CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group call on Tuesday the 3rd of November 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Ricardo Holmquist, Sébastien Bachollet, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dave Kissoondoyal, Joanna Kulesza, Justine Chew, Maureen Hilyard, Nadira Alaraj, Sarah Kiden, Sonigitu Ekpe.

We have received apologies from Marita Moll and Satish Babu.

Our Spanish interpreters for today are Paula and Marina. And a friendly reminder that we do have RTT services available for today's call as well. I will put the link in the chat for you guys to follow if you would like. A friendly reminder to please state your name when speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels and to please keep your lines muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise.

Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Claudia. Can you put the presentation on the screen? The idea of the call today is to begin the comment for the draft PTI and IANA fiscal year 22 operating plan and budget, to also begin the IANA naming function review initial report comment, and most importantly, to begin the work to do the recommendations prioritization that we somehow started at the recommendation thresher on the ICANN 69. But we need to start this and to see how we

---

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.

can work these different tracks in the Work Stream 2 as it seems to be being discussed on the different SOs and ACs, in the ATRT3, that's the newest one, maybe the most important one, but also SSR, CCTRT and also the multi-stakeholder model, although it's not recommendation, we have Marita Moll assisting us to have a track and to keep track of this multi-stakeholder model evolution and to be there and to stay with this evolution and not to be one of the losers of this evolution.

So without much further ado with this agenda, please go ahead with the next screen, it's the next PTI and IANA fiscal year 22 operating plan. I will have three, four slides which are very easy to see. It is part of the operating plan and budget, the draft that was sent by Finance. There's nothing new there. As you can see, there are numbers for the fiscal year 20 actual and 21 budget and 22 budget.

What I can say from these slides is that we're comparing maybe pears to pears and not with apples and comparing fiscal year 22 with fiscal year 20 that is actually the one that's real, because fiscal year 21 is just a budget, and I don't think at the end of the year this will be similar to the reality once the COVID [inaudible] when this was prepared. And I guess there will be some fluctuations. If we see 20 with 22 in this slide, we see almost an increase of 30%. That's a lot considering that ICANN incomes are very flat over the last two years, only maybe 2-3%, no more in increase. Next slide, please.

One of the good things that this draft has mapped is the operational activities that PTI and IANA are going to do in this year, and it seems very nice to have them. They now have a strategic plan. They're trying

to attach the operations and the activities to this strategic plan. Next slide, please. One more.

And you see a set of improvements [that will be valid] not only for this PTI and IANA fiscal year 22 operating plan, because some of those improvements are related to the IANA function review that was just concluded. Some of the things that are there are also related to the review. So they began to put some of the activities related to this functional review. Next slide, please.

Anyway, I'm passing these three slides [very quickly] because they are screenshots of the draft operating plan and budget that is already in the Wiki, so nothing new there, I didn't add anything there, it's just to show that there are some activities on operating plan, some enhancements they want to do to the system that looked very nice. They're trying to renew most of the system they already have. Also, they are now spending a lot of money in doing that. They're doing a lot of things with the money they have. Next slide, please.

And this is just a draft I made to have a conversation with you all, and I hope to see hands up and this kind of thing. That's only for having something to discuss. Beyond the appreciation for the opportunity to comment, it's also the inclusion for the sake of transparency for the operational improvement activities and system enhancement, and my only concern is this 30% increase in the budget. So I see the first hand. Very nice. Thank you very much, Cheryl. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Ricardo. I am perfectly comfortable with the PTI budget and the IANA 2022 operating plan. I actually would say that we should not see or articulate that the 30% increase in budget is a concern, but rather, it is a welcome investment in the core business of ICANN, because there are significant investments required to keep what is the core business of ICANN at its best, and that is what this budget is doing and what is seen in the reflection of the expenditure proposals that are also highlighted in the recent review.

