CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the OFB working group recommendation prioritization subgroup call on Wednesday the 26th of May 2021 at 18:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Vanda Scartezini, and Sébastien Bachollet.
	From staff today we have myself, Claudia Ruiz.
	Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name for the transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Cheryl.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you, Claudia. Apologies for everybody who may have had a problem with the link. Apparently the one in the agenda, if you dig that far like Olivier does, is correct, but the one in the calendar invitation is not. So Claudia is going to make the magic happen to ensure that that doesn't happen again, but that's why we're starting just a couple minutes late.
	This is a rinse and repeat agenda for the ATRT3 recommendations. We've got Vanda joining us. It may be that Daniel has fallen foul of the same technical glitch, so we'll hopefully see him if he gets to his emails, etc. to see the change. Vanda is with us and Sébastien will be, as usual with the ATRT3, taking us through the rationale and in a perfect world, we will be finishing the ATRT3 recommendations today.

I am assured that all of the action items are complete, but let's have a quick look at those just to double check. Hang on, there's one there with Alan Greenberg's name.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you should flog him and take him out of this meeting and not allow him ever back again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I shall have a brown bootlace delivered for the method of his own choice of self-[inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Does that mean I never have to come to one of these meetings again also?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, not at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we may even be finished if we finish ATRT3.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, there is this multi-stakeholder model and overall one to do. So no, we're going to make you do double duty. You have to not only attend, you're going to have to listen to the recordings as well.

Okay, so we do have one outstanding one. Alan is going to attend to it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course I will.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Eventually.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eventually.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Let's get out of this slippery slope quickly, back to the document. Thanks, Claudia. And we will be looking at the tab ATRT_version 2. With that, we should find the last green line, and I'm going to hand it over—

ALAN GREENBERG: On line 84, or 83.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. We'll remove the green so we can actually read it eventually. And Sébastien, if you can talk us through recommendations [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Cheryl. We are in recommendation 2 about assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations, and it's

quite clear that we didn't find the same level of real implementation as the staff were telling us, and we think that it's important to review the ATRT2, but we need, of course, to put it under prioritization because life has passed and evolution arose in ICANN.

But here, we have the situation where we need to go through the ATRT2. What a little bit struck me is that the Board notes however that as a formal matter, the bylaw reserve for ATRT3 or other future ATRTs a role of final assessment of the completion. That means that we think that ATRT2 was not totally implemented, ATRT3 says you need to do it, and now it's ATRT4 who will say, "Oh, maybe ATRT2 was not totally implemented." I think we have a little difficulty here about how we can streamline the process.

But nevertheless, my proposition is for this item, medium, moderate and medium. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Let's go to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since this is a combination of things, I think medium medium medium is as good an answer as any. I do have a question, though. During your deliberation, did you have any thoughts on why we seem to have a continual ongoing problem with all the review that ICANN's evaluation of their work is always better than the next review committee's evaluation of the work? That seems to indicate an inborne problem that really needs to be addressed.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, we discussed that. And if you look at some of the recommendation, there is something about the fact that we need to have all these recommendations and the decision by groups or community groups in one place to be sure where they are and to know what is the decision of the Board and of the Org, and the second point, it's a position of the fact that we will have shepherds for each and every one of those recommendations. Therefore, it can't be totally [going nowhere.]

And we have seen that, for example, for Work Stream 2, we had a long time with no work and suddenly it came back. But it was also because of the pressure of the shepherds on that issue. And I guess it's the way ATRT3 feels that it could be enhanced for the future, the validation by Org what it's done or not done. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sébastien. Let's see what Vanda says as well. Alan, there are a couple of approaches that we've taken in ATRT3 that will probably help. Vanda, did you want to comment?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, indeed, I believe Alan and Sébastien just said what we discussed on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. One of the other things, I think, Alan, that we need to recognize here is that the prioritization exercise in itself is part of the double checking and remediation of this issue. Unfortunately, the time passed between any recommendation being made—including those from previous ATRTs—staff believing it is or isn't implemented to whatever degree, depending on what the Board did or didn't approve, and that's where the clarity of what is done and how it is reported in an appropriate dashboard, a one-stop shop and more regular updates and all those sorts of changes will help that also, as things change, as requirements change, as stuff simply overtakes some recommendations for example, some recommendations will never get implemented because an alternate mechanism to deal with the same issue may very well have been brought into play. So it's tidying all of that up that comes through with the prioritization exercise that we're going through right now ourselves. So there's a whole bunch of things in play to improve this going forward.

