
BRENDA BREWER:

Hello everyone. Good day. I'd like to welcome you to the ATRT 3 Plenary number 60 on the 17th of April, 2020 at 11:00 UTC. Members attending the call are Cheryl, Sebastien, Jaap, León. We have observers Hanyu, Herb, and Sophie. And attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Technical writer Bernie and we have apologies from Wolfgang and we are joining Osvaldo and Vanda right now.

Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record. And I'll turn the call over to Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much, Brenda. Hi, Vanda. And we'll get a few more people joining of course as we go through. I know Sophie's joined as well. Thank you very much.

Right. Just to remind you all that we work under a system of continuous disclosure and so if you have any statements of interest that you need update, you should be letting us know now. And not seeing anybody wave or put up their hand or make a noise. We'll move through that first piece of administrivia and move into any action items, new or closed. Jennifer, with these few days between these meetings, have we done anything?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Cheryl. Well, we have one action item that we will close today that we captured on Wednesday's call which was Bernie was going to

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

add the recommendations into the executive summary section, so that's agenda item four. So, after today's call, we'll close that action item. But, other than that, nothing else. Thank you.

JACQUES BLANC: [Inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jennifer. Jacques, I think your line is open. You probably don't want us to hear what you're saying and I don't speak French, so.

JACQUES BLANC: Ay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: However, Osvaldo, I assume you may wish to raise to the attention of us all what you've put into the Skype chat during any other business? Well, I assume that's going to be [rephrased].

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. [Yeah, thank you.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a problem. Okay, so we do have a piece of any other business, which we will cover off and we will call for more any other business at the end of today's call. Number 60, quite a landmark, ladies and gentlemen, seeing as we've been operating for only just the smidge

over 12 months. I think it's impressive that we've got 60 meetings under our belt. Okay, I'm getting a message that says my Internet connection is unstable. So, Brenda, you might need to be poised with the dial-out option if I somehow disappear. Doesn't matter if I disappear while Bernie's going through agenda item three or four, of course, but if you can just keep a close eye on me, that would be appreciated.

Today's agenda is going to be diving into section nine of the report. And, yes, we will soon update from version 1.8. We're all looking forward to that. But at the moment it still is version 1.8 and thank you very much, Jennifer, for putting the link into chat. And, of course, until Zoom updates this, which they promise us they will be doing, you need to copy and paste that link to the Google Docs to open it separately. And, with that, let's dive in, Bernie. The floor is yours on section nine.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, ma'am. Good morning everyone, good day, good afternoon, good evening wherever you are. All right, two pieces of business today: review section 9.3. After we do 9.3, we will discuss—well, actually three pieces of business—the ordering, whether sections two go before sections three, and then we'll take our second whack at the introduction. This is our third pass on section 9.3.

All right. So, as far as my notes are concerned, I completed all of the edits that were made or requested on our April 15 call. Yes, that was only two days ago. So, "best practices" has been changed to "good practices" everywhere, so that's done.

Let's go down to the next comment, please Brenda. All right, and my 2019 was corrected to 2017 and that was confirmed with the Wayback Machine. So, that's fixed. Next comment.

Okay. Ah yes, we had categorizing, which Sebastien pointed out was difficult. So, let's reread this to see if it makes more sense to everyone. "There is no cross-referencing or linking of the information versus the goal or the four expected outcomes listed in this Strategic Plan." So, is "cross-referencing" okay for everyone?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, better.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Cheryl, comment? Cheryl, if you're speaking, you're muted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. For whatever reason, since I've updated my—

BERNARD TURCOTTE: We're hearing about every second or third word from you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The space bar is not unmuting me. It's always been a thing in Zoom. Okay, so [capitalize that] ...

BRENDA BREWER: Cheryl, I'm going to dial-out to you. We're getting very unstable audio from you. One moment.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. So, we'll ... Better for me when translated from Vanda. Okay. We'll wait for Cheryl to get back and maybe come back to this.

Next comment, please, Brenda. Yes, okay. This was the same fix updated 2019 to 2017. Welcome Pat. Sebastien, your hand is up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can you hear me?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Now we can, yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. That was tricky, I am on my phone for the sound. Okay. My concern here with this new date is that we start to work on and we were hoping—and I am not sure that it was already there for three years and if we hope something, it must not have been at the beginning. It's why I would like ... I think the way it is written may be ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, I understand your point after rereading it. I just fixed the date. Okay, I'll fix that, no problem.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Cheryl, are you back?

