JENNIFER BRYCE:	All right, everyone. Welcome to the ATRT3 plenary meeting. I believe today is the 8th of April.
	I'll just do a quick roll call. On the call, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Bernie Turcotte, Demi Getschko, Adrian Rodriguez, Jaap Akkerhuis, Jacques Blanc, Jim Prendergast, Negar Farzinnia, Osvaldo Novoa, Pat Kane, Tola Sogbesan, Vanda Scartezini, Wolfgang Kleinwachter, and Avri Doria.
	Brenda is trying to rejoin us. Unfortunately, I don't have the agenda to display on the screen right now, but, as usual, our first agenda item is the welcome, roll call, and SOI updates. For that, I'll turn it over to Cheryl and Pat. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, Jennifer. If you can scramble and find the agenda, that would be really handy. Now, let's get any of statements-of-interest updates. I note that Daniel is having problems getting in. It might be that he's in the waiting room and not being allowed in there [with Brenda B.] in charge.
	But, anyway, other than Jaap telling us about repairs in his house, I don't see anything happening in chat. So let's see if anyone has any updates.
	Okay. Then our next piece of administration, assuming that you all are going to agree with the very simple agenda that we have already distributed is to ask if there's anyone with any Any Other Business that

they would like to put on to our agenda for today. We will again ask before the close of today's call.

Pat has informed us that, even though today's call is slated for 120 minutes, he actually only has 90 minutes that we can stay for. So let's see how we go as we progress through our final report. We may have all had enough by 90 minutes. Let's see what we're up to. As usual, we'll take a bio break. Let's try to make that a little bit short of the hour into our call today. We can assess how we go through the rest of the agenda.

The next piece of administration, assuming that you all agree—we will be moving on through our normally advertised program—is to ask if Jennifer can take us through any action items that are currently outstanding or any of the closed ones that need reporting on.

Jennifer, is there anything we need to share?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Cheryl. The work plan was circulated to the whole review team on Monday after the leadership call, where we made some proposed updates to the workplan. I had asked, based on our discussion on that call, for feedback by this plenary call this Wednesday. So just to note I haven't seen anything to the list. Thank you all for taking the time. I'll just assume that we can go ahead and post those updates now to the wiki. So, after this call today, I will do that.

Other than that, no other action items (closed) to report. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jennifer. Excellent. Yes, at the leadership call on Monday, I was delighted, as was Pat, with putting the finishing touches on that workplan. So I'm pleased to see that everyone else agrees that's what we need to currently publish in our update. We're tracking pretty well, considering the upheaval of not having a face-to-face meeting.

With this, I would like to now see if Jennifer, you're able to—ah, good. You just popped in the link for the document that we're about to dive into, Version 1.8 of the report. So you all have it in chat.

Jennifer, if it's possible, do you have hosting or share-screen capabilities in the absence of Brenda?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. I will be able to share my screen. One second.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Bernie, have a sip of water, take a deep breath, and get ready to dive on in. I know we've done quite a bit of editing and updating from last week's call. So watch this space, people. We're now going to wander all the way down to, I think, Page 53.

Is that correct, Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: No. 36, I believe.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, he wants to do something else first. Okay, Bernie. Over to you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. This should be the review section, which we went through last week. We had a few comments. They were integrated into the thing. But, given that that was new text, we'll take time to walk through the rationale for our recommendation, which was basically set.

ATRT2 recommendations—I think that's clear. The survey—that hasn't changed. If we go down a bit, please, Jennifer. All right. Specific reviews—whoa, whoa. Okay. The RDS—the recommendation is in the final report of the temporary specification for gTLD organization data. The Expedited Policy Development Process removes the need for a specific review on this. CCT—we said that we would recommend one more, two years following. The release of the new gTLDs—there was that question of a CCT review that was pending for what we were going to do. We did post Jonathan Zuck's remarks. He was the Chair of the CCT. He was happy with the recommendation of two years.

Maybe I'll ask Cheryl or Pat: are we doing anything else on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [I'm not] inclined to. Pat, what's your urge on that?

PAT KANE: I'm not inclined to, either.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:	All right.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay. Well, unless anyone can give us a compelling argument, I think we're settled then, Bernie. Thanks.
BERNIE TURCOTTE:	All right. Great. So no more issues with CCT. Let's drop down a bit, Jennifer, to SSR. SSR is still going on three years after in the letter confirming the pause of the activities as part of the results of concerns regarding access under. Blah, blah, blah.

What did we add—this is new—at Sebastien's request—I thought that was a really good idea—was the third bullet. There are a number of groups in ICANN which are involved in or have become involved in security and stability for ICANN. "Given some of these were not constituted when SSR reviews were started, ATRT3 believes the responsibilities of these groups versus the scope of the SSR reviews should be considered by the next ATRT review prior to launching the next SSR review. These groups include the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), which was just getting started when the first SSR review was launched, the ICANN Technical Experts Group, which had not been created when the first SSR review was launched, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, and the Chief Information Officer. The first meeting of SSR1 was held on 29 October 2010 at a time when the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) was just getting started."

