

PAMELA SMITH: Today is the 20th of April 2023, and my name is Pamela Smith with icann.org, and this is the meeting for the discussion on the Pilot Holistic Review, ToR Version 2, and this is meeting 2.

Attending, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Pat Kane, Avri Doria, Herb Wayne, the ICANN's Ombudsman, Vanda Scartezini, Katrina Sataki, Maarten Botterman, Matthew Shears and Sébastien Bachollet. From ICANN org, we have myself, Jason Kean, Larisa Gurnick, Daniel Halloran, Giovanni Seppia. And let me scroll down. Just make sure I haven't missed anyone. And with that, I turn the meeting over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Pam. I appreciate that. And as we were talking earlier before we hit the record button, some of us we're also talking about how refreshing and rewarding it is to work with Kane's staff team on this because there was a flurry of interchanges going, who's doing what and what's going on in the lead up to this school. And we've now worked out what we're displaying, what we're going to try and achieve, and what we'll do for an agenda. So thank you very much. It's a pleasure to work with you all.

There will be more people by the look of it joining us, but we have a relatively light looking agenda. But we do want to dig into a couple of documents that have been open for review, one in particular, which we are working on and one that I'd like to propose that we may have a way

*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*

of working on that should make some of our work later on in this project a little easier.

For various reasons, pardon me, and Pat and I didn't arm wrestle. I said I'd take today. He's been a tad busy. Excuse me. But we are looking at input at this stage, just to refresh everybody's mind, from the shepherds because obviously the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, the OECD team has put this version 2, the document that we'll be looking at in a moment. Together they've put their work into it. We're using that as a piece of foundation work and we have homework to do in terms of making some comments and also doing some cross checking, some of which is still outstanding, but not all of which was intended to be completed by today.

That being said, we're hoping to spend about 50 minutes or so of our time today doing that. We also want to sneak in a little bit of additional timing if we may under the next steps to look at quickly how far do we really think we can get at the moment. Pam set up a cadence of meetings on a fortnightly basis up to the 1st of June. We haven't progressed in this last fortnight near as far as we had hoped to. It happens. We're volunteers. There you go. I'm not going to do anything about it. Just keep on moving forward. But as we do do that, we probably need to look at do we need to have other plans for after ICANN77. So that's the only addition to the agenda that we wanted to make. But pause for a moment if there's anybody who wants to make a change or a piece of any other business for us to consider before we get down to the business of our documents.

And not seeing anybody waving at me frantically. In that case, Jason, let's stick straight into the Pilot Holistic Review, ToR version 2, dated 16th of March. Can we find a new title?

JASON KEAN: Cheryl, would you like me to review the action items from the previous meeting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you insist. I think we'll find most of the month down, but go ahead.

JASON KEAN: Okay. Quickly schedule biweekly meetings until ICANN77. That was achieved. Send out the Excel spreadsheet itemizing public comments.

Also achieved. Analyze how the revised ToR addresses public comments. That is actively being pursued by the ToR team. Formulate questions for survey for SO/AC leadership. This one is ongoing. This is after the analysis. And then lastly, there was a ToR team to determine whether to request a meeting at ICANN77, and if so, what type? We did have Mary Wong do some research. She put her feelers out. The consensus was that given the brevity of the session, how close we are to it, the current format, that would be extremely difficult, likely impossible to do so. She did recommend though potentially a webinar thereafter. So I'd just like to leave that with you all as an update on those items.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thank you particularly for number 5 because that was one I had neglected to remember that we needed to look in our agenda. Perhaps to prompt aging brains, you might just pop in as an initial item on future agendas. Review of the AIs and will make me look further down the sheet. Perhaps even others look further down the sheet. Mary, you said it was a suggestion. And just before I go to Sebastien, is there anything you wanted to clarify on that AI number 5?

