

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thank you, one and all. I hope you had a good middle-of-day break. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr and the rest of the team who are chafing at the bit here in Brussels ICANN office on the downhill moments for the last day of our three-day event, which has been the Accountability and Transparency Review. We're having our face-to-face which is the activity to look at both the public comments that have recently come in to our initial report, and of course to look towards building consensus and text on our recommendations and suggestions and the development of our final documentation due at the end of March or the beginning of April.

With that, thank you to everybody who is not only back in the room after our one-hour break but also those of you who are attending remotely. We definitely and deeply appreciate your attention to our details. Please do let us know whether or not we have any problems with the audio. The Zoom room today has been, we believe, more stable but let's hope that, in fact, that continues for this afternoon's sessions.

I'm going to now hand over to Bernie who I believe has probably almost stopped typing. He, over the middle-of-day break, has taken the time to put additional text in to the displayed document and I'm going to ask staff to put the link into this Google doc, so those of you who wish to follow along directly in the doc can do so as well.

This is a scratch pad document. This is not necessarily going to be the text you will find in final documentation but it is where we are crystallizing our thoughts and developing our final documentation that we will be building consensus on, and undoubtedly, you won't be surprised to see similar text, if not this, in our future and final report.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So, I think I've filibustered enough now and I'm going to hand it over to Bernie to take us through this material, which he has captured from this morning's discussion, our pre-middle-of-day break discussion on the aspects of organizational reviews. Over to you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Good morning, Brussels. Let's take a minute to go back to specific reviews for just a sec. I'd like some feedback. I've tried throwing in some words on SSR: "SSR review should be suspended until the next ATRT review but could be reactivated by the ICANN Board, should there be a need for this. The reasons for this are," and then we're going through the details for that. Is that about what we talked about this morning?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It sounds like it. They're just looking around the table. Sébastien indicated we had suggested turning it on its head, but perhaps with that new lead-in it's less important to turn on its head. I can certainly take that as a friendly. Is anybody sort of screamingly loud in core objection to it? All right, let's continue on.

BERNIE TURNCOTTE:

All right, back to organizational reviews. All right. So the objective is replace the single oversight mechanisms of organizational reviews conducted by consultants every five years by internal continuous improvement processes, which will include multiple mechanisms for gathering input on a more regular basis. All right, thoughts, comments, questions? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. It's not just gathering inputs. We are thinking about a survey and so on, but it's also doing some reviews, if we replace it also by the five-day meetings. Therefore it's not just gathering information, it's also—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It isn't to the point of actually including that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I absolutely agree. I didn't get quite to chew that part into there. All right, so that's noted more. I'll write that in there. Okay. Second bullet: "Perform as a minimum annual satisfaction surveys or equivalent mechanisms within each SO/AC as to their membership satisfaction regarding performance within that specific SO/AC. The results of these would be public and used as input for the overarching review and could be used as a trigger to undertake other actions if a serious issue is identified in the results. Of course, this would be supported by ICANN staff as necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I would like that we spend some time about what we want to call this around each seven-year review. Here, you talk about over-rushing. I was more with a systemic. There may be some differences. I am not sure that the word "overarching," it's already quite using in ICANN and ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, Sébastien, we'll get to that at the bottom and we can beat this one to death. I have no issue with that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Then we put into brackets, please, "overarching." Thank you

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Put a pin on it, yes. That's right. Okay, so I will put "overarching" in square brackets. There we go. Third bullet: "Each SO/AC will need to undertake some type of formal activity to support its continuous improvement activities." Activity, activity. "Process to support its continuous improvement activities. These could include a variety of processes such as three to five-day workshops, being held at least every three years, to review continuous improvement objectives and the progress made against these.

Regardless of the process selected by the specific SO/AC, this should fit in the financial constraints available for these. The results of these activities would be used as input to the overarching reviews and supported by ICANN staff as necessary," overarching in square brackets. All right, let's throw that one open. León.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: I know that we want to provide as big or as much freedom to SO/ACs to determine the processes, etc. But would we want to add something that encourages to standardize across SOs/ACs? Because otherwise, I can see the difficulty from the Org point of view and from the board point of view on implementing and supporting 20 different processes to the same end.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, this is a tension here folks because, if we read the comments, those that were in favor of the continuous improvement process were saying, "Yes, but don't tell us we have to hold a three to five-day meeting every three years, et cetera." I guess we could blend the two and say there will be a baseline that is required as presented to accomplish this. And then on top of that, how you want to deal with it is there is some flexibility within each SO and AC. Would that be where we're going here?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: I think it kind of goes where I'm trying to get. So I would say not only a baseline but also a limit maybe?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Limit.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Because I know parts of my community and this could grow into a very strange animal.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, that's what I put in. This should fit in the financial constraints.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: That's perfect.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I thought about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I completely agree with the question raised by León. I understand that we don't want to be too prescriptive, but I really think that the way we think about this review, I think that the core thing from my point of view must be this three to five-day workshop each and every three years. If one organization, and if there is a budget, want to do it more frequently that's another question.

And then, we already open from what we suggest in our document for the moment that we open with a lot of variety of processes to help around this workshop. Therefore, I think we already made a good step in opening other possible activity. But as an element of comparison, and because I personally think that what will come out of the three to five-day workshop is an excellent element for the overarching review, I think we need to have some common [inaudible] grounds. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Other comments?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I agree. We need to set up some framework for the work to be done or we are not recommending enough. We're going to change that. We need to establish some clear process for them, like a framework where they can select the people the way they want to but be limited by some constraints because it's not for whatever they want to. I agree with León. If you leave all that, it's crazy.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Thought here, guys. Okay, the comment framework makes perfect sense to me. I agree, okay? And I think that Sébastien is going there versus the comments that we have. Is it a thought that we would say the SOs and the ACs need to come together to establish that with ICANN Org, the baseline?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Getting a “yes” on one side of the table and a “no” on the other, so we clearly need to discuss that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Why I say no, here.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Please tell us why you say no.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My example is a meeting strategy working group we set up and it was a multi-stakeholder group with participation and active participation to each and every representative, into brackets, of each SO and AC on the board and so on and so forth. And as soon as it got out of our group, it was changed by the implementation, that means by staff, and it was changed by some leaders who were very happy to change it because

they were not majority within the discussion, but as within the leadership teams, they were the biggest voice.

Therefore, I don't think that it's a good idea to go. We need to propose something. We have a very strict process today. We are getting out of this process but we don't want to have a process completely open because, if not, we can retire ourselves. We can't say, "We don't need ATRT. They can do everything they want. We change the review and we give to somebody else to decide." No, it's our duty. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, so I'll come back. I mean that framework has to be defined somewhere. We don't have the time, I think, to do that here. And so, do we say "ICANN will develop it"?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, if there's going to be a framework and it can't be us doing it, then "who" is the question I think that he's asking.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: First, I would try to give you an answer and my answer is the following. If we agree that the next review is an overarching review, holistic review, whatever name we give, therefore it could be the good place to do it because they will have to have a look at the overall organization. And they could say, "Okay the next phase," taking into account our inputs, "will be organized later. The five days will be blah, blah, blah." It's my proposal. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you. I think the overarching review gives us an opportunity to have a holistic approach to the organization as such. As we have mentioned, since 2002 there has never been a basic check of the organization as such. And I think Sébastien's reference to the meeting review group had "yes and no" because this was a very specific group.

And so, if it's combined with the idea to have workshops for each of the SOs and ACs and then every seven years, so this could be ... It depends on the composition of this review group. So, it could have been representative from all groups but also some independent outside us. So that means if we fine-tune this idea, this has more opportunities than risks. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Wolfgang. I see Vanda's hand, but I also want to check, Sébastien, is yours back up again? Okay, we'll go to Vanda and then we'll go ... Oh, just to Vanda now.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well in the first moment I agreed with Sébastien but I believe that being the first movement, the holistic idea is not a good idea because they have no basis to review everything because the others have been not completely [reviewing], so it's something that goes against our proposal in general. At the same time, it can work if it's something with just one focus, not the whole group that should think about all the reviews but the process of those organizational reviews and the holistic review could be the same group [inaudible] this first one with the focus to define the process.

Just that, because not to really analyze the holistic environment of ICANN. And then, after those groups have done their own reviews, then we have grounds to have these holistic group to come out with that process that we've already done, and then analyze, and they can be reviewed. So, as I said, yes and no. But we can do that, define that the first holistic review is not exactly the whole list but a group that we'll define under the framework. We are suggesting the whole process of everything.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I think if I've heard you correctly, Vanda, you're coming down on the side of having the entity, whatever that is in shape or form, that runs the holistic/overarching process, also focus specifically on the process of some baseline or harmonized set. Have I got that correctly?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Okay. Just yes is fine. Okay. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I really think that the holistic overarching whatever review needs to be done as soon as possible. One of the reasons is it's 2002 last time, but it's also because we are at the end of one cycle of the revision of all the SO and ACs. It's the right moment to decide. We postpone all the ... And we change, not just postpone, but we reorganize/reshape the reviews and then we start. But we start, not with empty; we start with a review done by each SO and AC in the current form. Therefore, there's plenty of things. Okay.

