JENNIFER:	Hi, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Jennifer and I'm going to do by best Brenda impression today, so please bear with me. Thank you for joining the plenary call today on the 29th of October 2019. This is the ATRT Plenary 40.
	We have myself, Jennifer, from ICANN org, and Bernie, the technical writer. From the review team: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jacques Blanc, Sebastien Bachollet, Tola, and Vanda. I'm sure we'll have some others join soon. Osvaldo mentioned that he was going to be late.
	We have apologies from Leon, Demi, KC, and Negar.
	With that, I will hand the call over to you, Cheryl. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks very much, Jennifer. That was an excellent rendering of a Brenda welcome. Well done, indeed.
	I will go through the usual administrivia, even though there is fewer of us than usually gathered at the beginning of the call. Of course, we'll expect others to turn up in short order, remembering, of course, that, originally, this was scheduled in people's calendars to start one hour later. Unless they have changed their calendar invitation, it may still be in their calendars to start one hour later. So perhaps some people may in fact flood in in the next hour when they realize that in fact, "Oh, yes. That's right. We had started an earlier because it's a three-hour duration for our call." So I'm certainly going to do everyone the courtesy, nothing that Jennifer has [pinged] to the list. So, if they're

looking at their e-mails, they will get a reminder that any number of our people who will be joining the [inaudible] will perhaps have that as their reason.

That said, are there any statement of interest updates?

Not hearing anybody and seeing any hands come up. Let's then dive straight into our agenda. Our agenda today is one of the more restricted agendas for our longest – I think on our record, at least – call. We've scheduled three hours for today call and we have another call coming on Sunday, which will be the completion of our pre-public comment publication work. But we will be continuing our work throughout, but it will be a closing off after Sunday's meeting on our documents as they are finally prepared to go through the public comment period, which we have undertaken to begin on the 16th of December. But more of that from Bernie once we get to our agenda in full.

We'll going to be looking at the completion of the discussion on our white paper, Version 2.1, and we'll be reviewing the Doodle polls. So, Jennifer, you can be ready to queue that in a moment. That would be terrific. Then we're going to spend a major part of today looking at our report, Version 5.1, and then [inaudible] our meeting planning, which will be set for Sunday, the 1st of December, at 21:00 hours. Another potential call is not possible because of the timeline we are up against for getting our documentation [inaudible].

If there's anyone who has Any Other Business at this stage that they'd like to foreshadow, can they please let us know? And we will be calling for Any Other Business again before we finish today's call.

Vanda? Yes, please. Do go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's not any other business. It's just to say that we are trying to reach Manal, but I believe that he was in Berlin and not able to respond. But I'm contracting Liu, and we are dealing with these questions that we have in our private group about one point in our agenda for [GAC]. Just to let you know that we are waiting for Manal's answer. Okay? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much for that, Vanda. We look forward to that probably being resolved in the next day or so.

Sebastien? And I note a thumbs up to your on that one. Thank you, Vanda. Sebastien, go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say that it's a pity because you could have sent that to me and I would have [inaudible]. I saw Manal many times during these two days, and I could have [inaudible]. But you need to take into account the full team sometimes. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure Pat could have also offered the same services as well. But Vanda and Liu did not, and there we are.

Let's go on then now to having a quick look at our Doodle poll results, and that will lead us into our white paper, Version 2.1. It looks to me that, from that, there is at least one of the currently discussed option in the current 2.1 version paper that each and every one of us can support. That was the intention of the poll: to find out if there was at least something that each of our active members could have supported, although I'm now looking down the list and concerned to see that a couple of our members have not been able to complete the poll. I note KC has been unable to complete the poll.

Who else? Jennifer? There's another one missing. At least one [inaudible] missing?

JENNIFER: WE have Lui [certainly] missing as well. And Ramet. I sent everybody a note today. I did see KC on the list, who had some questions or comments. She says she wasn't able to complete because she had some questions about the options still.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is that [KC]? We can hope that, by [inaudible]. I'm not sure Liu would be a in a position to do it? Do you want to leave the poll open any longer, just for giggles? I mean, we did say we'd close it.

Bernie? Sorry, you were trying to say something?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	I think Vanda has it right. We have a clear majority of the active group at this point. It was just to give us indication going into this discussion, and now that's done. And we have to close by Sunday. So I would just close it down.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Sure. Happy to close it down, but equally happy to leave it open if people simply wan to have their points made on the record, not that that would make any changes whatsoever to what we were dealing with. It's certainly got a strong enough indicator. But, remember, we were not voting. We were not actually polling to get our preferences. We were asking, are there options which you have a preference for? In other words, to see whether there was at least some support for each of the options. And there is indeed exactly that: some support and some more significant support for each of the options.
	Sebastien, before we move on, you had something to say about the poll?
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Yeah. I would like to suggest that we leave it open for then moment because I don't think, for [inaudible] reasons, it would be good not to allow KC. For the moment, she asked questions and we may wish to help in answering the question. I hope that she will fulfill the Doodle after that. If not – for example, on Sunday – she doesn't do it, we can close it. But I would prefer that we leave it open. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

[inaudible] political motivation. As I said, I was happy to do so. I'm not sure there's any politics involved in that. But certainly let's leave it open. When we close off all our [final] document, then we [inaudible] simply for archival interest. At least it'll make it look like everybody had an attempt at making their opinions on the record.

With that – Bernie's saying, "Close it off after the meeting on Sunday"; we can do that – let's continue on then. Welcome, Daniel. I think you've just joined. With that, let's go back now. Jennifer, if we can have our Version 2.1 of the white paper. Bernie, I'm going to pass it to you to take us to where we may go now.

Oh, that "Y" in front of then white paper was a typo. Or not a typo, it was me accidentally – I did that [inaudible], but I removed it. I touched the keyboard. I don't know even why it was [there]. Oh, well. Hopefully I didn't have any other random keyboard issues. I was reading through it, I realized I popped in that additional letter. My apologies.

Okay, now it's been rectified. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you very much. Well, it should be fairly simple now. Basically, I think the … excuse me. I'm getting the mouth in gear. The review section is done with the survey. I think the only question we should ask at this point, given the results of the survey and the fact that Option 2 and 3 are close, do we want to go with just two options into the public comment – i.e., Option 1 and Option 3 – or do we still want to go with all three? If you have a preference for that either way, could we see some indication of that?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Can I say something?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, please?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I would suggest that, since we are going into the issue of public comment, we could [inaudible] all three. Then we can be able to at least get feedback from the community on the response that [we'll be given] and to help us to make [perfect] adjustments after the community feedback. That's my thought. Thank you. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. I'll tell you why I'm asking the question, and this may help. Option 2 and Option 3 are, in a number of ways, close. When you submit that in a public comment, you end up getting a lot of cross-talk between the options. So people will, in a way, get a little bit confused between bot, and that can lead to some funny results. But I'll be glad to take direction from the group either way, and I don't want to spend a lot of time on this.

                        Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Exactly in your line. I'll give a quick translation. 2 and 3 make it difficult to give a clear understanding for someone reading it for the first time of what we are really talking [inaudible] differentiate from one to another.

I do believe that it can make confusion and leave people with doubt. [It's not a] clear proposition because it's hard to understand, especially when you translate it.

So, in my point of view, we should stick to 1 and 3 because 2 is [inaudible] because they are quite different and people understand 1. It will take some time to understand 2 [and] 3. If you mix it with 2, there may be confusion for making a decision for people not completely [involved] in that. That's my point. So I will stick with 1 and 3, even though 1 is not my suggestion. But 1 and 3 [inaudible] majority. I believe they'll be the best for people to choose and comment on. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That's exactly my point, Vanda. Providing 1 and 3 provides very distinct options.

Secondly, we have to understand that this is a public comment. It doesn't mean, because we put 1 and 3, we will end up with just one specific model. We will be looking at the results of the public comment and then adjusting our speaking.

I see Cheryl next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Vanda, thank you so much for that analysis because I was not committed one way or the other. I suppose, if anything, I was slightly more biased towards putting all three out, primarily because I was trying not to use the Doodle poll as a poll per se but rather for what

it was intended/stated purpose was, which was just to ensure that each one of the options had at least some support.

But hearing your rationale, Vanda, has certainly turned my thinking. I think, having the greater distinction would in fact be the better advantage from a going-to-public-comment point of view, noting specifically, to Bernie's point, that this is, of course, not the end. It does not mean that we will only be then making a recommendation on 1, as she is writ, versus 3, as she as writ, as a response to that public comment. I think there is greater sense in doing what's now proposed with Vanda's rationale of putting out #1 and #3 and seeing which way the compass of the community is going to be pointing us. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Cheryl. As practice for what we're going to be doing today, because we have to move a lot of stuff very quickly, I'll just ask anyone who's opposed to going forward with only 2 to put up a red X right now. We'll wait a few seconds.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It looks very clear to me.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Daniel has [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tola has his hand up.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, Tola?

TOLA SOGBESAN: Hello. I just feel, before we jump into this, a bit concerned with the questions raised by KC. In deciding what we do with Options 1, 2, or 3, we need to have a compass. We need to have those questions answered. What are we actually [inaudible]? Why [aren't we reviewing] what has currently been done? Those questions really matter to me as well. I read it a couple of times. Even when we're putting it for public comment, I want the community to see why we're doing what we're doing.

So I'm thinking maybe we need to answer those questions that KC raised and see how [inaudible]. After answering them, then we move to what we need to do today. I don't know. If the Chair would prefer, [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tola, the current Chair is going to say we don't have the luxury of that time. She would also be saying, with her Chair hat on, if we believe the answer to those questions belong in the final document, then we have time to perhaps look at that. Or we can certainly take that into account in our rationale in our problem statements and our explanations in our final reporting.

Tola, you obviously don't want me to finish my statement before you respond, so do go ahead.

TOLA SOGBESAN: No, you can finish, please. Go ahead. I just [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. The other point I was going to make is that answering the questions for KC is then of course going to allow KC respond to the Doodle poll. If she said yes to everything, no to anything, yes to one thing, or no to one thing, it's not going to change the majority of people's preference for Option 3. So putting Option 3 into the mix makes good, rational sense. Putting Option 1 makes sense because it is a very different proposal, and, based on what Vanda has just explained, that's certainly, from my personal (not my Chair) point of view, making me say, if we're going to drop one, it may as well be the middle one.

Now, please, over to you, Tola.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you. I'm not obviously speaking on behalf of KC. I'm saying I'm convinced that those questions matter to me as well. Rather than waiting until the end of the final report, why do we want to begin with an assessment on the wrong footing? That's my understanding.

So my thinking is, if I'm able to get answers to the reason why I am changing the status quo, then I'll be able to guide myself in the reason why I need to do it. So, if I have those questions, what is the problem with the current review? There must be a particular problem. If we're able to identify what the problem is, [inaudible] purpose. We define: "This is the statement. This is what we feel is wrong with the current

situation. Because of this problem, this is what solution we are preferring."

So it's that problem statement that is my challenge right now. What is a problem statement? What is actually wrong with the current reviews that we have in terms of accountability and in terms of transparency? I know we have discussed it a couple of times, but it needs to be spelled out. When we send it to the community, we want the community … Because each individual will be interpreting then problems according to their lens. But we can guide them by saying, "These problems – 1, 2, 3 – are the statement we have pushed out." Now, with this problem statement, they are now open to make comments. That's my thinking.