So, happy with what's said, but I don't see 30% increase as a concern. I see it as a final revelation for intelligent investment in what is the entity's core business. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I can change this. As I mentioned, this is only to put something in the screen and have a brief conversation, because if we don't put something, nothing happens, it seems, so just to begin the conversation. Hope to see more hands. Go ahead, Nadira.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you. Maybe my concern, not about this, from the earlier, the budget, I noticed for the personnel for the year 22, they have a reduction for the personnel than the expected allocated budget for the 21. So I'm wondering why they anticipate a reduction of personnel budget. Kind of curious. Note that I read the details only from this presentation. I didn't have time to read the budget earlier. Thank you, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Nadira. That's why I took the fiscal year 20 [figure,] because 21, I don't think they have this personnel. They're reflecting a reduction but I don't think this reduction [is real.] If you see fiscal year 20 versus fiscal year 22, you see an increase in personnel that is more or less related to this increase in the budget. The other place they're putting more money is in travel because they are spending money now going to different places to do the KSK rollover. And the other place they are putting money is in the system enhancement. As Cheryl already mentioned, it's very nice that ICANN is investing in their core business.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yeah. Thank you, Ricardo. I remember now from the previous presentation of the change. So they need staff. And maybe by the time 22, the staff will be less. Thank you. It's much more clear now.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thanks for the comment. I see no more comments, and the idea of this comment is to be in the Wiki, so any changes can be made very rapidly. These comments are due for the end of the month. They already asked today to remember to remember to comment for this. So I expect to have this on time to submit a comment from us.

Joanna, please go ahead.

JOANNA KULESZA:	Thank you, Ricardo. This is most informative. And as you guys know, I'm [inaudible] ignorant when it comes to budgeting and reading those tables. So thank you for giving us a recap here. I'm going to be very candid even though I realize we are on the record. I'm curious if looking at this in terms of the prospective comments we might be putting forward, there is any chance—and I'm asking your expert opinion on this—for us to provide feedback on the discussions we've had in terms of volunteer motivation, finding some sort of feed for funding the volunteers we have for At-Large.
	I know it's a touchy subject. I realize it comes down to metrics and who we would fund and based on what criteria. So I understand the challenging part of this. But again, having listened to the discussions we've had around COVID and Zoom fatigue and those things, I'm curious if there's any room for us commenting on these specific issues to try and feed that discussion into the broader conversation. Again, I'm not going to insist on this, I'm just curious if you guys think there's an area for us to try and advocate for that or whether we should just abandon that, because I kept hearing this in the discussions we've had around ICANN 69 and I'm curious if there's an opportunity for us to provide feedback on that. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Wrong budget. Simply enough, Joanna. The place for that is in the ICANN budget and operational plan, not the PTI and IANA ones. It's an arm's length activity, a business unit activity that is the core business of ICANN which has a separate budget, the background of which many of

us can bore you on, but it's basically the wrong public comment to make those points in. That's all.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Anyway, Joanna, we would have a lot of opportunity from I guess November 8th as will come out the ICANN budget up to maybe middle of January. That's the end of the public comment. So we'll have [inaudible] three meetings to remember your words and put some of those in our comments. I see no more hands. Please go ahead with the next one.

The next one is for the IANA naming function review. The same as for the PTI, I tried to put some screenshots of the reports in this case of the executive summary because it's 69 pages there. In the middle of the screen is one that says IANA function review team, in our evaluation of PTI performance, have found that PTI is operating with a great deal of operational efficiency and is serving the needs of the IANA customers. IFRT have identified no major areas of deficiency or operational improvement that PTI hasn't already identified internally or in conjunction with CSC.

So as you can see, some of the improvement we see in the prior slide are related to this final sentence. As you can see from the functional review, it seems PTI is working fine. I [told to] Holly—I expected Holly to be in the call. She's not here at this time. [inaudible]. Holly confirmed with me that they have the same sense that PTI is working fine from the CSC where she is. So it seems it is okay, this function review. Next slide, please.

They basically made four recommendations. This is recommendation one. Recommendation one and two have high priority. These are requesting only that PTI publishes the IANA functions transition plan as required by the IANA naming function contract. Next slide, please.

Recommendation 2, sorry, the priority here is medium. They're also recommending something that is on the contracts that need to be addressed on time. Next slide, please.

Recommendation 3, sorry for screenshot, they have two different screens and it wasn't easy to put in the same screen for me. This is medium priority also. And as you can see here, the way the review team worked was going down with the ICANN bylaws and the contract ICANN has with IANA to perform the functions. And they went, one by one, with these different sections of the bylaws and the contract. So the recommendations they made were the holes they found in this contract between IANA and ICANN. So it's a very nice way to do these things. Please go ahead with the next one.