The next holistic review in seven years will be with new inputs, a new way of thinking, new things, but for the moment it's important that it's done. And it's important it's done now because if they suggest some changes in the organization, therefore it will change also, as a review, what we'll have to do. It's why – I didn't consider that before – I suggest that this group will be also, in addition to doing the holistic review, in charge of defining how it could be organized, this five-day workshop. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All I'm hearing is agreement with what you've said. Nobody disagreed with the first part, and I believe Vanda just supported the second again, and I'm looking at the table to see if anyone objects to that. So, it seems to me like we're in violent agreement, so let's move on.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a minor qualifier. What we were aiming for, Sébastien, is defining the common framework for tracking continuous improvement, which is in my mind more than just saying what the three to five-day workshop is going to be. We're trying to establish a common framework so that we have a common point of reference. I think that's important. If we agree with that, then I'm okay with this. I think that makes sense. I can weave that into it. So we would have an "A." I guess my only question on that is, is it the same review, the first one and the next one? I'm sort of split. They're different beasts. It's an overarching/systemic/whatever review, okay, but the first one will have different inputs and a different set of outputs if it's going to manage creating that common framework for continuous improvement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My response to that question is, and therefore, so what? I wouldn't expect them to be the same unless none of them are doing other than performing the status quo and vomiting out no-change reporting. Now, assuming that they are not going to be doing that, then no, everyone is going to be slightly different and may very well be operating on a new baseline because they'll have had seven years of new design and new ways of thinking, possibly.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Next set of questions is I heard a few things in there which I want to clarify in my mind as I try and write this for you guys, right? How do we see the structure of that? We haven't really spoken about that. Do we see this ... Because let's remember a lot of our comments and the survey really said that ... I think we're okay with the regular three to five-day, every three years. We can get away with that even versus the comments. But the big overarching review should be done by professionals, right?

Now, are we talking about doing a similar thing to what we were talking about for SSR in that we have a community oversight group which will manage professionals which will undertake this, or is there ...? It's not clear in my mind. I just want to understand what we're thinking. If we're not thinking the same thing, let's get to thinking the same thing and then I can write it for you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Bernie. We have Jacques on the line.

JACQUES BLANC: Indeed. Thank you, Bernie, because that was why I was raising my hand. “Professional” has got no meaning. I mean it's quickly done. “Professional” has got no meaning. What do we mean? Professionals inside of ICANN, qualified professionals outside of ICANN, [audit] professionals? I think we could take a bit more time to express better what we mean here and most of all what we think we would achieve by saying who is going to go on this overarching review.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, let's now go to Sébastien, and if anyone else would like to get in the queue, please?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I can repeat again and again, I don't feel comfortable with whatever “professional” we want to put. It's a holistic review ... [audio cuts out].

JACQUES BLANC: Go ahead. We've got auditors, we've got all sorts of professionals inside of the community. Could we define that it would be not undertaken by professionals but supported by professionals? And that is another direction, meaning we've got all the professional tools at the disposal of the team so things move quickly, faster, and produce the right results. So I think maybe, you know, it's a couple of directions that we might envision there. And it's a question, I agree with you there Sébastien; do we want external professionals, external to ICANN, to undertake the review or do we want them to support the review? And that would be different.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: An important differentiation. Thank you, Jacques. Let's go to Vanda next.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I do believe our experience with some undertaken-by-professional reviews is not the best one. And if we're trying to change that, I do agree with you, Jacques, that we could use facilities that can be provided externally, and this means that we do not expand [for earn our] money, and in training people from the staff with some specific tools that will be used and less of a review, and so on. I do agree that we need to use all the groups that we have. Members of the board, members of the .org.

I believe that that's the best way to conduct anything inside the ICANN to follow the multi-stakeholder model. So I do agree, but to have some support from professionals that bring specific tools for one or two different kinds of approach. Because the review GNSO, for example, is something different from a review of ALAC or something like that. So the kind of professional and the kinds of tools needed, it's a little different because they need to reach this kind of different language, different person, et cetera. So it's something that I do believe that we work but we need to take care to pay attention of, as Sébastien said, that we need to be under multi-stakeholder model and do this in that way. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. We have León. And Bernie, I'm going to put you to the end if you don't mind. I'm going to have León, Wolfgang, and then Demi, going back then to Bernie.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you very much. So, I guess what I'm hearing from Sébastien, and my line of thinking is pretty much similar to Jacques' line of thought, maybe we can find some wording to say, "Okay, well this is an overarching review of ICANN as a whole that will be performed by both qualified professionals from within the community and contracted external professionals." That could create, I guess, the right mix of people and skills. Because my fear is that we just say "from within the community," Jacques. I don't doubt that we have very capable people, but ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Big but.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: We saw that with the ccTLDs, right? We wanted to have someone that was not from the ccTLD community that participates within ICANN brought into the review team, and we couldn't find one. So what happened? We had to change the bylaws. So that is the [lock] that I am afraid of actually putting upon us. And of course, not having this flexibility to say, "Okay, it is a mix from both outside contractors and well-recognized and accredited members of our community," those who will be in charge of this holistic overall overarching review. Does that make sense?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, León. Vanda, I'm assuming your hand is down. That's an old hand. Remind León to take his down as well. Wolfgang, then ... All right, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just to be very clear in my mind—and sorry, I stepped out for a sec—who would be in charge of the review?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Review would be performed by this mixed team of people, both outside contractors and professional –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Not “perform.” Who's responsible for it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we come back to that when we've heard everyone else's hands, please? Thank you. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: León has used the right word, “mix.” So, if the professionals or outsiders, an external consultancy firm, I would say no, because we have enough experience, you know? A waste of money for people who have no knowledge and produced a report one hundred and plus pages, totally useless. And so far, the mix is important, but just to trust the insiders is also risky.

Take the discussion on the multi-stakeholder model. I think [inaudible] was an external person, an expert, and he has produced really useful stuff. Brian Cute is an insider, but I don't see any real outcome so far after he has worked on this issue for nearly two years now. So that means it depends, you know? You have to be very careful and probably within the nomination team for putting the right body together here. But “mix” is the keyword in my eyes. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Wolfgang. We're going to go to Demi now.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you. Just trying to find a kind of wording for this. Maybe we can say "undertaking in a professional way." Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Demi, thank you. That's short and sweet. Thank you very much. Wolfgang, you're putting your hand down, I assume. Okay. I wasn't prepared for that to be so fast, Demi. Sébastien, back to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I understand the discussion here, but I just want to raise a few points. The first one, it's that "As end user, [did I am a] professional?" Why the inside professional will be worked for free and outside professional will be paid? All that, for me, raises a question. Therefore, I would like much more that we go to what León said this morning, that we come back to a possibility to have not just "selected or supported by a SO and AC," but also experts who are willing to serve as the other but not just supported by one SO/AC but could be in the group. He didn't want to give a name, but there were people like that who could have been there with the SSR2, for example.

And my last point is that, for me, whatever the limits of the current group who select the member of a review team, we can't change everything, but I suggest that we leave the SO and AC. We could be composed like the ATRT to do this holistic systemic overarching review. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Demi, I'm assuming your hand is down. We're going back to León.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. Just to follow up on Sébastien's remarks. I can see and I am sympathetic to the sensitivity of saying outsiders will be paid while our volunteer base will not be paid. From my point of view, this is not about discriminating insiders versus outsiders and providing better conditions, so to speak, to outsiders, but rather, I see this as a matter of responsibility and accountability towards our community and towards the organization.

If we pay someone to do something, we can, you know, enforce and say, "You need to do this." If we don't, regardless of the commitment that our volunteers show, I don't feel we have a mechanism to put a finger there and say, "You need to deliver, you need to perform, you need to accomplish this." And I see that is causing some conflict to you, but please don't see this as something that diminishes our community or our community members at all. It's just an operational point of view, not a quality or a qualification on our members of the community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I see your hand's up, Sébastien. Do you want to respond?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We as, member of the community, are pushed to work by our people who support us to be here and accept [if our capital is small], I don't think it's a good idea to try to tell us that the only things to have

somebody doing the work, it's because we put them money. That's a wrong way of thinking in this organization.

If not since, 20 years, I am participating to ICANN, I must have done that from outside and be a consultant. There are people who are doing that very well. That's okay. But I don't want to push that to be the nature of the things especially, and sorry once again to say that, but especially when it's people who came from the community who stopped to be volunteers and now they are paid. That's good. But why we are not paid also, there is no reason at all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rabbit hole warning now. Yes. Thank you. And I couldn't agree with you more, Wolfgang. Yes, León, I'm coming back to you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. That is why I was careful of using the word "contracted" as opposed to "paid," because I see the contract as a means to execute an obligation, and that is why I was so careful on framing this as "contracted external persons" rather than "paid." You can agree to have a contract without payment, unlikely of course, but it is possible.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, León. We have a contract, ATRT3. We need to deliver a report and we are not paid. We have a contract here but then why we need to contract people –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Time out. Time out. Time out. And I do mean time out on that topic. Back to the point of how we construct an entity which is going to be doing the overarching and holistic review that we all agree is an important and vital part of what we are going to be proposing. And we're trying to look at the present absence or how we define any and all professional or independent services to facilitate aid or otherwise act in this capacity. So, what we have are several different views.

We need to hone down onto what we can agree with or what we can live with, but whilst I've got the microphone, I wanted to remind you that we're talking about organizational reviews in the component parts currently that do utilize, and it works to a better or not so good degree depending on the quality of the independent examiner contracted—note my careful use of the terms as well—but it is that independence at the moment that we may or may not be looking at continuing and in what capacity these professional services do or do not continue.

