CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group call on Wednesday the 24th of February 2021 at 17:00 UTC.
	On the call today on the English channel, we have Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dave Kissoondoyal, Vanda Scartezini, Joanna Kulesza, Judith Hellerstein, Justine Chew, Marita Moll, Matthias Hudobnik, Ricardo Holmquist, and Sébastien Bachollet.
	On the French channel, we have Aziz Hilali.
	We have received apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Satish Babu, and Nadira AlAraj.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, Amy Creamer, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.
	We do have Spanish and French interpretation available on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are David and Veronica, and our French interpreters are Isabelle and Camila.
	Another reminder that we do have RTT services available on today's call, and I will put a link in the chat for everyone to follow along. Also, please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise, and state your name when taking the floor so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels.
	Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Holly.

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.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you. Could we start with a review of the action items, please? There we are. There's only one outstanding, and I don't think we're going to do that today. So, thank you, and let's go straight into—we've got two really important items on the agenda today. The first is Amy Creamer, and the second one, at the last meeting, some of you will remember—I hope—that [Marita Moll] started talking about the MSM update. She'd had a really good look at the document surrounding the strategic plan and budget, but we didn't have time to spend a lot of discussion on the points that she was raising.
	So I said for today's call, let's go back to those slides and let's have what was becoming a very interesting discussion. So that will be the second half of today. So with that, over to you, Amy. Thank you very much.
AMY CREAMER:	Hi. So Claudia, did you want to go to my new slides, or did you want me to pull them up? Thank you. So I'm going to speak briefly today about the IANA naming function review. Next slide, please.
	I'll talk briefly about the background, the work execution and then the recommendations. Next slide, please.
	So the IANA naming function review is one of the mechanisms that came out of the IANA stewardship transition to ensure accountability and transparency. This is the first IFR, and it will be repeating every five years. It was convened in September 2018, but due to problems finding volunteers for all the seats, we did not start working until December 2019. So the review has taken approximately 14 months

because the IFRT right now has completed their work. Next slide, please.

This is a standard ICANN review cycle. We're still considered to be conducting the review until the Board takes action. Next slide, please. And then here's the review team composition. That's also on the IFR Wiki. The co-chairs were Frederico from the ccNSO, and the GNSO volunteer was Tomslin. Next slide, please.

Okay, so our work execution. Next slide, please. So we conducted the review in accordance with the scope specified in Article 18, and this review is not like other reviews. This is a unique review, it has its own set of bylaws, and very detailed bylaws about exactly what the scope is, what they're supposed to look at, etc. So it differs from the standard review that you're used to.

We were very careful to follow the ICANN bylaws, and it basically centers around reviewing and evaluating PTI's performance against the IANA naming function contract in service of work. So that's the core of the review. Next slide, please.

We set up several starting documents, such as rules of engagement, set up the roles and responsibilities between the review team members, leadership, and ICANN staff who's supporting them. Next. They also had a scope of work, and we ensured that this followed the ICANN bylaws. So it set up what the team's objective was for each scope requirement and how they're going to go about executing it, and what inputs that they should consider, people they should talk to. So it's an extremely

detailed, really, roadmap for how to proceed with their work. Next slide, please.

And then they had a standard workplan which is just basically a timeline, and they actually met their goal of completing this within 14 months. That had been their original goal. So it was a great and positive surprise to meet that. Next slide, please.

So the recommendations. We had four recommendations. The first one was that PTI had not yet published their IANA naming function transition plan as required in the IANA naming function contract. And PTI has actually already completed that. you can find the transition plan on the PTI webpage. It was posted on the 1st of December 2020, and I'll just show you a screenshot of where it is. Next slide, please.

The second recommendation was that while the annual attestation of the PTI president was published, the archives of previous years were not. And the annual attestation is another mechanism that came out of the IANA stewardship transition. It's just sort of a templated attestation of following all the requirements of transparency. So PTI has already completed that one as well. They have put the archives under their agreement archives section, and again, I'll show you a snapshot from the page [where it is on.] Next slide, please.