However, if everybody feels otherwise, I go with the Chair so that we don't waste too much time on it. But just let it be on record that that's what I'm thinking. I[inaudible], but I'm convinced—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for putting that on the record. I am a little astonished if, at this point in our deliberations, you don't believe that our paper has not already laid out the background and the rationale for the problem quite clearly. If anyone else feels that we have in some way, shape, or form

totally missed the mark on all of the drafting we've done, please do let us know now. But I certainly thought it was very obvious.

I would also remind you that, while we're considering all of this – by "you," I don't mean you personally, Tola, but you, the review team, in general – it is the community itself that has raised concerns [inaudible] to us but in general during the work [of] Brian Cute and in the responses that were received to the not one but at least two public comments on the topics of reviews that have been conducted in the last seven to nine months that [buries] enormous problems with the review processes. So, if they need the rationale more clearly defined, that will be a very interesting set of circumstances indeed.

But let's look to what Vanda has said in our report. If you go to Surveys, etc., you'll see that there's a lot of explanations that were done as rationale for those [pre-]solutions. I really cannot understand why there are doubts now. So that's Vanda's response.

Is there anyone who'd like to reiterate the point that Bernie just asked for us to poll on? We have taken an undue amount of time on what should have been an extraordinarily simple and [inaudible] extensive deliberation that we put out Option 1 and Option 3 in our public comment paper. Remember, the white paper is not part of our public comment paper. We are not publishing the white paper for public comment. We are simply using it as a way to ascertain what we will put in our report.

So the question is, is there anyone who objections to only putting in Option 1 and Option 3 from the white paper? If so, put a red X now.

	With that, Bernie, back to you.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Thank you, ma'am. Just casting back to Tola, if we go back to our discussion on Wednesday, I think even KC agreed that what we should in the white paper for discussion were points of rationalizing. But she didn't agree with prioritizing them and I said they weren't prioritized. But I think is said, and as Vanda had said, there's enough pressure directly from the community to look at some options.

Let's move on. So that's done. We will go with two options. The next question from the white paper is prioritization. We said we would move that to the next step in our recommendation. What I'm proposing that we do is that that will be part of the discussion for Sunday. We need to get the core of the report cleaned up and out.

So I will ask if there are any objections to moving that part of looking at what we're going to say regarding prioritization. You'll remember that we said we would give a framework for how the community could get together to develop this prioritization system. That's the objection we need to come up with some stuff for, but I don't want to take us out of our current thinking of 5.1 and the other things right at this point because we really have to get the core of the document.

So I will ask if anyone objects to us taking that prioritization discussion to Sunday. Please put up an X right now.

Question, Sebastien?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I'm not sure that I get your points. You want to postpone the discussion about the prioritization to Sunday? Or you want us to wait for Sunday because we will have a new version of 5.1 document, which will include the question of prioritization?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No, there will not be a new version of the document. I'm proposing that we first focus on cleaning up the document. There are a number of things we have to go through as a group. If we have time, we can start the discussion on prioritization today. If not, we make it a priority to work on prioritization on Sunday. That's what I'm proposing.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. One of my concerns is that – it's not the first time – we have two documents, one that KC commented on, 2.1 … And you have taken some comments in 2.1. I don't know how we will deal with that, but we need to take that into account. If we do that on Sunday, it's okay with me. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, great. The only thing that has changed in 2.1 is I just didn't want to lose or screw up KC's comments when I was writing the new options. So I'll just report the new options into the original 2.0 and we'll keep all the comments and we'll have that for Sunday. All right?

Excellent. Thank you very much. So we have a general agreement. Ma'am, shall we proceed to 5.1?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, please, which means, Jennifer, if we can switch our shared screen to show the 5.1 document, that will be terrific.

Excellent. Now, I believe we actually need to go to the bottom of the document. We're going to do Section 15 and then 16.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That is correct, ma'am. We'll go to Section 15 first, which is about three-quarters of the way down. I'll give you a little background on where we are and how we're going to work here. As agreed to two weeks ago, I have completed slimming down the main part of the document. What does that mean? That means all the detailed analysis of ATRT2 and all the detailed analysis of the surveys have been moved to Section 15 for ATRT2 and Section 16 for the surveys and [have been replaced] with the summary tables in all the places.

Now, I've gone through and cleaned up everything. I've annotated everything where I think we still have a few decision to make. Now, given some of the ATRT2 analysis, we still have a few things to clean up. I think it's best to go through those, answer those, and then we will go back to, after we finish Section 15 and 16, Section 3 and look at suggestions and recommendations and walk our way through the rest of the document.

I hope that's okay for everyone, but I'll give everyone a chance to ask questions at this point.

Two green ticks, but Sebastien may have forgotten to remove his old tick. Not seeing any questions, let's dive into this. What I have done when I've gone through the document is we still have the color coding. Green is no suggestion or recommendation. Blue is a suggestion, and red is a recommendation. We basically have no reds at this point. Where there is new text, there is either and a comment in the margin, or the text has been highlighted in yellow so that we can walk through it.

Let's starting going down until the first text bubble, please, Madame Jennifer. Okay. So, significant rewrite as requested in Montreal. Let's go back up to the questions to see what this is. ATRT2 Recommendation 4: The Board should continue supporting cross-community engagement aimed at developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation. Develop complementary mechanisms whereby the supporting organizations and advisory committees can consult with the Board on matters including but not limited to policy implementation and administrative matters on which the Board makes decisions.

Implementation. The recommendation is effectively implemented in the GNSO but requires further cross-community engagement to be considered fully implemented with respect to all ICANN communities in regards to the distinction between policy development and policy implementation.

With respect to developing complementary mechanisms, whereby SO/ACs can consult with the Board, the Board has instituted the Board Advice Register for the ALAC, SSAC, and RSSAC advice and has a separate register for GAC advice. However, there is no such registry for the ccNSO, GNSO, and ASO. Obviously, policy recommendations to the Board from these SOs are tracked, but all other requests simply fall in Board correspondence, where there is a wide variety of topics, including topics included from condolences to noticed regarding changes to GNSO registry agreements. Given correspondence is only sorted by date, it's very difficult to identify topics or which SO communicated with the Board or vice versa. Additionally, it's difficult to track the status of any request made by   SO in this system. Effectiveness insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion. There is no meaningful metric to show any particular improvement of the wider ICANN community understanding the difference between policy development and implementation of policy, as was called for by this recommendation. ATRT3 does recognize and appreciate the considerable work already done in the GNSO regarding non-PDP and cross-community working group processes.

However, this is not an example of ongoing and Board-facilitated cross-community engagement. This being said, it does not properly implement what was in the recommendation. As such, ATRT3 will be suggesting that ICANN … Sorry if I lost the wagon there for a sec. Similarly to reviews and the implementation of review recommendations, ICANN should provide a centralized system to track the development, approval, and implementation of policy by the SOs. Additionally, ICANN should, in a similar fashion to its action request

registry for ACs, institute a section on its website to track requests and communications from SOs and associated follow-on actions if any is required.

So that's the new version of this one. I think it lines up with what was asked for and discussed in Montreal. Are there any questions or objections?

Not seeing anything, let's move on. Next bubble, please, Jennifer.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. I am a little bit late.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Apologies, Sebastien. Please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Just one small question. We talk here about SOs because that's the only one, but I wanted to know about the NomCom. Don't we need to include them somewhere also if there's some [big] change that they need to be … Because, if we don't do it, then it will be [org] somewhere. We have SO. We will ask for SO. We have AC. But we don't have [inaudible] for NomCom. I don't know it will be used, but I think it would be better to ask for each and every division of the organization.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	The NomCom is a bit of a different beast. I'll ask Cheryl. They have a privilege communication channel with the Board, as far as I know. Is that correct, Cheryl?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Indeed they do. That is true.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	So I'm not seeing the point here. They already have a very privileged communication channel with the Board, and they're just finishing their review. I'm not seeing the point of this. And introducing the NomCom in here brings in another type of structure. We're all familiar with what SOs and ACs are and how they work and what they [happen] … The NomCom is another type of critter.
	But I'll be glad to take direction from the group. Anybody else really feel we should be including the NomCom here?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	If we go back to the question, remember this is talking about policy development and the difference between policy development and implementation of policy.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Which is really beyond the NomCom.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely out of NomCom's field.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: And the questions—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: NomCom makes nor can it ever make any suggestion pertaining to policy or otherwise. Now, in terms of what Sebastien I think was saying – that there would be value in a tangible way for the ICANN Board to show in a continuous reporting type of tool – if there are any interactions between any advice, etc., from the NomCom and any implementation perhaps of recommendations regarding the NomCom that are outstanding, that's a fine, fair, and reasonable thing to note. But I'm not sure – in fact, I'm sure that it shouldn't be noted in this aspect of this question. But it can be noted elsewhere, certainly.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. Sebastien, does that make sense to you?

Oh, he had a green tick. All right, thank you. Let's move on to the next bubble, please. Okay, here we go. 9.1: Proposed bylaws change recommended by the ATRT2 to impose requirement on the ICANN Board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN's advisory committees.

So we have non-implemented because they didn't change the bylaws. I have a question … and partially effective there. This is going to permeate the document here. If something is not implemented, I don't

think we can assess its implementation. So either it's partially implemented and partially effective or it's not implemented and the effectiveness assessment is not applicable. So there's a bit of an issue here. I would say I'm in the middle on this one.

I see Vanda's hand up. Vanda, give us a hand here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe there's not only black and white. Sometimes people find ways around the change of bylaws to make things happen. Maybe this could be the case. So it looks strange if it's not implemented [but] it could be effective. But maybe it's better to see if that's not the case [that] they found another way to do things properly and make it clear in the effectiveness analysis. But I believe that that could happen. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. I see Cheryl's hand up. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. Thanks for noting this particular disconnect in terminology. I had wondered about the nomenclature, I think, in a previously meeting as well, and now I see then benefit of listing perhaps if something is not implemented that it cannot be measured for effectiveness, which is the same thing as saying not applicable. So we could, when this does happen during the document, if we decide upon the language now, either say "not applicable" and explain then – "However, blah, blah, blah" – or we could say, "Effectiveness unable to be assessed due to non-implementable. However, there is no

consistency in the responses from the Board. Hence, other response, etc. etc." You know what I mean? It doesn't mean we change the conclusion. We just need to fix, if we can, this mismatch between being able to make a statement about effectiveness when something was not implemented. What we're saying is partially effectiveness is a workaround for a different approach at dealing with then issue. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:　　In this case, I think, as I said … ""Not applicable" is clearer." Thank you, Vanda. Yes, I think so. So I guess our choice here is, if we keep the not implemented, we will move the effectiveness to not applicable and just leave it at that .

Any objection?

I'm not seeing anything. Let's move on to the next bubble, please. Oh, lots of yellow text. This should be fun. Recommendation 9.5: Conduct a review of the anonymous hotline policy and process. Implement any proposed modifications to policy and publish a report on the results to the community.

Staff have been scratching around this one for a while. There was those reports which we were told were the implementation report, which has some text. Jennifer – bless her soul – found another implementation report dealing with this specifically. However, what that report says is that, "Yes, we got the review done. We've got recommendations. We've implemented some of the recommendations. We're going to finish implementing the other recommendations." Then nothing. We cannot

get an answer if the rest of the recommendations were involved. I've got a footnote with that second report that's found.

So what I'm suggesting on this one is the review was conducted and ICANN began the implementation of the recommendations and noted that these would be completed. But there is no trace of this having been done. I was kind and did not include the fact "was not done since 2016."

