BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the ATRT3 Plenary #54 on the 25th of March, 2020, at 11:00 UTC.
	Members attending the call today include Cheryl, Daniel, Jaap, Jacques, Demi, Osvaldo, Pat, Vanda, and Wolfgang.
	Observers joining are Everton, Jim, Sophie, and Herb.
	Attending from ICANN Org are Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer Brenda is on the call.
	I don't have any apologies today.
	This meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking.
	Cheryl and Pat, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you. I'll jump in and then obviously Pat will take over. Bernie will be doing the lion's share, of course, when he's taking us through some of our items in today's agenda, particularly the review of our sections of the final report.
	As Brenda indicated, welcome, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, depending on where you are. I'm noting that, in the chat, most of you seem to be having the benefit of weather, if not the benefit of some rather odd work and social constraints on us all as we manage our world in the days of virus management.

Let's get started. We've got not an extensive but a very important agenda tonight [inaudible] and quite a bit to get through.

Is there anybody who has an update to their statements of interest? I'll remind you all that we work under continuous disclosure for our statements of interest. If there is any substantial change to what we do and how we do in terms of working commitments that is apparently outlined in our [existing] statement which would inform everybody.

Not seeing anybody making any comments or put up their hands, we will tick that one of as our administrivia. I'm going to go to Jennifer, who's going to take us through some of the action items, new and closed, noting today that two [on] our discussion there. We're going to look at really more information regarding our timeline and the fact that, when we know a little bit more of what we're doing, we'll finalize our note to the Board regarding new deadlines for our final report being completed and also that, next week on our meeting on the first of April, Susanna Bennett will be joining us so that we can look further into accountability indicators and the exciting new program of open [data] that ICANN has recently undertaken. We'll then jump into reviewing Sections 9 and 10 of our final report, which is currently Version 5.8, and then get started on our discussion of our review of reviews. There's a Google Doc link in the agenda, and it will be coming out into the chat as we get to there. We'll then have a minute or two for Any Other Business and, of course, do the [inaudible] decisions reached.

Is there anybody who has any Any Other Business they'd like to declare now?

Not seeing anybody, we'll call again towards the end of our time today to see if anyone has any Any Other Business. Hopefully Bernie will be back from getting his glass of water, but, before that, let's go to Jennifer and see if there's any action items that we need to delve into.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Cheryl. We don't need to delve into anything. As you mentioned, it's just information. I wanted to just briefly give a status update to those who aren't on the Monday leadership call. Staff is working with Pat and Cheryl and Bernie to put together a timeline of the next couple of weeks of the review work. That's going to be informed well today by how the discussion goes. Once we have that timeline, we can work on the draft note to the Board regarding the review timeline. So just to let you know that those two pieces of work are still in progress, and the note to the Board will follow from the timeline.

Then, as Cheryl mentioned, just to let you know that Susanna Bennett has confirmed with some of her team members that she will join the ATRT3 meeting on the first of April. So we're factoring that into the timeline as well.

Nothing else to report. Just a status update on those two items. With that, back to you. Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Jennifer. I appreciate that. We will also make sure that everyone is aware that, as we tend to with all of our guests, we will have Susanna at the outset or beginning of our call on the first of April

so that we can spend our time with her as a guest before we get back on to the remaining agenda, which of course will be a continuation of our review of recommendations regarding reviews.

With that, let's dip our toe into the water of Sections 9 and 10. Bernie, if you're back and if we can just display that now, I will also ask Brenda or somebody from staff if they can put the link to that report into the chat so everyone can follow along as need be. Bernie, over to you [inaudible].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: [inaudible] Okay. Thank you. Can we stretch that a bit so we can—there we go. All right. KC had a comment: "[inaudible] Work Stream 1 is implemented. Text and footnotes included next comment." So that has been addressed, as far as I can see. But no comment from KC yet.

Let's keep going. [inaudible]. That's done. "Needs footnote [for] that publication."

Let's keep going down. [Already there. It's after 219]. "I don't see why there should be an executive summary." That's talking about the finances—the corporation—so we can have a discussion of that one when we review the executive summary in detail.

"What about the public comments themselves?" I was unclear what KC was asking there.

Next. "Footnote for SSR2." I asked KC to provide me the link so I could include that.

All right. Let's go down to the next comment. Yes, for the Board section—oh, sorry. "[Line in] ATRT2 [count of] recommendation [inaudible] ATRT3."

Let's go down. Okay. As noted previously on this section, I'm moving the finance stuff back up here.

All right. Let's keep going. Okay. "We have a few things around why we drifted into gTLD specific. Added a note below the table. Needs status of this exercise. I've added a footnote to TLD. Non-gTLD specific [but the note is now]. Still [valid] [inaudible] current status of other process we've staffed to finish [figuring that out]."

Next set of comments. Per Seb's comment, I fixed that. "What changes solve what accountability problems?" [Not] if you read the recommendation. It has been clear to everyone else, including SO/ACs, which approved this.

Let's go down. Can we see the source of this quote? "It's clear it's from Work Stream 1 final report. The footnote for this provided in 6211 just above but can include it here. What is the CCWG accountability?" Well, the final report explains all of this one you read it. Link in 6211 again, but for completeness I have added it here. What is the definition site? Added a footnote pointing to the relevant section of the bylaws defining this. What is the definition of this? Added a footnote pointing to the relevant section of the bylaws defining CEP."

Hopefully that will answer KC's questions.

Next section, please. KC disagrees with this. As we stated, it's been in the report probably for the last six months. So we can have that discussion on this in the final review of the text.

Moving on: 8. We're working on this section. I've cleaned it up quite a bit but am waiting for us to finish our discussions on the recommendation regarding reviews.

