BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone, and happy new year. I'd like to welcome you to the ATRT3 Plenary #43 on 8 January 2020 beginning at 21:00 UTC.
	Attending the call today, we have Cheryl, Demi, Jaap, Sebastien, and Vanda. Observers Avri and Chantelle. From ICANN Org, Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. And Bernie, our technical writer has joined. We have apologies from Wolfgang.
	Today's meeting is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking. Pat—Cheryl, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you, Brenda. Hopefully, we can tell the difference between Pat and I speak if not when you have us in a lineup. As Brenda said, welcome to the 2020 new year of work but only a small part of the year for our work to be completed. I trust those of you who took family time off over the recent weeks or had particular observances that they were rewarding and that your batteries are replenished as we get back into our work for this coming term.
	Now as you all know, we have a slightly lighter than usual turnup today. So we may, in fact, want to just double-check that everyone is getting the calendar invitations, etc. Brenda, I know there have been some work groups that have had some problems with some of their calendar invitations coming back over from the ICANN break. So just double-check that there's not a technical glitch somewhere.

With that, let's move on to asking is there anybody with statement of interest updates? Not seeing anybody wave at me in the room and not hearing anybody clear their voice, just note that Pat has joined us [inaudible] co-chair and Leon Sanchez is also in the room as well as another observer, Taylor. Welcome to all of you.

Let's then move on to looking at our action items. Dear, it seems so long since we've looked at action items. New and closed. To that, I'm going to go to you I believe, Jennifer. Jennifer, over to you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Just a couple of action items to highlight. Before the break, we had an action item to post the report summary and the translated versions. Those have been posted to the ICANN.org website as well as shared via email. I think you're all very aware of that, and thank you for sharing with your groups if you've done that already. And if you haven't, please consider doing that.

And then the next item just to introduce I guess Agenda Item 3, we've obviously scheduled the webinar for 13 January and 14 January at the times 20:00 UTC and 12:00 UTC. So thank you for participating in the Doodle poll. Just to note that we did try and select those times, and it seems like most review team members can do either one or the other so that's great. Hopefully, we'll get some good turnout. We've also posted the announcement at ICANN.org. And then promoting that via the usual channels, but do as well try and promote within your groups if you haven't done that already.

With that, that covers the action items, but do let me know if you have questions about anything that I didn't cover. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jennifer. Is there anyone with any questions on these action items? I do note that certainly Vanda but also Sebastien and Daniel have been doing their best to make sure everyone knows about the upcoming webinars. So thank them for that. I notice Liu has joined us as well.

With relation to the webinar, we're going to look at some of the logistics and planning of that as an item under any other business. So if you're wondering when we're going to talk about how we're going to present, we will be looking at that following on the Item 3. We'll just work out exactly who is going to say what, where, and how. But we'll be going through the slide deck as well in Agenda Item 3.

Talking about agenda items, I did neglect to ask—my apologies—is there anybody who has any other business that they wish to note now? Welcome, Herb. Okay, not seeing anybody, we will of course ask again toward the end of our call.

So with that, let's dive into the main feature today which is our preparation for the webinars this week. We have a slide deck to display. You've had it sent out in email only recently. Many of you will see some familiarity with much of this work, and some of you have in fact already made outreach and engagement opportunities in your own areas. I noticed I think it was Jaap, you did one, and I certainly know that Sebastien and Daniel and Vanda have been involved in not one but two

activities within the At-Large community. So hopefully we're going to be shaking out a few more very useful [inaudible] of public comment when we get through these webinars in this coming session.

So handing over to—who am I handing to? Am I handing to Bernie, or are we going through this ourselves? Pat, what's the rule here? Bernie, are you going to manage this one?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sure can if you want me to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, happy to do so because Pat and I haven't touched base on this. So I'm sure we'll be happy to stand back.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, thank you very much. For those who have not read it, very inspired by the first section of the document we published for public comment. Very few things are new, and also having [springed] off what Sebastien produced and the comments that came on. So not much new here, so the things that are not new we will go over very quickly. There are only four sections: background on ATRT3, key findings, key recommendations, and key questions. Next slide, please.