Additionally, Work Stream 2 made further recommendations on this topic, which were in line with the review recommendations. Implementation assessment partially implemented, implemented, implemented. We'll fix that.

So really I think that's what it is. They did implement some of the recommendations and there are the Work Stream 2 recommendations on this to keep going on that. So effectiveness. ICANN shouldn't complete insufficient information to assess. Then, on conclusion, ICANN should complete the implementation of the reviewers' recommendations, as well as those of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 on this topic. I think that's the best we're going to do with that.

Are there questions or objections?

Going once … going twice … sold. All right, thank you very much. So 15.9 I will note as being okay.

Let's move to 15.10. Remember, we've got about 47 of these to go, but not all of them, obviously. Jennifer, if we could drop down just a bit.

The Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities of those ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players.

You'll remember that we had a lot of discussions around this and, at the end of those discussions, it was agreed that Sebastien would take a stab at this and clean up this one. "It was an [anonymous] report on the implementation?" Sorry, Sebastien. I'm not sure. So I think he's done a good job on this. We'll just leave through it because this will apply in other areas. So it's important to take the time to go through this one.

Following the key word of facilitating, ICANN Board and ICANN org have developed or enhanced the following programs amongst others: Fellowship, NextGen, ICANN Academy, Leadership Program, some improvement in some participation, captioning, funding additional members of the community, GAC.

The other key word is equitable. It may be more difficult to assess, but the programs listed above show some good implementation and can count as a good attempt towards being equitable. Implementation assessment implemented.

There was some available statistics under effectiveness. So, partially … and I'm reconnected.

The conclusion. This is obviously a major recommendation which has met with some success. As such, the ATRT3 may consider making a suggestion to keep this objective alive with – should be "continuing enhancements."

EN

Let's throw it open. Questions, comments, objections to have this? What I was saying is this touches on a number of points relative to our PDP Section 7. So that's why this makes sense. Anybody?

Okay. Looks like we're good on 15.10. Now, what I will say, as Jennifer is scrolling, is, because of where we are in the timeline – I should have made this clearer earlier – if we're closing an element here today, it's closed. We're not coming back to it later in the day. We're not coming back to it Sunday. It's done. We cannot go back and relitigate anything from today. Once we have said it's done, that's what's going into the public comment document. We can get back to it after the public comment and adjust it – more than sure. Of course, no problem. But, if we're going to meet our deadline, what we're doing right now is we're closing things.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say that I put … I would strike 2019 because there's no need to have a date/year in that. And I would do it also in the summary at the beginning of the document. But just do it now. As you are asking if there are changes, just to let you know that I've done that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. Thank you very much, Sebastien. 15.23, Recommendation 6.6: ATRT2 recommends the Board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI Working Group to identify and implement initiatives that can remove barriers for participation, including language barriers, and

EN

improve understanding of the ICANN model and access to relevant ICANN information for GAC members. The BGRI Working Group should consider how the GAC can improve its procedures to ensure a more efficient, transparent, and inclusive decision-making. The BGRI Working Group should develop GAC engagement best practices for its members. That could include issues such as conflict of interest, transparency and accountability, adequate domestic resource commitments, routine consultation with local domain name system multi-stakeholders and interest groups and. And expectation that positions taken within the GAC reflect the fully coordinated domestic government position and are consistent with existing and relevant national and international laws.

Let's go down to where the change is. All this other stuff is as is. That was just to give you some information. Overall assessment. First, one should recognize the significant improvements that have been made by the GAC since ATRT2 recommendations have been made. Additionally, it should also be noted that this type of recommendation implies more of a continuous improvement process than a single outcome. As such, ATRT3 will suggest that GAC continue with these improvements and that it should work on defining a certification process.

So that was the update Vanda gave us at the beginning of the call. There was a little bit of confusion about what they were asking relative to that. If you want to read more about it, go to the GAC Skype chat and read on it. We don't have the time for it today. Basically, there's a fundamental question which we need an answer for from the GAC, and they'll determine what we can put in here.

Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Just to agree and reinforce that, without the feedback [from now], we cannot decide right now. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Thank you very much. So that's more of an update because nothing has changed. Once we get an answer, we'll post what we do with it. But right now there's nothing much more.

Next bubble, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Bernie, sorry. Just before you do, I'm not sure that that language is a problem even if we don't get the change or an update from Manal. I think the language you've got there is generic enough because the language from Manal is to clarify the difference between the GAC processes, which talk about accreditation, and the disconnect, which is what they're complaining about, where you have more than one part of government giving accreditation and how one works out which arm of the government tops the other. So I still think that language is generic enough because it's—

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	We had several comments that said it was not from GAC members.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Which led to my going back and—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll note that their problem was the term "whole of government approach," which is not in this text.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No it's not. Then there was some issues about providing diplomatic-level credentials. Some people thought that really required—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So the term "diplomatic."

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, if we can make a note: if needs be, we can adjust this language. I don't want to see nothing here—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh, no. There will be something one way or the other, but I think we have to wait for the—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That's fine.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to [inaudible] "diplomatic." That is not the case.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, that is correct. Next bubble, please. That looked like a mighty ugly one. All right, where are we with this question? Oh, one of the mother questions. Policy development. Might as well [tag-hole]. This is part of the PDP section. Really this brings up 10.5 that we did a few minutes ago with Sebastien, [who] talked about continuing in the same vein. We will make that suggestion.

As far as the rest, there's a lot going on around PDPs in the GNSO. There is the EPDP that is ongoing. There is the development of PDP 3.0. But, as we have discussed, PDP 3.0 is a menu or rather a series of options, and people have not decided where they're going to land on those options. So, at this point, maybe I can send it over to Cheryl for a bit of background on this discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Only if I'm unmuted while I'm talking.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, that would help.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Bernie. I was talking to myself there for a second. Look, what is important here, I think, is, as we know, there is significant involvement with the GNSO Council in its development of the council proposal for changing the PDP process of the GNSO to what is being called PDP 3.0. It's only very recently that the wider community, in terms of at least the advisory committees, have been asked – at least the At-Large community and the At-Large Advisory Committee, and I assume [others] – to provide some feedback on the current state of what I've previously described as a bit of a menu that the council has not quite decided upon which bits to order off.

Now, certainly from the At-Large community – we assume therefore also the At-Large Advisory Committee – there has been considerable concern with a couple aspects – in particular, the aspect that the way in which the GNSO Council may be suggesting seats at the policy development table in their space be allocated. The thinking has been narrowed down to a couple of choices, but one of those choices is a little bit along the lines of the EPDP process, where we have a set of seats that are allocated to different parts of the GNSO in greater number and then to the rest of the ICANN community in significantly lesser number. All others would simply be observers and have no voice, per se. Their opinions would need to come through the authorized representatives.

That is a blast from the past, for those with a long enough memory, to a design of PDP process that was found severely lacking many years ago and resulted in the PDP process (the more multi-stakeholder, open, and engaged one) that we currently work with. So this could be a simple matter of the pendulum swinging. But, if it is a pendulum swinging and

if that was the decision that the GNSO Council made, then certainly at least the At-Large Advisory Committee and the At-Large community would be pushing back quite strongly. I would expect other advisory committees and indeed perhaps other parts of ICANN would push back as well.

So I think whatever we say here also needs to recognize the fact that, whilst it's probably too early for us to make significant recommendations regarding PDP processes out of the ATRT2 recommendations, which were quite specific because of the process going on not only with PDP 3.0 but to a lesser extent with Brian's evolution of the multi-stakeholder model work, we should recognize that and recognize that that work will be coming to fruition after our final report comes to pass. But we should have a placeholder text noting our concerns that whatever is decided upon must strengthen and enhance, not weaken and erode or constrict the multi-stakeholder model that ICANN operates.

There you go, Bernie. I think that's just about everything you've heard from me in the last few weeks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Unmute goes better. Thank you very much for that, Cheryl. Basically what we're saying is that, out of all that Section 7 stuff, we'll be going to using that 10.5 text that Sebastien crafted to keep encouraging ICANN to ensure participation.

Then we're just going to have this block of text that's going to talk about everything and say, "Here's our thinking on this." There's a lot of

moving parts. There's a lot of things that are going to finish after we have handed in our final report. But let's keep in mind some of the core principles that need to be included in whatever those final results are, which is what Cheryl has just said. We would craft something along those lines as what has been said.

Let's have some comments or objections to doing it that way.

Okay, I'm not seeing anything. I'll give it one more minute. I really think, after going through all our discussions on this and seeing how we were trying to almost read the crystal ball as to what's going to come out, it just didn't make sense. I think this is the best approach.

Thank you very much, everyone. I take it as this will be our approach for the public consultation.

Next bubble please, Jennifer. Where are we? Oh, this is still PDP, so this is covered now by what we've just discussed. Thank you. Still PDP.

Let's keep going. Next bubble. New text following Montreal. All right, what is this about? 11.4: The Board should prepare a complete implementation report to be ready by review kick-off. This report should be submitted for public consultation, and relevant benchmarks and metrics must be incorporated in the report.

Yeah, we were really excited about that. So let's have a look at the new conclusion. The first part, which is not highlighted, was as it was. As outlined in various sections of this report, ATRT3's assessment of the implementation report – the executive summaries (see Section 9 of this report) – found that there were significant issues. This being said, ATRT3

recognizes the implementation and likely positive effects of the new (as of June 2019) operating standards for specific reviews.

However, given the significant issues ATRT3 has identified with ICANN's implementation and reporting of implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations, coupled with the untested changes, which would also address this, ATRT3 will be suggestions – here's the next text – that the Board follow through with requesting an implementation shepherd (Section 4.5 of the new operating standards) from ATRT3 for the implementation of its suggestions and recommendations, as well as holding a public comment to avoid any confusion – not a public consultation because, as you will remember, we were told, "It says public consultation. That's not a public comment'; we'll get back to that later – on its implementation of the ATRT3 suggestions and recommendations at least six months prior to the next ATRT-type review being held, recognizing ATRT3 will be making recommendations with respect to specific reviews.

So that's how we've reframed that one: a slight slap on the wrist. Obviously it was not done properly and we're saying it has to be done properly next time.

Questions? Comments?

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have the impression that I have made the writing comments, and it seems that it's disappeared. Do you think that it was written

somewhere else? Because I guess my comment following is that, with the question of "at least six months prior to the next ATRT," we will be in trouble if we take Proposal 3 with [ATST] going on at the same time as the organizational systemic review.

Yes, I also now discovered that we may have missed this part of my proposal, but still the question is, if it's the next one and we do something in the middle 2021, it will not be feasible. Therefore, I have no disagreement with that except that the way we will figure out how we will do the review may change this assumption. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I agree, but either we leave it fluffy and then we don't know what we're going to get, or we give this and … As I said, this is going for public consultation. If ICANN has an issue with that, they will get back to us. If, once we finish looking at our reviews, when we're doing our February meeting, we see it doesn't work, we can change it then. Does that make sense, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLT: Definitely that makes sense. The only thing I would like to be sure of – I know you will remember everything I [inaudible]. Then I give you this task to remember that we need to figure out [later]. No, it's a joke, but we have to figure out that we will have to come back on that to be sure at one moment after the comments eventually that we are still aligned with what we have suggested in other parts of the document at the end. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah, we'll have to do a sanity check on a bunch of things, but very good point. Yes, I agree. All right, noted.

