

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr and my fellow co-chair, Pat Kane is here as well today, along with several of our review team members from the third accountability and transparency review team, known as ATRT3. We'll recognize them as we go through today as Pat and I will do our best to give a slide from our presentations for as many of them as possible to speak to.

Next slide, please, which is the inevitable agenda slide, and you will see we're going to take this through four basic parts of our agenda. I'm going to be doing background and scope, overview of recommendations is going to be managed by Pat and include as many of our other members as possible, and then there'll be next steps, which I'll play with. Oh, no, I think Pat will do next steps and I'll do Q&A. That sounds about right, I think. Next slide, please.

Background and scope is what we're going to be covering here, and throughout, if any of you have a comment or a question, if you look to chat, Brenda's put an example of the question in bracket, put what it is you want to say, and question, to end that, or the same would go for comment. Put whatever you want to say and "comment," again, in brackets. We'll read those out to the record and deal with as many of them as possible as we go through in chat, but we will have plenty of time for Q&A at the end where we will activate the raise hand system as well.

So you'll see the very pale background of the Accountability And Transparency Review Team number three, ATRT3 members who were able to gather together for our last face-to-face meeting which was held

---

*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.*

in the Brussels office, and we thought it was a good background just to humanize the slides a little bit to put this rather dry text, which is of course what our mandate was under Article 4 Section 4.6. So what we're reviewing here is ICANN's execution to its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision making reflect the public interest and are accountable to the Internet community. So that's our mandate. Next slide, please.

We did have a few things we looked at here, and we also might note, while we're looking at this slide, we've taken the care in today's presentation to have less on the screen. we maintain that if we put a whole lot of words up, you can read them just as easily as us reading them out to you. So you'll see more visuals on today's slide set, but please note the slide set which is published and available for you to download has all of the necessary material in the speaker notes, which is also published, and of course, there are extensive appendixes as well, which we won't be going through in detail, but form part of today's presentation.

So let's have a look now under these—I think we ran out of shapes to use, by the look of it—set of shapes of what we considered our scope of work. Our scope of work was to assess ICANN board governance, the role and effectiveness of the Government Advisory Committee, or GAC as we tend to call it, the processes by which ICANN receive public input, the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community, policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross-community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development.

---

We also looked at the extent to which the ATRT2, our predecessor, recommendations had been implemented and the effectiveness of any such implementation. We looked at the independent review process, the accountability and transparency relating to strategic and operating plans, including accountability indicators, and we also looked at specific and organizational reviews.

One of the big ones—and one that Pat will be taking you into more detail on shortly—is the prioritization and rationalization of activities, policies and recommendations. So I'm quite sure that many of you are very keen to go over that. Next slide, please.

Here you'll see our acronym, the SMART acronym, the specific, measurable, attainable—or achievable in some language—relevant and timebound, or time-based, as this image happens to say, is the methodology which we particularly adhered to for, apart from anything else, apart from the fact it is good practice, it has been done by at least ATRT2 in the past, but it is also an expectation under the new guidelines which we operated under. We were the very first group to operate under the, at that stage, just coming out of draft, operating standards for specific reviews, and part of that was a strong guidance that this SMART-type framework should be applicable to any and all recommendations made, and you'll see that reflected in our report.

So our final report was submitted to the ICANN board on the 1st of June 2020, and considering the fact that we were unable to have our normally very productive face-to-face meetings to finalize our report by its April [inaudible] date, we think handing our homework in just a little bit late but well and truly before we said we would is a good thing

---

---

indeed, and we're very thankful for everybody who worked so hard to help that happen, and for the board's indulgence to wait patiently while we took that little extra time.

The report is available for public comment up until the 31st of this month, 31st of July 2020, and we only make five recommendation with regards to accountability and transparency. Now, [inaudible] we think they're very important recommendations, but we did apply rigorously to this SMART process and you'll find all the gory details in our report about each and every one of those.