Let's go to Section 9, please. Here we are: accountability indicators. The introduction: "Accountability indicators were added to the review requirements of the ATRT3 by its plenary in July 2019. Information assessed related to accountability indicators. ATRT2 recommendation 2 related to accountability indicators. Non-ATRT3 survey related to accountability indicators. See Annex B, Question 35 and 36. Other information related to accountability indicators. ICANN's accountability indicator, ICANN's strategic plan, Internet for Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers adopted fiscal year '20 operating plan, analysis and identification of issues related to accountability indicators—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry to interrupt you. My Internet dropped. Therefore, I am back just on my phone. If you can tell me where you are on the document, I would appreciate it to try to follow what is happening. I have text in front of me, but no Internet. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. We're at 9.3, Sebastien—analysis of information and identification of issues—in the draft report.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Okay.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	This is essentially copy-paste from the accountability indicator report. I don't know if it's really worth going through this in detail. It just brings up exactly what we went through in detail on the accountability report. So let's go down a bit. But I'll be glad to read it if someone really wants us to go through that. The statistics are exactly the same as they were in Annex C: the accountability indicator report.
	Let's keep going. In Section 9.4, we have our recommendation, which we discussed and agreed to in the scratchpad document.
	Let's hold here for a second. Do people want to go through that in detail?
	No. Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Just one point. Can you tell us … We say we get it on Monday, but what is the link between this part of the document and what we have done with the accountability indicators in the scratchpad? Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Okay. The links are as follows. This section, if we go back up t 9.1 … sorry. This section on accountability indicators says, when we started it, there are not ATRT2 recommendations. There are the survey questions.

Then—good point. What I forgot to include in here in 9.2.3.4 is our Annex C, which is the accountability indicator report we just completed. Then we go through the analysis and the information related to the accountability indicators. So really this is the introduction, as far as I'm concerned, to our Annex C, which is the accountability indicator report that we produced. After 9.3, then we go into the recommendation which was from the scratchpad.

Does that answer your question, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you very much. Do we have any other questions?

Not seeing any. All right. Let's go to 10. Prioritization/rationalization of activities, policies, and recommendations. As noted in Section 1, the finance stuff has been moved back up to Issue 1. Introduction added to the requirements by ATRT3 plenary in August 2019. Information [assessed] related to the prioritization, blah, blah, blah. ATRT2 recommendations related. There are none. ATRT3 survey. Annex B. Question 37-42. Other information. Results of the evolution of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. ICANN Board paper on resourcing and prioritization of community recommendations. Draft proposal for community discussions. Recommendations access request review, which is the list of all the pending recommendations for approval and implementation, which gives us 325 or whatever. Summary of

recommendations relating—oh, no. Sorry. That's the next one. Public comment draft. Financial assumptions and projections for the development of fiscal year '21-'25 operating plan and financial plan. ICANN Org reviews website. Operating standards for specific reviews. ICANN bylaws Section 4.4.4.5 and 4.6. And the draft fiscal year '19 plan and budget blog post.

So that's all the material that was considered here. The analysis of the information to identify the issues gives us the following. Neither the bylaws nor the operating standards provide a clear, consistent methodology for formulating effective review team or cross-community recommendations, nor do they provide a basis for evaluating resource requirements associated with such recommendation, prioritizing recommendations across the universe of review teams and cross-community working groups of for budgeting prioritized recommendations. This has resulted in a backlog of 325 recommendations (summary of recommendations) which are either awaiting approval or implementation. This number does not include the ATRT2 recommendations from this report, which will include the 21 recommendations from ATRT2 not or partially implemented and the SSR2 review recommendations due to be completed in the next few months.

Adding to the challenge of potentially implementing all of these recommendations are the following considerations. The draft financial assumptions and projections for the development of the fiscal year '21-'25 operating plan does not include funding for the implementation of all of these recommendations in the operating costs and has little or not surpluses available for this under most scenarios. The significant delays

EN

in implementation will cause some recommendations to no longer be applicable or desirable. There is no process to retire recommendations which have been approved.

ATRT3 also notes that the responses to its survey regarding the prioritization. 92% of structures and 73% of individuals supported ATRT3 making recommendations about prioritization and rationalization of ICANN activities. 100% of structures and 85% of individuals supported ATRT3 making recommendations about including a process to retire recommendations as it becomes apparent that the community will never get to them or they have been overtaken by other events.

I don't know why there's a question mark. I'll fix that.

100% of structures and 97% of individuals supported ATRT3 making recommendations about having the community or representatives of the community be involved as decisional participants in any mechanism which makes recommendations for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN. It is in this context that the ATRT3 concluded that it will make a recommendation with respect to prioritization of recommendations [from] reviews and cross-community working group[s].

I'll pause there for a sec and see if there are any questions. I don't think there should be anything new in there.

All right. Now, the recommendation we have gone through and basically okayed as part of our scratchpad. So, given that we want to have as much time possible to discussing our recommendation on reviews, I think this basically takes us to the end.

I see no questions and would propose that we close this off. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that, Bernie. Just to remind everybody, particularly those who are observers that may not have joined us before, by using the terminology "close this off," it means that we're relatively happy with this as a penultimate draft. But, of course, we will be doing a full run through of all final text and looking for the [consent] regarding all the recommendations and suggestions that we're making. So it's not as if it's never going to be looked at again.

But right now, we're going to be moving on to discussion of our next very important section. With that, hopefully I've given [inaudible]. I'm getting "Internet is Unstable" messages. If I drop off, I do have an audio connection, but it's probably going to be safest to have Pat [inaudible]. I'm sure everyone else will appreciate if you manage the queuing and everything through this next section in case I'm challenged by the communications gremlins.

With that, I'm going to hand it over to Pat and obviously back to Bernie to take us through the review-of-reviews discussion.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. Let's bring up the scratchpad document, please. Thank you. I believe the recommendation on reviews is the before-last-one in that document, if I remember correctly.

Brenda, can we go down on the document, please? Thank you.

BRENDA BREWER: I'm sorry, Bernie. You want me to scroll where?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: To the review of reviews. It's the before-last recommendation on that document … Accountability indicators … I think it's the next one. Oh, no. ATRT2. So it's the one after that. Sorry.

BRENDA BREWER: [It's all right. Okay].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Prioritization … nope. I guess it's the last one. There's only one left. It better be that one.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BERNIE TURCOTTE: [Yay!] Thank you very much. I'll just make sure that Sebastien is still with us. Are you there, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I am there, just on the phone. But I am trying to follow with the other screen. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, great. So we're on the scratchpad document at the bottom: Reviews (second draft). Specific reviews. RDS reviews should be terminated. CCT reviews: there should be one additional and clearly scoped CCT review. On the changes to the format here, just to put us back in context, Sebastien suggested some edits, and I included all of those in this part.