BRENDA BREWER: No, she is not. I am having a little technical issue with Zoom at the moment, so ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, so.

BRENDA BREWER: Well, perhaps she is back.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am not. I still have a connection, I'm listening fine. Apparently, my Internet connection is unstable. I did put in chat that it was only a matter of capitalization of G and G in the previous section when we looked at cross-reference.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was a very minor thing. My apologies.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Got that, thank you. Next comment, please, Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER: One second. Sorry. Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Ah yes, after our discussion, Sebastien had pointed out on the last one that our first bullet talking about the public comment and there only being 15 comments, which were mostly SOs and ACs, was not a bad thing. I don't think it detracted, but I don't think it added a lot, so I just removed it.

All right. Let's keep going. And did the same thing on the operational plan where I removed the public comment bullet and also, I fixed the full title of that document based on the draft ICANN operational and financial plan, fiscal year 21-25, five year, and fiscal 21, one year. All right. Next comment.

Okay. So, from my notes ... Let's reread this paragraph, make sure it makes sense. Do we have the whole paragraph, Brenda? Or can you back me up just a bit? There we go, thank you.

"ATRT 3 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 operation initiatives in the 21 Operating Plan, will make it 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 and public consultation processes with respect to the strategic and operational plans given the community is provided with no clear information on what targets are being proposed and how these will be assessed.”

So, we added in there “given the community,” which Sebastien quite correctly pointed out, no one’s getting additional information. So, that should fix that one. The next paragraph, we added in the transparency, as per Sebastian’s quite correct comment. All right.

And then on the goals, go down in the bullets. Goals, yes. So, basically took out the one paragraph requirement. We’re not being overly stringent on that. Critical I’ve added the footnote that says they cannot succeed without it, so just to [the] definition. The next bullet I did the same thing. I removed the suggestion about pages, so there is no text limit on it. For some reason, those comments didn’t stay in there.

Next bullet please. Removed the text limit on publish annual status report and ICANN shall publish no overarching report, again, removed the text limits that were in brackets, anyways.

So, those were all the changes in this section 9. If you want to, we can reread the whole thing if required. If not, I’ll be glad to take any other comments at this point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Bernie, just note there’s at least by my ... on the second bullet point on the top of screen at the moment there is that font size issue there.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh yeah, look at that. Isn't that interesting? Okay, we'll get that fixed. That'll be caught in the wash, as it were. All right, given there are no other comments, let's proceed to this ordering issues. Brenda, if you can take us up to section 9.2, please.

Now, we said we would put a pin in this. After thinking about what Sebastien was saying yesterday, I still like this section in this order. If the only thing that is bothering you, Sebastien, is this reference to the ccNSO, I can just take that out if we are going to leave this as is. But I'll throw it back to you Cheryl, and we can have discussion on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Let's open the queue, but Sebastien, could you respond to Bernie on his offer to withdraw the small section on ccNSO?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you but I don't think we need to spend much time on it. I feel that I would prefer to enter into the conclusion and then get the information about what was the document we were talking about because ccNSO was just one example. But I feel better when I have something to read and then I have the element if I need to go in deep dive. If not, I will have to go to read the 9.3 and the 8.3 and then go back to 8.2 if I want to have additional information. But it doesn't matter. It's not so big deal whatever we decide, but that's my preference and that's it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thanks very much. Many of us were, certainly myself included, not going to die in a ditch over this one way or the other. But let's see if there's anyone else who would like to make a case for moving it or not. So, if you empathize with Sebastien and his preferences, please indicate now and we will change it. And if not, as Sebastien says, it's not a huge issue, it's just a personal preference that he would like us to consider.

