
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. I would like to welcome you to the ATRT3 Plenary #49 on the 26th of February 2020 at 11:00 UTC.

Members attending the call include Pat, Sébastien, Daniel, Jaap, Vanda, and León.

Observers include Avri, Herb, Sophie, Hunyu, and Mr. Bachar Bong.

Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie is on the call. We do have apologies from KC, Wolfgang, Osvaldo, and Jacques.

Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking, and Pat, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Brenda. Good morning, everyone, or good afternoon, good evening, and again, welcome to Plenary #49. We've gone through our roll call. Let's go ahead, does anybody have any SOI updates? Hearing none, seeing nothing in the participant window or in the group chat, we'll go ahead and move on. I do want to mention, I didn't see it yesterday, Osvaldo is welcoming into the world this morning a grandchild, and so good, positive thoughts for his daughter this morning as she goes through a C-section apparently.

Let's move on to action items, new and closed. Jennifer, please.

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.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Pat. One action item closed from – I was going to say last week’s call, but a couple days ago we asked to cancel the ATRT3 engagement session in ICANN 67. That has been done, so the session has been canceled. Thank you. No other action items to report.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Jennifer. On that topic, since it’s the next item, I have not received any updates from either Larisa or Theresa on face-to-face meeting per our requests, and I think that’s going out for a planning standpoint. Is there anything that staff can share at this point in time? Jennifer, I guess that would be up to you if you’ve heard anything.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Pat. I've not heard anything, and we'll certainly follow up. And I'm sure if Theresa or Larisa had any more information, they would have shared it. But we'll definitely follow up and hopefully get some news soon.

PAT KANE: Alright, so I will go ahead and ping them as well right after this meeting. Bernie, your hand is raised.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. I was speaking with Theresa last night, and they are working on it, but there is no news.

PAT KANE: Alright. For me at least, Bernie, you were coming in not really clear. Can you repeat that, please?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, sorry. I spoke with Theresa last night and she confirmed they were working on trying to arrange this, but has not finished that yet as it's proving difficult right now with all that's going on for ICANN 67.

PAT KANE: Did she give you any date that we could look forward to or expect some kind of information from her?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: She did not.

PAT KANE: Okay. Thank you. So more to come on the face-to-face as it rolls in. Since we've not heard anything, we're still open. Alright, so let's move on then to the recommendation text and take a look at getting to the final portion of the text. Bernie, I think this is going to be mostly your show here today, so if we could go to the accountability indicators, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Actually, I'm going to propose a minor change to our agenda. I'd like to do the report layout first as I think that's going to be the easiest one and will allow everyone to ease into our meeting, and then we'll do our recommendations if that's okay with you.

PAT KANE: That is okay with me. Any objections from the review team? Vanda says okay. I see nothing in the participant window. Okay, Bernie, go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Brenda, if we could bring up that document, please. Excellent. Alright. Actually, we'll back up to section two. You'll remember after Brussels that we were talking about a much shorter document, so basically, everything that was ATRT2 discussion and analysis conclusions and suggestions is now going to be in an annex. Similarly for the survey and the accountability indicators. So we've tried to pack everything into annexes so we keep the report down.

I've been playing with it in the next three sections to give you a flavor of that. So for the GAC, issue two – and I know Sébastien will be pleased – I'm trying to line it up so the issue numbers and the report numbers match up. Yes, finally we're getting there.

So as it was in the draft report, we've got the prolog sort of explaining that the GAC is a slightly different beast. And then the other ones, it's the same text that was in there originally. Can we go down to the next section, please, Brenda?

So in the introduction, that's the same thing, and this is where it starts getting different in 2.3. So you'll notice that now we have a new section title, information assessed. So 2.3.1, ATRT3 assessment of ICANN Org's implementation of ATRT2 recommendation, see Annex A Recommendation 6.1(a) to (h) and 6.2 to 6.9. So basically, we're not going through the details here.

2.3.2, ATRT3 survey results, see Annex B, survey questions 15 to 18. Analysis of information, very compressed. ATRT3 assessed that most of the ATRT2 recommendations had been implemented and were effective but does make a few suggestions with respect to these, see Annex A Recommendation 6.1(d), 6.1(h) and 6.6. With respect to the ATRT3 survey responses, ATRT3 also makes a few suggestions, see Annex B Sections 15, 17 and 18.