We need to note the important role that in a normal accountability system, external evaluation, occasional external evaluation, preferably independent external evaluation, plays in many, if not all, industry-standard systems. All right? You don't get to stay an accredited laboratory unless you also pass the occasional external review. And so, there is something there that we might need to consider holding onto.

But how it's held onto, how it's described, whether the priority of working with, working for, working under, working over, you know, tossing a report over the fence and then having the community deal with it, bunch of ways, we now need to try and drill down on those things. So hopefully, I've also allowed during that little intervention to time out to have finished, and we can go back to collegiate, collaborative, and constructive consensus-building. I couldn't get

another C in if I was trying to. I think I've now got Wolfgang, then Vanda.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I would avoid the language “contracted entity.” I would say “contracted professional,” because “entity” is really ... You know what I mean. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. So schooled. So learned. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I'm in favor in either way. I am in favor to have the community to decide that to be foremost as a natural representation, the most enlarged representation that we can have inside the ICANN and get to the experts to help in some way. Can be many ways. Can be writing, can be helping to organize the work. I have good experiences and bad experiences inside ICANN. The good one, we redefine LACRALO, for instance, with the help of one person. The external experience guy does allow the group to find a very three days consensus part and et cetera. So, for me, it's up to the community, once defined, and completely representative of all groups, even .org, yeah, the ICANN Org. So they can define the kind of expert they needed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Sébastien has put into the chat that in his opinion it should be the same way as to create an ATRT for the holistic review, with some specific requirements for the members from the SO/AC. I will remind you all before I go to Bernie, and Vanda you're putting your hand down I assume, that under the guidelines—you know, those new guidelines

we're working under—the guidelines actually have written into it the ability for such review teams specific, and this would be, I guess, a variation on a specific, a holistic, to call on subject matter experts.

And what we can do, perhaps, is suggest in this case may also have the capacity to call on particular professional services. And that may allow for those of us who believe an outside industry, best practice, finger-on-the-pulse point of view, that as well-meaning as many of our altruistic volunteers are, me included – I used to come from this industry, but I'm not up to date with the most amazing thing that happened yesterday in Singapore, and maybe having someone who is could be useful. So let's look at that sort of language and hopefully, Bernie, you've got something to contribute on how we can get there.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That's not all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pick one. Simple ask.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Simple ask.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're contracted, you know?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think of myself as support services to you. But seriously.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [In fact, you are an intern].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I don't know about that. Not according to ICANN. So I'm in the middle, right? You guys think I'm inside and they think I'm outside. Sometimes it's good to be in the middle. Sometimes it hurts.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He's a doorway. He's a portal.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I'm a portal. Oh, God. Yeah, right. No, but seriously. First thing, I'm in agreement with Sébastien. That was my thinking, that we use the ground rules for the specific reviews to create this team. When I was talking about managing the review, I wanted us to be clear that that would be it, but also if one of the objectives of that first one is to provide a common best practice for community continuous improvement, I think we're going to need that subject matter expert to help that group. That's just the reality. I think in my mind, we're really close here. I think we're getting there. Yes, we can start with a holistic review of all of ICANN and Sébastien has explained well what that would use as input and the ...

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We need to set up the process.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We need to set up the process for the continuous improvement and the SOs and ACs to kickstart that. And that would be done with this group.

That would get nominated and we have a framework for managing that. I think the tweak we need, to a certain extent, is in the specific reviews guidelines we detailed sort of the reference of what we're going to do with each review and we would have to create some expectations to sort of box that in as to what are the results we would expect of that if we're in agreement that, okay, we understand the process, we understand how this team is going to get created.

All right, what are we asking this team to look at? We need to write it down. We've got one thing, which is to create that standard framework for the SOs and ACs to have common ground on a continuous improvement, with as much flexibility as we can, on the "holistic" review or "systemic." Let's agree on a word, I'm tired of changing words and I don't care what it is. I would just like to define what are the expectations so we can write that in, because otherwise we'll get whapped on the head on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

All right. I need to step out for just a moment, so you're going to have to manage your own queue. I hope you don't mind that, Bernie. Do you think we can manage some of that definition on what we mean by our "holistic," what the structure and function, the scope, et cetera, guidelines will be in the next ten minutes? Shall we have a go?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

If we agree on this, I think we can give it a shot.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Well, that's your marching orders until I return back into the room and I'm looking forward to see the success on the table and on the screen when I return.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you very much. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Before we go there, I just wanted to put one question and I am mixed with which could be my answer. We have some requests in the comments that [we are there] because their organizational review will start soon. Here, either we say we postpone any SO/AC reviews until the end of this holistic review, or we ask this holistic review team to do first a definition of how it could be done by SO and ACs the first six months. And without waiting for the end of the 18 months, they can start. There's a positive thing in each side of my question. It's why I am mixed on that if we need to postpone everything and if we need to say it, and if we want to have something different, we need also to say somewhere in these papers. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I understand exactly and this is where I was going to go next with this, so I agree with you, that's the question. My thinking—sorry, binary mathematician kind of thinking, here—is if we think through what we're asking this review to do, which is why I was also going there, is as you said, there may be recommendations as to the structure of ICANN, right? I mean, that's why we're doing this. We want to make sure our structure is good. If there are recommendations to change the structure, we're reviewing a structure that may change. To me, that doesn't make sense. So yes, exactly, I think we need to say, "We're

going to postpone any planned reviews right now and we're going to do this to set up a basis of a good way forward." To me, it would make more sense.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Much more.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I see a lot of agreement around the table. Okay. So that's fine for everyone? Yeah. Okay. But I did have exactly the same question and that's the conclusion I came to. Yeah.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I totally agree with you. We are changed, completely, the system, so we need to stop everything and not to start something without the framework clear.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. All right. Excellent. So let's get back on track then, as to our expectations of what a ... I'm going to call it "systemic" because to my mind ...

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Systemic is better.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: To my mind, this is what we're talking about. I mean, we're talking about looking at the system from the 30,000-foot view. I'm more than willing to take any name you're going to come up with. I'm not tied to it,

but I'm suggesting that a “systemic review” sounds to meet the requirement more of what we're talking about here. Yeah. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have no problem using “systemic” or “holistic,” but I think we need to avoid “overarching” not because of the meaning but because it's used already within ICANN and we don't want to compare that with when it's an overarching topic, an overarching ... But therefore, is it “systemic” or “holistic?” I don't care.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I agree with you, which is why I suggested systemic. Holistic sometimes can ...

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Can have a meaning of more spiritual.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, exactly. León.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thanks, Bernie. This might be my non-nativeness in English, but systemic, at least in Spanish, could be confused with, you know, something that happens in a cycle, right? Exactly, systematic. So, maybe the word we would like to use could be “integral”? I don't know if that's the right word. But at least in Spanish, that would translate into ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Because when you look at “systemic” in English and you look at systemic issues within an organization, they are issues that are pervasive throughout the organization.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: They are not issues that reoccur. Systematic is something else.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Ok, good.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Systemic is very clearly defined.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. It's something that runs across everything, which is why I'm suggesting it.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Perfect. Thanks.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I do believe that we don't have that. I believe I'm thinking in Spanish and in Portuguese, and I believe that we don't have a good translation

for systemic and this could generate, you know, can be used “systematic” as a translation of that. That is the main problem. That sometimes we need to think about the language ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We'll have to advise the translators to be very careful, but I think we're going to work our way through it. Okay. Now, getting back to our systemic reviews, the major goals. Okay. So, the first one, from what I understand, is to analyze the results of all the reviews, the latest results of all the reviews, organizational and specific. Right?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm looking at Sébastien. That is one of the things you said, right? I'm trying to just make sure we're on the same language here.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. The question of ... I guess it's good to have the inputs of the specific review, but I think we would have push back on that. It's why I am a little bit ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well the ATRT is going to be the only useful one, right?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, if it's ATRT, of course, but it's why I am not sure about ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: ATRT and organizational reviews