I got to take that one out. That was a random bullet I forgot to kill when I was writing it. "Responses to the public comment on the draft SSR2. Some of the responses were very supportive, especially with respect to DNS abuse. However, the ATRT3 notes the very detailed comments of the SSAC and SAC 110, which put into question the usefulness, implementability, or supporting justification of a significant number of draft recommendations. Given ATRT3's final report will be published prior to SSR2 publishing its final report, ATRT3 will recommend suspending any further SSR reviews until the next ATRT review can consider the final SSR report recommendations, the results of the Board's consideration of these, as well as the prioritization of these according to ATRT3's recommendation on prioritization (see Section 9)."

I should probably add in something about that scope bullet that we put in, so I will take a note on that: "last point." But that will be a minor fix. I don't think anyone is going to lose any sleep over that.

I'll pause here for a sec. Are we good? Questions? Comments?

Not seeing any. All right, let's keep going. "Organizational reviews have been undertaken for a very long time." I believe I fixed the wayback machine listing and used the ICANN one, so I'm not going to go through reading all of that. Let's go down a bit.

Let's go down a bit. "The CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 report has been approved and has got a bunch of accountability indicators: transparency, participation, outreach, and updating of policy recommendations and, as noted, the Board paper on enhancing streamlining ICANN reviews, and the SSAC paper. Issues associated with

the timing and cadence of organizational reviews. There have been issues with recent organization reviews with respect to recommendations made by the independent examiner (ALAC, SSAC, or RSSAC), [and] the publication of the summary recommendations, which lists the 320 review recommendations which are pending, which include 164 organizational review recommendations." Then we talk about Section 10: the support on prioritization.

I'll hold there. Questions? Comments? Thoughts?

No. Okay. Sorry. Dropped off there. We go into the justification for some of our recommendations on timing. "ATRT3 concludes ICANN has reached a point of diminishing returns with respect to organizational reviews and has noted SOs and ACs have significantly evolved since the inception of organizational reviews." Blah, blah, blah. We went through all that. There were no comments there. "However, a continuous improvement program in each SO/AC/NC would not cover all the aspects of the organizational reviews, per the bylaws," quoting the bylaws. That's where we bring in the systemic review.

Let's go down a bit more. Then we have the issue of cadence and timing, where we suggest that organizational reviews—the issues—are removed, given we're going to continuous improvement programs in each of the SO/AC/NC. Specific reviews were mostly left with the ATRT. Then we're linking the start of the next ATRT with the end of the previous systemic reviews/recommendations, the first one being approved by the Board, and vice-versa, approving the start of the next systemic review after the Board has approved the first recommendation

from the previous ATRT3 recommendation. I think we showed that that worked quite well.

That takes us to the end of that section, I believe, Jennifer. Yes. So that's our rationale, our second reading. Are we okay with this?

Not seeing anything. Excellent. On the recommendation, the only point we had left was the CCT review thing, which we talked about earlier. I'll remove that note.

If we can just scroll down, Jennifer, please, and make sure I didn't forget anything else. The recommendation we have gone through ad nauseum, and I believe that we're all okay with that. Of course, I have to adjust the recommendation checklist per the rationale we have finished, but the recommendation checklist does not involve any new material. It basically is just grabbing stuff from the rationale and moving it into the checklist. Then we have Sebastien's wonderful diagram.

Seeing as there are no questions or comments, I will propose that, as per the other items, we close Section 8, if that is okay with everyone.

Yay! We get some clapping. We get some checkmarks. We get some thumbs up. Any objections?

Going once … going twice … all right. We're done with Section 8, folks. Excellent.

Well, we do have our work cut out for us in Section 9, though. I will give a brief introduction. We agreed last week, after going through it, that we should adjust the text a little bit based on Susanna's presentation. There were further exchanges with Susanna's group after that. Basically,

I think the notion [in] the accountability indicators will go away. So it brings to the front Susanna's comments of "Why are you focusing on a mechanism? Focus on the accountability of what the accountability indicators are focusing on." What we're talking about are, of course, the strategic recommendations, objectives, and goals from the strategic plan.

Working my way trough that, to make a long story short, I've decided to rewrite Section 9.3, which basically affected everything else. Basically, what we were looking at doing … Sorry. Dropped off again. What we were looking at doing is making sure they were providing meaningful indicators for what is being required in the strategic plan and in the operational plan. So I started from that.

Cheryl and Pat were kind enough to provide some input after some reviews. We decided that this made a lot more sense, especially in the context where we're probably looking at ICANN going away from the accountability indicators, which were for the 2016-2020 strategic plan and the latest version of the operational plan. Of course, at the end of this fiscal year, in a few months, we'll be going to the new strategic plan, which is the 2021-2025. The idea was to try and build something that will last.

Now, this has meant, if we're not strictly focusing on accountability indicators, that we needed a change in title. So I am proposing—that one is open; I don't particularly care, but I thought we needed to keep accountability indicators in there—"accountability and transparency, including accountability indicators, of the strategic and operation plans. And   I   think

EN

including accountability indicators should go at the end of that sentence. It gives you an idea of what we're trying to do here.