Recommendation, suggestions and observations. Recommendations, none. Suggestions and observations, please see relevant sections in annexes A and B. So that's actually the entire GAC section as it would look in our final report. I'll pause here for a second, see if there are questions or comments. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just a question; do we have the possibility to look at this document in Google Drive, or just when ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: What we're looking at is the document as it is in Google Drive. I'll post the link, or Brenda will post the link, in the chat.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, because there are two posted the same day, one by Jennifer and one by you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. This is a very early draft just to give you an idea, so I don't know if I would spend a lot of time commenting. But if you want to comment, just sections 2, 3 and 4 only, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, it was more to know where I can read in a bigger screen than this one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Very good.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And I see that Jennifer has posted the link. Thank you very much, Jennifer. Alright, any other questions or comments?

PAT KANE: So Bernie, just to be clear, only make comments on sections 2, 3 and 4 because of where you are on that right now?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That is correct.

PAT KANE: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, let's go to section 3 where we have a recommendation, so it's going to show what that can look like. It's also a slightly heavier section. 3.1, the introduction, same as usual. 3.2, ATRT3 assessment of ICANN Org's implementation of ATRT2 recommendations, see Annex A Recommendation 6.1(d), 6.1(h) and 6.6. ATRT3 survey results, see Annex B, survey questions 19 to 27.

Other information. In these where we've had other presentations or documents that we've looked at in detail, this is where they're going to be listed. You'll note that each of those has a footnote giving the reference. So under other information, we have public comments versus other public input methods. That would be Annex C because it's a bit long. Presentation by public comment support team to ATRT3, we've got a copy of their slides. Public comment trends report, 2010 to 2018, and improvements to public comment posting.

Under the analysis section, 3.3.1, ATRT3 assessed that most of the ATRT2 recommendations had been implemented but does make a suggestion with respect to one, see Annex A Recommendation 8. With respect to ATRT3 survey responses, ATRT3 makes a recommendation. Public comments versus other public input methods. ATRT3 – so this is

the same text that we had in our report that sort of explains our issues. I'm not going to read through the whole thing. we had accepted that as acceptable text. Let's go down a bit, please.

And then in 3.4, we have our full recommendations. So as we approved it at our Monday meeting, it's the same recommendation to maximize input from public comment, bla bla. Let's go down, that's the same recommendation, "additionally with regards to other types of inputs," same recommendation.

And then we have our requirements checklist. I was debating if this was the right place to actually put in the checklist. I haven't finished making up my mind. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just one question to be sure that I get everything here. When you start at the beginning, you were talking about ATRT2, and in 3.2.1. That's the same reference at 2. Something for ATRT2. But later, you are talking again about ATRT2, and it's a different place.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I might have copy pasted that wrong. Sorry, it was late last night. But I'll double check that. I'll refer to the right ones. Good catch.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, and my second point, it's maybe for the ease of reading and people who forget what they were reading three lines before. It's adding something like – because in 3.3.1 you say ATRT3 assess that

most of the ATRT2 recommendations have been implemented, as it's maybe the first time we read that, it's contradictory with what we say in general. Is it here just [in link with] public input? And if it's so, it may be useful for easier reading to add that regarding public input.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm not following you on that one, sorry.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I will try again.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's very early for me. Sorry. Yeah, I may not be up to speed.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. No worries. Globally speaking, ATRT2, we don't say that recommendation has been implemented, most of the ATRT2 recommendation has been implemented.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. No, I understand. Okay, so something along the lines, although a significant number of ATRT2 recommendations have not been completed, for this case, if you look at –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, my question was, is it you are referring to all the ATRT2 recommendation, or you are here referring only –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, just the public input ATRT2 recommendation.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's why I suggest that you add –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, I get it now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: – at the end, implemented regarding public input. Like that, we know that we're talking just about those ones here. And I know that you can read the title of the section. We are. But it's easier for a reader. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, I understand now. Thank you. Alright, anybody else while we're taking a break here? Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Regarding what Sébastien said, I believe that in GAC, in the GAC section, should be written something like that, because we are not doing any recommendations, so in the recommendation line, we should say most of the recommendation for GAC was implemented or in process to be implemented, or something like that just to complete the mind of the people that are reading at that time. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright. Thank you, Vanda. I'll note that and have a look at that when I review that. Okay, two great comments. Anybody else? Going once, going twice. Done. Alright, so let's continue on. Let's go to the bottom of this section, Brenda, please.