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess. [Audio cuts out]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Not saying it's the only thing, I'm saying one of the things is A, yes. So, we're going to look at if it's fit for purpose. We're also going to look at the interrelationship, those areas where the elements of the community touch and interact, or the gaps there are for them to touch and interact. Right? I believe that's the way Pat put it, which is why I'm coming up with this gap thing. He was very strong in saying, "Well, we've got all these silos, we've got these few mechanisms for how we work together. Are they enough, are they effective, and is this what we want to do?" So, we've got two major objectives in this systemic review right now. Sébastien, and then Vanda.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. I would like to suggest that we reverse the order because if I take your first point, the answer will be, "But we've already done that in our organizational review." We assessed that it's still useful. Therefore, I suggest that first of all we look at the interaction and we see if each of them, taking into account this interaction, are still relevant as they are. Because if we start to say, "We will do what you have done in each of and every ..." it will be complicated, from my point of view.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So, I'm aligned with that because what I see is we're going to affect what the groups have done, that they're going to do, is assessing and check if the interrelation is okay. And the other issue I believe will be important to reach is the attractiveness that we have for maintaining a constant evolution into the community. You know, new people come,

some ways to keep interest on those groups that is ... In some time, we need to reach that. And like Paula said, that's not our business, but it must be the business of someone. It's not ICANN Org business because it's community business to think about how they can continue to stay working and attracted in this multi-stakeholder model. That's something that they need to reach.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. As our technician Sébastien works the microphones, I will go to Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you, Bernie, but you raised already the two points I wanted to mention. I think we should really open a channel to rethink about this structure. So we live with this structure which came out from a certain reform process 10 years ago. The landscape is changing, and already four or five years ago in Buenos Aires, I called it at this time, Work Stream 3, so we have to rethink it and probably that's the best way to do it. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. I don't see any other hands. Vanda, on your comment, I agree with you. But where I see this is in the continuous improvement of the SOs and the ACs because the requirements are specific by SOs and ACs. And as an example, I'll just bring up the ccTLDs, which is my former home. You can't bring in more people. I mean by definition of that SO, the members are those ccTLDs, which has clearly defined what it is, that want to be members. That's it. There are 242 and we've got over 200 that are members, and that's it. That's all, and there's nothing the ccNSO can do about diversity.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Anything.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. Well, the thing that is built in, in several areas, is the geographic representation. That's automatic. And in the council positions, that has been hard-coded into a representation. So, that's why I'm saying this thing is an SO/AC thing for the new members. While you were gone, Cheryl ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm back.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You are indeed, and I'm going to be handing the chair back to you. I'll just summarize. Okay. So, we have three things for this initial or this new group based on the ATRT3 selection process. It's first mission is to come up with a common framework for continuous improvement. The second thing is to review, if you will, all the SO and ACs' interrelationship and identify any gaps, and see how well that works or doesn't work, and then assess if the SOs and ACs are optimal structures as they are now, versus the mission of the organization.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This means assess the reviews of each one of those that we have.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just to make sure I understand, there is in this first ... Are we using the term “holistic”?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No. I'm sorry. No, we've decided that we will not use “holistic,” we will not use “overarching.” We will use “systemic.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: “Systemic” works for me. Happy with “systemic.” All right. I just needed a term to use. In this initial systemic review, there is going to be the principles/practices guideline for the framework for continuous improvement. And that's not limited to the ACs or the SOs, that's continuous improvement and could include the entity, the whole shebang, I assume. Perfect timing.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm going to leave a pin on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think we're overreaching with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That's what I was wondering because you know ICANN Org may indeed wish to look into continuous improvement.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And I think that will be at their option.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, all right. No, I just want to know where we were headed for that. So, there's that aspect. The other aspect is—if I think about it as structure and function for the other two—there is a structure review to see whether there are any gaps and whether it is a design that is fit for purpose. Have I got that correct? But that might be unique to this first one. It might continue on, we don't know, but it's part of this first one. And then there is the function review, which is how well the existing component parts of ICANN are functioning within their specified purposes, which is kind of what the current bylaws say an organizational review has to be. Is that correct?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Please help me understand.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So, what we're trying to do is go ... My understanding, okay, is the organization reviews have been done and so ... Daniel has gone flat, after putting something in Cheryl's face.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For the record, ladies and gentlemen, something that annoys the living daylights out of me, and I see it constantly with these mics, is this business of putting them up in the air when one finishes with them. You cannot look down a table and not see this forest of things to focus on. Put it down flat, not up in the air. Thank you very much Sébastien, and I appreciate your attention to that, too. Thank you, Osvaldo. Right, back to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: In all seriousness, the objective is to make sure—in my mind at least, and please correct me—there is consistency in understanding and evaluating the results of the organizational reviews that have been done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And—I am channeling Pat here. If he listens to the recording, Pat I hope I'm doing you justice—there is looking specifically at the area of how the SOs and ACs can interact and any gaps in this area. And while you were gone, what Sébastien was saying is that the order is important. We need to do that before we look at the structural review.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Okay. My reason for wanting to be very clear on that to my understanding is a personal bugbear in what is currently one of the missions of the component part approach to organizational reviews, and that is this continuing purpose question that is hard-coded into what one has to look at.

And if we're going to conduct a systemic review, that should not be necessary because by definition the systemic review will affirm, modify, or otherwise the continuing purpose. But the amount of time spent now, if we go into the third cycle of, "Does the GNSO have a continuing purpose? Will duh, kind of!" You know what I mean? So I'd love to get rid of that. And this seems to be a way forward of that. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's exactly why in our discussion we put that in this order. It's exactly for this. It's already done. We don't want to reassess. We need to reassess the globality and if, in the globality, we need to change something, it's not because one part is not having any more purpose. We want to reorganize it [or suggest to].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is a great strengthener, as far as I'm concerned. Fantastic. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think we have violent agreement. I have what I need to draft something for you guys. I mean, we've answered all the questions. I think we have. We're clear on where and how we want to go and I can write this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good. Excellent.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Or a first draft of it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, right. Now, back to our previously advertised agenda. Everything goes back to our previously advertised agenda. If memory serves, from the 13:00 block on, what we were going to be looking at is determining the structure of the final report and our work approach. Everything we've done up until 14:10 CET time is valuable and, I think, fantastic. Well done, team, to get this far. But we do still now need to look at how we're going to get the work plan done between now and then. Bernie, you're giving me a T signal, which means I've actually over-spoken my time.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, it means time out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Time out.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go on. Didn't realize I was offending you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You were not. What's our time? I don't know. What time are we at?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ten past two in the afternoon.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. As we talked about the first day, I think one of the things that's important to do when we're in a face-to-face, I'm hoping it won't take that much time, but really think we need to run through all our recommendations and prioritize. We said we would do that. I think that's an exercise we need to do in face-to-face and it'll help make a big difference. And if we allocate ourselves an hour, I think we can get through the rest of the agenda in the remaining time. That's what I'm proposing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. We'll just make that as a modification on the record of the agenda. Does anyone have an objection to that? Nope. Let's go for it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. I am, however, going to have to take a body break for about two minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We're going to have that pre-mid-afternoon five-minute break, ladies and gentlemen. The caffeinated beverages have kicked in after lunch and we're all going to take a little five-minute break. We can stop the recording, but we will be starting again at ... In fact, we're going to make it a three-minute break at quarter past the hour.

Thank you, ladies and gentleman and I hope you all appreciated the small break we've taken mid-afternoon, mid-mid-afternoon. We're all

back, bright-eyed, bushy-tailed and much relieved to get onto the next part of our work. So, Bernie over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, ma'am. All right. Let's go to the analysis spreadsheet, third tab, report sections, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What are we looking at now?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's to define specifically who's going to ... Which one we're going to be recommendations or to make sure ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, prioritization. One, two, three. Okay. Sébastien, it's three buckets. Yeah, that's good, bowls. In English, it's common to use buckets. Let's be clear on what buckets we want. I would propose just one, two, three. Bucket one has to get done, is a priority, is a recommendation, is fully fleshed out according to the requirements. Bucket two: important, should meet most of the requirements of our recommendation, maybe there will be a few gaps. Bucket three are comments; observations and comments. Are we okay with that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, totally okay. My question is that you remember the first day you told us that maybe putting together some of the elements will be a way to have them put finally in the bucket two or maybe bucket one because of this. And if we've got two hours there, I don't know if we will be able to do that, but it's up to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, that's a very good point and something I was going to bring up, which is an overarching question as opposed to a systemic question. We've got ... That was for you, Sébastien, you know that, right? You know that, right? Okay.

The overarching question for me is around incomplete ATRT2 recommendations, all right? We've come up with suggestions, we've been critiqued in our public comment on some of those, whether they fit, whether they don't fit, blah, blah, blah. There is concern. I will say there is general concern that we and other specific reviews have concluded the same thing, that the implementation reporting is inadequate and that they have not been completed.

Now, if we look at it, about half our recommendations are fixing ATRT2 recommendations, which have not, according to us, either been completely implemented or implemented at all. Now, given time is short we can go two ways. I mean, I think we can stick to our guns the way we have laid it out in this report or we can have one recommendation for all of those and say ... And I think that's fair because ICANN was supposed to implement those and the communities should have agreed that they were implemented properly. Maybe we can just say there is a full-fledged recommendation, level one, saying, "A number of recommendations as detailed in the report of our analysis

of ATRT2 were not properly implemented and ICANN should work on implementing those per some of our comments.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just remember that in some cases, GAC for instance, we have some of those recommendations that we believe is not to be done, that, in our words here, should be retired. So It's not all. We need to at least put some observations in that basket, specific ones, that this recommendation, we are suggesting to retire or something like that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: As I said, “should be completed as per our analysis,” and our analysis for the GAC one says "don't do anything more" so I think we're covered there. So that's the suggestion on the table that will actually cut our work in half here. So are we in favor of this or not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, does that make clear what the opportunity is for bundling? Over to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I agree. I just want to be sure that in doing that we take out the one who are linked with prioritization and reviews because we don't want to talk about the subject. If they are something from ATRT2 on that subject, we need to bring that to our holistic discussion on the review.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, I think we're good because we have—let's be clear—from my understanding agreed that there will be separate recommendations on reviews, prioritization, accountability indicators, and if we agree here, ATRT2. So, those are four first-level recommendations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Looking around.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My question was—and I don't remember if we have—but I guess we have some recommendations who are linked with one of those three subjects. They will be from ATRT2. They will be taken out of ATRT2 because we will take them in the other buckets, in the other three topics. Yeah, because we have something about ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I have to say I'm a little lost. I'm not remembering that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which one Sébastien? Because I'm drawing a blank.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I don't remember that [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am red, not blonde, but I will check.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Pending that. Okay. Let me say this. If that is the case then yes, I agree with you, but I at this point cannot come up with a ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If there's going to be an issue of that. But yes, if it is an issue, obviously that would be the case.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, good. So is there a general agreement that we should bundle ATRT2 with that caveat?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is calling for a consensus. Rough consensus on this.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, no. ATRT2 incomplete recommendations. There will be one recommendation for ATRT2 from us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, I need you to articulate in a single sentence, it can be as long as you like, but just a single sentence, what it is I'm about to call for a consensus, rough or otherwise, on regarding how we make a

recommendation as in bucket one out of ATRT2 aspects of our existing work. Over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: ATRT3 recommends that ICANN complete the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations which were noted as only partially complete or incomplete in ATRT3's analysis of ATRT2 implementation of recommendations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Subject to ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Subject to the caveat, which is if some of these link to either prioritization or reviews that will ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Subject to our analysis because there are some that we decided to do nothing about.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. It was a subject to the analysis.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Subject to our analysis.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Okay. Daniel.