Let's go down to Section 9.3, where the meat of the thing is. Now, I'm actually going to walk us through this very slowly. We will take questions as we go along, if you want. But I'm trying to paint a picture here of what we want to get to. Please be patient.

"ICANN has been producing strategic and operational plans, in keeping with corporate best practices, for quite some time, with some of the earliest versions dating back to 2003." I couldn't find anything earlier than 2003. And I couldn't find a 2003 version. I found a reference to the 2003 version. So, if someone has a pointer to the 2003 strategic plan, please send it in and I'll include that.

"The development of strategic and operational plans at ICANN is a significant undertaking for the Board, ICANN Org, and the community. Conforming with these best practices, the latest version of the ICANN strategic plan has a clear mission statement and a limited number of strategic objectives which are then broken down into goals, which in turn have a number of outcomes and risks associated with each goal. Again, in keeping with best practices, ICANN produces an operational plan which is derived from the strategic plan to identify activities which will contribute to achieving the objectives, goals, and outcomes of the strategic plan."

Next page, please. "ICANN also updates the community on its progress versus the strategic objective goals and outcomes via the annual reports since 2012, ICANN Org reports to the Board since 2016, and

accountability indicators since June 2019. Although these efforts meet the best-practice requirements for such activities, ATRT3 notes some issues with respect to the transparency and accountability of reporting on strategic and operational plans. A current example is the fiscal year '19 annual report, noting this is the fourth annual report presenting a status of the ICANN strategic plan for fiscal years '16 to '20. In reporting on the first objective of "evolve and further globalize ICANN," it updates the reader on the three goals of this strategic objective. The update for the first goal of further globalizing regionalized ICANN functions refers to the six regional reports for further information. Each of these lists all of the events and developments for the region in the past fiscal year and provides some excellent statistics on regional implications in ICANN for a total of 57 pages." Yes, I actually went through that.

"ATRT appreciates the very long list of details provided in these reports but notes that the volume of information provided is excessive for an annual report and overwhelming for anyone trying to understand what was done to achieve the goal, as not all the information provided is directly linked to achieving the goal. As such, this represents a transparency issue versus reporting on the strategic plan. There is no categorizing or linking of the information versus the goal or the four expected outcomes listed in the strategic plan. There is no assessment and summary provided which details [whether] the goal or outcomes listed in the strategic plan are being obtained or not. The information provided with respect to the goals of the five-year strategic plan only include information on the most recent fiscal year and, as such, does not provide a complete view over the total period with respect to the progress towards this goal. ATRT3 notes that these issues are present in

most goals in this annual report and that the ICANN Org reports to the Board, for the most part, suffer from these same issues. ATRT3 welcomed the publication of the ICANN accountability indicators in June 2019, hoping this would provide improved progress reporting versus the goals for the 2016-2020 strategic plan, as the indicators presented in this website perfectly mapped to the goals in the strategic plan. However, a detailed analysis of the accountability indicators by the ATRT3 found a number of significant problems with these (see Annex C for a detailed analysis). ATRT3 also notes that it is unaware of ICANN publishing a final overarching report with respect to any strategic plan which would assess with precision the success and failures of that plan. Such an evaluation is a requirement for much smaller projects and would therefore seem to be an expectation for a strategic plan."

We did confirm since then that there is no wrap-up, and there never has been. That's a little odd. We've been producing strategic plans since 2003, and we've never had a wrap-up. We just jumped to the next one.

"ATRT3 therefore concludes that ICANN is, at worse, failing and, at best, following short of community expectations with regards to being transparent and accountable as it should be with respect to its strategic plans and therefore misses the opportunity to improve future strategic planning efforts. Although the conclusion is clear, it is important to look for the root causes of these issues so the problem can be addressed effectively in a recommendation by ATRT3 setting strategic objectives and goals based on the 2021-2025 draft strategic plan. ATRT3 notes that the public consultation on the 2021-2025 draft strategic plan only received a total of 15 comments, most of which were from SOs and ACs or their subcomponents, which would seem to indicate a failure of the

community to buy into this process [and] overwhelming complexity in understanding what results are being sought. The '21-'25 strategic plan has five strategic objectives, which break down into 17 goals, which in turn break down into 59 targeted outcomes. These outcomes lack specificity. Most of the 59 targeted outcomes do not clearly state what needs to be done to attain the outcome or how one would measure the progress to achieving the outcome. This makes it very difficult to determine in a clear and simple fashion if the targeted outcome is achieved or not, which in turn makes it even more difficult to determine if the strategic goal is achieved, therefore making it almost impossible to determine if a strategic objective, which is composed of multiple strategic goals, has generated the expected results. ATRT3 believes it is a reasonable expectation that, as a minimum, all goals and outcomes have a clear and simple criteria for success which can be factually assessed."