3.4.2, suggestions and observations, please see relevant sections in Annex A and [D] and we described in section 3.3 exactly where in both of those annexes we had suggestions. And then four, since I felt like doing it last night since that's a short one, the introduction is standard, information assessed, relevant ATRT2 recommendations and analysis. There were no ATRT2 recommendations related to this. ATRT3 survey results, summary of results, see Annex B questions 28 and 29. Other information, none. Analysis of information and identification of issues. As the analysis of the survey responses clearly indicate, there's widespread support for decisions made by the board. As such, ATRT3 will not be making any recommendations or suggestions with respect to this issue. Recommendations and suggestions, observations, none and none.

So that's the basic layout I'm proposing. As you see, Section 4 is actually half a page, and so we keep it compact. If people want more details, they're given the exact pointers in the various annexes where they can go look for things. Would that approach be okay for everyone?

Okay, I have a thumbs up from Pat so I'll take it that we're okay with this approach.

PAT KANE:

We also had an okay from León and Sébastien, and Daniel and Vanda.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yeah, I just saw those pop up on my chat. Excellent. Thank you very much. Just a note, the section 13 of Michael's questions for the SOs and ACs and the results, since this was not really in our scope but is interesting, I'll just have a note and that'll be one of its own annexes where people can have a look at it, unless there are some objections to that. Not seeing anything. Alright.

Okay, thank you very much. So that will be our format and what I will be spending my waking hours on over the next week or so. Brenda, can we go back to the scratch pad, please, and have a look at our recommendations? You are so efficient. Thank you. Let me grab a glass of water here.

So public input, we finalized on Monday. There hasn't been any changes. Let's go to the next one, please. Alright. Accountability indicators. There were a few comments. We made the changes. We finalized it. I did not see any additional comments or queries, so I will ask for any right now. I'm not going to read the whole thing. I think you people have seen it, you know where it is. Any last calls on accountability indicators?

I should note while you're considering that, I finished the report. I'll be posting that to the Google Drive in the next few days so you can have a look at it, and I've basically gone through all of the accountability indicators with the criteria that are set here and evaluated them.

Alright. Nothing on accountability indicators, so we'll consider that text final. Let's move on to the next one, please, Brenda.

ATT2 recommendations, there were a few minor comments on those things. They were integrated. I have not seen any additional input. Let's give it a call; any final input on the ATRT2 recommendation? Going once. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Just one point, not really linked with ATRT2 but generally speaking, we will have to look when we will have all our recommendation, when they are supposed to be done. Because we talk about prioritization, we need also to take that into account, but we need to do that when we have all the elements for that. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yeah, that is Section 12 of our report. You're absolutely right. Thank you for that. Okay, so ATRT2 done. Thank you very much, everyone. Let's move on to prioritization. Similarly, we had a few comments that were integrated here. we closed it off Monday midnight UTC. I've not seen any additional comments. Let's open it up; are there any questions or comments at this point before we declare this one done? Going once, going twice. Okay, sold to the lady with the white dress.

So we've got four or five of our recommendations and we're heading into the one where we have a minor point of discussion. Sébastien proposed a few amendments. I think on specific reviews, we're rather close. RDS to be terminated, I think we agree. CCT reviews, basically

what was proposed. I don't have any issue. SSR reviews, given SSR2 will not be completed prior to ATRT3 completing ...

My only point of including that in the recommendation is that's a justification, and we usually do that in the checklist. It's not that I'm disagreeing with the point. So me and Sébastien can finish that, but I see his hand is up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Here my proposal was just to flip and to change where we talk about the ATRT to talk at the end. But what you put into brackets here was coming from your proposal, not mine. Really, there is nothing – I just reorganized by putting some dots.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, that's possible.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The text is the same from RDS, CCT and SSR. The only thing I had was to change to be able to come after [to] ATRT and not [inaudible] when we will terminate –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And to open the discussion about what I call an overarching responsibility for the future ATRT – that I suggest to change the name, but that’s the only thing here in this specific review I have changed. [inaudible] even the given SSR2 will not be completed [inaudible] –

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Well, then I apologize, Sébastien. Minor point, we’ll fix that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That’s okay. No worries.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright, let’s go down to the ATRT section. So we've got two things here. We've got ATRT review should evolve to take into account the following additions and modifications and become ATO1 RT, accountability, transparency and overarching 1 review team and shall start before the 5th of April 2025. [Should the review] of the reviews, including the one terminated – should review – okay, we’ll fix the wording – all preidentified documentation that is required. That was in there. Terms of reference to be established at the first meeting. The operating standards should be amended to allow for review teams to obtain professional services as opposed to subject matter experts, should they require such services.