DANIEL KHAUKA NANGHAKA: I agree with that statement. Super cool. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. I wasn't going to do a rollcall consensus but thank you for getting on that. Is the level of comfort around the table, and remotely from the review team members, one that you can live with this and/or support this? Does anyone wish to object to us putting that out as a bucket one recommendation? Okay. Excellent. Yay us. Where to next, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yay us. And you will appreciate that, and I'm talking to everyone here ... Why did I lose all the numbers of the recommendations in the reference? Okay. Sorry. Mismanagement of the spreadsheet on my part. Okay. Three, four, one. So our objective now is for those that are not ATRT2 related to decide if they're bucket one, bucket two, or bucket three, which is very important/critical, nice to have, and observations. All right.

Given the results of the ATRT3 survey showed limited satisfaction on board performance, transparency and decision-taking, the ATRT suggests the board should establish the same targets that uses for publishing agendas. The board should show the date of publication of materials. All of these relevant indicators of board performance should be grouped in a single area. Board minutes should indicate how members voted, including executive sessions. Board minutes should

include, in addition to the rationale, summaries of the main discussion points covered prior to taking notes. Now, I will suggest that our discussion should be on whether it's bucket two or bucket three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Before we do that Bernie, is not the link with the ATRT2 here?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: This was from the results of the survey.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: By the survey.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Then what we are doing, it's in fact checking all of the results of the survey when we say something if they need to be taking care somewhere, which ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sometimes they overlap, I agree with you. In this case they overlap. But you know, we can have belts and suspenders.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but here my feeling is that it's overlapped with something that was on the ATRT2.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. It overlaps with the ATRT2. Actually, my memory is coming back and yes, you're quite right, it overlaps with recommendation one so it would be covered by our ATRT2 recommendation. You're correct. There are a few where they overlap. I apologize. Okay, so that one's covered. ATRT3 suggests similarly to reviews and implementation of review recommendations, ICANN should provide ... Actually, you know what, I'm going to change documents, which is going to make this a lot simpler.

If we go to our report, okay, it's going to be a lot simpler because there, we understand. Yeah. Okay. Three, three, three, four. Okay. So on our report I'm in section 3.4 and there we're ... Yeah, if you can bring that up, I think we'll all get a really good understanding. So 3.4.1 is ATRT2, so that's covered. 3.4.2 is ATRT2 recommendation four, covered. 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, and then we get to 3.4.6, okay? So up to 3.4.5, we're covered. Okay. As I said, great. It makes our job easier, right? ATRT3 suggests that the board should take concrete steps to ensure that board members continue to regularly meet with the community at ICANN meetings, including the subcomponents of the GNSO and at-large. Again, I think that's a bucket two or a bucket three. I'll leave it up to you to decide how you want to go with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Open a queue.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: For me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Osvaldo? Mike?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I vote three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You vote three. León?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: I don't think it is appropriate for me to vote on this, but I'm going throw my opinion. No, I would make it bucket one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: How is it going to meet the requirements?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Well, yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Under the guidelines to be ...

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Sorry, I didn't say anything.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's going to be hard to meet the requirements for two.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Scratch that from the record.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: The respectable board member from Mexico has corrected his position very gallantly.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [This is why we are talking about others].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So, we have one vote for three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: These requests for informal discussion have been a strong point for registrar stakeholder group. Really looking for efficiency here, so I would go for two.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: One two. Anybody else?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, I'm more for three. I'm going for three because it's important, but it's not exactly ... It's aggressive specifically for one group that is so rare that they can care of that. So I do believe that's a suggestion. So I believe, in my opinion, these suggestions, I will put on three. The strong suggestion, I would put on two. That's my mind. So that's why it is ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You two stop playing handsy the over the microphone. Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Just to clarify, I think it's three because it's an improvement on something that is going on. You know, it's something new, just to improve something, so I would say three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: In addition to this, and I'll point to León here, if we put this as commentary I believe the board will take note of it anyways.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Yeah, I mean that is why I was suggesting to give it a higher priority because I think that we are really committed to make it happen.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So, even if we don't make it as a recommendation, the board will understand this?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Yes.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Okay. I think that solves it for three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

So, let's make sure we're clear because we are well aware, we know it's important as Jacques has pointed out, but the board is also well aware and is currently making headway and taking steps to already meet this. We can make it a three, which means it's reinforced, but as an observation, not something that is elevated to an emergent issue that needs particularly addressing. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

It makes sense, but my impression is that, León, you were thinking that it's a low hanging fruit, as you say in English, and it will be good if it's in two because we will show that they are taking care of something who is important for some part of the community. It's just a diplomatic issue, where to put it, at the end three or two, but if the board can show that is taking care of something, too, quickly, it's a good way of thinking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Understanding that our role is not here to make the board look good but it is an important tool that could benefit if we put it in a two rather than a three.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I will note to this that it's going to be a pain writing all the justifications to actually justify putting it in a two.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I have another ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wait, Vanda. Demi first.

DEMI GETSCHKO: This is Demi. I am also going for three because you see that the recommendations takes a less formal meeting. Less formal meetings is something, of course, bucket three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Is there anybody, Vanda you included, who [inaudible]?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I have tried to help those choosing two.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, no, no.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. It's getting to silly time here at the Brussels office at ICANN. Let me ask the following questions. I know that there are some of you who would like it to be a two, but you've heard, hopefully, that to bludgeon it into a two is not actually going to be an easy task. Any of you who are hoping for a two on this unable to live with it being a three? Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am totally able to live with three. I just want to put this following caveat. In the next part of the discussion, if we have other questions who could be linked with that to help us to have something more broader to put it into, just don't because we have said three now that we can't move [if not interested]. But if not, I agree I can live with three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is an iterative process so yes, we would be able to modify and go back, of course. Bernie. Clear enough.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. I agree with Sébastien and that we will do an overarching review of all our answers after and see if there is a possibility for combinations into a holistic fashion.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We'll make a systemic comment.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Yes. Good point. No, a systemic recommendation. All right, 3.4.7. Seriously, folks, I think you're understanding why we have to do this face-to-face cause I think it'll make a difference. Let's move on quickly. Do you consider diversity amongst board members? We cannot enforce this, okay? There is no way. It's a suggestion and as Vanda has said, in my mind, writing the justification for trying to fit this in two, again, would be impossible. I'm suggesting it's a three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: So Bernie, I did agree and I did agree with your statement, but I have no problem to leave it in this three for the moment. But really, we can do it and we can explain why but we don't have time to do that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Thank you, Sébastien. 3.4.8.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Anyone else on 3.4.7? Let's not over rush here. Let's get a little bit of time and just to make sure everyone is comfortable. So 3.4.7 is a three. Okay. Moving on.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 3.4.8, “are you aware of training programs for the board members” strongly suggests ATRT3 suggestion related to ATRT2 recommendation two. It's done. There's a link. 3.4.9, survey question: “are you satisfied with the financial information regarding communication, budget, information, community, especially to public comment proceedings?” ATRT3 suggests that the board and ICANN Org adhere to the successions regarding public comments. Those are covered elsewhere, and they may actually be in others. One recommendation, tailored budget information so SOs an ACs can easily understand budgeting relative to them and a clear rationale for a simple language. This was very popular with some of the commenters. I would go with a two on this one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Bernie. And just to draw your attention, if you haven't been watching your email, the note from Jennifer this morning, I think we should also recognize that she's passed onto us about the changes to the public comment pages and that these changes are proposed as part of the information transparency initiative. This was not material that we had access to at the time of writing this, but it is material I think we need to be reading into this now. I'm not sure it's changing its ranking, but I just want to make sure that we capture and include it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I've gone through it doesn't change any of our stuff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Fine.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So two on 3.4.9. Okay. And 3.4.10, "Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the ICANN Org, blah, blah, blah." Comment. That's a three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nobody's [joking]? Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Hey, we finished section three. All right. Two points. Thank you, Demi. All right. 4.3, 4.4 coming up. Okay. 4.4.1, ATRT2, that's done. 4.4.2, ATRT2 recommendation done. 4.4.3, ATRT2 recommendation 6.6. 4.4.4, survey question: "Should the GAC accountability be improved?" ATRT3 suggests that the GAC, in addition to suggestions 4.4.1 and 4.4.3, pursue its continuous improvement efforts and focus on making the GAC communicate clearer. This would facilitate the community's ability to