MARY WONG: I'm sorry, Cheryl. I don't believe, you said earlier. Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So I thought Jason said you had a suggestion of some other alternative, but I must have misheard. It's up to you, Sebastien, then.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I thought there were also an action item about possible meeting of this team around ICANN77. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is action item number 5, which we're discussing right now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: For me, it's not exactly the same here if I understand well. It was how we met with SO/ACs, but that's one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The meeting at. Okay, I see what you mean. Right. You're talking about engagement with number 5. You think that's engagement. We need now to clarify with Mary exactly what she researched. Mary, please.

MARY WONG: Thank you. And I apologize if my connection is poor, and I hope you can hear me. Because of the nature and the length of the policy forum, I

think Cheryl, you and others on the call know well, we think it will be extremely difficult at this stage to schedule a session, especially based on what we heard at the last call that that session might need to be with community leaders. So, given that, we thought that what might be helpful to consider is obviously making yourselves available to all the individual SOs and ACs as they plan their individual meetings, which might make for really good individual engagement. But that if you wanted more of a plenary type outreach and engagement session, that might be something that would need to be done virtually rather than during the policy forum.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, I think we've got a little bit of a definition issue here and as noted in chat as Sebastien, as how I heard it, was differentiating between the opportunity to interact with SO/AC leadership or SO/ACs in their schedule, and we certainly appreciate the concept and we'll discuss in our next steps the opportunities we might be able to offer, but there was a question of should we meet together. Have I got that correct, Sebastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So that hasn't been looked at or pursued. Mary, is that the case?

MARY WONG: Yes, that is the case. Because my understanding was the focus at the time was with the community or community leaders, but we'll take that back. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, even if it is a matter of possibility, as you say, to make ourselves available, there could be the equivalent of an office hour, I don't know.

But let's see if we can do some clever thinking and take that online, sorry offline, between now and say the end of next week because I believe any room allocations would need to be being made well and truly by then, have I got that correct? When do your forms need to be in if there's a request for [00:09:35 –inaudible]?

MARY WONG: Sure. I guess that's for me again. So I think the question is whether this group needs to meet officially and publicly on the meeting schedule. If

they are answer is yes for this group, then that request window opens next week. If the group simply needs time to meet and it does not have to be on the meeting schedule, we have a lot more flexibility. Oh, I see, Sebastien, I apologize. I keep missing all kinds of things. If it's a day after the meeting that's a whole other matter, and I don't know if I want

to take time discussing it on today's meeting, unless it's something that you'd like us to pursue at this stage.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we also need to look at the point that Matthew put in chat where some more informal interaction is possible as well. My only problem with meeting for breakfasts is the ability to provide some degree of privacy for such an interaction. Vanda go ahead quickly?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. No. Just to remember, June is tied for me, is very difficult because it's the final selection of Hong Kong. And if it's out of the normal hours, it's okay for me. But during the regular hours, chairing in Hong Kong will be unable to go to any other place.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well noted Vanda. And as Mary said, and Jason reported with the very compressed policy meeting and it changes being quite full, it gets very difficult, but it is also time when a lot of other things are going on.

All right. I'm going to suggest then that Pat and I continue to have this conversation with Mary and Avri and Katrina and Matthew and see what if anything we can do. And this can be taken onto our chat for some feedback and some brainstorming. If you've got a good idea, we've had a few suggested a day after, a drop in space or an informal breakfast. There's three that we could look at, or nothing at all. That's possible too. Then we need to decide and get on with that job of organizing that relatively quickly.

So can we just take that off this meeting's conversation and work on that and any ideas you have if you could pop them into the Skype chat. We'll pick them up over the next couple of days because if Mary needs to do any more research, she needs to know what she's researching for. How's that, Mary? Does that work for you?

MARY WONG: Perfectly. Thank you so much, Cheryl and everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's all right. Okay. All right. All of these things always take the longest than we ever planned. So we've now got less than 40 minutes to go to our document and we go to our document. There we go. And thanks to all of you from the Shepard's group that have put in some of these comments, remembering, of course, that it was the intention to have the shipments put in comments at this stage. But we do need now to have a little look through. Avri, I think that's an old hand, but I will double check. Vanda, were you trying to get my attention again or is that the one you put up before when we dealt with?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your hand is an old hand?



VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your hand is still up. That's all. There you go. That's it. VANDA

SCARTEZINI: No, it's just is the old one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I figured. That's all right. Not a problem. Okay. Now Jason is not particularly in fine fiddle, but how's your voice going to hold up, Jason?

Because even with my glasses, I'm not going to be able to see this as a screen share on these comments.

JASON KEAN: Perfectly well, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right. Then over to you and we're going to open a book queue on each of these, although some of these comments predominantly by

Sebastien and Vanda. Thank you again to both of you. It won't be too much discussion more of a yes, we agree or no we don't. Let's just take it from the top then, Jason. Thanks.

JASON KEAN: Great. First up, we have Sebastien. We may have posed this to you, Cheryl. Would Sebastien like to walk through them and I can support in the documents?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, okay as long as we don't spend more time embellishing than necessary. Over to you Sebastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. The first comment is just to tell you when I have done that. Let's go to the next one. My question is, I can't specific review terms of reference. Is it for all those specific reviews or is it for the ToR? For the pilot holistic review or realistic review, because it seems to be rather bigger than just what we are talking about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's open a queue on that because that goes to another issue you raised later in your comments as well, Sebastien, where you talk about is this even a terms of reference for a holistic review? It seems to be a terms of reference for creating the terms of reference for a holistic review.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, exactly. Agree with you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just read your comments. I'm only quoting you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. But that's linked. Yes, definitely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, responses? Nobody from the OEC. Ah, thank you, Avri. VANDA

SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I don't understand the comment at all.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But is it ICANN specific review term of reference for all the specific reviews or just the one we are talking about? The title is just strange for me.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. It's a mistake. It's about pilot next to maybe. It's a wrong title. VANDA

SCARTEZINI: Oh, so it's that kind of comment. Sorry. I didn't get it. Thank you. KATRINA SATAKI: It is a

wrong title. Sorry for that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's that kind of comment. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So that needs editing. Fine. That'll be fixed. Thank you very much. Somebody needs to own that. I guess that'll be you Jason. Keep going down, Sebastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Next comments. This document for me, it's not a term of reference for holistic review, but whatever we want to call the group will work pilot or any working group. It's work to define what's a holistic review will be doing in the future. Therefore, it will not be a holistic review at all. It's something to define how we will do a holistic review. And therefore, I really feel that we need to change here even the title because it's not what ATRT3 require for. It's something to be done before. Some of the comments we get was to put a CCWG whatever the name once again, but I feel strongly that here we will not end up for any realistic review. That's why I put this comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, just hold on that one for a moment, Sebastien. Can I ask anybody from the OEC small team, any responsible thinking on that as you develop this very necessary, but very different approach and the documentation? I think what Sebastien's suggesting here is that there's a drift from what was the terms of reference for this activity called holistic review. Oh no. It has to be pilot. Pilot holistic review to something that is more a mechanism to be a foundation for a future

holistic review and he's interested in the nomenclature there. Did you have any thoughts on that at all?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, maybe I'll start and then Avri and Matthew joins me. So as you know very well, better than I do, ATRT3 came up with the idea of having holistic review and has a set of objective that holistic review needs to achieve. And when the Board approved the recommendation, the Board also noted that there's a list of things that are unclear and that need to be clarified and then suggested to run a pilot holistic, pilot review for holistic reviews.