I recognize what Sébastien is saying, however, with the not handing it to ATRT4. I think there is enough major change out of ATRT3 recommendations that if they are all put forward and in practice and effective and there are regular community updates, we shouldn't be in the same position as we've been with previous ATRTs. That's why, even though it's a low priority from ATRT3 itself, it's still, in Sébastien's proposal—and I'm very much in support of that—a medium moderate medium outcome. Olivier, did you want an opinion as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: And then I'd like to get back in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No opinion on that specific ... I'm happy with the way you're describing it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I just want to make it clear I'm not worried about the fact that the world changes and some recommendations are not implemented or they are a low priority and they're deferred. And what Sébastien is talking about, the shepherds should help, assuming the shepherds actually are actively involved. We're not going to talk about my RDS review where I'm the shepherd and haven't heard from anyone in a year and a half.

I'm not worried about the fact some aren't done and the world changes and all those things. My concern is ICANN's putting green in a box where for instance nothing was ever done, but they grasp at straws to make it look like they did something and seem, to someone who isn't looking at it carefully, that it's done. It's not the decision to not do something, it's the obfuscation of not doing anything by pretending it was done and hoping no one looks at it in detail. And that I found regularly in many of the reviews.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Interpretation [inaudible]. Understood, Alan, and that's not—as someone who's done a fair few reviews—an unusual circumstance [inaudible]. But ATRT3 has put a bit of a circuit breaker on that as well in as much as it was the first review team to ever also operate under what other review teams are going to be expected to operate under in the future, and that is also where you have clear and unambiguous guidance in terms of metrics, achievability, timing, all of those sorts of things from the SMART style.

And to be quite honest, some of the previous recommendations, while well understood by the people who made them, one assumes, were practically impossible three or four years later for anyone to know what it was that they were after specifically. So quite often, interpretations had come into play, and only those with the history or the deep dive knowledge could establish that, oh, no, this is not at all being done because this is what was meant and this is what was thought. None of that should happen going forward, because to make a recommendation going forward, has to fit different criteria which are far more measurable and able to be better managed from a project point of view. Now we have Olivier, so I'll go to him and then come back to you, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. When reviewing the ATRT2 recommendation implementation, was the ATRT3 provided with the same type of undecipherable super deep table, or was there a better way found to help with the evaluation and the presentation of the data?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We were presented with a table. It had been an ongoing dashboard development as well as a report. We found the traditional [inaudible] that Alan was referring to that had occurred, but we also had the luck, I guess, of assigning to various of our ATRT members and with quite strong staff support the ability to deep dive in many cases because they were involved in the actual development of the last lot of recommendations. So we did have a better chance of having that auditability, but that was by accident as opposed to design, and it's the design part that has changed going forward. Alan, do you want to get back in the queue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really. I guess my concern is more the attitude in staff that their job is to make things green as opposed to addressing the issues.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's very clearly not the case.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that attitude doesn't get fixed just by process. Let's go on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But it does by having things designed in a way that that is minimal. Part of that is the measurability, the timeliness, the specificity of the recommendations, etc. and having the much more transparent and regular updating, especially involving shepherds where you have people who do have the knowledge and understanding of what was intended.

And I understand that you as a shepherd haven't been contacted, but note Sébastien did also mention the rather long amount of time between Work Stream 2 shepherds being created and acted on, and I think that's more of a capacity of what's happening in terms of Org and going forward, and our prioritization exercise comes back into play there, because we now have the new department, the various commitments, the budget allocations, etc. for Work Stream 2. In other words, we're designing a model that is far more likely to succeed than ever before. Does it need to be reviewed again? Yes. ATRT4 or an ensuing one will have the joy of doing that, but also continuous improvement and the holistic review will pick up various of these pieces. So there's going to be a continuous observation as opposed to an, "Oh dear, four or five years have gone past, let's have a look."

