

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hello and welcome to the first of two of the webinars of the third Accountability and Transparency Review Team, known as ATRT3, with regard to a draft report for public consultation. This is a well-represented group, with members coming from all parts of the ICANN constituencies and stakeholder groups—from the GNSO, as well as the other organizational component parts, the support organizations, and advisory committees.

My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and we have Pat, who is co-chair with me, who's going to be taking us through quite a few of the slides today. And we also have a couple of the Work Track leads who have joined us today, who are also going to be taking us through some of the slides in their area.

I'd like to, on behalf of all the ATRT, welcome you all to today's webinar. Note that as a webinar, we are not conducting any sort of roll call, but that we would look forward to taking your questions at the end of our presentation. We will move through these slides relatively quickly. We do realize that some of this material is background material, and indeed, things that some of you will have seen before. So, with that, Brenda, if we could move to the next slide, please.

Thank you very much. Just a brief overview of our presentation today ... We're going to take you through the high points of the ATRT3 Draft Report. We're going to look at the key findings, along with the key recommendations and suggestions that we are planning to make, and look at the key questions, which our review team is seeking input from

---

*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.*

---

you in the public comment period, and then we'll open up with Q and A towards the end of the session.

Please, if you would like to, put questions into chat during our session. So that you can punctuate our chat with questions, just use the little arrow points at the beginning and the end, mentioning that it's a question—the usual format. Brenda will probably put in a sample for you in chat in a moment, so that we will capture those and get back to them, as well, at the end of Q and A, or of course, if time is not available, after today's webinar. Next slide, please, Brenda.

And again, thank you. This third Accountability and Transparency Review has been carried out in accordance with the ICANN bylaw, Section 46b. We held our very first meeting back in April 2019, and we have to complete and hand in our final report within 12 months of that date, in which case that date is the 5th of April 2020.

ATRT3 has opted to make, in our initial report, both recommendations and suggestions—and in some cases these are strong suggestions—in its final report, due to new requirements for what we would classify as a recommendation. We'll drill down into that just a little bit more in the following slides. The determination of an item as a suggestion or a recommendation will be finalized in our final report. Next slide.

The new Operating Standards for Specific Reviews, adopted in June 2019, were retroactively applied to the work of ATRT3. It's within these new Operating Standards for Specific Reviews, that we realize are untested and definitely recognize that we are the first review which will be making recommendations under this new set of standards. But we

---

do feel that as a beta testing, we will be making every effort to not only follow the standards to the best of our ability, but also to give valuable feedback onto our experience with these new standards.

The ATRT3 concluded that not all its recommendations could or should meet these requirements of new standards. So, as such, our recommendations, or things we feel strongly about, which do not meet the requirements under these new standards, will be labeled “suggestions.” We may come up with another term, but at the moment they’re called “suggestions.” However, the ATRT3 has been assured that its recommendations and its suggestions will be considered similarly by the ICANN Board. Next slide, please.

ATRT3 assessed the following scope items. We assessed the assessing and improving of Board governance, the assessing the role and effectiveness of the Government Advisory Committee known as the GAC, assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input, assessing the extent to which ICANN’s decisions are supported and accepted by the internet community, and assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross-community deliberations and effective and timely policy development. Next slide, please.

Our scope also included assessing and improving the independent review process, assessing the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency Review Team recommendations have been implemented, Specific and Organizational Reviews, a review of ICANN’s accountability indicators, and a prioritization and rationalization of activities, policies, and recommendations. Next slide. Thanks, Brenda.

---

And with this, I'm going to hand over to Vanda, and she's going to take us through the Government Advisory Committee considerations. Over to you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. I'm Vanda Scartezini from Latin American and Caribbean region. I will call your attention for some issues related to Government Advisory Committee—the GAC that everybody knows. When you read—and please comment—our report, it is important to understand the specific nature of GAC when assessing the ATRT2 recommendations.

The GAC, as you know, is composed of official governments. And those governments normally cannot commit their government to anything without formal authorization. It sometimes generates delays, and generates discussions. The recommendations that ICANN community can make for the GAC via those process—the ATRT Review—may have limited applicability, or may have to be adapted to fit into the GAC context. So, we expect you to have this point in mind when reading our report. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Pat, over to you.

