
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the ATRT3 Plenary #61 on the 22nd of April 2020 at 11:00 UTC.

Members attending the call are Adetola, Cheryl, Daniel, Jacques, Jaap, Vanda, and Leon. Observers are Everton, Jim, Herb, and Avri. Attending from ICANN org is Jennifer, Negar, Brenda, and technical writer, Bernie, is on the call. Sebastien will be delayed today. I might note that Daniel mentioned he can only stay for the first hour.

Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking. Cheryl and Pat, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Brenda. I didn't think I heard you say Pat in the roll call. Perhaps you did but I definitely know he's here.

Thank you all for joining our call today. Is there anyone who has a Statement of Interest update that they need to let us know about? Just to remind you all we do work under a system of continuous disclosure. Not hearing anybody or seeing anything in the chat. We will assume that it is not the case. I note there are some interesting weather banter going on in the chat. There's some rather brisk and unfriendly cold weather sweeping our Canadian friends.

Well, with that, let's move straight into just a quick review of the agenda which is not terribly complicated but all very important. We have – ladies and gentlemen, I feel like doing a drum roll – now updated

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.

version, to a new version 2.0, and we'll be going through our report version 2.0 to look at changes since our last meeting. We're also going to dive into the review of Section 11. It's not going to take us terribly long but it's there and it's as requested for our discussion last week. We're also going to look at the future of our calls and how frequent they need to be. We'll do Any Other Business. If you have any other business that you want to flag to us now, please let us know by putting it in chat. But we will make a call for any other business again before we close off. We'll do our usual confirm of action items and decisions reached. That will be it for our #61. We are, I think, progressing very well as we start getting to the penultimate, if not ultimate start of our report. So with that, I'm not seeing anybody wanting to bring any other business, let's dive right in. With that, I'm going to ask Bernie to take us through Section 11 about all of the changes that have been made as we've moved to version 2.0. Bernie, over to you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Okay. I was actually hoping to do Section 11 first, which is why Brenda put it there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

That's fine. If that's what you want to do. I just was beautifully going through the agenda. I did jump out of the action items because I think this was the only action item, Section 11.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you for indulging the odd number here. Section 11 you'll remember from our last call, we decided to add a section where we would prioritize our recommendations. We had discussed then there was no opposition to high priority being Section 8 on the reviews and Section 10 regarding prioritization. Medium was Section 9: Accountability and Transparency of Strategic and Operational Plans and Accountability Indicators. Then low priority we had recommendations from Section 3 and priority input in Section 7 regarding ATRT2.

Straightforward, KISS as it work, keep it simple. I want to know if that is okay. Going once –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's the queue [inaudible]. Pat, thumbs up. Everyone okay with it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Great. Because what I have done then is whenever we refer to our recommendations, I place them in that order in other places in the text.

All right, our next major section of changes was from Section 9. Brenda, please. No, that's 8 so lower. Okay. Keep going down. Back up to 9.3, please.

We had mentioned that we removed – the best practices weren't too good. If we go down a bit, the next major change was – okay, stop there. Thank you. I removed Board reports because, really, they weren't updating again strategic objectives. So I just removed that bullet when we were considering other things that made sense right now.

Then if we keep going down, further down ... Okay. Then there was the change on the date for the accountability indicators. The phrasing also had to change at the beginning. So we had “ATRT3 hoped that the ICANN Accountability Indicators would provide some clear progress reporting versus the goals for the 2016 - 2020 Strategic Plan as the indicators presented in this website perfectly map to the goals in that strategic plan.” That’s the only change. We’ve removed the date and fixed the phraseology a bit.

Then that takes down to the other changes we had talked about. I removed the references to the public consultations. Then it takes us down to the bottom of the section where basically I’ve removed the recommendation and put it in the recommendation section. We conclude with, “As such ATRT3 is making a multi-part recommendation with respect to the Accountability and Transparency of Strategic and Operational Plans.”