So in the text I have proposed, [since] we were leaving ATRT reviews basically as is with these changes, the date of the 5th of April [2025] – I'm open. I understand that we didn't deal with that, so that may actually be a good thing if we’re keeping it every five years. But this

being said, maybe we should consider this in line with the systemic review that we're doing in the next one for the date is my only possible question, and whether we want to change the name or not. So I'll throw it open to the floor. We've got a proposal to change it to accountability, transparency and overarching review. Questions, comments? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, just to explain where I am coming from here. It's that I know it's embedded in ATRT2 currently that there is a need for the review of the current review, but I think either we have a long list of items to say if RDS is terminated, if there are any topics on this to be taken care, it must be discussed by ATRT. CCT, the same, and SSR, eventually the same. It's why I suggest that we completely embed it in the title. And I am not sure that "overarching" is the right word, written the right way and so on, but the idea is to give ATRT – or the ATO1 – responsibility to have this overview of the situation, and it's why I also add "including the one terminated," because the responsibility today of ATRT is to look at the current review. If we terminate some, they're not supposed to be taken into account. It's why I have added that. The date is just to say that it must be done before five years, but it could be more flexible than that. It was to put a suggestion here.

And regarding your question about systemic, if we do a systemic review in the next two years, next one will be in seven years, and therefore there will not have been clash before, I guess, 35 years before we have a clash with ATO and systemic review. I tried to check on that also.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I wasn't concerned about a clash, Sébastien. I was more concerned that the systemic review has had a chance to be completed, its recommendations accepted and implemented, before we actually get into an ATRT.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I think we can look at that, I think but that's okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Thank you, Sébastien. Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. I'm not certain what changing the name, ATO, buys us in terms of all of this, because there's already enough flexibility in the bylaws, it seems to me, that you can put enough of whatever we want done into AT. So if we need to modify what the requirements are and what specific requirements are that are added to an accountability/transparency review, I think going to an ATO is confusing from the standpoint of you lose the tie back to previous – even though it's evolving, I think you lose that tie back towards the next evolution. So I would suggest that we leave it as AT and not call it ATO.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Pat. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I do agree with Pat. It's a little confused to change names, and I do agree with you, Bernard, that the 5th of April is something that's not supposed to be here. We don't know if it's always [terminated] to set up a fixed date here. So for me, it's a little confusing. I will leave the same name and take out this date. And please pay attention on what Avri is writing in the chat, because she's asking for the note, and it's important to respond to her. But take out the date from here. I do agree, it's something more that we could not define this date without more explanation. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright. Thank you, Vanda. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah. I totally understand that you will wish us to keep the name. I wanted to change it because even ATRT3 is not at all ATRT as it was meant to be at the beginning. Therefore, it's one of the reasons I was suggesting we change. Not just because of the meaning – and of course, we can add what we want into ATRT, but it's more to not take with us all the history and the participation of chair of the board, chair of the GAC who is not anymore the truth. And we have already changed completely, from my point of view, what is ATRT. It's why I was thinking that a new name could be a good idea to not take on our shoulder, on the shoulder of the next one, all the history even if they take into account what it's done.

The date is here for one simple reason. We have discussed about when the next review must take place, and we have also discussed how long it

must take. During our discussion, one moment, it was the idea of having each seven years, and it's why I wanted to be clear that we talk about seven years for the systemic, but ATRT as we are redrafting it must be kept within the framework of the five years and not too much more. If not, we will be [unbalancing things.]

And I saw the question of Avri. I don't see where we have written that we don't want and we can't have for ATRT subject matter expert within or interview by or helping ATRT – or ATO, whatever name we finally got. Nothing written here that we may not take that into account. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sébastien. Pat.

PAT KANE: Sébastien, thank you very much. I understand exactly where you're coming from now when you start to describe the perception of ATRT3 versus the perception and the focus that a broader community had on the ATRT2 and ATRT1. I think that when you and I have talked about having a post-mortem at the end of all this after we've delivered our report, whatever documents or whatever recommendations we put into – I'll call it a will – to what would end up being ATRT4, one of the things that I think we should document is just that, and make certain that we share with the future ATRT those thoughts about making certain that we are – recognize regardless of what the composition of the team looks like and say that you need to make your own stand and make

certain that you are heard in the same context as ATRT2 and ATRT1 were. So thank you, Sébastien. I appreciate that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: This being said, Pat, are you okay with the proposed name change now, or are you still with Vanda that we should try and keep the same name?

