PAMELA SMITH:	This is the meeting of the discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR version two. It is Thursday the 6th of April, 2023 at 20:00 UTC. With that the roll call is, the attendees are Pamela Smith of ICANN org, Jason Kean, Larisa Gurnick, Giovanni Seppia and Mary Wong and Sam Eisner and Theresa Swinehart of ICANN org. And then Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Vanda Scartezini, Maarten Botterman, Osvaldo Novoa, Herb Waye. Herb, I'm sorry I forgot you in the ICANN org people. Katrina Sataki, who will be kicking off the meeting, and Sébastien Bachollet. And with that, I will be quiet and hand the meeting over and put myself on mute. Thank you.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you very much, Pamela, and thanks everyone for joining the call today. I'm Katrina, I'm kicking off this meeting in my capacity as the Chair of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board. That is the committee that deals with different reviews, including ATRT3. And just a brief recap of where we are and how we got us thus far.
	As you remember, we were following ATRT3's suggestion regarding the Holistic Review. And when the board approved the recommendation, the board identified a list of gaps and suggested having a Pilot Holistic Review. And I think more than a year ago or

around this time last year we gathered this team of volunteers from ATRT3 and from OEC to come up with the terms of reference document. Then they published it for public comments, received a lot of comments, some supporting and some not so supporting. And after that first round of public comment, a small team from the OEC took another stab at the ToR document, we called it version two in Cancun.

Thanks again to everyone who made it to the meeting. We briefly discussed the document and then afterwards we shared version two of the terms of reference document with you. I hope you all had time to read it and think about it. And so today, as you can see the agenda in front of you, we will briefly talk about analysis of public comments. And then we'll go straight to the ToR. And we really would like to hear your thoughts, your feedback.

So what you think, what were your impressions after reading version two. Will it work? Maybe you have some new ideas popped up and then we at the end of the meeting today I hope we will come to an agreement how to move forward. Most importantly, are we still determined to move forward and are we brave enough to come up with some enhancements to the document and present it to the community. Should we continue working on this version two that we presented to you or maybe start something from scratch.

But if we decide to work on this version two and add some meat to it, sorry to those vegetarians among us if there are any. You probably saw those placeholders in the document. So if we decide that we go with this ToR version two, how are we going to do that. Are you as a ToR team ready to continue working on this document or you just say give it back to the OEC and say, deal with it, and continue.

But I really hope that we can address this well, can find a way forward as a team. And with that, I think let's move to the next agenda item. So that was a very brief welcome from me. So analysis of public comments. And update on the status. So I don't know who will take it, Jason, you or Larisa? No, you want us to do that. We can do that. I'll give the floor to Avri then. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Sure. I think the folks at staff did a very careful analysis of the comments, the pros, the negatives by commenter, by type of commenter, by and large, as opposed to going down that at the moment. The sort of appraisal that came out of it is on almost everything where there was support, there was also a problem. And the most serious problem that came out was a disagreement in one way or another over the scope of the Holistic Review.

There were lots of problems, there were lots of indicative this needs to be longer, no, the six months isn't right. No I mean, a

year isn't right, or year and a half isn't right, you need the option, lots of things like that. But really, the fundamental difference that we found in that is that the terms of reference just don't have an agreement, the scope of them are you changing the organization? Is it just within a particular SG? Is it the whole organization? Is that happening in this review? Is that not happening in this review? Do we have enough time to do that one in this review?

So then a post analysis of that, looking at what can we do about it, there was one set of suggestions that said, oops, we need a cross community working group to sit down and figure out what an agreeable scope is for this. And cross community working groups do a particular job, and they could probably solve this one. It would delay this review by a long shot. There were other kinds of solutions that had to do with maybe we can't do one. And we just admit that and sort of go back to ATRT4 and say, "Hey, folks we just couldn't get agreement among everyone to do this." Didn't want to do that either and several other possibilities.

The one that we settled on was, can we come up with a term of reference that people can buy into? Can we come up with a term of reference that includes dealing with this scope? This is still a pilot. we already had the pilot questions from the board that we felt needed to be included, and those were part of the decision made by the board. The other one that was left open that wasn't

made a specific decision was the scope. So basically, can we build answering that scope question into this?

