
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group single-issue call on ATRT3 draft reports on Monday the 6th of January, 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Vernatius Okwu Ezeama, Daniel Nanghaka, Alberto Soto, Ali Almeshal, Anne-Marie Joly Bachollet, Aris Ignacio, Avri Doria, Bill Jouris, Christopher Wilkinson, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Ejikeme Egbuogu, Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chillcott, Hanan Khatib, Joanna Kulesza, Kaili Kan, Katambi Joan, Lito Ibarra, Laurin, Marita Moll, Nadira Al-Araj, Priyatosh Jana, Ryan Finnesey, Sébastien Bachollet, Sonigitu Ekpe, Suhaidi Hassan, Vanda Scartezini, Tijani Ben Jamaa, Yrjö Länsipuro, Zak Muscovitch, and Siva Muthusamy.

We have Sylvia Herlein-Leite on the Spanish channel. We have received apologies from Alfredo Calderon, Eduardo Diaz, Roberto Gaetano, Adrian Schmidt, Bastiaan Goslings and Bukola Oronti.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Our interpreters for today are Claudia and Veronica. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes. With that, I'll turn the call over to you, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone, to this first call of the year of the Consolidated Policy Working Group. Welcome, everybody. I hope

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've all had a good holiday break, wherever you are in the world. Today, we're back. We're back with ATRT3, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team work, with a statement that is required by the end of the month. We've already had Sébastien Bachollet in one of our past calls speak to us about the ATRT3. But today, we have all of the members of ATRT3 that are present. I think someone needs to mute because we can hear somebody just coming in. Yes.

So all of our members of the ATRT3 team are present on the call. This is a call, really, to go quickly through the presentation again for those people that have not managed to make it in the last call and then have a frank and open discussion about what statement or elements should be in the At-Large statement, eventually.

So, without any further ado, let's look at whether there are any amendments to the agenda as it currently is on your screen, bearing in mind that it's a pretty simple agenda. It's a single-issue call. I am not seeing any hands up and so we can go directly to the action items. That's going to be really easy, isn't it? The action items are all complete. We'll go through them next Wednesday, which is in two days' time, when we'll have our normal, standard CPWG call. But the point is that the first action item there was a single-purpose call to be scheduled as soon as possible in the first week of January, so there we are.

Let's, then, move swiftly to agenda item three. That's the presentation. I do not think that we have an updated ... Yes, we do have an updated ATRT3 presentation. I'm not sure who has volunteered to take us through this. I hereby ask openly, who is the person who's going to take us

through this presentation? Claudia is currently starting screen sharing and sharing the slides, if she can. There we are. Fantastic. I see that this presentation was originally done by Sébastien Bachollet. Perhaps we should ask Sébastien to take us, then, swiftly through those slides. Then, we'll be able to use most of the call, today, on discussion. Sébastien, over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Please, Cheryl, Daniel, and Vanda, jump in whenever you want. I must update the date. It's not the right one. It's 2020.01.06. We have made very few changes with it and it's where we are. Let's go to the next slide. We will go quickly to where we are with ATRT3. We started in April last year and we need to finish this in April this year. Therefore, your inputs are requested now and not later because we need to finalize our work. We will talk about the key findings, some of the recommendations, and the specific areas where ATRT3 is seeking for comments. Next slide, please.

The ATRT3 scope was assessing and improving board governance, assessing the role and effectiveness of the Governmental Advisory Committee, assessing and improving the process by which ICANN receives public input, assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community. By the way, I have a voice in my audio. If it can be muted, this one? I don't know if it's just me.

Assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross-community deliberation and effective and timely policy development.

Assessing and improving the independence review process, assessing the extent to which prior accountability and transparency review recommendations have been implemented. Specific and organizational reviews. Review of ICANN accountability indicators and prioritization and rationalization of activities, policy, and recommendation.

As you will see in the presentation, some of those items are not discussed here because we have done the work and we consider that either the work is well done or there is no specific issue we want to raise as a team. But of course, feel free to look at the detailed report. If you have comments on those specific parts, they will be welcome. Here, we will concentrate on what we as a team consider as more important than the others and where we really would like to have the feedback of the community. Next slide.

Methodology. We go through what has been done in ATRT2 and sometimes in ATRT1. A survey was conducted through [interaction] of individuals and structure. We will get closer feedback on the important questions and answers. We had interviews and meetings with the community both in ICANN65 and ICANN66.

We received briefings from various groups: the ICANN Org Public Comment Team and the NomCom Review and Implementation Working Group, but also the team who are taking care of the multi-stakeholder evolution. We review in detail the accountability indicators and many ICANN documents. We received clarification from ICANN Org. One of the difficulties was to be sure that what we read as the ATRT2 recommendation was what was requested, as it was a long time ago. But we tried to do our best on that.

Next one, please. Next slide, sorry. Key findings. Implementation of ATRT2 recommendations. We will [go] through all of them. We assess the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations. You have more detail in section nine of the report. But we get [full done] by ICANN Org and our finding is that 60% were implemented, 23% were partially implemented, and 17% were not implemented.

We [really think] that for the future we need to find a way to avoid such divergence in implementing assessments for specific reviews going forward. Therefore, ATRT3 notes the new operating standard for specific review adopted by the ICANN Board in June 2019 and the new website for tracking the implementation of review recommendations should address most if not all of these issues going forward. Next slide. And if I can ask Vanda to take this slide, as she was the one most specifically in charge of the GAC and she wrote this slide today? Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay, thank you. Well, GAC considerations, what we found as important is that the team consider relevant the information from the GAC and understand the specific nature of the GAC when assessing all of the ATRT recommendations because many of the recommendations could not be implemented as asked because of the nature of the GAC. The GAC is, as you know, just official representatives of governments. Those representatives are subjected to a number of expectations in how to interact with the ICANN community and can rarely commit their government to anything prior formal authorization. This makes a lot of difference from other ACs and SOs.