PAT KANE:

Cheryl, I think you've got one last slide.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, I didn't think so. Please go ahead. All right. I shall do this, then—not a problem. ATRT3 methodology ... What we did, we reviewed the implementation and effectiveness of the 46 distinct ATRT2 recommendations, remembering that the ATRT2 recommendations were, of course, made more than five years ago—in fact, closer to seven—and indeed, we were looking at a very different ICANN at that place and space in time, and also that there were no specific guidelines for what makes a recommendation.

We conducted a major survey of individuals and structures—that's the SOs and ACs, as well as the GNSO constituent bodies, as well as the At-Large Regional At-Large Organizations—on a wide range of relevant topics. The results of the survey are found in full detail in annex B of our draft report. Sorry. My dogs are now barking in wonderful timing.

We held interviews and meetings with the community at ICANN 65 and 66. We received briefings from various groups, such as ICANN Org's Public Comment Team, the Nominating Committee Review Implementation Working Group, and indeed, the other specific review leaderships. We reviewed the ICANN accountability indicators in detail. We reviewed a large number of ICANN documents. We also requested and received a number of clarifications from ICANN Org. And now, with my increase in dog barking, over you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. The timing is perfect. So, if we can move two slides forward, Brenda. In the key findings area, I've got three sections here—

---

one around ATRT2 recommendations, one taking a look at the survey, and one looking at the accountability indicators.

So, in terms of the ATRT2 recommendations, which we are obligated to review the implementation of all the recommendations coming out of ATRT2, while we got a report from ICANN staff indicating that everything was completed, what we found in our assessment that 60% were completed, 23% were partially implemented, and 17% were not implemented at all.

And so, that 17% had to do with a specific recommendation that was made out of ATRT2, and we did not count as implemented if there was credit given for some other implementation in a different manner or in a different process. So, while only 60% we had done as completely implemented, the other ones were some variation and some partials as well.

So, what we believe is that with the new Operating Standards for the Specific Reviews, we think that this will alleviate some of these situations. But you will also find that in our prioritization recommendations, we've accounted for this particular issue. Next slide, please.

So, in the survey results ... I'm just going to walk through some of these questions. But what you'll find here, we're going to put in the ones that are overwhelming from individuals and structures that have responded in one direction or another. So, the first one ... Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the ICANN Org website should be better organized? Clearly, structures, yes, individuals, yes.

---

Should ATRT3 make recommendations about prioritization and rationalization? Again, overwhelming yes, please do. And again, this is what I was talking about also with the recommendations being complete or satisfaction with the completion of recommendations coming out of review teams.

Should recommendations include a process to retire recommendations as it becomes apparent that the community will never get to them or they've been overtaken by events? Yes. I think this is one of the issues that we identified with respect to the desire to have 100% completion, because there was no way to say "no longer makes sense" or "solve in another direction."

Should the community or representatives of the community be involved as a decisional participant? This is overwhelming yes. They are community-drive recommendations, and the community should at a minimum be participants, but probably should be leading that process. Next slide, please.

How would you rate the effectiveness of the specific reviews? Clearly, there's some dissatisfaction with the specific reviews from the structures. And what we're finding in some of the anecdotal evidence is that time involved, cost of reviews, effectiveness of and implementation of the recommendations—there's dissatisfaction across the board there.

Should specific reviews—again, the Accountability and Transparency, the SSR, Registration Data, Competition and Consumer Trust—be

---

reconsidered or amended? Again, yes. Should Organizational Reviews of the SOs and ACs be reconsidered or amended? Yes.

Please rate how effective the current system of public comment consultations for gathering input. 50% thought they were effective or very effective, but 88% of individual respondents were in favor of reexamining the concept even of public comments. Next slide, please.

And then, lastly in this particular section, accountability indicators. It was interesting that over half of the people that responded to the survey indicated they were unaware of the accountability indicators. And then, when we took a look at the accountability indicators, two thirds of the respondents indicated that they didn't meet, necessarily, the objective of what they were trying to measure. So, that's it for the key findings sections.