So, [inaudible] to you [inaudible] to ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You're fading in and out again, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Shuffle the order or not. If you want us to shuffle the order, please give us an indication. That reflects how I probably feel, thanks Bernie. But if you want the order to shuffle, then put up a green tick. If not, we will just move on. [Inaudible]. Back to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Cheryl, we've lost you basically.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, no you haven't. I've still got a phone line here.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: There you are. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Then I get stereo in my headset as me talking to myself, which is psychologically probably a very validating thing, I guess. I don't disagree with myself all that often. Sebastien, you've got your hand up, but what I was calling for was for support from anyone else in the group today to follow your preference of having it moved. But, back to you Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Just to be clear, when I say X.2 and X.3 will be the same for all because Osvaldo asked why would we do here and not in the other? Yes, definitely, it's just because it happened to be here that I saw that it could be better to move it. But if you don't think that's a good idea, let's keep like that. But yes, Osvaldo, we will do the same for each item and not just for this one. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, that is correct that's the [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sebastien. And that's something that we were quite clear on when we discussed it last week, last call I should say. So, if you're going to be supporting [inaudible] ... Sebastien's proposal?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Cheryl, we've got two mics going. And they're slightly out of phase, which is very disturbing. There we go.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, well probably as disturbing as anyone else. So, thank you, gremlins. I think we've only got me in mono now, excepting in my headset.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. So, one final call, is there the feeling of the group that we need to shuffle the order, as Sebastien feels more comfortable with? Last call we had ambivalence, let's see if we can get some support. Okay. I see some support from Jacques, but that doesn't seem to be prevailing. Okay, let's then move on. Thanks, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, thank you everyone. So, at this point I will propose that we close, as we did the other sections, section nine given there are no further comments. So, are there any objections to us closing down section nine? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. Just to be sure, the yellow part will be ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Removed.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Removed, okay. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

And I'll fix the recommendation to match up. So, yes, there'll be some housecleaning. All right. I'll repeat the question. Any objections to now closing section nine? Going once, Cheryl gives me a thumbs up, Pat gives me a thumbs up. All right, going twice. Done. All right, thank you everyone. We've finished all our major section. Excellent. Brenda, take us to the top please.

All right. So, executive summary. We've done some fixes here. Basically, there were some recommendations on the workstream one, I accepted KC's changes. There were no other changes. Let's go down a little bit further. There were a few minor edits. There was nothing significant. Let's keep going down a bit further. Operational reviews, blah, blah, blah, that's in the context of the accountability ... Okay.

Let's take it from this paragraph: "It is in this context that the third Accountability and Transparency Review, ATRT 3, began its work as per the bylaws, which were based on the affirmation of commitments between ICANN and the United States Department of Commerce signed 30 September, 2009, which required ICANN to commit to undertaking several reviews including accountability and transparency reviews. In defining its scope, ATRT 3 added two elements to the eight defined in the bylaws." We've now accepted this title, so I will remove the yellow prioritization and rationalization. "To accomplish this, ATRT 3 undertook a number of activities." Those are the same basically. Let's keep going down, Brenda please. Past the bullets. There we go.

“For each topic in its scope, ATRT 3 gathered all the relevant and available information.” Thank you for the change there, Sebastien added available. “Assess the information to identify if there were any significant issues and made suggestions and recommendations where necessary. In considering and analyzing all of this information, the ATRT 3 identified five areas which it deemed required recommendations. In making its recommendations, ATRT 3 has adhered to the new guidelines for specific reviews as well as its own requirements for recommendations in its terms of reference. All ATRT 3 recommendations are meant to be smart,” and we’ve got the footnote what that means, “and included a complete checklist of requirements as per specific reviews recommendations. ATRT 3 concludes its report by making these five recommendations.”

So, what I’ve done here is I’ve included the PowerPoint version of the recommendations. Where they are short enough, I have included the whole recommendation, or where it’s impossible to condense it too much. This is a first go at this and I will note at this point that at the bottom of this section, we’ve got the complete recommendations as they are in the sections. So, this is not the only reference in this section. This is the reference in the executive summary just to keep it tight a bit. Let’s see how we feel about it when we walk our way through it. All right?

So, “ATRT 3 concludes this report making these five recommendations. Recommendation on public input, section three of this report,” I have not prioritized, I’ve put them in the order in which we go through the sections.

“Regarding public comment proceedings, each public comment proceeding shall clearly identify who the intended audience is. Each public comment proceeding shall provide a clear list of precise key questions in plain language that the public consultation is seeking answers to from its intended audience. Where appropriate and feasible translations of the summary and key questions shall be included in the public comment proceeding and responses to public comment proceedings in any of the official ICANN languages shall always be accepted.”

So, as it says up there, this is a summary. “With regards for other types of public input, ICANN shall develop and publish guidelines to assist in determining when a public comment process is required versus alternate mechanisms for gathering input. Develop and publish guidelines for how alternative mechanisms for gathering input should operate, including producing final reports. Develop ...” Sorry, dropped off there.

“Develop a system similar to and integrate it with the public comment tracking system for all uses,” that’s got to be fixed. “For alternative mechanisms to gather input.”

