
BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. Good day. Welcome to the ATRT 3 Plenary Call number 68 on the 29th of May, 2020 at 21:00 UTC. The members attending the call today are Tola, Demi, Lou, Cheryl, Vanda, Sebastien, Pat, Jaap. Observer Herb Waye is on the call. We have from ICANN Org Jennifer, Negar, Larisa, and Brenda, and Bernie Turcotte, our technical writer. Today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And Cheryl and Pat, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did you want it, Pat? Or did you want me to take it? I'm happy either way.

PAT KANE: Why don't you go ahead, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right. I'll toss it to you later on, then.

PAT KANE: I'm sure you will.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everybody. I think it is with great delight and pleasure that we enter into our ultimate pre-

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.

lodgement of a report meeting. So, looking forward to going through today's agenda.

Today's agenda is a fairly simple one. We'll do our usual administrivia, which I will get to in a moment. Then, we will go into any issue in terms of errors and omissions on our final report that any of you have noted. So, this is a final toilette, for the want of a better word. We will make sure that everybody who believes they have sent in a minority statement can see that that is the case. As we had brought to our attention very importantly in our Brussels meeting, it is possible for emails to go astray. And we do not want that to be the case in any of the minority statements that might've been sent to us. So, we just to confirm that anyone who believes they've had one sent, that it has been received, and then just confirm that we're ready to send the report to the Board.

And any other business. With the any other business, I would suggest if you've got a piece of any other business, you pop it into chat now so we can note it. And we will get, of course, another call for any other business a few minutes before the end of our time today.

So, with that fairly simple agenda—that will do as a welcome as well—is there anybody who has an update to their statement of interest? If so, let us know now for the final time. Okay. Not seeing anything. So, there we are. It is good to know that we have worked under continuous disclosure on our statements of interest and we have, of course, trusted that any particular changes have in fact been reflected on the statement of interest that each and every one of our review team members have

launched at the beginning of our process. Thank you, one and all, for your commitment to that piece of accountability.

Jennifer, do we have some action items to review?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, Cheryl. Hello, everyone. Thank you. I have three action items from the last calls I just wanted to go over very quickly that we can mark as closed. So, Bernie was going to complete the public comments response spreadsheet, which obviously was circulated to the list and there was some discussions from that. Bernie updated the transmittal letter text based on the feedback from the review team on the call that we had last week.

And then there was a final action item that Bernie was going to update the final report to include text in the recommendation similar to the moratorium text that was in the transmittal letter. And I believe that there was some information that Leon passed on to the co-chairs that having that text in the transmittal letter only would be okay [inaudible]. So, I believe it has not gone into the report as well. So, that's the update on that action item.

So, we'll mark all of those as closed and that's it. Back to you. Thanks, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, thank you very much for that, Jennifer. I'm sure you'll miss doing that with these regular meetings. We'll certainly miss hearing your beautiful voice telling us what we've achieved and what we still need to

achieve at each call. I must say, Pat and I have discussed it and it's been an absolute pleasure to work with all of the staff involved with the ART3. So, certainly happy to put that on the record that it has been a delight. And of the pleasure we've had, Jennifer, you are a particular delight. So, thank you very much [for that].

Okay, let us now ask for ... And I think what I might do, Pat, is let you take item 3 and 4, and we'll wrestle over number 5 and see what happens with 6. But, let's see what the review team members have or have not noticed we did or did not miss in our report. Pat, you've got the helm.

PAT KANE:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. So, we did send out the unformatted or the not final formatted version of the document a week ago and the formatted document came out later in the week. So, just put it to the team to see if there were any errors or omissions from your final reading of the report, that are not already addressed in any of the minority statements, that we would need to go back and review or take a look back at. So, please raise your hand in the participant window if you've got something that you would like to take a look at or that you've discovered so we can look at it. Or in the comment, in the group chat. Osvaldo, your hand is raised.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Hello. Sorry. Just a question because I don't know what is the custom. In the recommendation, where it says "unanimous support, or consensus,

or full consensus,” it doesn’t appear anywhere how many votes were given to that decision. Is that going to appear somewhere or not?