So, if we can move on, then, to the next section, please, on key recommendations and suggestions. I'm just going to read this recommendation for you here. "In addition to its earlier suggestion on ATRT2, ATRT3 suggests that the Board should ensure that the first Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice, the second RDS, and the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Work Stream Two Review Teams provide implementation shepherds as defined in the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews," so that we can ensure that the intent of the recommendations are kept in place, so you are not having to guess and follow review teams—what that intention of, or what the purpose of a specific recommendation are.



---

And then, also, that these recommendations will be tracked very much the same way that ICANN today tracks advice coming from the advisory committees, in a central location, on a single spreadsheet. Next slide, please.

If the implementation of specific recommendations is transferred to another process, the Board needs to make certain that they are clearly reporting that and noting any factual reporting information and the progress of the implementation when they are transferred. Next slide, please.

Issues with respect to prioritization ... So, we have very strong support from the ATRT3 survey that the ATRT3 should make recommendations on prioritization. However, we recognize that this is a topic of discussion right now across the community, where the Board has an activity going on. There's an activity going on, coming out of the multistakeholder model review. What we are suggesting as ATRT3 is to create a community-led entity that can take a look at the prioritization process and develop something. Next slide, please.

So, creating that prioritization process ... We believe that the Operating Standards for the Specific Reviews will be a good base foundation of creating and operating this community-led entity that will be tasked with the development of an annualized prioritization process. We think that all community members participating in this process should have a significant experience in ICANN, and would hopefully have actively participated in one of the major reviews or major workstreams, in terms of what drives recommendations for the community.

---

The membership must include representatives from the Board, as well as the ICANN organization, but not be solely those entities. Community-led entity developing the prioritization process should have this be a one-year task, so that we can complete the process in a determinate period of time. The community-led entity could request services of professional facilitators, which we would expect some funding from ICANN to allow to happen. Next slide, please.

Are we on the next slide? That is the next slide. Sorry. So, the requirements for the prioritization process itself ... Again, we believe that the Operating Standards for the Specific Reviews would be a great foundation. This must be conducted annually by members of the community, with participation of the Board and the Org.

The group actually performing this prioritization should be a standing group from represented structures—not necessarily specific individuals. And the process will be called upon to have a one-year review, unless we have an exceptional circumstance to where priorities change, there's an issue of budgeting, or there's an issue of priorities that become extremely time-sensitive. And then, this group would be reconvened as required or as needed, and as everything here, should be conducted in an open and transparent fashion. Next slide.

So, with respect to prioritization, it should apply to all recommendations coming out of cross-community working groups, community working groups, Organizational and Specific Reviews, as well as any other type of community-driven recommendations. The prioritization process should only consider information that is provided with respect to the

---

recommendations, and should not be required to generate additional information to evaluate or prioritize the recommendations.

The prioritization process ... We recognize that many of the recommendations would be multi-year projects. And while the prioritization process will have to go through and prioritize those, from a budgeting perspective, they'll have to be reapproved—or we recommend that they be approved—on an annual basis. Next slide.

And then, in terms of what we think the issues should be measured upon, budgeting availability, cost of implementation, complexity and time to implement, what are the prerequisites and what are the dependencies on each of the recommendations, the value and impact of implementation, and the relevance to ICANN's missions, commitments, core values, and strategic objectives—fundamentally making certain that we get the biggest bang for the buck or the things that are the most important or impactful to the improvement of ICANN and the ICANN processes. Next slide.

So, I'm going to pass this over to Daniel now, to introduce recommendations around specific and Organizational Reviews, and Sebastien will be in support of this as well. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Pat. Regarding to the Specific and Organizational Reviews, the ATRT3 Team could not come up with a consensus on a single proposal, to address the issues related to the Organizational and Specific Reviews. But we did manage to narrow it down to two distinct options for this Draft Report. Also, still, we are calling upon our input

---

from the community via the public comment to assist the ATRT3 in coming up to a conclusion on the topic for its respective final report. Next slide, please.

The first option is that we should keep the current set of Specific and Organizational Reviews, as they are more important in regarding to the accountability mechanisms for the community, in combination with the new oversight mechanism to manage reviews and implementation of the recommendations.

The new oversight mechanism should also be responsible for a new Independent Accountability Office, in some ways similar to the Office of the Ombudsman with respect to the oversight, which includes responsibility for the SOs' and ACs' accountability, as well as the coordination of the reviews and the implementation of their respective recommendations. Next slide, please.