So, what we did in this document. So, we had objectives we set as objectives, those objectives defined by ATRT3. And also, we set as objectives those questions that the Board wanted to be answered by the pilot. I don't know if that answers your question, Sebastien, and I don't know if Avri and Matthew want to chime in and add anything. But, yes, in this, well, the suggestion is to run pilot as envisioned by the Board and answer questions set by the Board and also address objectives. Rather how future holistic reviews will address objectives defined by the ATRT3. But I see Avri has her hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I think the hook is that last part, Katrina, what you were saying. That's I think what Sebastien is looking on to the last part of what you said. So we've got in queue, Avri, and then Matthew. Over to you.

AVRI DORIA: Perhaps I should have let Matthew go first. Yeah, I think what the Board did in its decision was whether using the word pilot is strictly properly or whether we should have had a committee to define which word we want to use and what the word pilot means in all cases is perhaps something that wasn't considered properly. But basically was, yes, let's try to do a holistic review. But before we can actually do it, we need to determine and we need to answer these questions. Let's make that part of this pilot exercise. And so I think that's in this rev what we've taken further, though we've added the scope issue to part of what we need to figure out. So the pilot is, yes, how do we get this holistic review going? And let's make sure we at least do a piece of, take at least one or two topics that would be holistic review type topics and do them. So maybe it should have been a hybrid pilot. You know, let's figure out what holistic review really means and come to agreement on it review, but the word we used was pilot. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's it, while we try and work out a whole new language to use. We're not hearing you, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Can you hear me now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Perfect. Sorry. I'm not sure that we really need a new language. I think that what we tried to do here was actually to put in place a mechanism

so that some of the measurement tools or some of the processes that would be necessary for a holistic review to be undertaken are trial, if you will, and that's what we kind of talked about the alpha testing and things like that. So I think in that sense it is a pilot, right? We're putting in place the mechanisms that will allow us to do holistic review. So I'm not sure that we necessarily need. It may not be what we anticipated the pilot was going to be, but I think it does provide that kind of approach that would be necessary for the holistic review to occur.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Matthew. Vanda then Sebastien. You're muted Vanda. You're muted Vanda. That's it.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. I'm even more [00:23:25]. That's why they'll not see all the time. I believe that, yes, like Matthew said, we need to organize, propose a process, and then follow this process as a pilot to check out the results if you are satisfied with that, or what is need to be in changing it? Which will be the recommendation as a guideline for the next one. So for me, it's too tough. The first one is really organized, defined the process, to follow this test, this process, and then do a pilot. And then this pilot will be one review, one holistic review, to guarantee that process works. And with that, we can send to the community guidelines for the next

one. This is not an impediment to the next holistically review changing anything in the process. But the basing on that process should be

Page 15 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

available before we start regular, let's say, the word regular holistic behavioral process. But because till now, there is no process established and that anyone that takes sharing of that could follow. So that is the mission in my opinion of these pilots. That's two mission. Define the possible, organize the issue, and then make a pilot guarantee that the process works. The process works. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. Straight to you, Sebastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. It shows that we don't have the same understanding on what we are doing. And in fact, there are two pieces in this work, as Vanda just explained. There is define the way we will work and to do a pilot. Maybe we can just consider to do the first part of the work, and not to do a pilot as such, but to have a first holistic review later on. But one of the reasons I would like to change the name it's because if we call that a holistic review, next one will be in seven years. Therefore, I really feel it's not just a question of language, you can tell me that, but it's not just a question of language, it's what it's behind and what it will be understood.

If it's a holistic review, then we would have to wait for the next one, and the next one will be seven years or eight years or whatever. It's why I have suggested here maybe not enough, but to say that it's a pilot about holistic review and not a pilot holistic review. It's maybe a little



bit my understanding of English, but I think what we need to work because you think it's important, I would say 8081 didn't have all that,