"Annual operational plan based on the 2021 draft plan. ATRT3 notes that the public consultation on the draft '21-'25 operating and financial plan and draft '21 operating plan and budget only received a total of 13 comments, much of which were from SOs and ACs or their subcomponents, which would seem to indicate a failure of the community to buy into this process. It is probably also important to note that the comments which were made mostly focused on the financial considerations, and very few focused on operational initiatives or functional activities. The one-year '21 operating plan presents the reader with 15 operational initiatives and five service groups under functional activities, which are further down into 36 units. It is important to note that details of each entry in the operational initiatives

EN

and functional activities is very well organized and presents certain critical information very well. understanding the link of the operational initiatives"—"operational initiatives" I should probably clear up—"are the key undertakings in the operating plan to support the goals and objectives of the strategic plan. Operational … of the organizational initiative presents a section titled "Strategic goals and targeted outcomes supported." So, for each operational initiative, we have a section in there.

"The main issue is that any specific operational initiative can contribute to a number of goals and outcomes. As an example of this, the operational initiatives named facilitate DNS ecosystem improvements lists [in] that it contributes to eleven goals and outcomes from the strategic plan. In fact, the 15 operational initiatives collectively have 59 entries which support goals and outcomes. The main problem with this is that there is no cross-referencing provided which indicates which goals and outcomes are supported by which operational initiatives. Adding to this complexity are the 36 functional activities, which in turn contribute to operational initiatives by listing 100 such contributions. This type of matrix approach can be effective but significantly increased complexity and essentially makes traceability of what contributed to a goal or an outcome impossible and also makes it impossible to measure progress for any given goal or outcome from the strategic plan. Relative to this, ATRT3 commends the ccNSO for its detailed and insightful comments on ICANN '21-'25 operating and fiscal plan." If you haven't read it, I do highly recommend it.

"Understanding how to assess the success of the operational initiatives is, at best, very difficult. Each operational initiative has a section titles

"How progress is tracked." ATRT3 notes that, to track progress, there needs to be clear measurements versus target towards which progress can be made. Unfortunately, this is really the case in these sections. As an example, the operational initiative titled "Evolve and strengthen the multi-stakeholder model to facilitate diverse and inclusive participation in policy-making," lists five entries, none of which has a specific target, and measurements are, for the most part, vague or very broad, such as metrics related to public comment proceedings. These observations are applicable to most, if not all, of the operational initiatives. The issues identified in this analysis bring to mind the following quote: "All problems in computer science can be solved by another level of indirection, except for the problem of too many layers of indirection."

"ATRT3 concludes that the almost complete lack of specific measurements, milestones, and the definition of clear targets with respect to the goals and outcomes of the '21-'25 strategic plan as well as in the operational initiatives in the '21 operating plan will make it very difficult, if not impossible, to track progress and assess if these elements have been achieved or not. This conclusion may also help explain, at least in part, the lack of participation in the public consultation process with respect to the strategic operational plans. Given the average community member is provided with no clear information on what is being proposed and how it will be assessed. ATRT3 understands that there may be a number of factors which have steadily evolved over time to create this situation without there being a specific intent to do this. However, ATRT3 believes this situation is no longer desirable or acceptable, as there can only be very limited accountability if there are no targets set, well-defined measurements

made at regular intervals versus those targets, and an assessment if the targets are met or not at the end of the period."

"As such, ATRT3 is making a number of recommendations with respect to the accountability and transparency of strategic and operational plans. Goals, strategic or not, outcomes, targeted or not, operational initiatives, etc., must provide a clear and concise rationale in plain language explaining how each goal/outcome/operational initiative is critical to achieving the results of the one it is supporting—e.g., for each strategic goal, there must be a rationale as to how it is critical for its strategic objective, "critical" meaning it'll fail without it."

There's a footnote which basically says that there should be no laundry list of projects which contribute to something. We're looking at the things that are critical. If it's not critical, it's not there. There is no point in having 53 projects listed that would contribute to a strategic objective. It doesn't make sense, in my mind. It only guarantees that you will be completely unable to assess if it was reached.

"Goals, strategic or not, outcomes, targeted or not, operational initiatives, etc., must have clearly articulated, in plain language, specific criteria for defining success and shall be smart unless appropriately justified."

And then we have, "ICANN should review its '21-'25 strategic plan and '21 operating plan to ensure they meet this requirement. ICANN shall publish an annual status report on all strategic plan and operating plan objectives, goals, outcomes, and operational initiatives. This should clearly assess each of the elements presented in the strategic and

operational plans—objectives, goals, outcomes, etc.—clearly indicating what progress has been made versus the target in concise and plain language. Any additional comments with respect to the assessment should also made in concise and plain language. Prior to being finalized, the report will be submitted for public comment. Ideally, such reports would allow a maximum of one page per item."

Let's get away from the 53 pages for saying there are great things that have been done.

"ICANN shall publish an overarching report at the conclusion of strategic plans, starting with the 2016-2020 strategic plan," meaning the one that ends in June this year. "This should clearly assess each of the elements presented in the strategic plan—objectives, goals, and outcomes— clearly indicate if it was attained or not, and justify the assessment in concise and plain language. Any additional comments with respect to the assessment should also be made in concise and plain language. The report shall conclude with a section distilling the results of the assessments and how this could be applied to the '21-'25 strategic plan." I'm missing a dash there. "Prior to being finalized, the report will be submitted for public comments."