It should be limited to the duration of one year. Additionally, all data required by this review should be identified and it's availability confirmed within 30 days of the review being launched. SSR reviews. Given SSR2 will not be completed prior to ATRT3 completing its work, ATRT3 recommends that SSR reviews should be suspended until the next ATRT2 review or any type of review that include current ATRT duties, which [shall] decide if these should be terminated or not. The review could be reactivated at any time by the ICANN Board, should there be a need for this. ATRT reviews should continue essentially as they are currently constituted but with the following modifications: Shall start not later than five years after the approval of the previous ATRT2's recommendations by the Board for implementation. Shall maintain responsibility to recommend to then Board termination, amendment of other period reviews, and the creation of additional periodic reviews, which may include versions of reviews terminated by previous ATRT.

"This phrase is not clear for me. I don't understand." We can work on the wording of that. Thank you, Osvaldo.

All pre-identified documentation is required for the review—that is the next ATRT2 review, such as the previous ATRT's implementation report, shall be available at the first meeting of the review team. Terms of reference shall be established at the first meeting. Note: the operating standards for specific reviews shall be amended to allow review teams to obtain professional services which is not covered by subject matter experts, should they require such services.

I think we'll all remember this discussion from Brussels, where we all agreed to that.

Before we go to organizational reviews, let's see if we have any comments here. I have the cleanup to clarify the language for Osvaldo under that ATRT thing, but, apart from that, I think we're good on specific reviews. But let's confirm that.

All right—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet. Please.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, sir.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We have still something in brackets, but is it not the right time to discuss it? It's after the yellow lines.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Let's go back up to that. Good point, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's after the yellow lines. It's, "Shall start no later than five years after."

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. "Shall start no later than five years after the first approval of the previous ATRTs' recommendations by the Board for implementation." Did you put that in, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess a long time ago, yes. The idea is that, as we have seen now the possibilities that are done by the Board in different Board meetings … And some may be not approved by the Board but sent back to other groups. Therefore, I think it's important to say it's the first one. When they start the first approval, we'll start the [inaudible] for the fires.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Will trigger the timer.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. I understand that now. If people are okay with that, I can work some language around that. I don't think it's not exactly like that, but I can include things that will convey that meaning.

We have a thumbs up from Cheryl. I'm not seeing any objections. So I shall take a note to edit that and Osvaldo's comment. That would settle specific reviews, unless there are other comments.

Going once … going twice … done. So that section for specific reviews has a few edits, which I'll be working on. But they're just edits. We're not having any massive discussion.

For the massive discussions, let's go to organizational reviews. The current formula of using consultants to perform individual evaluations of each SO/AC/NC (meaning Nominating Committee) every five years shall be terminated and replaced by …

Let's halt there for a sec. I think there was general agreement to that in Brussels. We've never argued about saying that we will terminate those and replace them. Is there any discussion about that at this point?

Going once … going twice … okay. Let's go on to the next one. Shall be replaced by a continuous improvement program. ICANN Org shall work with each SO/AC/NC to establishing a continuous improvement program. Such a continuous improvement program shall have a common base between all SOs, ACs, and the NC but will also allow for customization as to best meet the needs of each individual SO/AC/NC. These continuous improvement programs will include …

Now, we have a few comments. Sebastien was talking about including the Board in a review. I was uncertain that was in our scope. We'll get to that one next.

Is there any discussion around the continuous improvement paragraph we just read? It's got all the key words in there. We've added the NC. We've added the common base. And we've added customization.

All right. Now let's go to that comment from Sebastien. "Thanks, but even if I know that the Board is a [specific beast,] it will be useful for the systemic review to have some part" – let's see that full comment, please, Brenda, from Sebastien; thank you—"in the request to SO/AC/NC completed by the Board also. Like it reports every three years."

If I'm understanding that one properly, Sebastien, you're saying that the SO/AC/NC requests to the Board should be part of the evaluation that we're talking about. Is that correct?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. The idea here is that, for the systemic review, what will be used, among other things, is a report made by each SO/AC/NC every three years, for example. I think the Board can complete the same type of input to the systemic review. We don't ask them to go through all the other details. They have already a lot of possibility to have an Internet review, I guess. The continuous improvement program is already something that the Board works on for a lot of years. Therefore, I was just thinking that we need to have this input as the other SO/ACs to the systemic review. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. That's interesting.

We have a comment from Leon in the chat. "Something like the 360 review it currently does."

I guess so.

The part I'm struggling with Sebastien, is, are we asking them to produce a new report? In here, we're going to specify to a certain degree what we're expecting from the SOs and the ACs and the NomCom. From the Board, they already produce a lot of material.

"Are we asking for some new material? Are we asking that they amalgamate that material so the systemic review"—I'm perfectly fine with the systemic review, considering this. I think that makes a certain amount of sense, but I'm unclear on the specific input on how we should write that. If it's just access to the documents like we did in ATRT3, I think, fine, we can mention that. But, if you're looking for a specific additional review document to be included in the systemic review, then I need to understand that so I can write it properly.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may, I don't think that there is already a document. And sorry, Leon, but I can't read anything when you make a comment on the chat. I have no Internet. I can't read anything then. Thank you to Bernie to mention that. I'm not sure that the 360 is 360. If I am not mistaken, it is done for Board members. But what we are here looking for is a global view of what was—I would take some example—the relationship between this. So I see then the Board [inaudible] for the last three years. Board improvement was done within the Board. It could be using already-existing material, but also I guess you [won], as we are looking for a new

EN

type of review with this systemic review. It's where I think the Board must have specific inputs. I am not sure that there is already further comments or documents that are fully answering the idea here. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm struggling a bit here. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I would like to understand better. I believe that all improvements that the Board is doing related to how they work and which they process they are following now is [posted] for the public all the time. I don't know if [we could] put [it] together in just one report. It's not just more work than needed for the Board itself because once we go for our systemic review, we can get all those processes and review them—anything that the Board has already public.

So I don't know if we should add more work for that or if this could be the participation of Board members when this systemic review is done. The members could address all the issues they have, not necessarily a specific document just to put together. I don't know. I believe it's just more work that does not add much value for the group that will do the systemic review. But whatever. I can live with that, but I believe it's not adding value and is giving more work for groups [inaudible]. So I believe it's done. We can see all the progress if you go to the Board page. So I don't see it needed, but I can live with that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Thank you, Vanda. Cheryl?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, Bernie. I unmuted and then muted myself. In listening to what Vanda just said, if I understand what Sebastien's trying to achieve here in this section, as I understand, what he's trying to do is to ensure that there is a specific calling out just in the same way as this [set] of bullet points is specifying things that the support organizations, advisory committees, and the NomCom observe—in other words, that layer of structures within ICANN and their subcomponents. There is also in the same way an interrelationship/interaction report/set of data points report or whatever that is applying to the ICANN Board.

