

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group call taking place on Thursday, 28th of March 2024 at 1400 UTC. On our call today, we have Claire Craig, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Bill Jouris, Sébastien Bachollet, Faheem Soomro, Eduardo Diaz, Jonathan Zuck, Shah Rahman, Tommi Karttaavi, Fatou Sarr, Amrita Choudhury, and Pari Esfandiari.

Currently, we don't have anyone on the Spanish channel and, no one on the French channel either. But just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Avri Doria, Marita Moll, and Justine Chew. And from staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call, and I will be doing call management. Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

We have Spanish and French interpretation as usual. And on the Spanish channel, we have David and Paola. And on the French channel, we have Claire and Dominique for our interpretation service. And one final reminder is the real time transcription service we have. I'm going to share the link with you on the Zoom chat. Please do check the service as well. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Claire. Thank you very much.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Thank you, Yeşim. Claire Craig for the record. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all of you. Welcome. And thank you, Heidi, for reminding us that today is UA Day. And I know that there are a number of excellent, events that are planned across the globe, and I hope that we all get an opportunity to check some of them out. I actually had an opportunity to check one out yesterday, and it was quite good. So, we look forward to these events that continue to stay awareness of the importance of universal acceptance as well as internationalized domain names.

Today, I was also looking forward to welcoming our new co-host Marita, but unfortunately, she's unable to attend today. So next time. Our agenda for today, we're now on to Item 3. Let me look at-- This screen is very small for my eyes, so I have it over here on another screen. Item 3, the proposed bylaws to limit access to the accountability mechanism. And that is being led by Alan Greenberg. And I know that they have already posted something in the Google Doc, and we will discuss that.

Then Item 4, the discussion of At-Large response to the proposed update to Recommendation 7 by the CCWG AP. And, again, I know that something has been posted there already in the Google Docs. Jonathan spoke to us about that last week, but I think today, Alan is going to continue to lead that. And I'm seeing Judith is saying that she is also contributing to this item.

Item 5, we have Cheryl and Tommi who will tell us what's going on in the ATRT3 recommendation 3. 6, the Continuous Improvement Program, and we look forward to that discussion. And for those of you who felt that at OFB-WG, we really didn't have that much of a events

and activities to keep us busy. We've added quite a few thanks to very able Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Sébastien. So, we're going to be talking today about ATRT4, the pilot holistic review, as well as to get your feedback on the NetMundial+10.

So, when I took this position as co chair, I was like, okay. All right. This seems a little bit doable. But I know that you guys are really stretching my understanding. But thanks to all the persons in this group who are really very knowledgeable of all these areas, I am coming along slowly but surely, and I will get this. So, thank you again, and we go on next to any other business. And so, that's it for the agenda, but let me find out if anyone has anything else that they would like to add at this point in time.

I'm not seeing any hands, and I'm not seeing anything in-- Well, I didn't see the comment. What's the comment? Right. Nothing about the agenda. So, thank you all. So, the agenda is adopted, and we move right into Item 3, and I will ask Alan to take the lead there. Is Alan on? I think he is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Claire?

CLAIRE CRAIG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Sorry to not to raise my hand. I just wanted to let you know that we have not gone over all the action items.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Oh, sorry. Thank you. Thank you, Heidi. Good. Heidi, I cannot see it. Let me open it on my screen. It's one of those things of aging. It's gotten even smaller. Okay. So, the actual item, the first item, the bylaws to limit the access to the accountability mechanism to Recommendation 7. Noted that ALAC and At Large is generally supportive. Then we are going to be dealing with the volunteer pen holders who was talking providing ALAC's response to the bylaw update to limit the access to account accountability mechanism, which I think that is Item 3 on the agenda, and then we move into item 4.

So, by the end of today, we should have completed Item 3. I think because I know that a lot has been done by the team, the pen holders of that, and it should probably just to close, to clean it up. And that is due in early April, but I think we're more or less finished with that. And then also we have started the response to the draft to the response from Tripti Sinha's letter on recommendation 7 and which is to be submitted by 17th of May.

So, those are all action items for today. So, thanks for that, Heidi. And we now move on to Item 3 on the agenda, and I ask Alan to take the floor. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Statement was drafted by me with comments from Judith. There's still one or two issues to resolve in it. If we could pull the statement up, please. If you scroll to the bottom, there's a point to the Google Doc. Okay.