Next bubble, please – well, wait a minute. Sorry. Are there any other questions or issues or comments before we move on?

Okay. I don't think we have any. Next bubble, please, Jennifer. Next text. All right, what's the new text about? Recommendation 11.5: The ICANN Board should ensure that, in its budget, sufficient resources are allocated for review teams to fulfill their mandates. This should include but is not limited to accommodation of review team requests to appoint independent experts/consultants if deemed necessary by the teams. Before a review is commenced, ICANN should be publish the budget for the review, together with a rationale for the amount allocated. that is based on the experience of the previous team, including ensuring continuous assessment and adjustment of the budget accordingly.

Basically, what we're getting here is that, as we have been told, there is a flat amount allocated for reviews, a certain amount for organizational reviews, and a certain amount for specific reviews – and that's it – which, to my mind, doesn't meet the spirit that they were asking for there. So I've made a few changes to try and bring this more in line with what was in the recommendation.

So let's give this a read. From effectiveness. From a transparency point of view, the review fact sheets provide great transparency into the reviews' progress on all fronts, including financially. This brought to light the almost doubling of the expenses versus the original budget for the

CCT review. However, it's unclear what accountability was associated with this. It is difficult to fault the review team, as the budget for all specific reviews is set at a specific amount (currently $550K), prior to the review team being selected and determining its work plan. Effectiveness: partially effective.

Conclusion. The ATRT3 recognizes and endorses the importance of Recommendation 11.5 of ATRT2 in that it has generally been implemented. ATRT3 will suggest that review teams assess their allocated budget with staff once they have established a work plan and that they be allowed to request reasonable and justified amendments as necessary to ensure they can complete their work, their task, and ensure greater accountability of the review teams.

So we're saying, if you want to make the reviews accountable for the budget, you have to give them a chance to look at the budget in the context of what they're going to be trying to do.

Sebastien, I see your hand is up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was a previous one, but that's good because I wanted to ask you one question.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, sir?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Let's take the example of the CCT review. If they assess at the beginning that they need X dollars to do the work, and if they discover that, for example, when they were thinking that they will get as an input some data or some survey or some elements, and they are not there and they need to do it or ask that it's been done, therefore they will need, in the middle of the work, to request more money. Is it—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sebastien, I know where you're going with this. This doesn't say that we're changing the process for midway, making recommendations for change. What this is saying is, as opposed to not having any say in the beginning, you should have a say in the beginning. That's all we're trying to say here.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. But we [need] to be sure that any review team will be able to make an additional request if needed.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. I'll take that as a friendly amendment. Let me write something in there according to the current processes. Okay?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. Great.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: This is half a thought, half a question. How is the recommendation we are going to make about what the future reviews are going to be going to impact this? Because—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: We don't know yet. That's what we were talking about in the previous point with Sebastien: once we make up our mind with reviews, we're going to have to go through all of this and adjust things accordingly.

JACQUES BLANC: Absolutely. That's why I don't see much use to discuss this in detail now.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Absolutely. I agree with you, but the point is we went through it. We decided we should say something. We're saying that it's a placeholder until we decide what we want to do with reviews.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay. So, in this case, maybe let's just be clear here that this will be impacted by the final review charter recommendation.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Absolutely. But, this being said, Jacques, ICANN is still going to want to have a budget before you start whatever model of reviews we have. We're saying, at the beginning of that, you got to give the review team a

EN

chance to look at what it's going to try to do versus its budget – and not alone but with staff – and make sure it makes sense, as opposed to the current formula of, "Here's the package. This is technically what you're going to work with. And you don't have anything to say about."

But I think we've spent enough time on this one. I agree with you. Anybody else on this? Thank you, Jacques, for the green tick.

Not seeing anything. Next bubble please, Jennifer. We're doing pretty good, folks. Oh, yeah. I'm going to have to ask … This is Recommendation 11.7 with the reviews: In responding to review team recommendations, the Board should provide an expected timeframe for implementation. If that timeframe differs from one given by the review team, the rationale should address the difference.

Me and KC exchanged on the text. I think she ended up rearranging my text but keeping all the basic parts. But she rewrote the conclusion, and I'll ask here if people understand it. Maybe it's just me that's not understanding it. Given the assessments, ATRT3 and the untested state of the new operating standards that attempt to address the underlying issue – accountability and transparency with respect to ICANN's execution of previous recommendations – ATRT3 will make a recommendation that explicitly includes – she says "recommendation"; I'm not really sure about that – metrics that reflect this specific accountability and transparency issue and will make a suggestion that the Board properly implement and practice sections of the operating standards quoted in this section.

I think, instead of trying to guess our way through this, I'm just going to mark this one as we'll leave it open and we'll see, when I can get a hold of KC, if we can maybe get to some understanding.

I see Vanda's hand.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: In the same line, it's not quite clear about if we should say that we're going to recommend or ask [for metrics]. We didn't decide yet about that. So [even it's] not how the review is going to be. So we should be more generic about positions at this time for comments. I agree that it is not tested, about the operating standards and blah, blah, blah. But I don't believe that the second part should make a recommendation that explicitly includes metrics. I believe we need to be more generic at this point for this comment period. Just that.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you very much for that, Vanda. I'll be reaching out to KC early next week to see if we can get some clarity on that.

Anybody else? … Sorry, that's my dog.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's an opinion. [inaudible]

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah, Ava hasn't been in on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I think is Ava is supporting Vanda as well. That's all.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. And we are now in Section 16. We finished Section 15. Just a reminder. The only thing we've got left open is that KC comment, which I will be reaching out to her about. The rest of Section 15 is now closed.

This is just to note I've redone the analysis. Michael had made a comment here and I—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Bernard.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh, sorry. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Before you go on, I'm trying to find my comments. Maybe you will get through 15.33.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: 15.33. Let's go back up to 15.33.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have the impression that you say that, if it's something with the GNSO, then let's go outside. It was a discussion we have already have with one previous one. Is it this one?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, that is, I believe.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Therefore, here you will come back with a proposal and we will discuss it again? Or—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, what I said is we would text along what Cheryl had said to make sure that, with whatever decisions are taken in the ongoing work of PDPs right now, they respect the fundamental requirements of work in ICANN that include the community. Something along those lines. I think it makes sense that we'll dump that on the list for comments. But we won't have a meeting about it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But if we have a possibility to [connect] … Because I …

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Fair enough. I recognize that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. That's okay.

EN

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. So back to our 16 bubble, please, Jennifer. And I'm sorry to be rushing you guys, but I know it's late and you're up. I know we all want to get through this. I'm just trying to manage that. I'm not trying to force you. I'm just trying to make sure we get through the work. And we do have a fair amount of work yet to go.

This was just about restating how the analysis was done. I did that according to Michael's request. He didn't comment back, so I imagine that'll be okay.

Next bubble, please. Oh, okay. Next bubble. Slightly modified text to recognize that the Board has now approved Work Stream 2 implementation. I'm not going to waste a lot of time. You understand that the Board has approved Work Stream 2.

Moving on, next bubble, please. Okay, what do we have here? [inaudible] conclusion based on the ITI update document. Okay, this we have to take the time on. Let's go back, a little up, to the question: Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the ICANN org website should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics?

Of course, our wonderful 100% answer from structures and 82% from [inaudible] individuals. So that left no room for the imagination, as it were. So I've recrafted. You'll remember, when we were in Montreal, we had that ITI update document. What I've recrafted here is the following. ATRT3 notes that the information transparency initiative update [that] was provided presents a good summary of activities to

date and notes that soft launch of the new site is expected in fiscal year '20 Q4, with the full site available fiscal year 21 Q1. More details are available at … So we quote that.

Given that the launch of the new system is due at about the same date that the ATRT3 final report is due, ATRT3 will not be able to comment on the effectiveness of this initiative and, as such, will not be making any recommendations or suggestions to this issue.

There's obviously, as we look at that report, a whole bunch of stuff that's going to change. Again, a little bit similar to the PDP discussion, we've got enough stuff to be concerned about. I'm saying let's give them a pass on this one and hope for that.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I agree with you, Bernie. May I suggest that we add one sentence saying that it will be wise for ATRT-whatever (4, let's say) to have a look at that specifically? [inaudible]

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Good suggestion. Noted. I will do that: evaluate the results. Any other questions or comments?

Okay. Next bubble, please. Oh, I love no bubbles. What's the song? "Tiny Bubbles"? Yes. Even though her mic is turned off, I know Cheryl is laughing at this point. Oh, we were doing too well. What does this refer

to? Should ATRT3 make recommendations …. oh. I just put a note there to say we're in Section 12. Fair enough.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLLET: Bernie? Sorry. I guess we go through 16.19.4?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: 16.19? Let's go back up to 16.19, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's not [inaudible] for you, but I'm not going as quickly as you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Don't worry. You're not spending your whole days inside this document. So 16.19: Please rate how effective the current system of public comment consultations is for gathering community input.

Okay. 16.3. 16.4 is the conclusion. I don't think that one has changed. Can we blow that up a bit? My eyes a little tired. Thank you. The objection of public consultations is to allow as many members of the community as possible to contribute so the results are in effective representation of the community's views on the matter published for public consultation. These results clearly indicate that there is a portion of the community which has issues with how effective public comments are in that the concept should be reviewed. ATRT3 accepts that the responses to these questions have flagged some serious issues which it will consider in its recommendation or suggestion for public comments.

Yes, Sebastien. Your point is?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, sorry. I understand now that—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: This is just a conclusion. The actual recommendation we will go through when we go through Section 5.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm sorry. I apologize. When I see red, red for me means we need to stop and [inaudible]. It's not way you use the red. I am sorry for that.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. No problem.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My mistake.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: If that's your only mistake, we're doing great. No problem. We're almost at the end folks. And this was the painful part. The rest hopefully will be more fun. It's red but we're not stopping, Sebastien. Those are exactly as they have always been –oh, yellow. That was Section 12 of the report, right? Nothing. Blah, blah, blah. Blah, blah, blah. Blah, blah, blah.

And we're done! So 16 and 17 are done and locked. Thank you very much, everyone. I will now take a sip of water and we will go back up to Section 3, please, Jennifer. Oh, that's pretty good because I was hoping we could get all of this done in about two or two-and-a-half hours, and we're pretty close.

Now, it's going to be a bit of a different beat here because what we're going to be focusing on is the suggestions and recommendations. Let's scroll down. Just to give – stop there for a sec. Just give everyone a feel for it. Basically, you'll remember, on the ATRT2 section, we've now got a table: ATRT2 recommendation, the implementation assessment, the ATRT3 effectiveness assessment, and whether there's a suggestion or a recommendation. As we discussed at the meeting, in then final report, there will be hotlinks all over the place so you're not digging around. I've highlighted that we've included Not Applicable for things that we've noted as not implemented.

Is that okay for everyone? The format will be exactly the same as we go through all these things.

All right. Next page, please, Jennifer. Then we get into survey. Here we've done essentially the same thing. Let's go up a bit and pause there. Except the table is a little different. Here, given the survey questions don't have a specific number, I've included the survey questions. I've included the results of the analysis. Then the last column is the same thing: if there's a suggestion or a recommendation. And those are all the things that we've just finished going through in 15 and 16. 15 will become Annex whatever for ATRT2, and 16 will become Annex whatever for survey.