All right, folks. That's it. Thoughts, comments, or questions? We won't go through the recommendation because this has been completely changed. But I haven't changed it yet.

As I said, we're now aiming, I think, more at the root of the problem. We're giving very clear instructions on what we're expecting. Really, I honestly believe that this is going to help with public participation

because, right now, basically having two individuals comment on the strategic plan, and two or three individuals comment on an operational plan, is odd for me, given this community. I think the reason individuals don't comment is, to use a known sentence from science fiction, that "the fog factor index is rather high." I mean, we keep pointing from one thing to another thing to another thing to another thing, but we never have a clear objective. With the most recent ones, not only do we keep endlessly pointing to other things but we deluge the reader with information, yet we don't provide cross-referencing to understand how it's going to go. I think we're basically saying, "Okay, that doesn't make sense. Let's get back to basics." Basically, I think this is what this is saying. When you're providing objectives, it's about saying what you're going to do, having a target, having measurements against that target so people know how you're getting there, and basically, at the end, evaluating if you got there or not and saying, "What were the problems?"

All right, I've been talking too much. Questions? Comments? Issues?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I had a sip of water because that was an awful lot of words, but I'm perfectly comforted, as you know. Pat and I have gone through this text this text any number of times with Bernie in the last few days, and we're hopeful that you will all see this modification as a positive step forward.

Sebastien?

EN

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you very much. I will try to say it quite calmly, but I am really sorry: It's not an ATRT3 work. We are doing exactly what we aren't happy with in the organizational reviews. Who from ATRT has worked on this issue? Who has done the work? If it's Bernie, great. Thank you very much, Bernie. I love that, but I don't love the way it's done. I tried to say that before, but this time it's a little bit too much. The best ideas, the best inputs? Great, but we, as ATRT members, where are we involved here? Just to read and accept? I can't. It's not what we were supposed to do and how we were supposed to work.
	Therefore, I really like that, I think it's good, but I don't know. I need to spend time to read all the documents. I don't know if I will have time before the end of the work of this ATRT3 work.
	Therefore, I really think that we need to think about how we have work in this group. I really feel bad here. Sorry. It's my start of my second day of work. The first one was very physical and I am very tired, but I think I must say what I said. Sorry for that, but thank you very much for listening.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay, Sebastien. Thank you for your contribution. We're all very aware that this new text. Indeed, of course that is why we went through it very carefully and read it out. So hopefully those of us for who English is not our first language have the advantage of hearing as well as reading the text. It is now open for discussion and deliberation. That is, of course, exactly what we're trying to do right now.

But let's see what others also wish to see. I note in the chat … I believe it is … Yes, it is for this section. Vanda notes that, while the new text is clear for her, indeed she also had [an individual] comment, which is the [end game] that was articulated. She also notes, in keeping with what Sebastien was suggesting, that she needs more time to go over and thoroughly go through this new text. Of course, we do, but this is where we are. We will see how we go through that text, as you just had a first reading.

Osvaldo notes in the chat that he likes the text but would like some time to read it carefully. Again, absolutely reasonable and certainly what we expected will be happening. There was no intention, Sebastien and others, if that was what you were fearful of: somehow pushing this through as what would really be the product of only the Co-Chairs and the technical writer.

Sebastien, you still have your hand up. We'll go back to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl . I don't "still have," I have again my hand up. Thank you. Your summary of my intervention makes it seem like we didn't understand each other. It's maybe my level of poor English or something else. But my problem is not to have to read it. It's, who has started work on that? Who is a member of the ATRT who wrote that? I don't know, and I don't see [Ethan]. We didn't spend to discuss the issue before having "final"—I know we will have the time to read it— text. I am very, very concerned with the way it's done and not with a result. It's still to be looked at in detail, as others have requested, but I

am very, very concerned because of the way we are working here. Sorry for that again, but it's my point. It's not the fact that we will have time to read it again. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sebastien. Would you like to perhaps give us some examples of how text in this final reporting would be better processed, as [with] any modifications? We can have a look at that as alternative or a different way forward.

I just want to note in the chat that Wolfgang says he shares part of Sebastien's concerns. "As ATRT3, we have to have an eagle's perspective and concentrate on the strategic issues. How do deal with all the strategic plans is a strategic issue. We have to come to more clear, simple, and workable recommendations about went wrong in the past and we ought to do better in the future. If you have one-letter bottle, you should not try to fill five letters into this bottle."

Indeed, Wolfgang. Thank you for that. Those of us who've been working on this text[—apparently Pat and I don't count as valid or viable input and drafting parts of] all the contributors, which is fine if that's everybody's opinion. But that was indeed the intention.