And so some previous recommendations could not really be followed. The recommendation ICANN can make for GAC via such processes as the previous and this one, ATRT review, may have limited applicability because of that and sometimes need to be adjusted to fit into the GAC context. And so, our work was done under those considerations that I would like to share with you when you read the report and see what we are talking about, taking into account that the GAC is a specific animal and that we need to think about the GAC as different from the other ACs and SOs. Thank you. Séb, back to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Vanda. The next two slides are survey results. Therefore, we take into account some of the results, here. We asked questions and you have the answers by individuals and by structure. The [item] was the ICANN.org website, prioritization and rationalization of ICANN activities. You can see that there is a strong demand that ICANN find a way – when I say ICANN, it's the overall structure; all the board, staff, and community – to enhance the prioritization and rationalization of ICANN activities. Next slide.

The questions around the specific reviews and organizational reviews. That was also an important point that we have to take into account because there is a very big request that the ATRT3 come with some suggestions. Here, I would say specifically that ATRT3 is a place to do that. It's why we have done more specific work on that. And the last question was around public comment. It's mixed for individuals if the public comments are effective or very effective. But we also tried to make some

proposals to enhance the public comment. We know that staff is working on that. Next slide.

Accountability indicators. Initial consideration for accountability indicators generated concern about the relevance or effectiveness of a number of these. The survey shows that 54% of the structure weren't aware of the existence of accountability indicators and 67% find the accountability indicators somewhat ineffective. We have found that the referenced website doesn't contain relevant and up to date information but we are also making some proposals on that. Next slide.

In the next part of the presentation, we will concentrate on the question for the public comment. Once again, not to say that it must be done just to answer those questions. If you have only the time to do one part, those questions are the more relevant for our point of view but feel free to take into account the overall document and make comments on the other part, of course.

Therefore, here it's the suggestion/recommendation with respect to specific and organizational reviews. The second suggestion is with respect to prioritization. The next slide is explaining [wording] from our point of view.

What is the difference between a recommendation and a suggestion? The ATRT3 makes a distinction between both. A recommendation will meet the requirement as set out in the operating standards for specific reviews and suggestions might not necessarily meet this standard but ATRT3 doesn't consider a suggestion to be less important than a

recommendation. And the determination of if an item is a suggestion or a recommendation will be finalized in ATRT3's final report.

Of course, in the report, you will see that we take the wording ... We say "recommendation" and "suggestion" but those words can change relative to the comments we will receive and, of course, of our next part of the job [inaudible]. What is important is that the board representative or a member of ATRT3 tells us that they will not consider differently where ATRT3 will make a recommendation or suggestion. They [will take] all those proposals into account. Thank you. Next slide.

Here, we will go to specific issues and we have a few of them here, [it's] implementation of ATRT2 recommendation. ATRT3 makes a suggestion to complete the implementation of a number of ATRT2 recommendations which were only partially implemented or not implemented. You remember that our finding was that just 60% were implemented, which means that, here, we are talking about 40%.

We suggest that the board will ensure that First Competition, Consumer Trust, And Consumer Choice, CCT1, Second Registration Directory Services, RDS2, Cross-community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Work Stream 2 be taken into account and provide implementation shepherds as defined in the operating standards for specific review to avoid any confusion as to the intent of the recommendation during the implementation.

The implementation of this recommendation should also be tracked using the review website. Remember that we talked about those two items earlier in the presentation. If the implementation of a specific

review recommendation is transferred to another process, the board should ensure that any implementation reports should clearly note this and ensure factual reporting on the progress of the implementation of such a transfer of recommendation.

If you remember, in ATRT2 there were requests for a review of the ICANN ombuds office. It was transferred to Work Stream 2 and the job was done within Work Stream 2 but not implemented as any decisions were not yet taken by the board. It's now done. We hoped that they will be implemented soon, now, but it was referred to us as an ATRT2 recommendation implemented and it was not the case. Therefore, we think that for any such case in the future it must be clearly noted. Thank you. Next one?

The issue on prioritization. Next slide, please. Considering the strong support in response to the ATRT3 survey indicating that ATRT3 should make recommendations with respect to prioritization, but then recognizing that there are several significant activities being undertaken in parallel by other parts of the ICANN community regarding prioritization.

Evolution, for example, it's done in evolution of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. It's also taken into account in ICANN board papers on the resourcing and prioritization of community recommendations. The ATRT3 propose that only a community-led process can legitimately develop a system for prioritizing the implementation of reviews.

Cross-working groups and cross-community working groups recommendations. The ATRT3 wishes to align with the effort currently underway to develop a prioritization system to avoid conflicting recommendations or duplication of work. And ATRT3 has opted to provide some high-level guidance for the proposed community discussions regarding the creation and objectives of a community-led entity tasked with developing a prioritization process. Next slide.

Therefore, ATRT3's suggestion: developing a prioritization process. Overall, the ATRT3 believe that the operating standards for specific review could serve as a good base for framing the creation and operation of a community-led entity tasked with developing an annual prioritization process.

All community members participating in this process must have significant experience in ICANN and have actively participated in a major process in ICANN, as in the CWG/CCWG and Accountability Work Stream 1 or 2 or ePDP. There must be included in the team the board representative and an ICANN Org representative also. The work must be developed in a fixed, one-year term. Of course, they could ask for help both from ICANN Org but also for services of a professional facilitator to expedite its work. Next slide.

Following the suggestion about prioritization, it's a requirement for a prioritization process. The ATRT3 considers that operating standards for specific review could be a good base for that. It must be conducted annually by a member of the community. We think that the prioritization process should apply to all recommendations, whatever they are coming from, and needs to take into account different elements like budget, cost

of implementation, complexity, and time to implement, prerequisites and dependencies with other recommendations, value an impact of implementation, relevance to ICANN's mission, commitment, core values and strategic objectives.