So, as I understand it, the proposal is to ensure that it's not just a matter of annual information being accumulated from the layer within the organizational diagram of SO/AC and their component parts but also is inclusive of whatever has happened in the ICANN Board. I think, from my point of view, what would be important about verbalizing that as some sort of point here is that it will then allow us to capture a set of data points that can be perhaps used to show a degree or development of improvement for the Board and the Board's interaction with the component parts of ICANN as the continuous improvement program goes on.

So, Sebastien, I've probably mangled that. Please tell me if I have, but I think that I heard those principles as what you were wanting.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Your thoughts, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think it's a good, I will say, summary. I want to just take one example. I am not sure that everything exists to report what the Board is doing. It's why I am not asking them to do a lot of new things but just to put together, each three years, where there where and where they are now. It would be easier, like for the others, if it's done by the Board and not by the systemic review. The systemic review will have to do. If it's better if they take pieces from each and every one, including the Board. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sebastien. I'm glad I wasn't misinterpreting you. To that end, we, perhaps, Bernie, could have a go at some sort of text whereby we note the importance of the curation of this annual data capture exercise as a foundation of the continuous improvement program and ensure that it's inclusive of the Board without being overly prescriptive. Obviously we'll have to come back to this language, but do you think you've got enough, Bernie, to try and make my gibberish and Sebastien's aspirations into something that we can then work on at our next call?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'll give it a shot.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you kindly.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Cheryl. Okay, thank you for clearing that up. I think that was a good discussion.

Let's go into our next section: annual satisfaction survey of members. Each SO/AC/NC shall perform a comprehensive annual satisfaction survey or equivalent mechanism of its members. The focus of the survey should be on the members' satisfaction and issue identification versus their respective SO/AC/NC but can also include satisfaction with ICANN Org services, such as staff support, travel services, translation services, etc. For SO/ACs that are composed of substructures, this should apply to their individual substructures. The results of all substructures shall be aggregated to generate a result for the given SO or AC. The results of these would be public and used to support the continuous improvement program, as well as input for the systemic review. If the survey results note a significant issues, this shall be the trigger to initiate appropriate measures to deal with any such issues.

So that's the satisfaction survey. Are we good here? We didn't have any outstanding comments on that.

I'm not seeing anything. Let's call that one as "okay."

Regular assessment of continuous improvement programs. Each SO/AC/NC will undertake some type of formal process to evaluate its continuous improvement activities—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bernie, I am sorry. I tried to get off mute and [inaudible] was not working.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No problem.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have a few comments on this. I didn't write it, but when you read it, I had two questions or comments. The first one is on the first bullet point on the annual satisfaction survey of members. We are talking about members, and I know that we have some members, but, at the same time, we are not a member organization. It's where maybe we need to add a survey for the members and the participants just to be more open on some parts of the organizations where there are really members. It could be larger than just the members themselves.

The second—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'll just interrupt you for a second. Leon has typed in the chat: "Maybe we can use "constituents.""

They're all good comments. I think that's a good comment, Sebastien. It's a great comment. Leon, ""Member" and "participants" have to be defined," is what Daniel just put into the chat. I think I'm getting the hint, and I'll try to include something on that one.

Great. Sorry, Sebastien. Back to you for your second point.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. Thank you. The second is that I suggest that you change translation by language services at the end of the first bullet point.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Good point. I will do that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Anything else?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Not for the moment. Thank you, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: My Editor in Chief: Sebastien.

EN

All right. Not seeing any other comments, let's go back to the regular assessment. This is where we are going to have some more discussions.

Regular assessment of continuous improvement programs. Each SO/AC/NC will undertake some type of formal process to evaluate its continuous improvement activities at least once every three years. This would allow the systemic review to consider a minimum of two assessment reports for each SO/AC/NC. Details of the assessments will be defined during the elaboration of the continuous improvement program with each SO/AC/NC.

Now, on the righthand side, there's a comment there where I've copied some original text from Sebastien. Can we go to that and expand that comment, please, Brenda? As the original text: A five-day face-to-face every three years of each of them except during the time of the systemic review.

I have removed that. That is the heart of what we're talking about relative to regular assessments. What I have included in here is a more flexible approach to that which combined with the next section. I'm going to propose I read the next section because they go hand-in-hand because, in part of the to-and-fro with Sebastien, we were talking about ensuring that we're not losing funding and that the idea behind this continuous improvement program is not a cost reduction but really a shift in approach to make something more effective. So I am going to propose we read the next couple of paragraphs and then we consider the whole thing together. So if we could go down a bit, Brenda, on funding, which is just one paragraph.

Funding of the continuous improvement for SO/AC/NC. The continuous improvement program is not meant to be a cost reduction activity versus current overall costs of organizational reviews over a five-year period. ICANN shall ensure that, as a minimum, the same overall budget is available for the continuous improvement efforts of the SO/AC/NCs.

Part of Sebastien's concern was that, if we don't specify this five-day meeting every three years, there would be some cost cutting. I tried to address it there.

Pat, you have a hand.

PAT KANE: I have two.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Excellent.

PAT KANE: My question here, Bernie, when I read through this is, do we want this as a statement about the same exact dollars or percentage of budget?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I crafted this to leave it open so we could have a discussion about that.

PAT KANE: Okay.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	So I don't have an answer for you. I think it's something we can talk about.
	Here's the full concept. This is where we have some divergence of opinion with Sebastien, so I'm going to take it over to Sebastien at this point.
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you very much, Bernie. On that point, I am perfectly okay. It's a good way to say part of my thinking, but one of my concerns—I know that you are pushing more for it to be more open, and each one could decide—is that the risk is that, if we enter into a three-year discussion about how we will do continuous improvement and what we will do in each and every SO and AC, then they will have nothing in common at the end of the day. Therefore, it's part of my concern.
	The question of budget, I guess, is well-taken. The question of Pat is a good one. We may say something—the same overall budget—as of today but keep it evolving in the future because it's not the same amount of dollars, if you say there's big inflation or something like that.
	But, at the same time, maybe what we can say is that [inaudible] one of the ideas was to have this five-day retreat we would like each SO and AC to consider. Some SO/ACs or the NomCom may already have a retreat where they can add one or two days or three days and not the full five days to take that specific into account. Others may not have and will be happy to use that as a way forward.

