**BRENDA BREWER:** 

Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the ATRT3 Plenary 48 on the 24<sup>th</sup> of February 2020 at 19:00 UTC. Members attending the call include Sebastien, Wolfgang, Jaap, Cheryl, Leon, Osvaldo, Daniel, Vanda, Pat, and Jacques. Observers joining are Sophie, Jim, and Herb. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda and technical writer Bernie is on the call.

Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record, and I'll turn the call over to Pat and Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Do you want this one, Pat? If you're talking, you're muted.

PAT KANE:

Oh. Sorry, Cheryl. I was muted. All right. Welcome, everybody, to our Monday meeting. If we could go through and have anybody with any updates to their statement of interest.

Okay. I see no hands and I see nothing in chat. So, thank you. Jennifer, if we could through our action items for review.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Pat. This is going to be very quick. You may recall on our last plenary we had no action items and decisions, so since this is our ... In place of our leadership call. I have nothing new [inaudible] to report.

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

PAT KANE:

Fantastic. Thank you. So, let's go to the next item about ICANN 67 Remote. So, we certainly are not going to be meeting next week in Cancun for a face-to-face on the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 6<sup>th</sup>. We had conversations at the end of last week with Leon and staff to try to figure out when we could meet. The team of course is looking at what they can do with ICANN 67, making it virtual. So, that is at the forefront of their priorities at this point in time and we expect to have something back from them sometime hopefully this week as to what we can and cannot do. Currently, we're taking a look at times. I can't remember what the dates were, but here in the States in Los Angeles or DC. I think, Cheryl, is it the 15<sup>th</sup> through 19<sup>th</sup> of March? Is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes, however many days within that range is our—

PAT KANE:

So, two to three days, hopefully within that range. So, we're expecting to get back some information from Theresa and Larisa's team as to what is possible and where we could be. Any questions about that or concerns? I'm happy to answer what we can or what we might know from the team. I see no hands in the participant window and nothing in the group chat. Yes, Sebastien, your hand is now raised.

**SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** 

Yes. Sorry. Just to tell you that as soon as we ... I know it's the same for everybody, but I just changed my passport, therefore I don't have any

document for the US. I need to redo everything [inaudible] so on and so forth and it could be in five minutes but it could also take a little time. Therefore, as soon as we know, I will do that. I need to know where we are going in US if we are going to US. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Yes. Thank you very much, Sebastien. I think that if we had our druthers, I think the Los Angeles office is probably better equipped than the DC office, at least from when I've been in. The DC office, I think the room that we would be in is very long and narrow, much like the Brussels office if I recall. The room that we were in last April in Los Angeles was more conducive to more interaction, I think. So, hopefully, Los Angeles is the place, but again, we don't know what the options are available to us yet. But as soon as we know, we will let the team know. So, thank you, Sebastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I would be assuming US anyway. So, if people need to refresh their US entry documentation, even if it is just the online one that Sebastien referred to, it could be quite quicker. I would do so.

PAT KANE:

That's absolutely correct, Cheryl. Thank you very much. But even if we were to eliminate other offices, Singapore is currently in an area where travel is being more and more restricted from. So, Singapore is out. I think Brussels was ... We were just there and that wasn't quite as

conducive, so I think it's going to be US only. So, either DC or Los Angeles. Yes, thank you very much for that. Any other questions?

All right. Let's move on to the next agenda item and that's to complete the review of the public input recommendation. So, Bernie.

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** 

Thank you, sir. Can you hear me?

PAT KANE:

Yes, we can.

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** 

All right. Let's go to our document on the web. I think we answered all the questions and integrated all the comments. Sebastien picked up a few tiny edits after we closed it. I made those changes. I'm not going to read the whole thing. I think people went through it and have a fairly good idea of what we were doing. I'll be happy to answer any questions. Otherwise, we can consider this one closed. I have Vanda saying, "It's done for me." Okay. Excellent. Not seeing any other questions. We're pretty close.

So, I think that one is done and we'll be closing the next three in the next couple of hours. Again, maybe since we've got some time, accountability indicators. We've got one comment from Sebastien and that's about it.

I completed the report on the accountability indicators. I'll be posting that fairly soon. ATRT2 recommendations currently sitting with no comments, so I think that's going to be closed off fairly easily.