Now, there was also a strong tendency from some members of this group that this shouldn't just be meta, that this shouldn't just be about a future Holistic Review, but that we should actually do some. Now, doing some when we don't know what the scope is, would just, at least in my view, and I think the view of many others, would be almost an impossibility, because whether what we were talking about was in scope or out of scope would be a constant subtext, and we'd constantly have to go there.

So we really do have to have a fairly good notion of what is in scope and what is not. But once we've done that, we'll no longer have enough time to do the whole holistic panorama that there might be. But could we pick one or two of the most meaningful subjects and perhaps the most definable holistic topics, like how does communication work between stakeholder groups and such? Is there good communication? How do we communicate better?

Or another one of the issues, and apply the guidelines that were determined in the first part to that as a subject area, to basically do a test case of the Holistic Review methodology, while genuinely doing a piece of Holistic Review that would be recommendations that we would have to figure out how to deal with, because we don't have a bylaw yet.

And the other thing is to help the group help us define the bylaw, because what we need to come out of this with is a bylaw for a Holistic Review, so that it can take its turn, take its place in the sequence as was defined by ATRT3, and get that going. But until we know what this review is, so that we can define it clearly, such that all of the constituencies, stakeholder groups, et cetera, can agree to it, is we need to determine we need to answer the questions first.

So I think I've rambled on a little bit about sort of looking at the analysis of the comments, but more how we analyzed post that, when we accepted that we had a sense of opinion that we couldn't really resolve on the scope, how did we move on? And so we moved on with this revision that was put together. Getting to the revision was somewhat a labor of persistence, because the first effort was to take the previous one and try and tweak here and there to try and bring it together.

That was an effort that didn't pan out. And eventually Katrina sort of sat down and recast our form into something that seemed more logical, seemed to lend itself to this tripartite notion that I just spoke of. We didn't continue on it down to the nitty gritty, because we thought we had reached a point where it was time to come to you all and sort of say, because we did leave you for a while wondering what was happening, but this is what we were doing in the meantime.

Now that we've gotten to this annealing point that we think we have the beginnings of something that could conceivably work. So it was time to bring it back to you to see if you and Katrina already pretty much said this, to see if you think this could conceivably work. Are you willing to work with us in terms of trying to finish it up? And we would have to go out for another public comment because it is significantly different. It isn't just a tweak. Hopefully we would have answered the comments.

We would have to go back to the comments we got and say, "How does this revision to respond to those comments?" See how we do and such. But as Katrina said, the OEC has doing this on its list of activities and I'll either succeed at it or I'll fail at it. And I want us to succeed at it, even though I've passed the chair of that onto Katrina. But does the OEC just try to finish it up or do we have a ToR team work with us to try and finish it up? And I'll stop for the moment and I'll hand the chair back to Katrina to call on anybody that wants to speak up.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Avri. That's a very comprehensive and clear analysis on everything that's happening. Thank you, Cheryl, I see your hand, but maybe I'll give the floor to Matthew. Maybe he wants to add anything to what Avri said, because he was also on that small team that came up with version two. Matthew, would you like to add anything?

MATTHEW SHEARS: No, I think Avri summarized it very well. I think what we tried to do was really put in place a system whereby the work that the community or the concerns of the community had raised in the public comments were actually addressed not only through the ToR, but more importantly, through the work that the Pilot Holistic Review would undertake.

I think in that sense, that's an important factor of this, but the other one is, as Avri mentioned, is we see this very much as a way of, I think we called it alpha testing or testing if you want, some of the key elements to a Holistic Review, which we've talked about at the meta level, but we haven't really talked about in terms of how they would be developed or agreed or indeed implemented. I think what we're looking at here is really an opportunity through the pilot to do that fundamental and very important work that we know needs to be done.

It would probably be detrimental to leave that to an actual Holistic Review, because certainly in my mind, it would probably contribute to derailing. I think there's value in taking this very measured, productive way of approaching this with the end result, which will be a bylaws change, which is necessary to do a bylaws mandated Holistic Review. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Matthew. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to let Vanda go first, if you don't mind, Katrina. Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to think out of the box, I do believe what Matthew said it's okay. And my suggestion maybe is to go by slices. So maybe define the methodology step by step. Then test that methodology with some groups that maybe is open to test that. So if we can do that in a short period of time, and I believe it is possible, I believe we will have more convincing opportunities to show to everyone that the question has been answered.

