

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the ATRT3 plenary number 56 on the 1st of April 2020 at 21:00 UTC.

Members attending the call today include Cheryl, Vanda, Wolfgang, Pat, Sébastien, Demi, Jaap, Osvaldo. We have guests today: Susanna Bennett, Daniella Campos-Lopez, Linda Chin, Victoria Yang.

We have observers: Everton Rodrigues, Herb Waye, Jim Prendergast, Berry Cobb.

Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, Brenda, Larisa, technical writer Bernie Turcotte. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record. Cheryl and Pat, I'm happy to turn the call over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks so much for that, Brenda. And just before we dig into our first non-administration item, which of course is something we're all very much looking forward to, and that's our interaction with Susanna, Victoria and Daniella—so pleased to have Susanna and the team onboard today to take us through accountability indicators and open data. I know we're all very keen on going through that in particular—but let me just check first of all, does anyone have any statements of interest updates? Just to remind you, we work under a model of continuous disclosure for statements of interest and you need to report to the first available meeting after a change in your SOI regarding any of those details.

---

*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.*

---

Not seeing any, we'll then get on to the more exciting part, but just before we do, after today's session with Susanna and team, we'll be doing our usual admin of action items closed and new, we'll then dive into completing our review recommendation text section and we'll be putting the link into chat at the appropriate time then, and time permitting, we will be beginning our review of our final report document. And again, we'll be putting the link into chat at that stage.

We'll go to Any Other Business. If there is Any Other Business that anyone wishes to flag now, please do so in chat, and we'll do our usual wrapping up concerning action items and decisions reached.

Taking that then as read, Susanna, just before you dive into your presentation, might we ask, do you wish to take questions during or at the end?

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Hello everyone. Thank you very much, Cheryl. Thank you for having us. Cheryl, looking at this agenda, can you share with us how much time that you have allowed for this topic?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, certainly, we wouldn't have thought you'd have needed anything less than 20 or 30 minutes. So if you can keep it to that, great. If it goes on longer, we have enough flexibility because item five is an "if we have time" one. It's a two-hour call, so if you want to [press it to] 45, we can certainly live with that, but we would have thought 20 to 30 minutes should do the job. But let's see how we go.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Okay. Wonderful, Cheryl. Thank you so much for that. And with that, I think it'd be good for us to go through the presentation and answer any questions that the team may have. We also have a list of questions sent to us a few days ago that the team have provided us, so we'll go through those as well.

Thank you very much, Brenda, for bringing up the slides. Yes, let's go to the discussion topic. So maybe go to the next slide real quickly, and here's a list of questions that you provided, and thank you so much for these questions and thank you so much for the opportunity to have this time with all of you. And let's take a look at these questions real quick. The first two are relating to what is the plan and the rest of the questions are more related to open data platform, open data initiative. So [we were just] a bit differently, but we will go through all of these questions.

Let's go back to the last slide, please. Thank you. So first, wanted to emphasize what's the purpose of accountability indicators. Really, the purpose is to report the organization's progression towards achieving the five-year strategic plan, and the plan we are in currently is FY 16 to 20. That will end very soon and then the focus would be on the next five-year.

It's been a journey, certainly. We all realize that ICANN is quite unique. And to report the progress towards the plan, we learned quite a bit over the last few years, and we continue to try to improve and especially

now with the focus on applying the learning to development of the progress reporting towards a new five-year plan.

So to this purpose, over the last few years, several mechanisms have been leveraged, actually since 2015. First one is, if I recall, quarterly stakeholder calls that started in FY15 Q1 and it lasted until FY18 Q3. Then we switched over to a CEO report instead of doing all the calls and other means of communicating with the community, other means, for example, the regular CEO dialogs within the community groups and various blogs and engagement at ICANN meetings regarding the progress towards the strategic plan, and various updates.

Accountability indicators started in August 2015, and at the time, we called it key performance indicators, KPI dashboard, and we renamed it in August 2017 to accountability indicators for the purpose of better describing what these indicators really try to do.

As described earlier, the purpose is to report how we achieve the strategic plan and be accountable for the progress to achieve that. So I wanted to talk about some of the challenges we have seen and learned. A lot of it is very similar to what ATRT3 had identified, and we really appreciate all of the great work, documents put together, very good.

So I want to just name a few key ones. The very first one is we realize the current five-year strategic plan is not very clear on what are the metrics or what are the exact target outcomes. That makes it challenging for us to report against how we really achieve the plan.

The second thing is ICANN is quite a unique organization, we all realize. Some very hard metrics, very hard to apply to the work we do. for

---

---

example, the work on the reviews, the work relating to supporting the policy development of the organization. It's hard to easily put into charts and graphs, and as you identified in your report, I just want to quote a few things because it was very well said. It said it should explain in plain language how it is crucial to attaining its related operational plan objective, and second point you made there was, must indicate in plain language what is being measured as well as how and provide links to the data and talk about clear objectives, and also, again, explain in plain language how these objectives were set.

So that really points to we need narratives on top of charts and graphs, not just charts and graphs with a little blurb of caption on the bottom. It doesn't really tell a story. So that's the third thing we really agreed with you.

The fourth challenge we highlight here is, there's so many various sources of information to report the organization progress at different times and different format, and it's very difficult for anyone to really connect them together and see the entire picture. That's another key one we had identified, especially with the limited bandwidth of the community. Community members are stretched and it's hard for you to spend time to try to connect all these various progress reporting.

So these are the key challenges we identify and we very much agree with ATRT3's findings. Some of the improvements we've been learning and applying, I wanted to share a few with you. CEO report provides a narrative description. We know it's a large report, and we're working on—especially in the comms team—how to make that much easier to

navigate, make it easier of the community to see the forest from the trees more.

And what we're thinking about is that maybe an additional improvement to that is that we can add more charts and graphs to it that tell a story on top of the narratives. As you mentioned, the charts and graphs need more narratives.

Some of the other improvements that we have done is the dashboard was advanced to accountability indicators which allow interactive drilldowns and more information can be seen. But as you mentioned in your report, it's not easy to navigate, not easy to understand what kind of stories we're trying to tell.

And then various improvements in the new five-year strategic plan. That's finalized by the community and the board, and also, the improvements in the operating financial plan over the current one in the five-year, and also improvements in the one-year plan. You have seen the drafts—and thank you for all your feedback on these draft plans. The team is working on finalizing that for board adoption in May.

So I will spend more on these improvements when we go into the next session, it's what we are thinking about the plan for the reporting [towards] FY21 to FY21 strategic plan. So let me go to that part.

So we have started planning for the reporting and reviewing all the notes on what we have learned over the years and the feedback from ATRT3 team, and again, very much appreciate the work this team has done, and the collaboration with this team is really important, so appreciate today your time.