Prioritization. Right now, no comments also. So, we should be good on those. Then we have the reviews where I think there's a discussion at least between myself and Sebastien about the need for a face-to-face and I think we're trying to work our way through that. That's about it, sir. So, back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. So, I think the only other item then we got on the

agenda, before we get to any other business—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat?

PAT KANE: I'm sorry, Cheryl. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. Sebastien's hand seems to still be up.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We have a hand.

PAT KANE:

Oh, I apologize. I missed that. Sebastien, please.

**SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** 

Yes. Thank you. If we can come back to the accountability indicator, I didn't want to enter into a discussion on the document for that. I would like to share with you why I was asking for possible raw data and you will decide if you want to add it or not. But my reasoning is the following, is that we may end up with having data on an Excel sheet [inaudible] and we don't get the initial [inaudible] why I think it's better to say it clearly that we want the data, but including the ones who are the base of all this work. It's knowing a little bit how it's working and sometimes we get an Excel sheet and we don't get the initial data. It's why I was asking that. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Yes, Bernie, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. I fully understand Sebastien's point of view. He is correct on one side of this thing. The other thing, though, is making this a requirement to have access to the raw data is I'm concerned that in certain cases there will be concerns about releasing the raw data for two things.

The first one will be that it's not a question of confidentiality, but rather that it will require additional work to get it into shape so that it can be released as raw data.

The second one is of course that some of the things may be in the raw data include confidentiality issues, which again may cause people to have to do work to scrub the data and may not be that useful once it's scrubbed.

So, I think if it's available and it's easy, I don't have a problem with it, which is why I had left it just as data. But I have a concern of absolutely requiring access to raw data, that it may be a deal killer. Back to you, Pat. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. Any other questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not so much a question as just pointing out that I think that the

language that Sebastien proposed in terms of the "where possible"

possibly gives enough wiggle room there. [inaudible] where possible.

PAT KANE: Sebastien, are you good with that?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. We'll put that in.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm okay. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. All right. So, we go back to the agenda, please. So, taking a look at establishing our agenda for Wednesday at 11:00 UTC. Bernie, which documents are we going to go through on Wednesday or which ones are going to finalize and put to bed?

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** 

We will do a quick closing of the three recommendations I mentioned earlier and I think our big thing will be finalizing the reviews recommendation. I should also have a skeleton for a new format with a couple of examples for the final report about how we slim that down so we can go over that and see if we're happy with that.

PAT KANE:

Excellent. Thank you, Bernie. So, we'll go through the welcome, roll call, any action items reviewed. We'll give an update if we have one on our follow-on face to face. Then we'll go through those sections for review with Bernie and then we'll do any other business and then close with [confirming] actions. Any other suggestions for the agenda? Sebastien?

**SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** 

Not so much about the agenda for next meeting but I have the impression that you are doing the meeting as if it was a leadership call, but we change it to a plenary call. Therefore, I know we can close the meeting. I have no problem with that, but we may also start some discussion on the last part of the document. But we can wait for next Wednesday it will be okay. But just to say that this one, we are already in a plenary. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

So, Sebastien, which section of the document are you referring to that you want to look at?

**SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:** 

The only part where we have discussion between Bernie and myself. It's about the review. I don't know. But we can say that people, if they have any comments, they will put them into the Google Doc or we discuss here. It's really up to you. We can wait for Wednesday and see where we are at that moment.

PAT KANE:

Yeah. Bernie, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I'm not sure everyone took the time, and since that's the major item, maybe it would be great to ask everyone to go over the Google Doc, especially the review section. I've left both the original text and the text that Sebastien is proposing. We're bracketing the things that are different between the two and highlighting them in yellow. Maybe the best thing is ask everyone to be really ready to have a good conversation on this on Wednesday and we will take the time to really clear it because we just don't have a truckload of stuff to do.

PAT KANE:

So, I think that's a good suggestion, Bernie. Anyone else? Yes or no? All right. So, we'll do it on Wednesday and we'll encourage people to take a look at that section and be prepared to discuss.

All right. We'll move on to any other business.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Pat, this is Jennifer. I'm struggling to raise my hand. I have a question, if I may.

PAT KANE:

Yes. Please go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you. I'm not sure if the review team wants to discuss this quite yet, but of course we have time blocked, two full days, on people's calendars, the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> of March for the face-to-face meeting which is obviously now remote. I wondered if it might be useful to discuss how, if at all, you wish to use that time.