Therefore, my suggestion is to add that in the text but not to be too prescriptive as you try to do, Bernie, the document. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Sebastien. Out of this discussion, we have three points here. I think the first point Sebastien brings up is a good one, which is, in defining this continuous improvement program, we would be at this for five years. And that's not going to be very useful. So maybe what we need to include in here is some sort of stipulation that this gets done within—let's be reasonable—a year or a maximum of two that each SO and AC has their program in place and can do its two evaluations before the 12-18 months. Cheryl types that in there.

Since Sebastien doesn't have Internet, I'll read a few comments. Jacques say, "We'll now call him Two-Hands Pat." From Cheryl: "[I am concerned. Is exact dollars percent or statement of … sufficiently suits my thinking best here.]" Vanda: "I believe overall budget. Leave this open enough. Specific about dollars or percentages is a little restrictive in my view." Cheryl: "Relative to implementing the continuous improvement program, suggest 12-18 months."

I think something like that. That's a really great suggestion, Sebastien, because you're absolutely right. As probably many of us have lived through various continuous improvement exercises in various employments we have been in, they don't necessarily percolate to the top very easily. If you don't put in a timeline on that, they tend to fall to the bottom a little too often.

So will propose something along the lines of the 12-18 months, unless there is an objection. If there is an objection, please put up a red X in the discussion. But I think that's a really good suggestion. Thank you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think I agree with that. I just want to remind us that we have suggested and we will discuss later on that there's a systemic review. This systemic review will be around 18 months. That could be good timing to have that done by each SO and AC in parallel to the specific review. By that, at the end of the systemic review, we have both elements to be worked on after that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Interesting suggestion. Thank you, Sebastien. All right. So I'm taking that 12-18 months. We may end up combining that with an initial systemic. That is to be discussed in some of the later paragraphs.

The second point … Well, I'll go the third one, which is the budget, since we've got a few comments. What I'm reading in there from the comments and part of the discussion is that Pat had a question of whether it was percentage or dollars of today. What I'm getting from the comments so far is that the general way in which I've crafted this is probably adequate it. I'll re-read it.

The continuous improvement program is not meant to be a cost reduction activity versus current overall costs of organizational reviews over a five-year period. ICANN shall ensure that, as a minimum, the

EN

same overall budget is available for the continuous improvement efforts of the SO/AC/NC.

Now let's have a discussion on that one. I think we can wrap that one up fairly quickly. Do we leave it like that? Do we make it a little fuzzier? Or, as Pat has suggested, do we make it a little harder?

People are being shy. Pat?

PAT KANE: Thanks, Bernie. The reason why I bring it up is that, when we talk about prioritization of monies, I'm concerned that, from a budgeting exercise, that if a staff can push around certain money to do certain things, we want to make certain we're staking out a claim of specific dollars for this as opposed to leaving it up to how funds get assigned in the future because, if we take a look at the five-year strategic plan, which one of the items is a fiscal component in terms of making certain that ICANN is fully funded, I'm not sure what that means three, four, or five years from now. So that was part of what was drawing me to say something specific or hard in terms of the available monies as opposed to more loose and open to what happens in the future.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, but what we've got written here, Pat, is "versus current overall cost of organizational reviews over a five-year period." I think this is not a percentage-based approach but it's as close to a hard dollar approach I think we can get.

Then we go onto to say, "ICANN shall ensure that, as a minimum, the same overall budget is available for the continuous improvement efforts of the SO/AC/NC."

I understand your point, but I think we're covered by writing it like that.

PAT KANE: Very good then.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Any other comments?

I see Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Every I time I hear—more than I hear it than when I read it—where it says "the same," part of my brain goes, "Same as what? Same as what when?" This is I think is where, if I could be in a sufficiency term … I know it's "at a minimum," the same as "current," but we don't say the word "current." I don't necessarily want it tied to "current," but I do want it to be sufficient. So I'm not helping, I know. It's just I wanted to just pop that out and see if someone more articulate than I am can see what I mean and perhaps some sort of words together. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I understand what you're saying, Cheryl. I wrestled with this. The best I could come up with is, the moment you start deviating from the

current, you start creating a need for a whole rationalization one way or another.

For Sebastien, who doesn't have Internet, I'll read a few comments. From Wolfgang: "[Originally, on this budget thing, for me it's okay.]" From Leon: "I guess the key heroics[:] we are expressly saying it shouldn't be a cost reduction mechanism." [inaudible] heroics. I'm unclear on that part. From Vanda: "Leon, cannot be understood as reduction of cost mechanism." From Leon: "Exactly, Vanda. It should not be understood as that, and I feel the way it's worded reflects that protection." Cheryl: I'm wresting here as well."

What I'm going to suggest is, given this discussion could extend quite a lot out, I'm going to propose that we put a lid on this. Sebastien was generally satisfied with it. We're getting quite a few comments. They're happy with the text. We're getting some concern from Cheryl and Pat. Let's take this to the list. We'll come back to it on our next call, if that's okay with everyone.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I just give a few feedback on that, please?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Please, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I love the comment made by Cheryl because I think we can work on that and maybe use that word but also keep the minimum. Like

that, we have some flexibility—not the flexibility in the reduction but flexibility in addition if the budget allows.

My second point is because I know that we understand that we [reasoned] here. Why are we talking about a five-year period? It's because we used to have five years for each SO and AC review. Here it will not be the same. Therefore, it's the five-year [inaudible], and it will be the six- or seven-year future. Here I don't know how we can write that, but—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I understand your point. As you were saying it, I was looking at that. I can fix that fairly easily, I think.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. That's my two comments. Thank you for the discussion.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: And they're good. Everyone, let's discuss this on the list. If you have some time, I'll be bringing some modification so people can comment back in the scratchpad document. Let's give this one a second shot at our next meeting.

I see a thumbs up from by Co-Chair, Cheryl. Unless there are objections, we'll move on.

Our third point here was regular [assessment]. Sebastien originally was suggesting a five-day workshop every three years for each SO and AC.