It's a relatively simple statement. It simply states the facts that we were chartering organization of the CCWG accountability, and we approved the final recommendations. We are charting organization of the new auction proceeds and approve the recommendations, and we are one of the decisional participants in the empowered community, which would be required to change, to do a bylaw change.

We support the bylaw change. We commend the Board for finding this path, which would avoid another fundamental bylaw change in the future should it happen. And noting that removing accountability measures is an onerous change. It's something we don't want to do lightly, but the bylaw is worded to make sure that it is no easier to do that than it would be to-- or I'm sorry. It's easier to do that than change the fundamental bylaws, but it doesn't require any fewer steps, with regard to ensuring that it is a safe thing to do.

I do note that there was one issue that bothers me, and that is the new bylaw would say there may be limitations but doesn't say what they are. And anyone reading the bylaws would have no idea what the limitations are or how to find them. And I am suggesting putting a pointer to what the limitations are. There was an objection from Eduardo that putting a pointer to a web page, which can theoretically be changed relatively easily, is a weakness. But I note that changing the web page doesn't change the conditions. All the conditions still would have to be met in

any real case where the accountability limitations are. It just makes it an easier way to find them, and there is already a precedent for having a URL, a very comparable URL in the bylaws.

I think that's about all. There's one change that Judith suggested, if we scroll-- Well, it's on top. You can see it. I don't feel that the additionally and furthermore are appropriate because this is simply a numbered list, and all of those things are comparable. The order doesn't particularly matter, so I would tend to remove those words. I'm not going to die in the ditch over it, but I don't think they're needed, and I think they confuse the issue just a little bit. I open the floor to any questions.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Claire speaking to the record. Thank you so much for your work, Alan, in driving this process. Are there any questions for Alan or any comments on the work that has been done? Yes, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

No. It's a good statement. I'm fine with drafting the other one. And Alan accepted my other changes, so that was good. The only question we had is we were wondering, I think Eduardo had the question on the link, and we had said that we put the link. The link was there already, and so we're just commenting on the link. But, otherwise, it's a very good statement, and I'm happy. And thanks to Alan for starting the drafting early, and so I just had time to comment on it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I thanked you for her quick comments.

CLAIRE CRAIG: This this one went through really, really very quickly. Alan, I know you said you had one issue and that was just the way a particular item was worded. Do you want to repeat that again? How do you think we could resolve that?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you scroll to the top of the statement, yes, Cheryl. Yeah. It's just the two words in red that Judith suggested. I said I don't think they're appropriate, and I think Judith just agreed that we'll drop them. Well, I think we're in in good shape.

CLAIRE CRAIG: All right. Good. Staff, please help me. Does this come to the ALAC for voting on or what's the next step?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to let staff answer that. It most definitely goes to the ALAC. It has to go to the ALAC. And moreover, it should preferably go to the ALAC before issuing if at all possible. This is a really critical issue, and we don't want to cut corners.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Great. So, that said, can we just have a temperature show of hands? Because I think this is very straightforward, and it seems as if it's something that we can all agree to. But just by a show of hands, can we

see a tick or yay. I'm seeing couple of hands. Some persons have not done anything. Does that mean that you don't agree or? Oh, they're putting comment in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: The chair could comment also.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Jonathan, he agrees.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. No. The chair of this working group.

CLAIRE CRAIG: No. I said I agree. I agree. I am totally supportive of this. And as I said at the very beginning, I'm learning so much because you guys are just so efficient and experts in this, and it's helping me to be able to move forward to learn about all of these things very quickly. As you know, ICANN is not an easy environment, but I'm getting there. So, thank you for the work that you've done, and I guess we can take this forward so that we can have this completed long before the deadline.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'll do a final cleanup and proofread just to make sure there's not too many other typos left in it.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Okay. Great. Thanks for that, Alan. So, we now move on to Item 4 of the agenda, which is also Alan taking the lead on this. So, Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That's the letter. The letter essentially says that the CCWG said we should limit accountability procedures for the selection of projects. The Board noted wisely that there are other things that ICANN will act on, including the Board's approval, and there may be other things along the way that we also want to similarly limit the accountability on.