Because in my opinion, the first reactions from the Holistic Review behind all clear issues, there is also the anxiety to how to do this work inside each constituency. How they will do, who is going to do that? How much time will take for myself and my group to do that? So those questions, when we start to talk after we finish ATRT3, with individuals that show up some concerns, that was behind the questions, is they don't know how they will do that, because we didn't present a clear methodology in the how inside those constituencies they will deal with this change.

They were used to have contract someone, make the change, and two or three guys inside the constituency will dedicate this time. So it's another overview, and they were afraid they cannot face in day by day dedication of time. So my suggestion is thinking about slicing the problem with this two first methodology, and then pick up one pilot, really one example. Because the opportunity to get together all those constituencies and try to work the interrelations of them, I believe will be very difficult while they are not convinced how they will do that. So that's my point. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Vanda. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Katrina. Pardon me, thanks, Vanda. What I'm hearing from Vanda, and I suspect whilst it might not be universal amongst the full depth of feeling from each and every one of the ATRT3 shepherds, who are pretty much your ToR team, your shepherds plus a couple. What I heard from Vanda is a willingness to do a couple of things.

First of all, a willingness to work with the OEC from a version two baseline, and ensure with a full frank and fearless set of analysis, the creation of a next generation document, the public review, that will be a terms of reference which to the best of all our

abilities will answer or at least address the concerns raised in the first public comment.

I think that's the answer to one of the questions, Katrina, you raised in the introduction. Should we do this? I suspect unless someone wants to scream very loudly, and I can certainly speak on behalf of Pat here, but the answer is yes, we should. Because there's a couple of things we need to recognize. ATRT3, and that was a long time ago now, let's face it. A lot has changed. But what hasn't changed is the need we saw for the opportunity to rationalize how reviews are done across ICANN.

So that kind of hasn't changed. How we proposed in ATRT Three and those recommendations would have worked if indeed all the things had lined up and all the pieces had fallen into place. They didn't. Therefore, accept that. The worthiness of the exercise still exists. But we actually have opportunity now to build a better and more detailed model. So get into those layers, that slicing that Vanda referred to, those particular aspects that Matthew articulated in terms of making sure that the methodology is developed, et cetera, et cetera.

Will that meet the initial desire for change opportunity and switching to continuous improvement in as fast a track as ATRT3 had desired and envisaged? No, it won't. But that horse has already bolted. So let's take the opportunity to also work closely

with the authors of the comments that came in. So part of the misalignment here is not actually understanding.

People writing documents that they believe are clear and are articulating a certain meaning, and yet they're not, because when we get the responses back, we go, "Well, hang on, we thought that was clear." So let's make sure before this next version goes out that there's been, I don't know, some focus groups, do some smart thinking. I'm sure there's enough smart people in this group to do that, to just make sure that we know the messaging is absolutely clear, because I think that's where we can perhaps gain some time and get back on a track again. Does that make sense? I hope so.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, absolutely. Thank you very much, Cheryl. Anyone else would like to? Yes, Martin.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just one thought. Having looked at the list of organizations, groups that have reacted, what should we do about exploring what those that didn't react think? Didn't they react because they were happy, or didn't they react because...

KATRINA SATAKI: Because?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I don't have the answer, sorry.

KATRINA SATAKI: I don't know, I just...

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I'm not God.

KATRINA SATAKI: Fair point. And thanks a lot to Vanda, Cheryl and Maarten. So a few things I'll summarize. One, we're working together to get this done. Sorry, before I summarize, Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know how to express all that, but it's far from what we were writing in ATRT3. And we can't say, because two years past, it's over. It's a review, and therefore the review must be taken into account. And as it is written in the bylaw, as it was accepted by the board, it must be implemented. And when I say it must be, it's not in three years. And it's where we are.

I am very concerned with all what is happening, but I was happy with the agenda because I think the first point we need to do, it's to get together to answer the public comments. The analysis is

one thing, but how we answer, why we didn't understand the same thing. I have few ideas for that, but we need to start by that.

And I wanted to take one example of what the board is doing in policy development process with the GNSO. When they disagree with something or they need more clarity, they get it back to the team who have set up that. I know ATRT3 is disbanded because it was just one year, and the GNSO is still alive. But it could have been a good idea to get back to this group and to say, "Hey, we don't understand that. We want more element on that." And so on and so forth.