EN

I thought that was overly prescriptive. The reason I thought that was overly prescriptive was that, if a SO and AC wants to do an annual update of its continuous improvement program and publish that, then that's great. They can use the funding that would be set aside for that for other continuous improvement activities. The three-to-five day workshop, as I understand it from what Sebastien was suggesting, was a face-to-face activity. Today in our discussion Sebastien said, "Well, maybe we could combine it with some other things." I'm going to keep arguing for the more flexibility.

We could include in there the notion that, if people don't do anything else, then they should get together every three years. But we do say that indirectly. "It's continuous improvement [inaudible] at least once every three years." Maybe we can expand that a little bit, saying, if they're not doing anything else, then they're going to have to have a face-to-face every three years to produce a report.

Also, let's remember that part of the concern Sebastien I had that I think is correct as we discussed on our first point was that, well, it may take a while for the SOs and ACs to actually get a continuous improvement program. So now we've agreed to put in a timeline on that in our recommendations, saying, after our recommendations are approved, there should be a 12-18 month period for getting that done.

Here's my take on that as my proposal to Sebastien. I would amend the text that is there right now—"once every three years"—and expand that to say that, if the SOs and ACs are not otherwise producing that report every three years, they should or will—they shall; sorry—have that three- to five-day workshop to produce that report.

I've spoken enough. Sebastien, I think I'll give you the floor for a minute or two.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Bernie. I think it's a good way forward. Just one thing. I would prefer that you just put five days. If they do four days, nobody will argue with them. If they do three, it will be the same. But I suggest that it's five days.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Understood.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But, for the rest, I think it's a good way forward like that. It gives also the possibility for the others to say, "Hey, guys. I would like to do the same, even if I want to do something else in addition." I guess I love that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you very much, Sebastien. I think we got a way forward, pending me able to pen something that is satisfactory to everyone. I will certainly try to do that. I think we're doing okay. So I've got to write some text on the regular assessment. Right now, we're keeping the wording as it is for the funding. We will go back to it on our next meeting.

In the meantime, if you have suggestions, please put them in the document or put it on the mailing list.

And that would conclude this section. Thank you, everyone. Let's go down to the next one: the systemic review I believe.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, I'm suggesting, because we're running [two of] our meetings … Pat and I were trying to give a small break partway through. It seems to me that this is a natural point in time for a five-minute break. You can rest your voice and have a sip of water or three and we can stretch our legs.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Bless you. Thank you very much. All right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's make it quarter past the hour. We'll get back into this next session.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you very much. Talk to you in four minutes.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: And Herb has got time to …

Thanks very much. Pat and I have just taken a short break with the rest of the review team while we've hopefully stretched our legs and

grabbed coffee and had a sip of water. Now we're back into the thick of it.

Bernie, hopefully you're slightly more hydrated now.

If you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. I'm back, Cheryl, and ready when you are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good to go then. Over to you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. I saw above the systemic review that we missed a paragraph. Can we go back up to that, Brenda, please?

[inaudible]. Regardless of the process selected by the specific SO/AC/NC, this shall fit in the financial constraints available for such activities.

Ah, yes. Okay. So we said his is not a cost cutting exercise and "as a minimum" will be put in there. But we're also balancing that with the process selected by the SOs and ACs and the NC for their continuous improvement program. That should fit in that envelope. This is not a blank check we're writing to everyone. I think, these days, the financial realities of the company only make sense.

Since we didn't discuss that, let's throw that on the floor. Is that okay as a counterbalancing to the previous paragraph?

Going once … going twice … sold. Thank you, everyone. So we'll take that as being acceptable.

We've now reached our final chapter in our reviews recommendations: systemic review of ICANN every seven years. Now, you'll remember, in Brussels, we agreed to this concept. I think there are a few details we have to finish ironing out here. Let's get that done. We've actually put everything else away on this. So I think we're doing great. We have all of 45 minutes left on this call, so I'm really looking forward to us maybe being able to work our way through this. I'm hopefully [inaudible].

A systemic review of ICANN every seven years should operate on the operating standards for specific review.

Why we put that in? Let's not reinvent the wheel. Specific reviews have a bunch of rules about how you choose people, how they have to work together, etc., etc. So let's be practical about this.

Now, the objectives of this review—some of the things we talked about. Review continuous improvement efforts of SO/AC/NC based on best practices. Review the effectiveness of the various inter-SO/AC/NC collaboration mechanisms. Review the accountability of SO/ACs or constituent parts to their members' constituencies. Review SO/AC/NC as a whole to determine if they can 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.

Now, this last paragraph is a copy-paste from the bylaws, so we're not inventing text here. There may have been a minor edit to fit it in here.

Are we okay with these objectives for the systemic review? Let's remember this is where the pieces/the reports—at least two reports from each SO and AC—will fit in here. We're going to include some text about requiring the Board to produce at least two reports that we can include in here so that the systemic review team can have all that input when they start. Let's throw it open to the floor. Are we good?

Deafening silence. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I have a question. The—oh, I never remember the name—Empowered Community—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Empowered Community, yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Is it something that we can put also as a bullet point here? It's really a question. When you read that, I saw that there is also this list there. Maybe it's better to put it here, not to say that we need to change it but to say that it needs to be reviewed as the other body we are talking about.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: That's a really interesting question. The reason I'm sighing a bit is that we've baked in a lot of Board oversight into the mechanics of the Empowered Community. If we start to going to deeply into the Empowered Community, we're touching on mechanisms that have huge ramifications. So I'm …

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Bernie, I agree with you, but just to take one example: just go back to in 2002. Imagine that the Empowered Community was already that. That was not the case, but when ICANN split the GNSO [into] the GNSO and ccNSO, it would have had an effect on the Empowered Community. Therefore, if we do something like that [or] crunch together something, it will have an implication on the Empowered Community. It's why I was thinking to add that as the point of at least concern that needs to be taken into account or—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Oh. [inaudible] I really have no problem. Under the last bullet, if we want to insert something on the impact of the Empowered Community, I have no problem with that. I think that makes perfect sense.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may, if we do that, I suggest that we do any impact on the Empowered Community and on the Board—that we cover also with that. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, I understand that. Agreed. Pat?

