

---

BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the ATRT3 plenary number 67 on the 20th of May 2020 at 11:00 UTC.

Members attending the call are Cheryl, Pat, Sébastien, Vanda, Jaap, Wolfgang, and Osvaldo. Observers, Jim, Everton, Sophie, and Avri have joined.

We have from ICANN Org Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda, technical writer Bernie. Apologies from Daniel.

Today's meeting is being recorded. Kindly state your name before speaking for the record. Cheryl and Pat, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll get us started, Pat, and we can fight over the rest of it as we go. I'm sure one or two more people will turn up as we get going. We are getting towards the goal here, ladies and gentlemen, so this is all very exciting. Let's first of all see if anyone has any update to their statements of interest. If so, let us know now. As Pat and I have said all along, we work under continuous disclosure, so if there's something you need to let us know about, do so now.

Not seeing anybody, let's then tick that one off and briefly look at the agenda for today. We'll do our usual [inaudible] the draft transmittal letter that Pat and I have put together with Bernie and Jennifer, and thanks to both of them for helping us put that through. It's not a particularly complex or long one, but it is an important cover letter.

---

*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.*

---

We'll have a look at the public comment response examples. This is, as we've discussed previously, the appendix. Bernie's managed to get a couple of examples so you all know what to expect from the opinions as it's going to be completed in the next little while.

Wanted to just go and make sure everyone is aware of the recent blogs we put out which talk about Work Stream 2 and of course therefore has something to do with the accountability and transparency of things like the supporting organizations and advisory committees. So we'll have a brief look at that. Have a quick tour on recap and next steps, and then Any Other Business and action items and decisions reached.

Is there anyone who has any action items that they'd like to let us know about now? if so, let us know, we will call for action items again before the end of today's call.

Okay, in which case, Jennifer, where are we on action items, new and closed?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Hi everyone. Last week, we took an action item—Bernie took an action item to be more exact—to clean up the documents that we discussed on the call. So that was the prologue and then section 7.3 of the text. In response to issues raised by the board, he cleaned those up based on the comments. They were minor edits.

We were then able to send the whole report as well as the appendix documents to the communications team per the usual process to do their proofing, which is just a grammar and spelling proof and no other

---

changes will be made to the documents. And they're going to put those in the template. So that is in process now and we've asked for the documents to be back to us before the 28th of May so that we can post them and everything is in process with respect to that.

Let me know if you have any questions, but that's the only action item I have to report on. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jennifer. We've got Osvaldo. Go ahead, Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Just a question regarding the minority statement or report. The due date for them is next Friday, or do we have until the 28th? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe it was this Friday at 23:59 UTC. Pat, can you confirm?

PAT KANE: Yes, I believe that we said it would be this Friday, so it's May 22nd at 23:59 UTC.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Okay. Thank you. Because Jennifer said that they will receive the document on the 28th. Thank you.

---

PAT KANE:

This coming Friday is for any of the minority statements that are being requested from any of you, noting of course that they will simply be appended without any further to-do. We just have to incorporate those into the report. And of course, if there's any spelling, grammar or other errata, that's nothing to do with us. However you have them is how they get included.

Noting we've got a few more people who've joined since the beginning of the call, so Brenda will have collected those names. Thank you all for joining us today.

All right then, does anyone else want to raise any questions? If not, let's see if we can—Brenda, have we got the draft transmittal letter? This is the letter that Pat and I have planned so far to have as a cover note.

Okay, so as you will undoubtedly remember, we've had a number of times during the development of our work and our discourse and our discussions that we have said, right, we will put that piece of information into a cover note or transmittal letter, and this is what we're looking at now.

We think we've dotted all the i's and crossed the t's, but obviously, we could have missed something so this is why we're having this discussion. And opening it, it's only a very brief note for your perusal. We think that most of the things that we have mentioned through our work have in fact been picked up in what is now the prologue, which you've all agreed to now. So this is not a particularly wordy document. Pat, did you want to read them through this, or how did you want to take us through?

---

PAT KANE: I'm happy to read through it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Over to you then.