Recommendation number three actually came from the CSC, and the CSC had identified a duplication of the ICANN bylaws. So let me just show the next page. Next slide, please. In the bylaws, there was one section on the remedial action procedures of the CSC and one on the IANA problem resolution process, and those are actually one and the

same. They call it different names, and that's probably how it got into the bylaws in the first place, but they are actually just the remedial action procedure is what the CSC refers to it currently. So we are suggesting a bylaw change where we remove the redundant section.

And then recommendation four, which is really probably why I'm here today, was to have an amendment to the IANA naming contract, specifically section 7.1 in a statement in regards to a series of the root audit reports that PTI publishes. The statement is that the relevant policies under which the changes are made shall be noted within each monthly report.

We are recommending that this be removed for a couple of reasons. One, this is a legacy statement from the NTIA contract. The NTIA contract preceded the IANA stewardship transition and we moved from that contract to the current IANA naming function contract. And the transition, there's a lot of things going on at the time, and so they basically took the NTIA contract and used it as a template and did some rewriting but they missed this issue. So the reason why the IFRT is recommending that this be removed is—actually, let me move to the next slide because it gives a better visual.

So here's the root operations audit report, so if you wanted to look at them, and it's the report of all of the changes that have been submitted. The contract language is saying that every time a modification is made, which is documented on this report, you have to reference under which policy that modification is allowed.

So there are a couple of problems with this. One is that there are no policies that oversee the modifications. PTI runs by a series of technical documents which is what set up the standards for all of the modifications that can be made, particularly the IETF papers.

So, there is no actual policy to reference. These are actually technical documents. And it's also impractical because there's no single statement within the IETF documents that you could line up perfectly with each modification.

So PTI has never done this, because it's impractical and impossible. So we are suggesting that it be removed, and the review team felt very confident that it was not something that would be missed, it was not something that would be needed, and we've never published it and there's never been a complaint about that.

So this is the recommendation though which is requiring a lot of extra work, because it's a contract change. So let's go to the net page. Oh, and this is just—I showed one of the actual reports pulled off of that page, and this just reiterates exactly what I said. Next slide, please.

So the IFR bylaws have a set of unique requirements if any recommendation requires an amendment to the IANA naming function contract, the service of work or the Customer Standing Committee's charter. This recommendation is making a change to the contract itself. So the series of extra steps that the IFRT had to take according to the bylaws was that they needed to consult with the ICANN Board and they did that on the 11th of December 2020 and there's letter exchanges that are posted on the Wiki and also on ICANN's correspondence table.

They consulted with the CSC on the 16th of September, which was the CSC's regular meeting. They consulted with the community. There's no precise definition within the bylaws, it just says you must consult with the community. So they did it through a special webinar that they held on the 29th of September, and then also, they had a session at ICANN 69 where this was reiterated.

A special public comment has to be held just for that recommendation if it's a contract change, and so I think that's why I was invited here today, because the public comment went live two weeks ago and it's going to end on the 22nd of March.

And then they also need to get approval from the GNSO council and the ccNSO council, so the IFRT co-chairs have already sent a letter to the councils and it's been added to their agendas for the March meeting where we believe that they will approve it. Next slide, please.

So this actually wraps up my presentation. [inaudible] looking for people to please put some input on the public comment. We would prefer to have comments that support it rather than no comments. And everything is tracked very cleanly on the IFR's Wiki as well.

So that's actually the end of my presentation. Oh, I'm sorry, it's not the end. In regards to the projected timeline, so right now we're in February, we're out for public comment. I mentioned in March, the public comment ends. We're expecting the GNSO and ccNSO council to approve it. And then in April, we will be submitting the final report to the Board. At their April Board meeting, they will be taking Board action. And there's one extra item—according to the IFR bylaws, it doesn't

apply to other reviews—is that the empowered community will then have an opportunity to make a rejection action if they want to reject any recommendation.

So I think that this recommendation more than any other recommendation, any other review, has had the most transparency, the most consultations and taken a lot of extra steps to make sure that this has received approval and no disapprovals from the community.