All right, basic stuff on ATRT3. There is nothing new here except there is no exception. We are noting that we are making recommendations and suggestions. We were asked to explain the difference. Next slide, please.

So we've included this slide: Difference Between Recommendations and Suggestions. Let's walk our way through this one.

"ATRT3 is subject to the new the new Operating Standards for Specific Reviews adopted by the ICANN Board in June 2019. This requires that all Recommendations provide significant details to justify making a recommendation as well as providing clear implementation requirements, ranking, and evaluation criteria which can be a major undertaking for each recommendation.

"In this context ATRT3 will limit making Recommendations to topics which it believes are of critical importance and will include all the information required of recommendations by the new Operating Standards.

"However, ATRT3 will also make Suggestions and Strong Suggestions which it believes are also important but may not include all of the information required by the Operating Standards. These should be considered similarly to recommendations by the Board.

"Strong Suggestions will be ranked as having higher priority vs Suggestions."

This is the text we're proposing to explain our difference between recommendations, suggestions, and strong suggestions. I'll pause here for a second in case anyone has questions or comments. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Definitely we need to explain that one point I think it could useful to add is that for the moment label we use are just

suggestion and we will take into account comments we will receive. For example, if there is one suggestion that a lot of people push to have this as a recommendation, we may decide to change it. Therefore, it's still under the labeling we use, we will take into account the comments we will receive. That's the first point.

The second—no, maybe I will come back after when you will go through the number of suggestions and recommendations we have. I will have a comment at that time, but that was my first comment. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Yes, I agree with you. I actually ran out of room. I really wanted to limit it to one slide. I'll see what I can do to slide that in. Thank you. Your hand is still up. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I'm in the same line of Sebastien, but also people comment on the word "suggestion." Maybe we could also say that any proposal for other words related to suggestions or strong suggestions will be accepted and analyzed or something like that. Just to encourage maybe people to suggesting something more acceptable than just suggestion since people during our last call were a little worried about if suggestions will really be understood as something that will be done, will be guaranteeing some way that they will be considered as important or as mandatory or something like that. So those were the points that people raised during our call in the At-Large, so maybe explain during not to write but explain in open during the webinars. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Bernie. Vanda, as you know, I was in that meeting as well, and so I well understand the confusion, lack of understanding, etc., that was evident in a number of the At-Large community because they felt that the term "suggestion" was too wishy-washy. I think we can probably look to ourselves as enough of a resource should we, indeed, wish to make any change of terminology that we have been using for nine months now and reporting to the community, let me count them, four or five times. So I don't know whether they were in the room or in the room and just not listening in the other times where we had used the term suggestions and strong suggestions, but we've always used those terms since we've been reporting to the community.

So I think we may very well want to consider, annotating, or somehow making it very clear in the documentation, but I'm not particularly keen to ask for input on people's ideas for other nomenclature. I think amongst us we should have enough talent to come up with—gee, look up a thesaurus—other terminology. So if we need to change the terminology, I think we can do it ourselves. But, yes, we certainly should speak to the strength of the term as we are using it. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, let's get back to it if there are no other comments or questions. Okay, so a few points noted, and I'm sure we will be reworking these. Next slide, please, Brenda.

Okay, here there is technically nothing new. What we've done on each of the items is we've included how many suggestions have been made. So we'll run through the first two just to give you a flavor.

"Assessing and improving Board governance: produced five suggestions related to ATRT2 recommendations and five suggestions based on the results of the survey."

"Assessing the role and effectiveness of the Governmental Advisory Committee: produced three suggestions related to ATRT2 recommendations and three suggestions based on the results of the survey."

I think you get the flavor. Next page, please. And we go on, and next page, please.