“Publish to the complete public comment guidelines for the ICANN organization. Explain why its blog posts collect feedback and information.”

I chopped off some sentences, tried to make it shorter. There’s that one thing to fix there, but it’s, I’d say, 80% close to what that recommendation gives. Until I see a hand, I’m just going to keep going.

“Recommendation of completing implementation of ATRT 2 recommendations, section seven of this report.” That’s the full recommendation given that’s the only thing that’s there.

“Recommendation on amending specific and organizational reviews, section 8 of this report in summary,” this one we may have some points. I collapsed a lot of things. So, let’s give it a shot.

“Cancel any future review of directory services, RDS given the GDPR and the results of the EPDP, allow for one additional CCT review following the next round of new GTLDs. Pause any future SSR reviews and request that the next ATRT decided these should go on as is, be modified, or cancelled.” In brackets: “SSR 2 will not be completed prior to ATRT 3 completing its work, therefore not allowing ATRT 3 to undertake this task.”

“Continue with ATRT reviews with a modified schedule and scope. Stop all the current organizational reviews and replace these with continuous improvement programs in each SO/AC/NC. Add a systemic review, which will look at all SO/AC/NC and their relations.” And “Proposes a new system for the timing and cadence of the remaining reviews.”

So, spent a bit of time on this one collapsing it into this. I think it does justice to the recommendation and catches all the key points. And if I were using this in a PowerPoint, I think it would sort of make sense. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Bernie. Yeah, I suggest some changes in one part of the [inaudible] but it seems not [in-full]. I do feel strange that we cancel any future. We stop it, we ask for end of but there were not [inaudible] ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I can fix that. Okay, no problem.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, next one. "Recommendations for accountability and transparency relating to strategic and operational plans including accountability indicators, section 9 of this report. In summary this recommendation requires goals, outcomes, initiatives must provide a clear and concise rationale in plain language explaining how each of these is critical to," actually it's the same text we just approved.

Goals and outcomes is the same thing, but we have a comment from Sebastien. "I am concerned that we ask more and more administrative work and not real work." And this is relevant to saying that the changes we're requiring here be applied to the 21-25 strategic and the 21 Operating Plan."

So, I think we should talk about this and I see Sebastien has his hand. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. Yeah, I put it here but I could have put it in some other place. My concern is we ask a lot of following work, verifying if things are going well and I feel that we may end up to have one group of people in staff who are just verifying that the other group will work well. And I would like very much that we put some caution on that. Is it this place, or it is another one or it's globally. But that's my feedback on the reason why I write this sentence here. But it's not just specific for here, it's globally my feeling. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yeah, thank you. Yes, I found the comments on the review of the 2021-2025 Strategic Plan and the 2021 Operating Plan are too specific. I think our recommendations should be general and not go into the specific of what ICANN should do immediately. These plans are already presented, so I would say the changes should be for the following work, not ask them to review what has been done already. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Osvaldo. I think part of the issue is that we haven't begun this plan and basically if we do not seek to ask them to input this, basically nothing is going to happen for the next five years. So, we might as well not make this recommendation, I think.

The point is if we're going to track ... This has been the situation we present here has been going on for quite a number of years as far as

Strategic and Operational Plans. And if we don't ask for things to be changed now, basically there won't be another ATRT before these things would come in. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, I agree that even they don't change completely for this 21, they may change during the year to adjust to our requirement. And for then on the Strategic Plan and Operating Plan will be better. So, we are not asking here that they change everything for June, is review it during the year after they start. There is no demand that in June they start with completely different plans that they have done. But, is an alert that there is a lot of issues in that and they need to pay attention and change things. So, I agree that we should underline that 21-25 should be rearranged to meet the requirements. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Vanda. Pat.

PAT KANE:

So, as Osvaldo was speaking, I think the word came down to review and I think that if we were going to change this to be "shall upend these success criteria or metrics," I think maybe that's the action that we're asking them to do is to go and add to the plan the appropriate measurements. As opposed to review the whole plan. Does that work, Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Yeah, I like your proposal very much.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I think that makes perfect sense. I certainly can live with that and I think it preserves ... I think Vanda hit it on the head. We're not looking for a change here, and I think what Pat is proposing is perfectly in line with that. So, let me fix that. All right, taken on board.

Okay. "ICANN shall publish an annual status report on all Strategic Plan and Operating Plan objectives, goals, outcomes, and operational initiatives, which will include the above requirements as well as an assessment of progress to date. ICANN shall publish an overarching report at the conclusion of the Strategic Plan starting with the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan."