Page 16 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

and they do the work and they do the 8081. I was thinking that pilot, the holistic review could be the first one and do like ATRT1. But it seems that now we need to have process and processes. Okay, if it's that case, let's do the process and then let's try to have a holistic review or a pilot holistic view who want to call them. But I don't know, in 6 months after we end up this work or in one year, but not in seven years. That's one of the reasons behind my thing. Thank you. And sorry to be  
[00:27:57 –crosstalk]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. No. I hear what you're saying. But let's go to Avri and then we'll see what we can simmer.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. First of all, I think the reason that we've been calling it a pilot holistic review is because we cannot have a holistic review as defined until it's in the bylaws, etc. I see absolutely no issue with the pilot holistic review when it's making the recommendations about the bylaws to say, and the first one of these will be held in three years or that. And so I don't see a foregone conclusion that because we're doing a pilot now means we have to wait seven years. I think figuring out when that next one needs to be, all things considered, is indeed one of the things that the pilot can determine. So I think any name we put that has the word holistic in might be mistaken for that. But I think and I think we can make that explicit in here somehow. At least that's my thought. That it doesn't mean seven years.

And I thought it was in the language here somewhere, and maybe it fell out at one of the edits that one of the things we had talked about was this PHR being determining when in its recommendation for the bylaws, how it would proceed, when the next would be, how the bylaws went, etc. So I don't see that as being an issue. I'm sure we could come up with another name. We could call it Fred, but I really don't think that'll limit it. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very, very briefly back to you, Sebastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say that I am not sure that it's in the responsibility of the holistic review, but let's imagine that I can do. That means that we will push the other reviews and specifically the ATRT4 also from some years or some months or whatever. Therefore, we have to take all that into account. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. Okay. So here's what I'm hearing. That in fact both the original ATRT3 shepherds. Pat, yell at me if I'm misquoting here. And the OEC work that's been done on the ToR that we worked on together are probably one and exactly the same thing at this stage, and that is to clearly establish guidelines and help the community understand and indeed accept by having a little bit of experience in one of these things, to have greater clarity, to have a mutual acceptance of what is going to

happen with a holistic review going forward. And in doing that, at least

Page 18 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023 **EN**

I think you used the term alpha testing, but some form of testing, as Matthew was outlining, for a sampling of some of the objectives that need to come out of ATRT3. Because what ATRT3 recommended can't happen. That ship has failed. Right? The timings are all wrong. It's too late. There's all sorts of unintended consequences because it put a little package together. So we kind of got to fix these and these things now have to change going forward because.

I agree with Avri. I'm quite sure we can do something to make that clear. I'm assuming, and I'm getting a thumbs up from Pat, so I can't be totally crazy. We're like, probably can be, but Pat doesn't mind. I'm thinking I like preambles that set the stage here. So let's have a little work on text, and welcome Tola. Nice to see you here. Let's have a little play on text and just put some concepts, suggestions in different colors or something on this document at this stage, treat it a bit like a scratch pad that shows what we've said today. And to be honest, the language that Matthew used in his intervention, I think we could almost copy and paste that in and see how that goes, because it seemed to be very clear to me so that the intent of what this is meant to do is really, really clear.

We also noted in the review of, not necessarily criticisms, but comments made in the public comments that a number of parts of the community still had this tripping up over the word pilot. And so while we're, well, we're stripping up on the word holistic and also tripping up on the word pilot. So if there's some clever thinking that any of you have, maybe in the same documents if a Q&A as Matthew is putting in chat. Excuse me. We can probably try and help that way. But we do recognize that titles

matter if for nothing, just for metadata and if we do need to make some

Page 19 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

change. I actually think just cutting things down to the list is the ones here starting to call it PHR. It takes the word holistic out of the synthesis going on in people's heads. They probably can talk about a PHR more effectively than pilot holistic review. But let's see how we go with that between now and our next meeting.