There are a couple of other people in the queue. We have Jaap and then we have Pat. Jaap, over to you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Hi. I must say that I find the changes kind of [big]. I wish I would have had more time to read it, like everybody else. If we were notified so we

could read it in advance … But I have to say, being more on the pragmatic side, there's a lot of issues raised in this that are actually issues that we think [inaudible] accountability problems [inaudible] remember that especially somebody like KC repeatedly asked where this stuff comes from. Referring to the strategic plans is totally the only way to do that. So I really think that [inaudible] but really, [as] any kind of process, I think the contents of the work is [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jaap. I appreciate that. Just before go to Pat, I just note from Vanda in chat that she says, "I do not see that a first draft, even by Bernard, is against our way of work." In her opinion, it is a facilitation over the issue, and we should go deeply into this text to see or add our points and make it our [inaudible] I think she meant, or even change it completely.

[inaudible] Jacques also came in there agreeing with Vanda, which seems in line with Sebastien's opinion.

I'm a little concerned that you all seem to believe that we were presenting this today and expecting you to somehow accept or sign off on it. It is new text. It needs to be gone over carefully. We would like to think it is a positive change and we'll improve the type of report we will be producing in the end.

Jaap, did you want to have anything else to say? Or can I go to Pat now?

I'm going to assume that's an old hand, Jaap. Pat, over to you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Sebastien, thank you for that input. I understand where you're coming from. But we've been engaged really a lot in the last several weeks, and we've been active in getting through things and doing some good work. Bernie presented a suggestion, and Cheryl and I said, "Yes, please go ahead and do that," so that we could accelerate the conversation. Again, it's not an effort to circumvent our process or circumvent the way that we're working. It's really an attempt to accelerate since we've now just said, "Okay, we will be done by the end of May." I think Susanna Bennett's conversation showed that we were not addressing what the real opportunity was in our report. So we took that opportunity.

Again, just to emphasis what Cheryl has said here, this is wording that we've asked of Bernie or approved of Bernie's suggestion to go off and do, so its up for conversation. Again, it was not an attempt to go around anybody. I think, if we were idle, I would have the same exact concerns that you've had. But we've not been idle. So I'm supportive of where we are, but, if this text doesn't work for us, let's dig into it. I understand that you've got some conflicts now, as do we all, given the change in our global environment, but please do what you can in the text. Again, it was just an attempt to accelerate, no to circumvent. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. If indeed the problem is, before I go to Sebastien, that we didn't send out an e-mail to say, "New dive into the document," which, if you're registered in the document as someone who is observing and watching for changes, you ought to have been pinged/e-mailed an update that says, "The following changes have been made in the

EN

document." But we could very well, I guess, sometimes in the last, it might have been, eight to twelve hours have sent you an e-mail, and you could have had eight to twelve hours where you may or may not have had the time to read through it. But we have now done a first readthrough, and it is now open for your analysis, your dissection, your deliberations, and your comments. If you would like to have the other text as a side-by-side so that you can see what you have previously worked on and were apparently comforted by to compare with what this is, which we believe—or at least Pat and I believe—does fit more intelligently and articulately what we have learned from Susanna's and the introduction of the group, then that is easy enough for us to try and do. So, if you want us to do that—I think that would be an excellent idea—I'm sure Jennifer and Bernie will be able to find a way of doing that and getting it out.

"Yes," Vanda has said, "side-by-side would be helpful."

Sebastien, a final word on this issue before we move to something else?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you for the "final word on this issue." I would like to ask Pat why the question as not asked in the proposal to work on that for the members of this group. If it's because we are not able to work, therefore we may close the group. If it is because we have no time for the comment, we are not yet fixing the final time. We are still in discussion on that. But, if it's for another reason, I would like very much to understand why it's not the members of the group who are doing the work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, do you want to answer that.

PAT KANE: Absolutely. Sebastien, thank you very much for that. I do understand where you're coming from. Tola said the same thing in chat. Perhaps that is an oversight that we've had in terms of pushing that out to the team as opposed to saying, "Yeah, that's a great idea," and we move forward. It wasn't suggestion that we are unable to work. It wasn't a suggestion that the team can't handle that. It was an acceleration. That was a suggestion. We said, "Yeah, go ahead. We'll run it through the team. We'll talk to it when we have another meeting."

So, again, I'm not suggesting that we are unable to do that and we probably should sent a note to the team. I, frankly, missed that. It was oversight. No intent whatsoever.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Gosh. Well, all our [inaudible] and concerns and disappointments about insufficient time to read a document before it's formally read through in a meeting has been well-noted. Bernie has indicated that a [pure] side-by-side might be difficult, that there is, of course, the regional. We will find some way for those of you who may indeed have greater challenge with the English perhaps to see the radical differences. And they are radical differences. This is a very new direction and a total replacement text for Section 9.3. But we believe that it does

fit with what we have heard many of you discuss as we've gone through our deliberations.

It is now back to you between now and our next meeting to start digging into it, making comments, putting the suggestions on the document, as is the normal way, and seeing what, if anything, you cannot possibly live with. For what you do disagree with, then pull it out and tell us why. If there is additional text that you think would be benefitting our report, then put it in the comments. Obviously, if you can tell us why, that's great.