It's the final recommendation, recommendation 4. As you see, it's a low priority. Again, all these recommendations, these reports, you can see it on our Wiki for the comments for this IANA naming functions review initial report. So you can go there, see the complete report is over 70 pages long, very nicely prepared. Next slide, please.

And here, I tried to do the same thing, to have something to begin the discussion. The idea is not to have this as a comment but to begin a discussion. I expected Holly to help me with this comment. Also maybe [inaudible] see it and support this recommendation that's very simple. I

understand [inaudible] being in the team to support the recommendations, but I'm just saying there just that we encourage the ICANN Board to go ahead and implement these recommendations and also congratulate the functions review for the methodology they used. They show us the methodology in ICANN 69. They have a presentation there. Looks very nice, especially for technical issues. It was a very technical approach for a very technical place of ICANN. It's not maybe the methodology you can use to check ALAC or any other AC, but it looks very nice for the technical recommendations.

And as I mentioned before, this is only a draft comment and I'm not expecting this to be the final one, and I hope to see [inaudible] for this comment and [begin] the discussion because we are like seven minutes ahead if nobody speaks. No hands raised. Would you like to comment or [inaudible] also? Let's go to the next one. Seems to be an easy one.

These are the third task we have today. We have from the thresher found out we have more than 250 recommendations that we have produced in the last years, and it's not easy for us to do a prioritization of these recommendations. Although we started to do something with the ATRT3 in the recommendation thresher session we already had, not maybe in the best way. The idea was to get some spark there to ignite here.

It seems that from [inaudible] the different SOs and ACs working on Work Stream 2 [instead of the] ATRT3. We have Marita in the other side speaking about the multi-stakeholder model. We have Laurin Weissinger talking about SSR recommendations. So we have a lot of recommendations and it seems we can do something like [inaudible]

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Ricardo, Nadira has her hand up.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yes. It is a general comment, not in particular on any of the topics. Because we are discussing from the perspective or we want to provide comment from the individual end users' perspective and not on the overall recommendations, I think it's better to limit—the same way the accountability work party group. Do you think we follow this approach? Then if we want to follow this approach, we can narrow our focus on handling these recommendations and come up with a concrete kind of feedback in general about this. Maybe we'll have a focused kind of reading about these points. This is general comment. Thank you, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Nadira. Go ahead, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you very much, Ricardo. I just wanted to comment on what you had noted about Work Stream 2, and just to provide more detail, several SOs and ACs are currently prioritizing the Work Stream 2 recommendations and they have a goal of identifying by the end of this calendar year which Work Stream 2 recommendations impact their SO or AC and which do not, and then the level of impact or resources that would be needed for implementation, ranked as a high, medium or low. So as ALAC and At-Large have just begun to examine all these

recommendations, there may be a Work Stream recommendations maybe a small team that wishes to focus on this or may wish to look at this first just so that the work is in a similar timeline. But just looking forward to your thoughts and next steps. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Evin. Let's hear Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Ricardo. Totally supportive of going through the exercise for Work Stream 2 as a first step, a prioritized—pardon the pun—exercise in prioritization, and to go through those recommendations to extract and highlight those that have a particular effect on or likely to impinge on the end user perspective. But we also need to do that high, medium and low opinion piece so that the input from the At-Large Advisory Committee based on our work is timely and on par with what is going to be coming in with the other ACs and supporting organizations, noting of course that Work Stream 2 is currently under implementation phasing. So you've got a number of At-Large community members, Sébastien and myself and others like Olivier included, that are still part of the Work Stream 2 implementation—Vanda's here as well—that are working with the Implementation Review Team and that should also be [inaudible].

And at that point, I actually would like to suggest that that is our work between now and the end of the calendar year. I'm happy to have a small team do an initial pass, but I think it has to come back to the committee as a whole for this very critical piece of work.

As to the rest of the prioritization pieces, as you've listed, I also note, Ricardo, that you mentioned breaking up into small teams for, I fear, all of them, and that is where I am going to depart my support. But I'll let you finish your presentation and come back to my concerns on that aspect a little later.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Cheryl. Let's see your comment at the end. Nadira asks, in the next two slides, I will have most of what you mentioned, also for Evin, and if they're not there, I will do the comment. Please go ahead with the presentation, Claudia.

We need to focus on what is important for At-Large, for ALAC, and not only what is important for ICANN. [That] has to be a priority. But our priority has to be the end user, the At-Large community, the ALAC, and try to focus on this kind of thing. Next slide, please.