All right, so the one thing we did is add a summary at the end. "Related to ATRT2: 16 suggestions and 1 strong suggestion. Related to the survey: 1 recommendation, 11 suggestions, and 2 strong suggestions. Related to other topics: 1 strong suggestion." I think that helps position where we put in our focus.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Bernie. [inaudible] I didn't get [inaudible] before, and I think we need to reconsider that because we made only one recommendation and I know it's a very important one. But we may look at if there are no others, what we have called strong suggestions can become recommendations. Because it seems to me that we will face something that we will say, "Oh, you don't want to work too much and you have just put one recommendation and the rest is suggestions and we don't need to go through all the work that has to be done for a recommendation." My feeling was that we were having two, eventually three recommendations, but it seems that now it is not the case. Therefore, maybe we need to reconsider that in going through all the suggestions. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Anybody else? Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, I do believe that in the previous slides when you explained why the standards are so demanded, we should maybe explain better that it's not the quantity of [the work]. It's a lot of things that are impossible to raise [for are] many suggestions. Because, for instance, in many suggestions we made in the GAC, it was impossible to refer to all the items into the new standards. So maybe this could be better explained, not give the impression that we are lazy and that we don't want to make so much work. It's something that I do feel people understand that way. So maybe we just explain better that the demand sometimes cannot be reached. It's impossible to be reached in some ways, but we

want to make suggestions that can be taken into account. Because I believe the sensation of, well, we are lazy will be around the community, yes. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. I was taking that in the context, as Sebastien has pointed out earlier, that we need to be clear that the labeling of the various recommendations are suggestions are currently draft and may change by the end.

But fine. I get the point. I don't think it's critical. We can remove the blue text unless there is an objection, and we'll try to by gaining some space by doing that we'll see if we can add a bit more information that, as Vanda points out and it's a very good point, that in certain cases it would just be impossible for some points we consider important to make recommendations because we just could not fill out the information. So great point. Thank you very much, Vanda. We'll take that into consideration. Your hand is still up. Thank you.

Anybody else? All right, next page, please. Oh, sorry. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. I really think that we can wait, of course, until the end of the comment, but if we can go through in one of our next calls maybe to the [inaudible] strong suggestion to see if there are no that could be well suited recommendation. Because my feeling was that we, or at least I, didn't push for a recommendation because I didn't know before the end how many we will get and I didn't want to add work to

the work we have already. But here with only one recommendation, I think we need to rethink that. And I understand perfectly the argument of Vanda about the GAC, but I'm not sure that the other part of your work can be specified the same. And therefore, I would suggest that we go through at least some suggestions again. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think that's a very good point, and I think in our report we make that point very clearly that the labeling in the report that's out for public consultation is a draft and that we reserve the right to change the labeling of any recommendation, suggestion, or strong suggestion. So, indeed, we will be doing that anyway, Sebastien. I think you're probably right that we can do some of that considering early, but probably our consideration of those will be more informed by the results of the survey.

All right, great. Thank you. Anybody else? Going once, going twice. All right, we're done with this one. Next page, please.

GAC considerations. Basically following on Vanda's comment, I know that Sebastien included a version of this slide in his text. We just grabbed it and copied it here. Vanda, do you think that's okay?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It is needed just to alert people that they can read the ideas and the report with this in mind. It is something like just pay attention when you read the whole document, just that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, so the text that is there is okay for you?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It is okay. It is okay. It's extracted from the report.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, that is correct. All right, excellent. Next page, please.

The methodology, this is copy-paste from the report. Next page, please. And we're done with that section and we're into key findings. Ah, yes. I just saw your hand, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, one thing. I really think it's 46 and not 47.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You preempted my next slide. I will recount. It's possible. Let me have a look at that. I will note that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's why in my presentation I have put 46 or 47. I guess you have 47 lines, but the first one is not an ATRT3 recommendation.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Ah, okay.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was my—but I may be wrong. You better do check again.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I'll do a double-check. Thank you for that. All right, next page, please.