PAT KANE:

So, I know that was asked and I know that when we went through that, I don’t recall ... I did not write down names and numbers but I do know that when we went through that—and this was mentioned on the call itself that we took the consensus—that there was only one vote of “no consensus” and that was on Recommendation 1. And, Osvaldo, that was you specifically. So, of the people that were in attendance on the consensus discussion, we had four of five that were full consensus of those that were in attendance, and we only had one, which was Recommendation number 1, that did not have full consensus, and that, again, was your vote on that particular [inaudible].

So, while I don’t have a record of the exact numbers, and I couldn’t find anything in my notes, I do recall and I do know that on the call when we talked through it on the recording that is the case.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

May I continue?

PAT KANE:

Yes, please.

OSVALDO NOVOA: No, just to know because since the situation with Michael. And so, I think would be fair to know how many yes we have and how many abstentions. I don't remember how we did it. I think it was if nobody said no, it was full consensus of the people in the call, right?

PAT KANE: No. So, the way that we did it was we had hands raised in the participant window or green checks for yes. And so, I guess it was green checks for yes and red exes for no is how we did that and we did a count. And I'd have to go back and listen again to see if I counted out loud to get a final number. But that was how we took the vote.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yeah, my question is because I think [inaudible] full consensus recommendation had 10 votes and I think that's fairly fair to be written down since we are 16 in the group. That's really my only point. Thank you.

PAT KANE: So, Jennifer, I will get to you in one second. But Osvaldo, I think when we say that we are 16 in the review team, we didn't have 16 people present. And we had some that we didn't believe, or weren't aware that had stopped participating or were just taking time off ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That were on leave. They literally had said that they were leaving for personal reasons.

PAT KANE: Right. And so, I understand what you're driving towards but I think that's probably a process to benefit someone who wants to say we did not achieve consensus. I'm opposed to having the numbers and maybe Jennifer does have the numbers. So, Jennifer, I'm going to call on you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. Yeah, Pat. That's all I wanted to say is that we do have the numbers and they're recorded in the call summary report so they're certainly available. I did not take the names specifically. But the numbers are there if you do want to include them somewhere other than the report. Thanks.

PAT KANE: All right, thank you very much for that, Jennifer. Osvaldo?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's include the numbers and we can add that to the transmittal letter. It seems to me that's the simplest way of doing it. That's the cover note and it's where we mention the consensus in the first place anyway. So, let's just include the numbers. That seems like a simple edit. Is there any objections to that?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Excuse me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're objecting?

OSVALDO NOVOA: No. I was going to continue my argument. I wasn't asking for everyone to show the names of who voted what or even to put to the numbers if you don't want to. You can just say that the consensus was full consensus of the people that were in the call. It's just a clarification, I didn't want to—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Osvaldo, we have the numbers. We'll add the numbers. It's not a problem. KC?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. Yeah. This is the first time I'm hearing that I was not the one that was dissenting. I thought when Pat had said previously that there was one dissenter, that was me because I had said on the previous call, when there was a pre-vote and people said, "What are you inclined to vote now?" I had raised my hand about dissenting and Pat had counted it. So, I had thought that I was being counted as a dissenter for that vote. Now, I wasn't on the next call because it was in the middle of the night and I said I wouldn't be on it. But I did not think that would mean that my vote would've been changed.

So, I guess this needed to be handled in email where time zone doesn't matter because I didn't know because I had established what my view was the time before when I wasn't on the subsequent call, that view would've been erased from the record.

PAT KANE: So, KC, to address that specifically, I do know that when we had the vote that in the recording, I did mention specifically at that point in time that had you have been there you would've been a dissenter.

KC CLAFFY: Doesn't that mean there's two then?

PAT KANE: So, while we didn't necessarily count it ... The way that it was recorded, you were not the one because Osvaldo was the one. That was the way it was recorded through the use of the participant window. But it is on the record that had you been there, you would've dissented.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. That's weird. But you're going to not count it as a dissent? You're not going to send it in as two votes against, even though you know there were two votes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Doing so, that's easy. Again, now we're adding the numbers, that's not a problem. At the moment, we say consensus or not. Now we're adding the numbers, it's not a problem.