If we go down a bit, a bit more, so we’ve got the two things. We’ve removed the page limits, etc. Stop there. We’ve added a new bullet here. So instead of trying to repeat that we’re asking ICANN to do something relative to the ‘21-’25 Strategic Plan and ‘21 Operating Plan in each of the two bullets above, we’ve created a new bullet just for that. Let’s read it. “For the 2021-2025 Strategic Plan and 2021 Operating Plan ICANN org shall produce a supplementary document using the criteria defining success in reporting on the progress of any relevant goal, outcome, operational initiative, etc. to create a listing of required rationales and specific criteria defining success (as defined by ATRT3 in this Recommendation) for each goal (strategic or not), outcome (targeted or not), operational initiatives, etc. that are found in

both of these documents and post it for public consultation prior to finalization. Once finalized ICANN org will append these to the 2021-2025 Strategic Plan and 2021 Operating Plan and use the criteria defining success in reporting on the progress of any relevant goal, outcome, operational initiative, etc.”

As we discussed last week, you’ll remember Osvaldo was uncomfortable with us talking about reviewing the Strategic Plan and the Operating Plan. I think everyone was supportive of that, but also supportive that ICANN needed to produce something according to our guidelines because it’s a five-year period. So we’ve added that bullet point. Is that okay? Okay, I’m getting green ticks. Cheryl, your thumb is still up. Even better if we get Osvaldo ... “I like the proposal.” Okay. Cheryl brings me a thumbs up again. All right, folks, last chance here. Going once, going twice. Okay, great.

What I have done then – and I’m not going to go through it in detail – is I’ve redone the checklist for the recommendations because it’s not the same recommendations as we had with the accountability indicators. As usual, they’re just basically phrases of this section or straight-out copying of the section brought into the checklist. I’ll let you go through those at your will.

All right, then the following changes we will go right to the top of the document, please, Brenda. All right. We have our executive summary and way at the bottom of this section the main change is – okay, right there. ATRT3 concludes this report by making these five recommendations in order of priority. So we have used the same prioritization scheme as presented in Section 11 of the report. These are

the same summaries of the recommendations which we presented at our last meeting, so I am not going to run through them. So we have high priority Section 8 and Section 10 if we go down just a bit. Then we move into medium priority where we've got Section 9, which we've just finished discussing. Then on low priority we have Section 3, which is public input, then followed by Section 7, followed by ATRT2. Those are, in certain cases, summaries of the recommendations. In the case of ATRT2, it's all recommendation because it's not very long. The other place where this impacted it is a little later in the sections where we have the full recommendations. So if we go down there, Brenda. It would be four or five pages later I think.

Summary of Major Findings. There we go. Review Team Suggestions and Recommendations. The only thing that has changed here is ATRT3 makes five recommendations in order of priority. High priority in here what we've done ... oh yes, there's that point, which is why I highlighted. We'll get back to this in a sec. All the recommendations are exactly as they are.

Here we are proposing a change on the reviews for RDS. We said we would look at just cancelling it. Someone pointed out to me that the public consultation on the final EPDP report only close on the 6th of April and that there may be changes yet, and then the recommendations have to be or not approved by the Board. So I discussed this with Pat and Cheryl, and we thought it was a good idea to follow up and make this similar to the SSR recommendation, so let's read it.

"Given the final results of the EPDP process will certainly have an impact on any future RDS reviews and could even remove the need for any

further Specific Reviews on this topic and considering that ATRT3's final report will be published prior to the EPDP publishing its final report, ATRT3 recommends suspending any further RDS reviews until the next ATRT review can consider the future of RDS reviews in light of the final EPDP 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 if applicable."