Hopefully, it will not be done five years or more after the recommendation or suggestion are done. We'll help to be sure that it's still relevant. Thank you. Next slide. Daniel, you are not on ...

[CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:] He's audio only, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: ... The screen but you seem to be on the call. Do you want to take this slide, as you were more involved in the reviews than the others? It will allow me to close my voice.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, sure. Can you hear me?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Go ahead, please, Daniel. Thank you very much.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. Just to pick up from the issues regarding the specific and organizational reviews. We went [through surveys] to discuss what issues affect the specific and organizational reviews and all these questions

were asked in the survey. One of the results in the survey came out that 67% of the structures mentioned that at least there's a little bit of effectiveness after the question was asked whether the specific/organizational reviews were ineffective or somewhat ineffective. 91% of the structures [agreed] that there was at least a little bit of ineffectiveness of the reviews.

According to the survey, the organizational reviews, 46% of the structures mentioned that they were effective and very effective. But at least the majority of the responses mentioned that there was a high level of ineffectiveness at [54%.] [This at least brought forward at least] [inaudible] recommendation to be [derived at.]

Following up on the issue of organizational reviews, it was enquired whether it should be recommended or amended. 83% were in agreement over amendment of these reviews. [We at least brought in] very strong recommendations regarding to the reviews.

So ATRT3 could not come up with consensus on the single proposal to address the issues related to the organizational reviews. But at least there are two distinct possibilities for this draft report and we are still going back to seek input from the community on this [inaudible] that will guide the ATRT3 team to come up with a conclusive recommendation regarding the specific organizational reviews.

As I've mentioned, [inaudible] the members mention that [45%] of the structures mentioned that the reviews were effective, that means that the [54%] claim that they were not effective. And if the structures also mentioned that the reviews were effective, then that means that there is

a lack of consensus in the feedback, just like what was mentioned in other respective opinions of the survey.

So still, the options that are pending review from the ATRT3 is that the first option was to keep the current state of the specific and organizational reviews and [inaudible] they are more important with regard to the accountability mechanisms for the community in combination with the new oversight mechanism to manage the reviews. So this new oversight mechanism should at least be the responsibility of the new independent accountability office.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Daniel, wait a second. Sorry, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You need to say when you change slides because it has not followed them. I guess you are now two slides ahead of the presentation in the Zoom room.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Oh, sorry.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. Go ahead, Daniel. Sorry.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Can I proceed to option two?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, okay. Next slide, please. Yeah. Go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. Yeah. The second option regarding the pending recommendations from the ATRT3 is that we should at least maintain the current concept of the individual organizational reviews for each SO or AC. We should also [inaudible] conducting three- to five-day workshops that are focusing on SO and AC self-inspection in a context that's of continuous improvement. Also, further, to conduct every three years or more frequently, as determined by each SO or AC.

So these reports of these reviews then feed into a new holistic review. This will help, at least, to solve the timeline that it takes to be able to conduct these respective reviews. So still, the new holistic review will also focus on the improvements that have been made by the SOs and ACs as presented in the different respective organizational review reports which are conducted.

So instead of having at least five years before conducting the review, the ATRT3 is making a recommendation to at least conduct every seven years for a maximum of 12-18 months that allows for the implementation and maturing of the recommendations made by the individual organizational reviews and also the previous holistic review.

These are some of the issues that are pending. Still, allow me to continue to the next slide, still on option two. Here, we are looking at option two of the specific reviews [of which] the specific reviews, as mentioned earlier by Sébastien, where the accountability and transparency review, the SSR – that is the Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review ... And then, there's the competition, the CCT review, and then the RDS review.

So as the [accountability review as well as] relevant portions of the CCT and RDS will be combined into [at least] a single review, which will be conducted every seven years for a maximum duration of 12-18 months to allow the implementation and maturing of the previous recommendations.

So what [does this have to do?] Because [we discover that] according to the previous rules, ATRT3 is conducted after every five years. But this time, we shall have at least a more extended timeline to be able to look at this review. So joining this to the CCT and the ATRT3 at least provides a very good position whereby it looks at the [different review] as a holistic approach. It has at least [inaudible] which also contribute to saving costs of the review, and also to carry out [deep] analysis of what has been going on regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the previous review.

Just to highlight, also, what was mentioned earlier, after reviewing the ATRT2 recommendations, there are those recommendations that were not implemented. All others are still in the implementation phase. [So within the seven-year period, it at least would give time to be] able to carry out the proper assessment of the recommendations that have been implemented, probably looking into the issues that [inaudible]

mentioned regarding prioritization of the recommendations of different respective reviews.

I think that is the brief about the specific and organizational reviews that are pending recommendation. Let me give the floor back to Sébastien. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Daniel. Thank you very much. Well done. The last two slides are about public comment and we'll go quickly because time is [running on.] ATRT3 is suggesting that public comment not only seeks general input on the entire document but first of all to clearly identify who is the intended audience, just to be sure. Of course, everybody can comment, but if it's this type of audience or this type of audience, it will be better if it's written into the document. A clear list of questions, if it's possible, and the translation of a summary of the document to allow people less common with English at least to know the main topics of the document.

The last slide is accountability indicators. Mainly, ATRT3 suggests that ICANN staff make a communication effort to allow the committee to be aware about the accountability indicators – hopefully, a serious review of those accountability indicators to ensure that they are meeting the set objectives and provide data who are useful, up to date, and who can be useful to inform decision-making processes.