PAT KANE: That's fine.

KC CLAFFY: I'm sorry. What numbers are we adding? I don't even know.

PAT KANE: We're adding your dissent.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, your number now is making it two, not one.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's what you wanted. That's what I'm hearing. All right. Take a win when you get it, people. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl. So, I guess, clarity of consensus is important of course. And to that end, I would like to suggest that the co-chairs guide the Board, when delivering the final report, by maybe adding some documentation, as you have already provided and as you have highlighted, on the decision-making process. For me, it's clear. I've been through pretty much all the process—maybe not from the very

beginning, but I've followed the process closely, of course. And I think that it is clear to me that the recommendations are actually consensus-based.

Now, stating these in a clear way would help, of course, the Board understand that however we might have some minority statements, each of the recommendations does actually carry consensus approval from this review team. And that's the way I see it. So, I just wanted to flag it because I think it will be useful for those who have not followed this as close as we have to understand that, yes, there might be some minority statements—strong minority statements I would say. But nevertheless, the report encompasses recommendations or contains recommendations that actually have consensus from this group. Thank you, Cheryl.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Leon. KC, is that a new hand or is that an old hand?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. Old hand. I'll go get it.

PAT KANE: Thank you, KC. So, yes, thank you Leon. So, I think when we're describing full consensus and general consensus, I think that's what you're referring to and we will certainly, in our conversations, have that taken care of in terms of when we have that conversation.

All right. So, back to any actual omissions or errors in the final report as [what's been recorded]? All right. Seeing none additional ... Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, thank you. I was hoping—please, the one typing, can you switch off your mic? I guess it's KC but thank you. I was hoping that I will not be the one to say things were wrong in the document. And I am really sorry but I feel bad here. And I feel bad because I don't know why I need to be the one. Okay, let's go to, if you'll allow me, page 5. So, changes made by the reviewer from ICANN staff went wrong.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just hold for a sec. Brenda, can you put us onto the document and pull up page 5 so we can see what Sebastien is referring to?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I was looking to my own screen. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem, Sebastien. We just need to follow with you, that's not a problem at all. And page 5, I think he said. And yes, I'm having a sound problem that is [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Page 5 up to here ... You have here in the middle of the page as a sub-paragraph before the bullet points, "ART3 choose blah, blah, blah ...

ATRT3 hopes that this can be considered in a future holistic ATRT review or other relevant process.” No. It’s in a future Holistic with a capital “H” review or ATRT Review or other relevant process. And I don’t care if you don’t add the “or” or whatever, if you just want one review as a word. It’s not a holistic ATRT Review. This is very important that we are talking about an Holistic Review or ATRT Review. That’s here and we have the same problem, of course, as it’s a copy, at the end of this prologue.

PAT KANE:

Yeah, Sebastien. So, thank you very much for that, you’re absolutely right. When we talked about Holistic, we were going to go back through and capitalize, so we will [inaudible] one. Thank you very much for pointing that out, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay. And I have to admit that I didn’t read all of the documents. But if we can scroll down to page 7. Here, stay here. It’s just to say that in the last sentence before the two points, “It is also ... reviews also.” I don’t think we need two times “also.” But that’s just ... I was thinking that staff when rereading all that will have solved that type of issue.

And if we can scroll down in page 10 at the beginning. Yeah. Here, when you read the sentence, we start with “where appropriate” and at the end we say, “shall always be accepted.” My understanding it’s that we may split the sentence in two. Will be easier because we say, “when appropriate” and at the end it’s “always.” Then it’s okay for two ideas different but in the same sentence it’s strange.

