poll, so we may find some additional people may be able to join, but we shall see. And that can be brought up a little bit later.

Now, under the circumstances, if we move on back to the Agenda, thanks very much, one of the things we needed to remind everybody about is that we do have, it'll be obviously linked in the Agenda that went to the list, but if Negar, you would be so kind as to put, or Brenda, the link to the ATRT3 Engagement Session Feedback into the chat so everyone can also get it from the chat links. It would be quite useful just to remind everybody that any of you who wish to honor various Engagement Sessions out of the Montreal Meeting, please do so from this document. And if you want to make any annotations or additions, you are welcome to do so.

So, with that, we'll now move on to what are the more substantive parts of today's meeting, unless there's any discussion on anything so far. I'm not see anybody raise their hand in chat. We're going to be looking now into the matters of our recommendations regarding prioritization. But just before we get into that, and before we lead into

the reviews and proposed recommendations, and there's a couple of links for everybody to fire out of the Agenda as well, Pat and I would just want to make certain that everyone was absolutely clear what has to happen in the next ten days.

Working backwards from our drop dead date, we need to ensure that we have sufficient time now, if we're going to have our face-to-face meeting in the beginning of February as you just saw as a result of the Doodle Poll, for that to be a substantial and meaningful meeting, we need to have the feedback from the public comments in our hands and ready to work with during those three days. So, we have to move backwards from there.

To do that, we cannot shift from our mid-December publication of our initial report for public comment. So, what we need to do in the next ten days is to come agreement on what is going to be in that document, that initial report, to go for public comment. That does not mean we need to take consensus calls on recommendations before that publication. It does mean that we need to agree what we will be putting to public comment. So, let's make sure we remember what we're doing and when.

As a result of public comment, we may indeed wish to, as we've already done between the Singapore Meeting, during our meeting in Montreal, and even in the meeting that we've held since we've returned from Montreal and up until now, building on the development of consensus and working towards firm recommendations. We should, indeed, when one wonders why one would go to public comment if one wasn't going to take into account what comes back to us out of public comment in

the final recommendations that we make. So, it is those three days in February that we will be building consensus in terms of recommendations for final reporting, and it will be at that point in time or after we've done that, that Pat and I will be making a consensus call and not before that.

Now, Pat have I covered off every bit of the administration type procedural stuff that we wanted to make sure everyone understood? Because we just got the feeling that, from some of the chat, that people were concerned that we haven't reached consensus and therefore we can't make any statements in this next report. No, we can in fact interrogate the public to see what they would like to choose from. Pat, your opinions on [inaudible]?

PAT KANE:

Cheryl, I think you captured it. I think that really lays out what the next ten days is going to be like and it's going to be a lot of review work and people are going to have to stick close to their mail so that we can turn this thing in so that we can get a process by December 15th. But, I think you're accurate in describing what we need to be able to do and think about achieving consensus because that'll happen once we get feedback back from the initial report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

So, what we'll be doing between now and our initial report is perhaps, on a number of points, needing to take the temperature of the Review Team. So, opinions will be sought, it will not be consensus, opinions will be sought, and agreement will hopefully be managed as to what we put

into the report, the initial report, so that we can get public comment back on things that we ourselves may not have been able to come to total agreement on as yet. Is there any questions or concerns about what we think is a timely and reasonable way forward to getting to meeting all of our milestones? I'll open a short que before we move on.

Okay, nobody wanting to jump in. Just noting that Osvaldo has joined us. Welcome Osvaldo. We haven't actually got our teeth into the main bits yet, so perfect timing in fact. If you would like to just review a little bit of the process that I've just gone over, the transcript and record will bring you up to date on that. So, with that, I'm going to now, I think, take a sip of my libation, and hand this, I think he described it as the lion's share of today's work, over to Pat. Pat, the floor is yours.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. So, the next section that we're going to cover is the discussion paper that we sent out on Sunday. And there's been some comments on the mailing list, and I think and I'm hopeful that everyone has had a chance to review it. It's a short document, it's three pages, so I hope everybody's had a chance to go through it and take a look at it. Has anybody not had a chance to look at it and go ahead and show by in the participant window, if you can click on 'no' if you've not looked at it or not read it or not seen the commentary that we've had on the discussion list, just so I can know when I give a high-level summary of it, where I need to be in terms of detail. Alright, so it looks like everybody has had a chance to read it. Okay.

So, one of the things that I do... Internally. This is not intended to be how we would we write this as part of a recommendation or put this into the paper itself. This will inform, again, our discussion so that we can put the appropriate wording into the paper, or at least give Bernie the direction for him to put this into the paper as we've talked about it.

So, if we think about what we're trying to do and our top two priorities, we talked a little bit about this last week, the top two priorities on our list are prioritization and reviews. And one of the things that we're talking about here is a making a recommendation on prioritization that we push this to, you know, make a recommendation that's around getting a Community Group together. Whether that be a CWG, CCWG, in terms of getting all of the discussions that are going on to include the Board, to include the MultiStakeholder Model Evolution led by Brian Cute or one of his areas of focus is prioritization, and not try and develop through ATRT3 a competing view of what they might produce.

But the recommendation would be that everyone get together and solve that, and that we would supply a set of criteria, a set of requirements that we have for that conversation, such that the Community solves this and not just that the 18 or 11 of us that are working through this. So, I'd like to throw that out for conversation right now on that aspect of prioritization, unless Bernie or Cheryl, you want to clarify anything that I just said about prioritization. So, let me go to Bernie first, clarification on anything?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Nope, I think you've said it quite well.

PAT KANE: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl for the record. The only thing that I would just say is you did interchange CCWG or CWG, and I just popped in the chat or any other form of representative model. You know, we're not weighted to any particular design here. So, let's not get caught up in a minute here, any time you hear a term, challenge it and think of what other alternatives may be offered. So, this is a free-flowing conversation now. Thanks.

PAT KANE: So, thank you, Cheryl, for that. So, I want to open it up to the Plenary to ask questions, to make commentary. Because I know that on the chat most of the, or on the mail, most of the conversation was around reviews, but since we're looking at these as one feeding the other in terms of this proposal, I wanted to start specifically with the prioritization and see if we had any commentary on that first. I'm opening the floor. Yes, Sébastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I am not sure that my connection is stable enough, but if you can't hear me, just tell me in the chat and I will try to find another solution. Thank you for opening the discussion. I think the question of why we are, why I am more inclined to do the work about review and not yet about prioritization is that if we didn't find a way or ways to announce the reviews, the discussion about prioritization will

be moot. We really need to have that. I would say that it's the first thing.