Essentially, we don't want people filing IRPs, spending huge amounts of money which would come out of the auction proceeds and slowing things down. And in virtually every other granting program, the organization that makes the change the selections makes the selections. And if you get rejected, you get rejected. And so that's completely normal. Why the accountability CCWG ended up with that one type of restriction but not making it more general, I cannot remember.

I think I'm the one who originally suggested it, and I certainly don't think I suggested it to limit it to only the selection process. But honestly, that was years and years ago now. But in any case, the Board caught this, and I think that it's completely appropriate for or to widen it to make sure that we don't have things slipping through the cracks. So, I think they did a good catch, and I think we should support it.

And the statement, if we go to the statement of-- Judith, sorry. You wanted to make a comment before we go to the--

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I think why we didn't notice it is that we were focusing on the independent panel, and we were just wanting to make sure that that panel and we just did not notice because we were just so focused on the independent panel, how it'll be constructed, how it'll be done. And the Chairs did not notice also that we should have included that. And so, I just I think it was just a slight of hand, and it's good that they caught it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If we can go to the statement. Just point you to at the bottom again by the-- And, again, it is a very, very short statement. It says the ALAC is one of the chartering organizations, confirms the Board's interpretation is correct, removing the phrase and cites the phrases from the recommendation is entirely in line with both the intent and the understanding of the recommendation that the ALAC had when it accepted and ratified the final report, and that those words, that sentence "accepted and ratified" is verbatim out of the acceptance and ratification.

And I point to where that document is. Not an easy document to find because the way-- The reason it's not easy to find is because of the way our policy web pages are structured. There is a button to download the statement, but there's no way to find out what the URL is. You can't just hover, and you can't say copy link because it's not actually a link. It's a button. That really should be changed. It was a pain in the butt to find that copy.

There was another copy attached to the Wiki, but things in the Wiki, again, I think that's the one I actually ended up using on the Wiki, which is not nearly as stable as a web pointer. So, that should be fixed at some point. In any case, Judith did make a number of suggestions, all of which I incorporated with one exception, and that is she said that the intent and understanding was what we had as seen in the linked statement, linked comment. And in fact, it is not seen in the linked comment.

The comment makes a very simple statement that's already there and doesn't go into what how we interpreted it. So, I believe that the added phrase is incorrect. It's actually incorrect, so we shouldn't do it. But other than that, they it's a very short statement. Judith found a couple of other things that I missed, and I think it's pretty well ready to go unless someone has a comment. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I guess I was reading from my memory in the statement and seeing maybe words that may not have been there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Words we wish now had been there, but they weren't.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Words we wish there had been there but weren't there, but reading back on it, it's like, oh yeah, that's what we said. That's what we meant but we didn't say, and it was so long ago too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think the message we're sending is if someone had suggested it at that point or if the recommendation had said that at that point, we would have clearly accepted it. There's no question in my mind that this would have been a controversial issue, and that's all we're confirming here.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thank you. Judith, I'm seeing your hand still raised. Did you have something else you wanted to add?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, but I just wanted to address Harold's point. Harold was confused. He thought he had to come-- Harold, we already, the two things that we were assigned, Alan has addressed already. So, the Recommendation 3 is already done, and this Recommendation 4 is done. So, Harold, Alan was so fast and speedy, that has already been completed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just about as fast and speedy as Judith was to get in a comment after I wrote it. So, I think we make a good team.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thanks again. And you were so speedy that I think by the time staff sent the reminder that this was on the agenda and that you had volunteered to do this, it was already written. So, there was something known as

front-end loading. Talk about front-end loading. You all have gone way ahead. You're moving like lightning. So, thanks for all those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Claire, many years ago, there was a book called *The Last-Minute Manager*. And it described a work process technique where you do things by the deadline, but just. After only 30 or 40 years, I'm trying to fix that.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Yeah, yeah. And again, Alan, I would say, there aren't a lot of younger ones in this group, I believe. And so, as we age, we have to be a little bit more reasonable and recognize that we can't wait and do everything last minute. So, I really appreciate the fact that you all just took it in front and got it done. And that it's a very simple statement, which, again, is something that we have to commend, because no sense making something long and drawn out if it doesn't have to be. So, thanks for the effort. I think even Maureen commented on it and sent her agreement, if I'm not mistaken, on the list.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe so.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Maureen's only comment was that we wish staff had also caught, the Board had also caught the issue of that staff people, members who are on the PCWG auction proceeds, after a number of years, should be

able to help out or assist, consult on helping other grantees get the rewards, get projects. But we are now excluded because they're reading into words that were not there.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Right. Yes, I remember. Thanks for the reminder of that, Judith, for her specific words. And I think, as you all know, that was ventilated quite a lot at the Puerto Rico, ICANN79 in Puerto Rico. We went to the Board, Alan took a proposal, we spoke about it, and again, they said this is the first round, and therefore they didn't want to delay it by making any changes and that kind of thing. But I think it's one of those items that we have to continue to bring up, continue to let them know that it has not ended.