And just after that we have “with regard to other type of public input, ICANN shall,” I don’t know who is ICANN. It’s ICANN Org, ICANN Board, ICANN Com, ICANN whatever, but it’s not ICANN. And I guess when you look at the beginning of this recommendation, section 3, it’s ICANN Org, therefore I think it’s better if we write Org.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, it’s easy enough we can fix that ICANN dot Org, but this is, of course, a summary that you’re looking at.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I know, but you know I am struggling with the word “ICANN.” ICANN is nobody or it’s everybody.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We all have our little issues and we all have our ideas. I understand that. Easy to fix. We can do that fixing. Just while I’ve got the microphone, staff tell me that we had gone through and capitalized Holistic to capital “H” and in the style check, ICANN—ICANN Org—changed it back? So, we will look at that and fix it up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I know. I went back to the previous document we sent to the readers. And yes. It was changed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right. The readers had a rush of blood to their heads so we'll fix that. That's okay. Thank you. Go on.

PAT KANE: Anything else, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Sorry. If we go to section 8—that means page 10. The beginning of the recommendation. It's more question than suggestion, but ... Maybe further down Brenda, please. Here. We have in the second colon "ICANN Org" in bold, but some of the work, it's also directed to SO, and AC, and NC. It's a question. Is it not fair to add them as the one receiving this recommendation?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we answer that question, then? Pat, I'm okay with it. Does anyone else have a problem? I think that's, again, an easy fix.

PAT KANE: Yeah, I have no objection.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Continue on. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Section 10 at the second part of page 12. I am not the only one who sees that. But I guess we need to take out, in this context, that because

we don't know what is the context here. Then, "ART3 recommends" could be a better start for this part of the document. And yes. I know it's a summary but the cut and paste feels a bit strange for me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, just deleting those five words? Okay. Yeah. Bernie's telling me he's already fixed that as he's going. Okay. Continue on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Next page at the end. It's my limitation in English, but "shall too consider." Is it the right spelling? Or is it the right way to write it? I have trouble here. But I don't know what to write.

KC CLAFFY: Well, it wouldn't be something—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want to comment there? Okay, go on.

KC CLAFFY: I think I circled a bunch of these, also. But I kind of considered these editing stuff. I figured there'd be an editing pass. And I lot of my stuff I figured Bernie could look at and decide whether he agrees with or not and dismiss it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. We realize these are not errors and omissions but no one else came forward with errors and omissions. So, if you have a better ... We will give it another go over. Can I hear from that then, KC, you want Sebastien to stop his minor edit input and only have any major omissions brought to the floor at this time? Is that what you're asking?

KC CLAFFY: No, not necessarily. It's hard to know what he's going to get at. Some of them may not be minor, but on the "shall too," in particular, I figured Bernie would ... I mean, technically no. It should be "shall consider." But I had circled a bunch of "shalls" going, "Are we really allowed to say 'shall?'" Is that really appropriate? Because it's kind of a mandating word in English. But again, I figure that either Bernie or ICANN has decided that's appropriate diction so it's fine with me if that's expected.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. That's certainly the way I was looking at it. Pat, did you want to just ask Sebastien to first of all bring forward any major things and then get back to it later?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will do that immediately. They are minor things. But the one I think is more important it's when you look at page 16. You have "per the ICANN Bylaws section 4.6." And if I am not mistaken, the way it is numbered, it's not the same in the Bylaws. It should take 4b. You go to 2 and I don't know why there is no 3. It's in a romantic way of writing it. E is missing, or it's wrong. Then, I suggest that we cut and paste exactly the same

thing as in the Bylaw because if not ... Maybe I'm the only one who will take care of these things. But I feel better when it's the right numbering.

PAT KANE: No, Sebastien. I agree with you on that because it really ought to have the header of section b as well.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And there is one missing, I guess. But please check and if I am wrong, I am sorry to bring that to you. But if I am right, just fix it please. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Yep. Got it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And I have some few other minor things and my last one, because I didn't read it all, it's when we say, "a bylaw change." I would have said "bylaw change" because it may be more than just one in each of the topics. And if you want to go, it's the beginning of page 19. And I stop here. Thank you, sorry.

PAT KANE: No, please don't apologize, Sebastien. Thank you very much. It's much appreciated. All right. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Pat. It's good that Sebastien introduced the topic on the reviews, of course, because I wanted to make this group aware that it continues to be a concern and there are still some doubts in terms of the holistic review, how this replaces the individual, independent review of structures. There is a concern about whether we will lose the focused review that meets the conditions in the bylaws. That we might lose the individual bottom-up dynamic of having the group that is being reviewed respond either positively or negatively to this external review.