Here there's nothing new. That's directly copy-paste from the report. That's given that we've decided not to go into numbers of suggestions and strong suggestions, we would remove the second bullet. And the third bullet is copy-paste from the report. Not seeing any questions or objections, let's go to the next page.

These are copy-paste from the report. There is nothing new here in that first section where we lay out the key results. Next page, please.

Again, same thing here. Next page, please.

And then we close up with accountability indicators, copy-paste from the report. Next page, please.

That completes the findings. Now we can go into key recommendations and suggestions. Issues With Respect to the Implementation of ATRT2 Recommendations: "In addition to its earlier suggestion on ATRT2 recommendations the ATRT3 suggests…" those are exactly the points that are in the report copy-pasted into here. Next page, please. And next page, please.

Issues With Respect to Prioritization. Basically, given the thing was long, I decided to just keep it short for this presentation instead of running through the whole thing. But I'm looking forward to feedback from this

group if that's the right approach. So boiled down the introduction on prioritization to these two paras, and let's take the time to walk through those.

"Considering the strong support in the responses to the ATRT3 survey indicating that ATRT3 should make recommendations with respect to prioritization, and recognizing that there are several significant activities being undertaken in parallel by other parts of the ICANN Community regarding prioritization (Evolution of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model and ICANN Board Paper on Resourcing and Prioritization of Community Recommendations: Draft Proposal for Community Discussions) ATRT3 proposes that only a community-led process can legitimately develop a system for prioritizing the implementation of reviews, CWG, and CCWG recommendations.

"As such the ATRT3 suggests guidance for the creation of a community-led entity tasked with development and operation of a prioritization process (see draft report Section 12 for details)."

The key question here is, do we want to get into all the details of the suggestion that we make? Because it's a couple of pages, and I'm not sure that we're going to carry everyone in a webinar format. But I'll be glad to take input on that. Anybody? Or are we happy with the way it is? Pat?

PAT KANE: We're going to get questions here on the details would be my [inaudible]. So do we want to at least put in maybe not all of the details, but we've got to give some kind of leading indicator I would think.

EN

Because I think there were questions that came up in this in previous presentations done by members of the team so far. And so I think that there's probably benefit to put something on the table such that we can at least shape the questions that would come in as opposed to just letting the questions be anywhere and everywhere.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good point. All right, thank you for that, Pat. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I do believe that we should only have some bullets. For instance, this last paragraph, it's important to highlight that we are suggesting the creation of a community-led entity. Because for someone reading all these [big write], it's passed through without clear understanding what we are really suggesting. So I will suggest a very clear bullet for that point.

And the general point over there in the previous paragraph could be reduced because it's quite difficult to read all those when you are in some way watching and listening at the same time. So it's especially for someone that is not a native in English and perhaps the translation also made a lot of errors. So bullets, simple bullets will be more easy when we are focused on the points that we need them to make some comments. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Good point. I think we can adjust that accordingly for those things. All right, anybody else? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, to understand very nice everything I try to have a more easy-to-read presentation with bullet points. Therefore, if you wish, take my slide because the content is almost the same but I guess it's a little bit easier to read. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. All right, anybody else? No? Okay, next slide, please. So prioritization is going to [get redundant] for the comments, and we'll look to Sebastien's slides.

Issues With Respect to Specific and Organizational Reviews. Again, condensed lead-in text. "Although ATRT3 could not come to consensus on a single proposal to address the issues related to Organizational and Specific Reviews it did manage to narrow the options down to two distinct possibilities for this draft report.

"The ATRT3 is seeking input from the community via the Public Comment to assist it in coming to a conclusion on this topic for its final report."

I don't think there's anything major there. Those are pretty much copy-paste from the report. Next slide, please.

Option 1 is copy-paste from the report. There's no editing there. Next slide, please.