Basically, what we're saying it doesn't really change the recommendation to a large extent. We're still saying there should not be one until the next ATRT, and then the next ATRT should look at that. When I wrote this up in Section 8, I gave some more logic to it which we will go to, but I see Sebastien's hand. Please, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you very much. Sorry to be late. I don't know really where we are but here specifically on this, I consider that EPDP is just one element. In fact, I don't care about EPDP. The fact that EPDP is going on, it's an answer that we don't need RDS reviews anymore. Why? I consider that in fact historically it was a WHOIS review. WHOIS is gone and now it's named RDS but it was not the request of the Affirmation of Commitment. And the fact that WHOIS was one of the reviews it's because it was 10 years ago or 20 years ago that still no issue to move WHOIS to something else. Now we are in something else and, frankly, what I would like to say is no more of those reviews. If there is a need for the future – EPDP result is just one element that show that ICANN is taking care of the future of WHOIS or the replacement of WHOIS, and therefore there is no specific need for review. It's why I personally

consider that we may say we stop it and the RDS. EPDP is just one element of good health of this work within ICANN today. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, thank you, Sebastien. As I said, I don't think this is going to change a lot but this was trying to be consistent and conservative in doing this. I don't feel I'm going to die in the ditch on this one. Anybody else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just a minor editorial point for formatting and an extra period in the chat from Jacques. That's all.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I saw that. Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: I'm not sure. We don't know how long it will take for the EPDP to publish its final report. So what you're saying is that there won't be any RDS review until after the EPDP final report and then the decision whether to continue with the RDS reviews will be taken, is that right? Sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Not quite. What this says is that the decision to continue or not with RDS reviews would be taken after ATRT4.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sebastien's point is it's not only EPDP. The fact there's GDPR and other factors are causing that the RDS review is no [inaudible]. I mean, we might as well take the decision here and just say as we previously did that there's no longer a need for it and be cancelled.

Anybody else? Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: I would refer your proposal then to just eliminate the RDS reviews. That way, we leave the decision open to after the EPDP final report and implementation of some of its recommendations. So it's much more factual to take the decision after you see what happened in the middle. I would prefer your proposal.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, thank you, Osvaldo. Yes, that's what I was trying to do here is be conservative and it sort of matches exactly what we're saying for the SSR review. All right, so we have two views. We have some for the text, we have some against the text. Sebastien, you're next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. SSR it's a review itself. We need to have them after. Here we are talking about policy development process even if it's an EPDP and

it's not a review. It's one of the elements of the work and there are other work going on in ICANN, generally in GNSO, more in particular what's next about WHOIS and today RDS. I really feel that EPDP is not one element we may change the view about a need for a future RDS or not. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Okay, anybody else? I'm going to be mean here and put Pat on the spot. Pat, do you have any thoughts on this? Please go ahead.

PAT KANE: Unmuted, all right. I'm actually supportive of killing RDS altogether just because I think that the initial implementation of this was driven by something very specific with US government. But I also believe that we should be consistent with the documents. So I'm supportive, Bernie, of the wording that we have in here in a hope that ATRT4 kills this altogether. So I would leave it the way that you've got it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you.

PAT KANE: But when we do get a chance, I do want to come back to something that popped to my mind about priorities and the way we listed priorities.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat. I think, to be consistent, we are in charge of reviewing the reviews. Not reviewing each and every PDP even if it's an important one as the EPDP. It's why if we want to be consistent, we have the RDS review report. And considering all that, we think we can kill the future ... or there is no need for a future RDS review. That's my consistency. I understand the other one, but I don't feel comfortable with it. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, folks, how about we take a – oh, I see Pat's hand. Pat?

PAT KANE: Thanks, Bernie. Just as a follow up with Sebastien. The thing about the EPDP for GDPR is that there's going to be a lot of issues around privacy and access to data and those kinds of things that are going to come out of that policy development process, and I don't know or have any idea what will be accepted or not because there's even questions going back to what the Board has accepted as part of the Phase 1 recommendations, and the Board looks like they're moving the definition of what they approved from the Phase 1. So I just want to be cautious to Bernie's point and be conservative that should something come out of that process that ends up being a true accountability mechanism that we either identify something specific that rolls into an ATRT for the future or does it need to be separate because it's very