EN

After we're finished, the summary tables for ATRT2 and the survey … Then we get into 323: other information. In the case of the Board, there as none. Then we get into Section 33, which is analysis of information. What we've done here you'll quickly understand. We're restating – that should say ATRT2 Recommendation 2 – the conclusion for that, now that there is only – oh, thank you. I don't know who did that. So the conclusion is our issue statement, if you will, for making a recommendation.

Let's drop down a bit. For the ATRT2, we've got all those details of the thing that we're going to be putting in our suggestion. Then there's ATRT2 Recommendation 4. It's the same conclusion that was in our detailed analysis of ATRT2 Recommendation 4. [inaudible] for what the [statements] are going to look like as we go through them.

Let's go down a bit. Let's go to the survey questions. The format is a little different right after 10.5. 336 is the survey question: "Please indicate your satisfaction."

All right, I'm back. Hopefully. Here what we've done is we've said survey question, we include what the survey question is. Here we haven't only included the conclusion. We've included the analysis as well to help people understand what's going on. In this section, just to be clear – this issues section – we're only including those things where we said we wanted to make suggestions or recommendations. All the other things don't come in here.

Let's go to the bottom of this section, please (33). We're not going to do this for each section. Here we go. 34. Now, this is where we make the

recommendations. In Section 33, we said, "Here are the points where we're going to make suggestions or recommendations." Section 34 is, "Here are the suggestions and recommendations." In Section 33, we said why we wanted to do those things. So these are the things we actually have to go through.

For Recommendation 2, given the results of the ATRT3 survey on Board performance, transparency, and decision-taking show limited satisfaction. This should encourage the Board to consider the following specific suggestions from ATRT3. The Board should establish the same targets it uses for publishing agendas and minutes of Board meetings to the agendas and minutes of all its official committees and publish these in the accountability indicators.

As we saw, the Board has some very clear guidelines for these things and respects them and publishes the results, but this doesn't apply to committees at all. So we're saying, "Let's mature a bit on this one."

The Board should show the date of publication of materials on the Board website instead of only in the materials themselves.

That was a bit of a problem. If you go through the Board website, yes, they have these wonderful timelines for publishing things, but then they just get inserted into the website as an entry and you don't see when they were put in. You have to open the document and you hope that it was posted the date that the document is dated. So we're saying, "That's a slight improvement here. Let's actually show the darn dates."

All of these relevant indicators of Board performance should be grouped in a single area of the accountability indicators. If we're doing

EN

this for accountability and there are accountability indicators, the geographic distribution of the Board is one place an accountability indicator in the accountability indicators, and the performance relative to publish minutes is in a completely different section of the accountability indicators. We're saying, if they're about Board accountability, can we all bring them in to the same place so we don't have to go hunting all over the place for them?

The next one is: Board minutes should indicate how members have voted, including in executive sessions.

In regular Board meetings, there is no problem. There is a good trace of who voted how. Not in executive sessions. They just say things we're approved. So we're asking for the same transparency as for Board meetings to be applied here.

Finally: Board minutes should include, in addition to the rationale, summaries of the main discussion points covered prior to taking votes. You'll remember – I believe it was the Registry Stakeholder Group that had made a very cogent comment about this. When we had discussed this, I think everyone thought that made sense.

So there's our suggestion for ATRT2 Recommendation 2, which we felt was not really very well-implemented.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I think it makes sense. Just one suggestion is that now we are moving to ATRT3 suggestions: #1, #2, Recommendation 1, blah,

EN

blah, blah. I suggest that the title for 3.4.1 would be ATRT3 Suggestion 1, and, into brackets to keep in mind where it's coming from, ATRT2 Recommendation 5, because we are not suggesting a recommendation. We are just taking the inputs of this ATRT2 recommendation to our own action. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I think that's very reasonable. I don't have a problem with that. We'll be correcting that through that throughout.

Okay, great. Any other comments on the specifics of this one?

Yeah, friendly amendment. Absolutely.

All right, let's go to ATRT3 Suggestion 2, based on ATRT2 Recommendation 5. Given ATRT3 has assessed ATRT2 Recommendation 5 as not implemented, ATRT3 strongly suggests this be rectified by completing the implementation of a single unified redaction policy as well as the adoption and [endurance] to effective process in support of the requirements of the recommendation.

You will remember that the ATRT2 recommendation was about this single unified redaction policy. Michael is very much into that. There were a lot of recommendation in Work Stream 2 about that. Basically, there was some hand-waving on the part of ICANN, I think, saying, "Well, we put all the different processes into a single document, and that should be good enough." I guess we're saying no. So you're going to have to do some work on that.

Let's see if there are any issues with that one.

No? Okay. 9.1 for 343: ATRT3 suggests the Board implement a minimum time to provide an initial assessment of recommendations made by SOs and ACs which require action.

You'll remember there was this thing about how there is going to be a register request from SOs and ACs. There is certainly one for ACs. They do get it, but, as it was pointed out, there's never a timeframe from when they get to it. They were saying, "Well, we have to do an assessment and then we have to see what it's going to take, and this and that." We're saying, "Well, okay, but how about you give us a general idea?"

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to be sure that I understand, we are asking them to do something within three months or six months or ten months? Therefore, isn't [that] the maximum time to provide an initial assessment?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: We could put one in. I think we're being very reasonable if we say, "You consider this and you put in a minimum time to provide an initial assessment." There may be considerations we're not aware of, which is why I don't want to put in a specific number. We're just saying they should come up with a specific number.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, my point … the question … Are you [inaudible] with the time … We want them to act before three months. That means that … If we tell them that they put a minimum time, that means that they will have six months and they can act in ten years. At least it's my understanding of minimum and maximum.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I don't know. I think, to a certain extent, we have to expect good will from then organization here. But let's see what Jacques has to say and then we'll come back to this.

JACQUES BLANC: Well, it's exactly the same thing as Sebastien said, in fact. Implementing a minimum time means to me – I'm not English, nor American, nor whatever; just French – that, for example, you should not answer before having thought about it one month, for example. That's a minimum timeframe. A maximum timeframe would mean you have to answer under three months or four months or whatever.

So I got the same sense that Sebastien here got, that we should suggest that the Board implements a maximum time to provide an initial assessment. But once more, maybe my understanding is not good.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No. Actually, I think that's probably a really good comment. All right. Let's take that onboard as a friendly amendment as maximum. Do we want to include a three-month hard-coded in there or just leave it as a maximum time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I'm not sure it needs to be hard-coded, but I do think a stated timeline or maximum timeline or maximum milestone date [inaudible] – because I'm also not an English speaker but an Australian native and speaker – makes good sense here. Thanks.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	All right. So we'll go to maximum. We'll clean up the language a bit, but we won't put in a hard date. Tola, I see your mic is on. Do you want to say something?
TOLA SOGBESAN:	I wanted to make a comment before, but I align with what Cheryl said.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Okay. Thank you very much. Jacques?
JACQUES BLANC:	Sorry, guys. One way we could word that would be we suggest that the Board implements a clear deadline, whatever it is.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Let us work with the language. I think we have the idea here. We will take care of that. Drafting by committee when we're under pressure is never a good idea. Recommendation 10.5, which you'll remember was Sebastien asking that we carry on with the supporting participation: ATRT3 suggests that

ICANN continue to support and enhance the following programs amongst others: Fellowship, NextGen, ICANN Academy, Leadership Program, CROP. ICANN should also continue to improve the options for remote participation, including captioning.

Jacques, is that a new hand?

JACQUES BLANC: No. Old one. Sorry.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very minor edit. I would suggest it should be leadership programs because there is in fact more than one. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Good point. Programs. Okay, noted. Great. 345: How does your structure feel regarding the Board's interaction with your SO and AC? ATRT3 suggests the Board should take concrete steps to ensure that it is not perceived to be in an ivory tower and that not all interactions between Board members and the community, including the subcomponents of the GNSO and At-Large are formal.

I think I want to read the note I put in there. After thinking about this, I believe this is the best we can hope for, given the concerns that any formal requirements for directors to liaise with community would

EN

create a nexus, which would then create a problem versus their fiduciary responsibility.

When we got into this, we were thinking, "Oh, okay. It might be fun if you would allocate specific directors to liaise with specific parts of the community, given that some of them already come from the community and other ones don't. But they could gain from understanding." After walking our way through that, if you put in a formal requirement, it creates a problem at the Board level. So I tried to draft something which pokes away at them, but I'll be glad to take comments.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy with the sentiment. Don't get me wrong. I just have a problem using terms like "ivory tower," which I personally an unconvinced translates well. To me, for example, I take a Tolkienesque view on the term, and I'm not sure how others take the view. So I think there might be other language we can use and avoid the "ivory tower" reference. That's all. Not trying to redo it now, but see what you can do with it.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh, I will do something with it. Ivory tower: no. Okay, noted.

Let's go down. Survey question: Do you consider diversity amongst Board members satisfactory?

Oh, yes. We had so much fun talking about this. Given the bylaws specify how voting Board members are selected SOs and ACs nominated and EC confirmed and NomCom, it would be difficult for ATRT3 to recommend modifying this delicate balance without launching a major process to formally study this. As much, ATRT3 suggests that SOs and ACs which nominate voting Board members voluntarily accept to alternate their nominations based on gender. Additionally, ATRT3 notes that the Empowered Community should consider the bylaws requirements on diversity when considering the confirmation of Board members.

[I tried] to blend in as much as was available for us on this one. Questions? Comments?

Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: It reminds me of thoughts that were flying during the Registrar Stakeholder Group, that trying to enhance diversity on gender, for example, could reduce diversity on geographical areas and so on. So, when we say, "accept to alternate the nominations based on gender" … And I'm sorry because I realize, as I'm saying that, that this is not in yellow but, if we say, "based on diversity," wouldn't this be wider? Because we're only addressing one aspect of diversity here. That's the only thing. Sorry again if I'm moving up and not staying in the yellow.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No problem. Thank you for that, Jacques. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I must say I was rereading this and remembered what feedback we got, which is what Jacques was referring to on some of the interactions we recently had. I wondered whether perhaps the text should say, "voluntarily accept to alternate their nominations based on, for example, gender." So we're mentioning gender. Obviously, that's important, but, as we recognize [inaudible]. I think also SSAC stated it was the technical diversity that they're interested in and not the gender diversity because they maintain they have no concerns with gender [inaudible]. I also have much more limited females presenting themselves to join their group.

So I just wanted to suggest that. But perhaps Sebastien can give his language that reflects those concerns.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Cheryl. First of all, to answer the point of Jacques, the geographic diversity is a done deal. You can't have any SO selecting. When they say you can't, there's always a way to do it [inaudible] the ccNSO currently. But you are not supposed to be able to select someone from the same country/two people from the same country. I guess they need to have some geographic diversity. That is in the bylaws.

Here we are pushing for gender balance. I like this way of writing. It's not to say that they don't have to take into account other diversity, but what we meant here is to push SOs to have two seats on the Board, to have one man and one woman. Among that, they can choose one technical and one lawyer. They could choose one from the U.S. and one

from South America [inaudible] and so on and so forth. Therefore, it's just one way to have a gender balance in addition to any other diversity issue.

Therefore, I have the impression that it's well [inaudible], but, as you know, I am biased. [It's up to you]. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I suggest I'm biased. It's certainly not always in agreement with the mechanisms that, in the past, you've supported, Sebastien, for working towards gender equity. As you know, I still believe that it is the qualities that one brings, not one's gender, which should be the most important deciding factor. But we often differ.