All right, now, I've added these as hopefully something to help people understand where we're going following the comments from the At-

EN

Large presentation. I don't know if this is going to work, but we're giving it a try.

"Initial impact on scheduling." So this is the impact of Option 1. This is specifically for Option 1. I would almost ask you to hold your questions until we're all the way through because we have some other things after that help compare things, all right?

"Initial impact on scheduling would be limited (see Reviews Timeline – if no changes are made - slide)." So there's a slide later on.

"No changes to current format or duration of reviews (1 year Organizational and Specific Reviews with potential extensions for Specific Reviews)."

"Creation of a new oversight body (potentially independent) which would mainly ensure proper implementation of review recommendations and coordination of reviews (e.g., every 7 years vs. current every 5 years)." We're talking about the coordination of reviews where they could stretch things out. Next slide, please.

Option 2 as is, copy-paste. Next slide, please. Again, copy-paste, so there's nothing new there. Next slide.

All right, now, a very busy graphic which is a little bit small. What we've got here on top, the columns are basically quarters starting in June this year and going to 2027.

On the top half above the big black line, what we've got—thank you for that, Brenda—is what it looks like under the current requirements, i.e.,

EN

if there are no changes brought to reviews. And that is what it looks like under Option 1.

So basically, below the first gray line, you've got the specific reviews: ATRT, RDS, SSR, etc. And then you've got their proposed duration all the way through.

Below the second gray line, what you've got is the organizational reviews. So we've got the GNSO, At-Large, ASO, NomCom, RSSAC, SSAC, and ccNSO. Of course, we don't have the GAC because they are not subject to these organizational reviews.

So what you will see there is I've got the duration which is basically they're all 12 months. What you may have noticed in the specific reviews is that, except for ATRT4, the other reviews are scheduled for 18 months since that seems to be the average.

On the bottom multicolored line, what we did is just a simple sum for each quarter of how many reviews are ongoing. So basically 0 and 1 gets green, 2 and 3 gets a yellow, 4 and 5 gets a red. So basically, we see that in the middle of 2024, we have a number of reviews which is the usual traffic jam of reviews that we get under the current system. And then it falls off again until we get back into green and then yellow. So it's not a very sophisticated system, but at least it gives an idea of what's going on and what we're trying to address.

Below the black line, you've got Option 2, so specific reviews, what they would look like. You will note that in the squares it's written—if you can, I now it's written very small—but most of the small squares are 1 week. So basically ATRT4 on the first line below the third gray line you'll see is

12 months. The SSR reviews are 1-week reviews, and the CCT is 12 months.

Below that we've got organizational reviews which are 3-5-day workshops at most every three years, or I should say at least every three years. So there's a maximum timespan of three years. They must do one at least every three years if not more often. What that can look like culminating into a wholistic review every 7 years.

To avoid a bit of an overlap, I've moved the wholistic review to be in 2024, not to collide with some of the specific reviews. But that's just a suggestion. We can move it out to 7 years so that there are minimum two sets of reviews from the various SOs and ACs.

What we see as the bottom line, the multicolored line, is we get a much more even spread for the load. It's basically 0s and 1s, a few 1-2s and 2-3s. All right, next page, please.

Now, on Option 2, there are some assumptions, and they're listed here. "Assuming the next round of new gTLDs is 2022 the last CCT review would be held in 2025.

"Relevant elements of RDS and CCT reviews would be integrated into ATRT4.

"SSR would be 3-5-day workshops held periodically as called for by the Technical Committee."

Under organizational reviews: "Each SO/AC would have at least two reviews in each 7 year cycle–except for the first one.

"Each 3-5-day workshop should focus on priority items and can be scheduled per SO/AC preferences at least every 3 years."

All right, so that's our wrap-up of what we're trying to present here. I'll take your comments right now, so let's throw it open. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I don't know how to say….