The main impact of this option is that the initial impact on the schedule would be limited, in reference to the Reviews Timeline, and also if no changes are made within this respective slide. And then, furthermore, the changes to the current format or duration of the reviews—that is the one-year Organizational and Specific Reviews with potential extensions for the Specific Reviews.

And then, also, the other impact would be the creation of a new oversight body, which is potentially independent, which would mainly ensure proper implementation of the review recommendations and coordination of reviews—looking at this every seven years, versus the current five years, of which the review processes do take place. Next

---

slide, please. From this, then, hand over to Sebastien to walk us through the second option. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Daniel. We will go through option two now, with the first slide Organizational Review, and then we will go to specific review, and then we will have a global overview of the two options.

The Organizational Review ... We suggest to maintain the current concept of individual Organizational Reviews for each SO and AC, but conduct them as a three- to five-day workshop focused SO/AC self-inspection, in the context of continuous improvement. These reviews would be conducted every three years or more frequently, as determined by each SO/AC.

And the report of these reviews will then feed into a new holistic review. This new holistic review will focus on the improvement made by all SO and ACs, as presented in their Organizational Review report, as well as on the interaction between SO and AC. This new holistic review would be conducted every seven years for a maximum duration of 12 to 18 months, to allow for the information and maturing of the recommendations made by the individual Organizational Review and those of the previous holistic reviews. Next slide, please.

Now, we'll go through Specific Reviews. Those reviews include Accountability and Transparency Review Team; the Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review Team; the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review; and the Registration Directory Services, RDS, Review, formerly WHOIS Review.

---

Accountability and Transparency Review, as well as the relevant portion of the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice, and the Registration Data Services, would be combined into a single Accountability and Transparency Review, which would be conducted every seven years for a maximum duration of 12 to 18 months, to allow for the implementation and maturing of the previous recommendations by the review. Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review could either be a three- to five-day workshop or more traditional review period, depending on topic. Next slide, please.

I'm sorry it's written a little bit small, but you have the first part of the document what is the situation of the Specific Review, taking into account option one, and then Organizational Review, taking into option one. You see that the color at the bottom of the first half page change quite dramatically. That shows that there is still, with this solution, some bottleneck. We would have to take that into account if we decide to go in that direction for the next reviews.

If you take the second part of the document, you see that the colors are quite the same, except for one. The yellow part is, in fact, the CCT Review Number Two will be only one after the next round, if any new gTLDs. Next slide, please.

And if we take some assumption made for option two ... For the Specific Review, they say we assume that the next round of new gTLDs is 2022. We are not committed by that. It's just an assumption. The second and last Specific Review would be held in 2025. Relevant elements of RDS and CCT Review will be integrated after that into ATRT4. SSR would be,

---

like I said before, to a five-day workshop, periodically, as called for by the Technical Committee.

Organizational Review ... Each SO and AC would have each two reviews in each of the seven-year cycle, including the first cycle. Each three- to five-day workshop should focus on priority items, and can be scheduled per SO/AC preferences at least every three years. And I guess I give back the floor to Cheryl, please. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. We are noting the questions as they're coming into chat, so please keep that up. That's fantastic. The issues with respect to public comments is where we're going to go to now. The ATRT3 recognizes that individuals, especially those whose mother tongue is not English, or who lack detailed technical knowledge, may find it challenging to provide meaningful input on long and often complex documents that are published for public comment only in English. Key elements to comment on may be difficult to identify without reading the entire document. Next slide, please.

Thank you. ATRT3, therefore, strongly suggests that public comments not only seek general input on entire documents, but also clearly identify who the intended audience is. In other words, is this for general community, for technical community, legal experts, etc.? This will allow potential respondents to quickly understand if they wish to invest the time to produce public comments.

This is not meant in any way to prevent anyone from commenting, but rather it is meant to clarify who is best suited to comment and, of

---

course, whose particular expertise is being sought out by the group seeking the public comment in particular. Each public comment proceeding should provide a clear list of precise key questions in plain language that the public consultation is seeking answers from its intended audience. Next slide, please.