Unless any of you want to have some more time on this, I'd like to get Sebastien to move further down in his comments. Okay, Sebastien, back to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Next point is to add the world subsidiarity. I think when you read some of the—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we jump the little ones, the things that are just toilet just sort of generally fixing hands and butts and words. Let's skip those and just jump to substantive. So now I think the next substantive would be Vanda. Vanda, could you speak to your point?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Sorry, Cheryl. But for me, subsidiarity is a very substantive question. It's that in these documents, there are a lot of things it says it must be done by the pilot holistic review. It must be done by the SO and ACs. When we talk about the topics, the SIP, we are not giving them how they will do it. We will not say how we will get information from them. And it's why subsidiarity it is for me a very important word. And I put it at the end when I have read all that. It's why I suggest to

add it, but we can discuss it at the end. No problem. But it's not just a word, for me, it's very substantive one. Thank you. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. You say pardoning the pun but you want kind of the subsidiarity to be substantial. And it would be. It's not really changing meaning.

However, though, it's refining the meaning. Is it not? So let's very quickly make a suggestion on that rather than debate one word versus another as concept of what you are suggesting is now clear because you've spoken to it. And we leave that open for other people to comment in the document in case they've got a thesaurus with another word they want to pop in or even a sentence and we will come back to that next week. Okay? But I'd really like to get a start through the review of comments as I possibly can today. Now it's to Vanda. Yea, sorry, Vanda. Jump in.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I recommend one general, I would say, guideline? I think what I like and what I saw in Sebastien's comments, for sure, what we should be aware of is to say, well, we now spent a couple of months doing all those things and then that's it. I think the dynamics of time and changes should be well reflected in the document throughout as a general principle.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. And I got Vanda. I've got a blue screen for Vanda. Vanda, are you there?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Yeah. I'm here. So what I stopped, well, basically, on our SSAD that we should be more positive here because the test of the

adjustment needs to set guidelines. I believe we will set the guideline.

So that is the work we're going to do. We need to be clear on that.

That's the work we're going to do. So you set a deadline so no need to

set. Yeah, we need to set, but the conclusion is, we will set the

guidelines. In the same way, I state here that we're going to work for--

it's like information for the reading that we're going to try to discuss

different methodology, different process, and so on to select with the

self-care nothing for the community. If you will construct the process to

resuming the guidelines, we need to discuss better and that get more

information from everything because I think that people are also

concern about not to have independent to review and so on.

So this new information really needs to go out for the reading that we're going to discuss with the outsider, we're going to have those huge study about the best alternative. And they're only [00:39:01 -inaudible]

to give the guideline. Because what I'm hearing around is people are

afraid that this just come to the idea is there's three, four people sitting there, and nobody can suggest to order ideas and so on. So I believe we

will need to in some way make it clear that we'll be listening to others

and get all expert discussing everything before we finish the process.

That's, I believe, that we'll go, like, in other process, to public comment and so on. So it's something that people looks afraid about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, there's a couple of things to try and unpack there. What I heard first was something that I think is reflected elsewhere in other people's comments. I noted Avri also popped in a few things where there was a strengthening in the terminology. So things were not flexible and less ambiguous. The differences between wills and shells and those sorts of things. So we can all agree, I think, to wherever possible make this document as clearly defined as possible and where we mean a guideline which is not then open for further debate and modification, but a guideline that is to be followed, right? That it has a certain rationale and strength to it. And also what you're saying, if I heard you correctly, is that somewhere in this document, and this might be something we need to have a little bit of a page at the NJ's and there's sort of a scratch pad for, and we need to think about these letters, get back to who's type round to its whatever you want to title it, that we should also make sure the document makes clear to the reader of the document that we have in the pilot worked with community, and did I get it correct? And outside experts as needs be. Is that what you were saying?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Yeah. All right. So can I ask you if Jason pops a placeholder in the end of this document? For you to try and unpack that second part a little bit and maybe put a little bit suggested text that we can come and

have a look at again next week. But I think we can all agree that strengthening things and making things clear that when a holistic review

Page 23 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

then uses these guidelines, they don't spend the next month discussing changing the guidelines because the guidelines are the guidelines they've agreed to.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right. One's easy, one needs work. We can do both, but can we agree on the first part and get back to the second? Good, then

we're to Sebastien. I'm watching the clock, and I want to live at least the last 10 minutes of our call for administrivia. So we're not going to get terribly much further, but let's see how we go. Sebastien, back to you?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, then we leave out two of my comments. Okay, I think one discussion with [00:42:53 -inaudible], lack of identified dependency.