Now, when you look to the prioritization, it's a question we have to handle, and we have to handle with effectively a lot of input. But for the moment, it's not considered as input, it's considered that there are powers at work. But either it's our responsibility or it's the responsibility of somebody else. If it's the responsibility of somebody else, then we would just give our input. If it's our responsibility as an ATRT, therefore they need to feed us and not to have competing work.

And I feel that what the Board have done is in competition with what we can do, and they didn't really give us as an input. But as this is what the Board thinks about, and now we want to comment from the Community about that. I think they are competing with us, and that's not good. Now, is the question of prioritization, of course it's much more than just reviews. It's all the ccTLD something, all the PDP, all the work done in each part of this organization, even without those names are in competition on what we can do. And I don't know how we can link those topics like that. And my last point is that even if it's not our task, I want to put again on the table that in the next two months, there are four or five or six very important issues that will come for comments by the Community, and we can talk about what we will do tomorrow but that's a pity that we can't do anything for today. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Sébastien. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Pat. This is Leon. Just to follow up on Sébastien's thoughts and to clarify that what the Board is doing is definitely not in competition with what the ATRT3 is doing. So, once there is some outcome from this exercise that the Board is doing along with the Community, of course this will feed into the ATRT3 process as some addition input but it's definitely not in competition with what the ATRT3 is doing.

So, we already have the Operating Standards which allow for the developing of principles and supporting steps on formulating recommendations to make them more effective. So, again, this is just another input for the ATRT3 to take into account and it's definitely not in competition with what everyone is doing here. So, [inaudible].

PAT KANE:

So, thank you for that, Leon. This is Pat, and I do appreciate the clarification on that. But from a timing perspective, this is just me I'm not speaking for the group of course, but the timing to me would have the appearance of competition in terms of what we're doing because we're not able to put it out in, because it's still draft, we're not able to take a lot of that and put that into the document that we're going to put out for review today. And so, not knowing where you're going to go with that and not knowing what the ultimate output or direction or suggestions to the Community are, I have to think of that as competitive in terms of putting together a product for initial review. And that's just where my mind goes on that specific item.

And I understand you're not trying to be competitive, but the suggestions that come out of that in terms of how prioritization is done, is certainly, it could be complimentary, but it could be competitive in terms of where we're trying to go with this. And so, I think that while we want that as an input, the timing is such that it may impact our recommendations or suggestions. Wolfgang, your hand was up. Wolfgang? If you're speaking, Wolfgang, you're on mute.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay, can you hear me?

PAT KANE: I can, yes, thank you. Wolfgang, we can hear you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Can you hear me now?

PAT KANE: Yes, Wolfgang, we can hear you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay. Thank you. No need for an additional comment. I just wanted to say the same thing what Pat has said. This is additional comment which is helpful for us if it comes in time, that's fine. If not, you know, we are an independent body, we take the eagle's perspective, and we have to make our mind with regard to the key recommendations. And there is certainly a difference of the mandate between the different processes.

And it could, as you have just said, it could be competitive, but I'll see it primarily as Leon has said, as an additional input into our processes and we should not be too confused or too angry or to be afraid about parallel processes.

So, let's form our opinion independent from the other processes. We take note of them, but we should not be too much influenced, but as you have said in other interventions, you know, we need a certain feedback from the Community so that it comes not on the blue from the members of our group. So, let's put this for public consultation as we have planned. So, no additional comments at this time. To prioritization, I think what you have outlined in the white paper, it's fine with me. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you for that, Wolfgang. Sébastien, if I can go back and address one of the comments that you made in terms of putting this to an additional Working Group of whatever the right nature is, do you think it would be appropriate for us to suggest that ATRT3 have specific representation as an entity on that Working Group. So, whatever constitutes the group is that we would have representation as ATRT3 as part of that process? And Daniel, I'll get to you in a second. Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, thank you, Pat, for the question. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I am not sure. I would like that we preserve what is ATRT and we can have this discussion. I think it's the moment to do it. But I think ATRT

must be, I will say, on top of the party, on top of this organization, and therefore, we can't be introducing in one another topics.

Maybe you don't see, you don't feel like me about ATRT. Maybe the change of legal environment for ICANN has changed that, but it was meant to be the place where the Board was supposed to give feedback and where ATRT was a group to ensure ICANN's accountability and transparency of the Board but of the rest of the organization, too. Therefore, I am not sure that it's good idea if we want to be introduced in one another party to discuss. But, it's my feeling taking into account your question. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

So, thank you, Sébastien. Appreciate the input. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Daniel speaking. I hope I can be heard well. I'd like to respond regarding to the issue of prioritization. I had already typed in the chat, but I'll just simply make my point. It'll be [inaudible] that [inaudible] recommended that [inaudible] it could look as though we have [inaudible] Community input [inaudible] discussions regarding to the priorities.

But I think realistic to what our [inaudible] can comment and not look at how the process of prioritization is taking place. Because [inaudible] lists you are going to have to start discussions on the implementation of the recommendations that come from this process. So, I think [inaudible] is stick to just the recommendations and then we leave everything to the [inaudible] implementation [inaudible]. Thank you.

PAT KANE: So, thank you, Daniel. We lost you a little bit at the end but I went back and read your item in the chat, and just so we can have everybody who probably couldn't hear it, was that I think you're recommending that we make our own recommendation, we let the Board take whatever their work product is in their paper, and either approve or adjust or have them part of the public commentary as part of our thinking, and then kind of ignore if you will what's going on in Brian Cote's group. Is that a fair representation?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, that's a fair representation but also it gives us a respective roadmap of the new methodologies of how we're going to be able to implement the respective reviews.

PAT KANE: Okay. Now, we've not talked about how we would do prioritization, really, in any great detail if we were to make a specific recommendation other than what we've put forth with the time that we've got available. So, I'm not certain that we have time to do that as this point in time, but where do you think we are, Daniel? In terms of looking at what a prioritization process would look like?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel speaking. Is that question towards me?