take in GAC advice and properly consider it. "A" is going to be hard to put into a solid recommendation format.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I'm at 4.3 on that because remember the answers of GAC, what they have done, they open, they communicate writing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: And they have a lot of constraints to use words and then it's almost impossible. This is something that we can ... Just to attend this survey or something like that. But it's nothing that will really happen so we cannot put them two.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Three. I support it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Three? No objections to three? Great. Moving on. I'm sorry, Demi's hand is up, my apologies.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just a quick clarification. Why is this phrase of accountability, because we are talking about the working of the [community]? It's maybe transparency but not the accountability.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I see that point, actually, Demi. That that is a useful one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, we're not going to relitigate all of that. It's a comment now. It's a note, so let's not do that. 4.4.5 survey question: "In your view, are you satisfied with the interactions the GAC has with the board?" ATRT3 suggests the GAC and the board develop joint messaging. Three.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: They have done. They are in the process and we talk with them now and they are interacting and continue to do that and the answer was they appreciate our suggestion and they are done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But it's a three. It's just an observation. Yep. Yep. Good.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: She keeps turning it off. It's not my fault, mom. Mom, mom, she turned off my mic.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: You don't put the hand down.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sorry. I'm going to need a second here. "In your view, are you satisfied with the interaction the GAC has with your SO and AC?" Daniel, don't lose it or we're all going to lose it. ATRT3 suggests that the GAC, considering the success of the current mechanisms that are in place for interacting with the board, work with the GNSO to implement similar

mechanisms to facilitate interactions between the GAC and the GNSO. If we remember the comments from the GNSO, they were mixed on this. There were some good parts, there were some bad parts. I would toss it in as a three, personally.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anybody have issues with it as a three? Nope. Even the people from the GNSO were saying yes. Vanda, you're going to argue the other ...

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, yeah. Because this was specific ... [Audio cuts out] And they agreed that the board system that they make allowed that interchange of opinion and the timely response to each part. So the suggestion was, from the GAC, maybe we can repeat the same process that GAC and the board have to have timely, organized things and to answer that. So that is the point that I believe is important because ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is it a three or is it a two, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, it's a [crosstalk] We need to listen to GNSO. Yeah, but in my point could be two just to allow the two to enforce in some way ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right. We're going to go to Demi, then Osvaldo.

DEMI GETSCHKO: I propose that we change the wording here, not to mention directly GNSO, but SO and ACs, as in the survey question, because the question is the relation between GAC and SO and ACs. Maybe not to be very specific in GNSO, let's open generally. I vote for three also.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. The GNSO and the GAC have been working on this. We have the GNSO liaison to the GAC and we have a semi-periodic meeting between the leader of the GNSO and the GAC leaders. They are working on ... Both the GNSO and the GAC are aware of this requirement and they are intending to continue improvement, so I would vote three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible] Back to you Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And the response to our document and public comments said exactly what Osvaldo was saying, so that's why I would vote for three.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I can survive with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, excellent. Moving on then.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Gloria Gaynor. I love it. We're done with section four. We are cruising along. Public input, there we're going to have a bit more fun going to section ... Of course.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm checking to [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: 5.4, ATRT2 recommendation eight, so that's done. Where's my 4.2? Survey question: "How effective is the current system public comment and would your structure respond more often to both?" That's being said, recognizes in general. Oh, these are our recommendations on how to improve the public comment process. Got a lot of good traction. I think it's a two or maybe a one.

s

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bernie, if I may, can you go to the next one and put them together? We could make one. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, this is a bundling opportunity, I think, at this point.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I agree with that. That's fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So we're bundling, we can move it to a one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bundled and move it to a one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. No objections? Excellent. Continue on, then.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We are done with five. Warp speed, Mr. Sulu. Yeah, 6.4, nothing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are done!

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We are done, 6.4. Seven.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We want to celebrate every little moment, here. Okay, people.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Seven. All right, this one we're probably going to have a little bit of a debate on it, or I estimate we could. 7.4, ATRT2. So that's done. We're done, okay. Eight, independent review process. We're done. There are no recommendations or suggestions. Nine, ATRT2 recommendations. I would suggest they're covered by ATRT2 recommendations, so we're done with that. Ten is reviews. We finished that. We're writing as a one, right?

Okay. 11 is accountability indicators. We're writing it as a one. 12 is prioritization and we're writing it as a one. There are a few ATRT ... No. Ten, we should take the time to look. There are probably some ATRT2's in there, just to make sure. We're going a little too quick, here. 10.4, ATRT2, ATRT2, ATRT2, and we have our recommendations, so we're good on ten. 11 is all new so it is a one, and in 12 we have a few ATRT2's so going to 12.4.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Sébastien, while we're scrolling and making ourselves busy.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Just to be sure, you say we are done with ten but ten, we have to choose if we put them in ATRT2 or if we put them in the review. It's one of the points where are a connection, no?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Let's go back to that. Let's put a pin on that. Let's finish 12, and then we'll go back to ten, okay? Good point. 12.4, and we have the same question in 12. It'll be a practice run for ten. All right. 12.4.1, that's the recommendation so we're clear that's a one. 12.4.2, ATRT2 recommendation 12.1, "ATRT2 suggests budget consultation process be improved to allow for greater ..." That's covered under ATRT2. There's no linkage there that I can see. We're good?

ATRT2, recommendation 12.3: "ATRT3 suggests that the board implement ATRT2 recommendation 12.3" [Understand] perform some benchmarking. No. That's covered under recommendation 12. We're clean, okay?

We go back to 10.4. Page up. 10.4, all right. ATRT2 recommendation 11.4, “The board follow through with requesting an implementation shepherd for the ATRT3 implementation of its suggestions or recommendations. ICANN open a public comment proceeding on its implementation of ATRT3’s suggestions and recommendations, such that the implementation report is available at launch with the next ATRT3 review.”

Given the entire discussion and discomfort of the community around the implementation of ATRT recommendations, I think we should move this one up to a two.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But the question of the shepherd is already taken care in the review part we talk about, saying that we want a shepherd somewhere. We have discussed ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, it’s in the operating standards going forward but these reviews were done before the operating standards, that’s why that was there.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I suggest that we add something in the reviews. That is not to taking care of that. I think we need to link that to review and not to ATRT2, is my suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But going forward, there will be shepherds because of the guidelines.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm going to keep arguing for two and separate, even though it's an ATRT2, because in a way I agree with Sébastien but it doesn't fit into our reviews recommendation. If you will, it's a bit of an outlier but we can get a lot of good publicity from it. We don't have that many twos. It's a low-lying fruit.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Anyone object to it being segregated and given a two? I'm not seeing any objections.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. 10.4.2, ATRT2 recommendation 11.5, "The importance of ATRT ... Notes that it has generally been implemented and suggests that review teams assess allocated budget," blah, blah, blah, "covered by ATRT2." 10.4.3, recommendation 11.7: "Given ATRT3's assessment that this recommendation was not implemented, implement the recommendation that was originally ..." And what was that? Recommendations 11.7. Let's just make sure what we're talking about here. I can't find it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you think this one is going to need to be pulled out and not scooped up with the ...?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm just trying to make sure. I don't want to waste people's time. I'll find out. I think it's going to be covered by ATRT2. If I come up with a problem, I'll flag it to the group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. To me, I'm reading this, it seems that it's one of those we say needs to be implemented, and our level one for the ATRT2 says they need to be implemented so it's kind of done.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Here it is, okay. I've got it. I can read it right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: "In responding to review team recommendations, the board should provide an expected timeframe for implementation, and if that timeframe is different from the one given ..." I think it's covered by ATRT2.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's on the bottom of page 87 if you're looking for it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I wanted to come back to the 10.4.1, to be sure that the two items are taken care of in basket two as one single issue or two issues because it's a little bit different.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I would join them. I think I can manage that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Then both the entire 10.4.1 who is in basket two, independent of ATRT2?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That is what I'm proposing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Everyone happy with that? Excellent.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We're done, folks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we're done with this bit.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. Not all, just to be clear, here. We're done with this bit. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's quite an achievement. I do want to recognize that that exercise was the development of rough consensus or, can I say, on most cases, consensus. That includes our remote participants, Tola and Liu, because I have been noting their support on a number of issues. Let the record show that on our Sunday meeting here we did in fact establish consensus of the ATRT on these points. I really want that minuted, please. Thank you. Bernie, looking at our structure and our work plan, I believe, is the next cab off the rank?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes it is, ma'am. All right. I think under that one, if we can put the agenda back up, please, my first question to the group is, are we happy with the report format as it stands, or do we want to do some major surgery? That is the first question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I ask, as we're contemplating this, it is a large and bulky document.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If there is any opportunity to slim it down, that that would be appreciated by the reading public, I suspect. Now, I'm only channeling

what I think I would hear if I asked them, but my guess is that if we can make any saving on volume by tabulating ...