PAT KANE:

I think that's a great suggestion to have that conversation. But I think that what we're trying to do primarily is to find other face-to-face time that we could replace that with to do what we originally intended to, but would we have anything to do at that point in time to go through documents or have conversations? Cheryl, I'd love to hear your suggestions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's a bit of a conundrum, actually, because we're not going to be as productive in the work we had planned for the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> without it being face to face. I am sure about the progress, the benefits, of utilizing that time other than perhaps another plenary, if we feel that that's worthwhile. But that's just my kneejerk reaction, particularly since it was specific—or specified, I should say—in the resolution of the Board when they cancelled the Cancun face to face and switched it to a virtual. But they will be working with our review teams that are meeting adjunct to the Cancun meeting to work out alternate arrangements.

And if we go on and talk about working on the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> [inaudible] minimal support we can get to do that at that time, I'm not sure that that would null and void in some people's eyes the requirement to work with us to find alternatives and I don't think that having that brought up as an argument would be very attractive. So, total kneejerk reaction there, Pat. Be cautious in what you wish for, people.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I totally agree with Cheryl.

PAT KANE: What?!

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, yes. Totally agree with Cheryl. I can repeat again if you wish. I totally agree with Cheryl. No problem. But I think it will not work. The only reason for us to meet sometime the 5<sup>th</sup> or the 6<sup>th</sup> it will be if we have something to present to plenary session or whatever type of session during the 7<sup>th</sup> through the 12<sup>th</sup> of March at the virtual ICANN 67 meeting.

If not, we don't need at all this time from my point of view. We can wait [inaudible] will have to wait after the meeting to have our face to face. Except if we have something to present to the virtual meeting, no need for anything on the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Bernie, please?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Completely agree with Cheryl and Sebastien. I would not that we probably can make that call better after our Wednesday meeting. We'll probably have a pretty good idea where we're sitting on a couple of things, and if we have to—we were supposed to make a presentation at a [comment] session during that physical meeting. Unclear if we're still on for that.

So, at worst, we can just add a regular type plenary, not a full-day meeting and get something done. Thank you.

PAT KANE: All right. So, we're going to keep it open as an option and we'll make a

determination on this Wednesday as to whether or not we think we

need it. Great.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but we can also use a Wednesday usual time, one of the two

times. The 4<sup>th</sup> of March like that would clear the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 6<sup>th</sup>.

PAT KANE: Yeah.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe a best way. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Yeah. That is correct. Thank you, Sebastien. All right So, anything else

we have from the room?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here for one moment just on that last-minute ... One of the

things I've put in chat just then was we are still unsure, as just about

everyone is—and the AC/SO chairs, I know they already met this

morning—as to what this virtual schedule is going to be looking like,

although people are working desperately on it. Regardless, whether or

not our "public meeting" would get [inaudible] that downsized virtual approach.

But there would be little value in us doing that wedged into the Monday or whenever it was going to be, in an already fraught virtual design, where we could get exactly the same interaction in a webinar at a time and date when people are less likely to be on their seventh hour virtual meeting or whatever, and trying to squeeze it into their normal work world as well.

So, we may find real benefit in stating to whomever is working out what does and doesn't make it to the schedule—certainly not us—that we could benefit from having a later but towards the end of the month webinar regarding our public-facing interaction on our final report. That could actually be an action item that we can get out of today's meeting. That's all. Thanks.

PAT KANE:

Okay. I think that's good, Cheryl. Thank you. Seeing no other hands in the participant window and seeing no other comments in the group chat, Jennifer, we can go through our action items that we've arrived upon today.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you, Pat. So, the action items are for Bernie to send the link to the Google Doc to the list for everyone to review once he's made the adjustments and then we are going to talk to the Meetings Team and let them know that the ATRT3 team would be happy to do a webinar

post ICANN 67 and see if we can get a new time slot or get removed

from the agenda.

Other than that, I didn't take any other action items, but do let me

know if I missed something. Thank you.

PAT KANE: That's all I captured. Thank you, Jennifer. All right. If we have nothing

else, we'll declare today closed.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

PAT KANE: Thanks, everyone.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Have a good evening, everybody.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Have a nice day, bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]