So, there are still some doubts and concerns about the holistic review and how this could, of course, replace the reviews that are being carried out per the current bylaws. Of course, there is understanding about the contradiction that exists in selecting independent reviewers that are both knowledgeable of ICANN and have no bias toward the constituency or group being reviewed. I mean, there are still, as I said, some concerns about how this is all going to work and play together. So, I just want you to be aware of this because when it goes to the Board, of course, the Board will ask some questions as it has already done and it will be good to follow the direction and see how this evolves. Thanks, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Yeah, so Leon, thank you very much for that and I look forward to hearing the specific comments from the Board in response to the recommendations. And because we're here at the end and I much look forward to, again, the feedback that we're going to receive and what the next steps are after that. So, thank you.

And thank you very much, Leon, for conveying to us the concerns of the Board and we appreciate you participating with us as much as you have.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, and I will not give an answer. I think, Pat, you summarized well. We will be very happy to answer, but please read—and I know, Leon, you have read it—but read the document and I would like to underline one point. If we go in that direction, it will be the first time since 2002 that we, ICANN as a whole, will have the opportunity to have a look to the overall organization. It will be the first time that we will be able to go outside of the silos to see what is happening and how we can evolve the organization. If, and I know, that there are people who consider that the organization is very well like that and we don't need to change, but if we have no the opportunity at least to look at, it will never happen. It's why it's so important that we have worked, I think, in the good direction for that. And I agree completely that we will wait with great confidence for questions from the Board and from others.

My last point is that just remember that we are ATRT and remember what was the role of ATRT. It was to review the way the Board is working and it's not the way around. I know that it's maybe difficult to

understand or to listen, but it's very important that we are supposed to be the independent body while looking to the work of the different part of the organization, but specifically to the Board. Therefore, if the Board disagree with us, it will be interesting because I don't know who is the one with more muscle. ICANN board of course have money, time, people, we don't, but we are ATRT, and since the beginning, even if it's ATRT 3, we will need to see our inputs as a good way to go. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Sebastien. Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I just want to state that we saw a lot of problems in the review systems that is working right now in ICANN for long time. And certainly, I believe that we as a group, or at least many of us, will be open to explain any point in how they can be implemented as suggestions and as a guidance to the implementation group because it's, for me, totally clear that this proposal will really enhance the possibility of have better reviews, independent reviews, and a holistic view of the ICANN as a whole. Because this is a lot of time, as Sebastien said, that as remember in 2002, that's nevermore from that time we have a review and a holistic review of ICANN as a whole, and I personally see a lot of things that should change and we doubt those views, will never change. And, I don't know, it's good for the future of ICANN. Thank you.

PAT KANE: So, thank you very much, Vanda. And we've wandered a little bit off of this particular agenda item. So, Larisa, you're next.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Pat, and sorry to keep wandering off, but on the points that have been discussed, just a suggestion that there will be an opportunity once the Board gets the final report, it will go out for public comment. And at that point, it'll be to inform the Board as they consider how to act on the recommendations. So, there might be usefulness if you all would be open to having a webinar or some engagement with the community on behalf of ATRT 3 to help those that may not be fully grasping the nuances and the points that have been discussed very thoroughly here in this venue to share that with the broader community to inform their understanding and sort of the thought process and the viewpoints that you've all shared on this list. I would encourage you to think about that and take advantage perhaps of a webinar and an opportunity to explain your views to the community while the report is open for public comment to make sure that people do understand your perspectives in the context that you have all described. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Larisa. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Larisa, I am sure that we are all ready to help with that. I wanted to come back to your point and please if you can scroll to page 82. Just a question, do you think that really you want to keep my [3-letter, my

tree diagram], before the graphic about review multi-year timeline?
Question mark. Thank you.

PAT KANE: We'll take a look at that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Page 82, at the beginning.