It's also worthy of noting that we reached full consensus on four out of the five recommendations, and consensus on the recommendations pertaining to amending specific and organizational reviews. And all the details, including exactly how the consensus call polling went on that, is included in our report and the cover letter that was sent to the board. Next slide, please.

Thank you. Yes, that is the COVID-19 bug. I almost felt like we shouldn't—it should be that which should not be named. But of course, over the course of our work, all sorts of—but certainly several—unforeseen events occurred that we dealt with. That included, of course, COVID-19, which we're all dealing with. And some of them had had an impact on ICANN's accountability and transparency.

Now, we could clearly not continually add things onto our scope of work, and we certainly couldn't address all of these even as they came along during our progress.

Just to remind you all, an accountability and transparency review team is timebound to a 12-month period, so it is to have its work completed 12 months after it holds its first substantive meeting. So we certainly couldn't add the following things in. We're aware of them, we recognize them as important, but we did not go into any details on the proposed change of ownership of the .org registry, we did not go into—although many of us are painfully aware of—the efforts made in the expedited policy development process, the EPDP in response to the temporary specification that has been running in response to the General Data Protection Regulation, and that's been two phases to that work.

We also did not look at the accountability and transparency issues related to domain name system abuse, although we recognize that as an incredibly important and indeed ICANN-wide issue that needs to be looked at. And we certainly didn't have time to look at the dreaded COVID-19 consequences for ICANN. Next slide, please.

The ATRT3 final report contains a number of very important annexes. They are quite detailed, they are a big part of our transparency and what we have done, and we do encourage you to not just stop at the executive summary or just the shortlisting of our recommendations, or even delving into the details of our report. We certainly encourage you to go further than that and look at the annexes. And that's Annex A through H. they're listed there on the slide. I'm not going to go into the gory details of them at all here, but I would like to [recommend an illuminating and rewarding] read. Next slide, please.

And I hope Pat's got his singing voice ready, because we are now going over to you. It's all yours, Pat.

---

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl, but there will be no more singing. I wanted to cover just at a high level the topics of the recommendations that we made, and throughout the high-level details we go through, I will be including members of our team who are on the call today.

One thing that I would call out however is, as Cheryl has pointed out, the report annexes, Annex A and B will have several suggestions that we have that did not obtain the same level of review or research that are required by the new operating procedures. So for other areas that we thought were good ideas to take a look at, you will find those in Annex A and B.

So the five areas we focused were an assessment of the periodic—now specific and organizational—reviews we had as the highest priority coming out of the review team, and this is the one area where we did not have a full consensus. And you will see in the report there are three minority or dissenting reports on this topic authored by four people, and so take a look at those as well, they're important to read, from the member of the team.

The rest of the areas that we did have full consensus on, taking a look at prioritization, how do we look at the recommendations that are coming out of all of the review teams as well as to include Work Stream 2? The third area, and this was a medium—and these are all relative to each other, not necessarily that it's low overall or medium overall, but relative to each other—is taking a look at transparency metrics, how ICANN is either measuring themselves through the accountability

---

indicators or taking a look at metrics as they pertain to, say, the strategic plan from 21 to 25.

The last two are public input. We're seeing a lot more use of nontraditional tools to communicate information from the board and the organization. And then the last one is to take a look at the ATRT2 recommendations and view them as far as implemented or not, which is also a requirement of the review team as well.

So we're going to get into the details of the periodic reviews and organizational reviews. Next slide, please. And Sébastien, if you will cover slides 11 through 13, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Pat, and thank you for all who participate to this webinar. I think it's a very important topic we are going through here. We are going through the assessment of reviews, and the problem statement was there are too many specific and organizational reviews occurring simultaneously, some with limited effect and relevance.

The outcome was to improve the use of the resources of SOs and ACs regarding specific and organizational review, and try to improve the timing and the cadence of all the reviews. Restructure specific and organizational review to ensure that they are effective and continue to have a purpose. And remember, ATRT is the only review team who can suggest creation or deletion or anything about the other reviews. Therefore, we have taken that very seriously in our job.