Admittedly, we have some aspects with our bundling and putting into the three buckets, we'll have the front end of whatever we produce being a little more ... Not insular but segregated and easier to manage. You could manage by just going through that material and not digging as deeply as we needed people to do on this interim report. But we did get criticism on the complexity and the details in that, so that as a basis for your following discussion. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

If you allow me to dream, we fix some discrepancy in the current interim report, we leave as it is, and we do a fresh document with our recommendation. And if we have to report to something we make the link to other documents but we do a short, on-the-spot document and we don't try to redo everything here. Of course, we will have people who say, like our friend from the registries constituency who are ATRT1, ATRT2, and [ATRT21]. They will tell us that we don't. But what we have to produce today is the final report with our recommendations. If, for the first time in ICANN, we have a short on-the-spot document, it will be marvelous. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It certainly would get my vote if I was making one. We've got Demi and then Vanda.

DEMI GETSCHKO:

I'm also strongly in favor of a short document. I think we can have a preamble or something at the beginning on the points, the

recommendations, and the decisions we have, and leave all the old text, that is very important also, as an addendum of the document, not in the main body. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm the same line. I'd like to have the resume of the idea what was the work. Also, we have the resume, and then the resolutions, the recommendations that we have in one, two, three, and explain what is important of those ideas, and that's it. The rest is annexed for this, and that, and that, and the list of the annex, that's it. For someone that wants to read, they go to the annex.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a little bit like at the library, having the primer and the main piece, and if one has a great desire to track back and, dare I say, even map, you pull out the other volumes and folios. Back to you Bernie, and I think we need to see if we can frame a work plan as to how this might happen, as well.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: What I'm taking away from this is we're redoing a short document? I'm very happy with that, no problem. But I will first update our current document with the results of today and fix the things, and then work on resuming that. That's okay. In preparing the recommendations, of course, we have our list of things, now, that we have to meet. What I'm going to propose is that I work on those, put them up in Google Docs, and that we give very specific times, not leave them open forever.

We will send notice, we will say, “Here it is, you’ve got 48 hours. Go over it, respond, make comments, make fixes,” but we’re getting into a phase where we can’t have long, protracted discussions unless it’s absolutely necessary. I would suggest that the core of what we’re going to do, the document itself, the short document, I understand we’re going to have longer. We’re not going to post that for 48 hours. We’re going to write it. My objective would be to have a draft before we go to Cancún so people have comfortable time to read it and comment it, and our job in Cancún will be to finish editing it. That’s my plan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. There’s a plan thrown on the table for your considerations, ladies and gentlemen. What is your reaction to said plan? Vanda, your hand is up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, just some more administration issues. Those things must be done in this short time and we will continue to have our meetings during the Monday and the Wednesday. I’m suggesting that we have a whole meeting on Monday and a whole meeting on the Wednesday so we can debate something.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, my problem with that is the [impost] of the Monday meeting has only been on the leaders and the continuing leaders who are interested from the work tracks. That has been valuable, it has been useful, it has been important, but I think it’s a big ask to say to the rest of the review team members, “And now, you’re meeting twice a week,” because that’s what I’m hearing from you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, it's three weeks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand that but we'll look at what we do when. We can have longer meetings, as well. We can certainly have, maybe, additional meetings as needs be. I fear if I throw too many people face-to-face instead of asynchronously collaborating on agreement of documents, that we're going to get one or more people dragging us back into exercises of relitigation, and I'm a little concerned about that, just from my management point of view, okay? Bernie, I first of all see you, but I also thought ... Did I see Osvaldo's hand, then? Yes.

OSVALDO NOVOA: I didn't notice I had put it up but I think one meeting a week should be enough, and that leaves us time to work during the week on the document. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Osvaldo, I appreciate that. Bernie, back to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just a note. I will not be ready with anything of substance for a meeting next week, meaning in three days. The next meeting would be on Wednesday the 19th, and then after that is the 26th, which may be a little tight, also, depending on who's traveling when, but we should get two in. I think that's reasonable.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will get the two in, but what we are going to need is a commitment from everybody to be prompt and proactive in the collaborative documents. And when Bernie sends to the list, "Here is the current text," you should all be getting prompts with the e-mail saying, "This has changed, this has been edited," etc. Make a point of going in then and there, and if you have a comment make the comment, then others can react to your comment in as close to real-time as possible.

Then, after 24 hours, that's going to be either accepted, rejected, or incorporated and then we're going to keep moving on. This is going to be fast-paced and there is not going to be the opportunity to say, "I'm sorry, I want you to go back," because we will not have the time. Bernie, can I ask, at Cancún meeting will we have the opportunity then, in our one day with a short document, to go through it from go to whoa, and do justice to a reasonable review of what then will become a final report?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That's what I have said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I realize that but now we know it's a smaller document and we think that one day we'll do one long day, maybe, but one day we'll put it to bed.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, ma'am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Is anyone concerned about that as a plan for what we do at Cancún in our own face-to-face meeting on whatever day of the week it is? I'm not seeing who you're pointing to.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, it's me. Sorry. I have no concern.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know you have no ability to put her hand up, my dear. That's fine.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I do want to clarify that we actually have two days in Cancún.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Even better. Two days in Cancún.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Thank you. While I actually have the mic, we do have a meeting scheduled currently in the calendar for the 12th of February, which is this coming Wednesday. I'm hearing that we should cancel that. Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. 12th is just not going to work, unfortunately. The two days in Cancún, when we're definitely going to have the luxury of really going over this with a fine-toothed comb. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just a suggestion, as we have three time slots for the moment, can't we not have the meeting on Wednesday the 26th but to have on Monday the 24th, just to leave one full week to finish the writing if needed, like that? And if for any reason we need a second meeting, we have the Wednesday. But my goal was not there, it was more to push ahead to help the writers—not a writer—to finish.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So what we can do with that, on that Monday, is work on an hour meeting because I know we've got people who have meetings immediately after or immediately before. Sorry?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's now shortened. It's 45 minutes because we ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. That's the leadership team meeting. What we can probably do is budget for the whole of the review team an hour on the 24th, noting that we have people who we know have meetings both before and after. Does that work? Jennifer, can we just provisionally pop that in on the February 24th?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. That's our full hour for the whole review team on the 24th? Okay, so we'll start at, I believe, 19:00 UTC. Okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. It's just a one-off and if we need to cancel it, we can. It allows it to be in people's diaries.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Got it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. All right. Then, to some extent, that is looking at what we're going to do for the Cancún meeting. I would like to see if we can take a couple of minutes, now, if there's nothing else on this agenda that we need to do ... That's where I'm heading. What I'd like to suggest you do is now, in five or six minutes, stand up, get up, [buy our] break, grab a coffee, come back to the table with your coffee, and so we'll have a working break rather than a leave-the-room break.

We're going to take a five ... Sorry? Thank you. We'll take a break now to 20 after the hour. We'll reconvene, coffee, and cake if you want it, in hand at 20 after the hour, and we will spend ten or 15 minutes or so looking at our messaging so we've got that clear, and then the update to the work plan can be done after and not in a face-to-face context. Yes, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I am missing one point, how we do the answer to the comments, because we didn't get to that point.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I will draft it, and I'll put up a Google Doc, and we can go through it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Bernie captured notes in most of it as we went through all of the comments, and so that will be tidied up. In fact, that will be something

that may come out later this week. When do you think that might come out, Bernie, in all practicality? End of week? Okay. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, Bernie, you will do. But I would prefer to prioritize those new issues and new document, and the second day in Cancún could be a good time to review the answer and to publish it. Anyhow, we are out of date to publish something to be discussed at Cancún because it's three weeks before. Then, we are out if we don't publish it three days before.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to be clear that the response to public comments is a traditional appendix to a final report. It's not a separate publication.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, but where I think we need to concentrate is to have the new document ready, as we need that for the final report and know it must be included in the work plan. I would like us to concentrate on the new document, that was my suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But you were asking [audio cuts out] your question about when the other document could be ready. He'd given a date and he can update the date if it's a problem. That was just responding to that that has to be appended to the final report. Okay. Can we now, at 17 minutes past the hour, come back for our break?

It'll be, now, to 25 past the hour. Sorry about the constant updating of our timing, here. 25 past the hour, come back with your coffee, do the

needful now, and we will get onto messaging, which hopefully will not take us too long and we will be able to have an earlier completion after some final words.

Excellent. Okay. Mini-break. I'm interested to see that not many people have cups of coffee in front of them. Obviously, we have not driven this group to sheer exhaustion as yet. We will see what we can do in the next few minutes to rectify that.

Negar, Jennifer, who's going to play the primary role with this messaging story, here? We know we normally put out a blog. We certainly appreciate ... Pat and I always work with you two to ensure that it gets designed, developed, edited, and then put out in a timely fashion but we do need this group to help us establish what the key points and messages are. I'm happy to hand the microphone over to you, ladies, and we will just intervene as needs be.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you, Cheryl. I, just during that quick break, put together some bullet points, which are by no means comprehensive or possibly even accurate. I just was trying to draft some thoughts on what you might want to communicate coming out of this meeting. As Cheryl mentioned, yes, we will do a blog, which usually is just an update to the community as to the progress that you made, but also looks forward as to what's coming down the pipe, particularly for Cancún. Yes, during this quick—I hope—discussion, let's get some key bullet points that you want to communicate in that blog. Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think this is great. The thing that seems to be jumping out at me is that we, as a group, considered the public comments and significantly modified a number of critical areas of our report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, that's a great capture because I realize that Avri, Jim, and a few of our favored viewing public have been with us through the whole gruesome experience but the majority of the ICANN community has not been, so let's articulate that. That's terrific. Any other asterisks/do bullets need to go into it? Sébastien, any thoughts?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe somebody can read it. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I'm happy to if that would be helpful. Starting off with a thanks to the community for their inputs to the draft final report, and then the next bullet points are things that you undertook during the meeting, so, "Analysis of the public comments received and consideration of how these will be responded to." As Bernie just said, "Significantly modified a number of critical areas of the report and carried out an initial impact analysis."