I guess it's the last slide. Thank you very much for listening. I am sure that all of us from the ATRT3 from At-Large will be happy to answer any questions.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Sébastien, can I add something on the accountability indicators?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, of course, Daniel. Go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah. Thank you very much, Sébastien, for giving me the opportunity to speak. One thing is that ICANN ... There's a website that has been published called "The Accountability Indicators." But also, in the survey, members are asked about their knowledge or awareness about the accountability indicators. I think approximately 60% were aware of the page, aware of these accountability indicators. It means that there's still a lot of work that has got to be done to make sure [inaudible] for the community [inaudible].

When we reviewed the page of the accountability indicators, we discovered that not all items regarding accountability and transparency are highlighted. But I think this is a work that is in progress, and at least it was put to the attention of the staff at ICANN Org. At least they have [inaudible] accountability and transparency can be ... At least they have it in the community and in the organization. That's why if you look at the suggestions that came in from the ATRT3 team that "ICANN should [inaudible] communications effort to make the community aware of these indicators," and then also a formal presentation of this at the various ICANN meetings.

It could be one ICANN meeting or various meetings. [inaudible] members that are kept apprised of the knowledge of what has been done to be able to enhance accountability and transparency within ICANN Org. And then also, the second one mainly was about coming up with the strong suggestion to take a serious review of the accountability indicators in order to meet the stated objective of each section and subsection.

There are at least six [new sections] in the accountability indicators. All of these are looked at in detail. The measure of accountability and transparency was also evaluated of the accountability indicators webpage. [Yeah, I think the data that is there is useful,] but it can be more and more useable, which helps in making appropriate decision-making within ICANN Org. Also, another challenge is keeping the data up to date takes a lot of work and so forth. Thank you very much. Back to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Go ahead, yes. Of course, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just that I'm very keen to get to the questions, and I see that at least Alberto has a hand up already. I just wanted to point out to those on this call that as you've heard from Sébastien, Vanda, and Daniel, it's we four who have been representing At-Large and ALAC in the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. I think we also need to be aware of and credit the fact that Vanda, Daniel, and Sébastien have also been the co-leads of three out of the four work streams that the ATRT3 has run with.

And I think that's also something that you all need to be cognizant of – and that some of you may be aware that I share overall administrative leadership with Pat Kane – that these three other members that you sent along to ATRT3 have been instrumental in the work that has been done throughout all of this, and the development, and the analysis. And the one work track they weren't leading was the community section. That's where we talk about public comments, communications, etc., etc., and all four of us have been active participants in it. I just want all of you to recognize the input that your members on the review team have had to date. Thanks for that, and thank you all.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Much appreciated. [inaudible] this work with us. Alberto, you have your hand raised. Then, I will go to some questions in the chat if we can try to answer them. But first, Alberto. Go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Sébastien. I read the ATRT draft report. I was willing to participate in this working group but, unfortunately, I have

some issues with my health. But what I noted down is that there's no difference between suggestions and recommendations. I think it's late because we have the final report but for any other working group I think the following: a suggestion, when you suggest something [inaudible] an item, it's just an insinuation. But a recommendation is a piece of advice.

I am saying we try the pros and cons in relation to that issue. The difference is a subtle one. Well, we'll talk about the effects. But if I "suggest" something, I cannot "demand" something afterward. But if I make a recommendation then I'm saying "this may happen," "this may not happen." There's a key difference in the advice I'm giving. On the other hand, when we talk about ...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I may respond to that?

ALBERTO SOTO: To implement when there are differences in reviews or evaluations, I think to myself, "What about the metrics?" If I think of mentors in a follow-up, in a monitoring, what about those mentors? Do they know about the metrics? Do they know about the topic for which they are going to make suggestions? In some cases, when we talk about prioritization, the word is "suggestion," but I think that these are recommendations and not suggestions. And it's not just a topic or an issue of words. I think that this may be very important in the very end. Thank you very much.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alberto. Please, Cheryl, go ahead if you would like to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sébastien. Thank you for the question, Alberto. I, Pat, and the others have gone over this, we had hoped, enough times to help the community in general understand but I'm happy to go over it again.

ATRT3 is unlike any review team before it so we cannot compare the language we are using to any of the other review teams, be they organizational or specific, because ATRT3 is the first and only review team to date to ever work under the new guidelines; the guidelines we adopted as draft good practices when we started our work. And when the board approved those, they became our operational guidelines. It is within those guidelines that a group of very specific metrics and criteria are necessary before any review team can make what's called a "recommendation."

And so, as we find ourselves in this transition point of language – and obviously the whole of the ICANN community will get used to this as we go forward – we needed to find a way to make, yes, basically, all of the sorts of things that were previously recommendations in other review teams clearly defined but still workable under the new rules.

As Sébastien mentioned and I also put in chat, what is important is that suggestions, as we are putting them forward, and strong suggestions, and capital-R "Recommendations" which meet all of the criteria including ongoing metrics and analysis requirements, as part of the new rules they are going to be treated, from the ATRT3 report, equally. So we're just in this transition of terminology/language use. Hopefully, that helps.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I guess the next one is Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Can you hear me?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. I thought I was muted but okay. Actually, my question works well with the response that Cheryl has just given here. It's interesting that we're all focusing on this. I also was quite surprised to see the differentiation – or the lack of differentiation – between “suggestions” and “recommendations.” And the concern that I have is whether suggestions are actually defined in any way in the ICANN context?

Doesn't this open the door to having suggestions where, although the group takes it on the same level as recommendations, being dropped altogether as we've seen that even some recommendations in the past appear to not have been implemented?