Are we all now perfectly happy with the medium, moderate and medium classification on all of this? I believe we are, and if so, let's move on. Back to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, I believe we are done. I had one suggestion related to Work Stream 2, but I think it's not needed to be discussed here because we have Work Stream 2 and it's now in the end and really priority for ICANN, therefore I don't think this suggestion must stay. But we have done all the job for ATRT3, it was the last recommendation we were supposed to—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Can you please share the [inaudible] with Work Stream 2? Because there's a generic discussion that I think we also need to have now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Its suggestion Work Stream 2 seven, improve staff accountability. It's not a joke, Alan, because I feel the question you raised is exactly this one. It's how we have staff accountable to what they do, really, and not what they don't do really. Therefore, I don't think we need to discuss it under ATRT3 but more generally in Work Stream 2 and how we improve staff accountability.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sébastien. And yes, there is that interplay between a couple of these moving parts. Regarding interplay—and it's because of ATRT3 being, I think, a pivotal piece of work—and yes, I am biased—that I wanted to raise the following generic point just to get your feedback on, and that is, whilst the ATRT3 recommendations will go in the mix with all the other recommendations—and we know that Work Stream 2 ones are getting greater attention at the moment [inaudible] various of the other pieces out of, say, CCT RT and indeed RDS and SRT are getting variable prioritization just organically from Org because of either interactions or focus because of other projects going on or moving. For example, things to do with DNS abuse and the subsequent procedures outcomes for new gTLDs. There's an interplay there which means some of those things will be getting attention [inaudible] etc. earlier than others. And we recognize that this change of method and prioritization

exercise is in itself an important change that will hopefully see far les of this huge shopping list of associated and unassociated recommendations going forward in a much tidier and more organized and capable of modification set being dealt with in a transparent and community-based way.

However, I believe that we should ensure that whoever is bringing this list to the table and representing the views of the At-Large community and ALAC in particular needs to push anything that is associated with ATRT3 as an ordinant or uber priority over just about everything else.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, thank you. I think what we have done here going through all those recommendations, maybe except the multi-stakeholder model, but we will see how we will handle that, give us this global view of what is happening with all the review recommendations.

On one hand, I'm quite happy that Work Stream 2—as shepherd of Work Stream 2—is taken care by staff, but I feel that the arguments to take that as the priority, it's for me weak. Yes, it was done for the IANA stewardship change, but now life passed and from my point of view, it must be taken with the other recommendation and see what is the more important for ICANN, even considering the IANA stewardship transition.

I don't feel that there are things who are in Work Stream 2, some are not so important anymore now, and I agree with you that ATRT3, some of them are quite, I will say, more important even that Work Stream 2 [inaudible] because we were not working with the same topics, the

same goal and at the same time. Therrefore, I would like very much that we as At-Large and hopefully ALAC will push, even before that we do everything on Work Stream 2, that we start some of the ATRT3 recommendation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Can I have comments from Vanda and Olivier as well? Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, I don't have much comments on that. I believe while we have done all those things in the ATRT3, we have discussed most of this, so I believe we could go further, more quickly on that, because among us, I believe we agree mostly with the positions that Sébastien is raising here. So even Alan and Olivier that have not participated in that, they have the same alignment with us. So that's the comment I have, because we can go quickly on that because we in certain way agree among us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Olivier, can I have input from you, please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Haven't got very much to add. I think that—I haven't kept my ear as close to the ground as I used to in the past on these issues. I have a feeling that things have improved with time. So I'm not so sure that the issue is still as strong today as it ever was before. And it's actually—part of my questioning with regards to the previous

section on ATRT3 and the question on how staff was sharing the information, and the point that was made that sometimes you feel that there is a push for the tick the box, green box scenario thing, I have a feeling that—and I might be wrong on this—the philosophy has improved and that it's not so much tick the box anymore as it was with the previous CEO. So it looks to me as though this is slowly fixing itself. That's the feeling that I have. Whether to keep pressure for that, I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. I appreciate that. What I would like to then—with your agreement, and to some extent it plays into some of the—well, they're not quite recommendations, they're laudable aims identified in the multi-stakeholder model, which is still the bit that we need to look at next, the ATRT3 work is very broadly encompassing recommendations, broadly encompassing their wide-reaching and in many cases, they are overarching and systemic in nature. And because of that, they should not be queued, in my very biased view, in some sort of aged or maturity or how long ago something ended versus something was reported on versus something that the Board has approved [inaudible] but rather, they should be of a high ordinance in priority overall and run in parallel, if not in front of, other activities, either planned or currently ongoing.

And what I'd like to happen, if possible, is if someone who is far more capable of articulate and coordinated activity than I am right now, could capture the essence of what I just said then as a note that we can also empower whoever gets the job of brokering all of this information. I

think we need to make sure that he work of ATRT is still an overall first if not fast-track parallel activity with all of the other things going on.