distinct on its own. So I just think that there's enough possibilities of something else coming up out of that that we should leave it open like this.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Pat. Seb?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Do you really think that it will be a need for RDS? We might need something about privacy review. We might need something more specific. But here we are talking about RDS as it is today. I understand your point of view but my consideration is that ATRT3 kill it and ATRT4 can create a new one about privacy review or whatever topics they want to. But why will we ask them to do two things? One, killing RDS and the other while creating another one, or to be able to follow on with the RDS. It's why really I consider that we must decide to kill it and the ATRT4 will have the possibility to create whatever review teams they want to suggest. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, thank you, Sebastien. Leon, can I put you on the spot? Can you give us your thoughts on this?

LEON SANCHEZ: Sure, Bernie. I am not sure what to say about this, but I would like to see a little bit more of what others think.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Sorry for putting you on the spot there. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: I have been participating in the very initial RDS reviews. It's a bit of a dual feeling. [RGPD] notwithstanding and privacy notwithstanding in things do stay as they are then Sebastien is right, let's kill it. Let's propose to kill it because we're not doing anything. By the way, we just recommend something, not doing it. It's just a recommendation. That's kind of important because then you know the decision may be something else.

But on the other hand, I had seen some voices chime in and say, hey, you know what, if we really want to have a truthful WHOIS and something that we can rely on then let's, for example, make a category of domain name which would be certified, where you would have to push your [idea] forward, for example. I don't know under what condition and so on. In this case, you would have again an RDS review needed.

So all in all, when I consider everything and I consider we're recommending something, I personally would tend to leave the door open and let history follow its way until next time there's relevant elements about this.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Jacques. Anybody else? Cheryl next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi. Thanks, Bernie. I'm not entering an opinion but just – Sebastien has his hand up again. We'll go back to you now, Sebastien, but I was thinking that what we might do on this, I mean, we've heard from a number of people, I was going to see if we could find out if anyone is less undecided or less conservative and wishes to support [part of line]. That's all. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Just to say that some time ago when I was member of the Board, the Board wanted to kill WHOIS and replace it with RDS. Yes, it was not our responsibility, therefore, it went through GNSO and it takes a lot of time decide to change, and I will not come back to the old story of that. It's why really I consider that our view here is important and I consider we will help the organization in killing RDS now and ATRT4 will be able to recreate or to create what they want. But for now it's time to say, okay, it's done. What it was set up for reason by US government, by GAC, by so on and so forth, and agree with ICANN and now it's done. We are now in another period. We are not talking anymore about WHOIS and we don't need this renew name RDS review anymore. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl, your hand is still up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, no, it shouldn't be. Drop it down. Just go to Leon.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Bernie. Having listened to the rest of the team, I lean towards leaving this recommendation as is. I agree that WHOIS is, so to speak, dead although I don't like to say it's dead, but it's definitely not what it used to be and we'll never go back to what it used to be, I guess, in light of the current circumstances. Although we don't know, maybe GDPR is performed then ... I mean, there are lots of things that could happen that we don't know. So as I said, my feeling is that RDS makes really little sense to me at this time. But however, I would remain open to say whatever comes out of the PDP should be reviewed by the next ATRT. So that's what I'm reading at least, the way I read it and I understand it. That's what we are putting in to this recommendation, so I would support leaving it as is.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Leon. Yes, that's exactly what it says. Cheryl, over to you. Let's wrap this up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Bernie. So this is what I'm hearing. First of all I'm noting that the two views are not terribly different or they're not very far apart. It's more of a matter of how definitive to be and timing. But, Sebastien, we've definitely heard and, in all cases, I think understand, if not actually agree with what you're saying but I'm not hearing as much

as an appetite from the rest of the review team to be as definitive as you're encouraging us to be in the report. What I am hearing is more people comfortable with the old bit conservative text which is in keeping with and echoes in many ways the recommendation that we're making on SSRT. But I also have noted people who are very neutral as well.