In particular, I was intrigued by the calling of “suggestions” regarding the non-implementation of ATRT2 recommendations. Isn't there a mandate for ATRT3 to review the implementation of the ATRT3 recommendations? And in which case, shouldn't these suggestions actually be recommendations in the strongest sense of the word? It is

particularly important for recommendations from a previous team to actually be implemented and not just be dropped. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Again, I'm happy to respond if you like. Thank you. Olivier, we hear what you're saying. Certainly, regarding the recommendations made previously by other review teams, many of these were overtaken by other activities that met the needs. But because we took a very strict view on whether things were implemented on that – and that is, "Were they implemented under the way had recommended them?" – and if the answer there was "no," then that's what we reported. If they were wishy-washy, fluffy recommendations, we haven't made those into capital-R "Recommendations." We've made them into strong suggestions or suggestions.

We actually don't need to re-authorize previous recommendations. For example, they are not accepted and being implemented under the Work Stream 2 program. So any of those that were caught up in that Work Stream 2 work were, in our report, not implemented. But they are being implemented in the other work practices. So that's where some of those differences occur. In terms of our use of "suggestions," remember that all future review teams will be working under the new rules and their recommendations will be limited in number, quality, and quantity by very strict guidelines as to what our recommendation actually is. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Marita, please.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. Thank you, Cheryl, for that great explanation. Yeah. I was really pretty confused about “suggestion” and “recommendation” taking the same level. The way I see the word “suggestion” is that it’s kind of a wishy-washy word and I would have suggested a stronger word – pre-recommendation, maybe. But be that as it may, I’m just a bit concerned that waves of people will be confused by that particular word, using the word “suggestion” to mean something much stronger than a suggestion.

That was not why I put up my hand. I wanted to ask you to go back to the comment slide and maybe run through it again because I didn’t catch it. If we could just run through the highlights of that comment slide one more time, would that be okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Sébastien, could you take this? Because I actually have to join our ATRT3 leadership call.

MARITA MOLL: Oh, right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [But I’ll do my best as I can in your absence, people].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Yeah, we can’t [take that into] [inaudible] each other but I’m sure you will do great. Thank you very much, Cheryl.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Me too.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Go, go.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you. Allow me to drop the call now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Daniel. Thank you, Cheryl. Okay. Public comments. ATRT3 recognize that a number of individual responses to its survey do not represent a statistically significant sample. It's a situation. When you compare it with the number of organizations with the global number of organizations, a good rate here ... The participation of the individual was not so important but enough to give us some good feedback. We think that to announce and have more participants responding, it will be better to allow respondents to only respond to survey-type questions. It could really open the door ... Sorry. If it's just like that, it could open the door to abuse on the [tribute governance] report.

But in the same time, individual official results were [inaudible] [English would] 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. A key element to comment on may be difficult to identify without reading [inaudible]. It's why we suggest four points.

Clearly identify who the intended audience is. The second is a clear list of precise questions in plain language. The third one is that the answers to those questions must be included in the staff report. And the fourth point is that, where appropriate and feasible, translation of the summary and of those questions would be included in the public comment proceeding, and will allow people to answer in their own language. It's to take into account the six official ICANN languages. Marita, is it clear or not? Just ask a question and I will try to answer it. Thank you. Go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, Sébastien. It's clear enough, thank you. I guess all of these things are not happening right now? Hello. Something's in the background. I guess all of these things are not happening now, the things that you are suggesting? That is not what's happening, is that correct?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

It's not happening in a general sense. Sometimes you have a question raised to request comments, sometimes not. It's not done generally. It's done sometimes for some questions or some comment periods. Yeah.

MARITA MOLL:

Okay. Thank you very much.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Marita, it's Cheryl, here. Just have a look in the chat as well. I'm typing at the same time, as well.

MARITA MOLL: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, Vanda, and I will cover all of the questions.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Olivier, I guess you are the next one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. I'm still troubled with this whole thing about suggestions and recommendations. I apologize for that. The question I have then is this is, with the tightening of the definition of recommendations on the operating standards for specific reviews, is this likely to enhance the effectiveness and the depth with which reviews are undertaken or is it likely to hinder the reviews? Clearly, there is a confusion here, I think, that could be pushed by the difference between suggestions and recommendations.

But my question is really whether ... I just wonder, what was the thinking behind it to have suggestions to tighten the operating standards for specific reviews? Because my concern is that by tightening rules too much, you end up not giving the free hand for a review process to actually point out things which go wrong. And sometimes it is a strategy. It is a

way to just being able to say, "We'll optimize this to be able to tick the box more easily," but that doesn't mean it makes the organization any better. And that's the concern I have. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I will try ... Okay, Cheryl, if you are ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just grab this quickly and then follow up? I just want to grab that one quickly and follow it up. Two things, Olivier. No, in my view – although here are other views, obviously – it enhances the future, not disadvantages it. It is very specific about the people who are making the recommendations clearly articulating the problem statements, the intentions of the group as to how they see those problems being [led] by implementation, some specifics on implementation, measurable communication, and metrics on follow-up for success. It is, in fact, an enhancement tool. I will remind everybody that these rules themselves were subject to no less than three public comments and I believe this group did comment on them in the affirmative.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I think we also say the situation when you have too many recommendations or suggestions and at the end of the day, there is a question of prioritization, which becomes more and more important. Therefore, we thought that it was a good way to go to have less recommendation and suggestion and to concentrate on some of the

issues that we can say in-depth where and how we want to go with what we call "recommendations."

But once again, those definitions of words are, "Which recommendation will stay a recommendation or will be a recommendation are suggestions [stronger]." And that strong suggestion will come definitely at the end of the work, even if today we mark some of the items with "recommendation" or "suggestion." Next is Abdulkarim, please.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. Thank you for the wonderful presentation and giving me the opportunity. Please, can we go back to the slide on prioritization? I think it is the first one on prioritization or the second one.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's page 13 for the prioritization issue and 14 and 15 for the ...

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yeah, I think it was where it was saying something about membership or who can participate in the reviews. One of the clauses was saying that the person who was going to participate in the review must have significant knowledge about ICANN and must have participated in a previous major process. Yes, this one. I'm thinking about the fact that I agree that committee members participating in this process must have significant experience in ICANN. But "actively participated in a major process in ICANN," I think this is a bit ambiguous.