I think we need to answer to some discussion on answering the public comments. Because I think that there are parts we didn't discuss really, but we disagree or we are not on the same page, I would say. Not a disagreement. But the link between the continuous improvement program and the Holistic Review seems to be not understood the same by the one who write it and the one who read it. And if you give me two minutes, I will try to explain what was in -- I will not talk on behalf of others, in my mind, hopefully it was on the mind of the full group, but I can't talk on behalf of. But the continuous improvement program is to replace, to take the place of the organizational review. And there is no link between starting one and not starting the other.

Holistic Review is not waiting for the continuous improvement program. It will be an input to the Holistic Review when and only when the continuous improvement program will be able to publish things, to deliver information, to deliver decisions or changes. But if we don't start that in parallel, we will not get it even for the second Holistic Review, if it happens one day. And when we talk about self-assessment, I don't see the difference between a continuous improvement program and a self-assessment. Therefore, we have to be careful on how we put things.

The other point is that no, it is not something linked with each and every part of this organization. It's a Holistic Review. It's a view from the top, not from the top because it's top down, but from the sky and to see how ICANN is working and how we can improve them. If I want to take an image, we need to be able to create after a Holistic Review, the split of the DNSO and ccNSO and GNSO to disband the PSO.

I don't know what will be the ccNSO of this next Holistic Review, what will be the, not the ccNSO as a name, but what will be equal to what we have done in 2002. But it must give this possibility. And the relationship between all those groups, we had during 20 years done silo reviews. The objective is to continue the program, that's the silo work, I will say. And the Holistic Review is to have what is happening in between and amongst those groups, not

inside the group. I will say, because the truth needs to be said, except if we need to split one group because it's important to set up, once again, like the GNSO and the ccNSO.

That's some of the points I wanted to raise here. I don't know yet if we need to start with version two or something else. We can do the same thing that we have done for the first version. It's been hours in coming back to this document. I started to do the same thing for the one and the two, but I am not sure it's answering the question, but that's it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Giovanni, please mute because occasionally we hear you talking. Thank you. Thank you, Sébastien. Please lower your hand. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just to respond and I guess put some food for thought on the table to some of what Sébastien just stated. I think there's real risk in some of what is proposed there. I'll come to that in a moment, but it seems to be a couple of pathways that we need to look at here. First of all, the analysis looking at and from my perspective, I would absolutely ignore version one that went out for public comment. Just thank you very much. That's all very useful.

But now we've got the public comments. Let's deal with it. Let's build on the work that the OEC small team put into it, because I think it was as shocking as it was for a moment to me. And it is not other than a good effort to meet the needs that were obvious from the public comments received and therefore has to bring us along a further point, a more likely to succeed point to take to the next step. So I wouldn't be interested too much, if at all, looking over to version one, version two. I think we just here's version two.

Now what we need to do is see where version two does or does not meet what is articulated as concerns and suggestions from those public comments. And how well we do that and how interactive we do that and what we do with people who we didn't get public comments from that can all be sort of bundled in along that same line of activity. So I think that's, from my perspective, at least, a very, very worthwhile starting analysis.

I am concerned, however, if we try to hang on the whatever good reasons to the overview that helicopter view that Sébastien was identifying, and that ATRT3 did absolutely note has been at least 20 years since it was something similar was undertaken. I don't believe there is enough reward in trying to push that through as she's written. And my reason for that is from where I came from, even back when we split the DNSO, which yes I was a member of

way back when. In those days I lived in the CC community, not in the at large community.

And unless things, and Katrina you'd know better than me have changed drastically, ifautocratically designed superimposed modeling was thrust upon at least the CC community, they would simply go so long thanks for the fish. It wouldn't be an opportunity to create a more sensible layer between CC and now generic management of policy development, it would be a destructuring destabilizing and destruction of as we know it. I don't think that's a risk I'm certainly willing to take.

I think we need to bring the communities, along with us. They didn't understand the purposes now. So we now need had to market this as a benefit and opportunity for building a better model from our own thoughts out. And as desirous as it might be to just wave a magic wand and create a new ICANN. I think there's too much entrenched concern fear and loathing to have that react very well. And I certainly am well and truly aware that the CC community doesn't need ICANN at all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I think we all want CCs to remain within ICANN and everyone who is that ICANN remain and continue working together. So, if there are no further immediate comments, then let me do the summary. So first thing we're working together

right so we're working together to get this ball rolling. Thank you very much for that and thank you very much for your willingness to collaborate on this one. That's one thing.