PAT KANE: So, "Dear Maarten, on behalf of the third accountability and transparency review team, ATRT3, and pursuant to the ICANN bylaws section 4.6(d), please find attached the ATRT3 final report for submission to the ICANN board of directors. As ATRT3 advised the board on April 3rd 2020, the cancellation of ATRT3's planned face-to-face meeting at ICANN 67 significantly impeded its ability to complete its work by the planned date of April 5th 2020."

"We are appreciative of the board's understanding of this matter of our delay, and therefore pleased to be submitting the attached final report within our revised timeline of the end of May 2020. This report contains five recommendations with regards to ICANN accountability and transparency in the following areas: prioritization of review and cross-community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability Work Stream 2 recommendations, amending specific and organizational reviews, accountability and transparency relating to strategic and operational plans, including accountability indicators, public input, assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations."

"In keeping with the guidance in the operating standards for specific reviews, ATRT3 has provided fact-based analysis, articulated the noted

---

problem areas, developed recommendations that follow the SMART framework, specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timebound, and has prioritized our recommendations.”

“ATRT3 also reached full consensus on four recommendations and consensus on the recommendation pertaining to amending specific and organizational reviews. Given the recommendation in Section 8 of its report, ATRT3 is proposing significant changes to organizational reviews and specific reviews. ATRT3 strongly suggests that the ICANN board implement a moratorium on launching any new organizational and specific reviews until it has made a decision on this recommendation.”

“The following ATRT3 members have offered to act as implementation shepherds for the operating standards and stand ready to answer questions and provide clarifications once the board has resolved on the ATRT3 final report. Sébastien Bachollet, Pat Kane, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, and Vanda Scartezini.”

“We would like to thank the entire ICANN community and the ICANN board for thoughtful engagement and feedback throughout the process. Sincerely, us.” León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Yes. Thanks, Pat. Thanks, Cheryl. So we had our board caucus group meeting. We discussed of course several issues. One of them was this transmittal letter. And while the board agrees with the feeling of calling for a moratorium and suspending all reviews while the ATRT3 recommendations are assessed and approved, etc., there is a concern that having this strong suggestion only within the transmittal letter

---

would put the board in an awkward position. And let me explain you this.

So what this transmittal letter is asking the board to of course suspend any further reviews, and this actually could result in the board violating the bylaws provision. And as you know, the bylaws require the board to conduct reviews.

So one possible way forward, because as I said, the board agrees with the sentiment and is aligned with the suggestion, so a way forward for this to be carried out would be to include this as a recommendation in the final report as opposed to as a suggestion in the transmittal letter. So that is what we discussed, that is the feeling.

We are also waiting for feedback from ICANN Legal as to the possible way forward, any implications that this could have. But as I said, preliminary, what we suggest if the ATRT3 team could assess this, is that you put this as a recommendation to the board rather than a suggestion in the transmittal letter. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, León. Pat, can we put a pin in that just for a minute or two, see what Osvaldo and Sébastien wish to say? And then we can open up a standalone interaction on that. Would that work for you?

PAT KANE: Yes.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay then, Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Thank you. Well, the part on the moratorium, I think it goes against our recommendation since the recommendation was for the—at least in the organizational reviews, to evolve to a continuous improvement program. If you don't have any organizational review, to have implemented the new recommendation would be no evolving. It would mean changing the organizational review into continuous improvement program. So I think it's not congruent. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have no idea what to say to that, Osvaldo. Obviously, I speak an entirely different language than you do. It may be a matter of interpretation. Let's see what others are saying, and we all see if we can make sure, if it is as cloudy as you're indicating, that it is not so unclear. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Osvaldo, sorry, but you need to read the document. And I spent time to put a design to allow people to see what is taking care and when it will be taking care. Therefore, I think it's really important that we say together that the first next review must be a holistic one. Therefore, if we don't stop all the other, we will have a mess very soon. Therefore, I think it's well explained in the document and I see no impediment from my point of view to add the sentence. I will would withdraw from the letter, I would add this sentence or

---

something equivalent in our recommendation about reviews. I feel it's a good way to go.

My two comments is, first one is in the letter, we go from ATRT3 to "we," and I think we need to find a way to be either the third person—I don't know how you say it in English, but "it" or "we," but don't mix things in the document. That's the first thing.