PAT KANE: Okay. All right, so if there no other identification of errors or omissions, let's move on to item #4 and confirm acceptance of the minority statements. We have received three minority statements: one from Michael, one from KC, and a joint one between Tola and Osvaldo. They have been included in the most recent updated PDF that have been sent around from Jennifer shortly before we started, the bottom of the hour, or the top of the last hour. And I don't think we have any more. Are there any that we have missing or that we have not been able to include or did not recognize receipt of? Please raise your hand. Sebastien, is that a new hand or an old hand? It was an old hand, thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Old, sorry.

PAT KANE: Thank you so much. So, not seeing any hands in the participant window for identification of additional minority statements and thank you for

sending those three in. And I know that they came in PDF format for two of them and Michael's came in a Word Doc, but it's now been put in a PDF. So, I think we are ready to move on to step #5, and confirmation ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, sorry. Pat. Sorry, just before we do ...

PAT KANE: Yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, dear. And it is something just for the record. I just think it would be appropriate for the record at this ultimate moment of our work that we do have a statement from, I'm assuming Jennifer, who is the staff that handled the receipt of the PDFs, I know I mentioned when they came in, I noted them so there was a time stamp as close as possible of receipt, but I think we should probably have a statement in the record now from whoever, I assume Jennifer, that they were handled faithfully and without any edit or alterations. It's all just a mere formality, but an important one.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Cheryl. Happy to, yes. I, myself, received the statements from the people that Pat mentioned and I put them into the document. I made no changes other than just formatting of them. And also, they're all in Appendix H, and at the top there I put the link to the mail where

the original submission was as well just so that there's that cross reference back there. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jennifer, and Michael, thank you for the confirmation that there's no issues with your submission. I appreciate that. So, can we confirm that the final report is ready to send to the Board, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Subject to the toilette that we have discussed on today's call, I believe that is the case.

PAT KANE: Okay. And do we have any other business? I see no hands raised nor nothing in chat. Jennifer, can you cover any decisions that we have reached as an accounting?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. So, we went through some minor edits that Sebastien mostly raised and I took that as an action item, I know that Bernie's working on them as we speak. So, the report will be updated to reflect those. The team also agreed to include the numbers from the consensus discussion that happened on the 6th of May into the transmittal letter, and I believe also into the report as well. Did I capture that correctly?

PAT KANE: I believe so, yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Very good, thank you. And then, after those edits are made, then the team just agreed that the report is ready to send to the Board.

PAT KANE: Great, thank you very much, Jennifer. And Vanda is applauding. So, that really draw us toward the end, but before we close—and that’s the end of the meeting before the report goes out, I don’t think we’re completely done because we do have to go through the Board review and some comments will come in and the outreach and conversation with the community post this. But, before all that happens, in case we don’t spend a whole lot more time together, I do want to thank everybody for the last 14 months. It’s kind of a long year, but I know that we’ve had differences of opinion and differences of how to approach this and what to cover and what to include, and I know that the work product, with inclusion of the minority statements, is a good picture of what we’ve discussed and what we’ve covered. So, I want to thank you very much. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, indeed. I’ve worked with a number of teams on a number of things, and I must say the usual thrust and parry that we’ve had has been carried out I believe in a very good spirit and with excellent intent. I note Herb has his hand up, and I think it’s important to hear from him. I will just say, for the record, I am a little concerned that at the end of our process, there seemed to be some very specific criticism of some of the ways that we went through procedures, and, Pat, I think it’s

incumbent on you and I to look at how we can investigate those and ensure that there are important learnings from those as we delve into the whys and wherefores of each. So, that will be a post-ATRT 3 activity, but in many ways no different from the shepherding that we know we will be doing anyway.

Personally, it's been an utter and absolute pleasure, compared to some of the other experiences I've had in ICANN, to work with you all. And I certainly look forward to looking with you all again. And in particular I just want to recognize the staff, including of course Bernie. He has been fabulous. I know he does this a lot for a lot of different teams, but his expertise obviously shows very well and reflects on us as a group very well indeed.

And I also just wanted Pat to note what I like to think of as our faithful audiences, our faithful listeners, our listening public. We've had observers throughout the whole process here and it has been, I think, a very good thing that that interest has occurred and has been maintained. It's all about transparency and accountability. So, I'm going to mute because my family is being besieged by my 5-year-old granddaughter and there's [dogs] and kids and things running around. So, I'll have background noise, but Herb, you wanted to say something?