PAT KANE: I'm with Vanda, we should try and keep the same name.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. I'm going to vote for that also for the following reason. We're changing a lot of things, and although I fully understand Sébastien's point of view, I think it will give security to people. Also, my other reason is the ATRT is a special review because some of our recommendations carry more weight than the recommendations of other reviews in many ways. So I would just think that we would want to cement that.

I will also make a note that we're a little light on attendance today, so we probably won't make decisions. I would imagine, Pat, that we're going to try to walk our way through as we usually do as a first reading and try to tackle it again and see how more people feel. Does that make sense to you, Pat?

PAT KANE: Absolutely, it does, Bernie. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright. Great. So unless there are further points on this one, right now, we'll keep that square bracketed text, and we will keep the date in square brackets. We will keep a thought on this and post that to the list, see if something comes up. But let's go at it again on our next call. Alright, that would close off specific reviews. We're almost there, so I'm not really overly concerned.

Organizational reviews. I think here, we're very close also. The only point that we have as a difference is Sébastien is proposing – as he did at the outset, and let's be clear, he's been very consistent on this – that – it's now a five-day, but it was a three- to five-day face-to-face retreat every three years.

My point for not including that when I wrote the initial version of the text was that after reading comments and seeing how this thing would evolve, I thought it was always understood though that that is a suggestion, but really, the SOs and the ACs get to decide. So I don't know if I'm presenting this properly, Sébastien, but I guess the point of discussion here is whether we mandate a three- to five-day face-to-face retreat every three years or whether we leave it as an optional point. Am I presenting that correctly? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

No problem you are presenting it, and that's good. My point is that if we don't have something who is common, it will take five years before we finally find something in common. Therefore, I prefer to have something proposed, and eventually, because we will not – I don't think it will be

written in the bylaw as a mandatory, I am sure that it could be flexible. But if we don't come with a suggestion to something who is common to all SO and AC – and I'm still insisting to add [X,] at least NomCom must be one of them in one day or another. But when I say that for example, the board is already having a retreat and they might decide to add one day and not five days in what they're doing to tackle this specific issue or do that in three – add one day in each of their retreat, or whatever.

But I think we need to be flexible in the implementation, but we need to be clear on the proposal, and I really feel that we need to put it as a commonality on what will be done. Because if not, the risk is that once again, it will take time to find something in common, and the second is that we may end up with something who will not be simple to do and acceptable by each and every SO and AC.

Once again, my suggestion is to put it as a requirement and to be flexible in the implementation. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright. Thank you, Sébastien. And my counterpoint to that is I think the thing that needs to be consistent across the SOs and the ACs in a continuous improvement program is the evaluation requirements. Whether they do it every three years in a five-day workshop or whether they do it annually as a review, but if they meet the requirements of reporting, I think that's the thing that's more important, and that's the discussion we're having here. Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I'm kind of with you there, because if you think that most of the ACs and SOs are actually consisting of volunteers, having a requirement to have a retreat every five – or five days, won't go well with all those volunteers that they're required to sit for five days. [Making the highest] requirement might be a problem for people to join. So more loose language would be preferred.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Thank you, Jaap. Any other thoughts or comments on this? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. May I make – I would say an alternative proposal or something written differently? But maybe Vanda first, because it's easier if you can make the comment before I comment on it myself. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Well, I do believe that you said another kind of sentence that is more clear showing that there is a flexibility, but whatever they do, they should do, and explain what they can do. But [just leave as, should support] as a common base between SOs and ACs is not really clear, and the additional point of Sébastien make it more demanded, and that's not the idea we have here. We want to give flexibility. But it's also not clear what the SOs and ACs should do. [If I'm external, I just ask for one

of my nieces here,] and she said, “What this guy should do.” Because “should” demands more clear what they “should.” If you give some flexibility and explain, for instance, or as a suggestion or something like this, it’s more clear what we are looking for, what they should do. When translate this to French, I believe, it’s not so clear what they should support. That’s my – okay, thank you. It’s just because it’s not ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Thank you, Vanda. Sébastien, you want to come in, or do you want to let Pat come in first?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Pat first, please. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Pat, yours.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sébastien, and thank you, Vanda. Vanda’s right. In terms of the flexibility, what we had been talking about and getting towards was setting a minimum frequency for these reviews to happen and then giving some flexibility as to how they happen. The idea was to try to drive towards a thought process and concept that delivered less required engagement time from the review team itself.