Next thing. We need to look what I hear that we need to look at public comments and see. So, how, again, another take is that we continue working with version two so we see how those public comments are addressed by what we're doing and what else we need to do to make sure that we move forward so we address those comments.

And then I really loved the way you put it Cheryl and you said that now we need to do some marketing. We have to sell the product because obviously, at this point it looks like we tried to sell honey to bees and bees were not happy with this approach so we need to repackage the thing. And we need to talk to SO/AC's probably before we move forward. So how can we do that so how can we organize these talks with SO/AC's? One of the ways so we can, or maybe we could survey SO/AC's and ask them certain set of questions. Maybe we already have some ideas. Larisa, what would you say about getting input from SO/AC's?

LARISA GURNICK: Hi everybody, this is Larissa Garnick, thanks, Katrina. There is possibly an approach that the OEC is using for a different topic, but there are some similarities in that there could be an outreach,

correspondence, some level of formality and organization to reach out to SO/AC leadership, so our chairs, and the next level down to incorporate the groups that comprise the different SO/AC's and well, this could also include some of the framing of the sort of the PR marketing kind of thing that Katrina was, that Cheryl were talking about to frame where things are.

And ask certain simple a short set of questions to help understand where each group, what their feelings or ideas or even understanding is relative to the Holistic Review and gathering that information within a month's time or something like that could then inform the board, the OEC, and others this group perhaps to get that broader perspective of where, how people are interpreting this what their concerns might be. And that might inform a way forward. This might also address Martin's question and what to do about those that didn't respond to the public comment, perhaps they would respond to something like this and help everybody understand kind of the temperature read. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. So, what do others think about the idea that we come up with a set of questions and then we try to solicit some answers. Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Yes, I know it's a world, easy world but I am not sure that we want to do marketing we want to convince people. And it does the same thing marketing is to try to sell something. Even if you don't need it. Here I think we need it, and we need to explain, discuss, and to answer the questions they have. It's not just one way. They have put comments in the comments during the comment period, and we never get together to try to answer these inputs, what is our view on the comments and I feel it's we need to start by that therefore I am not sure that it's asking them questions. If we didn't get inputs on what is what is our view on the Holistic Review, we will still have one way discussion, and not the other way. And it's what it's missing today. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Sébastien, and I agree with Avri who wrote a comment in chat. The issue is that at this point community obviously thinks that they don't need, you believe we need it. I'm sure that we need to work to enhance all this review thing. But what we gather from the community they don't think so and that is why we need to talk with them and to learn and try to address their concerns and answer all their questions. But to answer the questions. So we also need to ask some, because at this point they have provided us with a lot of information in as a comment in form of comments, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just a second that very much I think by I have a lot of sympathy for what you say, Sébastien, but the fact is that if you look to the pushback from the community, and to a large part of non-response as well. We didn't put something on the table that has to buy in of the community. That's the least thing to say. And because it's not only what we heard but also we didn't hear that I really liked the idea from Larisa to go out with some questions. Use that in the input as well.

So, what we've done so far with the comments is come up with the new draft. So we have looked at the comments, we have done something with it. And it's different, but I really am happy with the proposal that was made for exactly for that reason. Hope that that makes sense.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Maarten. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: I think one of the best ways because this is a somewhat contentious issue. And obviously we saw that in the diversity of responses in the public comment. I think in a way would be useful to have some try and see if we can secure some face-to-face time. Some of the differences between the ToR that went out for public comments and the ToR version to the we're now talking about our subtle and do need explaining.

I think in that sense, if we just put out a paper on it, that may not be sufficient in terms of ensuring that those were talking to understand where we're coming from and why we feel this is a necessary approach. So, I think questionnaires fine, papers are fine. But I think at the end of the day, trying to find time with different parts of the leadership of the various SOS and ACS, for example in Washington would be a good idea. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. So, first we survey them, we get some information exchange and then in Washington, we tried to secure some slots where we can talk face to face. If I understand you correctly. Thank you very much, Matthew. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: I think that's a great track for one part. I think another track is in terms of this REV 2. It is a sort of implicit answer to the analysis of the public comments and what might be useful, since several of the people from the ToR team, sort of said, we need to do an analysis of the public comments. Well, I'm not so sure it would be that useful for Katrina, Matthew and I, and even Maarten who was reviewing them are doing our analysis but the rest of you actually sort of taking your understanding of those comments and looking at our response to it, and sort of saying, Yeah, you hit it here, you hit it here, you didn't quite hit it there. Or you miss

dealing with the essence of this comment or you didn't understand the nuance of that.