---

The recommendation includes suspended RDS, security and stability review, until next ATRT, if they wish to put them again, or not. One additional—this one is about CCT review. Everything linked with the new gTLD and consumer trust. And we suggest also to evolve organizational review into continuous improvement program in each SO, AC, and we add the NomCom and add—I will say it's one very important proposal here. As a special specific review, holistic one, looking at all SO, AC, NomCom. And I will add here specifically for this, and the board and their relations, implement a new system for the timing and cadence of the review. And if you look to page 82 of the report, you will see that there is a design of the proposed timeline. Next slide, please.

Here, it's the only suggestion we will go through because the board have asked specifically that we and you specifically, you give feedback on this proposal who was at the end of our work, we take that into account and we suggest to the board, given the recommendation in section eight, that means in the section talking about reviews, of its report, ATRT3 is proposing significant change to organizational review and specific review. ATRT strongly suggests that ICANN board implement a moratorium on launching any new organizational or specific review until it has made a decision on this recommendation. And of course, you can see there are some more detail in the annex of this presentation and on the document. Thank you. Next slide, please.

We are still in assessment of review, and here we talk about continuous improvement. And ICANN shall evolve the content of organizational review into continuous improvement program in each SO/AC and NomCom. It must include that for the beginning discussion and then

---



---

work with ICANN Org and each SO and AC to establish a continuous improvement program. Such a continuous improvement program, we hope, will be able to have the same or common base between SO and AC and the NomCom, but will also allow for customization. And it shall be implemented within the next 18 months after this recommendation being approved by the board. And shall include annual satisfaction survey. And the next slide, somebody else will explain to you what it's about. Thank you all.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Sébastien. Vanda, will you take us through the next two slides, please?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Hi everyone. Thank you again. Certainly, all this continuous improvement will demand some survey about satisfaction of the members and participants. So we propose that each SO/AC and NomCom shall perform a comprehensive annual satisfaction survey or equivalent mechanism. Such survey should focus on member satisfaction and issue identification versus their respective SO/AC, NomCom but can also include satisfaction with ICANN Org services. For SOs and ACs that are composed of substructure, this should apply to their individual substructures, and the results of all substructures shall be aggregate to generate a result for the given SO or AC, like in GNSO, like in ALAC.

The results would be public and used to support the continuous improvement program, as well as will be an input for the holistic review.

If the survey results note significant issue, this shall be a trigger to initiate appropriate measures to deal with any of those issues. That is the general idea of the continuous improvement. If you detected some problems during those surveys or doing the process, during the year for instance, you can raise this point and take an account that you need to make something, think about that, change that, etc. Next slide, please.

So the regular assessment of continuous improvement program, at least every three years, each SO/AC and NomCom will undertake a formal process to evaluate and report on all the working continuous improvement activities inside the SO/AC and NomCom which will be published for public comment. This would allow the holistic review to consider a minimum of two assessment reports and related public comments for each SO/AC and NomCom. So we believe that the holistic review will have enough information about all the SO/AC and NomCom to make a good work considering all the relations between all of those.

Details of the assessment will be defined during the elaboration of continuous improvement program with each SO/AC and NomCom, and if those organizations decide and their budgets permit, the assessment can be conducted by an independent contractor—some groups may prefer this kind of work—or by having an intensive, it's for instance, my point of view, one- to five-day workshop to really debate and find those issues that maybe they found during this continuous improvement.

The board should publish at least every three years a summary of this continuous improvement over that period. Such report will be used, again, as an input for the holistic review. Thank you. I pass it back to you, Pat.

---

---

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. And if Jaap, you will take our slide 16, please.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Okay. Yes. What this actually means is that this continuous improvement program is not meant to be cost reduction activity, and it's expected to have the same cost as the standard five-year period review. ICANN shall ensure that as minimum, the same overall budget is available for the continuous improvement efforts of the various committees and advisories, including NomCom.