So I'll now take questions. I don't see any questions. Claudia, am I missing any?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Are there any questions? Is everyone confident about that? Amy, what I'm hearing from you is that even though people do not have questions, you would appreciate something from ALAC as a comment, if nothing else to support the recommendations.

AMY CREAMER: Yes. I think in general, it's better to have comments that support it rather than silence, because if there's silence, you don't really know if those councils looked at it, if the SOs, ACs looked at it. So it's always better to have a response from a service organization or other advisory committee, just to prove that they've been reached out to.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. and I have to say, just for the record, I am actually ALAC's representative on the CSC, and I have also had a look at this back in

September. So I think we can actually—I can lead the public comments, which probably at this stage is going to be of support, but our next task is to have a little team to make a public comment on this, and that's something that we can do.

Now, what was the March date that the comment is due?

AMY CREAMER: March 22nd is when it closes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fine. Could we put an action item for the next meeting to have just a discussion? Because I can imagine that we will have a comment and at least consider comment at our next meeting, if that can be the first action item for today. Thank you very much.

If there are no questions and if people are comfortable, I'd like to say thank you very much for the presentation, and we can move on to Marita. But thank you for your time, Amy.

AMY CREAMER: Thank you very much for inviting me. I really appreciate the chance to share the IFRT's work with you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, thank you. That was a very clear presentation, and we have a little task in front of us. The next slide is a slide deck from Marita Moll. Now, as I've said last meeting, we had a presentation from Marita looking at

the issues raised, in particular in relation to the multi-stakeholder model. In terms of if you've looked at the operating initiatives and you look at one of the important ones which affects us, it was objective three about the multi-stakeholder model, and what Marita has done is go through with a fine tooth comb both the documents on the budget and the strategic plan, and raise some really important questions which we really didn't have the time to deal with in the last meeting, but we do have a bit of time, so I thought we would then go back to Marita and her slides and have the discussion that we should have had. So, Marita, over to you. Thank you for your work on these slides.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Holly. That's the last slide. Is that the only slide you have? It is from my updates last night, [inaudible].

CLAUDIA RUIZ: You should be seeing the first page now, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, there's the first page. Can we go to slide five, please? We're not going to go through the whole thing again, [trying to find] what I was talking about last week.

This is a little update. the budget and all the supporting documents that we got, it's a huge document. It's like 350, 400 pages. Maybe when you get used to looking at these, the number of them, you start to see similarities and you only look for differences. I haven't been [inaudible] number of years, so it was all new to me.

But I began to realize that a large portion of it is the budget for—the whole operating plan for '21 to '26—

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Marita, I'm sorry to interrupt you but the interpreters are having a hard time hearing you. Do you by any chance have a headphone or microphone or something?

MARITA MOLL: Okay, I'm just going to get closer. Is that better?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Let me ask. One moment. Much better, yes. Thank you so much.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Sorry about that. Yeah, it's a huge document, as I say, 350 pages, and a large part of it is for the five-year period. So I expect that a lot of it—not all of it—changes all of the time, and a lot of it in the five-year period is aspirations and outcomes, and this is what we want to achieve by the end of the five years.

Then when you really get down to the part of the document that talks about the next year, FY22 in our case, this is the part that I'd kind of like to focus on today, because under the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model, there are the aspirations, the outcomes that we're looking for, which [are pretty motherhood.] We all know what they are, we agree with them.

But what are the activities that ICANN is expecting to do under that file in the next year? So in these next two slides—and there's more than I'm giving you, but they don't all apply to you. Some of them are for ccNSO, GNSO. These ones would apply to us.

I think let's start at the previous slide. This is the beginning of the activities ICANN is proposing under the multi-stakeholder model evolution section. I have six of them. two of them are on the next slide, but let's just look at what these are, because we can't try to talk about what should be done or what's being done or are we evolving, is progress being made, without looking at what they're actually planning to do. and this is how it's phrased.

So, no particular order here, but planning and implementing recommendations re: cross-community working group on accountability and Work Stream 2, the final reports of these two processes, this is something that we expect to see some activity on.