But, that said, I still think that, if we [inaudible] suggestion – and the suggestions as it is written would we would be requiring the Board to request if not ask that the ACs and the SOs alternate based on gender and it's going to be at least the SSAC push back on that because they do not, it would mean that they would have less [churn] possible, for example, because of the limited number of females they have within their already limited group. That sort of thing may be ameliorated. It's only a matter of putting off the argument until later or compensating for it now. But, if it goes as written, fine. We'll have the discussions later. But I am just a little concerned that we can't find language which still pushes gender to the top of the consideration pile but does not

make it a firm requirement or mandate so that there is the diversities considered but gender being preeminent amongst them. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I just remembered that the geographic and gender balance contribution for the gender and geographic balance [inaudible], but related to profession – for instance, your expertise – let's remember that each time the Board normally sent to NomCom, for instance, what they needed. So this information could be shared with all ACs and SOs, and they can contribute with a balance here amongst the persons that they are sending to the Board.

I agree with the idea in general, but I do believe that the word "contribution to" could be more acceptable than just pushing on in this and that direction because sometimes it's impossible because that is not the first qualification that we are looking for: geographic or gender. It's the qualification for that position that's the top in the line. Contribution for that may be makes more sense for people to take into consideration. Whatever. This is something that we could think after this time. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I get your point. First of all, I want to say that I prefer when we take about qualities and when we talk about skill. But never mind. Here I think I get what you are saying. I guess, if we take out "and ACs," we solve part of the problem because ACs have just one person, and it's a liaison, except for At-Large/ALAC. But it's just a liaison and we can't ask, when you have just one person, to alternate because that means, if we ask that, [each three years] you will have to change the Board member. That's not a good idea to recommend that. It can be the decision of the AC to do that. But it must not be coming from us.

Therefore, I think the only thing that we need to say is that suggest that SOs have one man and one woman in their seats. That means that Seat A and Seat B must be from different genders. I hope it's [inaudible] what you said in the [inaudible] we could have with the SSAC and with other ACs, I guess. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Let's have a look at Cheryl's suggested wording in the chat. It might be something along the lines of "Alternate their nominations on, for example, gender," or, "Alternate their nominations on greater diversity, such a gender."

Would something like that work?

I think that's a friendly amendment.

Seb?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know why, but I still think that gender balance must be an objective of the Board of ICANN and that any other consideration must be taken care of by the SOs, ACs, and the NomCom. Yes, we need to push for other diversities, but gender balance is a must. Therefore, it's a request that we can have to the SOs and to the Nominating Committee also. But here we're talking about that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. We're at a bit of an impasse on this one. I don't want to spend all day here. I'm going to take this one and say we're going to push it to the list and we're going to come back to it Sunday and solve it. So, everyone, think about this. Let's get some wording out on the list. I'm not going to argue against affirmative action now but certainly can. So 346 is open and going to the list.

Next one: 347. Survey question: Are you aware of a training program for the Board members? ATRT3 strongly suggests – oh, these were all done. So, if they're not highlighted in yellow, we've already gone through them. So let's keep going. There were recommendations [in] Section 3, so let's keep going.

For the GAC – okay, let's keep going. We did these summary—

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: Just before you go to the GAC, please, one important point we need to look at it – we will have to look at each part of the document – is that we end up only – that's okay – with a suggestion. We don't have any in the Board part. We have nowhere any recommendations.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That is correct.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. That means it's something we need to figure out because, for recommendations, we will have a little bit more work than [inaudible].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: A little bit more work? I think you're being very kind there.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I am kind.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But at the same time, we need to be sure that, in the Board section, everybody agrees that we will not have any recommendation. It's why I'm coming back here. I guess we will do the same for the GAC and for the others. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, that is correct. We will also remember that, when we discussed this in Singapore, [Maarten] had said that they will be tracking our

suggestions the same way they will be tracking recommendations from us. So I think we're doing pretty good.

Also, I will note the following, that, if, after we decide we have the public comment, we decide to change something to a recommendation, we can still do that.

KC?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry I'm late. Did it get written down somewhere what is the difference between a suggestion and -- what was it called? – a low-priority recommendation?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'm sorry. I missed part of that. I didn't hear your audio properly.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. Did it get written down somewhere? Because I never did understand what's the difference between a suggestion and a low-priority recommendation.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, as far as I know, we haven't discussed a low-priority recommendation. What we have talked about is, for suggestions, we will not be undertaking the work that is required in the operating principles to generate a recommendation. That's all we said so far.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. That sounds like a way to get out of doing the work for low-priority recommendations to me.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That can be your interpretation. I think that's a possibility of understanding it that way, too. But I think, when we had that initial discussion about creating suggestions versus recommendations, there was this concern that there was going to be this immense mountain of work if we made everything recommendations. So that's when we want to suggestions, where we said we would not undertake all that work.

Additionally, what we said is that, if they are follow-on recommendations from things that were not completed in ATRT2, ICANN – we're not under the obligation of making the case for making a recommendation for something that is left over from ATRT2 that was not implemented. So it will be a suggestion from us.

Does that help?

KC CLAFFY: I've said this to you before, so it's going to be a broken record and then I'll end up putting it some document somewhere later down the road: it sounds directly contradicting to what the operating standards have said, which is that these considerations about considering the expected impact on workload should not limit the number of recommendations the review team may issue. What I hear you saying is that that's exactly what we're doing. We're limiting the number of recommendations

because it's too much work to do all this for all the recommendations that we might have. So we're going to make the lower priority ones suggestions so we don't have to do this work. I don't know another way to interpret that decision. I'm not saying it's the wrong decision. I just think we need to be transparent that that's what we're doing and that it contradicts what the operating standards have said to do.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: KC? Sorry. Hang on a second, Bernie. I'm not sure it contradicts as such. Certainly is an interpretation, but what we have, which is unique to all of the other review teams that will be running under the operating guidelines and principles that we have all read and we all understand very well, is a hard-coded timeline. So our review, unlike any of the others, has had to make these particular decisions. I think they're the decisions that we made. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Cheryl. Do you wish to come back on that, KC?

KC CLAFFY: No. We'll disagree and it'll get documented somewhere else.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, great. Thank you. Going back to Section 4. We're not going through details of ATRT2 and the surveys. We've done that in Section 15 and 16. Other information. We have the ICANN 65 interviews with GAC. I've got a bubble there saying we suggest to put this in an annex or we're going to have the fix the text a lot. It looks just dropped in from notes, and personally I would just say we have interview notes from ICANN 65. And push that into an annex.

Would that be okay, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hello. Yeah, I believe that we already agreed on that in our working party for the GAC because there's a lot of issues. That could be in the annex. It will be clear over there. It's not necessary to put all those in the reports. [inaudible] if someone wants to go through that.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, absolutely.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: So for 231 to go to an annex. Okay, great. Actually suggestion – the analysis of the issues is the same thing as in Section 15 and 16. Again, given the time – oh, okay. I've got one edited for clarity. On 61H, when deliberating on matters affecting particular entities to the extent

EN

reasonable and practical, giving those entities the opportunity to present to the GAC as a whole [inaudible]. So I said I edited for clarity. Overall, the implementation and effectiveness are currently satisfactory. However, ATRT3 will be suggesting that the GAC engage in continuous improvement in its relations with SOs and ACs to increase the effectiveness of those interactions via early engagement whenever possible.

So I don't think I've changed the meaning there. I've just tried to clarify the words. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Let's remember what we have discussed in the year, especially from the GNSO. They made a lot of improvements going through this practical exchange of information and put liaisons, etc., etc. But there's still a lot of complaints that the business group as the GNSO as a whole in the business part needs to have some previews [of] information about if the GAC communique is meaning something like that they need to change their internal process or not to make it possible to not lose time and have a lot of problems with the contract, just because they just know how to do things after all the things are completely defined. That was what they asked about us. Maybe it's not clear – that conclusion. We believe, in the beginning, that, because we are quite involved in that, that was clear. But maybe it's not.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Vanda, I think, on the thing you're talking about – the GNSO – we've got another recommendation that specifically addresses that talks about instituting a specific process.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. This, too, is the same.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah. This is a generic one for all SOs and ACs.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. That one was because we got some specific feedback from the GNSO. So their recommendation addressing the [inaudible] for that probably because, in the time of ATRT2, already the problem was there. So there is two different recommendations. But the issue is the same. It mostly affected the GNSO, but the issue is completely the same. I don't know. It became a general answer, I believe.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: We're recommending in another part that we actually put in a process similar to the one with the Board between the GAC and the Board for the GNSO.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: But there is no sense to recommend for all groups to do the same.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That's right, yeah. Let's see what Cheryl had to say.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So we need to [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we're okay on that, Vanda. I think your concern is picked up in the secondary but still important recommendation. My question, Bernie, was – you've underlined "continuous improvement" and bolded it. I have no problem with bolding it, but I wondered as just a matter of form. If it's going to be a term of art as such, shouldn't we just capitalize it and have it as part of a glossary, unless an example of what continuous improvement program looks like is provided some[where]. It's a little—

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: I am sorry –

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Whoa, whoa.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly. I'll shut up.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Wait, wait. Let's let Cheryl finish and then we'll go to you, Sebastien. Cheryl, are you finished?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've had my place. I've certainly finished. Go ahead, Sebastien.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, thank you. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLET: It's to say it was not Bernie. It's my fault, and it's my fault because I took the document and I don't see that I must have [inaudible] that it was a suggestion and not changes and it's make changes. The reason why I have done that – I have no problem to write it in another way – is that I think it's important to see that even with the GAC we asked them to go to continuous improvement. Therefore, it was just to underline the fact that it's a term we use here that we use also in the reviews. That's was important. But I did wrong in doing that without showing that it was my suggestion and not the one from Bernie. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for admitting to your crime, Sebastien. Okay, I think we're good here, unless there are any other comments.

No? Okay. Let's drop down, Jennifer, please. Oh, those are things that we have already seen, which is why there's no yellow and there's no comments.

Let's keep going. Let's keep going. 443 is an issue we've already talked about a few times today, so I'm not going to spend a lot of time. We're waiting to hear back from the GAC.

So that will close off Section 4, unless there are any other questions or comments.

Going once, going twice … All right. We're done. Section 4 is locked. Thank you.

Section 5 Issue 3: Public input. We've got the relevant ATRT2 recommendations: 7-1, 7-2, and 8. We've got the summary of the public survey, as we have gone over them in Section 15 and 16. We get into other information. There's a brand-new section here. After talking with the Co-Chairs and a few other people I brought this up with after our comment we received in our Section 10, where there was a difference between public consultations and public comments, we were told, "No, no, no, no. Public consultations are very different thing than a public comment." We said, "Oh, okay. Let's go have a look at that." So here it is. I'm going to walk through it. It's not that long. It's about a page. It will give everyone an idea of where we are here.

The public comment guidelines for the ICANN organization provided an excellent starting point for this consideration. Public comment is a mechanism that gives the ICANN community and other stakeholders an opportunity to provide input and feedback on ICANN's provide and ensures ICANN and its community operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistently with procedures designed to ensure fairness per the ICANN bylaws. The

ICANN organization recently adopted internal guidelines for public comment that clarify its purpose and define when it should be implemented. The internal guidelines codify current public comment practice for the benefit of ICANN org. According to the internal guidelines, public comment will continue to apply to the following categories: ICANN org or community governance documents, such as the ICANN bylaws, operating procedures, and community charters, policy recommendations, including reports (draft, initial, and final) of potential, ongoing, and completed policy development processes, organizational reviews and specific review recommendations, implementation plans for policy and specific review recommendations, cross-community working group recommendations, ICANN org base agreements with the registry operators and registrars, and documents that impact community policy recommendations or advice.