We can expand this one, but this was the exercise that you did, I think, yesterday, when we looked at the criteria from the operating standards. "Initial prioritized exercise on the recommendations," which we did today, and then, "Determine the approach to work towards the Cancún meeting with the aim for final report publication on time in April 2020."

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I would like to say “completed the prioritization exercise.” I mean, we had consensus. We’ve gone it. I don’t want to leave doubt there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Actually, can we make sure we do say “had our consensus discussions on”? Because I’d like it in the public record that we established our consensus amongst those who were in attendance both remote and in Brussels, or words to that effect. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Cheryl is catching up, here. Any other comments, anywhere? Are you okay there?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe in addition to the thanks, the ones who participated online, as Cheryl said, it could be useful to add because they were, with the time zone, completely crazy with us almost all the time. I am not just talking about the members of this group but also the observers. That’s important. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Thanks for that. I mean, we did recognize it during it but I think those who weren’t here need to know that we do have some passionate followers and fans, and that they are both welcome and contributory. I wonder if we might also mention that we appreciated having a welcome in our kick-off from the chairman of the ICANN Board, recognize that the vice-chair, of course, is now fully seated amongst us as the liaison/member—it’s not the right word because he’s not a liaison but you know what I mean—to ATRT, and that we also had the pleasure of Avri being a consistent attendee up until the time she had to travel on

the final day. A remote attendant. And we could mention that Avri then was able to bring in the particular aspects of the prioritization paper that the board has been working on, and we can dove-tail that up somehow. Go on, Mike.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: And I think we should thank staff for spending their weekend.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I was going to do that here. I'm unsure that we need to put that in a communique, to be honest. Yeah. I mean, as much as I am serious about the thanks I was planning on giving them, including Eric and our tech guy from the last couple of days, kind of a job ... We appreciate it. I'm not sure the viewing public need to in the communique. Correct me if I'm wrong, ladies. Am I being too cruel?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I don't think there is any other way to spend our weekend, frankly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. It's probably worthwhile noting that we could put a couple of images into the blog, just to make it attractive. I suspect I saw a couple of candid shots of us actually looking like we were terribly busy being taken by Jennifer, but we're happy to also put our group shot in, and that sort of thing. You're all happy with that? In other words, permission to publish, excellent. What else do we need to take care of, ladies?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Well, I think with these things short and sweet, as best as we can. I think if everybody feels that we've captured the key points, I'd be tempted to end it there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Brilliant. Okay. Pat, as you may know, is now flying his way to Australia. He will be head down and tail-up for the working hours in a UTC +11 time zone, but we will, regardless, be doing whatever edits and first-rush on what the girls will put together for this set of messages, and we will have this put out as the final before publication goes out to the list. Even though you may all be traveling, please keep an eye out towards the end of the week.

I'm assuming it's towards the end of the week. I'm just hoping to see that that was a "yes," coming from Jennifer. It was a "yes" coming from Jennifer. Towards the end of the week, do keep an eye out because we want a fairly prompt reaction from you. No reaction, it will be assumed that you agree with the blog messaging because that blog we need to try to get out for Monday next. Correct, Jennifer? Is that our aim?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. I believe that the 17th is a US holiday. I have to mention that. I know we're a global team but our staff push things out in the US on Monday so let's aim for the 18th, if that's okay. It's Tuesday the 18th.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. In fact, the holiday plays in our favor because it gives our team that little bit longer. I'll leave all of the logistics in your capable hands but we need to fit in with that opportunity to have it pushed out

during the normal scheme of an ICANN week's weekly communications/events.

Are we happy with our messaging? Are we happy, now, on the final point of the existing agenda, that we will update our work plan over this coming week and possibly have it updated for our next formal meeting, which will be on Wednesday the—I'm going to say—19th? Is that correct? At what UTC time, please, ladies?

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's Wednesday the 19th at 21:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. And that is scheduled for two hours, still, or 90 minutes?

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's 90 minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 90 minutes, fine. With that, our purpose will be looking at the documentation that we have, priority being—as Sébastien was making clear before our mini-break—the new text for the new work. Yes, go on, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I was discussing with Sébastien during the break. I agree. There's no question I'll be working on that new report, but my first phase of doing that will be taking our recommendations and filling out the requirements for recommendations because those will inform how the report will look. Depending on how it goes, our main focus on that

meeting may be how the requirements for recommendations have been filled out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Let's aim for that to be the primary agenda item, at this stage. That means that we may not need to have a leadership meeting on that Monday, if that's going to be the primary agenda item. With that, we can can that 17th from a leadership point of view. Other than that, is there anything anyone wants to raise now in terms of formal business for ATRT3? Go ahead, Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: A question to Bernie; are you going to do that for ATRT2 recommendations that weren't completed, all the requirements for full recommendation?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, I understand his question. No, we're doing one recommendation, which will only refer ... I will do that for the one recommendation but it won't detail each of the sub-points that we had on them, okay? It'll just say, "Do them. And by the way, please look at our suggestions for how you complete that."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Thank you. Any other questions, clarifying questions, comments, or otherwise? In which case, let the record formally show our deep thanks and appreciation, not only to those people who have joined us throughout our three days of, I think, very successful work, and "yay team" to all of you who've contributed to that. But in particular, to the ICANN staff here, both at the Brussels office, the tech team, and the

supporters. They have not had an easy time because we had, in fact, challenged them.

I would very much like it formally returned, at least on behalf of us as a team—and certainly Pat and I in particular—to whomever is in charge of them here, that we definitely appreciate them having gone above and beyond the call of duty to try and bludgeon those gremlins back into the ground. It really was a difficult circumstance for them. It was attention that could have soured our work. It did not, thanks to their professionalism, and I would very much think that Pat and I would like to see those words transmitted back to them and to their managers.

And so, let's give them all an official round of applause. Ladies, without you, really ... I'd love to see you but Daniel insists on reading his bloody screen so close in this appallingly set up room that I cannot get a sightline. Thank you, thank you, thank you again for all of the stuff that makes the magic happen. It's making sure we can get in and out of the doors, it's making sure we're fed and watered, and everything else. We do realize, yes, it is your job, but you are here over a weekend and you've done it with not only professionalism but with such pleasantry and courteousness to us all.

I'm sure I'm speaking on behalf of everybody. Thank you, and our deep appreciation. We want to see that go back, and I know it's difficult for you to say that to your own bosses but we do want to see that go back to your bosses, as well, so thank you, ladies. I saw León before I saw Bernie. Go ahead.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

I just wanted to reinforce our gratitude to these ladies and Bernie, as well. That was it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to get to Bernie. God love his little cotton socks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Promises, promises.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I really, really think that if anything happens I might need to get a gift for Bernie at the end of this process, which will be a pair of cotton socks because the number of times I've said to him, "God love your little cotton socks," he says, "I don't have cotton socks." Clearly, he has a need for cotton socks so we'll have to fix that. But Bernie, thank you. It is a very demanding and taxing task.

We know you have the skillsets and abilities but dragging yourself to the other side of the world, dealing with all the things that go on in the human body, with that—I know you're up at two in the morning to work on stuff to have it ready for us the following day—you are absolutely appreciated.

And if some of our reaction to some of your text seems otherwise, please just assume it is our enthusiasm to get it as good as we possibly can and nothing at all to do with your contracted and/or paid professionalism. I do think you also deserve, and should be noted for the record, an applause because it has been a lot done in a little time. Now Vanda, but then Bernie with the mic.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I need to complain that he keeps beating on my head.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Can we make a note that in future Vanda is not to share a microphone with Bernie, okay? They're not playing nicely. They had to call to mother at least once.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And not sit next to each other.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I'm going to separate you two next time. Okay. Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, mom. Just a note, if we're wrapping this up ahead of time we may want to send a note on the list saying we've wrapped up, just so people don't try and join and figure it's not working.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And in the two minutes that I'm hoping the rest of this is going to take, that is going to be the final thing we need to do. Ladies, if you'd like to do that now, send it to the list noting that, with much joy and pleasure, we are wrapping our three-day event up at 13:45 of the hour, CET.

Finally, you have all performed, I think, above and beyond the call of duty when I know you've been tired, I know you've been stressed, I know you've been jetlagged, and I know you've done the very best to look at what you can live with in most of these changes and prioritizations and recommendations. I hope you are as pleased with where we are now as I am at having gotten here.

I want to note on behalf of Pat, again, his humblest apologies for having to leave, but I think, when he looks to what we've done and listens to the recording and transcripts of this, he will see what a fabulous job each and every one of you have done. I don't know how we get that back to the people who sent you here but we will find a way. Pat and I will find a way to make sure your sending organizations appreciate the terrific amount of work you've done.

It's not over. The fat lady has not sung. I'll let you know when I'm going to do that. We do have a lot of work and I'm hoping that you've all agreed to make that extraordinary commitment as we head toward the finish line. This is going to need to be a sprint. It's not a marathon. Anyone with another final word, speak now or forever hold your peace. In which case, I'm going to say for the last time, we can stop the recording. Thank you, one and all, and bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]