So the idea, I'm trying to say this is to have maybe small groups, maybe working groups, maybe presentations. The idea is to go back with the people that already worked on this and to give 5, 10, 15 minutes in each of the Operations, Finance and Budget working group meetings.

What I think is the prioritization we must have for these recommendations that are already there. I understand these are a big piece to chew when you go to Work Stream 2. That is 107 recommendations. I was in the transparency group. I was not in the full group all the time. I know there are a lot of people that were in several groups. And maybe for the seven, eight recommendations of each group, there's one that's particularly important for us.

So the idea is more than creating the small groups, we are very few people, some people already committed to this creation and to have this [inaudible] prioritization to keep us on track of what is going on with the different things. For multi-stakeholder model, Marita offered to work with it and to keep us updated on each of the meetings for the OFB, or as many times as needed. Same seems to be for Laurin Weissinger and SSR recommendations. I understand most of them were already implemented and had the rules put in place by ICANN. I would think that something like ATRT3 is more chewable with only five recommendations.

But yes, the idea is to at least have in the next two months, month and a half, a presentation from each of these different working groups, recommendations—I don't know how to call them because there were different approaches, and to give them 15, 20 minutes in the next meeting so to see what do you think should be the priority, the focus for ALAC, At-Large, the end user, to see, to recommend, to keep track, because most of the recommendations were already done to the board. Some were not implemented, some were implemented in a way we don't like, and maybe our priority has to be there, keep telling ICANN Board this is not the way we expected this to happen.

So that's the idea, that's the idea of the discussion. I understand the first one I want to hear is Cheryl with why we must go not with these subgroups.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] Work Stream 2 which as you clearly identified is the lion's share of them, and remember, there were eight tracks in Work Stream 2. Not all of the recommendations have a great deal of effect or concern for the Internet end user, so you get a bit of a good bit of news from that, and I'm perfectly happy for us to utilize the members of the various tracks, and in the case of some of us, the leads of the various tracks to help us work through those focus pieces that a small team with perhaps less vested interest eyes, in other words fresher eyes, might want to put together the list and then we can help triage them.

the reason I'm going to speak against breaking up into small teams for the rest of the prioritization exercise—which is at this stage not quite so time critical because of the Work Stream 2 being the first issue that the other ACs and SOs are taking up and is currently under active implementation, and that things like CCTRT are either being implemented or those that are yet to be implemented or have yet to be finalized through board processes are still exactly that. They're not actually on the triage table yet. So we've got probably until the beginning of the 2021 calendar year to get our teeth into those things.

And at that point, one would assume that the board will have also taken a decision on what is the most critical from this perspective, not most critical of all but most critical from this perspective of the ATRT3 recommendations, and that is the one on prioritization. Now, if the board has the good sense and intelligence—yes, I am biased—to follow quite closely what ATRT3 has recommended regarding prioritization and that it formulates a mechanism to work with its existing infrastructure that has been recently developed to look into these areas and manage these areas of prioritization which comes under Xavier's specific control,

if it takes up what we recommended in ATRT3—which includes to have a cross-community aspect to the mechanism of sifting and sorting these things, then we need to be able to help Alex plug in on behalf of the At-Large community our opinions on it all. And that means we can't, in my view, treat the rest of them—slicing out Work Stream 2—as other than a full set of data.

If we take it into separate sets of data, all we're going to do is replicate through a filter of our own admittedly At-Large interests—and that is the end users' interests—but we're still going to have competing issues on pr and resource allocation between the recommendation groups. And I think if we can avoid that between the recommendation groups discussion and go to and empower whoever's at the table having influence on the final prioritization process, that will be a greatly strengthened point of view. And that's my perspective on it.

So yeah, it wasn't too critical, I hope. But I just don't think it's going to save us any time or gain us any leverage if we break into small groups for the rest of the work, in other words, the non-Work Stream 2 work, noting that, one, if not all, of the ATRT3 ones, will be already done and being implemented by the time we get to that piece of work. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Cheryl. The idea of the small groups is not to have all the work in this working group but to have smaller sets of people, maybe one, two, three, that give us a presentation in the next [15 to 30 days] for the priorities [inaudible] mostly for this.