Those are slimmed down versions, but I think they capture the heart of what we were doing. And the next one I played with a couple of times trying to squinch it down, but it just didn't work. So, basically recommendation of section 10 is the entire recommendation, minus the lead-in text, which is about a page, page and a half, of explaining it. So, this is the meat, but as-is.

So, I'm not going to read through it because it's exactly the same thing as in there. So, let's go down just to make sure we've got all the points there and then we have the need to consider the following. Then, we've got a stray bullet right there.

So, basically that's my proposal to condense all of this. I've got that fix to make on the review thing that Pat proposed to change, which I think

will make this more acceptable to everyone. All right, all the rest of the text, if we keep going down all the way to ... Ah yes, Sebastien had a comment here and I guess we can talk about it at this point.

So, the affirmation of commitments, this is a copy paste, but Sebastien makes a question here: "Did we take into account in our work and in ATRT 1 and 2 ensuring accountability, transparency and the interest of the global Internet users?" So, maybe Sebastien can talk to this as an introduction to the subject and see where we go with that. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. No.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, we can hear you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Inaudible] came across that and I was thinking that we talk about ATRT and we never talk about interest of global Internet users. And yes, what we do for accountability and transparency it's also useful for global Internet user, but if it's written as-is with these sentences that say may we are waiting for something specific. And we must have that at the beginning, it's a little late to have consideration of that.

Because my impression is that we talk a lot about the accountability, a lot about transparency, but not about interest of global Internet user. Therefore, if you agree with that, with my assumption, we may wish to

write something specific for the next ATRT to have a specific review of that in doing their work. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you for that, Sebastien. Any other comments on that? Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, in a way I agree that even we make a lot of points, suggestions, and recommendations, that we will ensure and that we will improve the global Internet interest. I do believe that he is right. We need to express this in some points, but for that it's better each one of us that has those feelings that go through the entire document and suggest some adds just to make it clear that we took into account the global Internet interest. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Vanda. Any other comments? Not seeing anything. So, Vanda's proposing that we consider this when we do the final, cleaned up document. I think that's a fine suggestion and I propose that we move on. Would that be okay, Sebastien? A green tick from Sebastien. All right. Let's keep going.

The only changes and comments really come at the end where I included the full recommendation. So, if we could go down to the last section of this portion please, Brenda.

Yeah, there is that comment. We have that date and, as I note in the comment, we'll have to update this once we actually figure out when

we're going to hand in our report. That's just a technicality, but it's an important one.

All right, review scope. Next section, we can skip this, that's all copy paste. We'll remove the yellow in that, and we've got confirmation [on the other one]. Methodology. Work Party. And we have a suggestion from Sebastien. All right let's have a look at that.

"After identifying, prioritizing its scope, items through a series of brainstorming says the team agreed to conduct its work in four parties [inaudible] and were guided by ICANN bylaws. After completing the initial research analysis of data, the review team agreed by consensus to move work party deliberations to ..." Yeah, I'm happy with deliberations. I'll include that unless there are major objections. Yep, getting a thumbs up from Pat. All right, thank you Sebastien, we'll fix that.

Let's keep going. Summary of major findings. Let's keep going, that hasn't changed. Let's keep going. All right, review team suggestions and recommendations.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bernie, just one point. Sorry, it's in the text summary of major findings.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, okay. Let's back up to the top of that section please, Brenda. Okay, summary of major findings. Yeah.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't where this ["n"] come from, but maybe somebody typed ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I know. I forgot to remove it. I noted it last time. Thank you. Forest from the trees. All right. Next section please, Brenda.

All right. Sebastien quite correctly points out that we haven't talked about prioritization. I have removed it for now and I think we've basically ... Let me back up a bit. In this section, as recommended by KC, I've got the integral recommendations, so the text exactly as it is in the recommendation section. So, we've got all the text that is under the recommendation. We're not going to go through that, it's a copy paste.

So, basically in the introduction which includes the executive summary now, that's the end of this section. In the executive summary part, we've got that PowerPoint version of the recommendations and then at the end of this section we've got the full recommendation.