Continuing implementation of outcomes of ATLAS III. That definitely applies to us and has cross-functional work re: collaboration with community on evolving multi-stakeholder model issues, work with community to evolve governance structures and prepare for implementation of Org-approved review recommendations.

So just looking at these four, where might we see we could focus some activity? I think Cheryl has been pretty much involved with the first thing on there, and I think I've heard from other reports and fora that that's moving ahead. There is activity happening on that.

Continuing implementation of outcomes of ATLAS III, I also think I've heard that there's activity happening on that. I don't know whether under those two, we would want to document that activity or somehow have some kind of information about exactly what activity is happening on that or what's missing.

The third one, enhance cross-functional work re: collaboration with community on evolving issues. Well, I don't know what's happening on that. How would we track that? How would we document it? And working with the community to evolve governance structures and prepare for implementation of Board approved review recommendations. Again, these are pretty big. Some of them are pretty big. Some of them, you can pin down a little better. But they're big, and the question to us is, how do we want to kind of build some fences around that so we can talk about it or be able to say, "Yes, we could say that something has been done on that?" I see that Cheryl has put something in the chat, activity ATLAS III is driven by At-Large, so details—yes. So that's a piece of information that we need to attach to that activity so that we can always know exactly—or anybody can know exactly where the responsibility lies and what's being done. So, thank you, Cheryl, for that. That's great, because I think in the end, we need to try to build something that gives us that kind of information, and that was probably one of the easier ones.

I'm going to just stop here for a second and see if there's any feedback on what I've said so far. "Wording of fourth bullet is wrong, should not be prepare but rather implement." I kind of had to truncate some of that. I'll check that, Alan. It's totally possible. It was late last night after a lot of meetings.

I don't see anybody with hands up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Go ahead, Marita, but I think what I'm hearing or what I'm seeing and feeling is the documentation of this stuff needs to be collected somewhere so that actually, we understand whether or not we've done these things and what's outstanding. So I think this is really a very useful slide and something that ALAC needs to have a look at and at least either say we could tick this off and here's the documentation, or it's an action item for ALAC. So I'm very grateful for these slides, and let's move on, but let's keep in mind that there are question marks after all of these. If nothing else, to document that it's done or not done, and have a work plan to do it.

So go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Exactly, Holly. The whole point is that we're going to see this again, and [we don't] want to start at the beginning now next time this comes around and say, "Oh, man, we need to document this stuff." This is our time to get ahead of the curve here and to know what's being done, and then be able to ask the questions or see where the gaps are. We don't do this, we won't be able to track any of that stuff, and I guess sooner rather than later, start putting some of the information together.

Next slide, please. There's just a couple more on this list of activities. Next slide, please. Okay, yeah, so there's this one here, formalized collaboration work among leaders, and whether or not that's being

done, we should be able to find out if it's being done. I think Maureen will probably be able to give us some information and what is being done and whether or not she's happy or whoever is chair is happy with that kind of work, is it moving us ahead.

And of course, the last one is straight in our bailiwick here, in our wheelhouse, support At-Large in advice development, which includes drafting, research and facilitating. And a lot of that is being done all the time. It's being done every time we have a meeting by our great staff. So I think we might be able to say we couldn't do this without them on top of that. But it's another part of the puzzle.

So these are the pieces that I've taken out of the activities that are listed in FY22, and suggesting that we could let these out a little bit and see where it goes. Next slide, please.

I wanted to show you that in the FY22 section on this, it tells you how ICANN is tracking this stuff. So they're tracking it with membership tracking and other metrics. So we're talking numbers here. implementation of Board approved recommendations, those are not numbers but that could sort of be tracked. A bit more difficult. And metrics related to public comment proceedings. Again, that's numbers. Community activity indicators that track global participation, reports and statistics.

One of the things we said in our response to this is that we really encourage more than collecting of numbers, that yes, we need the numbers but we need also to have ways of asking what these numbers mean, are these numbers really where we think they should be?