With that, Bernie, where else do we need to go in this document on today's call?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: If I can … oh, I see a hand from Sebastien that you may want to take first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I will read that again, but I have one concern. Bernie was reading it. It's on Page 56, before the bullet point. There is, "As such, ATRT3 is making a number of recommendations." I think we need to be careful with the word "recommendations." Here we will do one recommendation for this part of the document, I guess, and we are talking about a different recommendation here. We may wish to change

the word or to write the sentence differently because, if not, we will have to argue and give the element for each recommendation we are giving in the next part of the document. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, back to you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. And thank you for that, Sebastien. That is exactly what I'm looking for. I'm hoping that you'll be able to go through that with your usual effectiveness and that we can go through this. I can say exactly what Pat has said. This was not an attempt. There is no request to approve this today. But we were told that our original approach to this would be of very limited value. I don't think anyone wants that. So, as Pat has said, this was just an acceleration of something for you to look at. Yes, please go at it as usual. It's in the Google Doc. Make your comments. We will, as we managed to do in the nine other sections, I think, come to hopefully a very good product.

Madam Chair, with closing Section 8 and opening this for comments now, we are basically, from my point, done. I will start cleaning it up. My next priority is to start working on the executive summary so that we can look at that, since most of the items are closed, with the understanding that this Section 9 is still very much open. So that's about it. I have to work on the executive summary, and I have to review the checklist for recommendations for Section 8 and will obviously have to redo it for Section 9. Thank you. Back over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Thank you, Bernie. I am personally quite pleased as to where we are in today's call. It means that what we can perhaps expect to do for our agenda on our Friday … Sorry, is it everyone else's Thursday's meeting? What's the time and date of our next meeting, please, Jennifer. Remember, I'm a day ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's 21:00 UTC on Friday.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So it is on Friday. Right. 21:00 UTC on Friday. Now, we do have that call in our schedule. I'm just noting Tola going back to our previous item, if you'd all pay attention to chat. Tola is outlining that he feels the first drafting was of some merit, but obviously getting it ahead of today's call would have been good.

Bernie, you can put in the chat how many hours they may or may not have had to work with it because we've all been working very hard on getting [inaudible] in the short amount of time we have between calls.

Anyway, yes, we hear what you said, Tola. That would have been wonderful, but we didn't. Our bad. Us-a culpa. Now let's move on and get something that we all agree to in the final documentation.

Now, back to where we need to go. We are aware that, for some people, including the ICANN officers—certainly the U.S. officers—the Friday is in fact a public holiday. Now, Pat and I are thinking that we are

in a pretty good place. If you all decide not to have the meeting on Friday, we think we can still bring everything to pass in our projected timeline. But, of the same token, the staff—Jennifer and Negar and Brenda and Pat and I—are perfectly happy and absolutely supportive of having the call on what is a public holiday or day of religious observance for some or many of us. So, in that case, if we can ask under Any Other Business to open the queue on your opinion on our meeting on Friday.

Sebastien, over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. My question is not too much on if it's holidays or if it's a feast but on if we have enough time to review the document as it is and to leave enough time for Bernie to write or to enhance the text we have already gone through in the executive summary. My feeling is that, if we can pause and come back in one week and, if in the middle of that time, we can do homework, it will be much better than to have a meeting on Friday. Just to let you know, in Europe, I guess, a day off is on Monday, but I will be on the call if there is a Monday call. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Just noting what's coming on what while you've been speaking. Vanda notes she's fine with a Friday meeting. She prefers not to waste what little time we have. We're here and understand that, Vanda, and, if that's the majority view, we'll make that happen. Osvaldo says he won't be able to join the call on Friday. He has

EN

activities and commitments on the whole day. Where he is, both Thursday and Friday are public holidays.

And Leon has joined us. Leon, you've missed all the fun, my friend. [inaudible]. I'm sure you will review the call and work out where we are. We're just discussing whether to meet or not to meet on Friday.

Let's hear from some others. Can we perhaps get a show of hands in terms of polling? Those of you who can attend our Friday meeting at 21:00 UTC and wish to do so can put up a green checkmark, and those who prefer not to, for whatever reason—it matters not what the reason is—meet on Friday but to meet again on the Wednesday—Sebastien has given us a whole lot of good reasons as to why that may very well be a good idea—put up an X, just to give us a flavor of where we are.

Pat, are you going to do a tally for me, my friend? Seeing as I may be [inaudible].

PAT KANE: Yes, I will. We've got five that are not in favor of meeting, and we have three that are in favor of meeting, this Friday at 21:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I note Daniel in chat says he's flexible.

PAT KANE: So we have three-and-a-half and five.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] you and I, Pat. Okay. Well, Pat, what do you want us to do? Because I see there's the small bias in one direction.

PAT KANE: Well, I think there is small bias, but I do understand, from the standpoint of staff, that they're actually off that day. It is a holiday. I know that the churches are closed here in—well, they can only have ten people in the building at the time—so services are cancelled in our area. But I would move towards not meeting this Friday and then having a leadership call on Monday and then picking up next Wednesday. That's what I would lean towards.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

PAT KANE: Bernie, your hand is raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Bernie.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. Yes, I think this makes perfect sense. If people are going to comment on the document, please go through that new Section 9. We're looking forward to your comments. Thank you.