The public comment on reporting of continuous improvement activities is only required every three years. It's actually an echo of the last point of previous slide. Anyway, regardless of the processes selected by the specific SO/AC and NomCom, they shall fit in the financial constraints available for such activities. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jaap. Next slide, please. The second recommendation had to do with prioritization, and the problem statement that we dealt with is no clear or consistent methodology exists for formulating effective review team or cross-community recommendations, nor is there a basis for evaluating resource requirements associated with such recommendations, etc., on the screen.

This is tied very closely to our recommendation number five which is taking a look at the ATRT2 recommendations. One of the items that we came across with ATRT2 recommendations is that in the assessment of

the ICANN Org, they assessed that 100% of the recommendations were complete, and upon review of ATRT3, we felt that the number, I think, was 62% were actually complete and about 20% of all of them have actually not had anything done specifically towards it, although they were declared complete.

Now, part of that with the recommendations is taking a look at a process to ingest all the review team recommendations and all the Work Stream recommendations such that you have a community-led entity that is tasked with going through all of these in a collective and prioritize. And specifically, it must be community-led because all these recommendations are actually coming from the community.

Each of the SOs and ACs should have a participating role, whether they like to or not. They're not required to, but they should. And additionally, there'll be a board member and ICANN Org member of that particular process. Next slide, please.

So definitely operating by consensus within the SOs and ACs, board and org members, consider Work Stream 2 recommendations which are actually still remaining from the IANA transition. The one thing we called out here is that from a prioritization standpoint, we should not retire any of the Work Stream 2 recommendations unless it's specifically decided by the board from this group, and the retirement piece is what I referred to back when I talked about the ATRT2 recommendations.

One of the things that we believe is that with the process to be able to retire a recommendation, there is no incentive to declare something complete that's not complete. And what we'll be able to do is to say

---

when a recommendation's been overcome by events, it's no longer appropriate, the costs have gone through the roof, or something of that nature, we can get rid of one of those recommendations, because I think that there's at least 100 that are outstanding right now that remain to be completed.

Conduct in an open and accountable, transparent fashion all the decisions justified and documented so that we have clearly what the decisions are made by this group. And integrate that into the normal processes of the ICANN organization so when ICANN Org goes through its budgeting process, this is a component that rolls into that budgeting process on an annual basis, and reviewed periodically.

When it comes to multi-year implementations, projects that'll take more than one year and go over multiple budgets, they still should be evaluated on annual basis such that we're not assuming that a project that we approved a year or two years ago will continue to move forward if it no longer makes sense, and it should be prioritized against new recommendations, old recommendations, so that we are efficiently using the resources that's we have available to us, either financial or staff.

And lastly, just from the consideration standpoint, these are all the standpoints that we want to make certain that we review as part of that prioritization process. Do they remain relevant to ICANN's mission? Is there still value and impact for the implementation? What is the cost and how much budget is available? Complexity and time to implement. Are recommendations a package? Are there prerequisites or do they have dependencies, or should they be done together because they're

---

---

affecting the same part of the organization? And then any relevant information from implementation shepherds.

One of the new procedures, there is an opportunity for shepherds or stewards to become involved such that we retain the intent of the recommendations and we actually deliver what the recommendation was that came out of the review team or the cross-community working group in some cases. Next slide, please.

So when we took a look at reports on strategic plans or operating plans, we were struggling with identifying metrics that made sense and actually ended up with measuring what was intended. We used the accountability indicators that are located online as part of this process. And I'll give you an example that came out of the accountability indicators. One of the indicators is to have an advocacy program for ICANN such that we bring new and diverse players and people into ICANN space to come in and participate in our processes. And the metric itself was how many conferences did we attend, how many presentations did we make as ICANN the community or ICANN Organization, which the real metric should have been when we go and do that, how many new people have we brought back into the community such that we're defining and determining how close we are to the intent of the metric?