So I guess what I'd like to do now is make a last call on this for anyone who wishes to support the proposal that Sebastien has argued quite extensively, and I'm sure we do understand it that this ATRT3 should recommend a no further activities in the area of RDS review. And if you do wish to support that and we have text very easily [inaudible] in here, let us know now. If not, what I believe I've heard – and, Pat, tell me if I'm wrong – is a preference for this old bit, more conservative and leave it for a while and see what happens, but there is an inevitability. So it's slightly different but the death still is ringing. So if there's anyone who feels as strongly as Sebastien does on this, please let yourself be known now. I'm not seeing anybody jump to the defense, Sebastien. So I guess the next question to ask you, is this a “you cannot live with” issue? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, no. I am here. Sometimes when you ask me tough questions, I need to think about. I am not straight giving an answer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem. I just didn't want to miss getting you back.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I can live with whatever we will decide, but I really feel what I suggest and I feel that we will help ICANN if we kill it today and leave ATRT4 to decide what they want to do with any of those topics in the future. Because the discussion on the chat about the name, yes, what is WHOIS, RDS, RDAP, and so on and so forth, that create more questions than solution. That's why. But I can live with that.

I just consider that if we take a PDP whatever in this review, we need to be sure that there is no PDP going on on other type of the discussion, for example, for the CCT or for SSR going in parallel with what we are doing just if we want to be equal everywhere, and I have no answer if we are not. It's important that we take into account any we have done in the other topics which are not a review. Because here we are answering in a slippery side I think if we talk about a PDP. But to answer your question, at the end of the day, it's not that that will cause me to disagree with the full report. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Sebastien. I think it's important to get that on the record as we go forward. So I believe, Bernie, we are in the position with this text that at this stage we haven't made a final consensus call on the new document yet. This is the preferred text so it would appear that this is the text that will go into our ultimate report for our final consideration. But obviously, there's still an opportunity should the debate that we had [inaudible] any.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you, Ma'am. Thank you, everyone, for the consideration. This is obviously not our last crack at this. Of course, there will be a full review of the final report.

Okay, Pat, you had some thoughts on prioritization?

PAT KANE: Yeah. Thanks, Bernie. It's just that when we went through high, medium, and low, those are relative to our priorities, not necessarily low priorities as we push them out to be prioritized across other recommendations throughout the community, right?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Correct.

PAT KANE: So if we could put the notion that they had that these are relative to our recommendations, I think that would be useful.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I can do that. All right. Thank you. Okay, I have one more strategic question as I was – I have a green tick from Sebastien. Yes, it shall be done. So it is written, so it shall be done as it were. I was rereading our report and it struck me on the reviews recommendation we have this very long recommendation, we talked about a lot of things but we don't include in there that we're asking ICANN to hold any future reviews until it makes a decision on this. Now, if we include that in the

recommendation, it's a little unfortunate. So I have this issue is we're making suggestions on sweeping changes to the recommendations, especially the organizational reviews, and yet some are supposed to start in the near future. And as we know, it takes a while for the Board to properly assess these and consider them and makes a decision, and it would be, I guess, unfortunate if some contracts were let to get organizational reviews going. And then if this recommendation gets approved, I guess it would sort of be cutting the legs under it. So open suggestion, folks. How do we want to handle that? Do we want to just throw it in the recommendation or do we want to leave our recommendation as is and in our transmission letter to the Board sort of say, "By the way, you'll note that in recommendation for Section 8, we're proposing significant changes to the specific organizational reviews, and as such, we recommend that you hold off holding any of those." Pat, help me.

PAT KANE:

Bernie, I like the latter suggestion that you made to make a part of the transmittal because it would be kind of a catch-22 to where our recommendation is to delay the organizational reviews, yet the recommendation hasn't been accepted by the Board.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes, exactly. That was my point.