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. I think we need to be careful when we talk about a review of the Empowered Community, since so much of the establishment of the Empowered Community and their powers are steeped in California law. I think that we should be very cautious here because, if we're going to allow the community or this process—this systemic review—to make recommendations that require us to go back and figure out how that works within California law and not just the bylaws, I think that's going to be a bigger chunk than what I would think we should do as part of a systemic or systemwide process view. There's already a process for us to change bylaws. It's well-recognized for the ICANN organization itself of the ICANN Board itself but that was a big chunk of time and money. I don't know that anybody would have the skillset to be able to—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Or the appetite.

PAT KANE: Or appetite, yes, to think through that—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Just a comment on that, Pat. I think, in my last exchange with Sebastien, what we agreed to is that we're not reviewing the Empowered Community. However, in the last bullet, where we say—we maintain

we're creating this; this is actually existing right now in the ATRT review section—"Do the SOs and ACs continue to have a purpose in ICANN structure as they are currently constituted or are any changes to structure or operations are desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as ensure optimal representation?" what we have agreed to with Sebastien is that, if there are any significant changes to SOs and ACs as per that paragraph, then we're simply adding a note that we have to consider the impact on the Empowered Community and the Board of any such changes.

So I don't know if that brings any comfort to you, Pat, with that change.

PAT KANE: Thanks for that, Bernie. I'll take a look at it and reread it and think about it a little bit further, but I don't want to present a crack or some kind of fissure that people could crawl through and say, "We're going to go make recommendations here." I think that that's—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I full understand, which is why I having that discussion with Sebastien. However, that paragraph is currently in existence. We're living with it and the Empowered Community. I think that, with any systemic review that is considering that paragraph, we have to make clear they understand the reach of any changes they're going to make in there, including the Empowered Community and all that it brings with it, including the Board also.

But, yes, fine. Let's all have a think about that one because there are certainly concerns there.

All right. That would conclude the objectives, unless anybody else … There are a few comments here just to catch Sebastien up. From Leon: "What impact will this have on in volunteer time [in] dealing with the piling of reviews?" Vanda responds: "Leon, remember the timeline we had done before exactly showing great reduction in [inaudible] time unless hours of work as soon in the slide. Remember it." [Jacque to everyone] … agrees with Pat when he was talking about concerns versus the Empowered Community. Tola: +1 on Pat. Jacques: "Maybe even out of our mandate at that." From Daniel: "I'm in agreement with Pat." And Vanda is in agreement with Pat.

So everyone has got significant concerns about playing with the Empowered Community. We're not reviewing the Empowered Community. We've taken that off the table. But, as a result of existing wording in the bylaws, we're simply highlighting that, if a systemic review goes down that path, there may be impacts on the Empowered Community and the Board. We have to take that into account.

Not seeing any other requests, I think what I have is a little bit of homework to do that minor adjustment on that last bullet of the objectives.

Now, on the last bullet of this section, in the initial version of this systemic review—should be "the" systemic review—should be launched now later than one year after the approval of this recommendation.

So we have a proposal on the table. We're starting the cycle, if you will, with a systemic review. Now, there are pluses and there are minuses to this. The plus is, if you will, to a certain extent, if we're undergoing a systemic review, there are no continuous improvement reviews within the SOs and the ACs, which they are not prepared for anyways because they haven't finished implementing their continuous review program. If we think about the 12 to 18 months to implement, it matches pretty much then 12 to 18 months for a systemic review. So, in a way, that is very good. It gives a bird's eye view.

Now, on the downside, what we've got versus waiting the six or seven years to get to a systemic review is we've got our work, which is coming to an end. We just finished an ATRT review. We've got the 325 recommendations pending, which we don't have a prioritization process for which is dealing with them, and yet we're starting another major review within the ICANN community.

Third is doing a systemic review which to a significant part is depending on the SO and AC continuous improvement reports, of which there will be none.

Now, the final argument for this, if you will, to a certain extent, is that, yes, we're saying we're concluding our ATRT3 work, but our ATRT3 work doesn't look at the SOs and ACs. So really, in a way, it could be an abbreviated, if you will, systemic review.

I think there are arguments for. There are arguments against. In my mind, I think it's really difficult to make a call one way or another. I would really like to hear from the group on that one. So what I think I'd

like to do is ask Sebastien to speak to it first because he certainly was the proponent of this, and I don't want to seem that I'm hogging the mic here.

So, Sebastien, can you talk to us for a few minutes about it? Then maybe we can have a discussion on this final point. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you. Sorry. It took time to find out how to come back with the mic. If I take your inputs, Bernie—I understand they are [inaudible]—I wanted to add some pluses.

The first one is, as it's written somewhere, ICANN didn't go through a systemic review since 2002—a long time ago. The second is that as inputs [inaudible] all the reviews done by SOs and ACs and the implementation plan that are on the table, it is a good input for the systemic review.

Therefore, I don't think that it must be shortened.

My last point is I really feel that it's something ICANN needs, I will say, even more today than last time we discussed it. The current situation in the world will need us and will need ICANN to have a way to think about organization in the future and so and so forth. I really feel that, if we put that as a proposal, it will be a good way forward for ICANN to go. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Thank you, Sebastien. I think those are valid points. We haven't had a systemic review since 2002. That's a really good point. And the fact that we can use the results of the current organizational reviews. [inaudible] of any continuous reports from the SOs and AC is also valid.
	I see a hand a from Vanda.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	I do believe that we have finished the round of AC and SO reviews. So, starting with systemic review, using these inputs, I believe that it's something good: to have, as we said when we discussed this, a holistic view of ICANN. Then we start to with the continuous improvement and so on.
	In my view, the first thing that we should do is to really, with this kind of holistic view, have a common base. After that, we can start with what we propose for continuous improvements and, again, systemic [review] and so on. We could use the situation now with all the reviews of ACs and SOs done and use this for the benefit of ICANN.
	I agree with Sebastien that it could be fiscal year 2022 or maybe at the end of next year that will be a good time for that. Thank you.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	Thank you very much, Vanda. I think those were good words.
	All right. Any other thoughts?
	Okay. I'm going to take that as people think this makes sense.

One thing I want to add in that … Brenda, if we could go back up just a bit. Okay. Systemic review of ICANN every seven years. As we have done in our own review, defining when the seven years starts should be based on when the previous one finishes and has its recommendations accepted by the Board, should we maintain that for this recommendation? Similarly to what Sebastien suggested in the other work: from the first approval of a recommendation by the Board. Would that make sense to everyone? That the seven-year clock starts not from when the previous systemic review started, not when the previous systemic review ended, but once the Board has approved the first recommendation from the previous systemic review, which would make it consistent with the other things we said and, I think, make sense.