So when we took a look at the strategic plan for 21 to 25, there are several areas that are, here's what we're going to do, but here's no metric and no determination of what success looks like. So we believe, in this recommendation, that ICANN should focus on improving the

---

metrics so they actually closer align with the intent of the project or the task that is being undertaken by the community. Next slide, please.

In terms of public input, one of the things we see that is being used more and more is the use of new tools that are nontraditional for ICANN in terms of sharing information from ICANN Org, ICANN board, to the community, and how are the comments received, ingested and fed into the overall process.

The use of blogs has become very prevalent as an example, and one of the things that we wanted to make certain is that there is a defined feedback loop in terms of what the community believes about the information that's contained within the blogs, and how does that get put back into the process so that we can use that to impact and improve policy within the organization. Next slide, please.

And then the last one of course is again the assessment of the ATRT2 implementation, and the recommendation here is that the items that were not complete be completed, but again, tied back to the prioritization process. And this is a question that came up earlier in the previous presentation that we had from Susan Kawaguchi, was, how do these tie together such that we get away from this gap between what we believe was complete, and then upon further assessment, wasn't actually complete or complete as intended? Again, the prioritization review along with the new processes with shepherds we believe will reduce the incentive to declare victory on a particular recommendation when it doesn't have to be because there's a way to retire, again, those particular recommendations. Next slide, please.

---

So next steps. As Cheryl called out earlier, we delivered our report on the 1st of June. We were a little bit late, but I think people understood. The final report is available now for public comment until the 31st of July, and we encourage everyone to please go out and take a look at that and provide comments where appropriate, and then we hope to have board action on the recommendations by the 1st of December of this particular year. And we've got a team of shepherds. I think we have five or six that have volunteered to continue on with ATRT3 over the implementation of these recommendations so that we can make certain that the intent is captured, the rationale is captured, that they're being done in a timeline that we believe that we have projected, and that the metrics that are put in place actually measure implementation success.

All right, next slide, please. And Cheryl, if you'll bring us home, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'll do my best. Thank you, Pat. And we're going to go to our questions now, but just because we do, I'm going to ask Brenda to forward just for one more slide to look at our list of annexes that are in this presentation. Thank you very much. So we haven't given it all to you, but I just wanted to take you through the answers which are included in today's presentation.

We've got, covered in great detail, the composition of ATRT3. You'll see it's not just a list. We are giving the regions, the affiliations, but what you'll find is in the report itself, we give you a great deal more. We give you attendance records, we give you all of the details that you could



---

possibly want from a dashboard about each and [inaudible] and indeed also in the extensive details of the report.

We got over our methodology in the annexes to this report. We look at our project timeline milestones, some of which we've touched on but we've got it even in pretty graphics. And we certainly look at a great deal of detail into the assessment of the reviews, and particularly the specific reviews. We've made some pretty [critical] recommendation here, and we realize that apart from the generalized, normal human resistance to change, there's going to be a lot of, "How does this work and what's going on?" And we've given you an enormous amount of detail in our report and we've given you some more detail in today's presentation as well, and we've even given you some useful links.

So take me back one to the Q&A section, and we've had a couple of questions come in during today's proceedings, none of which had me highly motivated to just type a reply, which was my job while Pat was wrangling the rest of the slides, so we'll pick up both of these that we received to date and then open the floor for anybody else's questions or comments as well. and I'll be calling on some of our members of the review team who have joined us today. And I think you've heard from all of them. I will just check to make sure we have not missed one.

Well, we've missed one that retired and was replaced by León. We do want to recognize that the ICANN board had been an integral part of this ATRT3, not just in a liaison or supervisory role. We're delighted with the fact that first Maarten and then León—so we feel we've been well connected, at certainly the highest levels of the ICANN board at this stage, so that they've been an integral and active part in all of our

---

proceedings. And whilst we won't ask Maarten to answer any questions—that would just be even bold for Pat and I—but we do want to recognize that we think that that has made a big difference in a positive way to our ATRT3 processes, in addition of course to being provided with absolutely fabulous staff and an excellent technical writer as well in Bernie Turcotte.