So, this is just round one. We don't agree with it, but we move forward so that things can continue, but we keep it at the forefront. So, thanks again to the team for working on this. And again, I think we may have a few more ALAC members on this call, so let's have another hefty environment by a show of hands who are ready to move forward with this a whole month plus in advance. Yeah, thank you, thank you. Right, yeah, so we just need to tidy it up and move forward.

Great. Thanks everyone for your comments, feedback, and it will be available and then staff will let us know what are the next steps. So, we move forward. Any further comments or questions on this? Jonathan, do you want to say anything on this? I'm okay with it, Alan, if I didn't say that before. It's very good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I think so.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Great. Okay, so thanks again team. And now we move on to Item 5. We're moving quickly along so we should have some fairly good time for Item 6. And this is the update on the ATRT3 continuous improvement. So, Cheryl, we now turn the meeting over to you. And Tom.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you very much for that, Claire. Just noting for the record, I wasn't going to hand it to Tommi, because not a lot has happened. And I figured while he's in this meeting, he can raise his voice but in fact he's in a crowded train. So, he's very happy apparently to let me do the talking. And he also noted as we certainly all will, that there was no CIP meeting held between this week's OFB call and last week's OFB call. So, there's not an inverted commas reporting beyond what we did last week to do.

That is true, excepting. We have in fact had a post meeting document sent. Now, I know Tommi and I have received the one that is earmarked for ALAC and Amrita is confirming. Thank you, Amrita. I had assumed that the regional CIP CCG members would have also received the ones earmarked for their particular component part of our part of the ICANN world, as will other representatives. Yeşim, if you could just throw up that link, please, just so everyone knows what is going on. Right.

So, what we all have now is an additional document to refresh your memories. Originally, we had this data acquisition exercise, which was a mind dump from the representatives on what they considered was recent and current activities that could be in any way, shape or form classified as continuous improvement. We've got that captured at least from the ALAC and many of the regional representatives, but I know it's still not all of the regional representatives, on a separate wiki page so that our community can keep up to date with what's going on in that.

That being said, as we reported last week, after ICANN79 and an interactive session focused specifically on the principles, the five actual guiding principles of what we believe a continuous improvement framework that is ICANN-wide needs to be built around. And reminding everybody again that those principles are not magic things that have been created out of air. They are linked specifically to what is in the current bylaws regarding specific and organisational reviews, organisational reviews in particular.

So those principles you'll see articulated here on what is basically a new piece of real estate, new Google Doc real estate for us to do further and more detailed work on now. So, it's our new homework assignment and it's a homework assignment that we will, I believe, need to interact with our communities on. So, Tommi and I will need to dig in deep with the ALAC and or its delegates. Perhaps it doesn't need to be the whole 15-person ALAC, some of whom probably don't know any of the answers to these questions. But rather those in the ALAC who do know what they're talking about in the matters of what is planning and possible for continuous improvement.

So, Jonathan is probably going to have to decide on that. And the same probably needs to be said for those in the regions as well. But what we need to do is ask ourselves the following questions and then go into details on what the answers might be. Most importantly, here you'll see the example states ALAC, but it would state RALO, APRALO, for example, if it was the one that Justine and Amrita have. EURALO is the one that Natalia and Sebastien have, and Bill would have one that says NARALO, et cetera, et cetera.