And as I believe Sébastien has said previously, if things do not get in the preparedness and planning process for things like the upcoming holistic review and the work feeding into that on continuous improvements, then the system that we envisage is fragile and may fail. But with all of this improvements, if it's managed, if it's nurtured and if it's run well, we now have a department devoted to doing that which has access to resources to do so. That should work, but we just need to make sure everyone understands that. Olivier, thank you, over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. What you were saying here has reminded me of some in the community saying there are too many reviews, we have to cut down on the review thing, the review cycle, this organization is suffering from reviewititis, as they might have called it. And the difficulty, of course, if we have less reviews, then we will have the problem with the way the organization evolves. It will continue to evolve but it needs to be kept in check, just for a simple reason in that if it doesn't get kept in check, then you do end up with the potential morning where suddenly we wake up with a specific stakeholder group or groups having pulled the organization towards a different angle than the angles that ensure a fair and equitable multi-stakeholder organization and debate, and this is one thing we need to be absolutely clear about.

ATRT is indeed that thing that brings the checking on the accountability and transparency of the organization, and is the one that needs to be really very much defended, I think, in the face of others. I know our community find it particularly important, but some other communities might not.

And here comes then the concern that I do have, which is that often these days with the new ICANN, as in post-the IANA stewardship transition in ICANN accountability, often, the Board and leadership have been saying, "Well, if the community wants this, we will just do it the way the community wants it." And by, "If the community wants it this way," they effectively mean the ones that are most vocal about things, and often, it is not us that are most vocal about it. So we do have to keep quite careful about that and make sure that it's engrained in ICANN that these ATRT will continue to happen and will be given the same importance as it has thus far. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, and that's very much in keeping with discussions we had in ATRT3. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl, and thank you, Olivier. Yeah, definitely. The question of the number of reviews, at the core or at the heart of what we discuss in ATRT3. And what struck me is that we suggest to postpone or even to close some review, and as it was under the responsibility of ATRT3. And we were very careful. We say, "Okay, it could be review by next ATRT." That means that we don't close them totally but we explain why we

think it's not needed in the near future. And incidentally, oh no, all those ones, we need to have them. Therefore, we are in a total contradiction here. We want less but nobody wants to give up any reviews. Therefore, we take our responsibility and we put on the table that we need to wait—if not stop—for SSR, for RDS and only one for CCT to go after the possible next round of TLD.

And I agree with you, ATRT, it's central, but I feel that the second point, to take into account what you ask for, that means that we didn't go in a direction where the organization one day suddenly wake up with somebody taking care of everything or a group taking care of everything, it's one of the reasons of the proposed holistic review and it's why it's so important that we start soon on that.

And the other way we decrease the number of reviews is to ask each SOAC and so on to take care of themselves. If they want help from outside, they will have help from outside, but it's not anymore a review each five years but it's a continuous improvement. And that's an important idea that Cheryl brings to the table, this continuous improvement, it's something we need to get understood by each and every So and AC and why holistic review is so important to start as soon as possible. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Well noted. Go to Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. It's interesting to remark that this continuous improvement is something that was raised by [inaudible], this member of the Board more than eight years ago, and still we have inside the Org the same approach for their work. Each group inside Org is working into this continuous improvement. So looks like it's so clear that the solution that we propose is obviously the way to go forward, that I don't believe, why the community still not understand or buy into that, because it's the way things are done in many of our groups independent of the fact that it's called this way, but inside ICANN Org, it's called this way. Inside the Board, it's called this way. Inside each committee inside the Board, we heard from members of the Board that they are working in using this kind of methodology now that is constantly improving. So every company is working that. So I don't believe we are still in ICANN not clearly organize ourselves as community. In our review, each community in constant development. So it's something that is out of my understanding. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. And you're correct, it is good if not best business practice. It is a standards-based approach. Anybody in a particular technical or critical risk field would feel very comfortable with it. But we are an entity that works in a multi-stakeholder, bottom-up model which means we've got to drag all the rank and file with us. And to be totally honest, there are whole industries out there in the real world, Vanda, that unfortunately do not walk the walk and talk the talk, an so we have to gentle them along and help them understand what it is, the difference between an occasional stress test and fitness training, because that's pretty much what it is, the differences there. Instead of

being thrown onto a treadmill from time to time and run ragged until one drops and sometimes has a heart attack and dies or requires major medical intervention, which is sort of the review corollary, that you get yourself race-ready or fit enough to survive by continuous improvement.

However, this is the circuit breaker, that's why the ATRT3 work is so important and why I believe we all agree that the super ordinance of the ATRT3 recommendations must be maintained and in no way put in a queue to fall behind. They can go alongside, but they must be continued as a first priority overall.