---

---

The info from you are very timely, actually, and they're similar so it's really good to what we have found. That will help us to improve the reporting towards this new five-year strategic plan.

So as I point out earlier the four key challenges, we are working on how to mitigate these challenges and continue the journey of doing better and better on the reporting and transparency.

The first one mentioned is lack of clarity on target outcomes. So the new five-year strategic plan and the draft five-year operating financial plan and the one-year operating plan and budget is supporting this clarity. For example, the five-year strategic plan first started with the objectives and then the goals of each of the objectives, and then target outcomes of each goal. So that's a big step to clarify what the organization really needs to achieve, and what outcome we need to work towards. So that's a big step that helps us to look at what the targets are.

Then the five-year draft operating financial plan and the draft FY21 operating plan and budget also has some improvements over the current five-year and one-year. One is the operating initiatives, the key major things the organization need to work on, and then the description of the functional activities. Both these in the draft plan describe how this can support the achievement of the strategic plan, and we link the operating initiatives and function to the targeted outcomes that are stated in the strategic plan. So I've put the right link.

And then also, we have a session called how progress is tracked that's stated for every operating initiative and every function activities that ties to the target outcome that's in the strategic plan.

The other three challenges we talked about, the KPI measurements are difficult for some parts of the organization, the lack of narratives, and also multiple sources of information. It's really taxing on the stretched bandwidth of the community to understand.

So what we are thinking about is to, one, leverage just one source and make that source much easier to read and navigate. That's the CEO report. So we're thinking about using the CEO report, and in addition to the narratives we have in the CEO group right now, is adding charts and graphs to support the narratives so we can explain better—in plain English, as you mentioned—and supported by figures and the stats and whatnot where applicable to help convey the progress towards strategic plan.

And then also looking at the data we have in accountability indicators that we built over the years and how we can leverage them, how to continue some of them to apply to be included in the CEO report. And the third one we're looking at is to leverage the recently launched open data platform. As we build up the platform with more and more data sources, what can really help linking the information from the platform to the CEO report and to help report against the progress of the organization. And of course, continue to leverage—and better leverage—the communication channels and increase collaboration with the community, including CEO dialogs with the community, the

---

---

community webinars, blogs, interaction at ICANN meetings—after this virus, of course—and in various community sessions.

So at this point, I think if we can go to the next slide, what I have just described can hopefully provide some needed info for your first question, seeking insights into the plan of progress. So I hope what I just said was helpful to address the first question. And then the second question, if there are any items, concern that you raised from the point of view [may] benefit from clarification.

There is one particular that was stated in the issue number nine about meeting ATRT3's requirements for accountability indicators within six months. So we'd like to understand a bit more of the timing of this that we can discuss a bit later. The rest of the questions are related to the connection with open data program, the platform.

So at this point, maybe we can see if we can have a short presentation of open data platform to this group. Some of you probably already attended the session we had at ICANN67. We have a pretty short deck that Victoria can help just walk through pretty quickly and address some of the questions here easier, and we can also do a demo if time allows. Is that okay with you, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes. That's fantastic. Thank you very much. And I'm quite heartened by what I've heard as well. I'm not seeing anyone in the queue. Can we form a queue now, please?

---

SUSANNA BENNETT: I'm sorry, Cheryl, is it okay for Victoria to present ...?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, absolutely.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Okay. Brenda, can you have Victoria share screen, please?

VICTORIA YANG: Thank you very much. So this is a very short deck for open data program. Just want to briefly touch on this program, then we can dive into some of the questions that you've shared with us. Thank you for that.

So ICANN open data program has two major objectives. The first one is to increase transparency and improve accessibility and availability of data, and secondly, through this process, we are thinking and aiming to strengthen ICANN's procedure and process to publish for higher data usability. So that's the two major objectives that we tried to achieve with the open data program.

In these slides, it basically provides a high-level recap of the open data journey within ICANN and within these slides, we will leadership team touch some of the questions that we received. Let me start with ICANN61. That's where we [inaudible] the community's interest and request together with our CEO's support, we launched the open data journey, basically, within ICANN.

We started by publishing a request for proposal, and that is to acquire a platform. So we received several RFP and the process to test and validate was quite intense, and that was led by the OCTO team. At the same time, we had some internal work within the organization. We worked with all the functional team and develop a data asset inventory. Also [together with the] metadata, those documents are published and available on ICANN.org via the public comment page. We can definitely share the link later.

So there, you will find the initial draft of the ICANN data asset inventory which includes about 300+ datasets. One of the objectives of this public comment is to ask the community what is your prioritization for data publication. We'd received many good input, and those basically helped us even during launch, V1, which I will share the platform briefly. We published 32 datasets at launch in V1. Many of those input from the public comment.

By ICANN 63, we purchased open data platform from Opendatasoft and we demonstrate platform features during the meeting. Then at ICANN64, we had a session to discuss with the community the high-level publication process and we got good feedback as well and it was a great discussion during the session.

At the same time, we started designing and customizing the open data platform together with our communications team [and in IT.] So by ICANN65, we had a pre-meeting webinar. We didn't have a session but we had different engagement with communities during the meeting.

Around that timeline, we already have the majority of the open data pages implemented with the UX design and we already start assessing some of the datasets for a day one launch. And that preparation lasted through ICANN66. So at ICANN67, we launched the platform.

The objective is to, one, of course, encourage the community to register so they can access the platform, access the available data. At the same time, we want to hear from the community if there's any feedback that we can improve. We know it's not a perfect platform, there'll be more improvement down the road, but community input is key and we appreciate all the collaboration along the way and we definitely look forward to more input so we can improve. And that's the major objective and we engaged with community at ICANN67. I know some of the members on this team participated in our session as well.

So what's next from here? The platform is open to public. At the same time, ICANN Org had announcement and published blog about open data platform. We encourage the community to register account to access the dataset and the platform, provide us feedback so that we can continue to improve.

And I want to couple this with what Susanna mentioned earlier. We are utilizing the comments we received via the public comment to identify what will be the next wave of publication for datasets. We received a good list from the public comment and we want to keep utilizing that. At the same time, we are also having continued dialog with the community to include some of the data that is high interest now, such as data related to abuse that the team is already working on assessing potential publication of those data.

---

---

Of course, as Susanna mentioned earlier, as the organization already stated working on plans to report to the progress reporting towards the strategic plan, besides utilizing the CEO report, we are going to add improvement to the CEO report such as adding data/chart or graphic.

By doing that, we will be reexamining whatever data is in accountability indicator that can be utilized, and those will be made available via the open data platform. Hopefully by doing that, we can mitigate some of the improvement and recommendations this ATRT3 team pointed out which is very relevant, such as what are the source of your data, how often is this data being updated, because you point out some of the data is quite outdated. [inaudible] [plain English] to explain some of the data. So these are features that the open data platform can help to mitigate.