Now, the decision we have to make, I believe, is do we prioritize things here or, as I mentioned on the last call, we originally had a section 11 where we talked about prioritization and we can include a separate section. I'm perfectly open to doing either one. I don't think adding a section would add a lot of text if people feel comfortable. But I don't think it's that complicated either. I think the last time we discussed this, we said that recommendations eight and 10 should be even and high priority ones, and then we move down to the other recommendations. I'm perfectly comfortable with that. But let's throw that open to see if there any thoughts or suggestions at this point. Keeping it simple would

be prioritizing in this area of the report. I'm open to suggestions. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. It's an executive summary and I feel we need to find somewhere else in the recommendations. Therefore, my suggestion is we do both of your suggestions. We do 11 and we [inaudible] ...

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Obviously if we do a section 11 then the results of 11 would then show up here. Yes, a little bit like our discussion about section X.2 and X.3. So, we've got a suggestion for prioritization. Pat gives me a thumbs up. Okay. So, what I would propose, then, we will add a section 11, which will be prioritization. Right now, if we go through our recommendations, we had—and we discussed this in Brussels, right? Basically, we've got the prioritization and the reviews recommendation on top of the list. I see everyone agreeing with section 11. Great.

Okay, and then we have section nine, which we just finished reading, which is about the Strategic Plan and Operational Plans. And then we have the public input recommendation, section three, and we have completing of SSR 2.

So, overall, how do we want that to look? I think everyone is in agreement that recommendation eight and 10 are on top of the pile. I don't think that's going to cause a lot of concern. If you have a concern with that, please raise your hand or show a problem. Vanda is okay with it with a green tick. Okay.

So then, it's only about prioritizing the three remaining ones. The three remaining ones are section nine, which we just finished; section seven, which is ATRT 2; and section three, which is public input. Now, do we want to put them all evenly on the second level, or do we actually want to try and categorize them? I can see an argument for both.

All right, I'm going to cause a stir then since we're having no comments. I would propose then that we have recommendations eight and 10 as our first priority and then as our second priority, the Strategic Plan and Operational Plan recommendations, and then as our third priority the ATRT 2 and public input recommendations. So that we have one, two, three for our five recommendations. I get a thumbs up from Cheryl, a thumbs up from Pat, and a check from Vanda, and ... All right, it's raining thumbs up.

All right. Excellent, so I think that's the way forward. I'll draft something for section 11. Folks, we're basically done. Cheryl, over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Wow. This is all very exciting, I must say. That is good news indeed and I want to thank everybody. Pat and I are probably up to the seeing the forest and trees as a big blur of black and white text at this stage, but all of the additional work that each and every one of you are doing, and calling out Sebastien obviously here with his comments, but not just limited to him. You're all doing a lot on polishing this text to be as unambiguous and as clear as possible. And so, I think this is a very rewarding part of our experience.

So, we've got another run-through on a few things. But let's now go back to the agenda. And thanks, Brenda. And I believe we will be diving into the thrill-packed and exciting world of any other business where, I'm afraid, Osvaldo does not bring us good tidings. Osvaldo, over to you.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Yes. This week we have several calls with members of my constituency regarding the report. I've been [advancing] some small description of the changes, the recommendations we are proposing and I just this week received fairly strong oppositions, in particular to the recommendation on reviews and in particular to the elimination of the independent reviews [which is] the organization review by an external organization.

Our constituency considered that this would prevent any radical change in ICANN or any radical organizational change that might be proposed by any of the constituencies. And it says also that our, the ISPCP in particular, has always been in favor of holistic review, that is specific reviews of each SO, AC, and the organization reviews. And that they don't see the systemic review as a substitution for it.

So, they are strongly opposed to our recommendation on reviews. We are preparing a document on it and I will present it to you as soon as I have that. I just wanted to give you the heads up. I told them that we are in the final stage and that most of the work is finished and that we have approved those recommendations, so they are considering to present a minority report on my name regarding this issue. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Let's see if we can get a queue [inaudible] on that, not in as much as us in any way, shape, or form, trying to rebuff or redress these concerns. I mean, the concerns are the concerns. But perhaps, Osvaldo, you can help us understand, is this very much a fear and loathing of change—and I see Vanda's hand, we can go to you next, Vanda—or is it that they feel that a properly constructed and fully accountable and transparent continuous improvement program is going to somehow drastically fall short of a—and here are my personal biases coming through, peeking the cloak—random assignment to, in some cases, dubiously qualified independent examiners? I think you see where I'm coming from.

We've deeply thought about all of this, but what is it that they are concerned about? And I wonder, if we can understand that, if we can also, perhaps, take that into consideration in the final documentation, because we do realize some of these changes are quite radical. Let's go to Vanda first.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Well, I see that the recommendation that we made for continuous improvement, maybe the continuous makes it difficult for people to understand. But in my view, it's not to prevent no one to change completely the way anyone, of AC or SOs, is working.