Now, as I said, we didn't do this explicit. We're answering this by doing that what we tried to do is create something that answers as much of it as we could. And then with the idea of going back later and seeing at the end of the day how much the answers and the comments compare, but having others while we're doing all these other things sort of go through the REV to the version to and see to what degree, it does or doesn't answer the public comments. We think we tried to average the mountain and answer them but did we. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I see two parallel tracks of work; so one is this questions for serving SO/AC's and I hope that Larisa and Jason could help us with some initial set of questions. Then we could all add our own and discuss that one. And the second parallel track, we will ask to our team to look at version two and public comments and see where we have misunderstood them, where we did not hit the nail between the eyes, and maybe where we completely went astray; or maybe on the contrary, this one has been addressed properly and we're happy with that, so that's for the ToR team. So homework to do. Anything else anything I've missed this off so far.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to accept that as homework, just because I suggested it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Cheryl, noted. So I assume yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm actually going to say pattern I will certainly get onto that homework and would welcome the rest of the ToR team to have input.

KATRINA SATAKI: So anyone objects? No, nobody. That's good. So the plan is that we have those that those initial questions, then we try to survey SO/AC's with some end game to have a face to face meeting in Washington DC. Yes, Jason.

JASON KEAN: Thank you, Katrina. Is there going to be a follow up call, are you guys looking to schedule additional calls and have additional meetings?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, that's the next thing on my agenda because we have to agree when do we meet. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If we want to meet with whoever group we want to meet in Washington, we need to be in a hurry to decide which one groups we want to meet because the schedule is still is already work on and it's already a headache therefore, we need to really decide if we want to have one meeting with all the leaders or if we want to meeting with each so and they see or if we want, whatever we want, but we have to decide it quite quick. And maybe before the next meeting. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Good point, Sébastien, thank you. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I mean I probably not the only person in this group as well I probably would be in a better position to bring this forward, but not knowing what the responses yet but there is certainly a request in from the GNSO, who I still take close interest in, I've served for several years with them on behalf of the ALAC, to have an additional day for them to do just non purely policy business at the end of the Washington meeting. So maybe that if we do some clever scheduling, that there are still opportunities, but it is as

Sébastien says, very difficult with the policy meeting of all meetings to get any additional time in place in people's agendas.

KATRINA SATAKI: That is true. Thank you, Cheryl, for that. Mary was very quick to respond in chat. So, Mary will look into the schedule. But yes, of course you are right. Those are very tight. So next, our next call. Probably, next week will be too early. What about in two weeks?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can certainly aim for two weeks' time.

KATRINA SATAKI: So, 20th of April. We might need to ask for the ops to check availability. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Just thinking, it would be incredibly useful I think for us on the next call to have feedback from, I think Cheryl, you said yourself and Pat and Sébastien, in terms of how well or not we have responded to the public comment so I don't. That is a quite a bit of work. But I think that will be a good thing for us to have a discussion around.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. So, will two weeks be enough.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I would suggest that we can at least have an update or progress. I'm not going to promise the whole assignment, the whole thesis may not be done but the outline of the thesis might land.

KATRINA SATAKI: Fair enough. Good. Maybe we could share this Excel sheet with all the comments summarize that that the stuff prepared for us, Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: I think you, Katrina; just a suggestion that maybe we go ahead and look at the calendar, two or three meetings, maybe leading up to ICANN77 if that's okay, they can always be canceled but that way, they'll be on the calendar.

KATRINA SATAKI: Good point. Thank you very much. That's excellent. And could you please also send the download the Excel sheet with all the comments and share with the team. Because that's easier. That's a very good document very good sheet. So thank you.

With that, if nobody wants to add anything and everybody's happy with our agreement, thank you very much. Thank you very much for joining the call and we'll be in touch with you regarding our next calls and of course,, happy Easter for everyone who celebrates, and just enjoy the weekend. So thank you very much again and bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say, any excuse for chocolate, I mean nothing wrong with that.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's true. Thank you very much. Be safe. Bye.