PAT KANE:

So I really like the idea of putting it as part of the transmittal.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. That's why I suggested that. I think that's really our only way out here, but I'll be glad to. I'm happy – transmittal test. Anybody else have any thoughts on this? I'm not seeing any. Sorry, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. When archeologists will come to this text and will not have the transmittal letter and they will try to find out what's happened, they will be in trouble. Joke aside, I think I would prefer an introduction to the document [who] could be the same that transmittal text but I would like that included in the document just to not have need to read two different documents to know the full story.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think that makes perfect sense. Once we craft the text included in the transmittal letter, we certainly can refer to it in the executive summary and in the Section 8 so that there is a very clear understanding that there was this request. You don't have to go dig in for a letter. I think your archaeological thing is quite correct because I did quite a bit of digging for this report and I certainly understand that.

All right, so if we're okay with that then I would call that our belt and suspenders approach okay for everyone. Cheryl gives me a thumbs up. Sebastien gives – it's raining green ticks and thumbs up. All right, folks, so it is written, so it shall be done. Or so it shall be written.

Okay, Madam Chair, back to you. That's all the changes I have.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very exciting really. Thank you very much. We really don't have anything else that we need to do on this version 2.0 and, Sebastien, because you were unable to join us at the beginning of the call, we did make a little bit of a joy and celebration about noting that we are now officially in version 2.0. So the nomenclature has finally changed. I hope you'll be pleased about that. I know you've been keen to see that happen.

Bernie, where are we now in this text getting towards final polish? Do you want to give us a little preamble or a preparation for our next agenda item which is discussing the cadence of future calls?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, it's my precious. I will never let it go. No, no. I'll be glad to let this go. Where I'm at I think is, as I have said previously, I think we've reached the point where I will spend the next week going over this with a fine-toothed comb just to make sure the logic and the points match, that all the elements in the checklist match what we've decided in our analysis and in our recommendations, fix up any typos and everything else, and try to have what I would consider a final document for review by the group next week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Bernie. Can I ask by next week – I'm thinking about now – but the cadence of the meetings would the timing on that be better to be the usual Wednesday meeting or what is now the usual Friday meeting?

Would 29 April or 1 May be the best time for us to slot that in to our plan?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Again, being conservative, I would prefer the Friday.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, all right. What we've heard then, ladies and gentlemen, is that with this text going off to be laundered, purified, and have all its I's dotted and its T's crossed, the intention is to have an ultimate text for our purview and review on May 1. So what we could do is in fact not hold, because I'm not sure unless someone can give us a reason to that we will then need to hold our Friday meeting this week, we could if you wish hold a mini meeting on Wednesday unless confident that we'll have very much on our agenda if we do. So it would mean that for once, because of all your additional work and you've all done a huge amount, we would be not meeting until 7, 8, 9, 10 days from now. It's 9 days from now. That would be a meeting on the 1st of May. I'm assuming that meeting would be the 20:00 or 21:00 UTC time. Is that correct, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: One second.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. Osvaldo says it's a holiday. Yes, it is, of course a holiday in various parts of the world. Although I'm not sure many people will be running

around doing May polls in large numbers. It's a very big May poll with 1.5 meter distance for everybody. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I am happy that it's on Friday. Yes, it's 1st of May but that's good that we will have a meeting of ATRT3 like that. My demonstration usually on the street will not be feasible then I will come with you. I just want to ask two questions related to the document. First one, can we be sure that any changes, even from Bernie, going on now is recorded or it's visible by us? Because I would like to start reading again the full document because I don't think waiting for May will be enough time for me. My second point is that, as you know, I like some graphics and I would like to have your point of view if we publish my proposal graphics and if you want me to update it to be more in line with what we say now in our 2.0 document. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, respond to some of that. But I would note with all of the discussion on holidays or not. Of course, 22:00 UTC for everybody else in the world except in me, it's late in the day, not early in the day. In fact, for me it's early on my following day. So I'll be talking to you on my Saturday morning. So it's probably not a huge [inaudible]. As someone said – it was Tola – in the chat, “We're all home anyway.” Let's get to Jennifer and have a look at the timing on that and try and organize the 22:00, providing the staff support can be organized for it. Bernie, to you, to deal with the graphics and of course the availability of watching and track changing and observing anything that goes on with 2.0.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. I absolutely agree with Sebastien. I'll clean up the document and any changes after today, I will use the suggestion mode so they're tracked. That's not a problem. And as far as the graphic, yes, it's still in there. An updated version I think at this point would be very useful. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Sebastien, if you could take that action item to update the graphic, that would be excellent. I understand, Jennifer, that we would have had as 11:00 UTC if indeed we had held all the meetings between now and it. I was suggesting 22:00, in other words, the latest of the times for the meeting, because it's a rotation of our times from today's call. I do understand the difference. I guess we can discuss which one you want, so there's no skin off my nose one way or the other. But I would have thought the later time would be the safest, just a little bit of more flexibility. Should anyone be doing anything on the 1st of May, it should give the most [inaudible] themselves. All right, so 21:00 UTC. Is there anyone who objects 21:00 UTC on May the 1st as our next formal meeting? Excellent. Looks like we've got that sorted.