The second is I would like humbly to suggest that you end by "co-chairs on behalf of ATRT3 review team."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I want to be part—not with my name here, but I want to be part of this letter and I suggest that you do that on behalf of all of us. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Very simple, friendly amendments. I'm sure we can do both of those. I'm sure Bernie's already changing the first person and articles, which is I believe what you've asked for in particular. Thanks very much for that. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you. I understand León's concern in part, because my understanding from what he has said is that the board has not a

---

problem with the substance, it has a problem with the wording and the language we have used. So I agree what Sébastien has said, that our message is very clear, that before ICANN continues with all types of reviews, the next review should be a holistic review.

So probably, the key point here is the word “moratorium,” because as León has outlined, this could bring the board in a position to say, okay, we have bylaws provisions and now we have a moratorium, and how this fits together.

That means if we could change it in a more positive way and would say a priority for the next cycle of review should be the holistic review or the first should be a holistic review or something like that, probably, this would be easier than to avoid a situation where the board—I don’t see it so, but if the board sees it so, to choose between following the recommendation of ATRT3 or breaching the bylaws.

So as long as León can reconfirm that it’s not a conflict in substance, it’s a conflict in just the language which is used in the letter, then I could live with the different formulation, but I would not compromise on the substance and our message, which is very clear also in the main text. Thank you. Back to ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Wolfgang. We’re trying to not be ambiguous, so that’s excellent advice. We’ll come back to what it means in terms of León’s intervention again in a moment. We’ve got Vanda, and then Tola. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I do agree with what Sébastien said, because as [inaudible] wrote in this chat, León has a clear statement, and I see no problem in adding the sentence into the report, because it's clear that our proposal is, but they can have some time and during some time that we cannot preview, maybe another in this current system of reviews can come out and we hope that they will not start this one.

So add the sentence inside the report, it's a good idea. Thank you, and let's see what León is saying. I understand also what Wolfgang has said, and for me, I was for talking about this moratorium issue because exactly when you translate that will be conflicted with the bylaws they have to follow now. That's it. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. We've got Tola, and then I'm assuming Wolfgang and Vanda's hands will be going down and we'll be coming back to the point León raised.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you, Cheryl. Luckily, León has just typed what clarification I wanted to seek in the chat. My challenge initially was trying to balance the statement that the board agrees with the substance but does not agree or does not see how our recommendation is binding on the board.

But he has clarified a bit, and [I'm glad] for us to move to the next step, which we had suggested that we could put a recommendation in the

---

---

report itself that will [now] make it mandatory to the board to implement what we have recommended. That is the clarification I'd wanted, and I'm glad that León had just typed that. Thank you. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. All right then, so Pat, did you want to make a response and a reaction? I've got a couple of things I'm likely to say, but I suspect you're probably likely to say them anyway.

PAT KANE: Thanks, Cheryl. I think that some of the recommendations that have come across from the rest of the group are helpful in that we might be able to modify or add a bullet to the overall recommendation that closes with "And oh, by the way, if you accept this, don't do anything until you made a decision on this one."

I get what León is saying, and frankly, if it's in either place, it's still going to carry the same weight and probably the same concern, because it's not been accepted yet as a recommendation. So how do you address not doing something if you've not accepted it yet? And that's part of the recommendation.

So I think there's benefit in either place, and there's drawbacks in either place. And I for one would prefer that we be upfront in the transmittal letter because it puts it right out there and says, "And before you even get to the recommendation, you should not do this until you review and accept—or reject—the recommendation."

---

So I get the concern and I get what León is saying, but if you don't start with it, you don't get to it until you actually dig into the document, and you may already be down the road of doing an organizational review. So my two cents.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Thanks, Pat. I'll come to Bernie in a minute just to see how cumbersome or otherwise putting a cross-reference into our now closed document will be or not, but I can't help myself.

First of all, I sincerely hope that the board does more than just read the transmittal letter. The question Pat and I also discussed was, should we go into greater detail on the recommendations in the letter? And we decided, no, just say that there are four recommendations with full consensus and one with consensus. And ladies and gentlemen, you're going to have to actually turn the page and read more than just over one A4 sheet to get your job done.