And again, it's also giving room for having this cycle. I think what can happen here is probably the clause should say something like, "Most of the members should have some certain experience." But if it is all members, I think what we are creating or what we're going to have is just a process whereby we're just recycling the same sets of people doing the reviews. And that is where I think there might be some issues with this because it gives room for recycling. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah. Thank you, Abdulkarim. I get that you wanted to comment here. I will be more comfortable to explain where we are but your point is totally untenable and there will be ... Great, in the comments, "We are not yet there." There is a discussion on that for us and your input will be taken into account, definitely, if you made it to the team. Thank you. The next one is Chokri, please.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE:

Okay, thank you. Thank you, Sébastien. I have some comments about the public comment issue. I think that the major problem with the current public comment process is that the community didn't have the ... I'm not sure, but all of that proposal would be particularly [strong] by the public comment process. And by the limited action of the community at some specific key question or key issue, it would limit more and more the action, the activity, and the proposal of the community members within the public comment process. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Chokri. It's a useful comment and we hope that you will be able to put it in writing in the comments. Yes? Please, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, if I may? Just because this is an issue that goes right back to – and thank you for your question, by the way. Sorry. They're asking me a question in the other one. Can you just ...?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. We will ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, I'm back. It's okay. I only needed a single little ... It is already a requirement that all public comments received are taken into account. That was something that came out of the previous review team one, and review team two reconfirmed that. What is not happening and what is not clear, and what is something that we're trying to fix, is that there is no uniformity, no clear understanding, and no normal behavior of working groups as to how they are taken into account and how that is reported back to the community and the public commenters.

So you have some comments that are received by a working group, they process them in some way, shape, or form in their own internal notes and records, and they show how they've done that. But it is not public, obvious, and transparent as to how it is. In other groups, it is done in a very public context. It's done over many, many months and everybody is

very clear on how everybody's comments are being taken into account. We're just trying to make a method where all of the comments are met by expectations so that when you put in a comment you know how they're going to be treated. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Laurin, please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hello, everyone. Thank you. I have seen specific questions. If people have been reading what I've been writing in the chat, they will know where I'm going. On page 15 of the draft, it says, "SSR could either be a three to five-day workshop or a more traditional review period depending on the topic." These are the basics of what I'll be talking about but I think it's applicable to if we have a review, as well. It's just a point of information.

I am going to see SSR2 vice-chairs. I am slightly perplexed by this and I'm not sure how this would work, particularly for SSR where I have the most insight. Just to give you an example, it took sometimes six to eight months for us to receive information from ICANN Org. I am not quite clear how this could be condensed into five or seven days, without significant changes. And even then, I would wonder how this is possible.

And my key issue with all of this – and I hope that the people who are on the team can comment on this – is that reducing the amount of time spent on the reviews, etc., etc., will take away accountability and will take away options to really hold people accountable and to really do research. I also take from this that you would – you as in the team, not you

personally – would want to maybe limit the topics? I'm also not sure how this would be done. What would the process be here to limit the topic down to something? Essentially, who decides what will be investigated? Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, [Laurin]. All of those are good questions. We will be happy to have your comments again. One thing I can say is that there were discussions about, what is the level of timing from the volunteers to be taken to account during the review? And we even heard that it will be better to give that to outsiders of ICANN. We [balanced] that with difficulty of the organizational review to be done by outside so-called "experts." We don't want to apply bad rules in a new area where it's not the best way to go. It's why we suggest this short [inaudible]. It was not just our idea of ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At least we could get started.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And the situation is that we need to take into account ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everybody. And we'll get that recording over to you. Don't worry about that. Jennifer, just ask ...

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, you are on both calls talking to ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. I also wanted to respond to [Laurin].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Laurin], a couple of things. One of the things that we believe has been a huge problem was that delay that you outlined, the eight months, I think you said it was, that it took to get materials, etc. One of the advantages of having a very short and concentrated set of expectations in this three to five-day or five-day session where you've got the close focus is that all of that preparatory material has to be ready.

Somebody is now dialing me. Go away, whoever you are! My apologies. In the background, I can't do anything with it, it's another phone. Restructuring of this in terms of how one would be looking at highly-focused and highly-specialized areas in what we believe – and also what the SSR2 representative within our group said – would actually be a way of ensuring greater preparedness and less problems such as SSR2 has. Okay? Sorry, I've just got to go and ...

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sure, sure. [Laurin], your question is a good question, how it will be determined. It's something where your inputs will be welcomed by

ICANN. [But it's the first of all answer] as SSAC could be one body to help. SSAC also [inaudible] [good server]. It could be any other group if they think that they are something linked with security and stability. But that's something that we need to get more in-depth into and it's why we need your inputs.

When I say "your," [Laurin], the inputs of all will be welcome on that issue. Alberto, you are next, and then Alan. I would like to close the queue here to be able to answer some of the questions on the chat, or try to answer them. And then, to give back the floor to Olivier and Jonathan for the next steps. Thank you. Alberto, please.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I'm running out of battery. It's kind of a blackout. In terms of suggestions and recommendations, in Spanish, there is a difference. But if there is a disagreement, as [inaudible] has said, if we say, "What are the pros and cons?" it's the same. And I may give an example: if I tell my wife, "I suggest you start close to the kitchen because dinner is almost ready," but I say, "I recommend you to stay there," it's quite different. Still, if the meal is then burnt and he says, "I already told you that there's no problem," there would be no problem. But in the case of the recommendation, it's much stronger than a suggestion. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, Alberto. You are right. But we need to find words. If you have a suggestion about wording, it would be great. But it's just too differentiate what is a mandatory way of analyzing an item and [inaudible] a recommendation where we don't go through all of those review

processes and we go to where we talk about a suggestion. Once again, the word can be changed but the difference is there. It's not the importance of the topic. Thank you, Alberto. Next is Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'll be quick. On the issue of suggestion versus recommendation, I'll just point out that there are times when you don't want to make a hard, firm, specific recommendation but you want to call attention to an issue. And perhaps it's a softer issue, perhaps it's not quite as urgent, and perhaps you don't quite have as much confidence in the recommended solution to it. I think the concept of a suggestion is a really good one because there are times when that is the right way to go.