So that was part of our submission, and I guess we'll also have to keep that in mind when we're looking at this [inaudible] trying to move this ahead, get our documentation going.

HOLLY RAICHE: Marita, could you move a little bit more close? Because you're starting to fade. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Holly. I'm moving away again. So about the tracking, we need to do a little more than collect the numbers, and as I was saying, we already said this in our response to the budget. So now we're kind of bound to paying attention to that and implementing that ourselves, looking for ways to look beyond the numbers that are collected. Next slide, please.

That's the one I think we were looking at at the beginning. So here we are, that's what I've been saying. We have to figure out ways to show that these activities are moving forward or not. This is the budget that has been allocated over five years. It's between $3 and 5.5 million. So that's the low and the high numbers that you're given.

And also, the other piece of information that we're given is that they are including one headcount for a project manager and advice and funds for implementation relating to the recommendations and outcomes, and that's from the FY22 budget. It's very general, but we can keep that in mind, that there are some funds there relating to implementation if we

think that there's something that we would like to do that requires some funds.

That was my presentation for today. Let me see. I haven't got the chat on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Marita, Cheryl has made a lot of comments. After Cheryl, I'm going to open it up for questions and comments, and then we'll continue from there. But Cheryl, do you want to have a discussion with Marita about some of the recommendations that have been made and from your knowledge, where we're up to, if we're indeed up to anywhere?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Holly. I was putting in the chat very much line by line, I suppose, I think it was slide 8 or 9 of Marita's very useful presentation, you noted that—as Marita noted in her chat—that my comment on the ATLAS III activity, that is up to us to manage, to publish and indeed to report on, so totally our remit for that.

I noted then that the Work Stream 2 implementation is a Board-Org commitment, and I have indeed this along with the other results of implementation regarding any of the cross-community working group or review team recommendations has already been undertaken to be put in a continuous recording mode, regularly updated, a new dashboard set up for the purpose. Haven't seen it come out other than rough drafting at this stage, but there is an ICANN-wide commitment to

improve and move away from mere numbers. All of that, of course, was picked up in ATRT3's recommendations, which was very specific about the way that any number of things were reported on by the Org in particular, but the Board and Org in general.

So with the implementation yet to come for ATRT3 recommendations, they will all be subject to a—hopefully—better way of us seeing things. And then obviously, the last one which was the collaboration one, the cross-ICANN entity collaboration one, at least in my view—certainly not my experience, because I haven't experienced much collaboration between too many other parts of ICANN—I live and hope—is one where that will be very much activity-based. So we should all be seeing it. One would assume that each of those incidences will be, however, reportable. And that was paraphrasing what I'd written. Thank you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Do we have any other hands up? Marita, your hand is up. Go ahead. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Holly, thank you. Cheryl, thanks very much for that. I will take all of your comments and slot them in where I think they work. But the thing that occurs to me at this point is how do we kind of articulate the work that we're doing with the work that ICANN, ICANN staff is doing? We're not them, we don't want to duplicate what they're doing. So that's another issue here, is that I'm sure that they must be doing some tracking. And does anybody have any suggestions on how we can find out what

tracking is being done and how it's being done while it's being done and not at the end of the line saying this is what we collected?

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't see hands, but Marita, where I would like to go from here, I'd like to take these slides offline, go through them carefully and see what steps have to be taken so that we can tick these off and say they're done or it's ongoing and we have a process to monitor it. As Cheryl points out, some of this is not necessarily in our remit, but we ought to figure out whether we can track it or not. Some of it is in our remit. Some of it may be easily done.

For example, with ATLAS III, that's something that was tracked, and it's a pity that Olivier is not on the call, because he was in charge of the ATLAS project, and it would be good to go back to him and say, could we actually just have a statement, either everything's been done or not? and something that we can track. But it seems to me this is not just this working group. This is a whole of an ALAC. Where are we up to with the multi-stakeholder model objectives as you've spelt them out? And in fact, another comment that I would make is there's a budget, and there's no tying of that budget except for saying one headcount and some funds. But other than that, I don't see where we've actually tied a budget that we ostensibly have or that ICANN Org has with activities. So to me, it's almost a separate activity, but what are we doing to either make sure that's spent on what you've indicated or not? And it hasn't been done.