Is the insert name of entity fulfilling its purpose? Is the structure of the entity actually effective? Is the operation of the entity actually efficient? And is the entity accountable, and there's a definition of the accountability there, to its stakeholders and external aspects of the ICANN community? And that one in particular was edited as a result from our recent deliberations. Also, Principle 5 is a somewhat more overarching one, which of course is all about how answers to all of those things do or do not fit in with the continued evolution and effectiveness of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

I'll hold there before we just pop down to see what has happened in terms of our own work. Jonathan first and then Alan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. Thanks. I feel like the structure of this begs the question whether we need to ask the question about the At-Large community as a whole. In other words, separating the ALAC from its individual RALOs creates silos that might miss the question about whether the At-Large community as a whole is structured to be fit for purpose and effective

and efficient. And I wonder how we go about asking that question in this context.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Luckily, ALAC will be able to decide to do that or not in its responses. Of course, the RALOs are being treated as in some way, shape or form similarly untethered as such and equally autonomous entities that is seen in the GNSO. So, as usual, the actual understanding of what the structure and function of the advisory committees is woefully less sophisticated and actually accurate than it is for the tail that wags the dog called the GNSO. And, of course, we all know how terribly, terribly precious the stakeholder groups, constituencies, et cetera, are about their autonomy and less said there.

So, I think that's a perfect point for us to pick up. And Jonathan, if you would like us to capture that in a chapeau to this homework, we can do. But it's certainly something that Tommi and I need to weave into the later work. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: With regard to that, I don't think it's just you and Tommi. I think that should be on the list for the RALOs also. Does this whole organization work? And remember, the bylaws in terms of the structural reviews talked about the ALAC. Our reviews always said the At-Large. We ignored the bylaws and made it the larger. And, in fact, in the first one, we ignored the RALOs because they were brand new. So, I really think it's everyone's job, not just the ALAC, to look at that.

Okay. However, that's not why I raised my hand. There's a natural question that comes out of several of these principles, perhaps all of them. But, interestingly, in the exercise that was carried out during ICANN79 where we were looking at these principles and looking at how to proceed and use them and verify if they were indeed good principles, the question never came up. And that is, asked the question is, what needs fixing? I mean, the natural answer, the question of continuous improvement is, what needs fixing?

And although that's a good question to come out of Principle 1, Principle 2, Principle 3, it was never asked. It was never discussed. And when we raised it, I was sitting beside Chris Disspain, and we both sort of came up with this, and it doesn't fit. And when we raised it with staff, they said, well, you could add that somewhere. It's not really a principle, but it's the core question. And if we ignore the core question, we're likely to generate a lot of paperwork and not really fix anything.

And so, I understand Jamboards and process and filling in little things, but ultimately, at some point, we have to say, if we're going to improve things, what needs improvement and how do we fix it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Alan, you're jumping ahead, of course. You are quite reasonably, I understand, jumping ahead. This is a process which is designed for baby steps to ensure that all the toddlers manage to get to the end of the race that at least are within CUI of each other.

And whilst, yes, anyone who's done any of these things in the past or thinks in these ways could certainly hop, skip, and jump further along

and faster, that's not what this CIP process is having us do at this stage. Is it something we need to attend to? Absolutely, because that's where, in fact, to use a metaphor, the rubber hits the road. In response to those principles, what then?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to note, taking a lot of baby steps may put some of these babies to sleep.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It might put us to sleep, that's true.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's certainly put me to sleep.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood, but staged implementation of things does have a tried and true tested methodology. And unfortunately, not everyone has the background in this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unfortunately, boring people to death the first day is not a good way to start. Sorry, I'm being very pointed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand and you and I can moan about this, but we're in it. We'll just do the job. Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Cheryl. I think what could be done, given how things have been planned, is once the RALOs make their responses, I think some of them would be pretty similar. The ALAC members could look at it and also make a comment so that you and Tommi could kind of work on it. Obviously, the deadline is shorter, so we will have to do it faster. But I think we know on the Jamboard what the thought process mostly was. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that, Amrita. And I do understand that-- Well, let me put this another way. I believe firmly that the way that ALAC has developed its previous review processes, as Alan pointed out, as ALAC and At-Large organisational reviews, has put us in good stead for doing exactly that. But we do recognise that that, of course, is not the case for all parts of ICANN, and we're trying to deal with all parts of ICANN. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. And this may be redundant, which I apologise. I'm sympathetic to Alan's objection about what needs fixing, but I think that the criteria for what needs fixing is equally important. So, I think that's what these questions are meant to ferret out is to figure out how to decide what needs fixing, as opposed to just everybody tossing theories in.