I don't have in my head the names of all these people, Work Stream 2, ATRT3. As you mentioned already, Sébastien, Daniel, already worked on the ATRT3. I know that you, Alan, Sébastien worked directly in Work Stream 2. I know more people worked there. León as a co-chair, and at the end, Tijani also as a co-chair. I don't know who has the time to do a presentation, maybe in one month from now, month and a half from now, on what they think is the recommendations, the priority they have.

Because if we took these in this working group, I don't think we'll have enough discussions to have these recommendations. Maybe we're going to ATRT4 and still working on Work Stream 2 if we decide to go only in this working group, because we'll have maybe another priority like next week it's ICANN budget, so we go and see this budget. If there's an operating plan, the next year's operational plan was huge. I expect the same for this year.

So that's the idea. I think the work that Justine, those with the SubPro, was great. Each week at the CPWG, she had a presentation. She only needs—I don't know how many people does she have in the SubPro small team working, but she produces a set of slides, in five minutes, she gave us the idea of what's happening with some of the points of SubPro instead of each one in the Consolidated Policy Working Group reading all these thousand pages of the SubPro.

So the idea is having small groups to have a presentation. I know that Marita can help also on the multi-stakeholder model. Laurin can help us on the security, stability review. I don't know who else can help us. I

don't know if you can help us with this ATRT3. Sébastien has his hand up also, let's hear from him.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:　　　Thank you very much. I understand your proposal, Ricardo, but I think Cheryl has a good point that when we will do the prioritization, we need to have one single group of people who think about that, because if we do it piece by piece, we will lose the big question with what is more important for the whole system and then we will have to integrate all those differently.

But if you want to know my point of view about ATRT3, we already gave presentation, and I don't think we need again to give a presentation. And [inaudible] At-Large has four representatives in this group. Four representatives is not just four against 18 people, because at the end of the day, the ones who were working were less than those people, and therefore it's quite strong voicing and working, not just because we had a large mouth but because we were all of the four hard workers and we came with proposals.

And for ATRT3, ATRT3 put prioritization in the five recommendations. And it's just five recommendations because it's important recommendations. I will say Work Stream 2 is a long list, but I the work were done the same way that ATRT3, it may end up to 20 and not hundreds. But who knows. But ATRT3 made recommendations and prioritized them. And I feel that we can [handle] prioritization if you want prioritization by piece. But the question will be how we put those recommendations in-between the Work Stream 2, in-between the

CCTRT and so on and so forth. And it's why if we want to do this work, we must be one single small group to do the work. And for the rest of the intervention of Cheryl, I fully agree with her, and I am sure that the people who are still shepherds of ATRT3 and Work Stream 2 are ready to help. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Sébastien. I don't know if I lost in the translation something Cheryl mentioned. Thanks, Sébastien. I understand it better. As I understand, the idea of Cheryl and Sébastien is not to have different groups but just one group that takes all these recommendations and goes back to the OFB working group [or not to have it at all. I wanted to hear.] Sorry, sometimes I miss in the translations, sometimes my English is rusty, so I miss something in the middle. So [inaudible] if you can go back again and let me know if you think it's better to have just one group [inaudible] OFB working group or not to have any subgroup at all. Yes, please go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Ricardo. I get your point, absolutely. My feeling is that small group to prepare presentation for the whole group could be a good idea, but if you decide otherwise, I will be okay too, but I think some work done by a small group will be much relevant and will be useful for the whole group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I could just jump in after Sébastien.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes. Please go ahead. You were next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm still in an IGF meeting and sometimes which keyboard I'm operating with which hand is an issue. My apologies, Ricardo. I would suggest that in many cases, we could simply look at and use part of existing presentations, because every one of these review teams have presented in many cases throughout and many times to the ICANN community, but also, they've all done webinars, and in the case of our work on several of these review teams, it has plugged in and we've done presentations, and we can reflect back on not only the work that Sébastien's done with ATRT3 in the Consolidated Policy Working Group but prior to that, of course, Jonathan was keeping us very much up to date with the CCTRT. So I think we can probably take from existing material in some cases and simply modify it, distill it down a little for our purposes. So it shouldn't be an onerous task of material preparation.