I would also like to highlight three points from the internal guidelines. Public comment is the default mechanism when seeking feedback from the ICANN community or general public. There may be circumstances where an alternative to public comment may be more appropriate. Alternative mechanisms include consultations or surveys for more targeted audiences and must be approved by ICANN org executive team members. Announcements, blog posts, social media campaigns, reginal newsletters, and mailing lists will not be used as mechanisms for collecting feedback. ICANN org supports the work of the community by managing public comment as a consistent and effective feedback mechanism. We hope the internal guidelines contribute to the accountability and transparency commitments of ICANN org.

To stay up to date on public comment [procedures] – blah, blah, blah – ICANN evolves. The public comment process will adapt – blah, blah, blah. As always, the public comment team is available.

So all of this were not my words. That's what's in an official document. ATRT3 understands that the public comment guidelines for the ICANN organization – sorry, fell off there – specify what subjects must undertake [inaudible] public comment processes. That public comment is the default mechanism when seeking feedback from the ICANN community or general public. Announcements, blog posts, social media campaigns, regional newsletters, and mailing lists will not be used as mechanisms for collecting feedback.

However, ATRT3 has a significant concern – that'll be fixed – that there exists a major transparency and accountability gap between the highly formalized public comment process and the alternative mechanisms for gathering public input, which has few if any rules beyond requiring executive approval. These include lack of formal guidelines to identify topics which do not specifically require public comment processes should use the public comment process or an alterative mechanism, the ability of the community to easily track when alternative mechanisms, specifically public consultations, have been used instead of public comment processes, and the ability of the community to easily find and see the results of alternative mechanisms that have been used.

Why are the complete public comment guidelines for the ICANN organization not made available on the ICANN website instead of only in extract? Why do blog posts collect feedback information when then public comment guidelines for the ICANN organization state that they

will not be used as a mechanism for collecting feedback? As such, ATRT3 will be making some strong suggestions regarding these issues.

So that's our additional information. Thoughts, comments, suggestions?

Thank you, Vanda. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My question is that …

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I see your mic but I'm not hearing you. Is it just me?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You don't hear me?

JENNIFER: I can hear Sebastien okay.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It is just you, Bernie.

Bernie, can you hear me?

Now we can't hear you either.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We seem to have broken Zoom. That's interesting. Certainly I can hear you, Sebastien, but I'm certainly not hearing Bernie right now. Jennifer, let's ping Bernie and make sure he's not dropped off for whatever reason.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible]. I guess we need to wait for his [inaudible]. "Sorry, having audio issues," says Bernie. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for reading that, Sebastien. I could have perhaps managed, but we'll wait for a moment, as I think I was indicating. We can hold for just one moment and then, once he's coming back in—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, I can hear Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like he's back in now. There we go.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sorry about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's all right. Back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTEIN BACHOLLET: Thank you. My question is that we will make a strong suggestion, but here we [have a list of] issues. That means that we want feedback from the community about this issue and we will make suggestions afterwards, or we will need to write these strong suggestions because … I will stop here and maybe have a comment after that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, the next section we'll look at is the suggestions based on those queries. So back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Because later on in the document, there is the same type of [parties]. Because I made comments on the other part, and maybe it's the best place to do it and we will discuss that when you will read this one. I am just a little bit concerned that, of course, they didn't implement the fact that blogs will not gather comments and input from the community, especially when it's the CEO writing something.

The other point is that I have trouble to understand why we need to have an alternative mechanism. I think, with the current tool or the tools they want to use, why not have an alternate usage of then tool within the same track and not have two tracks [inaudible]? But maybe we'll discuss that later on in the document. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. I don't think we talk about it, but I think, by using the same word as "alternative mechanisms," we're trying to provide for a system where we can easily track if anything is used to gather input.

Let's go down a bit, Jennifer, and see if we can find some of those other points. Clear, clear text, clear text. We've already gone through that. Clear text, clear text. Okay, here are your comments. No, it's not duplication. If you'll remember the way the document is organized, Sebastien, we've now moved all of the ATRT2 and survey information to Sections 15 and 16, which just finished going through. In this case, the stuff we just read a few minutes ago is not in those annexes. So I've gathered up our concerns here as the issue statement and reprinted it. So, is it duplicative? Yes, but I think, if we're keeping with the logic of the document, then it makes sense to restate this in this portion.

Does that make sense to you, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bernie, thank you. Yes, it makes sense. I understand because I read part one day and the other part the other day and it was very difficult. But I want to be sure that, when we will [inaudible] the document, it's clearly stated somewhere that it's not a duplication as such. It's because it's a different part of the document. Just to be sure that the people who read, if they read like me, will understand. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Good point. Thank you. I'll note that. 534: not duplicative. All right. Suggestions, survey questions. We've gone through those in then past.

534. These are the suggestions coming from that new text. ATRT3 strongly suggests that, for those topics which do not specifically require a public comment process to gather community input, ICANN org

EN

should develop and publish guidelines to assist in determining when a public comment process is required versus an alternative mechanism for gathering input. ICANN org should develop guidelines for how alternative mechanisms for gathering input should operate, including producing final reports.

Do we really need alternative mechanisms? Well, the organization says they're there, so what I'm saying is, if the organization says they're there, let's make sure we can track them properly.

ICANN org should develop systems similar to the public comment tracking system, which would show all uses of alternate mechanisms to gather input, including results and analysis of these. ICANN org should publish the complete public comment guidelines for the ICANN organization.

What we read up there is then only thing that is available to the public and obviously refers to a full document. I don't know why the full document wouldn't be published. But anyways, let's see.

ICANN org should explain why its blog posts collect feedback information when the public comment guidelines for the ICANN organization state that they will not be used as mechanisms for collecting feedback.

Let's throw that open. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I would be more pushy. They should explain but they should, for the last point, stop doing it, not just because they can explain. But it's the wrong way to go.

My problem with the alternative mechanisms is not too much that they're existing but it's how we found them and how the users of then systems are able to go from one to the other or to not have to spend three hours to find, "Now I want to make a comment on this topic. It's on another page than the first one." I really think, for the users' side, we need to have one place for comments, whatever the process is, because they take as an example that they will do a survey in another place. But we may end up in putting some questions [and] survey in what we will ask as comments by the public, and we don't want them to be on another side. Therefore, I don't think that we need to have two places for comments.

I agree that we can have a different mechanism, but that's not the same thing as to have a single place where we can find everything. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah, I know. I'm trying to go from there is nothing to track these things, because they get implemented in various sub-sections of the organizations and maybe we'll never see them, to actually providing some daylight on them so we can actually understand them. I fully understand your point, but the reality is they say they're using this and we're not tracking it. I'm saying let's track it. That's the basis of what

EN

this is. I don't think that we can go into saying, "Well, you shouldn't do that."

As far as the last point on being more pushy, I'm Canadian. That's not our style, but it basically means the same thing for us.

Any other thoughts?

Okay, great. So that should be locked down. Yes, let's leave the community to decide. Thank you, Vanda.

Section 6. So Section 5 is locked and we are get our breeze-through section: Acceptance of ICANN decisions. Basically, we've gone through this entire section. There have been no changes and there are no suggestions or recommendations.

Decide what … What I took Vanda's comment to mean, Sebastien, is that we will produce this in the public comment and we'll see what the reaction is. Then we can decide how we want to include this in the final report. That's what I took it as.

Sebastien, please go ahead.

Sebastien, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. If we want them to decide or to give us some input, we need to ask them questions. For example, one of the questions is, do you want to have all those in one place? I understand what you stay about that the staff is doing such-and-such a thing, but the users of the system

EN

must tell us what they prefer. If they don't care about having something in one place something in the other, it's okay. But if we want to have feedback, we need to ask them. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Good point. I like that point. Let me see if I can weave some of that in.

Getting back, that takes us to Section 7: PDP. I think I'm not going to take a lot of time on 7. We've agreed that we will do an omnibus statement at the end, which we will drop on the list early next week at the latest, which people can review, which will be a response in addition to gathering some input, cobbling some of the results from ATRT2 Recommendation 10.5 that we had. So all of this stuff will actually be handled in one clump as we discussed earlier. I don't think there's any point in discussing any of this, as we will be posting that to the list.

Thank you. So Item 7 is not closed. We have to publish that statement.

Issue 6: Assessment of the independent review process. That's been stable. That hasn't been touched.

Let's move on to the next one. 9: Assessment of relevant ATRT2 recommendations. A lot of changes here. Information gathering – that hasn't changed. What we've changed – I'm glad KC is here … We've discussed earlier bringing back Not Applicable for those ATRT2 recommendations which we have qualified as Not Implemented. The logic behind that is we can't assess the effectiveness of something that hasn't been implemented. So we've reincluded Not Applicable for those specific cases.

KC?

KC CLAFFY: It seems to me it would be more clear to say Not Implemented [A]gain in that column because then it explains with the same number of words why it's not applicable. At least to me.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, great, KC. Thank you. We'll consider that and I'll have a chat about that.

The table below has been updated. If we keep going … Jennifer? Thank you. So that's the same table we had before, but we've inserted the evaluations as they currently stand.

9.3. This is the new section. So we've rewritten this part. A table summarizing the results of ATRT3's assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations is … Okay. That is the results of that table we just scooted over a few seconds ago.

The results contrast with the October 2018 executive summary report that all ATRT2 recommendations were implemented. Some of the differences in implementation assessment can be attributed to a strict interpretation by ATRT3 of the terms "implemented," "partially implemented," and "not implemented." It should be pointed out that, even if ATRT3 has assessed the recommendation is not implemented, [then], in a number of cases, work was done on related items, which ATRT3 did not assess as being core to the recommendation and therefore the review team maintained they could not use the partially

implemented assessment. Verifying understanding of the ATRT2 recommendations. It's important to note that there were not implementation shepherds or similarly [inaudible] from the team which crafted the recommendations and the implementers. As such, the implementers could not obtain any clarification regarding the recommendations during the implementation process, which stretched on for almost five years. ATRT3 also recognizes that its interpretation of the ATRT2 recommendations is the best effort based on current information.

We have a comment from Seb that says, "And ATRT3 members." Yes, that is correct. I can certainly correct that.

A change of context from the time ATRT2 recommendations were made to the time they were implemented. Implementing ATRT2 recommendation took approximately five years. The context of the organization significantly changed during this period with the IANA transition. Additionally, as previously noted, there were not implementation shepherds nor mechanisms to amend or retire recommendations which were initially approved for implementation but later assessed as problematic to implement.

"Do we have ATRT2 recs that we can suggest to be retired?" I do not [go] to that list. Sorry, Sebastien. But I guess we can start by looking at those that we decided were not implemented.

Can we go down, please, a bit, Jennifer.

JENNIFER: Sebastien has his hand raised.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sorry. Didn't see that. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernard, and thank you, Jennifer. I think, if we can start to say that those recommendations could be retired … Because we can say they're not implemented, but, for some of them, we could decide or we can suggest that they are retired. We can start the process here with ATRT3, I hope. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Interesting. Thank you, Sebastien.

