

**Zoom Chat Transcript**  
**ATRT3 Plenary #63 – 06 May 2020**

06:03:33 From Brenda Brewer : Good day! Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary #63 on 6 May 2020 @ 11:00 UTC. This meeting is recorded. Please state your name for the record before comments. Kindly mute your audio when not speaking. Thank you.

06:03:40 From Brenda Brewer : Please observe the ICANN EXPECTED STANDARDS OF BEHAVIOR found here: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/expected-standards-2016-06-28-en>

and the ICANN COMMUNITY ANTI-HARASSMENT POLICY found here:  
<https://www.icann.org/news/blog/community-anti-harassment-policy>.

06:04:39 From Jennifer Bryce : report link is here;:  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1u7lGGjkz6BzDqhmguF8Qn-8liIUJZDos5g9OREQVyc/edit>

06:09:23 From Cheryl Langdon-Orr : Sure

06:09:57 From Cheryl Langdon-Orr : Jennifer just adjust thro formal Agenda record to match please.

06:26:36 From Sébastien Bachollet : OK

06:30:44 From Cheryl Langdon-Orr : perhaps Org Reviews \*AS\* a continuous Improvement programme

06:33:33 From Cheryl Langdon-Orr : The Brightly highlighted text works for me

06:35:46 From Demi Getschko : agreed with Jacques...

06:39:45 From Larisa Gurnick : With the first holistic review to take place within 18 months, there would not be an opportunity for any organizational reviews to be conducted by independent examiners in time for that, is that right?

06:40:11 From vandascartezini : the highlight sentence is ok for me

06:41:33 From Sébastien Bachollet : @Larissa, no org review before Holistic Review

06:42:31 From Larisa Gurnick : Thanks Sebastien. So what would the first holistic review use as the basis - results from the last cycle of org reviews?

06:44:21 From vandascartezini : AC/SC/NC can evolve if they feel it is needed

06:49:07 From vandascartezini : @larissa - we have all reviews as it are till now as basis for the Holistic review

06:49:38 From Daniel K. Nanghaka : @Vanda, you are right

06:50:21 From Larisa Gurnick : Thank you

06:51:32 From Chokri ben romdhane : I think that reviewing the ICANN strategies will be a good start point for the holistics view

06:53:10 From Pat Kane (VRSN) : +1 @Chokri

06:54:09 From vandascartezini : agree

06:54:30 From Tola : Agreed

07:06:06 From Daniel K. Nanghaka : @Seb - Good example of At-Large Reviews

07:07:31 From Leon Sanchez : I need to step away for a moment. Will be back shortly

07:11:31 From vandascartezini : bernard I agree totally.

07:14:03 From Jennifer Bryce : epilogue text is here:  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eKe8vzx48aBFFZRMQwj-1XcjfNTQvgZbA4GKZZEE54A/edit>

07:14:23 From Osvaldo Novoa : I need to leave for a few minutes.

07:17:42 From Cheryl Langdon-Orr : noted Osvaldo

07:19:01 From vandascartezini : take a look from Leon

07:19:09 From vandascartezini : comment

07:20:04 From Leon Sanchez : I'm back

07:22:13 From Osvaldo Novoa : I'm back

07:24:39 From vandascartezini : Wolfgang is right in my opinion raising some concerning

07:29:57 From Leon Sanchez : agree Pat

07:31:22 From Daniel K. Nanghaka : I think the biggest challenge here is on the time constraint that we are having

07:34:02 From Jacques Blanc : Agreed with Daniel. This has been the challenge since the beginning

07:36:33 From vandascartezini : yeah Wolfgang please repeat

07:39:26 From Wolfgang : I am back. As Vanda said, we should no go into the details, but raise the point, that we see new issues with regard to the functioning of the empowered

community as a key accountability mechanism, which should be analysed by a Special Task Force or something like that.

07:46:27 From Tola : @Daniel, what constraints, please?

07:47:22 From Leon Sanchez : Wolfgang, the resolution and its rationale provide details on the process and specifically say that letters from different governments were considered in the same way as input from the broader community was

07:48:27 From Leon Sanchez : So, respectfully, I think we are over stating the role of the governments alleged intervention

07:48:48 From Tola : Ok with me.

07:49:02 From Jennifer Bryce : Got it

07:49:30 From Wolfgang : @ Leon: Governments are part of the broader community. The special problem with the GA is it is "US" and arguments which are flying around is that the Californian Courts will replace the USG.

07:49:40 From vandascartezini : agree PAT

07:50:33 From Tola : That's the general storyline, @Wolf...

07:51:47 From Jaap Akkerhuis : Note that for KC it is likely a no

07:52:05 From Tola : We need to consider CSG submissions

07:53:43 From vandascartezini : Jaap. we can not vote for her

07:56:24 From Jaap Akkerhuis : To Vanda: what Pat said

07:58:05 From vandascartezini : thank you osvaldo.

07:58:34 From vandascartezini : about the next stpes

07:58:42 From vandascartezini : jaap

08:04:29 From Tola : That's point, Osvaldo.

08:05:31 From Tola : Thanks, Leon.

08:05:33 From Daniel K. Nanghaka : @Leon, does this call for a new public comment period

08:05:41 From vandascartezini : i believe the issue was lack of discussion with the community once more to explain better what we achieve

08:06:26 From Daniel K. Nanghaka : Probably we can have Community Forum session during ICANN68

08:08:38 From Wolfgang : I have to leave in 5 minutes for another Telco. Thanks.

08:09:55 From Leon Sanchez : So just to be clear, flagging this is not intended to push for another comment period

08:10:13 From Leon Sanchez : it is just for us to be aware that it could be an issue when Board consideration is done

08:13:00 From Jacques Blanc : @seb : shame, that ! 😞

08:13:31 From Osvaldo Novoa : @Sebastien. I appreciate the changes you've made to the document regarding my objections. My problem is that my constituency needs some more time to study these changes and comment on them.

08:13:39 From Jaap Akkerhuis : We are way past the time!

08:13:57 From Daniel K. Nanghaka : @Sebastien - how could you put a lot of water in the wine? - was the wine too sweet?

08:14:26 From Larisa Gurnick : This may be useful: Bylaws Section 4.6(a)(vii)(B) "The review team must consider the public comments received in response to any posted draft report and shall amend the report as the review team deems appropriate and in the public interest before submitting its final report to the Board. The final report should include an explanation of how public comments were considered as well as a summary of changes made in response to public comments."

08:15:02 From Demi Getschko : have to leave now. Bye all! thanks.

08:15:03 From Osvaldo Novoa : Thank you very much Larisa. I think that is what we are asking for.

08:15:05 From Pat Kane (VRSN) : thank you Larisa

08:18:33 From Daniel K. Nanghaka : Looking at the quote of Section 4.6 posted by Larisa, this may prompt us to create new timelines for review process

08:18:49 From Brenda Brewer : 21:00 UTC

08:20:22 From Herb Waye : cheers everyone

08:20:27 From Tola : Useful Larisa

08:20:31 From Jaap Akkerhuis : Onwards with the next call

08:20:32 From Osvaldo Novoa : Bye thank you

08:20:33 From Jaap Akkerhuis : bye