So I will stop there and so if there are any questions. Thank you.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Perhaps this point would be good to go back to the rest of the questions, three through seven on the slide deck. Brenda, please. Then I will address each of these questions, though some of them have been covered by Victoria, but I wanted to make sure this is clear to this team. So while Brenda brings this up, let me just read the question. So the third question, is there anything that you consider in the open data program that may be useful for ATRT3 to consider as a recommendation to include in accountability indicators?

Actually, it's a bit the other way. We wanted to lift the data from accountability indicators and put some of those on the platform. It's

---

easier for the community to assess and also do analysis and whatnot as Victoria mentioned, the tool can do that. So that's what we are thinking about, and then leverage the open data program, what's on the open data platform as we build that up to report progress through the CEO report.

The fourth question is, is the list of data collected by ICANN with open data initiative—which is a change to program now—is closed or open. As Victoria mentioned, when open data was initiative, there was a public comment done in 2008. Victoria, may I trouble you to put that link in the chat? That would be very good for people to look at. So that was done and we collected some really good input as Victoria mentioned.

Number five question, where can we find the list of data currently collected within or for ODI or ODP? As I mentioned, the names may change. Yeah, the organization published a draft as an inventory for public comment in 2018, and then we analyzed the input and derived the list of priorities as based on the input from the community.

All the datasets of the data asset inventory are candidates for potential data releases in the future on the platform. However, we need to go through several process assessments that include the technical assessments, such as the data structure, how it will fit into the platform. Of course, you understand the privacy and regulatory compliance such as GDPR is very important when we assess the data. And then Contractual Compliance, the obligation that we committed in the contracts, we need to be very careful, review those, make sure that we comply with the contacts when we release this data.

---

And then of course, the bandwidth of the functional data [stewards.] We can suggest to the data stewards which ones we think would be very good to release based on the public comments and the data structure and compliance. However, we do want to make sure that the functional teams also have the bandwidth to do so and how we can support them. So that takes time, and the good thing is we built the process already, we tested it with the first launch. Now, when we go forward, it should be a little bit easier and we'll continue to improve.

And also, in addition to the comments we received through the public comment process, [it's been] two years, so other data could be very interesting to the community and useful to the community, such as [DAAR.] As you know, it's a very useful one. Any data related to reporting DNS abuse for example. So we'll be assessing those as well.

So number six question, in addition to ODI/ODP, is there any other data collected by ICANN? And if yes, where can we find that list? Of course, there's new data that we're building, just like DAAR, for example.

However, [deriving that complete set of data as an inventory] for the public comment two years ago took quite a bit of time and resources of course. So we plan to use, considering the challenge with the bandwidth and resource, we plan to first use the public comment inputs and review the functional teams' inputs and the inputs from community that we will continue to engage, then assess what's the best releases for the upcoming period.

Then we will think about when's the right time to put together a comprehensive dataset inventory again. We'll do that again. Question

---

number seven regarding CCT and the request for data, does ICANN have a plan to collect the data needed within an outside ODI or ODP?

Some of the data, such as Contractual Compliance data that is indicated in the CCT report so far is included in that public comment feedback. So definitely, to answer the question directly, we will address those in combining with the public comment input and the other things I mentioned earlier. So I hope that shed a little bit more light on the questions you have. So Brenda, maybe I trouble you to go to the next slide?

We would really like the ATRT3 team to consider something here. As mentioned in the beginning of this presentation, accountability indicators are just one of the tools, one of the mechanisms. It's a tool to report the organization's progress towards this [future] plan. The purpose is to report the progress. So we suggest that the ATRT3 team will consider the focus on the purpose and with the focus on the purpose, we identified shortcomings that we already noted of this tool and other aspects, and we can together derive improved sets of mechanisms to achieve the goal of advancing the reporting of our progress and be transparent and accountable towards that.

Okay, so thank you for the time, and that's the end of the presentation, so I'd like to hear your questions, your comments. Much appreciated.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Susanna. I certainly was very heartened by some of the comments in the beginning of the presentation, and I hope that the rest of the review team is particularly pleased about the last bit of text on

---

the screen in front of us, and that's the opportunity to improve some of the mechanics, etc., on this.

That said, let's open a queue if there's anyone who wishes to make a brief follow-up comment, question or inquiry of Susanna and her team. Over to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and thank you, Susanna and Victoria, for your presentations. Well done, and useful. And you take a few times the word "open data initiative" and you transform it into "open data program." I tried to check in the ICANN website and I still see ODI and not ODP. It's one of the reason, and the question, I guess, we raised with ODI, but if it's a change, what does it mean, and what the new name may mean for us.

The second point is on the work we have done on the accountability indicators. Yeah, sometimes we talk about the tool because we were thinking that as we were discussing the content, we may also talk about the tool, but in fact, what is much more important for us is the content and it's where we concentrate, even if sometimes we say that the way that it's presented, it's not the best one. But it was not the main objective of our work.

And I am not sure that I get the full answer of the question about data collected by ICANN, because I guess if I understood well, Susanna, you referred to what could be the dataset to be in the open data program, but I am sure that ICANN have data they collect, but it's not aimed to be public, and my guess, we will be happy to know what is this list of data

---

who will not be public. The titles can be public, but not the content. And it's something that could be useful for the work we are doing.

And my last point is that the open data program start in beginning of 2018. I am really very happy because it was one of my suggestion or request or struggle when I was board member. That means five years before, it was something I put on the table, and now it's something going on, and that's great. Thank you very much.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Thank you, Sébastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sébastien. I think a lot of that was covered, but Susanna, did you want to respond in any way?

SUSANNA BENNETT: Sure. Thank you. Sébastien, thank you so much, and very much appreciate your work with the board several years ago to get us hear on the open data platform.

So first question, ODI versus ODP, it started as an initiative by the OCTO team, and when the OCTO team took it to the level of a beta, I think that was what we used at the time. Then Göran asked operations team to work with the organization to really operationalize or implement this initiative, so we changed it to a program, which is the goal of actually building up a platform and implement the data, put the data on the platform, so that's a difference. And we have communicated over the

last couple years in various ways, blocks and engagements and webinars and ICANN meetings and whatnot. So if it's not clear, we will of course continue to communicate that.

Your second question regarding the content focus, that's wonderful. I think you mentioned about what data that we don't plan to publish. So right now, we're looking at the public comment input from 2018, and assess each one of them—of course, look at the criteria, the process we'd built, follow the process and look at the datasets and the structure and assess the privacy issues and contractual issues and whatnot, then make it conclusion and propose to the steering committee made up of six executives to make a decision on the data to be released in the upcoming period. And then we'll continue to do that to go through everything that's on the public comment feedback, plus engaging with the community to look at what other data, more current data that was not included in the public comment two years ago—since time moved on and many new things happened—we wanted to listen to the community, what types of interests they have, for example, the interest on the DAAR information.