I guess the other response from me—this is me being perhaps a little more forceful than you're used to me being, [inaudible] some of you have worked with me before—if the board actually decides to accept or otherwise our recommendation—or not—and does it in a timely manner, this should not be a problem. This should not be a catch 22, because in 2021, unless memory truly fails me, there is only the GNSO one to start in terms of organizational review.

If one accepted the recommendation and started a holistic review, then a moratorium—which I believe by definition means a temporary and timebound suspension, not an ignorance of or banning of or never

---

getting around to, I would have thought this shouldn't be a catch 22. But that's obviously just how I'm looking at it. So León, help us with now moving forward. There's a concern raised. We can certainly, I believe, duplicate little more than the words we have in the transmittal letter in some way, shape or form, into the recommendation section. If indeed that is not an insurmountably complicated task at this stage. Bernie, what's the reaction from you and Jennifer on that?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Noooooooo. No, sorry. But seriously, folks, we will use the—if we're okay with that, then I will use a truly minimalist approach to insert that into our final report. I don't know where yet, but I will work to make sure that it's there but that it is as small a change as possible. and then I will fix up the transmittal letter to refer to that point in the report. That's what I'm getting, after putting it all in the third person, of course, and changing the "from" line. That is what I can propose.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. So thank you very much. Pleased to see that it's not an impossibility. This is taking a belts and braces approach, and as many of you know, I certainly have no problem with both belts and braces, and that's fine. León, now back to you. Oh, no, Vanda. We'll get to you in a moment, León.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Just a [few] suggestion, that we could in this letter just ask for pay attention on the section where the reviews recommendations is. It's

---

just something that we are worrying that if they don't pay attention beforehand on that, maybe this will take longer and maybe the review for next year starts and so on. So just a sentence asking for pay attention, specific attention on section 8. We appreciate, or something like that. But I do believe that just put not highlight the points that we are concerned. It's not a good idea.

So just a sentence for that in this not asking for stop or nothing like that. I understand the problem, but just to alert that please take a look and specific look and attention from that session, that recommendation, to avoid problems in start another review, but not mention that.

And put the sentence in the recommendation. I do believe that we need to have some alert in this letter.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Thank you, Vanda. I think Bernie was specific when he said he would put a cross reference to the section in a recommendation where this specific subpoint is building, acting as depth and color to the recommendation that we've made.

So I think we will definitely have that cross referencing. Bernie's got a green tick, so that's fine. Okay, León, is this giving you—and indeed, if everyone wants to jump in as well—any pause or any continued concern if we do as we have now agreed?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think the path suggested makes sense. I think that doing this cross referencing in the main document and also of course

---

mentioning it on the transmittal letter could ease the concern in the board and would actually help us move forward with this. Because as I said, the board actually agrees with substance, it's only the form that raises this concern.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, León. Pleased to hear that. Avri, you'd be waving at me furiously if you wanted to say anything, so feel free to put anything in chat or jump in if you wish. But I do want to bring everyone's attention to a very important point that Wolfgang has made in chat, and that's—to be very clear, let's have this on the record—we are indeed, as the accountability and transparency review team, independent. We're not trying to negotiate text with the board.

However, we are certainly not trying to be antagonistic or cause problems for it either. But I cannot resist but say again: if the board looks at, reviews, reacts and responds to our—dare I say not extensive—numbers of recommendations, there would not be a catch 22 because they of course could indeed have decided what they will do about our recommendations before 2021 even clicks over in the calendar.

So [inaudible] board, there won't be an issue either. All right, my Internet connection is unstable, so I'm going to ask if Pat would like to take us back now to the agenda, because I suspect my audio will drop very shortly. So Pat, let's go back to the agenda, and see what—

---

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. And just in time, apparently. All right. So we're going to go through the public comment response examples. Bernie, do you have that document, or does Brenda have that document that we can pull up?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Brenda should have that at the ready. There we go.

PAT KANE: Right, so Bernie, if you will walk us through this, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. There's not a lot. I tried to pick out a couple of examples. I just started working on this yesterday, so that's why you're not getting a full document. I tried to select some options. Now, forgive me, we're going to have to scroll because of the way it's structured. So Brenda, I will ask your forgiveness right now for having to mouse around this document.