What we don't want is well meaning volunteers "wasting their time" either doing more than repurposing, trying to recreate material that is already in existence, which will do the job equally well, because we're not changing any recommendations, we're sifting and sorting them. Thanks.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:	Thank you, Cheryl. Understood. So the idea as I understand will be for small groups to work on this priority to reuse a lot of the slides, presentations, webinars already used by the ALAC members in these working groups most of the time, or perhaps the ones who make the presentation sometimes like Jonathan or maybe yourself and Sébastien for the ATRT3. I don't know, I was not very active in ALAC at the Work Stream 2 time frame. I worked a bit in one of the groups but wasn't there to see all the work happening. So maybe it is Sébastien, yourself, Alan or León who has experience and they know from memory what the priorities must be. So I don't know if we can give us maybe a month with this small group and come back with some sort of presentation, some basic draft of priorities [are enough this time frame] with possible members of the small team.
	I know we will have a meeting for the week of November 16th. The idea of this meeting is to have the first impressions for the ICANN budget. Then we will have a meeting the first week of December and the idea there is to have some sort of presentation of the small group. I don't know if Sébastien or Cheryl wish to be in this small group. I don't know if we can add Marita. I don't know if Laurin will be happy to be in such group. I don't know if there is another volunteer for this small group. Sorry, I can't be there, actually, I have a lot of work in my real job, I have to pay the rent also. No hands up for volunteers.
NADIRA AL-ARAJ:	I would volunteer. I would be more as a fresh look, because I never was involved in the Work Stream 2 group.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Nadira. Also thank you very much, Cheryl, for [always being there.] I don't know if we have more volunteers and I don't know if, Heidi, we can send an e-mail to this group asking for volunteers. I don't expect this small group to be that long, but it would at least have four, five people. That's the idea. Sorry, Judith, we are looking for volunteers for a small group.

And I think this is all for today. Next call, as I just mentioned, shall be for the week of November 16th. I expect ICANN operating plan and budget to be placed for comments next week, so for the week of November 16 we might look at the first comments, first review of it. I don't think the numbers will be the important thing once it's more or less flat, but also, the operational plan, and I think it's important to look at the operational plan. Some of the ideas that Joanna mentioned in the intervention are there, are in the operational plans of the activities that ICANN is doing, and we need to check these activities, this plan, because we must be involved in [inaudible]. I have the hand up of Justine. Please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks Ricardo. I had a query. Could you confirm for me, please, the item on slide 14, last one, where it says RPM, seven procedures, can I confirm with you what RPM is? Is it rights protection mechanism?

EN

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: That's correct. For the thresher one, I tried to summarize the different recommendations and procedures that were there, and tried to find out what are the last ones.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. If that is the case, then I would think that RPM is prematurely placed on this list because the final report isn't out yet.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yeah. Sorry for that.

JUSTINE CHEW: It hasn't been approved, whereas the other ones, final reports have been approved by the board and it's gone into implementation. RPM hasn't. It's nowhere near there yet. Thanks.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Sorry for that. My mistake. Yeah, we take them out for the thresher, for the [spreadsheet] and the idea was to show the [spreadsheet] today with all these recommendations and what they mean and the priority [the board] already gave them, and you see Work Stream 2, CCTRT, SSR and ATRT3 are the ones that are [expected.] The idea is to share this spreadsheet and look at what the [board] already—the priority they already gave to these recommendations. Sorry, the priority, no, if they're implemented or not or what they do with these recommendations. It's already [expected that Alperen] [inaudible]. Please go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And I appreciate that we're very close to the end of your hour, Ricardo. I just want to point out, of course, that ATRT3 went through a great deal of effort to sift and sort and report on the validity—or otherwise—going forward and efficacy and usefulness of ATRT2 recommendations, at least those that have not been implemented. And please remember that it's not all the recommendations made, it's only those that are not implemented or substantially implemented or started implementing that will be being put through this process.

So again, we are going to be narrowing down the work, because not enough of that Work Stream 2 has been implemented yet, but there are certain things already on the implementation trail. Those don't need prioritization. They're already committed. Thanks.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yeah. Thank you, Cheryl. I know that some are already implemented. Maybe one of them will not be like the way it was implemented, but yes, the idea is to look at the ones that aren't already implemented because [if these were,] already implemented, there's not much we can do there.

So I don't have any AOB in hand. [Being that it's] 19:00 UTC it's time to end this meeting. I don't have hands up, so thank you very much, everyone, for conversation, for this meeting. Have a very nice day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]