HERB WAYE:

Yeah, thank you, Cheryl, and Pat, thank you also. I just wanted before we turn out the lights to thank you for the opportunity to observe from beginning to end. I was around for both ATRT 1 and ATRT 2, and the reports kind of just appeared in everybody's life with all of the

recommendations. And this has been a phenomenal opportunity for me to see the nuts and bolts firsthand of the review process and it's been eye-opening, it's been great to watch you folks work. I have to commend you on the incredible effort and commitment to the whole team and to staff. It's been mindboggling and I can only commend you all for the last 14 months.

It's been really interesting, really a phenomenal learning opportunity for me, and once again, thank you all for this opportunity to observe and watch from the sidelines. And hope to see you all real soon and keep washing those hands.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Herb. So, unless there's anyone who would like to say anything else before we close.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Pat, just to thank everyone for this great work that you all have done. I am very happy and grateful for having been part of this effort, for having the opportunity to work with so many talented people, and for having worked with people that I am sure that mean and want the best for ICANN and its community. And I would like to commend you both, Cheryl and Pat, for your leadership and taking us to shore in the safest way. And, of course, a thank you, too, to our wonderful staff who have been following us, supporting us, and working tireless hours along with us during the process.

And, well, of course, I say this with the confidence that I might be speaking on behalf of the Board in thanking all of you for this work and with gratitude to the community for all these efforts. Thank you very much.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Leon. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I would like to thank the whole team that has been here and for everyone who has been so much supportive to my learning process, especially in getting this work done. It's been a great learning experience and I appreciate it and I look forward to more teamwork on this. It has been challenging, at least I'm glad that we have got at least to the end of this. Thank you all.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much, Daniel. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's just to thank you again for the leadership, for the group and the staff, especially for Sebastien, that they have done really much more work than any one of us. And I do believe ... Thank you Bernie for the patience with us and certainly, I would like to remember the contribution of Maarten during the first time of our work. That was quite important for us, and certainly for Leon and Avri and everyone that have been with us during this year was a challenging time, but

anyway, we did. That's most of importance of this is that we finish, we did what we believe is the best for ICANN. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you so much, Vanda. And I'm going to assume, Herb and Daniel, those are old hands at this point in time. So, again, thank you. And yes, Leon, thank you for throwing out the staff the great support that we've received from them over the last 14 months and coming in on their days off and working through holidays when we were actually continuing to work. So, I do appreciate that and thank you, staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And can I just say something before you close? Because I've got to let you close because I think you need it. Pat, you've never worked—that's the granddaughter—you've never worked directly with me before. I mean, we've crossed paths, obviously. But I want to note for the record that for someone who said, "Well, I'm not quite sure about this but I'll give it a go," it has been a real pleasure working with you behind the scenes. I have felt nothing but trust and confidence with you as a co-chair. And I would recommend you for this role in anything that ICANN does, and I really wanted to put that on the record. It has been a delight. I mean, I know staff know how much we appreciate them, but leadership has a lot of responsibilities, and you've taken it all on just so professionally and so easily. I am rarely in awe, and as in a greater appreciation of anyone as I am with you now. So, big thanks.

PAT KANE: Well, thank you very much, Cheryl. I've enjoyed it for the most part and I've learned a tremendous amount. I took this opportunity because I encourage my team to do a lot of these types of roles and I felt that it wasn't appropriate for me to keep sending them off to battle without me having a full understanding of what they go through. So, this has been quite an experience and thank you for the education and I want to thank everyone on the review team for that personally. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it's hard to say goodbye, but I guess what we do, Pat, is say to Jennifer that if there's nothing else, roll the credits and capture the chat for the last time and we obviously will see a little bit of extra stuff go up on the Wikis and our work up to the giving of the final report, which should've been done in 12 months, but there was this little COVID-y thing that came and upset us. Not too bad to have done it in 14.

And so, congratulations, and we can, I guess Pat, stop the recording and say bye for now.

PAT KANE: Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]