So, do you want to go through these again and see for recommendation to ALAC as in general how we might document these things? Because these are important objectives, and it would be nice to be able to say, "Yes, we've done them," or, "No, we haven't done them. This is how." And obviously, Cheryl and Alan are part of that.

But how do you want to proceed from here? Because I think it's really important to track these objectives and make sure we're doing them. But what's your suggestions? And maybe we can take these to ALAC.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Holly. I agree, but I think it may be a little bit early to get this stuff into ALAC and say this is what's being done, because it's still early in the budget year. I think maybe what might be useful is getting to people like Olivier—let's invite Olivier to one of our meetings and ask him to maybe let us know what's being done around that and some suggestions he might have of if there's any gaps, talk to Maureen about the collaborative one, formalized collaborative work among leaders.

And there are some of the things like Cheryl has already suggested that are being handled in different ways. So we could maybe start, at every meeting, trying to pick up a little piece of this and maybe have a goal in two or three months to have something that we can actually take to ALAC and discuss it there and see what else we could do. How about that?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that works for me. I'm just reading the chat. The new tracking reporting proposed is very much designed to avoid [end-of-year] activity reporting, but we haven't seen it. My suggestion is we should see it and it should be put in place.

So I think from here—and I think your idea, Marita, of having just a small team work through objective by objective and either say yes, that's been done and documented, or no, it's not been done and these are the steps that need to be taken, and then have a report back at every meeting to say this is how we're progressing through—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My hand's up.

HOLLY RAICHE: To work through. Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What on earth are we doing? And I've been around for a few years. I think I understand a few of the basics at least. And at the end of Marita's presentation, I thought I knew what was going on. I am now totally lost. I have no idea what your objectives are, what you're trying to achieve, and to what purpose the volunteer time is going to be spent.

I've heard terms that are meaningless, I've heard wishy washy let's meet, let's greet, let's whatever, in time frames that make no sense, and I am honestly [aghast] at what it is that you're trying to get me to

understand, because I've never thought of myself as either an uninformed or stupid person. You fix that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm very baffled by that comment, because I don't think anybody called you stupid and I don't think anybody called you anything. I think what I said—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am clearly stupid, because I cannot understand where it is this group is heading on this task now. So I'm calling myself out, and I honestly am totally disconnected with what seems to be going on.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Cheryl, I think we're feeling our way here. Honestly, there's no game plan, and we're trying to figure our way through this. I see that you've put [up a new tracking and reporting proposal] that's very much designed to avoid—so we need to see this, right? I don't know about this new tracking and reporting system. So some people have some knowledge and other people have a lot more, and I guess we're just trying to pull all that together. There's no game plan, but we're just trying to figure out how we can figure out whether or not these activities are moving forward, because if we don't know what's going on inside, then we won't know what's missing. That's the problem. So it's all pretty amorphous, I agree. So nothing hard and fast for sure.

HOLLY RAICHE: No.

MARITA MOLL: Is that helpful? I hope.

HOLLY RAICHE: And I'm puzzled by the statement, "It has not been released yet. So yes, we need to see it." I don't know what you're referring to there, Cheryl. When do we—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The tracking document, the tracking method that Marita literally just referred to. As she was referring to it, my text was it hasn't been seen by anyone yet. It has not been used yet. It is an implementation undertaking as a result of several things, not the least of which is the ATRT3 recommendations accepted by the Board.

                          ATRT3 worked very closely with the multi-stakeholder model activities. We shared several of our tasks, and we walked them back together again.

                          One of the things that we spent a lot of time looking at was the effectiveness of all of this, an outcome of which will be a new way—yet to be seen, absolutely—to look at not at end of project and activity but during project and activity tracking. It should solve any number of problems, some of which Marita's focus has been on.

I am saying, simply, that we cannot know what we don't know yet. When we see it, then we will have something to respond to. Is that clear enough?