PAT KANE: Yeah. Because I think that when we're weighing what we can do versus what we're recommending ten days before we have to put a report, I'm trying to get, do we have a sense of the room as to what that would look like. And I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but I'm trying to get a sense for do we have enough thoughts to make a recommendation about prioritization, because I don't think we've talked about it enough for the room to have a sense, but I wanted to get your sense of where you think we might be.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, from my own perspective, I believe already that we have at least a roadmap or a map of what is happening regarding to prioritization, and the Plenary order of the members of the team can come to an agreement or consensus on what possible recommendations would come regarding to prioritization. I'm just still a little bit keen not go into the process already that is already taking place regarding to prioritization of tasks because it's really a discussion that is being held within various members of our different SOs, Brian Cote's work, regarding on how they are going to be able to prioritize their respective works.

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

DANIEL NANGHAKA: You're welcome.

PAT KANE:

Anyone else have something that they would like to share in terms of prioritization? Alright, seeing no hands, seeing nothing else in chat, let's go ahead and scroll up to the review section if we could, please. Thank you. So, in the review section, with what we've produced in Montreal, I'm sorry. What we presented in Montreal. We presented a slide that had three options, and clearly those three options received a lot of input both from our team and from the Community.

And I think that one of the suggestions that we had in Singapore, I think it was Singapore, or one of the meetings, maybe it was one the calls, at this point I can't remember, came by Jeff Houston through KC, was to have a smaller, three day event, which was odd because I heard that twice, once from Russ Housley and once from Bruce Hopkin while we're in Montreal to where the Community, there's a lot of suggestion around what a smaller more discreet process would like for improvement. And we also heard a lot around continuous improvement.

So, the objective here was to kind of say, "We have a lot of polarity or wide variance in terms of what we're thinking, what the Community is thinking." And a lot of that, and how a lot of that will be addressed, finds itself based upon how prioritization will be done. How many recommendations can actually be processed? Where are the recommendations coming from? How is the Community going to take a look and sort out what gets done, what gets funded, and then how do you retire recommendations over time, which is also part of the prioritization process.

So, given that and given that we think that the solution around Review Teams is based upon prioritization, or at least that's the direction that

this paper is going, how should we think about reviews? And one of the things that we've talked about as the Leadership Team is should we put a moratorium on reviews until the prioritization gets sorted out. And I think that one of the comments that Michael made yesterday makes a lot of sense, is that if you were to have a moratorium, it has to be timebound in case the prioritization process takes too long. Or the definition of the prioritization process takes too long.

And so, from that, he said six months, but I'm pretty certain that we couldn't get a prioritization process put in place or identified and approved within six months, but I understand that we don't want to stop evaluating ourselves while we're finishing this prioritization, if that takes too long. So, let's talk a little bit about those two items. So, the first one would be that the prioritization process is going to fuel what a review process would look like, and should we have a moratorium for a period of time until that process would be defined. Wolfgang, your hand is raised. Wolfgang, you're on mute.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Can you hear me now?

PAT KANE: I can hear you now, Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay, thank you. It takes some time for the unmuting. Okay, while I agree with Daniel that the feedback from Montreal was really great, but the feedback also demonstrated that the Community is a broad

spectrum of different opinions about this. There's a lot of very detailed comments and so far, I fully supported your approach on the white paper to have a number of options and to let's say to structure the feedback in to pros and cons for various options.

And what also was proposed, I think it was Tola, was helpful to say we should have probably undertake a spot analysis to find out what are from the options we have, where are the strengths, where are the weaknesses, where are the opportunities, and where are the strengths. If I remember the discussion we had in the Security and Stability Advisory Committee with Rod Rasmussen ran it and said, you know, the risk is that we lose specifics in the few bodies which have a very specific mandate. And for me this was a very good argument so that we have to be very careful and we have to deepen our understanding about our various proposals.

And so far, you know, to have a process with a number of steps which leads us to define a recommendation could be helpful. I think that at the moment we are working on a paper which goes out for public comment, and so far let's keep this open for a while so we can give our preferences, and if you read the white paper, then probably you could see there's a preference for Option 2, but nothing is decided. And so far the moratorium idea which is a new idea I think could be helpful not to postpone the final recommendation forever, but to have a window where you can further stimulate a discussion to get feedback and to come to a final end where you at least have a rough consensus about it.

So, you will never get in this very delicate questions a hundred percent consensus, but rough consensus is more than just a simple majority.

And probably we in our meeting in February, we can come up with a very concrete proposal and then this proposal could be tabled but put on hold until the end of the moratorium and to get additional feedback. So, to sum this, I think we are on the right track, I support your approach, I think we need more feedback and we should have a step-by-step process and not to push for quick decision here and now. Thank you. Back to Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thanks very much, Wolfgang, for that. Just to call out a couple items that have been in chat, Leon has noted that a moratorium might require a Bylaws change, and that's something that we should consider. Thank you, Leon, for that. And I think Daniel brought this up in that the next review isn't scheduled for 2021, so we may not even have to suggest a moratorium just that we complete the work on prioritization prior to 2021, such that we could move forward on reviews. And if that's the case, we're doing a short piece of work and maybe there's a declaratory, well it wouldn't be a PDP, but maybe that's what we suggest as part of the recommendation.

So, Wolfgang, I do like the idea of letting us getting more input during the public comment period, listing out the options. I think for us to build a full pros and cons or a swat that such as Jacques has suggested in the mail, that that will take some time and maybe we build that out once the initial report gets published so that we're prepared when the input does come in, such the February, we can fill that out and say, "Here's the options. Here's what people chose as options, and here's the strength of the options, and here's why we suggested this option or that

option.” And using that as part of that process. So, thank you very much for that Wolfgang. I appreciate it. Sébastien, your hand is raised.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Pat. A few comments. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. A few comments. The first one is that yes, there is no, if I see the right document, there is no review starting 2020 but we can't say that there is no review going on. Reviewing is not just the start. It's also the time where you do the review and are at least going on during 2020, and the implementation and there are a lot going through implementation in 2020. Therefore, when we say about moratorium, it's a question of when we will restart.