It's something that what we are suggesting may be not clear, but for me it's clear that we are giving to the community the freedom to do whatever they believe that will improve their work. If this change everything, okay, if they want to ask for other comments from external

points, I don't believe that the continuous improvement we will prevent then to do that. So, maybe it's not as clear as should, but I don't see why it's not able to change everything. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Vanda. And I just wanted to note out of chat, León's mentioning that continuous small changes, if needed, seems better than large, periodical changes. Thanks for that, León. Let's go now to Pat. Pat, over to you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. So, given what Vanda just said and what León wrote, what jumps into my head is that we've given the community, with these recommendations, an opportunity to evolve. Whereas the current structure that we have in place almost requires a revolution in terms of how we approach things. And I think that the current process requires us to do things periodically to change dramatically without letting the recommendations that exist become a chore and actually find their way.

And I think to Vanda's point that we've given choices to either go big or go small is really helpful to the community in letting the recommendations that exist and to come out to be implemented appropriately and not just be washed away because they didn't work the first time.

CHERLY LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. Vanda, I'm going to assume your hand isn't a new one, but let me know if it is. Over to you, Sebastien. Sebastien, it might just be me, but I'm not hearing any audio from you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And now you can hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. I agree with Vanda and León's comments. I just want to add one there is nothing in our recommendation I feel that prevents any organization to, budget permitting, can ask an external reviewer to work with them to do some changes, radical or not radical. As it was already said, we give the power to each SO and AC to do something and it's maybe additional point to the answer to Osvaldo's group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. And now making a personal intervention on this issue, and thank you for saying that Sebastien because indeed there is absolutely nothing stopping the, as needs be, and as defined by the ACs and SOs, external evaluators to be engaged and involved. And of course, the other opportunity is with the systemic reviews. So, I would also point out that—Osvaldo, I'll come to you in a moment—that what we probably need to do is improve our messaging or ensure that our

messaging [in any] presentations that we propose the community and use regarding these recommendations that we are very clear and very, I'm just going to [inaudible].

That means I hear myself, so never mind. So, that we are really crystal clear on expanding some of what we've said here today to hopefully help the community and Osvaldo's constituency be a little perhaps more comforted.

Just on that, it has been in my—yes, very long, when I was commercially involved in this area—experience that it is a good practice to have a periodic external review in any of these processes of continuous improvement, even when we had clients that were running quite well-established, internal quality systems management programs. So, there's nothing unusual or new about bringing in the occasional external evaluator. But it is still the empowerment in where that design comes from is, I think, where we're coming at, and of course the cadence.

Sebastien, is that a continuing hand? Did you want to say something before we go to Osvaldo? Okay, over to you, Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Thank you very much. I think your comments would be very helpful for me. I want to be very transparent on this, so that my position is clear. The final issue is that for many times our constituency has been feeling not very comfortable in its position in the organization.

That being said, anyway, I want just to share some of the comments I've received regarding this. It said, for example, "When any group who

undertakes self-review as a predominant method of facilitating change, the outcome is rarely satisfactory. The tendency is always to avoid issues that either will [reflect] badly on the particular group or calling to question aspects that are deemed too difficult or highly controversial. ICANN is continually struggling with change and it's far too easy for those who see benefit from the status quo to [inaudible] radical change that may challenge it. The ATRT proposal is promoting a step backwards by removing the opportunity for independent reviews to take place."

So, I think that the comments I heard today are going to be very helpful for me and also it will help to clear what we are proposing as a whole. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Osvaldo. Let's go to Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Excellent, thank you. I'm listening to Osvaldo and in fact what comes to mind for me is the requirements. And I understand the concerns of his community, and from my point of view, I would be happier with the systemic review. Because right now in the organizational reviews,

there's this ongoing purpose requirement in the bylaws, but that only gets looked at in the organizational review in that silo. And what we're proposing in here is that we break that ongoing purpose requirement and take it in the systemic review, which will look at all of the SOs and the ACs and the NC and try to understand what is the better picture. And, I think that's what we were driving to.

And, in my mind, maybe, as noted by several other speakers, we don't explain it better. But I think that portion of the requirements on the systemic review make it a lot stronger, and I would think a lot more interesting for a constituent like yours than the current one.