So we will obtain that information and go forward with that. At this point, we really don't have a decision made on the list not to publish anything. I don't have that list, I just have the list that we got from the public comment period that we're working though. I hope that's helpful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Susanna. I'm just going to move now through the queue, being very aware of time. Pat, and then Jaap.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Hi, Susanna. Thank you to you and your team for coming and joining us today. On the last slide, one of the things you said that I think is important is to focus on the purpose instead of the tool. I think that's one of the challenges that we had with the accountability indicators, is it was hard to determine what the purpose of these actual indicators were and what decisions were being made based upon them.

One of the things we were looking for is if this is what you're trying to drive towards, how does this data show how we're achieving or not achieving? And we're looking for an ability for the organization to describe where they are, not just so that we say we're doing a great job but to help the community and the organization make decisions about, are these the right things to do? How should resources be applied?

And when it comes to an age of prioritization because of budget issues or just the sheer magnitude of the things that are being asked of the organization, I think it's important for us to have a real clear picture of what's happening. And I would be concerned that if we're going to turn that into a report that comes from the CEO, that we may not have the ability to dig into the data even as little as we have inside of the accountability indicators today.

And the second piece of what I wanted to say was that as we go forward in taking a look at the strategic plan from 21 to 25, it'll be interesting to see how the accountability indicators are determined, because the strategic plan right now for 21 to 25 is a roadmap to get to a future state or a plan to get to a future state, and the metrics during that

---

---

period against the plan will be different than the metrics will be at the end of that plan once those five areas are addressed [in] the mechanism [you're putting] in place.

So I guess the question I'm getting to is when you talk about or think about the purpose, how will you drive new indicators or updated indicators that give the community and the organization the information to help us all determine what priorities should be addressed and how we should move forward?

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Thank you, Pat. Thank you very much. Very good points you made. Let me go to the first one—and I'm really glad this session's recorded so we can go back to the recording and to really digest the good points you made.

Yes, so first about the purpose, I'm glad that you support that. That makes it a lot easier for us to do our job in improving how we report the progress for this new five-year plan. And as you point out, the accountability indicators don't really provide enough information, are we doing the right thing? It's just showing some metrics, so you're absolutely right. And what we tried to do is how to actually connect the strategic plan, the targeted outcomes stated in the strategic plan to the draft five-year operating and financial plan right now.

So in the draft operating financial plan, each of the operating initiative and each of the financial activities, we tie straight back to the target outcome that's in the strategic plan, and then also have a session, as I mentioned, about how progress will be tracked. So thanks to Linda Chin.

She's on this call as well, she's in Singapore. She mapped all this together on a huge spreadsheet to make sure that every operating initiative, every function or activity ties straight to the targeted outcomes in the strategic plan, and also how progressed to be tracked is connected as well.

So that analysis there is super helpful to us for us to look at and how we could report our progress better. And not just showing metrics, not tied to any of this. That's already spelled out in these plans. So that, we are on the way to do and work closely with each of the functional teams and the team lead those operating initiatives to derive better reporting to the community and to the organization as well how we are achieving those. That will lead to some of [the, definitely,] discussions.

Quite a bit of the work that ICANN does, the organization cannot do on our own. For example, the multi-stakeholder model work, the MSSI team support the community on. It's a huge collaboration between the organization and the community, so that needs to have a lot of dialog to advance that. [So using narratives, we're supported with certain charts directly linked to] these target outcomes and what we try to achieve would be very good. That's what we are shooting for.

Then the second question you had; how do we include new information? Is that what you have? Sorry. Can you summarize that question quickly for me? Thank you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Yeah. Sorry, Susanna. I know I wax on a little bit and talk a lot about a lot of different things, so I am confusing at times. What I was trying to

---

---

drive towards was as we go through the 21 to 25 plan, there'll be different accountability indicators or metrics and purposes that we will be doing as we go through the strategic plan to get to this future state, which is really what the final objectives are in terms of getting from here to there.

Part of that will end up being a different set in five years to show the accountability of that future state. And my question was really, how are you going to focus on the indicators that show form an accountability standpoint what you're achieving as you drive through the 21 through 25 plan to get to that future state.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Right. Very good question, and you also mentioned about the navigation in a CEO report. So definitely, that's the period we are launching with the whole organization, the functional teams and the executives who lead the operating initiatives to review the information we already put together for the operating and financial plan and really think through what's the best way to describe our progress. Some would be narrative and some, we could leverage metrics. Some of the metrics maybe is already started in the current accountability indicators that we can leverage.

And some could be coming from other sources such as the data that's already on the open data platform or to be put onto open data platform. So it's all these pieces we need to think through. It's not going to be perfect in the very first one which needs to be released by I think August, September of 2020. That would be the first reporting of

---

progress towards the new five-year plan. And a lot of collaboration with the community on this, that's what we plan to do so we can hear your feedback and how we can do better.

Then the point you made regarding the CEO report is a big one, it's hard to navigate. We totally agree with you, and the [comms] has taken the goal to work on how to make it easier. Daniella shared a couple of preliminary points with us, but still got some work to do, of course, and then we are looking at adding metrics to report. So it'll be a combination of narratives and metrics together and could make the report even bigger. So, how can we make it easier for the community? All those are very good questions and we're focusing on those. Thank you so much, Pat.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Susanna. The last person to raise a question for you—I'm sure you'll be relieved to hear—would be Jaap. Over to you, Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Hi. It's a bit late here. I want to make some remarks as far as [inaudible] a lot of them actually will echo what Pat was saying there. I was kind of surprised that actually, you had to look at the indicators [with in one hand the strategic][inaudible] The early ones and then to find out what the purposes of the [inaudible] and also the other [inaudible].

Again, I'm stressing here, if I'm just a normal, slightly interested community member, this is a very steep course, trying to make any sense out of this indicator. So it's fine that all this stuff is online, but the

---

purpose and the reason why this is assembled should actually be there and you should not have to run around to find this stuff. [Or else it doesn't] matter. So that's kind of just—if that's really necessary to have deep understanding of reports and strategic plan to understand the numbers, they're completely way off. It fails its purpose.

The other thing is—this is just stressing what Pat said—there's something else completely different between the open data initiative—having a lot of datasets available doesn't make them an indicator of how [plans] are being done, it's just raw data, a bunch of numbers. And so people can make their own indicators out of the same data as you are using.