If I can share briefly my experience with the CCT review, part of the CCT review was to review the Applicant Support Program. And it was

amazing that no one, and frankly, there was quite a bit of resistance, even in the second version of it, to come up with objectives and goals for that program. Instead, everybody just had fixes. Here's what needs fixing. Well, yeah, but is that fix in any way related to something we want to accomplish?

So, I'm definitely sympathetic to figure out what needs fixing, but I think just having everybody spitballing what needs fixing leads to a bunch of people with unarticulated goals, what are the source of those fixes. So, I think having objectives and goals is, in fact, essential to determining what needs fixing and what doesn't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Indeed. Thank you. And I'll also point out—and again, it'll be very brief after, it looks like Sebastien is going to be last in queue. Claire had closed after Alan, certainly no one after Sebastien—that we are, in fact, trying to not only look at these principles, but also apply the SMART program into them as well. So, by putting it through those particular lenses, we should in fact have something far closer to what you're articulating. Very briefly, Alan, because you've already had a bite of the cherry, and then Sebastien, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Just a note, not relevant to us as such, but it's an interesting observation. In the GNSO, the GNSO Council has been reviewed. The only sub-part of the GNSO, and I say GNSO, not GNSO Council, that has ever been subject to a review and change is NCSG, was NCUC, was targeted in the first review and was radically turned over and different.

The other constituencies and stakeholder groups, the registry, registrar, business, IBC, have never ever been reviewed and were never subject to any review. This is all brand new for them. And in fact, to what extent ICANN has the right to review them is questionable, but nevertheless, that's brand new. So just an interesting bit of insight.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, there was enough change getting bicameral activities sorted. I can't criticise that process. That's really all ongoing. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And staff, if you can allow me to open my camera, it would be great. Few little things. The first one is I think here we are just, and just it's important, working on the transitioning the organisational review to the continuity program. Therefore, we are talking about what was included in the organisational review to be taken as a principle. Do we need other principles for the future? It's something we may wish to discuss.

And my last point is that I guess definitely we need to add one additional body who is At-Large. And how we can do that, who will be in charge of it, we can open this question. But I think it's important that we have another thing who is At-Large, who is not each RALO and not the ALAC. That's all. And as you know, I love the word holistic. It's maybe that we need that At-Large to have a holistic view of our situation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Sébastien. And a perfect segue to the next section, Claire. Before we jump into that, I'm almost tempted to treat them in a slightly different order than is on the agenda, but we'll get to that in a moment. Just to show you that, for example, there is very specific filling out of additional things with articulated criteria beginning to be populated. If you can scroll to pick any other principle. Thanks, Yesim.

This is all specific to the ALAC. We need to now continue on popping what we already know. What I would like to do is if the ALAC in this case, and I would strongly advise the regions in their case also interact with a small selection of their community to now ensure that the appropriate things are placed in this editorial process. I think we can wrap this item up. It's cut our next item short, but I'm hopeful that we can still manage it in a timely manner. Claire, did you want me to just scroll straight to that or what?

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thank you, Cheryl. I just want to say one thing before we go on to Item 6 on the agenda. And that is we put the CIP on this, and we said it's going to be a rolling item that we will discuss every week. And in our discussion as to what should be on the agenda, we thought, okay, there was no meeting. So, this doesn't have to be a long discussion, but maybe we need to really review the time for this so that we can continue to have some discussions on how this needs to happen.

So, thanks for taking the time to do this, Cheryl, because I mean, as we go through it, I think we really need to look at what's working, how we need to do things. And this is a work in progress, and we will continue

to do it that way. So yes, we may not have the 20 minutes that we had allocated to the new items, but these are new items. And so, they are going to be on the agenda, and we are going to be talking about them moving forward. So, we will tweak our agenda as we move forward.

So, I now turn the floor over to you and Sebastien. I know Sebastien has his presentation. And sorry to the interpreters, I'm speaking very quickly. I am so sorry. So let me just turn it back over to you and Sebastien. Thanks again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, let Sebastien play with these PowerPoints first because it's up on the screen. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But you wanted to change the order of the topics. Maybe we can go directly to pilot holistic review. There is nothing on my slide on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It struck me only, Sebastien, that perhaps we could deal with them in the order that they are going to be coming to us, which arguably would be NETmundial, pilot holistic review and then ATRT4, that's all. But no one asked me how to put an agenda together. So, they put it together in this order. Go ahead and we'll get to all of it, I'm sure.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. That's all. I tried to put some information on the slide. For second slide, it's about ATRT4. Go ahead. Next one. Here. I get to try to read the letter, the answer from the letter of [inaudible 00:48:32]. And for the moment, it seems that we are the only one saying that we need to keep the timing of ATRT4 as it was supposed to be.