So let's go to the first question that came in, and this was a question from Sophie Hey. It is, "Are there any mechanisms proposed to replace the functions of the RDS and SSR reviews while they are suspended?" Pat, I'm going to ask you to dig your teeth into that and anyone else that takes your fancy.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. So when we talked about retiring some of the current reviews, it was really more of a focus on how do we move into those specific items that continue to be important move into other reviews. So the ATRT review would pick up some of the items, some of the items would be picked up in the holistic reviews, and that was the intent.

The intent of the moratorium was so that we didn't start any reviews—I'm answering a different question. No, so there placement for those would roll into those particular reviews. Now, the RDS is going to end up being a new RDAP protocol at some point in time so it won't be WHOIS as traditional. We see that being addressed in the EPDP, which we didn't address, as Cheryl pointed out, here, because it wasn't complete. So it was hard to look at something that was still in progress.

---

And then for example, the recommendation around CCT as well where we recommend one more, because those are specifically around new gTLDs. And at some point in time, new gTLDs will become just a normal part of business and not something that is a milestone-based event, or at least presumably that looks like the direction it's going. So maybe you want more of those is all that we need. So that's one of the things we talked about there.

The SSR items, they probably ought to look at them from an issue of what is going on at the time, and not have to wait for a deep review of SSR but address them ongoing on a periodic basis, and again, taking a look at the process around continuous improvement and not wait for a full-blown review and address items as required, needed or identified. Sébastien, your hand is raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat—I was going to say, Sébastien is going to give us some more information. Over to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat and Cheryl. Yeah, it's also important to have a look to when those reviews were created. And a lot happened since in the organization of ICANN, in the topic taken into account. If we take for example security and stability, we have a really very good team working on that with SSAC. There is also some part taken into account by the RSSAC, Root Server System Advisory Committee. There is the creation of the OCTO, the office of the technical director, a team in charge of that within the ICANN Org. Therefore, we consider that it's also important to

---

take into account all this evolution, WHOIS, now RDS, and we think that it was a good time to give all to that and to give to the next ATRT the task to decide if they wish to restart it, to change it or to keep them aside for another time or completely. That's the role of ATRT as I say and I put in the chat the relevant part of the bylaw considering this question. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sébastien. I appreciate that. And don't go too far from the microphone because I think I'm going to ask you to respond to Susan's question, which I'm reading to the record now. So Susan Payne has the following question: "You mention that your covering letter proposes a moratorium on any reviews pending Board action on your recommendation 8. Which reviews would that impact? Was this something the full review team supported bearing in mind the four minority statements"

It was not full consensus on anything to do with the specific and organizational reviews. The minority statements, as listed, covered those in particular. So it was a consensus, not a full consensus on that. To take you back—and what I might do, Sébastien, while you respond to Susan, and obviously anyone else can jump in then as well, Brenda, if you've got that timeline—perfect. I thought that might assist you, Sébastien, while you responded to Susan's question.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and thank you for your question, Susan. Yeah, we try here to have a graphic to show how we think that different

---

reviews can be organized, and you can see the blue side, first of all, the left side, it's something that's already published on the ICANN website by ICANN Org and I take that as a basis to build with the team the rest part of the right side of the document. And here we tried to see what will replace what, and what are the lengths to each one.

In fact, we suggest that nothing happen before—if the board agree with that—starting the holistic review, and nothing before the end of this holistic review.

If we look carefully at current schedule of each and every, I don't think that it's pushed too much, I guess, the GNSO could be the first one who might have started something, therefore it's something. For GNSO, it could be a little bit pushback, but not so much. In fact, we're in a time when not so much things are going on. Therefore, it's all that we're taking into account and suggest it's this way of doing the review. And you see, of course, it's a lot on the orange side, but in fact, it's three per year, and during three years, we go through all the SO and AC and the same again the second time before the next holistic review. Thank you, Cheryl, I hope I answered the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I believe you have. Did anyone else want to pick up on anything? Thanks from Susan. And we really don't think we've cut anything out. We think we've rationalized and made it a much more manageable process. Well, we've got a few more minutes left, so we'd all welcome anybody who's like to just put their hand up and make any comment or question. Or of

---

course, you can always type into chat and we'll read it to the record and deal with it as well. I'll give a couple moments for that. Don't be shy.