Here's the text. So basically, we're removing from the individual organizational reviews this text and we're placing it in the system review. "Review SO, AC, NC as a whole to determine if they continue to have a purpose in the ICANN structure as they are currently constituted or if any changes in structures and operations are desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as ensure optimal representation of community views."

Now, this is basically copy paste from the bylaws for organizational reviews and we're taking this one whole level up in the systemic review. If I were sitting in a GNSO constituency, I would think that would be a lot more interesting. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Bernie. It seems what we need to do is have a little look at our messaging and make sure that our intents and purposes in our recommendation is perhaps gilded a little more to make it very clear

and take into consideration the concerns that we've heard from Osvaldo. So, thank you Osvaldo, this has been a very useful intervention and we very much appreciate it. I don't think it's too little too late. I think that we still have, not so much course correction, as the opportunity for explanation and embellishment in our final text. So, timely indeed.

Pat, did you want to follow on with anything [on that stage]?

PAT KANE: Cheryl, I think you covered it. I think it's good, and thank you Osvaldo.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great, okay. Well ladies and gentlemen, we seem to have come to the final part of our agenda for the day, which is very exciting. So, Jennifer, did we decide anything?

JOHNSON BRYCE: Thank you, Cheryl. Well, I captured one action item for Bernie and he's going to draft text for section 11 for discussion on a future call. And then the team is going to look at the text for the review's messaging based on the discussion just had in AOB. Other than that, I did not capture anything, but do let me know if there's something else I should record. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thank you. I think we've progressed with our text rather than [inaudible] action items, but certainly Bernie's work continues. He's a critical part of the work at this stage. But constant review, supervision, and read-throughs are essential because we all need to be as satisfied as we possibly can be that our fingerprints, our true intentions, and our best efforts, are all reflected in the final documentation.

So, with that, and let me check my timing. Only just 10 past top of the hour. It looks like we can draw today's meeting to a close. But before we do, let's just confirm the date and time of our next meeting, which will be Wednesday something or other.

JOHNSON BRYCE: Thanks. So, it's going to be on Wednesday the 22nd of April and the time for that one is 11:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great, totally inhuman time for me, but that's fine. All right, then. Thank you, Bernie, for putting your hand up because I was just about to flick to you and say where to from here as we start to bring these sections to sort of a closure. Over to you, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, ma'am. Well, first of all I'll finish making these last few changes and you will see in our email that we will move to version 2.0. So, we're there. That will include the new section 11. I see that as being a rather short section, given our discussion today, and we can review that on Wednesday. So, I'll try to have all those changes in 2.0 published

Monday at the latest so that everyone has a chance to read that. And then, basically, everything is done and closed for the moment. We'll have a couple of [go at its,] just review that things make sense on Wednesday, but I think we're getting there. Thank you. Back to you, ma'am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you so much, Bernie. And to that end, Pat, I would suggest what we do is make that very short version of an agenda an outcome of today's meeting that we will be operating in Plenary #61 on the fully updated, next generational version, which will be a 2.0 of our report. We will do a review of changes and first read of new text and that we will probably not have any additional item on that agenda. We'll run that for as long as it takes, obviously, but I would suggest we probably don't then need to have a leadership team meeting unless there's something extraordinary comes up on Monday, and we can get that agenda out sooner rather than later.

And the only other thing I would suggest, Pat, we might want to put into that agenda, on Wednesday is whether or not we confirm the necessity for the Friday meeting. It may be at that time that we can stretch the cadence back to weekly, at least for the week or two before we get to the [death knell] on all of this. But let's discuss that once we've had a go through version 2.0, which will be sitting perilously close toward penultimacy] I suspect. Do I have that correct, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I believe you do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, I love it when you say that. Excellent, and Pat's got a thumb up. Excellent.

All right, well ladies and gentlemen, thank you so very much for all of this very valuable discussion today. I know it sometimes seems awful and painfully slow as we dot the I's and cross the T's, but as we know, that is a very important part. These outcomes, these final reports are enduring. And as we have discovered when we've looked back at what others have done, unless we are really good at how they're written, they can be misunderstood, misinterpreted, or of course, in some cases, totally misplaced.

All right then ladies and gentlemen, thank you one and all. Thank you to our fabulous staff, as usual, and with that, we will have the additional action item of not having our meeting on Monday with the leadership team and we've got our agenda to put out as soon as possible. So, thank you. You can stop the recording, Brenda, and it's a big, from Pat and I, bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]