EN

PAT KANE: Thanks for that, Bernie. I think that's [inaudible]. I think that, if we give people the day off, the penance they have to suffer is that they have to go through and get the reading done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought we were supposed to be making the sacrifices until this upcoming weekend. I must have this whole Judeo-Christian thing all wrong. I'll stick to my pagan views from now on. It's a lovely time of year in terms of moons and seasonal changes.

Okay. You can put all your checks and crosses down now. It would appear that the majority of you believe that it would be of greater value to have a longer period of time to go through the new text—the significantly changed text—in Section 9.3 and make detailed comments, or not, on it so that, in our meeting next Wednesday, we can take it as a second reading and bring that section to closure. On our next meeting next Wednesday, which will be at the same time (11:00 UTC, I think it is), we will also by then have work done on the executive summary. So that's pretty much our agenda for next Wednesday.

I'm going to go a step further, Pat, and suggest that, if that's our agenda for next Wednesday now, we probably don't need to have our leadership call on Monday, which Sebastien has noted is the public holiday in his part of the world. But that doesn't mean that you and I will not remain available pretty much 24/7 for any interactions with staff or with our team.

With that, it looks like the decision is clear. We should be able to not fall behind, providing, as Bernie appealed to you, we'll get the homework done.

No, Vanda, I think we will drop the leadership call on Monday because, based on today's deliberations, we know what our agenda items on Wednesday will be. And, unlike this coming Monday, we don't have a major piece of work to do with the leadership team, which of course is what we all [did] with the modification of the timeline.

With that, Pat, is there anything we need to go through before we ask Jennifer to run through our action items? We will be calling a shorter meeting than planned today, but that's all right.

PAT KANE: I don't believe there's anything else, Cheryl, to cover. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. All right. Well, considering some of us are tired, many of us are stressed, and all of us are, I suspect, working under difficult situations, we probably will all benefit from the extra time that closing today's call early will give us.

Vanda notes in the chat that she wishes a Happy Easter or Passover for all of those who follow such observance. I think that's the good wishes that we will all be wishing each other. Certainly, Pat and I would like to make sure that we reiterate the "Stay safe, stay healthy, and make smart decisions, people," as we live in extremely troubled time. I guess it also behooves us to note that we are going to be under these

EN

strenuous and psychologically difficult circumstances for a bit longer yet. Of course, as we are coming down to the closure of our work, it would be wonderful if we can all be as patient, as tolerant, and as unreactive as we possibly can be as we bring our work to closure.

With that, Jennifer, do you want to do a quick runt through and confirm action items and decisions reached and just confirm the date and time for our next meeting on Wednesday?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Cheryl. Happy to. Action items: Bernie is going to work with staff to circulate the original text on the accountability indicators in comparison with the proposed new text [just as] the team with the review of the proposal. Team to make comments in the accountability indicators text ahead of the call on next Wednesday. Then the team agreed to cancel to the Friday the 10th of April meeting on the Monday, 13th of April, leadership call and use the time instead to read and do homework. So the next plenary meeting is going to be on Wednesday, the 15th of April, at 21:00 UTC.

I see Bernie has his hand up. I suspect he's going to correct me on the text comparison piece, so I'll pass it over to you, Bernie. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah. Let's keep it simple. I'll drop it in Version 1.8 after the new text, but I'll highlight it in light gray so that people understand it's different. We'll make it available all in one place.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Excellent. Thank you, Bernie. Because it is entirely new text, and we are very aware that it is entirely new text, with no apology for presenting the new text but a recognition that we could have given you a few more hours' notice. We may indeed find that many of you will be comforted, and hopefully most of you will add significant improvements to the text as we go through it between now, which was our first reading at this meeting, and our second meeting and second reading on this area on the 15th. That was confirmed as 21:00 UTC.

Staff and Bernie, thank you very much. Your work is appreciated. We do see you all as a vital part of our team. We don't want you to get—

TOLA SOGBESAN: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To each and every one of you on the review team, thank you so much for additional time that we know you're going to be putting into this work between now and our next call. We wish you a safe and loving time with your families over the next few days as well.

With that, Brenda [inaudible] and thank you … Certainly, Tola, go ahead.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Thanks. I just wanted to clarify. Bernie has suggested going through the work on the executive summary. So are expecting that as well in addition to what's going to be dropping? That's the other question [for clarification]. Thank you.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly. The agenda, which will be coming out for Wednesday's meeting, will have one of the items on the agenda after we go through the complete review of the final draft report. That'll be a second a reading of that Section 9.3. We will then go into a first reading of the modifications or new text for the executive summary as well.

TOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. With that, now I believe, Brenda, you can stop the [clock] and stop the recording. Thank you, once more, to all of our observers. We really appreciate the time you take to join us as well.

With that, thank you, everybody. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]