And I would like to say that I don't see why we will have dependency. It's a review. It's a holistic review. It must be something without any dependency. It must be something done with all the knowledge of the organization, what it's happening, how it's organized, and to suggest changes. Therefore, I consider that there is no dependency. That's all I will say. Thank you.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to go back to the OEC small team to react to that. Katrina.

Page 24 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you. Well, first, it's grouping of comments. And in comments, they referred to dependencies. So that's the name for that

group of comments. Those are comments where people mention dependency. That's one thing. Another thing, they did mention, dependencies, for example, holistic review is envisioned to look at results of continuous improvement. Right? So which means that there need to be some organized activities for this continuous improvement for the holistic review to have to look at, for example, surveys. So we need survey data, for example. Right? So I'd say those are dependencies. And those were identified in the comments. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, does that help you understand that the left hand column is really just a set of categorizing of the comments received in the public comment and therefore how the comments were addressed is being annotated in the second column.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, yeah, I can get the point, but I consider it's not a dependency. It's what it's the inputs to be done. And if you consider that when you have to give inputs to one group, it's a dependency. Okay, it's a dependency. But I read somewhere about the fact that there is a discussion on the multistakeholder model, and that's not a dependency. It something

done or going on. But the review, as it is a holistic review, it must be on, I would say, on top of that. Yes, of course, if you are taking about what must be the inputs to be given to the holistic review, yes, there is the

Page 25 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

dependency therefore. If it's that way you want to call them. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So I'm hearing a difference between looking at stacking up preparatory material that is required to make something happen in this process and a question of ordinance or hierarchy, is those things that's getting a little bit muddled by the use of some words. That's okay. We just need to recognize that and be cautious as we write anything in addition. I have a comment if I may, before we move off this page, about this whole block.

Because I think this block, this set of columns, which are very important pieces of information for the community to be able to have access to don't belong in a document which is looking at terms of reference for any activity at all. At all. It belongs in a document which is a response to public comments. And says, this brand-new thing, let's call it Fred, as Avri suggested.

This new thing called Fred, was developed because we took into account all of your public comments, insert information and link to the spreadsheet and the staff review and we dealt with them in the following way. And so this type of information kind of belongs to the community in the feedback to them on how their if it's an energy into the public comments were received managed handled and reflected in a thing we call Fred.

Because to me, I went, “What the hell is this doing in something that's supposed to be picked up and used by a whole new group.” Just me.

Page 26 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

Just keep that in your mind. We'll come back to that another day, but that would have been my major comment in this space. I'm happy to play with it, but I don't think it belongs in the final document. Fred doesn't need this. This belongs somewhere else. You don't love it. PHR. It works for me, Avri, I love it. I see. You people make me so happy even if it's early in the morning. Okeydokey. Matthew maintains it belongs as an introductory doctorate proficing, etc. Yes, even that would make me feel more comfortable, Matthew. It just jarred as part of the templating. But I was also willing to keep my [00:48:41 – inaudible] on that till later.

Just to scroll down, Jason, just briefly so we can have a look. There's actually big long parts of this document now that don't have comments. Thank heavens, everybody, just few. Now I just wanted everybody to see where comments have come in to date. Here we go. We've got a few more coming in here. Some of these are not necessarily substantive. I just want people to get in a look and feel now, Jason. That there are comments here and homework assignments for all of us and that would include now the OEC small team as well. I'd like to encourage us to not only put in from the shepherd's perspective additional and continuing comments, but also where a comment exists, put in your reaction.