The first one is from the board, in connection with section 13, the board observes that ATRT3 intent and direction is not yet clear in the draft report. So this was the point you'll remember way back in December when we were talking about—we were sort of waffling, I guess is the official term, about how our suggestions should be considered.

So the response, this was clarified with the following change in the review team suggestions and recommendations section of the report quoted in the change portion of the response, and then we have the quote, "Although ATRT3 makes both recommendations and

---

suggestions, it only requires the implementation of its five recommendations. Suggestions are meant to be exactly that: suggestions, and it is left to those concerned by these individual suggestions which can be found in annexes A and B of the report to decide if they should or not be implemented.” And in the “where” section, the last column, it’s in the introductory text where we clear that.

All right, let’s swing back to the left, see what our next one is. Another board one, 10.5, you’ll remember in our draft report we presented option one and two for the reviews. The board commented it did not consider option one as being viable, and then let’s go to the last three columns, please, Brenda.

So under response is option one was not retained, under change, option one was removed from section 8 of the ATRT3 report, and where, it’s section 8 of the ATRT3 final report. Let’s swing back left. We’ll do one more. I think you’re getting the idea here.

Again, developing a prioritization process, ATRT3 has kept the core of the recommendation and refined it in its final report. Some refinements in section 10 of the ATRT report, and then the change is section 10 of the ATRT3 report.

Let’s take one on the ATRT2. The RySG one, 12.4.3, implementation of ATRT2 recommendations will have to be reviewed by ICANN Org and the ATRT3 implementation shepherds and then go through prioritization. Changes, none. Global recommendation on incomplete

---

ATRT2 recommendations, and then it says—if we go right just a bit more, section 7 and Annex A of the ATRT3 final report.

I think that sort of gives a flavor where we're going with this. Don't want to spend the day going through this series. I'd be glad to take questions if there are any. And the intent is that I will try and finish this for the end of the week so we can have it as an annex to our report. Thank you. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie, for that. Any questions from the team? Cheryl, your hand is raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. With the usual signals telling me my Internet connection is unstable, so let me know if you can't hear me. I just want to double check, Osvaldo in particular, you at previous meetings were concerned that your community would like to know—and I believe that you're not alone in that—that we are telling our people that had responded to public comment exactly how their public comments had been dealt with.

this is the proforma design that we referred to, it is how the plan has always been to have this in great detail, as you can see, appended. So [I'll just go to] Pat to double check that Osvaldo and any others who were concerned about this aspect of our work, if they were clear on this. And it's, believe me, quite an extensive appendix once this is all done. Thanks Pat, back to you.

---

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. Thank you. Yes, I find it quite complete. I would have liked to have this before doing the minority statement, but okay, we'll have it at the same time. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Osvaldo. So Bernie will try to have this [inaudible] complete on Friday. Any other questions? I see nothing in chat. Vanda says "Yeah, long, but make it clear for the community." Yeah, very helpful, Vanda.

All right, so if we can bring up the agenda, please, Brenda, since there's no more questions.

All right, so the next one on the agenda is "note the Work Stream 2 blog." Cheryl, do you want to run with this one? Because I know you had talked about this last night.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. I can have a go. Jennifer's put in the link, but if we can just show that. Many of you, of course, will have already read this, I'm sure, but Pat and I, having only just got to it yesterday—or my yesterday, your last night, I believe, Pat—just wanted to make sure that the whole of the ATRT team was aware of this. We're not reacting to it as such, but we did want to make sure you'd all noted that because of our interest in

---

Work Stream 2 and in particular of course the fact that the recommendations of Work Stream 2 as referred to in this blog from Theresa in fact also spoke specifically to the accountability between the ACs and the SOs.

If you just scroll down a little bit below the [redaction register,] this particular paragraph where it says it is important to note that a significant part of the remaining recommendations apply to the community, such as those related to supporting organization and advisory committee accountability. And of course, this as a part of this blog, this particular sentence has particular crossover or nexus with our recommendations on reviews in as much as the evolving towards a continuous improvement program for each of the SOs and ACs. And of course, the Nominating Committee is a lynchpin to exactly that.

So I think it's timely for us to at least have noted for our purposes and our record that this blog has been published. We're not going back and opening up anything, but I think the two things strengthen each other.