In terms of delivery of end-products, both by the review team and by staff in terms of requesting things, I don't know what the right answer is. I know that in the review team that I ran we got staff responses that we needed halfway through our final face-to-face meeting where we were trying to finalize everything. And that just wasn't acceptable. But if the results don't come in from staff, I don't quite know how you handle it. I think partly it's goodwill and partly it's a commitment all around, including staff, that these things cannot be delayed. They're not lower priority because the deadlines may not be written in stone in the bylaws.

I'm trying to remember what my other point was, now. Oh, yes. One of the things I had suggested and others suggested was that you try to explain to us areas where all of our four members are not all united in believing these recommendations or suggestions are the right way to go.

That is, in formulating our responses I think it's really important that our representatives identify where there is not unanimity and there are differences of opinion. When are we likely to do that? I think that's a crucial input into us before we formulate any response. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Alan. We may have a call or discussion on different topics but my preference will be to have somebody taking the pen and starting to write, and where we will be able to tell the different points of view on that issue. It will be easier than just to comment and to say, "Hey, we disagree on that and we agree on that." But we'll see what Olivier, Jonathan, and ALAC wants to do with us on that. It's an important point that we get involved in the answers to these comments and that we have just, now, three weeks to go. I have closed the queue but it seems that Christopher and Jonathan want to take the floor. Christopher, we have just ten minutes to go. Christopher, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Thank you, Sébastien. Very quickly. First of all, let us recall that this is all about the process and we haven't got to the substance. The substance is the important output of this process. Secondly, on the distinction between recommendations and suggestions, I don't mind what you call it but what I think is important is not to lose, in the process, important points of view, particularly as, in the ICANN context, there are participants who have such strong economic interests in the status quo that if they have the opportunity to block a recommendation by refusing to participate in a majority, you're going to need some sort of suggestion

option which keeps alive the – in some cases – very critical positions that the board and the supporting organizations should actually be able to take into account. Thank you. And Happy New Year to everybody, especially our colleagues and friends in Australia who are experiencing a dramatic crisis. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Christopher. Cheryl, you wanted to say something? Go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, just briefly. Thank you, Sébastien. Just briefly. Christopher, thank you for that. It is, in fact, a challenge, as you well know, particularly in the development of policy, to ensure that voices are heard and equitably considered. But we also worry – and the ATRT3 has been very aware and we've got the empirical evidence to show that it happened now, of course – that all good works can go on and even be accepted and still yet not get followed-through properly.

And so, part of the focus of our recommendations and suggestions regarding prioritization are intending to try and put some structure and function around the remediation for that. And one of the things would be to have readjustments in prioritization, as was suggested, and be subject to specific and required community review. In other words, that the small group or small team that were to decide on re-prioritization, recognizing that sometimes that has to happen [result management] changes, that that is agreed to, and that the influence of the wider ICANN community and its interests are taken into account when that is done.

And so, when you look into what we're going to be proposing regarding prioritization and that annual review on prioritization – which means that reporting out to the community as well as looking up the white spaces between all the bits of work that is going on and looking at the resources and resource allocations as to what needs to happen as well as what needs we are already committed to – is a very important ... In fact, it's a linchpin to what we'd like to see going forward. Thanks very much for that, Christopher.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. One point I wanted to add is that we spent a lot of time on the differences between recommendation and suggestion but I really suggest – or even we comment – that you go now into the meat of the report, not knowing if we will decide if it's a recommendation or a suggestion. In other words, we need your input on the content more than what is put as the headline for each of those points. It's very important that we spend time on that and that will be the next step, I hope. Please, Jonathan. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sébastien. And thanks again for your presentation. I echo what Christopher said. We really do need to dive into the substance of this. I think that the next step is to identify a very small group that are willing to go through this in detail and come back to us with the areas that seem most critical to us and what we think our positions on those things should be. I don't know whether or not, as Alan suggested, there's a difference

of opinion between our direct participants in the review team or if there's a consensus there. I think that would be worth bringing to the surface.

But ultimately, I think by next week we need a presentation on, "Here are the main recommendations or suggestions that matter most to the At-Large and the position we should take on them," make a final decision about those positions, and then get somebody to start drafting the prose around them.

Personally, I'd be most focused on the things that might be controversial inside the organization and also things that might affect ALAC's participation in the organization. I think those are things that we might need to hear from the team. I don't know the best way to get that presented to us but that's how we get down to brass tacks. It's just a presentation as a subset of this on what positions we think we might want to take on them. I hear that Cheryl wants to say something so go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: After Sébastien. Please, go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I would like to. Yeah, definitely I will [leave the] floor to Cheryl for final words. I think all of your requests are good. I really think that the questions we put forward as a team are the more important ones. But of course, we can go to some other issue. It's why we presented the question about the comment period and the question about ... The

review and the prioritization are the two main issues for us. I guess when I say "for us," it's for ATRT3 but also for At-Large.

We tried to be innovative in the proposal we made. Of course, it's always difficult to see when you go from one point where we would like to go, and the discussion about how we present something is also one of the questions. I have slides with a presentation of option two with a calendar. That shows different things. For the moment, it's not yet the time to show that but if you are interested I can do that as one of the next calls. Please, take into account the fact that we tried not to be too [smooth] and tried to push something.