So let's try to separate the issues there and one is not really—just having datasets doesn't really tell you anything, especially when the purpose is not clear. Anyway, these are my observations here.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Very good, Jaap. I totally agree with you. Very good points regarding the complexity of the strategic plan and operating financial plan .we totally understand that. And part of it definitely is because ICANN is not a simple community or organization or as an institute to understand. I came onboard 2013 and really, my first year was very challenging. So you made a really good point.

How can we make these plans easier for anyone to understand? And also, how can we make the reporting towards the progress of the strategic plan easier to understand? Very good points, and it's definitely something we continue to think through and would love to have more

---

dialogs with this team and the community to help solve this challenge. Thank you for emphasizing that.

And your plan about ODP has the raw data, yes, definitely, and very good for you to point out. The important thing is that the data can be turned into analysis that tells a story on OTP platform and provides that [shared] capability, and community members can use the data any way they want and any analysis they'd like to do for various different purpose they have. And some of these purpose could fit the reporting of progress towards the strategic plan very well. So definitely, that's something very important to us, and thank you for pointing that out. Jaap.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Susanna. I certainly have found a great deal of value in our interchange today. We are going to need to discuss what the revelations that you've helped us understand in terms of current planning and where we're heading and what the aspirations are and where that needs to be considered in our current report text, but certainly, it's been a very important for us discussion and we hope you may have found some value as well with having us giving you feedback in your thinking.

Just one thing. I'm almost tempted to say I'd love to see that really scary spreadsheet that [Linda has] done, but then I thought, no, I don't want to look at it. It would be a little bit amazing, but I'm delighted, and I'm sure the rest of the team is too that you've got such amazing talent to help you get through [inaudible] we hope successfully to building better

and more understandable modeling when we look at accountability indicators per se, and of course, the value of the complementary—but only in a crossover purpose, not in any form of true nexus or replacement between the open data initiative and the very important transparency and accountability aspects, using data and reporting it effectively will give us.

Without any further ado, it would be a wonderful thing for us to be at this point earlier on in our process, but we're right down towards the end of the game here, and we'll be looking at finalizing our report post haste, but we really do appreciate the fact that we were able to have this valuable time with you and your team today, Susanna.

You're more than welcome to stay for the rest of the call and watch what wonderful fun we have, but we do appreciate that we're all very busy these days in our various forms of isolation. But do pass on our thanks specifically to your team for the time you've taken with us today.

Let's go back to the agenda now, please, Brenda, and with that, it's traditional for us to take a very small break between one hour and the next. Looking at the time, that would mean we'll reconvene with our agenda at ten past the hour on UTC and we will be skipping action items. We will in fact pick any of those up when we do our closing administration, and we will jump into agenda item number four, the review recommendation, etc.

Susanna, you want to have a final word before we take our break? Go ahead.

---

---

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Yes. Thank you so much, Cheryl. Thank you for all you said, and really looking forward to more dialogs with the team. There are a couple of things I'd like to ask. One is related to the clarification regarding the six-month, however, we can use another time. I know we've taken a lot of the time of this meeting—I much appreciate it.

The second is the last slide that was shown for the team to consider. The issue number nine is strictly focused on accountability indicators. We request and suggest the team to consider to shift the focus really on the purpose [instead of the tool,] and love to collaborate with you on that and have more dialogs on this. That'd be great.

So we can do that another time. I don't fully understand the process, so I defer to you and Larisa's team to help. Thank you. Thanks, everyone, for your time and all your comments, [having us.] Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Cheryl, we're at 11 past the hour. Recording has been started. We're awaiting your instructions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. I did give everyone until quarter past, but that's fine. If everyone has reconvened, I'm happy to start running now. So I would very much appreciate it if Pat managed queues for the second session while I am having Zoom problems. So Bernie, if you want to get going, we can get going now, but I did state a quarter past the hour.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, then my apologies. I was still working on the 11 past the hour.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was going to be five minutes, but once we'd heard a little bit more from Susanna, it ate a couple of minutes away, and I had a momentary generosity burst. Don't worry, it won't happen again.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. I feel much more grounded now. Okay, thank you very much. And with this banter, we've managed to take it to 14 after, so hopefully, we're okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. We're poised, ready to roll. So at quarter past, you're on.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, there we go. All right, back to our favorite recommendation on reviews. We did give it a full pass in-between our last meeting and today. Did work on this with Sébastien. We came up with some good suggestions. There are a few remaining questions to answer, so that's our purpose today.

Right off the bat, our first comment when we were talking about CCT reviews last week, KC had a number of issues around CCT reviews but we did not have Pat or León with us so we—as Cheryl says—put a pin in that one, and maybe we can ask KC to restate her issue now that we

---

have Pat online, and I believe León is here, and maybe we can have that discussion.

So KC, could you do that, please?

KC CLAFFY:

I guess the issue I had was there just seems to be such an overwhelming concern about the recommendation that came out of the CCT review that it looks strange to me that we would not recommend something a little stronger with respect to accountability than what we have right here.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Okay, but you were looking at the problem, I guess, restating it more clearly that the CCT reviews were not being implemented. Am I getting that right?

KC CLAFFY:

I don't know the status of that. I think a bunch of recommendations were redirected to other people in the community. But certainly, the CCT report is written in a way that many of the recommendations were considered prerequisite—or I forget the term they used, how they prioritize things, such that many of the recommendations were considered so important that they needed to be done before the next round of gTLDs. This text right now ignores that coming out of the CCT review, so the question is why, or what are we going to say about that? Basically, we disagree if we say that the next CCT review should happen within two years after the first introduction to the root of the new

---

gTLDs. It seems to me we need to say something about the current CCT and how those recommendations are going to be handled before the next round.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Okay. I think that's pretty clear now. I think that makes it better. All right, before we go to that, I did spend a little time digging up some stuff on CCT, and if we can go up to page 37, Brenda, I have a section of CCT that may be relevant here. Thank you.

So just from the CCT review page, I pulled out the text. Of the 35 recommendations, six were accepted by the board subject to costing and implementation considerations. 14 recommendations were passed through in whole or in part to community groups for consideration, and 17 recommendations were placed in pending status in whole or in part. All of the recommendations placed in pending status are awaiting further information.

So that's the status that's on the website. I don't know if León wants to comment on this a bit more.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Bernie. Yes, I can tell you that many of the recommendations from the CCT were drafted in a way that implied that the board should take action on certain items, and as we all well know, that's not the way we do things in ICANN. We use the bottom-up multi-stakeholder, consensus driven process.

So for the board to actually take these actions and to dictate these measures would have been to literally do things top down, and that of course contradicts everything we do in ICANN. So that's why the board felt it was important to pass on a certain number of recommendations back to the GNSO for example to say, "Okay, you need to deal with this, you need to conduct discussion within the community and then come back with whatever output you come up with and tell us how it ended."