All right, thank you very much to everyone who's been involved in this ATRT review of the recommendations. It's important that we have that conversation, and we've, I think, done it justice. Can I just get you, Claudia, to open up the MSM block now? We're going to look at next steps for where we're heading next.

Now, here we have, dare we say, wishy-washy stuff. Talk about fluff. All very important stuff, but very little of that goes to anything that could be currently seen as a SMART model, the measurability, the specificity, all of those sorts of things is sadly lacking here. But that's all right, that's got to do with the nature of the MSM project. And remember, the multi-stakeholder model was not a review team as such, it was an exercise, an important one, a community-based effort of trying to identify to some extent the type of things that would go into a holistic review. Yes, Olivier, that is all there is in terms of actual classifications of outcomes.

Now, the good news is that the identification of these general, very nonspecific bits and bobs—all of which are important, do not get me wrong, I'm not denigrating them in any way, shape or form—have in some cases picked up a gold star and been seen as important. The precision in scoping of work, for example, is one where great attention has been given, and even as an outcome, but certainly affecting the way that future review teams or reviews go but also policy development processes, etc.

Prioritization of the work, surprise, fits hand in glove with what ATRT3 is doing. There's a lot of interplay between these issues, these areas of work required, and the recommendations out of various out of the review teams, including ATRT3. But I'm of the opinion that this isn't ready for our type of deep dive just yet. I note that this is a perennial issue for the OFB, that rarely does the gathering of three or more OFB members happen without the multi-stakeholder model being discussed. And that's okay, it should be all pervasive, but other than those things that are recognized in a budget and planning prioritization exercising, which is good, some of them are simply not being even looked at, let alone addressed, even though there's a plan perhaps to do that.

So, how do we want to go forward with this? Look, we could bring in—and we need to bring in—Marita for a conversation. She has, from the CPWG and ALAC point of view, led a lot of this discussion. But there's a fair bit more work that needs to go into this before we could apply the same rigor and approach. Sébastien, your thoughts.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. Yeah, definitely a discussion with Marita will be useful. My impression is that maybe we don't do the same work. My feeling is that there are some of them who must be sent to the holistic review or must be part of the holistic review. I know that we don't have anything written on that yet, but when we talk about role and responsibility, holistic review of ICANN, culture plus trust plus siloes, complexity, representativeness and inclusiveness, I feel that it can be dragged to the holistic review.

When we talk about prioritization of work, we already doing it, ATRT3 recommendation, we already discuss that and it's the same. The question of the other points, I am not sure that they need to be singleized or we need to say, okay, this one needs to go alongside with what we are talking about in Work Stream 2 or in ATRT, more than doing, "Oh, yeah, this one must be high, high high or medium, moderate and medium." That's my first feedback on that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Appreciate that. And I think that fits with my concerns as well. Yes, the good news is that a number of these things are either already being picked up as Org-based work because they've also fed into the process that has developed the next five-year strategic planning documentation, or they're being picked up out of in particular the work of ATRT3 which of course ran hand-in-glove with the development of this identified areas of issue because we worked very closely with Brian who led this field.

So what I would like to suggest is that we do two things going forward. The first one is I think we need to recognize that whilst we've done everything in a tabulated form, we probably need to go back and have another run through some of what we've done before, not the least of which is the Work Stream 2, because we've had two updates now since we've had the first prioritization exercise. The work of ICANN has in fact changed the status. We have things that are now identified as being further along than we were along on all of that sort of stuff. So we need to go back and do some overall tidying up and overall shuffling together, I guess, of these other things. And I think that can be our work focus going forward in a fortnight's time.

But we also probably need to work with Marita on a mapping exercise that shows where these general concepts of areas of work are mapped. And you identified, Sébastien, ones that certainly seem to track with the things that came out of ATRT3, but there are others. Scoping of work, for example, links with the PDP 3.0 processes and so forth.

So let's make it that we perhaps spend, I'm going to say, another fortnight making our own notes in this MSM area, if we could indulge you to do that. It would be really helpful if we can work with the staff that are also associated with those recent reports that have—the webinar for example on the Work Stream 2 that just happened, all of that reporting, that community updating, we need to take that into account. That's sort of work that needs to be done.