But I would like us to take into account at least two points. The first one is that I have the impression that our first responsibility for ATRT is the review question and not the question of how to organize the overall work of ICANN because we are the group who can propose to end up some reviews to start new ones, and I think that it's the core of our responsibility we need to take into account.

The second point, I would like very much that we don't forget that one of the main points we want to achieve is to have a holistic or systematic review of ICANN and when and how it can be done for me is the main issue on our discussion. Where we were talking about putting all together, it was to allow this. And if I can add a subpoint it's that when we talk about the idea of three days or something or three day a lot of things, I would like very much that we try to find, once again, for that notice to give you. Maybe those three days could be a good idea to put

inside one single review to have specific tasks done with specific people with specific knowledge.

Therefore, I don't think it's one or the other. And if we can take all the inputs, I have the impression that we can build something robust answering the question we have in front of us and helping the Community without having too much say of that's good, that's not, because of course we will have to make some choice, but I think if we can have this review it will help us to find the best way forward for the reviews and therefore for the prioritization also. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Sébastien. And I think that when we talk about the holistic review, that's one of the things that doesn't exist today and I don't think that we got a lot of negative feedback on putting in a holistic review because I think that, Sébastien, you and I were talking yesterday and you made a comment that the last one was done in 2002, when we looked at ICANN as a holistic entity and not individual structural reviews of an SO or an AC. So, I think that, and Sébastien, at some point in time today, in the next hour and 15, we may want to share a little bit about what our discussion was yesterday, but right now I'm going to Tola because your hand is raised. Thank you, Tola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Thank you. This is Tola Sogbesan. Good day everybody. I just want, first I appreciate everybody's situation, and I appreciate the fact that we have divergent views. However, I just want us to remember that we are never going to have [inaudible]. We're never going to have any option

that's going to take [inaudible] and we get 100 percent approval from everybody. So, which means any option we pick eventually, we have one or two areas that some people will disagree with.

So, I would listen to everybody's views. I would have different perspectives. I just want to recommend that we move ahead. We move ahead, pick only one, exhaust all the possible areas that may need different, I'm sorry I'm in transit so you can hear some background noise. So, even in academics you find some research work excessively done, a professor is surrounded for each possibility plausible. In a few weeks, you find another professor debunking what the previous professor achieved [inaudible]. I mean that there can never be 100 percent solution that is [inaudible]. So, I think we've spent quite a lot of time discussing this issue. It is okay. But we should get to a part where we say, "Hey, we need to move on." Take this best approach and we take a decision the best interest of the Community. Thank you so much.

PAT KANE:

So, thank you, Tola. This is Pat. So, I find that very interesting in that we believe that, coming out of Singapore, that what we presented as part of the Montreal presentation in terms of options, was very the sense of the room and then what we're finding is that the options on that page are unsatisfactory to members of the group and also members of the Community.

So, if we pick an option and use that as the foundation for the report to get feedback, what is that option going to be then? So, is it not one of the options that we presented? Is it not the three options that we put

on the slide for presentation? Is it not the fourth option which is a three day cycle? And I use three days as a specific unit of time, not necessarily that it's days or weeks or months, but some discreet period, it doesn't have to be days, but what option do we put forward, Tola, because I thought we were there?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Yeah, I agree. And I understand perfectly the angle that you are looking at it from. I think one of the challenges I observed in Montreal was that at the meeting, we had concluded on two possible options. But when the presentation was made in Montreal, that was a toddler. So, the first contribution from one member of the group was that where did the third one come from, okay? From that moment on, the discussions have been getting wider, right?

But I don't have any issue with it, but what I just feel is we have had every member of the team add their views, what they feel like, or against a particular option. Now, that's why I called for this form. If Bernie can help us do a chart pros and cons on each of them, let everybody see it clearly, sometimes if I'm saying something from perspective I may not be seeing the negative side of it.

So, if all of us have the same document and we are studying it, we will be able to see, okay, you prefer Option 1, but here are the negative sides to it, and then what do you counter. But I still believe there is none of the options we presented to the Community that's going to be 100 percent [inaudible]. Thank you so much.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Tola. Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Thank you, Pat. I wanted to come back to the point raised by Leon about the Bylaw changes. I guess whatever we suggest about reorganizing the reviews, as the reviews from the aforementioned commitment was put into the Bylaws, therefore will we have to review the Bylaw anyhow. If we suggest to not pursue with RDS Reviews, we will have change of the Bylaws.

Therefore, I don't think that any of our proposals will be treated differently. At the end of the day, we will have to face that Bylaw changes will be needed. Maybe it's something we need to take into account because it will be another time to have a discussion around such proposals. But I think we can't have that as a red flag but just as a reminder I think. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Yeah, thank you, Sébastien. I think that was from Leon's perspective, a suggestion to keep in mind because what we would be doing was possibly making a Bylaw change so that we could figure out how to make Bylaw changes. And I think that that's how we should take a look at that, but yes, we need to keep that in mind.

But if there's nobody else that wants to weigh in specifically, I'd like to go and kind of talk and present where Sébastien and I ended up yesterday in terms of a conversation, because when it came to taking a look at the substantive reviews, so what I'll refer to as the AoC specific

reviews, we had been talking about rolling it into one in terms of what the presentation was in Montreal. And I think that yesterday in having a conversation with Sébastien, he kind of took, and I don't know if you meant to do this, Sébastien, but he kind of took a Sherlock Holmes approach where we threw out a bunch of things and what we ended up with was one, one review.

And this is the logic that Sébastien and I talked through yesterday, which was the RDDS Review, we're moving to a Policy Development Process around privacy and around access to data to where RDDS is going to look very, very different at some point in time in terms of what we're reviewing and what is available from a WHOIS or an RDAP or whatever the protocol ends up being used to access registration and specifically registrant data. So, RDDS probably dies on the line.

When it comes to the CCTRT Reviews, we made... We talked about this in Singapore, that maybe all we need is one more competition review at some period of time, one, two years after the completion of the next round. So CCTRT probably goes away, except for some components that are probably geared towards accountability and transparency, and then when you look at SSR, and I know SSR2 has had some issues getting done, but is there a picket fence, if you will, on what portions of ICANN you look at and what portions of the development of tools and systems and supportive policy.