I really feel that we have more arguments than any of the other groups. It will be important if we can have some exchange particularly with the GAC to see what could be the mood and to understand what it's at stake. Because yes, we have plenty of things to do. Yes, we can always defer things and say, oh, it will be done in two years. But in two years, we will have more work for all the things to be done. Therefore, sometimes it's important to do things.

And here, I guess the argument put by ALAC on the table are very important. And the fact that we are not able to have discussion among the community on that topic, it's a key individual answer. And that's not very good from my point of view. That's it what I have to do, say, to ATRT4, maybe we can stop here. And Cheryl, if you want to add things, and we will go to the other topics one by one. It's my suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, I'll hop in literally on the fly here. Yes, it was something in fact, I had also raised earlier through the week with, can't remember if it was Claire or Jonathan or all of the above. But I certainly did have also the conversation which noted that watching the opinions coming in

from elsewhere, that we are in the minority of suggesting that we do not defer ATRT4.

And I think it's simply a naivety and laziness on the thinking associated with the other group that all they've thought about is the resourcing and the efforts that the volunteers would need to put in as opposed to what we fear is unintended and unnecessary consequences.

My suggestion for OFB consideration would be that depending on the outcome, we could indeed, as you suggested, work over with or without the GAC, but as an advisory committee, ALAC can advise. And it may wish to prepare advice on this later. Will it make an overall change? I don't know. I somehow doubt it, but at least we can give it a good shot. So back to you and what it was you prepared next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Well, whatever next, next it's a pilot holistic review. There are nothing written in the pilot holistic review because we are waiting for the Board to give the, I don't know if it's with a white flag or a red flag or whatever flag they will give us, but they are still reviewing the last comment period. And we are supposed to start to work, but without the Board approval of this, I don't know where we are really. That's what I can say today, but maybe you have more information.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, it's not so much other information as my crystal ball gazing. And yes, people, I do actually have a crystal ball, a real crystal ball on my desk. So, I can gaze at crystal ball. The high probability is going to

be that the pilot holistic review will run as it is currently planned. And so, it is going to be the next thing we need to deal with.

Now it would be nice if ATRT4 was running in parallel from our point of view, but if it isn't running in parallel from our point of view, then it will be running after the pilot holistic review. So, we need to prepare, and we need to prepare the manpower and the thinking and the thoughts need to be developed and guided in a process that means we're not trying to rush things through as we come towards the actual processes.

For example, the pilot holistic review, you do have both deeply experienced people who've come from review teams and other ATRTs in the past. You've got a really, I think that the sporting thing is the deep bench of characters who could be put forward to serve on a pilot holistic review team, but those people also need to be looked at in balance of bringing in a good proportion of fresh and new thinking as well. Otherwise, we're simply, we're running the risk of certain biases occurring by too much concretion in our thinking. We did it this way back in ATRT3, therefore type of approach. So, some fresh thinking is obviously important.

So, looking at just the logistics and the thought processes, the development of running perhaps some outreach activities to work out what people are actually wanting to do and what their opinions are regarding both the pilot holistic review and the possibilities of what ATRT4 will be doing have to happen. And we probably need to put-- Can I use your train metaphor, Jonathan? We've got to get our particular order of the train organised. So, we have the caboose where it belongs and the dining car where it belongs and the passenger

parts and hopefully all being dragged along by an engine and pushed by another engine if need be.

So that's the thinking that I think this group needs to do now. And I would suggest that, for example, for Sebastien, you, me, Vanda, Daniel, et cetera, we might need to be split across the things. You've got also, from the bench, you've got experience with Avri and with Alan and you've also got newer and fresher minds coming in and we kind of need to get those "working groups" going ahead of the call. The bridge is the one that is from ICANN79. Yeah, thank you. Yeah, that's what's from ICANN79.

So that's where I would put this. I would suggest action for us out of this would be to now look at our resources, human and otherwise, and start doing the prior preparation which will prevent our peaceful performance when it comes at us, which will be coming at us, of course, sooner rather than later. If we could just have a quick go to NETmundial. Yes, I'm aware of the time. Thank you, Claire.