Results of these questions should be included in the staff report on the public comment proceeding, and where appropriate and feasible, translations of a summary and precise key questions should be included in the public comment proceeding, which could also allow for respondents in the official ICANN languages. Next slide, please.

We've come to accountability indicators, which we mentioned earlier as Pat Kane took us through the results of some of our surveys. ATRT3 suggests that ICANN undertake a communications effort to make the ICANN and wider community aware of the accountability indicators. Part of this effort could include a formal presentation of these at a future ICANN meeting.

ATRT3 strongly suggests that ICANN rapidly undertake a serious review of its accountability indicators to ensure that these meet the stated objective in each section and subsection, provide data that is useful as accountability indicator, provide data that can inform decision making processes, and present data that is up-to-date. Next slide, please.

Here, we're going to move into the key questions. As we alluded to in our suggestions for public comments, which is going to be found in detail in section five of the report, ATRT3 is including a list of topics and questions it believes are critical for comment on from public comment



---

respondents. These include recommendations with respect to Specific and Organizational Reviews and our suggestion with respect to prioritization, both of which we've gone into some detail in today's webinar.

The public comment on the third Accountability and Transparency Review Team Draft Report will close on the 31st of January. That is the end of this month. Comments made after this date may not be considered by ATRT3 due to our very tight timeline. We are meeting face-to-face early in February to go through public comments received. So, we have no wiggle room. We have no ability, nor any intention, of getting any extensions. Please pass that message to everyone who might be giving public commentary into this initial report. Next slide, please.

A report layout ... You'll see in sections three, four, five, seven, 10, and 12, all of these report sections are structured similarly. They are introduction, information gathering, ATRT2, ATRT3 survey, and other information. There is an analysis of the information and identification of issues in each of these sections. There is suggestions relative to issues that have been identified, and where relevant, there are recommendations to address these issues made. Next slide, please.

In this slide, you will see the parts of our report. We've included a summary with key points, questions for public comment. That's pages five to 16 of our report. And here, we've got a condensed version, which highlights all the key points from the report. This section has already been translated into the ICANN languages. We hope that is going to

---

make it much easier for people who do not have English as their first language to respond.

We have our executive summary, which is similar in some respects to section one, but includes a listing of all recommendations of suggestions. Then, we go into issue one, which is on the Board—dealing with the Board-related issue; issue two, which is on the Government Advisory Committee; issue three, looking at public input. Next slide, please.

Issue four, acceptance of ICANN decisions; issue five, the policy development process; issue six, the assessment of the independent review process; issue seven, an assessment of relevant ATRT2 recommendations ... This is a holistic view on how the ATRT2 recommendations were implemented, as was detailed in today's webinar. Issue eight, the assessment of Periodic and Organizational Reviews ... Next slide, please.

Nine, our accountability issues; 10, the prioritization and rationalization of activities, policies, and recommendations, which again, you've noted, we have asked specific questions on ... Then, next section is on the support organization and accountability; substructure accountability, which looks at the results of the ATRT3 survey questions regarding this; and finally, prioritization and interdependencies, which is yet to be determined, but that obviously we will be using this template in our final report as well.

So, with that, let's take the next slide, and mention that we have detailed annexes. So, all of our material is accessible to anyone who

---

wishes to delve into the details. We have the complete analysis details of the ATRT2 and the analysis of those recommendations by ATRT3 in section annex A. In the section annex B, we have our detailed survey results and analysis. And in section annex C, we have the Government Advisory Committee input from ICANN 65. Next slide. And don't worry, we're nearly towards the end.

This is the part we've been waiting for. We want to thank you for all your time so far, and we want to get into the questions that several of you have put into the chat, and that, of course, we will be looking at taking directly from open mic as we start. And with this, I think I'm going to hand it back over to Pat. Over to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. I wanted to go through the questions. Before we open it up to the floor, I want to go through the questions that we've received in the group chat. So, let me start off with the first question from Susan Payne. "Why do you identify the EPDP on Slide 19 but not other PDP work? Participation in the EPDP was highly limited to named individuals."

I'll go ahead and address that one. So, Susan, I would think of that as an EPDP as opposed to the EPDP. The focus there was to give examples of significant pieces of work that affected very much cross sections of the community. So, we're trying to focus on examples—not trying to limit the types of participation, but just showing the kinds of things that we would be focused on with significant efforts.