If there's a division there, and what you're left with is probably a very skinny SSR, and an ATRT. And if you have an ATRT, and Sébastien rightly pointed out yesterday, that we call ourselves ATRT3 but we're really a completely different Review Team than what ATRT1 and ATRT2 were in

terms of what we're reviewing. And at the point in time you end up with one and a little bit of another Review Team. So, it really does get to like one if you think about it from that direction. Sébastien, is there anything you would like to add based upon our conversation to that?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Pat. First of all, thank you to allowing to have discussions together. It helped me a lot including to put my mind into the right direction because sometimes when you think by yourself, it's a little bit difficult. Again, thank you for that. I think you summarized very well what is about the specific review where we are and where we can go.

And therefore, I include some changing names with having something with not just accountability and transparency but also something linked with systemic, with holistic, or with coordination, or with something we can show that it's not anymore the ATRT as we knew it. And the other reason where I think it's important to understand that we are not the same ATRT than the 1 and the 2 is the composition, not how we are selected, but the composition.

The fact that we don't have a representative of NTIA. The fact that we don't have the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC or the representatives when it's happened to be. Change including through the dynamic of the group and the review from the rest of the Community of what we are, when it was something with those three people, and it's not to say that we are worse than them, but we don't have the same title, the same position in this organization. I think it changed a lot of things including what we will be able to do.

But it's why I think we are in another dynamic with this ATRT3 and maybe there's a possibility for at least for this specific review, is that we include everything. And I want to add one thing I didn't write yesterday, but the idea about the three days. Let's take that we have in ATRT something for who work on the different issues and it came to something about security and stability. They could have a three day meeting, face-to-face meeting, with people who would have been in SSR3 and to make the work in three days, that is what is suggested by people who participate to SSR2 and who are railing with security as a SSAC. And maybe it's where I think we can put together the different ideas in one single point. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much for that, Sébastien. You know, outside of you questioning our pedigree, I appreciate everything that you said. So, let me move to the Organization Review. And one of the things that Sébastien has been consistent on since we talked about this in Singapore is what is that holistic view, what is that holistic view of the organization, and I termed this in Singapore, looking at the white space in between the structures and looking at the organization and how it interacts together. And one of the times in support of that we talked about was letting the SOs/ACs determine what they wanted to take a look at in improvement of themselves as well as what the frequency is.

Now, one of the things that popped up yesterday in the conversation with Sébastien that I thought was interesting was maybe there is a requirement to have a review within a period of time, and if you were to take a look and say you got six SOs/ACs, everyone has to have

something done within seven years or whatever that milestone would be staggered, but every seven years we would do a holistic review of the organization such that we do have, we're focused on the one with interim Organizational Reviews determined at the cadence of the SOs/ACs.

So, I thought that was interesting because what you'd get to is you'd get to one Community wide review on the organization with a requirement for SOs/ACs to do something within their group over a period of time. Now, what it is and what it has to be, but at some point in time they got to do some sort of self-examination. So, Sébastien, if you want to weigh in on anything on that, I would like to throw that out for the group to consider.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat. I think you summarized that very well. Once again, thank you for that. And I think it's also answering the question is that we don't do something or the other, but we try to give the response at the right level. I don't know the right word in English, but I guess so subsidiarity, and that's something important. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. Anybody want to weigh in on that? I see no hands. Cheryl, any commentary there?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I think that gives us plenty of food for thought. I personally am attracted to procedures that allow for appropriate amounts of internal

entity self-reviewing and having time to have implementation actually tested that the current cadence as we know is just not working for Organizational Reviews where one is barely got the ink dry on the implementation before one is having yet another external review. That's folly. And it appears to be that in some of this thinking there's opportunity to at least fix that or have done a good go at fixing that. And I'm also attracted to a concept of a periodic holistic review presence. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Leon, I'd very much appreciate your viewpoint on this.

LEON SANCHEZ: Sorry, my connection dropped for a bit. So, could you kindly repeat the question?

PAT KANE: So, okay. How much did you... When did you last hear what we were talking about?

LEON SANCHEZ: I didn't hear pretty much anything.

PAT KANE: Okay, so the question is kind of a long question because I wanted you to weigh in on the conversation, but I'll try to catch you up later because I

think what I would suggest that we do is since there's no more comments specifically... And Leon, I apologize for not getting to the specific question because it really was about the conversation, that we take the commentary... And Jacques, I see your hand, I'll get to you in one second.

Let's take the commentary that we received here and try to twist this white paper a little bit with Bernie and then see if we can't capture something along the lines of what I'm going to term as we're not throwing up all over what we talked about here today, take some of the commentary and see if we can squeeze that in this paper, such that a recommendation could be produced out of it in some period of time. So, I think Bernie and I will talk about that. Cheryl, Bernie, and I will talk about that. Jacques, please.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yes. Jacques for the record. So, in all that I'm hearing, I mean it's just a side note and it's further to my email yesterday more or less, and it's further to Cheryl's note into the chat talking about the processes. I think we will have a couple of things to face here. And all that remembering time is really short for us.

The first thing is what kind of principle are we going to recommend and let's remember we've got a process to follow here if we name that recommendation, okay? And one said what kind of principle are we going to recommend, more than one review, one holistic review, and so on. Any feels, I do feel, and maybe that's because I'm kind of a process guy before my former life and actual life, I feel like whatever we do

recommend which has to be in the spirit of the ICANN MultiStakeholder Model and Community Model, whatever we do recommend the process we're going to try and push forward are going to be paramount if anything we do recommend as any chance to work.

Because as I was stating, a holistic review, the term holistic is a great term, but I feel a bit weary about these kinds of big, big, I named it a monster and it's too strong a term but this kind of big organizations or reviews or name them the way you want, just turning on themselves, and turning, and being so big, and they want to embrace so much that they don't end with really recommendations or actions that can be professional. And my feeling is on the principle consensus, I'm sure we can find, but the process will be very important to recommend here if we want to start and push the Community and recommend to the Community something that could just work.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Jacques. I appreciate it. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Pat. Now I got a feeling and a sense of what you were expecting me to weigh on. Sorry about that. So, I mean, I think that ATRT3 needs to come up with a recommendation and this recommendation will be put for public comment, right? So, I see the value in having a holistic review, but I also would remind us about the purpose of reviews which goes down to the transparency and accountability of ICANN and of course the different structures that form ICANN.