Maybe we'll not go up to that but go into discussion. And, with the comments, we will find some middle ground or the best place to be. But when we suggest putting SSR and the LDS into the umbrella of the new accountability and transparency, it's why it was, for example, not to have them totally disappear at a global level. But we think that LDS is now, hopefully, well taken into account in DNS and with the participation of others like the At-Large.

For CCT, we think that the next round, if any next rounds come, need to be done. It's only after that that we think that there will not be a need for CCT after the third round in this new area. Or the next round, or whatever. But it must be taken into account in what we call "the new accountability and transparency group." I am already over the time and I will give the floor to Cheryl for the last words from our side. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much, Sébastien. Thank you, Jonathan. A couple of very brief points. Vanda and Daniel reflected some of the issues that had been raised in today's call and some of the requirements – that our viewing public still need despite us having had them in all our presentations since we began our work at the beginning of the year – still need to be clear on the definitions and what we mean and what we're limited by in terms of terminology of recommendations and suggestions. You will see that reflected in the PowerPoint presentations that are going to be used in our public webinars which I've put into the chat, now.

The ATRT3 webinars, two times, are running on January 13th at 20:00 UTC and January 14th at 12:00 UTC. We hope that as many of you as possible can also join that and put your questions and interact with us again in those calls. That's the whole of the ATRT3, not just your representatives.

Please don't get too hung up on this boogeyman comment on lack of contiguous and full consensus between your representatives. For example, I think all of us are now as one with our probable preference for recommendation two, under the choices for ongoing reviews. But that was something that took a lot of work to get at least one of us in line with the other three of us. We're doing our own work as well on moving forward and what Sébastien has presented in this work is a reflection from all of us. Where we do have differences is between us and some members of the wider review team.

And so we need your public comments to reinforce our opinions, if they reflect your comments, of course, where we still have some people who, for example, would put all reviews out to a paid third party like KPMG.

That's the extreme, I admit, but we still have to argue against that opinion.

With that, I look forward to future work on all of this. And also, if you wouldn't mind, Evin, is it possible for you to get the transcript and recording of this meeting over to Jennifer as a matter of urgency? Because the leadership want to look at and analyze all of the questions and end our call in completion so that we can take everything that has been said in today's CPWG meeting into account as part of our public comment. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Cheryl. That's all very illuminating. I think that it's a perfect example of something that we need to focus on if there is disagreement with the rest of the ATRT or with the community as a whole and that we should focus on the substance of that recommendation two about how the review should be handled, etc. I'd really like to get a couple of volunteers. That would hopefully include at least one of the members of the review team to take on as a task for next week to identify the primary areas that we should focus on and what positions we should take on them and have that conversation specifically so that we can get consensus on the positions we're trying to take.

We need a consensus-building call that works on a finite number of points and suggests the positions that we need to take and how we can add to the debate. We're running out of time on this call but we need to know what people are willing to volunteer part of that presentation and to help

lead that consensus-building call next week on this topic because of how we need to proceed. [cross talk]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sorry. At the risk of just not having death by PowerPoint again, could we not just take the slides that focus on the two areas that Sébastien has already highlighted in his response to an earlier question, the reviews and prioritization, and at least start building consensus or otherwise on our reaction to those? That's a subset of, what? Six slides? Pull them out of this and all four of us will be happy to work with everybody using those as foundational material to discuss. Will that work in a 20-minute/30-minute session?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That works perfectly, Cheryl. That's the kind of thing I'm talking about, it's drilling into this. What are the arguments being made by the other side? What is the nature of the controversy? That's the kind of thing that we need to address so that we can address it in our comments. Let's build consensus around a couple of things – I'm fine with that, for sure – and start with that subset. We just need to spend the majority of our time discussing our position at this point because hopefully, by then, we will have listened to a lot of overviews of what the recommendations are. But for us to be helpful, we need to find where our voice is most valuable. Thank you. Sébastien, do you have something else?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will do the two slideshows, one for each question, which was with slides. With that, you can take it into account and do whatever you want to. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thank you very much, Sébastien. I'm not going to follow the chat on this. Please reach out to staff. CC me, if you like, if you're willing to be a volunteer. We'll get a subset of folks going on drafting something once we have consensus on the areas we want to comment on and the positions we want to take. Thanks, everyone, for being on the call. I'm sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This presentation, this discussion, is not planned for our call later this week. Or is it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Our call later this week, on Wednesday?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I would have thought that the week after would have been better, after the webinars.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I think after the webinars is better. I mean, obviously, we start getting tight. But if we can reach some consensus and we really focus on substantive consensus then I think we can get something written fairly quickly. After the webinars is fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks [inaudible] [double-check].

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Back to you to close out the call, Olivier. Thanks, everyone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. [Thanks to everyone on this call]. Thank you to the [interpreters] for [staying] an extra ten minutes. We've got a call on Wednesday on [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Your sound is really bad, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can't do anything about it, sorry. We have a call on Wednesday [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: We seem to have lost him almost entirely.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No, I'm here. I'm still here. I've asked what time is the call on Wednesday?

JONATHAN ZUCK: He's asking what time the call is on Wednesday. Can someone from staff respond to that?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello. It looks like it's scheduled for Wednesday at 13:00 UTC.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, perfect.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, everyone. 13:00 UTC on Wednesday. We'll no doubt be able to discuss this briefly following up on the next steps. Thanks to everyone and thanks to all of our team who have been on the ATRT3 and who have been [inaudible] and really taking us through so much of this and answering any questions. Further questions? Just do it on the mailing

list. No doubt, they'll be able to answer further questions. Now, let's get this thing rolling for the next meeting. Thanks, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or [night] wherever you are in the world, and have a happy new year, as well. Take care and bye for now.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Thank you all for joining. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day or evening. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]