I think that doing another CCT review before the next round happens—if it happens at all, of course—wouldn't make much sense to me for a number of reasons. First, I don't think the CCT can review something that actually has some—the CCT review, as I understand it, is to review the customer trust in the domain name space. So we are aware that many of those recommendations are going to be implemented. Some are pending, as you rightly highlighted, and some others need further discussion by the community. So if we postpone everything until everything is sorted out, I don't know how this is going to turn out.

We also need to remember that the community achieved agreement when they drafted the new bylaws during the transition, and we were very careful doing the transition and drafting the bylaws in a way that reviews had a specific weight and importance that we thought they deserved.

So if we happen to alter the formula that the community came up with when drafting the bylaws, I think we would be altering this agreement and we would be affecting the overall balance that was achieved while drafting these bylaws.

---

---

So I would definitely caution us from recommending that we do another review before the next round, and instead, I would favor the current drafting that we have in order to have the next review happen two years after the next gTLDs are delegated [inaudible].

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you very much for that, León. Do we have any other comments?  
KC.

KC CLAFFY: Right. I understand all of that. I think that there were so many open issues brought up by the CCT review, and it wasn't that they were only open after the first round, they were recommendations that were commitments before the first round went into—that the CCT at least was pointing out they weren't done. So it seems like we're not just hearing this for the first time. There was one chance to do it, then there was another chance, and we're still ignoring that, I think.

I understand the cadence, I understand the bylaws, but this whole section is about changing that cadence anyway. So I don't think that can be a reason that we can't reconsider this.

I guess it would be good if we could talk to the co-chairs of CCT review now and see what accountability issues they consider to be still outstanding before we write the final draft of this report. That's what I'm most concerned about.

I suspect we've had some conversation with them along the way, but maybe it's been a while.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you, KC. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, KC, we certainly have had conversation with them, and in fact, for whatever reason, he's not on now, but Jonathan Zuck who was the chair of the CCT RT, was in fact with us throughout the whole of Susanna's presentation because I was having a private message chat with him on other matters anyway.

So he seems to have dropped unfortunately, and to that end, we can reach out to him with your specific question. I'll do so right now during this call. But I do think it's important for us to recognize that what this section is talking about is that we are suggesting when another review will be happening. I hear your point, AKC, that you think we should squeeze one in between now and prior to another round of gTLDs.

That's kind of not our job anyway. It is important to things like the GNSO management of the process and what they do or do not do as a council with whatever is or is not out of things like the subsequent procedures for new gTLDs final report when that happens before the end of the calendar year, because that's where there is a control point over what has been by then successful—or not—in implementation from the CCT RT recommendations, etc.

So I just want to be very cautious on what we're trying to do. KC, put your hand down because we're going to go to Pat now.

---

KC CLAFFY: Okay, I have a follow-up question or comment after.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, we'll do Pat first and then we'll get back to you, all right?

PAT KANE: Thanks, Cheryl. So I'm sitting here thinking about timelines and thinking about the next round of new gTLDs. And I know, Cheryl, you're the co-chair of SubPro. My over/under for delegation into the root zone is 2025 in terms of where I think we are. And the question I would have is, do we have time to get the six that were accepted by the board in terms of the CCT RT recommendations, and those that the GAC has provided advice to get done—and it seems to me that in four and a half years, we ought to have plenty of time to get things done.

So while we're arguing over whether or not some follow-up on the CCT should happen prior to the SubPro, I think there's going to be plenty of time to get these things done. And the biggest issue was data and access to data, and part of the challenge there is going to be, do the registries and registrars negotiate in their base agreements or in the RRA delivering that type of data—and those are bilateral conversations today, and I'm not certain that that fits into a timeline that we can put dependencies around given the nature of some of the publicly traded companies that are going to be asked for specific data.

So I hear what you're saying, KC, but it seems to me like a lot of that ought to be able to get done prior to when we do launches.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right. Thank you, Pat. KC, you have a follow up.

KC CLAFFY:

Thank you, Pat. That was perfect. It's not so much about when the next review is, although I'm also questioning why it says in here, the first bullet, there should be one additional clearly scoped CCT review, when the current CCT review found so many issues. It doesn't make any sense to me why we should say, "Okay, there'll just be one more," as if—whether or not—what comes out of that review, it's all that's needed. That seems, to me, inconsistent with what I've read in the CCT review.

So I think Pat's pointing us in a direction that would be better than discussing when or whether there's another CCT review before or after the next round. But the accountability issues in the current CCT review and how to address them before the next round, whatever the mechanism is for doing that. And I understand that there is a mechanism in place, but I have qualms about the mechanism. So it seems to me that we should put text in here that explains why we think there should only be one additional CCT review and why we think it should come after. And the answer shouldn't be because that's what he cadence says in the bylaws. It should be because there are these other mechanisms in place that we think are going to take care of the accountability issues brought up by the current CCT review. Does that make sense?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, KC. All right, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thanks, Bernie. So KC, the way that I would take a look at why the suggestion is out there—at least one of the thoughts behind my thinking around only having one more CCT RT was the focus on competition. And ICANN has already declared that there's choice and there's competition at the registry level.

So if we believe that, then if that's what we're trying to achieve with this CCT RT, that was the original intent, do we need to go back and evaluate whether here's competition after another round when you could end up with another 1200 TLDs launched over a period of time such that choice is expanded? And I think that's the portion that I was looking at when I thought about there's only a need for one more after that, because everything else after that would be around the trust mechanisms that we even talked about initially when we started this process a year ago. So that was my thinking behind that. Thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Pat. KC?

KC CLAFFY:

That was helpful, Pat, because now I understand where we're across purposes here that the competition aspiration, it seems to me the CCT report found pretty positive results on. There were some issues, but not like the consumer trust parts. So it's customer trust where all the recommendations that seemed to be prerequisite and a calling out of what was promised before, the safeguards that were promised and

---

whether they were effective or not, that's the part that I think is really where the accountability is.

I think that competition aspirations have been as achieved as they can be achieved in the ecosystem that we have. So on that one, I kind of agree, one more might be fine, but on the consumer trust, I don't see it. So explain how the argument works for the consumer trust side.

PAT KANE:

Thanks, KC. In my thinking, it was that the customer trust aspects would roll into an accountability and transparency review such that you would capture those aspects and tag that on along to the ATRT because it really is around accountability and the trust mechanism, again, was something that we talked about.

So those two have to happen together, because if you don't roll the consumer trust into someplace else, you're right, it's not being picked up someplace and it should be. So we had talked about initially—I remember talking about this, I think, in Singapore now, my mind might be a little bit hazy on that—was that we talked about moving some of those accountability-type items from other reviews into ATRT itself, and this was one of the ones that at least was in my mind. I don't know if everyone else remembers it the same way.