---

The next question came from Kristine Dorrain. “On slide 27,” it says, “for the workshop style, would the review team have to meet via email ahead of time to start collecting data? That’s the time-consuming part, and I don’t think you could figure out what was needed, request the data, and get the data in three to five days.”

Great question, Kristine. One of the things that we have talked about is that when the review teams get identified, that there will have to be some initial conversation on what data sources and resources are required to make those three days effective, because to your point, if you’re figuring out what you need, get the request, but the time you get to day five, you’ll have nothing in your hands. So, the idea would be to do something early on.

Question, “Slide 32, bullet two ... Did the Review Team consider that this suggestion may result [inaudible] in public comments? If the commenter can only see a summary, they may not be competent to respond.” The idea is that the translation—the full translation—will be available. But from a summary standpoint, it may allow people to focus in on the high-level questions and go through a smaller document, thus providing a greater input from a wider variety of responders.

The next question we have, from Susan Payne again, “Given that you say you will make a decision as to whether something is a recommendation or suggestion after the public comment period, do you plan to put your proposed final report out for further comment?”

No, Susan. We’re not going to because of the timing standpoint. We’ve basically got two and a half months between now and when we have to

---

be done. So, once we get the final summary document on the public comments in the beginning of February, we'll have less than 60 days to complete the final report. So, there will not be a public comment period on what will then be the final report.

All right. So, the next question, from Kristine Dorrain, says, "Extension ... the Registries Stakeholder Group has reviewed the report, and we have found some missing information--ATRT2 recommendations, rationale which are necessary for answering the ATRT3 questions. It's going to take time to find all the missing information, and we're about the request an extension. Why is there no possibility for an extension? We feel that we cannot respond thoughtfully and completely with the information provided, and an extension is necessary for a thorough response."

Kristine, basically, it's a time issue. One of the things that we've got as a requirement for accountability and transparency reviews is that they get conducted within a year. And so, we recognize that by April 5th, we have to submit our final report. Even though you can provide comments after the January 31st date, it's possible that they could be included, but it's not a guarantee that they will be included in terms of what our final report will look like.

Next question, from Susan Payne, "You do explain that the assessment of non-implementation of ATRT2 recommendation includes such recommendations which were dealt with in another way, have passed to another workstream, or have been superseded by events. Nevertheless, the assessment you make could be interpreted by those who didn't dig into the detail as a failure of implementation. Would you

---

consider in your final report including a second set of stats that make this clearer—for example, where there is a total failure versus where this is being dealt with in some other way?”

Susan, we’ll take that into consideration. I think that’s a great comment. But what we’ve found, even in our deliberations on the results of our analysis on the ATRT2 recommendations, was that some of the team felt that implementing outside of the prescribed solution or prescribed process was in fact a failure of implementation. So, we’ll take that under consideration and take a look at that. One more question from Susan, “Thanks, Pat. On my EPDP ...”

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may, Pat ...

PAT KANE: Oh, sure. Go ahead, Sebastien. Sorry. I didn’t see your hand.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Pat. Sorry. Just to elaborate a little about what you say about the previous question ... When we say it was not implemented, often it was because it was really not implemented. It was sent to another group. If we take one example, it’s Ombudsman Office. It was [said] as implemented. It was sent to Work Stream Two, and Work Stream Two has not yet agreed by the Board, and it’s certainly not yet implemented.

Therefore, it’s not just the fact that it was sent to another group that we say it was not implemented. It was because the end result is really this

---

one. Therefore, I don't think we are misleading people in what we say in the report regarding this specific question. Thank you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Sebastien, very much for that. Let me get to Susan's question. "Thanks, Pat—" because I want to keep saying that. "Thanks, Pat. On my EPDP question, thanks for the explanation, but an EPDP is an exceptional event. Can we assume that participation in a normal PDP would be qualifying?"

So, yes. An EPDP is an exceptional event, and that was a level that we thought about in terms of what would be significant. We'll take under consideration ... That's a comment coming from you, then, Susan. I will assume that a normal PDP should be considered as qualifying. So, we'll take that as a comment, and we'll talk that through next time when we get face-to-face in Brussels, at the beginning of next month, to go through the public comments.