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sebastien, if you're speaking, I'm not hearing you. Is that just me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, we can hear him.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can hear him.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It must be just you, Bernie.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Is it better now? Is it better? Bernie, can you hear me? It seems like he can't hear anybody.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Ah, okay, I'm back.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, you are back, Bernie? You can hear?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, I can hear you now. Sorry. Technical difficulties.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. It's very difficult because we go through a lot of work and what is here is first not what was my proposal, but I think it was not what we decided. We decided that we will start with an wholistic review as soon as possible. Therefore, I know that doing work twice is better than doing once, but if you take my slides—and it's not the one I presented, it was the one I sent to the group—the idea was to start with a wholistic review and it was written like that in the report. And if it's not, I will strongly disagree with what it presented here. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. All right, anybody else? Pat?

PAT KANE: Sebastien, I understand what you're saying. I think that this is intended to be representative in terms of an example of when that [inaudible]. I'm not opposed to having it happen sooner rather than later. The idea was a representation that showed some selections so that the SOs and ACs had and allowed for a seven-year cycle. And we can certainly [inaudible] that way if we needed to I would think.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: KC?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I guess I share a little bit of Sebastien's concerns. I feel like a lot of this stuff we were so rushed that it didn't really get consensus. I'm still kind of confused when there was consensus draw on the SSR2 reviews being a week. That sounds a little short to me. So maybe I just missed something. And I also think that there's I suspect at least some public comments coming in because I heard some people on SSR2 express concern about the [next] CCT review or at least some of the issues in the CCT review being postponed until after a new round of gTLDs. I think some of the recommendations in the CCT were strong, as in must be done before another round of gTLDs. So it seems like we need to address that concern. I think I need a little more time to think about this, but as it was so rushed over Thanksgiving weekend a lot of this stuff I think we just threw together and didn't cogitate very much about it, and now some of it doesn't even look familiar to me.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, thank you, KC. Pat? Pat, you're still on mute if you're speaking. KC, your hand is still up.

PAT KANE: Thank you. KC, on the items around CCT, the recommendation that came from the GAC and other areas was that we complete the current recommendations before we get to the next round, not do another CCT

EN

review before the next round. That we would take the current recommendations and get [them] deployed before we actually launch the next round. I think that's my recollection on that.

KC CLAFFY: Right, but this goes to my disagreement with some of the earlier comments that Bernie made about the claim in our report that now that we have these new operating standards, all of the issues with recommendations not being implemented should be taken care of. I don't believe that. First of all, I don't even believe that we're following the new operating standards. We're kind of linguistically navigating around them by using suggestion instead of recommendation.

I think it needs to be seen whether those operating standards are even feasible, much less effective. So [inaudible] to say, "Well, it's okay because all of the stuff the CCT report said in its review is going to be done before the new round." It seems to me an accountability and transparency review team would put in a recommendation that said someone needs to go back and check that these [ones] were actually done. Like the shepherd needs to sign off before we claim, yeah, we can go do the gTLD and then do another CCT review after that. I'm done.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on. If I can make a point as chair or co-chair of the Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs Working Group, I think we and the GNSO

Council are very clear on what the order of things needs to be. So I don't think that's in jeopardy here. Let's not get distracted by that. As Pat said, we have heard and have understood and are taking into account the CCT-RT current sets of things. There are a number of specific recommendations made which are germane to any subsequent round of new gTLDs, and they are being accounted for or at least deeply considered during the policy development process which precursors any such round anyway. So let's not get too much into the minutiae, okay?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. A few points from my point working backwards for KC, we have made I believe it's a strong suggestion that there will be implementation shepherds for CCT reviews, and we've made the recommendation that there be implementation of shepherds for things which might not get covered but we're saying they have to be covered.

Secondly, before the next ATRT review starts, we said that there will be a full report on everything that has been recommended. And I believe that we're also recommending that there be a public consultation on review recommendations as they get implemented. Anyways, so there are several things.