So with that, [inaudible] on this? I see some of you have already briefly breezed through it. All right. That's all. None of you should be surprised if someone says, "Were you aware of ...?" The answer is yes indeed, we were. And I think our thanks go to the team acting as the nurturers of the Work Stream 2 implementation process and several people on this review team of course are still involved on that activity as well.

So going back to the chat, if we can return back to the agenda now. thank you, Brenda. And Osvaldo was talking about the document that we've just looked at, the public comment analysis document which is an

appendix. I think everyone's clear that that's what you were referring to when you said you'd like to have had access to that. I guess timing is what it is. You haven't put in a minority report as yet, so if going through it changes anything, then so be it.

I just want to remind everybody too while we're talking about as we're going on to this next item six, the status recap and next steps, minority reports, if you're planning on putting one in, are your minority report. This is a minority report from a review team member. It is your personal reaction. And of course, if your personal reaction has changed from what is on the record, for example if you were in Brussels and completely agreed with one of our consensus views on a particular recommendation, you have every right to change your mind, but you would be of course changing your mind by putting in a minority report. Any such reaction from your community is not a minority report from a review team member.

So do make sure, if you're putting something in, you're putting it in an appropriate document. otherwise, I'm not quite sure what purpose it would be. This is not a public comment document that we're putting to the ICANN board. This is our final report. What the ICANN board does with it after that is actually up to them, we're just lobbing it over the net for them and any of your individual—in your own capacity as you act in your own right as members of this review team—issues that you want to have in any form of statement or minority report appended as is, as you've seen them, by this Friday, 22nd, at 23:59 UTC, will not be discussed. It will simply be appended as such.

---

---

Now, Pat, you want to take any other next steps with you and Bernie? Because I'm getting those "your Internet is unstable" messages again, but I see we've got Tola and Sébastien. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Tola, please.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you, Pat and Cheryl. I appreciate the reminder Cheryl just put forward. For me, that's the essence of group work, to bring the best out of what we're supposed to achieve at the end of your assignment.

I particularly appreciate the fact that when this issue of minority reports started coming up, a few improvements have taken place in our group work.

What I imply is that, yes, if we don't have any dissenting voice or varying opinion, we're probably not getting the best out of what we're doing.

So yes, whereas opinions can change by members, I recognize particularly that if we revert to [variant] constituencies, there may be some items that one have not been privileged to understand that some other members of their community may understand better and put us through. And that's the essence of multi-stakeholder approach anyway. One is not supposed to assume that every member of every team will know everything. And we're able to be guided, to be supported, be assisted by other members of the community.

---

And at the end of the day, individual members of the community, if convinced by the submission of the community, will be willing to put forward a minority report. But I'm glad that we're able to take a look at a few issues when this minority reports [have come up and we've been able to provide] the response to concerns, we've been able to tweak a little bit some of the wording, we've been able generally to improve our document.

And so, yes, I appreciate the reminder that members should understand that the minority report shouldn't [have the tag] community minority report. And I remember Osvaldo did make it clear that he's putting it in, but they have not mentioned that the community submit. Osvaldo is going to submit that, and I think it's within the right of every one of us.

I want to thank everybody for a good job done. We were able to make concessions where we have strong point of some key issues. At the end of the day, it is to the betterment of the Internet users, the individual and collective participation of ICANN, and I want to thank everybody for the job well done.

In particular, I want to appreciate Bernie for being the one we [inaudible] We pushed Bernie [up and down to get out the] good work, and I appreciate what every one of us have done. Thank you. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Tola. Sébastien. All right, maybe we can come back when we can hear you. Thank you, Sébastien, I see you're typing in. Brenda is

---

going to call you. All right, any other questions here? All right, let's move to item number six, the status and what our next steps are.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I guess that would be me and Jennifer. As noted on our last call, our report and the board and bylaws response has been sent to Comms for editorial cleanup as Jennifer has said. It's just really a final check for spelling and style, and we hope to get that back next week.

I will be doing the insertion about the moratorium on reviews in the report later today. We'll be sending that in so that's included. Once we get it back from Comms, we will have a final look, make sure they didn't change anything in meaning or spirit, and then we will put it out for a final review by the whole group as a full report. This should be, I believe, only for major omissions or errors. So we're not doing any style, we're not changing anything in the report. It's major omissions and errors.