Where are we? One more question from Kristine Dorraine. Dor-rain. I'm sorry. I'm pronouncing it wrong. "I see you working in good faith to finish in 12 months, but if that means the community has inadequate time to respond, I'm concerned about the quality of responses. Why can't this review team go past 12 months, to, say, 12 and a half months? I don't understand the hard deadline. We're all volunteers already."

All I can really say there is noted. It's in the bylaws as a 12-month process. We will note that, but I think we're going to have to stick to the 12-month timeframe in deliver, but thank you.

---

So, Susan has a question. Sebastien, I think this is for you. "Thanks. That's helpful. But in which case there's a distinction, surely, between not having been dealt with at all and still being a work in progress." Is that a question, Susan, or just a statement to Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will try to add something. In fact, when we say it's not implemented, it's not implemented at all. When it's a work in progress, it's partially implemented, very often. Therefore, I don't think there is so much distinction that we can dig into. As it's a good comment, we will look it in more detail. I am not sure that it will change something, but we will see. Thank you for you comment, and thank you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Do we have any other questions? Either type in or raise your hand, please. I'm not seeing any. Oh, Kristine Dorrain. Oh, hand went away.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi. Can you hear me?

PAT KANE: Yes, we can.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Oh. I wasn't sure if I was hard muted. Thanks. So, my question is ... Maybe one thing that might help is, one of the things that the Registries



---

Stakeholder Group is looking at ... Maybe this will help, because maybe there's something you can send around that will help shorten the workload.

What's missing is that you guys make a bunch of recommendations, specifically in ... I think that's section five you referred to in the table, where you say, "Here's a recommendation, and here's the 3.3.2" or whatever it is. So, when you look back, and you're like, "Here's the recommendation for ATRT3, and it kind of relates to ATRT2," and then you come back ...

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cool it, cool it, cool it, cool it!

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Oh. Am I talking too fast? Sorry.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Oh, yes. Definitely. Sorry.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Okay. Sorry. So then, when you map it back through the document, you never actually know what the ATRT3—why the ATRT3 recommended what it did. You start with the ATRT2 recommendation and you go from there.

So, in order for us to look at ... I apologize. I had to work from home today on a snow day, so I don't have my papers printed in front of me,

---

but I want to give you a hard example. For one of them, it's said we should do—I think it was publish something on the website or something. And so, to go back to ATRT2, the recommendation was to be more transparent about something.

So, I don't know if the new ATRT3 recommendation that you have on your table, which is very conveniently laid out, relates at all to the original ATRT2 problem. I can't actually see how it relates to the recommendation, but at least I can find that in your documentation and in the appendix. And so, what would have been helpful—and maybe you've done this in another context—but to see what was the problem for ATRT2, what was the outcome of the recommendation. And then, from there, what did the ATRT3 think about that, and how did you come to that recommendation now.

So, that's the missing steps. In order to answer and give really good feedback on your current recommendations, I have to go all the way back to the beginning and I can't right now. So, if you have more materials, that would really help us so that we could do a really thorough job in the time that we've been given. I'll stop, and hopefully I slowed down enough. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thanks, Kristine. I understand what you're driving towards. I'm trying to look on the website to see if we have—to see where the spreadsheet is that we worked through, that took all the ATRT2 recommendations ... I'll send that out, once I find it, with a link, that will show the spreadsheet that has each of the sections that we worked through. I think that's

---

available. Is that ... I think that's available. But I'll send that out, Kristine, when I find that, okay? Very good. Any more questions? Vanda, your hand is raised.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. Just to add some point to Kristine, our assessment and the suggestions and recommendations are not only related to the ATRT2. So, a lot of information come out of interviews and surveys and so on. So, those are into the report. Maybe we could add more information, but as Cheryl said, the appendix are there because it's a lot of things inside that come from other point of information that we got during those months. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Vanda. Okay. Seeing no more questions, either in chat ... Susan, yes. I see your recommendation about putting a link on the public comment page. Cheryl, unless you've got something else you'd like to add to close, I think we're finished.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No. I think we're done.

PAT KANE:

All right. Thank you, everyone, for participating today. We'll do this again tomorrow morning, so if you want to go through twice, we'll be here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for all the attention.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you all. Bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everybody. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**