So I think that's our next steps going forward. Does anyone have a better or different plan for what our little small team could do for this overall prioritization work? Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Not better and other plan, but I wanted to ask you, when do you think that we will have a longer time to get back to the OFB? Why I'm asking that, not too much about the OFB, but because I feel that it could be a good moment to invite staff from Xavier's team to listen and eventually exchange with us at this occasion. Or if you think it could be another way to invite them when we will do this review of what we have done since few weeks about prioritization of all that to see if it's fit together now, because I think it could be useful to have them in one moment with us to have exchange and discussion. Therefore, that's my two suggestions for you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. I think that's something that we should be aiming for, but my personal response is that we're a small team of the OFB, and so that wider interaction probably needs to be one that is an OFB-wide one. So I'd like us to continue to get our own house in slightly better order and have the OFB more fully and properly [inaudible] and briefed on where everything stands.

And remember, what we're trying to do too is ensure that when the particular prioritization tabletop exercise is done—and we don't know quite yet when that is going to be done, but we're told it's not going to be far off and that Work Stream 2 is currently getting top priority—that our people at that table are well equipped and well planned.

Now, we know what other parts of the [inaudible] done. They've certainly not gone as far as we have, so we know we're ahead of the

game. But I think it probably needs to go back into the clutches of the full OFB. Do I think they're ready yet? No. DO I think we've got our prepraration quite far enough along to take back to them so that even those who pay little attention may understand and feel more fully [inaudible]? Not quite yet.

So I would like to suggest that we ask that probably after the post-ICANN 71 briefing that is planned for the Work Stream 2 for example, there's going to be a reasonable amount of work for example changing between the webinar and update we had with the community only in this last week and that we now need to reflect in our own preparations here—and that's something I think we need to get on to—and the work that will be going on between now and the next update. So I think probably sometime in that August period is more likely to be the right timing, but I'm only second guessing here.

So what I'm going to suggest is as follows: that we take a meeting date that will include Marita a fortnight out, because we do have to do some mapping, and I believe she has a lot to offer in terms of the mapping in the MSM, that we spend probably 20 minutes or so with her, not looking at the MSM but looking at the work we've done in the other tabs. In other words, we do about half the meeting on probably Work Stream 2 and a couple of the other high points and holidays so that any updates are reflected in our documentation and our methodology, and that then once she's familiar with that because she will experience that process with us, which will be very much not superficial but updating exercise, that we then look at where these MSM things can [inaudible].

After that's done, then I think we're in a reasonable position to make a request to the OFB to give us an at least 15- but possibly up to 25-minute block of time in one of their agendas and really take them along so that they have a full understanding of what we've done and what we mean, which I don't believe they have yet, and then, of course, that should fit timewise with these additional updates that Org is planning anyway post-ICANN 71.

Can we see how that tracks? It's a bit muddy, but I don't want to leave the MSM work behind. I recognize that as an important and essential focus, particularly of the OFB, but I think we probably need to make sure that we gather all our threads together as well. I'll note Daniel has joined us. Apologies, Daniel, if you had difficulty getting in the room, as many of us did. We note that there was a technical glitch and we also noted that we thought that might be why you weren't here at the beginning of the meeting.

We've wrapped up our ATRT3 things. We're giving them super ordinance or overall importance over—along with if not over a couple of the other recommendations of all the other tabs and we're trying to look at a way forward. Daniel, did you want to make any comments before we look at wrapping up?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I'm sorry, I had technical glitches, then I also joined another call on AFRALO. But at least I had to get back in because this is where I belong best.

Yeah, looking at the question that Sébastien had asked regarding the timelines, I was of the view that since we are laying down the levels of priority, we could suggest what timelines suit best. Then whilst we get the key people who have great expertise in the respective subject, they could guide such that at least we have a rough idea of the timelines taken. That's my suggestion. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Daniel. I think those timelines can be firmed up as we do our second run through all of it. All right, let's work on our next meeting in a fortnight's time, hopefully with Marita, if not, then the meeting after that will need to be with Marita. We'll update the OFB on where we are and where we think we're going. We'll recognize the other work that is going on and integrate that back into our documentation, and we will probably aim for what Sébastien was suggesting in the post-ICANN 71 space.

So with that, I believe we've got our standard time now, Claudia. We don't have many action items other than one on all of us to put our comments in on mapping with regards to MSM and anything that is outstanding, Alan. Sorry, my friend, I couldn't help it. You've got the constitution that can put up with a little tiny [inaudible] from me from time to time.

All right, ladies and gentlemen. We started a few minutes late because of technical glitches. We have our next meeting date. I want to thank you all and thank Claudia for juggling all of the technical call and indeed document logistics today, and I look forward to having some updates

appear. And don't forget, we can e-mail each other, we don't have to wait for our next call.

With that, thank you very much, and bye for now.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. Have a nice time. Bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]