So, I wondering whether a holistic review would be able to achieve this goal, how this holistic review would be performed, and how the different interdependencies within the different groups and structures that form ICANN could play along in this holistic review. So, I mean, it's not up to the Board to make of course recommendations, but I would definitely encourage ATRT3 to make a recommendation along this lines and view it through the lens of the public comments received after the public comment period, of course.

PAT KANE:

So, thank you, Leon. This is Pat again. Sébastien, I'm going to respond here and then I'll come right to you. So, Leon, I think that you're absolutely right. The Review Teams are all about making certain that the appropriate people in the Community and in the Org and on the Board are accountable for what it is that they are responsible for within the Bylaws and in the processes of the organization, as well as making certain that we're doing that in a transparent manner.

But I think that one of the things that we are addressing, because I think that it's very clear from members of this team, is that the mechanisms that we put in place that result in recommendations to the Community when we do a post-evaluation and only 53 percent of those can be declared as complete over six years, after six years from the following review, do we really have the right process in place around accountability and transparency if we're not really, if we're just checking boxes, or we have the perception of checking boxes and we're not really getting things done to the intent or the meaning from the previous Review Teams.

And so, I think that's part of what the calculus has to be here as well in terms of how do we produce the most meaningful recommendations that can get accomplished with the limited resources that we have within the Community. I mean, if we were completely flushed with cash, it'd be different, but you'd have an organization that had 800 people and not 320 or 350 or whatever the number is today. So, I think that's part of the calculus, but I absolutely appreciate your commentary on the purpose of the Review Teams. And, Sébastien, since I was going directly...

LEON SANCHEZ: Can I do a quick follow up on that, Pat?

PAT KANE: Exactly, I was going to go right to you. Yes. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Pat. So, this is Leon again. You are right. I mean, if we are looking at implementation rates or radius, then maybe the question is not necessarily how we do reviews but how we actually go and implement those reviews. So, there is of course a relationship between both reviews and implementations.

So, I would think that the holistic review, I mean, if we just squeeze all reviews into a single review, in my mind that won't change the implementation ratio that we are having. It would just squeeze everything into one single review and exercise, come up with recommendations, and give us a similar result along time. So, I think

that what Wolfgang is saying in the chat is key. So, the key strategic issues is what we may be should be looking at when doing the reviews. So, we have talked about tying all activities of SOs/ACs, Review Teams, etcetera, to the Strategic Plan.

So, if we try to tie the reviews to the Strategic Objectives that have been highlighted or stated in the Strategic Plan, I mean the Operating Plan, we do the reviews under this scope, maybe that could help to better implement the recommendations of the Review Teams. Because we would have, of course, the mandated review that would go along the lines of the Bylaws and the original purpose of reviews, but it would also help us say, okay, we are making these recommendations which are in line with these strategic objectives and therefore would have at least in my mind and I'm just thinking out loud here, a better chance of being implemented because they would be already in line with the Board and the Organization are trying to achieve with the Strategic Plan. I hope that helps that.

PAT KANE:

No, Leon, that's perfect because that's why prioritization has to get solved first because prioritization and focusing on the things that are the most relevant to the organization and the Community and the Board so that we can get the things that are the most impactful to the future of this organization. And so, I think what you said is spot on to what this paper is talking about from the standpoint of prioritization and yeah, implementation is part of that process of prioritization, that it all feeds into what we're talking about here. So, thank you very much for that. Sébastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I think it is maybe a difficult discussion because we don't have the same level of input on all information, but I would like to, I will not repeat what Pat has said about the discussion we had yesterday, but please don't consider because we talked about holistic reviews that [inaudible]. If we will have missed the point.

The idea in this proposal and discussion was what each SOs/ACs who are currently subject to review will do and will be in charge of doing continuous improvement and once every, whatever they decide but every six years or seven years, they seek Organization Review. Therefore, it's why we are talking about six and add one, seven years. And those continuous improvement must be ended with a report of implementation and that we fuel what I call this holistic review in the seventh year.

And nobody has to do it at the same time as the other. It could be one per year, it could be altogether if the [inaudible] decides to have, I think it would be strange and a bit difficult to do. But it can be organized in the seven years as each SO/AC think it's the most appropriate for them and for the Community. And that will fuel what is inside, what will be done in the holistic review.

I want to remind you what Pat said, we are looking at the blank between what we have already done for this holistic review. It's not to do everything. It's to do the things not done at the other level. We, the civil society, has done there. That's one point. The second is I will be in

trouble to link that with Strategic Plan because the Strategic Plan is five years. Here, we are talking about seven years.

Therefore, we are not linked with one other Strategic Plan. And it must be the future of all that must be on top of the rest. If not, we will not be able to do this first, this holistic review for the organization, one, and ATRT next for the specific reviews. I hope that we will be able to put that into paper. I am sure that Cheryl, Pat, and Bernie will do a terrific job. I am at your... I am available to review it if you wish before sending it to everybody but if not, I will participate like the others. I think it will be easier to have this discussion afterward. Thank you again.

PAT KANE:

Thank you so much, Sébastien. Any other comment on this document? Because I think that we've got a lot of input here. And remember what I outlined about our conversation that Sébastien and I had yesterday is once again just another option that we can put in here to say, "Here's how you would do certain things and retire certain items, but that's just another option to take a look at."

So, do we have anybody else that wants to weight in? Because if not, I will take this and have Bernie go ahead and modify the white paper, suggestion paper, as such that we can get out in a couple of days and let everybody review that, take a look and see where we are, and then make some recommendations out of it that we can look at next Wednesday. So, Leon, your hand is raised, please.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Pat. This is Leon again. So, just to roundup what I think I'm hearing, maybe the team could be thinking about also making some recommendations to disclose, of course, to different topics that we've been discussing today that establish a cadence for reviews within a workable timing, allowing to avoid overlapping's, and also allow to have sufficient time to implement.

So, if we tie reviews to time, and we also tie recommendations to tight objectives, then we might have a better outcome of implementations. So, what an entire implementation process reporting, that's one interpretation, this could work better I think. So, that's what I wanted to add, Pat. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Leon. Larisa, yes.