Back to you, Sebastien, because I know you're passionate about this. I'm a remote participant. If I ever get their administration organised to say I am or I am not, or I am again, or I was, and now I will be, or whatever that nonsense is. We do have, I think, most of the onsite participants having at least heard something and not having retracted, but the remote participation is still fluffing about, but there you go. Maybe they have to buy another larger licence for their Zoom room. But what else needs to be said about this, Sebastien? It's very much your baby.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, it's our baby, but it's just to say that if ALSes want to declare themselves, they can of course, because ICANN is a technical community, but our own community may be more a civil society. What I would like very much is that we set up a page where all the people can say if they're onsite or online, and then to confirm if they will be onsite, because one of the problems will be the financing all of that to participate, and it's a short time.

Therefore, nothing to add, except that the next slide is to talk about the event cross-RALO roundtable about the 10th anniversary, 10 years later, on the exact date of the NETmundial in 2014. And then you have the programme here. I will not read it for you, but that's where we are. And I hope that you will be participating to this session all together. And if there are any questions, I am sure that Amrita, who is asking for the floor, will be able to give us information from inside Udmurt.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Product placement aside, Amrita, looking at the time, Claire, can you allow just a couple of moments to Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Cheryl. Very quickly. Yeah, there is a form on the NETmundial website, and the deadline to submit your comments to it is by 7th. They may extend it, but I think that's the first step. Based upon that, the HLAC, that high-level committee, is going to make a draft based upon which people will comment. And today, what we heard in the previous

call I was in is that whoever had applied have been selected because they were less than 500, and they can arrange a 500 in-person people.

Earlier, I had heard that there would not be any capping for remote, but I'm not sure. So, I'm sure you will be hearing about it. There was a typo. Many of the remote were sent a letter, and then it was retracted yesterday. That's what I heard. And I'm not insider. It is just that you get the information from various calls you are in. So that's about it. And the challenge with a lot of in-person confirmation is it is aspirational because the funding has to be arranged. So, we need to be realistic. And thank you so much, Cheryl. I'll leave it at that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And in fact, the assumption is self-funding, just to be very clear. How one does that self-funding is very much up to the individual, and perhaps some other discussions from supporting entities that they may or may not be involved with, but the assumption is, in fact, for self-funding. However, that may occur. Back to you, Claire, and apologies for the 60 seconds over the whole meeting time, but perhaps you've got an extension.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Thank you, Cheryl. No, I haven't gotten an extension. I haven't seen anything. So, we're going to just wrap things up here now. I think we can skip any other business at this point in time. And we need to just talk about our next meeting. But I just want to say that leadership has been very concerned that we want to grow the membership for OFB.

And in order to do that, we are still reviewing the spread between the two meeting times.

So, we're looking at that, and we're going to come back to you again, because especially with these new topics, we want to ensure that persons are able to attend meetings and contribute, not just listen to the recording. So, we are looking at it with staff, and we will come back to you on that. Okay? So, thanks again for being here, everyone. So, can we have the information on the next meeting, please?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Hi, Claire, this is Yeşim. So, the next week's meeting will be on the 4th of April at 1800 UTC, according to the current rotation time.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Okay. Thank you for that, Yeşim. And we will adjust those new items on the agenda as well. And we take your suggestion, Cheryl, since NETmundial+ 10 is the next item coming up, we should probably spend some more time discussing that, especially with the cross-RALO events that Jonathan is organizing. Sorry, not Jonathan, Sebastien is organizing. And then I think, correct me if I'm wrong, the next item should be the ATRT4. If that moves forward, we don't know, but we may have more to say. What are you saying, holistic review?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Holistic review, because it is already tagged the next thing off the-- We assume the ATRT4 is likely to be deferred despite our best efforts.

CLAIRE CRAIG: All right, so thanks again, everyone. Thank you to the interpreters. Sorry that I was speaking a little fast this time. I will try to remember those things. For those of you who celebrate Easter, do enjoy a wonderful weekend. For those of you with Ramadan, enjoy your fasting and everything that goes along with it. And the rest of you, looking forward to seeing you next week. Thank you again, staff. Thank you, interpreters. Bye, everyone. Take care. Have a good week.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]