Sorry. "Paying for the data and power." There's several things happening in chat. I'm getting that 21:00 UTC is too early for Sebastien and Jaap. What time do you propose?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may. Internally, there is no big deal but it's happened that during this period, I am working at 5:00 AM, that's 3:00 AM UTC during the weekend. Then if we finish at 11, it will be 1:00 AM for me when we finish here and I will have to wake me up at 5:00. I need to sleep some time. But it's one of the reason I would prefer the 11:00 UTC but if it's not possible, I will come anyhow, anyway. Thank you. Just to let you know my trouble.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Well, I'm most concerned about your trouble, sir. I won't even start about what happens when you live in UTC plus 10 or 11 times or however. With that, let's see. We seem to have a tension between an 11:00 or 21:00 UTC. Do you want to poll now between those two? All right, let's do a quick poll. If you prefer 11:00 UTC on the 1st of May for the next call, please put a green tick up. Herb, if you can do a count, please. Easy because you're counting yourself as well. I'm not going to vote either way because my [key effect] is low.

HERB WAYE: Cheryl, I show six in support of 11:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got Adetola and Jaap saying that ... Well, Jaap saying he doesn't mind. He's like me, doesn't mind either way. Adetola as well.

HERB WAYE: I've got a couple of late additions. Leon jumped into that so I now have seven that's showing favor with –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it seems to me that the preference is actually for the earlier time of the day. So be it. Okay. All right, that is fine. Jennifer, just to keep us utterly confused in a very flexible set of notes I'm sure you've taken, we're now back to 11:00 UTC on the 1st of May. Dear, it's like organizing ... sharing out of who pays what after we all shared dinner. It's the same amount of confusion when one tries to organize a time for everything. Jacques is delighted, I've even got a capital. Thanks to you. Okay. So 11:00 UTC and I think it's going once, going twice, going thrice. And it's sold. Bernie, over to you.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. Just a quick note, I don't think it's going to be that long of a call. We'll be walking through any changes that will be highlighted that I will have made in the document after today. Just to be clear with everyone, I think it's just going to be explaining what those changes are, where they are. But the big thing is going to be allowing everyone to comb through the report.