So if you just agree with a replace word, just go plus yes, me too. If you say I don't understand or you want to go to Vanda, can you clarify that? Then we can see that in our next call instead of actually talk about it in our next call. So it means we can say, okay. Sebastien said this, Katrina has responded that, Matthew has made this comment, it appears we

need to do this. Just trying to show order how we approach going

Page 27 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

through the comments. But as you can see, there's a lot of space that still needs work that to be developed. And we also have now and need for a bit of a scratch pad at the end for things that we want to park and come back to. So more homework required on this document. Jason, can you now take us just refresh our memory to the spreadsheet. Thank you, Pamela, for sending that out between last meeting and this. It was a godsend to me. I can tell you. This is the [00:50:41 –inaudible] information on how everybody in what was received. So I'm just trying to move the chat out of the way. And there's an extensive amount of information here. This I'm assuming is something we will annex or reference that you don't want to do actual work on, is that the case? Just give me a thumbs up or a thumbs down.

KATRINA SATAKI: We gave this to you to just as working material so that you don't have to go through all the all the comments, you can just look at these and look at that they have been addressed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But to that end, we also thought that it would be useful to cross check that comments have been picked up. You've got the clustering that we just looked at is it an exhaustive list? Is it fully inclusive of everything here? Do we need to check that that is the case? Are we going to try and make a best effort in addition to what the OEC has done to ensure that everyone can see that their comments? May not have had influence but have been to take an account of, and if so does it belong in another document or this one?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Well, the idea wasn't to add it to the document. It was, as I said, it just for you so that you don't have to read and open each individual submission. So you can just see them all together. But of course, if you think that we need to write next to each comment how that one has been addressed, that's a different matter.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that is something that some policy processes do do. I'm asking, is that [CROSSTALK]?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. Okay. That's one of the options of course. But I don't think you need to look again at all this. Should be full list. Don't waste your time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. But if it wouldn't be a waste of time if you were intending to have, as I said, some policy processes do. I'd rather be doing it while we go through than come to the end of a word document and you go, "Oh, and now we need to go back and go through these other processes as well."

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And that's a fair point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just little clear guidelines here. Thank you. All right. Next steps. A little bit of homework for all of us on the document with the OEC small team responding if they feel they want to some of our comments as we go through. We will try and move a little bit faster because there will be perhaps less discussion required on some of the other comments going on. I know everybody has not had a chance yet to pop comments in for a whole lot of very, very good reasons but that we have the next fortnight. Until our next meeting, and Pam, can you tell me is it at the same time and day in a fortnight's time?

PAMELA SMITH: Cheryl, it's been a fortnight's time on the same day and at the original time, which is 20 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Right. So that's the amount of time we've got. I'm assuming that it'll be probably Pat do the lead. then we'll juggle that one. And then it'll go back to Avri. And we also need to look at if not this week, by next week, will we be needing to book up some more meetings after 1st of June. At the moment, Pam has got us fortnightly until June 1. But we need to check our progress and see how we go.

So at the end of next call, we'll have a slightly longer block of time to review the cadence of meetings and activities going forward. In the interim, we will also have a look at options for some form of opportunity to have some concentrated working together on the

document we are reviewing. Okay? And where that happens around ICANN77 or not needs to be considered. Mary's got a little bit of

Page 30 of 32

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

research she'll be doing, but we also need to decide and commit to if we are making ourselves available for any of the AC/SO people who might want to interact. Because we need to decide that and either do or don't do that very, very shortly.

Is there anything else? Call for final comments? Thank you, Herb. I appreciate the fact that you recognize that it's a challenging initiative, and I hope you do think we're being kind and positive. We'll do our best. It's a tough to do the positive part from time to time, but we can but try.

HERB WADE: And thank you, Cheryl, for shepherding this forward. UNKNOWN

SPEAKER: Yes, thank you for taking it today.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Thanks, Jason. Get better.

JASON KEAN: Thank you. Bye everybody.

PHR\_ Discussion on Pilot Holistic Review ToR Version 2 – Meeting 2\_20 April 2023

**EN**

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**