KC CLAFFY:

I had never seen any text like that in this report, and I don't see it here.

---

PAT KANE: No, I agree with that.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, that was some initial discussions in Singapore when, if I recall correctly—and please correct me if I'm wrong—where we were thinking of collapsing all the reviews into a single review. But then after Brussels, I believe we came back to the notion of what we've got in this recommendation here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your thinking is correct, Bernie. That is the history of it. And of course, we did have a specific conversation in Singapore as well with the leadership of the CCT RT.

I have reached out to Jonathan. He's obviously either offline or unconnected for whatever reason, because he's normally very prompt with his reactions. So we'll put a pin in this. We'll wrap this now, we'll move on to the rest of our work for this agenda item for the next 20 minutes, and I will ask Jonathan to specifically review this part of our recording and give me and Pat some specific advice in response to your particular questions, KC.

Okay, Bernie, move us on to something that is not a CCT RT review discussion.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. Okay. So what we have next is a suggestion—well, unfortunately, it's still CCT—from Sébastien on additionally, a framework of data

---

collection must be in place prior to the next round of gTLDs and the availability of all datasets—minor correction there—should be confirmed prior to the selection of the review team members and must be provided within 30 days of the review being launched.

So my question was that, “So the RT has no input on which data it gets?” Sébastien came back, “Yes, they can choose among the datasets collected and they can ask for another one, but I doubt that if the data are not collected in advance that they can get it and analyze them within the one year of the review.”

So I think Sébastien makes a very good point here in that it seems to me that collecting this data is not something that you can do very quickly. So except for the minor edits to the wording, I would think that sort of makes sense to me now. Do we have any other questions on that?

Okay, we seem to be good on that one, so let’s go down to the next piece of yellow text, please, Brenda. All right. ATRT reviews should continue essentially as they are currently constituted but with the following modifications.

Sébastien and I were having some discussion around when to start the next ATRT. You'll remember some of the original text was X years after the board having approved the first recommendation. Then we went to after the systemic review. Anyways, had a talk about it, charted these things out, looked at the timing, and I think we came up with this which sort of makes sense in my mind. “Shall start no later than two years after approval by the board of the first recommendation of the systemic review.”

---

So we are linking it to the systemic review. We're giving it two years after the approval of the first recommendation by the systemic review, so that we can establish sort of a cadence where we're trying to avoid the systemic review and the ATRT review running into each other too much. Pat.

PAT KANE: Thanks, Bernie. What do we mean by the first recommendation?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I believe this was brought up by Sébastien. I see his hand, so I'll give him the chance to answer that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. The CCT shows that the board take decision on some of the recommendation, and it's why I suggest that we talk about—you can change the wording in English, but the first decision they take about agreement on one recommendation of this review must be the starting time for taking the two years, because if not, we have to wait the last one, and for example, for the CCT, it may end up in five or six years. Therefore, it's why I suggest that we take one milestone. It was the easiest one from my point of view, but if you have other milestone possible, I am open with that. But that's the reason.

If we can go a little bit down to the document, I guess I have tried to put some figures. It's page 45.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's a graphic.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you look at the line in red at the top, it's the first decision of the board, and if we take five years after the first decision about ATRT3 or two years after the first decision about systemic review, it must end up almost the same. But at the next one, it is cadence, and it's maybe better to the two years from the systemic review.

That's just to have some milestone, but if you have other milestone, it could be taken into account. Here, it was to be easily—it's generally supposed to be in six months after the final report receiving to the board. It's why I have taken six months, but it could be a little bit more or less, and that's where some flexibility—and I like very much the discussion we had last time and to link that with systemic review, because I guess it gives more flexibility of the overall system. It's not just we start five years after the last one but there are some events in-between, and if we move a little bit, the overall system move at the same time and that's not bad. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sébastien. Pat, does that answer your question?

PAT KANE: It does. Thank you.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: And does that make sense?

PAT KANE: It does.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. Excellent. I think we have to go back up a bit more, please, Brenda. Yes, that was that point. So we've got a timing consideration for starting the next ATRTs. Any other questions or comments? Going once, going twice, done. Okay, thank you very much. Let's go down to the next piece of yellow text.

The bylaws in the continuous improvement program, we've said each SO/AC/NC—for the Nominating Committee. As I was going through the bylaws, of course, it jumped out at me that the GAC has always been exempt from the organizational reviews. So my question was, do we continue to exempt them, or do we put them in here? And Sébastien replied, yes, the GAC also is going to do improvements. So I just wanted to be clear that we are including the GAC here and see if there are any questions or comments. No, it seems to be okay for everyone. Going once, going twice. Cheryl has a thumbs up. All right, we'll take that one as sold. Next point, please.

Regular assessment of continuous improvement programs. Again, we had some concerns relative to KC's comments last time that there were some external—the organizational reviews performed by external evaluators provided that external view and the idea of each SO and AC performing their own continuous improvement program looked like it

---

was a little closed off. We explained that there was the systemic review, which was meant to review these things, but we also threw in here that their assessments of their continuous improvement programs should be published for public comment, which I think goes along the same lines of making sure that they get some external view on those things. I'm getting a thumbs up from Pat and a thumbs up still from Cheryl. Any questions or comments on that? KC, please.

KC CLAFFY:

Not a new comment, but it just doesn't look independent to me. So I think there needs to be some explanation of why we no longer think that you need an independent review of the SOs and ACs. That's all.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Well, as I said, the independent part really external to that is the whole notion of the systemic review. If we look at that, the notion is that there are a certain number of criteria which we have to look at, and I think the notion the ATRT sort of looks at one end of the spectrum and the systemic looks at the SOs and the ACs and how they are evaluating that. And we'll go through that again when we get to the systemic review, but I think that's what we're proposing, at least that's the way I understand.

KC CLAFFY:

For me, it's just—maybe when we get to it I'll understand it more, but it doesn't really make sense to me now that that systemic review, which is a thing that has only just now been invented, hasn't been tried yet, why

---

it could totally replace the need for these independent reviews of the SOs and ACs that we've had for years. So I just still have problems—it's not new, so we don't have to keep talking about it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right. Thank you very much. Next piece of yellow text, please, Brenda. Okay, now, we did not have a very good timing consideration for the systemic review so we tried to line up again here. Systemic review of ICANN every six years after approval of the board by the first recommendation by the previous systemic review. So we're trying to keep it in line with the timing requirement that we brought up for the ATRT recommendation. I see your hand, KC. Is that an old hand?