And then if there's nothing to correct, then the co-chairs can send the report on to the board, I believe, is the process. But I will leave it to Pat to say if I've gotten that right.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Bernie. I believe that is correct. Sébastien, are you with us yet?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess, yes. Yeah, I just wanted to say a few words on the previous item, and first to support what Cheryl explained. I think it's a very important point.

And I want to stress that it's a team. We are a team selected by the chair of SO and AC, and a team was supposed to work all together to find the best consensus possible. And I guess a lot of us have tried to do that, and therefore, even if we agree on the final document altogether, it doesn't mean that individually, we agree with every single [item] in the document.

But we think that it's the best way to go altogether. Therefore, I would like very much that my colleagues who want to issue a minority report think about that, because it gives the impression that you are the only one disagreeing with something. No, you are not. But you will be the only one to put that in public and to differentiate from what we were thinking to be the best way to go for the future of ICANN. And I feel that if we all go to our constituency, yes, some of us or some part of our constituency will also disagree more or less with some parts, but what we were meant to do together is to find the right balance to go forward with ICANN. Thank you very much.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. Just to answer Sébastien, I think we did work as a group. I missed a lot of the meetings so I'm at a disadvantage here, but also, I've been

---

designated here by my constituency, and as such, I report to it and I have to present their view also. And even though I will present my statement as a personal statement, it will also reflect what my constituency thinks on the work I did or the work done by the group. So that's it only. Thank you. Bye.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Osvaldo. All right, so we're going to have a meeting this Friday as well to kind of go through some final items, to take a look at the final appendix that Bernie is producing as well. And then we should be in a good shape to produce and deliver the report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And disband as a review team. The shepherds will be accessible, obviously, still, but one last call. That sounds like a plan. Getting very excited about a last call, I must say, although it'll be an even number. You know I hate even numbers, people. Oh well. We all have to make sacrifices. Brenda is noting that the Friday meeting call which will be our very last one unless something really odd and peculiar goes on will be indeed one very exciting [inaudible] Tola, at 21:00 UTC on Friday the 28th. Hopefully not too much of a last dance, Wolfgang, but we shall see.

All right, so with that, Pat, I think we've probably done our agenda. It's an abbreviated meeting tonight, but that's okay, and I wouldn't think that next Friday's meeting is going to be particularly long, but do still have the standard 90 minutes slotted off in your calendar just in case

---

you all want to bid fond farewell and say thank you to each other. Bernie, you've got your hand up.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. Trying to be clear on which Friday. Are we talking about Friday this week, which would make it the 22nd, or Friday next week which would make it the 29th?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe we're referring to the 29th.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, just wanted to be clear. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We will cross paths again, I'm sure. Someone will have to sing "We'll meet again" perhaps. Tola, you might want to do that. Well, before we get waxing lyrical too much on today's call, save all your emotions for next week, people, all your fond farewells and hail fellow, well mets.

With that, Jennifer, I'm just going to quickly call for Any Other Business, but I assume you have not too many things for action items. Is there anyone with any Any Other Business for today's call, then? Not seeing anything, Jennifer, and then Pat, you can wrap this one up and we'll arm wrestle who does it next week.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you, Cheryl. I just wondered if you wanted to have a leadership call this coming week. I see you say “I think not.” Thank you.

Okay, very quickly then I'll just wrap up the action items. The review team made a decision to add a sentence to the review's recommendation regarding the moratorium on reviews as detailed in the transmittal letter currently. So Bernie's going to make that adjustment in the final report. And then Bernie's also going to update the transmittal letter with a couple of the other items that were noted, particularly by Sébastien.

Bernie's going to complete the public comment analysis by Friday, and then just to reiterate, our next call is going to be next week on the 29th at 21:00 UTC for 90 minutes. So let me know if I missed anything, but other than that, back over to the co-chairs. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Jennifer. And unless we have anybody else that wants to jump in to chat or raise your hand in the participant window, plenary number 67 is complete, with one to go. Thank you all very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

This is all very exciting, people. Thank you very much. We'll talk next week, and of course, watch the list. There will be things going on as well. Bye for now.

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Stay safe.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]