Back to Sebastien's initial comment that we start with a wholistic review, I went back and read the recommendation. I don't see that in there. I'm sorry if your impression was that it should start off with, but I'm in perfect agreement with Pat that I think that's not a problem. We can start with one if you think that's the way it's important, and it

actually might make sense in my mind. So starting—we can rework the timeline so that it shows that and that we're going there. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, thank you very much. It's always difficult when you have scheduled to put it in words and when you have words to put it back in the schedule. Therefore, my advice is that you take the schedule I provide to the group. If there are disagreements, we change it. But don't do the schedule to [words]. That was the work we have done [start] doing Montreal meeting, I guess. And then now you are trying to retake the [word] and to do it on a schedule base.

Because one of the reason I am very, very much in favor of having systemic review right now is that we may end up, and I hope we will be able to have at the same time, both wholistic review, one for the specific review and one for the organizational review. And it may end up to be a good idea to have all that in one single review to have a real, complete overview of the [inaudible]. [inaudible] specific topic. I can resend it, but the document was designed….

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, I have it, Sebastien. It's not a problem.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And the other thing is that I didn't invent anything on the way to show. I took the way it is shown on the current website of ICANN about the review timeline and review material timeline and I just tweaked that to be able to have a comparison from what is already shown on the

website and what it could be in the future. But we get through that and we [spat]. And with all of you, we translate that into words. It's why it's now in words in the document. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, thank you. We'll look to that, Sebastien. Okay, that would complete reviews. Next slide, please.

Issues With Public Comments. Standard text. Next slide, please.

These are copy-paste from the document. Next slide, please.

Again, same thing. Next slide, please.

Accountability indicators, copy-paste from the document. Next slide, please.

Key questions. Next slide, please.

Copy-paste from the document. And at the end, we just have the Public Comment on Third accountability and Transparency Review Team report will close on 31 January 2020 and can be found at…" and then we close.

Any final comments? Sebastien?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, thanks for that. Oh, Sebastien, do go ahead and then I'll follow up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. One of my points here is to be about the date. I need to check on my own calendar, but if I remember well, we are having our meeting in Brussels just after the comments are analyzed by staff. And it must be done just after 31 January then. I would like to suggest that we insist that we will not move the 31 January because sometimes people consider that when it's 31 January it will be 15 February and it will be too late for our work. Therefore, I think if we can say it during the two webinars, it will be great. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That's probably a great suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sebastien. Yeah, then I think we can focus on that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Thank you. I'm going to hand over to Pat in a minute, but just before we leave this I wondered if anybody else would like to make any comments or make any points or reactions to this. This will be, obviously, edited based on today's conversations. We've heard a lot from both Vanda and Sebastien, and Daniel has put a couple of things into chat. But there are a whole lot more of you in the review team. Obviously, KC had one intervention. But if there's anyone else whose voice would like to be heard on this. Thank you, Jaap, go ahead.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, I listened to the discussion [inaudible] that we should not really change things too much because this is based on the final draft and if we are now going to change our [inaudible] wording and so on, it will just confuse people even more than they probably already are if they try to read the draft. I actually was wondering whether we could have in the last or a next slide given some instructions for the reader or guidelines how to read the draft. Because we need to do that [inaudible] a lot of repetition, which is there for a reason. But maybe we should explain how the various parts of the draft [inaudible] and what is important to read as a minimum. I mean, of course, you have to read everything but I'm just wondering whether we could have a slide like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure Bernie is taking notes, Jaap. Thank you for that. I personally think that could be a very useful thing for people who have not delved deeply and lived and breathed all of this such as we have. And I saw a green tick pop up from Bernie during that, so thank you very much of that, Jaap. Is there anyone else who has an equally brilliant idea or comment? In fact, any idea or comment? Thanks, Jaap. If not, then I'm going to assume along with Pat that the other members of the review team are relatively comforted as to where we are with our material for presentation on the webinars.