LARISA GURNICK: Hi everybody. Can you hear me okay?

PAT KANE: We can.

LARISA GURNICK: Okay, thanks. Thanks for the good discussion. I just wanted to bring to your attention that the Board and the OEC have been discussing some of the elements of timing and cadence of reviews. And we can add a link

into the chat to the various slides that Aubrey had discussed with the Review Team Leadership and also in the public session.

Just to help frame what has been discussed as issues that pose challenges with the timing of reviews, not enough time for implementation and a couple of other simple kinds of observations that we were included on those slides that might help inform your discussions as you evolve the different options. So, I just wanted to put a pin in that and remind that some of that framing of the issues and looking at the timing and the cadence and the challenges with that might be relevant to what you're doing now. Thanks.

PAT KANE:

Yes, thank you for that, Larisa. But I think that yes, we're aware of that, and we are certainly having the same conversations in terms of what we see. I think that we came up with, in our conversations from the very beginning, are very much in line with some of the issues and some of the considerations that we see in those particular slides. So, thanks again. Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you very much. Just to comfort you, when I was thinking about the discussion we had yesterday, I took that into account. Of course, I don't have the same level of support that the Board gets and to be able to write this document, but I think that the big difference between ATRT and the Board, the Board is thinking about how to improve the current situation without changing it. We have the duty to

look at how we can change it, not just about the planning and the prioritization, but also about the content.

And it's where it's some time difficult to have this part of the discussion, and I would prefer to have a discussion together and not one group and the other, but it seems to be difficult. Therefore, we need to take that as an input but first I think the question about what we want to do and how we want to organize the review, it's even more important than how we will organize them one by one, even if it's already included in some of the thoughts we share with you after our conversation with Pat yesterday. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Sébastien. So, in moving forward from this topic, and I think that we've come to the end of the conversation, I would like to find out if we've got a general sense of the room, a general temperature of the room, in terms of what we've discussed in that while we're not making a specific recommendation, we are putting specific options as part of the paper that would have a let's have a broader discussion following what prioritization looks like, put some timeframes around that so that we don't let things be open ended, but I'm getting a feel that this white paper is directionally in line with the general sense of the room.

If you agree with that, please put a green tick, a yes tick, and if you disagree with that, please put a no tick because I want to see where we are on this. I guess I should mine in, okay. So, I've got seven green ticks, I've got no red ticks, and I'm going to assume that the remainder of the

Review Team is taking an abstention, if you will, on that particular item, but it seems to me that we've captured again the general temperature of the room that we are directionally doing, we have been in general agreement with the direction of this white paper. So, let me declare that. We'll close this out. Bernie, I think you've got, you do have enough, do you think, for us to take another cut at this in the next couple of days and put something out?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

I think there is enough there. We'll have to have a chat just to make sure that we're coordinated on that, but yes.

PAT KANE:

Absolutely. Okay, so thank you very much. I'll declare this section closed. And if we could bring up the Agenda please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Pat, Cheryl here. I'm just wondering if we're going to have enough in our existing block of time to do anything meaningful with our report. Maybe Bernie could just give us any significant changes that have been made as a high points and holidays tour because we do need to leave at least five minutes for our any other business. Thanks.

PAT KANE:

Okay.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Really, we're going to have to... Well, what's been going on with the document, there's Version 5.1 on the Google doc which is the master doc right now, so people can have a look at it. What I have been doing is, as per what we did on the last Plenary, I've been reducing sections, moving the details of the ATRT2 Analysis to an annex and moving the details of the survey to an annex so that the sections shrink down.

I haven't done 3 yet because that's the big one. But I'm down to Section 10 for shrinking down. So, 10, 11, there's not much, and then there is Section 12 with the reviews. So, I hope to get those done pretty soon but the review of the white paper is going to be the big thing. What I propose is that I will actually, there are a few items left to discuss. I will produce a list for our next Plenary, and we can just tick those off our list and then we will be done with that. So, that's my short report on that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Perfect, Bernie. Thank you. Excellent. Any questions from anybody on that one? Okay. Right. I seem to have green ticks still residual. So, Pat...

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sorry, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Cheryl. I was not very prompt enough. I just wanted to, if you'll allow me, Sébastien Bachollet speaking, to note how you and Bernie want to us to interact on this specific document. When, and how, I think it will be useful at least for me to know when he you are expecting us to interact on the document. We wait for him to finish, we... How do you want us to do it? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, the point of having a Google doc is to allow it to be a continuous process. And then, Bernie updates with a new version from time to time. Bernie, do you have a different take on that?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No, we're at the point of building the various suggestions and we've gone through some of those and people can look at the document for those and it'll keep increasing as I said, our master reference right now is 5.1 and so we'll be working our way from there. So, if people have time, please have a look at 5.1 and it is in flux, but most of the flux at this point is, as I stated earlier, about moving ATRT2 Analysis of Recommendations to the annex and moving surveys to the annex and just keeping the portions where we're going to want to state in the analysis portion of each major point, why we're considering making suggestions or recommendations and then looking at those suggestions and recommendations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, it seems that you're welcome to make suggestions and comments ad lib. And Bernie will obviously make our list of outstanding items and there'll be part of the Plenary for next week's call and of course we'll also be making sure they're clearly articulated at the Leadership Meeting on Monday as well. Remember also, however, that we will have a next generation of the white paper for everyone's digestion and commentary probably, Bernie I'm assuming we're going to be trying that for week's end, or thereabouts, but we shall see. Bernie has given me a green tick, so that's terrific.

Okay, now, in terms about any other business, you heard us start off saying that, you know, there is ten days, and we have deadlines looming where we would really have our drop-dead in terms of what we will putting into our interim report by that time. So, we're going to now have a very brief discussion on how we're going to manage that from a logistics point of view.

It is suggested that we increase the duration of our next calls and we could also increase the frequency of our next calls, so you could look at having a call that would go for up to three hours for example, or you could look at having two meetings per week of the 90 minutes. So, what is it that's going to work best for you? We now want to have a very brief conversation about that. Opinions, people. I see, first of all, Jacques and then Daniel. Jacques, after you.