KC CLAFFY:

It is an old hand, but as long as it's up, I'll just say you were going to put justification somewhere besides that it makes the calendar fit.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes. Thank you. Okay, we'll try to do that. Any other questions? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Not a question, but yeah, a question to [us.] Just to throw an idea, as we link the ATRT to the systemic review, maybe it could be a good idea—I don't know if it's a good idea, but to link the systemic with the ATRT. Like that, if something move, the overall system move, and then either to say six years after the first decision by systemic review, or something

---

like two and a half year after the first decision about ATRT4 and then so on and so forth. Just an idea. Hope it's clear. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

All right. Let's have a look at that and we'll come back to that one. So there is a possibility of crosslinking them, is what Sébastien's proposal is, and we'll look at that. The next piece of yellow that we have is review of SO/AC/NC as a whole to determine if they continue to have a purpose in the ICANN structure as they are currently constituted or if any changes in structures and operations are desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as ensure optimal representation of community views.

And then this is basically the language right out of the bylaws. Then we added the part in yellow, "But taking into consideration any impacts on the board or the empowered community." The reason for that—you'll remember as we were having a discussion on this clause, and Sébastien was pointing out people really have to understand that if you bring changes to the structure, that will impact not only the board but the empowered community potentially.

Oswaldo did not think that was needed. I agree with Oswaldo. I think the basic text of the recommendation is clear. But then adding it doesn't remove anything. So let's have a discussion. Oswaldo, are you on? No. Okay. So I'm going to propose, since it doesn't detract from the text and that we have had no other comments on that, that we leave it in. is that agreeable to everyone? Sébastien has a tick, Cheryl gives me a thumbs up. Going once, going twice, done.

Do we have another piece of yellow text before the checklist? No, that just says that I have to redo the checklist when we finish the recommendation.

All right, let's go back up to that. So getting back to KC, the objectives of the systemic review are to review the continuous improvement efforts of the SO/AC/NC based on best practices, to review the effectiveness of the various inter-SO/AC/NC collaboration mechanisms, to review the accountability of SO/ACs or constituent parts to their members and constituencies. And then this text that we just finished talking about.

So I think that's where we were hoping that the requirements for that outside the SO and AC review would get taken care of. I think we've gone over this a couple of times with the group and they felt comfortable with it, which is why we don't have any comments on that. KC.

KC CLAFFY:

So the rest of the world doesn't have all of your conversations that you had, so we just need some explanation of why this is the decision, why this is going to be a better solution to the accountability issues and why it's going to take care of the independence goal that was in the original review structure.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Very good question, and in section 8.3, which we have yet to go through, it lays out the rationale for these recommendations and we

---

---

will be going through those—well, given the timing, it'll be on our next call. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just going to jump in and say given the timing, we need to draw a line under this very shortly. So, did you want to finish wrapping that up? One thing I would say is we could put a cross reference or a footnote to cross reference to that section so the reader—who KC is concerned about—can jump to [8.3] and find the information that they will need.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I'm sure we can do that. But this basically is a nice breakpoint, so I'm not going to stretch it any further. I think I've gotten what I need from the recommendation at this point, and I will turn it back to you, ma'am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you so much. I appreciate it. Now, Pat has a hard stop at the top of the hour for other meetings. I'm very keen for us to finish on time, so Brenda, if you would be so kind as to take us back. Thank you so much. Obviously, our next meeting's agenda will continue on from where we're leaving here, from section 8.4, and then we will move into the remaining of the agenda—in other words, beginning of the review of ATRT3 final report v1.8, etc., in the following meeting.

I have put in a request to Jonathan Zuck as chair of the CCTRT to review our discussions and to get back to me on the responses to the questions

posed by KC. That is an action item, Jennifer, if you just note it so we do close the loop on that at some point.

There is no any Any Other Business listed, but Pat and I do have, of course, the letter—e-mail it will be—to send to the ICANN board via the chair regarding our finalization date, etc. for the report. Brenda, if you've got a link to that—or Bernie, can you put the link to that in for Brenda to bring it up on screen, please?

Thanks to those of you who put in comments, most of which were accepted. There were general [inaudible] and good things to add, some of which were rejected. Sorry, Daniel, it was an awful lot of what you put in. Pat and I wanted to keep it utterly and absolutely simple and that's what we've done. So just so you all can have a look at that, Brenda will display it now on screen because she can grab the link off Bernie, off chat.

This is what we will be sending on or about the 5th. We certainly want to make sure that it is also gone through the necessary preparation so it can become part of the public record, go up onto our Wiki, and be “advertised” in all the usual places. We're not going to do an Announce, but we're going to make it publicly available and advise the AC/SO chairs as well. So you'll see the CCs that were suggested are now in place.

This is not now open for any further edit. Early May is where Bernie maintains it is doable, and we did go into great detail with him on how he felt his work could be completed. So that's the current thinking.

---

---

Sébastien, do you want to speak very briefly on why you think it should be other than early May?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. There is [another] comment of Jaap also on that. I suggest not to say that we will not deliver early May but to give us some possible breath if we need. But our goal for us inside the group must be early May. That's my little tweak to the letter. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Sure. And noting what KC's put in, we'll just state May. So Bernie, you can strike out the word "early" if you like there, and the rest of it is good to go then.

All right, ladies and gentlemen. We just wanted to make sure you're all aware of what we're doing. It'll be put into its normal e-mail and copied to the list and distributed through various staff mechanisms as well.

All right, with that, let us now take the last couple of minutes to see where we are in terms of decisions, etc. I note several thumbs up and agreements. So Jennifer, over to you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Great. Thanks, Cheryl. I'll just start with agreement on the content of the letter which is going to be sent to the board as just discussed there, and then a couple action items. I took an action item for the ICANN Org staff to share the links to the presentations and the materials that were discussed today earlier on the call with Susanna and team.

---

And then Cheryl, you took the action item to ask Jonathan Zuck, CCT chair, to review the ATRT3's discussion today and provide a response to KC's questions regarding the CCT review.

We have our agenda for Friday already finalized as discussed today too, so that's good to go.

And I did not capture any other actions or decisions, but do let me know if I've missed anything. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I think you've got it all. Certainly enough, from my point of view, for us to get onto between now and Friday. All right, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much. With just a few seconds to spare to the top of the hour, I just wanted to note for the record that I thought it was time well spent today with Susanna and her team and that it would be good if you put your thinking hats on as to how we may take into account some of what we learned today in our text.

So with that, we will now thank each and every one of you, and of course, our fabulous staff support that they've managed to keep the gremlins at bay. We are having difficulties in Zoom with a number of dropouts in a number of places.

Stay safe, people. Make smart choices. We'll talk again on Friday. Please refresh my memory, what time UTC is it?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

It's 11:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 11:00 UTC. Thank you, Jennifer. And with that, as we tick to the top of the hour, you may stop the recording, and that will be our lot for today. Bye for now.

PAT KANE: Bye now.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]