Pat, it looks like the team and you and I have done a fabulous job of communicating absolutely everything, and everything is totally and absolutely understood. I am joking, just slightly, although we do hope that we've given you an informative set of exercises in today's call, and that you are feeling more comfortable and with greater understanding of the—only five, after all—recommendations that we've put forward as a result of our ATRT3 deliberations.

Maarten, are you going to ask a question?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

No questions right now, of course, and yeah, we do look forward to thorough deliberations of this report. It's really proposing a lot of bold and new approaches towards a more sustainable future. So without going into the comment, I just wanted to thank the team and you and Pat, but also the support team, very much for all the work that you guys have done, the dedication. I've had the pleasure of being indeed in some of your meetings, and I also appreciated the collegiality and the constructiveness of the discussions very much. So I really want to thank you for that part.

So looking forward to what comes out of the public comments as well, and then the final report for final deliberations to take ICANN forward into the future.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We hope we've helped, Maarten. We appreciate it. I see Pam's had time to raise her hand. Pam Little, over to you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Cheryl. I have two points to make. Firstly, I want to thank the ATRT3 team for hosting this webinar at a time that is reasonable and convenient for the Asia Pacific region, although I do know it's also not too bad for our colleagues from the European region. But I find this is very [awkward] for Pat, if you're in DC. So I hope you can bear with us for one moment.

I just want to make a comment about a paragraph in your final report about the concern over the PDP, the EPDP process. Apparently, there is an example concern raised because of SAC paper 111. I just want to make the point that the GNSO council has actually written back to the SSAC in response to their concerns and hopefully, that would be taken into account by the SSAC community and the community as a whole. There were some things that we thought were important to clarify because there was some misconceived or misperception or misunderstanding on the part of SSAC as far as the GNSO council was concerned. Thank you for hearing me out, and thank you all once again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for clearing it up, Pam, and we do appreciate all such focus on specificity and updates since we wrote our report. And that definitely is an update since we wrote our report. And we certainly want to mention here at what must be the official end of all of our duties that what Maarten mentioned about the collegiality has been, I think, a

pleasure for Pat and I certainly to work together with the team, but the team has been fabulous and put in enormous amounts of work, particularly under some of the recent more difficult circumstances. But we really could not have done it without the fabulous staff that ICANN Org has provided us. they are without comparing—my very biased view. And if you know me, you know I don't just say these things lightly. We did have a fabulous team, and that was inclusive of our absolutely committed ICANN staff [out of MSSl] and indeed our technical writer, Bernie Turcotte, who really did the hard yards with each and every one of the subteams and individuals as part of the review team. So credit where credit's due, we're happy to take all accolades, but we also want to note that it was a sum of many parts that's made this whole.

We hope, if you've got any questions, you will contact the MSSl staff in charge of the public comment and reach out to them for any clarifications. Pat and I and the team stand ready to be available to you to answer any clarifying questions or even come and do a mini webinar or presentation if needs be in the next couple of weeks as you're writing your public comments to your groups. But let us know. We are here to help. We think it will be a better ICANN on the other side of all of this.

And with that, if there is nothing else coming on the screen, I believe I get the really good job of saying thank you, one and all. Thank you for joining us today, thank you for making ATRT3 a good adventure. And Pat, it's been a pleasure, my friend. I hope we steer a ship together at some other time. Brenda, you've been amazing. And I now get to say for the very last time, you can close this meeting. Thank you, Brenda. Bye for now.

---



PAT KANE: Thank you everyone. Bye now.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Cheryl.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Bye.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bye everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**