                             Transfer to the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2. ATRT2 Recommendation 9.2 and 9.3 were transferred to the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2, and the Work Stream 2 recommendations on these topics remain to be implemented. As such, it would have been more precise and effective to clearly report – well, some editing – these as having been transferred to Work Stream 2.

                             We'll rework the language. Thanks for the edit, Seb, but it needs a little bit more fixing up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, it was just to say I don't think we need, if it must be clearer in the report that it was transferred to Work Stream 2 … I'm not talking about

partially implemented. Therefore, after the grammatical sentence, you may fix that. But my point was to strike this part of partially implemented because I think it's not a good idea from my point of view. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien.

Although this analysis clearly identifies some significant issues with the assessment of the implementation of ATRT recommendations by the organization, the new operating standards for specific reviews, which were approved in June 2019, combined with the new website for tracking the implementation of review recommendations, should address most if not all of these issues going forward.

I'm not going to read the operating standards.

This leaves two issues which the new operating standards do not cover: the implementation of CCT, RDS, and CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 recommendations. These recommendations do not provide the implementation details associated with their recommendation, which is required in the new operating standards, nor were they required to provide implementation shepherds, which could lead to interpretation issues, which were noted above. The tracking of the implementation or recommendations, which are transferred to other groups or processes such as then ATRT2 recommendations which were transferred to the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 … As such, ATRT3 will be making suggestions with respect to these points. The Board should ensure that the CCT 1 and RDS 2 and CCWG Accountability

Work Stream 2 review teams provide implementation shepherds as defined in the new operating standards for specific reviews to avoid any confusion as to the intent of their recommendations during implementation and should track their implementation using the reviews' website. If implementation of specific review recommendations is transferred to another process, the Board should ensure that any implementation reporting should clearly note this and ensure factual reporting on the progress of the implementation of such transferred recommendations.

All right, folks. There we have it. That's how we've restructured this following our conversations in Montreal. I'll take comments and questions now. Thank you.

Going once, going twice … Cheryl, I see your mic is open.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I was just going to suggest that we can continue on. I wanted to note that it certainly seemed like the right way forward for me. My mic was actually opened accidentally as I went up type into the chat box. Sorry.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you very much. And Pat has joined us. Hello, Pat, and welcome.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. I'm sorry for being so late, guys.

| BERNIE TURCOTTE: | You're not late. We're just getting to the good stuff. Thank you, Jennifer. Let's move on to the Section 10, please. |

Just as a recap, we've locked down Sections 15 and 16 and 3 to 6. 7 is open because we have to publish overarching statement that we talked about when we discussed it in Section 15. We also have an outstanding issue on the gender recommendation from Section 3. But we said that one (the gender one) we need to resolve Sunday. With the overarching statement on PDPs, we'll take the time to craft it. We'll send it early next week. But we've got to settle that one early in the week next week and make sure we're okay.

Is that everyone's understanding of these things?

All right, good. So Section 10 Issue 8: Assessment of period reviews. Information gathering – thank you for the green tick, Cheryl. We've done the same thing as we've done in all the other sections. We've gathered up the input – if we can go down a bit – and put it in a table. We've gone through these elements in Section 15. ATRT3 survey – we've done the same thing as we've done in the other sections. And – whoa, whoa, whoa. Analysis of information. Again, what we're doing is simply grabbing those sections where we said there would be a suggestion or recommendation and including them in here. As usual, the highlighted stuff is where we've brought in some changes versus the things that we've actually gone through.

10.33: ATRT2 Recommendation 11-4: The Board should prepare a complete implementation report to be ready by review kick-off. This

report should be submitted for public consultation and relevant benchmarks and metrics.

We've gone through that in Section 15. This just follows on. It's the same text that we went through in Section 15. We'll be amending that exactly the same way. So I don't think there's a point to relitigating this, as we've gone through that in Section 15. What'll probably be more interesting is going through – oh, some other change here. ICANN Board should ensure the budget … Again, same thing. We have gone through this in Section 15 and done any of the minor adjustments there.

Oh, we have KC here. Yay! 10.36. We were a little unclear on where you wanted to go with the conclusion. This is the conclusion you added. So we've made all the other changes you requested in ATRT2 Recommendation 11-7 analysis and in your conclusion. We walked through that in the group in Section 15, but we were a little unsure of what you were trying to get to with that one. So we'll take advantage of the fact that we have you here. Maybe you can help us clarify that.

KC, over to you.

KC CLAFFY: Are we on 11.7? The text?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Section 10.36: ATRT2 Recommendation 11.7. The conclusion.

EN

KC CLAFFY:	Okay. I don't know what was agreed to in Section 15. I'll have to go back and read that. But you're wanting to know if this conclusion is what I wanted?
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	We're just having trouble parsing it, so maybe you can walk us through it.
KC CLAFFY:	Okay. You mean, "Given the assessments, ATRT3 and the untested state of the new operating standard assessments of ATRT3," I guess.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Yeah.
KC CLAFFY:	"[inaudible] underlying issue. [inaudible] make a recommendation explicitly includes metrics that reflect this issue." Okay, I don't know. The last sentence looks like maybe an editing glitch because I don't know what sections of the operating standards are quoted in this section.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Okay. I just accepted your [inaudible]. So what I'm going to propose is you—

KC CLAFFY: I'm happy to take a pass at this, [if you want].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah, have a pass at it and send it back at us.

KC CLAFFY: Absolutely.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you. We're just a little confused by that. Thank you.

Next, let's go down a bit please, Jennifer. That's all standard text. There was no changes brought here. Here we go. Suggestions relative to issues. Here are some of the suggestions I pulled out. Obviously our major segment on recommendations – KC, your mic is open and you're typing. So, if you could kill that – thank you. So these are a few of the suggestions I pulled out earlier in the meeting.

Just to catch everyone up if you weren't there at the beginning of the meeting, we reviewed the results of the Doodle poll and came to the conclusion that we would go to public comment with just two options, which are Option 1 and Option 3, because they provide a very clear dichotomy between what they are and people made comments and were convinced that, if Option 2 and 3 are there, they're probably just going to confuse people, more than help them provide things. They are close and they are not. At any rate, this is a public consultation. We will look at the data and we will decide what to do. That's what we're going to build in to the end of Section 10 on recommendations.

EN

But, in the meantime, from some of the things we had above, I've tried to craft together a few suggestions relative to 11-4. ATRT3 suggests that the Board follow through with requesting an implementation shepherd from ATRT3 for the implementation of its suggestions and recommendations as well as holding a public comment to avoid any confusion, not a public consultation, on its implementation of ATRT3's suggestions and recommendations at least six months prior to the next ATRT-type review being held, recognizing ATRT3 will be making recommendations with respect to specific reviews.

Also, as noted by Sebastien when we discussed this previously, the six-months thing will depend on where we land when we come to a decision on what we will be recommending relative to reviews when we sit down in Brussels in February after we have the results of the public comments on this thing.

So that's our first recommendation, which is consistent with the other one, which is making sure that the Board does carry through with the requirement in the operating standards that ATRT3 have an implementation shepherd or shepherds for the things that we have so that there's no confusion.

The second one, on 11.5: ATRT3 suggests review teams assess their allocated budget with staff once they have established a work plan and that they be allowed to request reasonable and justified amendments as necessary to ensure they can complete their task and ensure greater accountability to review teams.

EN

Again, this is a recasting of a discussion we had relative to 11.5. There were two points made with this. In the first part, it is to be clear that, right now, all review teams have the same budget. They're just handed this thing. There's really not discussion. "Here's the budget. What do you need out of this?" What we're saying is that maybe that works, maybe that doesn't work. We don't know, but the point is, if you're doing review teams, maybe, once the review team has been constituted, has looked at its work, and has created its workplan, maybe it can sit down with staff and see if the budget makes sense. If not, if it's justified, make amendments upfront instead of starting this thing and saying, "When we built the workplan, we knew this wasn't going to work." So it's that feedback loop that makes sense so that everyone is aware of things.

The second point that was brought up was that this is fine but does this mean that, if something goes wrong, the review teams don't have the option of going back to ICANN? We agreed to some text there to make sure that it was clear that that possibility was not being removed. We're only talking about making sure that the review teams can review the budget at the start of the work once they have an idea of what they want to do.

So those two things were covered. Any questions, thoughts, or comments?

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Good summary of what we have discussed earlier. One point – I don't know how we can handle that – is to say that those recommendations will evolve in function of which recommendation we will make on the reviews themselves. It's a little bit chicken and egg, but …

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Well, as we have said earlier, Sebastien, once we make our decision on what we're going to do with reviews, we will have to take that result, once we finish crafting it, and go through the whole report and amend as necessary. But right now, with what we're given, we're putting those as placeholders which, yes, will have to be amended as required.

We've got four minutes left, so we're not going to start another section. We've done really well. We've got 11 and 12. They should go fairly quick tomorrow. 11 should take about all of five minutes, and 12 may be just a little bit longer. But, as we have stated at the beginning of this call, we will be working on the prioritization system as a priority for us on the Sunday call.

With that, I hand it back to Cheryl and Pat. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Bernie. That's a huge amount covered off by all of us today. You and Jennifer obviously, but also the review team has put in an enormous amount, and I want to thank everybody on behalf of both Pat and I – I can assure you, Pat, they did work very hard – for the fabulous efforts you've made. So we should look at about 15 minutes of Sunday's

meeting to be dedicated as the first agenda item, Jennifer, just so we clear that up on the meeting of Sunday, the 1st of December, between 21:00 and 23:00 UTC. Our first agenda item after administrivia will be the finalization of work in report, finalization of work for public comment in report Version 5.1. Then we will be moving just to dig in deep on prioritization for the primary item #3. Then we can confirm next steps, and we will need to look at when we will have a meeting.

Now, Pat, you and I and the leadership team have not discussed whether we will take a week, next week, off in terms of a review team meeting. We may need to have a leadership team meeting. It might need to be other than the Monday. I don't know. But we do need to work out our ongoing meeting schedule with the leadership team. So that can be a matter for later. We will finalize that perhaps before planning tomorrow.

Pat, did you want to make any remarks before we wrap and make sure Jennifer's got an agenda sorted for our Sunday meeting?

PAT KANE: Thanks, Cheryl. But since I was not here for most of today, I've got nothing else to add. But thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're glad you got you back home. Good to have you back, despite all the travel challenges you were fighting through.

With that, ladies and gentlemen, we're just about coming to the top of the hour when we said we would be completing our call. I'll just let

Jennifer make sure that she's got everything she needs from an administration point of view.

Jennifer?

JENNIFER: Thanks, Cheryl. Yes, that was very clear. Thanks for going through the agenda. I'll get that circulated tomorrow ahead of the Sunday call. Then I just wanted to record the couple of decisions as well that were mentioned just to reiterate. The decision to keep the Doodle poll open [directly] after the meeting on Sunday. There's a couple people who haven't filled it out yet. So follow up with those people. And then a decision to put out only two options regarding reviews for public comment, which is Options 1 and 3. Those are the decisions that I captured. All the other actions you already covered. So I think I can end there. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jennifer. More of that hot tea and lemon or whatever it is you're doing to improve your voice still needs a bit more work.

JENNIFER: It's whiskey.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, ladies and gentlemen – whiskey? Well, whiskey is fine, my dear. So you and Jacques both sipping the whiskey. No wonder this meeting went well.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much. We look forward to having you all join us promptly at 21:00 on Sunday, December 1st, to take us towards the finishing line for our public comment drafting. Thank you, everyone. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]