HOLLY RAICHE: It's absolutely clear in the sense that there is a process in place to do some tracking. Now, are you telling me that the ATRT3 tracking is going to address everything that has been identified by Marita's slides?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Everything that is in Marita's slides, with the exception of those specifically called out, such as collaboration between different parts of ICANN, things that relate to tracking of progress of activities and the success—or otherwise—of stated objectives under the strategic planning document, yes. It is not ATRT3 tracking, it was a Board-accepted recommendation that ATRT3 made to improve everything that is under that topic covered with Marita's slides.

HOLLY RAICHE: So what I'm hearing from you is there is a method not yet apparent or not yet realized to do some tracking of some of these activities. What I'm also hearing from the slides and from you is that doesn't cover all of the points that Marita raised, which are important points. And what you're saying is there is a response to some of what Marita has suggested as outstanding and we don't have answer to. You've provided an answer to some—not to all—so I would go back to Marita and say, we still have to look at what she's pulled out—because this is all part of

the multi-stakeholder model, and that's all of us—and we need to say what's being tracked, what's not. And you've also identified what isn't being tracked, and that's collaboration, and it may be that for collaboration, we sit down and say, well, this is an objective. Are we doing it? How are we going to measure it?

So Marita, I go back to your suggestions and say apparently some of these, there's a plan ahead for these to be tracked—not yet in place—and let's identify what is not being tracked, what will not be tracked, and how we're going to count it.

S oi still say, first of all, thank you for the slides, because I think it's really useful to see in the documentation, in the ICANN org documentation, what they expect of us. And I think it's very appropriate to say, well, have we done it, and are we doing it, and how are we doing it?

So I still say—and Cheryl, you can be part of this—what have we done and what have we not done, what have we got a handle on or not? And I'm still of the view that it would make a lot of sense to at least look at these and say this is going to be covered by a process that's not yet complete, but others aren't. And we have a budget, and in the budget papers, as Marita has pointed out, there's money allocated. There's the low, medium and high budget allocation and that money is not tied to anything. So it does raise the question, in ICANN Org's view, what should we spend that money on to achieve the objectives if we haven't already?

So that said, Marita, what I would like to do is to understand what is left of these activities that have not been covered by, if you will, other

tracking, and what we've still got to do. And I think Cheryl has identified certainly—well, ATLAS III I know there is a matrix and I've seen it many times before on what has or hasn't been done. It would be good to be able to say, has everything out of ATLAS III been done or not? So that we're not carrying things over from one ATLAS to another.

I also think collaboration is another thing that we need to think about. So we've still got a job ahead in just going through and asking Cheryl and others, objective by objective, what do we have to do. And yes, I'd like you to be part of that.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Holly and Cheryl and everybody. This has really moved the discussion a lot further. Now, understand that what I've put here, I didn't invent this stuff, these are the activities listed in the budget that ICANN says are going to be undertaken. And all we're trying to find out is, have they been undertaken? Maybe ICANN is planning to do this on its own. I'm working a little bit in the fog here because I don't know the answer to these questions.

A lot of this stuff has been really useful. Some of it is definitely underway. And we knew what when we started. But I think this is a good place to go back to the drawing board, take what's come to this meeting and maybe put it all together and see where we are next time. How does that sound,

HOLLY RAICHE: It sounds like an excellent plan. Thank you, Marita. And first of all, thank you for your time reading through the 300+ pages, and thank you for pulling out this stuff. My suggestion—I will talk with Maureen about it—is have a look and see what has been done and hasn't been done, because I know that certainly—and what's she's talking about, tracking what we're doing and making sure that we're doing either what we're supposed to do or we don't think the objective makes any sense anymore or whatever. but I think that that's an action item [you and] I can take and we can talk with Maureen about how to progress this.

But look, you've put a lot of time and thought into this, and I certainly appreciate it. So, thank you. Now, what we've got here with three minutes left on this call are, when is the next meeting? And can we go back to the agenda, please?