JACQUES BLANC: Yes, Jacques for the record. So, I've got great coffee at home and I drink it on a regular basis as Cheryl suggested, but nevertheless, if we

increase the length of our calls, I'm very afraid that either on one side or the other side of the world, we're starting to go to bed at two a.m. in the morning, so sorry. And I get for a certain number of us, which I am from, this might be an issue. So, I would recommend increasing the frequency of calls. My fivepence.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record. Looking at the timeframe, I think we can do two calls. It will help us instead of having three hours on one respective call, but I wouldn't mind having the three hours. But that timing will not be very, very good for [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thank you very much. Sébastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. In general, I don't care which one solution, but next week as it's IGF, I have already a few things on my evening therefore I would suggest that if we can get our call of three hours, it will be better. It will take half of my night, but you know that better than us, Cheryl, and I think I can manage. If we want to find another time this week, it will be quite odd I think. But I am open to any decision you will be taking. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. And I think when we checked, Negar perhaps you can, or Brenda, you can doublecheck again for me, but when we checked on our Leadership Call, our next call rotation, so our previously advertised meeting for next week, would be starting with a Berlin time of about 10 p.m., I think that's the case. And if that's the case, hopefully that will mean that there won't be too many clashes with the evening activities.

So, one way of course if we had a greater frequency of call, we could even have it without the time rotation and try to take it to the later evening option so as not to clash with IGF activities. Now, Wolfgang, you're deeply involved with all things IGF as well, how would that work out for you in your calendar? If you're speaking, Wolfgang, we're not hearing you. There we go.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: [inaudible] you should hear me. So, I'm fully occupied with the IGF from early in the morning to late in the evening all the five days. In terms of me, it's my host country, the country where I live, and so far I'm out for next week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, even at 21:00 UTC you're out?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so noted. Thank you. Alright then. So, that really leaves us then to almost flip a coin. We've got a suggestion that the longer duration may not suit everybody, and I must admit there is a diminishing return of depending on what time of day, it is for people with their meetings. Jacques, at 21:00 UTC, that's your late evening I'm assuming, is it?

JACQUES BLANC: So, 21:00 UTC would push us to one a.m. my time. I can try and do that. But it's really the latest one. You know, it's not so much my evening.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure.

JACQUES BLANC: It's not so much my evening activities. I mean, I'm more dedicated to ATRT twice a week, it's not a problem. It's more the sleep hours because I have to get up around half past four in the morning for miscellaneous reasons. That's all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, not a problem. Understood. Okay, so can we then suggest that we are going to then have at least a two hour meeting at 21:00 UTC on Wednesday of next week, as previously advertised. In other words, we have at least a two hour slot rather than our previous 90 minute one, rather than take it to three hours, we see if we can put in a second call,

which correct me if I'm wrong, Bernie, but there may actually be a benefit to that anyway because it will allow us to consolidate some of the work and then bring it back for final review. And I'm getting a green tick from Bernie.

So, would it be an insurmountably problematic impasse for all involved if we were to find a time, probably on our next time rotation, to hold a call on what would be a Friday UTC time. Brenda and Negar, can you tell me what the next, would it be 11:00 UTC on Friday? 11:00 UTC would be our next rotation, so would 11:00 UTC Friday be an impossible thing for other people. Obviously there would be travel coming back from IGF, so you need to look at that very carefully. Sébastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, why not but I think I will still be involved in IGF during the day and it's European Day, it's quiet. But I understand that if it's 10 p.m. or 9:00 UTC p.m. in for the others it could be difficult. But if it's during the day IGF will be quite difficult for me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sure. Understood and it would be impossible for others who are there. Would 21:00 UTC on Friday be an impasse on everyone? I'm getting a thumbs up from Sébastien. Jacques, is that going to be pushing the friendship too much with you?

JACQUES BLANC:

I mean, we've got ten days to do it, so I'll manage.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, alright then. And I'm getting a thumbs up from Pat and a thumbs up from Osvaldo. Alright, so what we're going to do then, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you for indulging me for the extra time it's taken for this action, Agenda Item to be discussed and completed. But let's look at two two hour calls, both of them running at 21:00 UTC. The already advertised and booked one at 21:00 on Wednesday and the other will be 21:00 UTC on Friday.

We will, I assume, note with my amusement, that that means it is my weekend because I am 24 hours ahead of the rest of the world, and I'm happy to put that time in anyway. So, that's not a problem. I'm just making it obvious that we all have to sacrifice. Okay, then let's get that out then Brenda as an invitation on a two hour call for that. That'll give us four hours, split the difference across a couple of days, and with that we should be able to put these things to final drafting then. Pat, is there anything you would like to raise at this point on today's meeting, or are we going to give these people a little bit of their lives back?

PAT KANE: I think that I'm good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, well if that's the case, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to ask you to be very responsive to things that go to the list. Don't put off until later in a day what you could respond to in an email message, as soon as

you read it. We really do need fast turnaround time on things as we go forward.

Please, you've got the links to all of the various document out of today's Agenda and I believe that the Google doc live link to the report will actually take you to Version 5.1 now, not 5.0 as advertised. But if not, I'm sure we'll send the correct one to the list. So, do keep a watching brief on those documents and make your comments and suggestions as we go through and also give us some very quick turnaround in reactions in responses to the updated white paper that will coming out by week's end. So, with that, Pat, I'll take it back to you to take it home. Thank you very much. Unless, of course, you're muted.

PAT KANE:

I was actually not on mute and I clicked it and muted myself before I started talking. So, I was already [inaudible]. So, Negar, if you will take us through any confirmed actions and decisions that we've reached today, please.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Sure, Pat. I'd be happy to. I've only captured a couple of items. A quick Action Item is that after the discussions during the Plenary call today, Bernie in collaboration with you and Cheryl will be updating the white paper and that it will be distributed back to the review team for further discussions next week. And two decisions that I've captured, one is to increase the duration of the Plenary call for next week on the 27th of November to two hours, the meeting time is still at 21:00 UTC, and the second decision is to schedule another call for Friday the 29th of

November at 21:00 UTC for a two hour duration as well. Please let me know if I've missed anything.

PAT KANE: I think that sounds right from matching up with my notes here. So, thank you for that, Negar. Unless we have any final commentary from the team I declare [inaudible] closed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much everybody and bye for now. Pardon me.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks everyone, have a great day.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Bye everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]