I also do not expect there to be any significant changes, there will be editorial changes. If there are a few inconsistencies, those will be fixed and pointed out. But I'm really not, at this point, expecting anything major. I would expect – touch wood – that there will be nothing major on that call and that we should get through it rather quickly. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly at the time of night, at least for me, I will appreciate that. Does that mean then, Bernie, after our meeting of the 1st of May at 11:00 UTC, we will be locking the version, whatever it is by then to a final report that we can then have a consensus call. Is that the intention? Timing-wise, I mean, it is the intention but is that going to work for timing?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, that's the idea.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. All right then. With that, you all need to get your heads into the right space. Your last guess at making commentary and trying to get any changes into our document, our version 2.0, will be some nine days. Hence, you are able to look at during all of the time between now and then, the report, as the I's are dotted and the T's are crossed, and a few paragraphs are formatted. One page has often word removed because Bernie knows I get very nervous when I have formatting that has words or sentences open. He worked very hard to make that happen, I'm sure. With that, those subject to [inaudible], all the changes that we expect to see on the document of the 1st of May, it should be very much in keeping with a final report that we will then take consensus call. Bernie, back to you for a moment.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Just from experience, folks, I'm not going to track changes in formatting. It just makes everything way too ugly and sometimes cascades. There will be changes in formatting, I am sure, but if text is not touched, it will not be tracked unless there is opposition to that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well noted, Bernie. I'm sure that what we all want to see is any changes in text so it's substantive document changes, not the [inaudible]. That may still even go on after the 1st of May but they will be things that will be very minor. Otherwise, it would need to come back to the [playroom]. Okay. With that, we now come to the ... and it's Any Other Business. Do we have any other business? Osvaldo, go ahead.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Regarding the objections that ISPCP that I presented in the last call to the elimination of the organizational review and the systemic review, my understanding was that there was going to be an explanation of the process to see how it includes what was included in the organizational review. Also just to let you know, there has been a support from the IPC and the BC regarding some of the objections, particularly organizational review, but I think they have other objections regarding our recommendations. I would like to know, are we going to get a more detailed explanation of the process so I can transmit it to my constituency? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, to my understanding, Osvaldo. Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes. I started thinking about what can be added. As part of the rules of engagement that we have agreed to today, if I add more elements of that text, it will be in track changes. But I don't think we're going to have a separate document, we're just going to include that in our document. And I haven't had time to actually write that yet, but it's still on my radar. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Is there any other business? If not, I think Pat and I have a small piece of any other business to informally bring you up to date with. I haven't checked my e-mails for a few hours before this call so I don't know if there was an e-mail following up Martin's informal message to you and I over ... or over my night but through your day. There may be something in the works but if we received anything formally to pass on to the plenary, otherwise, I think we should just make a brief mention of our message from Martin.

PAT KANE: No, I haven't seen where it's been posted, but there's been no follow-up e-mail from what we got from Wendy.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, all right. Just to say that chairman of The Board had stated his thanks for receiving our note, our e-mail message regarding our

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We received an official letter. Jennifer sent it to us yesterday at 4:40 PM UTC. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I obviously hadn't seen it and neither have I heard any. A message came through earlier and I'm just delighted to say that the formalities have followed the informality that we were delighted to receive. So didn't need to waste your time for being well up to date on it apparently, so excellent. You all know what we now know.

Is there anything else, Pat, we need to deal with tonight before we get consumed? I think there is only one action item but that might be one more if Jennifer is being clever. I don't know.

PAT KANE: Cheryl, this is Pat. I don't have anything else.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. In which case, Jennifer, what have we got?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. I took a couple of actions. Bernie is going to do a review of the document and make final updates and track changes to produce a document for the team's final review on the 1st of May. Between now and then, an action item for team members to make final comments in the document ahead of that meeting. We're going to cancel the calls up

until that 1st of May meeting which will be at 11:00 UTC. Sebastien took an action item to update the graphic, I believe, was in the Accountability Indicator section, but I may have misheard that one. Sebastien, please correct me if I'm wrong there. Other than that, that's all I captured for today. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The document as a review agenda or the review calendar that I have to update.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Got it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's in the Review section.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. I know which one you mean. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, then. Well, with that, Pat, do you have anything we need to deal with before we ask Brenda to close this off?

PAT KANE: Not that I'm aware of.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, thank you, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you to our passionate viewing audience. I do appreciate you all making the time to join us in these calls. I certainly believe that some of you are more than just de facto members of the team. So we really do appreciate you were keeping us on the straight and narrow with your presence. With that, thank you one and all. I'll ask you, Brenda, to stop the recording. Today's call has now come to an end. Thank you one and all. Bye for now.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, bye-bye. Stay safe.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]