Thank you. Okay, when is the next meeting? And I would suggest, first of all, is there Any Other Business? There being none, the next meeting, shall we make it in two weeks' time? And Marita, you and I and Maureen can talk about where we're going to with your slides. We also have to look at a response to the two—whoever's speaking is just breaking up.

MARITA MOLL: That's me, Holly. I wanted to say something under Any Other Business.

HOLLY RAICHE: Go for it.

MARITA MOLL: I put it in an e-mail somewhere, but I noticed that the unaudited financial statements for the first quarter of this year have been released, and because we're an Operations, Finance and Budget-group, we ought to look at that. And maybe we ought to get somebody in to walk us through it so that when we come up to the full budget at the next end of the fourth quarter, we will already have started and we won't be stating from scratch like it seems like that's how we do it.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's a terrific idea. Do you think we should meet next week to do that?

MARITA MOLL: Well, I don't know how urgent it is. We've got a big meeting coming up. Just before the next one comes up, we'll look for a place that we could have somebody from Finance just walk us through that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Shall we not set the next meeting but actually you and I can work through whether we need to meet next week or not? And we also need to have comments made in response to the IRT review. If nothing else, a sentence that says we've seen the review, thank you very much. So there are really two outstanding items.

Why don't we have an offline discussion and tentatively put the meeting down for two weeks' time, but I don't think it's urgent for the IRT review before then, but if it is urgent for the budget item, then we can set it for a week. Okay?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: The planning is also having a meeting during prep week, and perhaps they might also focus on this and we should be prepared for that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, Judith, are you saying that means we should meet in a week's time, or is two weeks sufficient?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That's the problem, I think maybe we should meet in a week's time because as I've noticed on some of these meetings, it's only At-Large people coming to these planning meetings, most of the time it's At-Large people, and we should have a good number of questions because no one really asks questions. So that's just a thought.

HOLLY RAICHE: All right. Why don't we tentatively say two weeks' time, but you and I can tic-tac offline as well as with Marita and decide if we need a meeting in a week's time. Okay?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Holly, just wanted to let you know, as Heidi indicated in the chat, in about two weeks, we will be in prep week, March 8th—

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I'm just realizing that. We better meet next week, because we have to actually make a comment, decide what we're going to say, if anything, and we need to do something about having a look at the budget. And you're right, if it's prep week, it's going to be too busy anyway.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right, and planning is having a meeting then, so we want to be prepared for the meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Okay. Judith, I think you're right. A week's time would be fine. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, Holly, so for the record then next Wednesday, March 3rd at 17:00 UTC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. Thank you so much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Thank you to Amy, Marita, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: We have a problem. Joe Catapano—when we have the Work Stream 2 prioritization team call at—I forget what time it is.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: 7:00 PM UTC. [17:00].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, 17:00. And then Joe Catapano has North American Advisory Group meeting, his first one, at—what was it, 13:00? So I think we could meet at—but then we're going to—I guess 12:00 would be—so yeah, I guess 17:00 is free, but we have meetings scheduled right afterwards too.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's all right. I always try to end on time, and in fact, we're three minutes over.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to be sure—and I've put it in the chat—I have already a call at 17:00 UTC, therefore I'll not be able to join.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh, yeah, EURALO.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And other EURALO people will be [to the] call. But go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. So I'm hearing that at one minute to the hour, I should say it's been lovely talking to you. Thank you. Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, so we're not going to have EURALO on our calls then, because they'll be on another call, unless we move a time.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: We can move to 16:00.

HOLLY RAICHE: We're not moving this any earlier, I can tell you right now.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay, no, I'm just saying because of the conflict with Sébastien.

HOLLY RAICHE:	I know. At this point, let's not waste this call with that, and we'll work through a time. But otherwise, the time is as it is.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Yeah, unless we can move the Work Stream small priority call and then use that 2:00 slot.
HOLLY RAICHE:	No, we're not moving this time. We can work through this. But are you saying you cannot make this time in a week's time?
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	I can.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Fine. Thank you. And Cheryl obviously can, and Marita can, and everybody else can. So we'll leave it at this time. Okay?
CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Great. Thank you all. This meeting is adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]