I see Pat has a hand.

The hand went away. We had a thumbs up from Cheryl, and I have an Agree in the chat from Vanda.

Pat, your hand is up.

PAT KANE: I apologize. I went to turn the handle [inaudible] muted myself. So I think that's a part of it. I think the other combination that we need to add to this specific one is there's got to be some correlation to the completion of whatever reviews the SO/AC/NC are doing from their continuous improvement efforts because, since the objectives are all based upon those areas, we've got to make certain we've got those components appropriately timed for when the systemic review begins as well. I think. I don't know how to—

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I understand exactly what you're saying. I will work through the timeline mechanics and be able to come back to that when we touch on that at our next meeting. I understand the concern. I will look into that and point out any issues.

PAT KANE: Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sebastien, over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If Brenda can scroll down to the image at the bottom of the document, [or in most of the bottom of the document], we can see there in the—I guess it's orange colors. They're yellow and orange. If we take that into account, it may be changed. It's not the final one. Here you have "The Board including" … But, from an organizational perspective, we go through each year to [three] SOs and ACs' continuous improvement and work to be done for each every three years. If we want to go through all the groups, it takes three years. If we do it twice, it takes six years. We didn't include any time in between because, for the first one, we have started three years before and have two years to implement it.

Therefore it's something that can be variable. We need to see how it will work for the ones who are doing the last three ones.

At the same time, we have 18 months for the systemic review. In the design, it's clear that we start the second one at the end of all the SO/AC three-year report. That's going to be taken into account because, if for any reason—good reason—there is ones who are taking more time, we need to be to adjust it.

One of the questions where we are talking about the review is that it was too prescriptive on when it must be done and how. It's why maybe we can find this time. In fact, if you take the first decision of the Board, it's not seven years. The seven years was for building among the six years plus some time to organize. But, if we take the first decision of the Board, it's maybe more around six years and seven years.

Therefore, it could be seven, but we need to be flexible to maybe do it a little bit earlier because it's needed or a little bit later because it will be more convenient for the overall organization.

That's some points I wanted to raise and discuss with you. Thank you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Sebastien. I think part of Pat's concern was with starting with a systemic review and getting the continuous improvement going in the SOs and ACs to make sure we're matching up the timeframe. But, as I said, I will look at it over the next few days and make certain. I think that I've got a green tick from Pat. Thank you. I like

EN

your flexibility approach, Sebastien. I think that's very wise, given what we've lived through.

Folks, we've done it. Basically, I think, pending the changes—the edits—that we've suggested, unless there is disagreement, I will say that we have general agreement on a recommendation regarding reviews.

Is that a correct understanding from everyone?

I get a thumbs up from Cheryl. I get a thumbs up from Pat. If anyone is in violent objection, please say so.

Vanda agrees. Demi: checkmark. Osvaldo agrees. Daniel agrees. All right. Jaap.

Okay, folks. Excellent work. We're done before the hour. Just to recap, there are some edits to be done and some verifications. I will now proceed to do that. They will be in the scratchpad document, so we can comment on those there. I would like to thank everyone.

Cheryl, back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wow. Thank you very much, everybody. I've left my pause running. I don't know whether that little blue ball looks like a pause to you, but that's what it's meant to be on the Zoom selection. Thank you for everyone's very useful discourse on this. I think we've progressed well in a topic that is vitally important to our work. Obviously, we will have another a little go at it, but this is a great step forward.

In this case, we have got a couple of moments for Any Other Business. If there is any other business, please bring it forward now.

Staff, do we have any other business that we're needing to look at?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted to suggest if we can spend a very few minutes on preparing the call with the COO. Do we want to send [Erin] and her team some questions about the open data, or we leave her to make a presentation and then have a discussion with her? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Sebastien. That, of course, is not our next call. It's the call after our next call. We've got a call scheduled for the 27th of March. We will certainly also have a leadership team meeting on the Monday before the call on the 1st of April. So we have a little bit of time to do that as opposed to squeezing it in at the end of a call now. Do put your thinking caps on on that. My immediate response is I think it's probably a reasonable thing to have a presentation and then a Q&A, but we can certainly discuss that.

Did you have a particular preference, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I understand your answer. Why I bring it here is that, if we have some specific question and issue, it's good to give her some time to be ready and not just a few days before. But that's just my thinking.

I think she knows what we are talking about, but maybe remind her in our invitation that we want to do that—to take what she can bring with the open data with what is the—I am so tired; sorry— … With the data we need to gather.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You obviously have a couple of questions or a bit of framing that you are very keen to make sure Susanna gets. Put it in writing when you're less weary so you're not struggling now [inaudible] French and put in to English at your leisure. We'll make sure that that gets forwarded to her. We can take a look at that as a small discussion point at the beginning of our next call. Okay?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I will try. It's about accountability indicators that is open data, that we need to be sure that she's [inaudible]. But I will. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. I mean, that is the topic. That is why she's joining us. That is what she's talking about.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, if you frame something, that's fantastic. If, indeed, anyone would like to frame some questions or some general questions or areas of interest within the accountability indicators in the open data program that we can forward to Susanna, we'll take somewhere between five and ten minutes at the beginning of our next call to look at that. Jennifer, if you can capture that as a little AI for our following call.

With that, I'm going to move to you, Jennifer, for any action items and decisions reached.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Cheryl. Bernie captured the action items quite nicely in his little summary there, but I will read what I captured. Bernie is going to adjust some of the text in the specific reviews to address Sebastien and Osvaldo's comments on the call today. There's text in the organizational review section to be adjusted based on comments on the call and also

comments in the document. Bernie will do that. Team members are encouraged to post suggested text to the list regarding the funding-of-continuous-improvement bullet and the organizational review section for discussion on the next call. Team members to share any questions or points of discussion to the list for Susanna Bennett and her team joining the meeting o the 1st of April.

With that, back to you. Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Jennifer. I can't think of anything else. Pat, is there anything we need to do for today's call.

PAT KANE: Nothing that I can think of. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. In which case, our next call is on the 27th of March at 21:00 UTC. Pat and I look forward to having you all there.

With that, I'll ask you to stop the recording. Thanks, Brenda. We'll close the meeting for today. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]