So Jaap, I understand that if we have five days, if we prescribe that, it is hard for people to dedicate an entire week to this process when we

know that even when we cover weekends, we have a tough time getting our whole team together for two or three days. So I understand that, but if it was a five-day period or even a three-day period, because this again is a recommendation, not a prescription at this point in time, that we're able to focus the review team on specific topics but give the flexibility to do this whenever the SO or the AC wanted – and this three years was a minimum review period. So I think that when Vanda's calling out the flexibility that we're trying to put in place, that's the key to this process here, with a minimum frequency of meeting. Thanks, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Alright. Thank you, Pat. Sébastien, back to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah. In hearing [Jaap] – and I don't know how to write it, but an idea will be that each SO and AC has, I will say, a possibility to use five days of face-to-face meeting. If they decide to do that in two days, three days or one day, four days or whatever, when they want, and if they lose it, they lose it. But one of the reasons that I would like very much that it's – we keep into a budget to be sure that it will be possible then.

Something around the same number of days, but flexible to how to organize it will be my suggestion. And I don't know how I can write that, but that's the idea. Thank you for your help.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, I think that's my job. So I think I understand what you're saying, Sébastien. And yes, these days in ICANN, budget is a very important point, as we know, given our prioritization recommendations. So why don't we say – I will take a crack at this. I think I understand what you're saying. And if I have questions, I'll get back to you directly and see if I can come up with something that we can look at in writing and then see if it makes sense for everyone. Does that make sense? I have a thumbs up from Sébastien. Would you be okay with that, Pat?

PAT KANE: Yes, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. So I think we've covered it, folks. I've got a bit of homework on this last recommendation. I think we're doing great, and hopefully, I'll get that writing. I see your hand, Sébastien. I'll be with you in a second. So I'll take it on as an action item to do some editing on this recommendation on reviews, and I will advise the list when I've got that done. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you, Bernie. Just one additional point a little bit further in the document, just to explain why I put nine months in front of your one year suggestion. The sentence was the initial version of this systemic review should be launched within one year of this recommendation being approved, and I put nine months.

The reason is that we will give the report the 5th of April. The 5th of October, or before, will be a decision, and it will be good to have the start in the summer of 2021. And it's why, just to not push everything three months more, will be one year at the end of all the review done and all the work done. It's why I was suggesting that we start at the beginning of fiscal year 22. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Thank you. I'll note that and I'll have a look at that when I'm working my way through this. Okay, Pat, I'm done so I'm going to hand it back to you. Sébastien, your hand is still up. Thank you. Pat, over to you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie, for that efficient review that we've gone through. Do we have any questions or [inaudible]? Please raise your hand. I'm also looking at the group chat. Sébastien, your hand's raised.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Sorry, Pat. Just to say that in the last few hours – and as you may have been sleeping or some of you may have been – I had some questions and remarks in the part of recommendation requirement checklist, and therefore, I think we need to finalize our recommendation and then we will go to this part, but just to let you know that I have had some comments there and more questions [that after I mention] here. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you so much, Sébastien. So not seeing any other hands or comments, do we have Any Other Business for today? Yes, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Pat. I just wanted to note that at this time, we have no plenary meeting on the calendar for the next week, Wednesday the 4th of March. So I just wanted to get some decision here if we want to have a call that day and at what time. If we're back on our regular rotation, it would be 2100 UTC.

PAT KANE: Yes, so Jennifer, thank you for bringing that up. I do believe, unless there are any objections, that we should return to our regular cadence since nobody will be traveling next week, at least not to the ICANN 67. [Maybe] go ahead and schedule a meeting on Wednesday and also conduct a leadership meeting this coming Monday. So normal cadence. I see a yes from Bernie and I seen o other objections: Vanda says yes, regular calls, I believe. Sébastien is affirmative. So yes, Jennifer, we will do that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you for the confirmation.

PAT KANE: Thank you. Alright, anything else on Any Other Business for today? We will let everyone know as soon as we hear something from Theresa or Larissa on a face-to-face in terms of where and when and what the

opportunity would be. I want to thank everyone for responding to their preferences in terms of location and dates. We'll try to accommodate as much of that as we possibly can, but of course, it's going to be sandwiched in-between what we receive as opportunities from staff.

So Jennifer, with that, I don't think we had any confirmed actions or decisions reached today other than the completion of the final text for the areas that we reviewed. Anything?

JENNIFER BRYCE: That's the only action I captured. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Very good. Thank you so much. And with that, I will declare the meeting closed, and positive wishes and thoughts for Osvaldo and his family today. And we'll see if we can locate Cheryl.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Okay. Bye. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bye, everyone.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]