Now as you know, the very next thing on our agenda today is any other business. And as any other business, we want to have a little look at

exactly who is going to be attending which webinar, who will be presenting what, etc. With that, I'm going to hand over to Pat. Obviously, he and I will be in both webinars are happy to present as much or as little as is required. But it will be very useful to know from all of you review team members who will be attending which or both as well. Pat, over to you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So I guess initially what we need to understand is who is going to be at which of the webinars. So for the one that is on 13 January at 20:00 UTC, can I get an indication by a yes who is going to be able to be a part of that one? Okay, and then who is going to be able to be at the one on 14 January at 12:00 UTC?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we note, Pat, in chat that Daniel will be at both webinars as will Sebastien and Vanda.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and thank you, Daniel. Okay, great. Thanks. So we've got quite a few of the group that will be in each of those webinars. So I would like to make the suggestion that we have more than just Cheryl and I participate in this presentation in terms of different sections.

So if you are willing to go through a specific section in either of those webinars, we would love to hear from those who want to participate or

will be able to participate on the 13 January webinar what if any of the sections you would like to go ahead and present, that would be great.

So I'll open it up for those who would like to be a part of it on 13 January. Okay, not seeing anything come up in chat or a raised hand— oh, there we go. Vanda suggested that she will do the GAC section on both of them. Sebastien, you are open to presenting. Which section would you be preferential toward?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will I have done the presentation twice on At-Large, but the second one, Daniel has done the one of the review and Vanda has done the one on the GAC. So I can do whatever you want, but I guess if [inaudible] is doing this part of the review, I have no preferences for any other parts. It's really up to you. [inaudible] if Daniel can go through the review, it would be great. If he agrees with that, it will be [inaudible]. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Great. So since we've got….

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat?

PAT KANE: Yes, go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. The rationale that was used in the presentations that were done for the Consolidated Policy Working Group in the At-Large community was that where there was a leader of one of the topics, they presented that. So that meant Vanda did the GAC and Daniel did the reviews section. And that might be a bit of a guideline for us as well, Pat. That depending on which of the leadership team we have at either or both of the webinars, that we also reach out to them and call on them for both presentation of material and, of course, answering of any particular questions as well. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. That's very helpful. Since we've got Vanda, Sebastien, and Daniel who have all offered to present during the webinar, why don't we do just that? Why don't you and I break open the sections and then just have these assignments? And then we can pick up where we don't have a natural fit that either you or I could do that presentation, or we could get Sebastien to do the reviews item if you would like or something of that nature. Does that work?

Yes, and thank you, Vanda. Bernie and I will certainly be there. Because I know Cheryl doesn't speak very clear English herself because of that Australian accent. But we will certainly be there to address questions. All three of us will be there.

Okay, so why don't we go ahead and do that, Cheryl? We'll break it up and hand that out. And we'll get that sent out no later than tomorrow so that people can have a chance to prepare for Monday, all right? Very good.

All right, any other business? Seeing no hands or anything in the group chat, let's go ahead and move on to confirmed actions or decisions reached. Jennifer, please?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Pat. A couple of action items. First of all, Bernie will update the webinar slide deck based on the conversation today on the call. I didn't note if he [inaudible] a date when that will happen, but I'm assuming it will be tomorrow knowing Bernie. Bernie, let me know if that's not right.

And then Cheryl and Pat will divvy up the presentations for the webinar and send a note to everybody as well on that so that they will have time to prepare which section they will present.

And other than that, I have no other action items. But, of course, as usual let me know if I missed something. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Jennifer. Is there anything else that we need to chat about today? Anybody click on yes or raise hand in the participant window. Seeing none and, Cheryl, unless you have anything else you want to add to today, I'll declare that we are done with this session.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent, and thank you, everybody, for joining. The numbers did come up a little while after the top of the hour. So relieved to see the majority of you were able to attend. Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

PAT KANE: Bye now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]