

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you. Hello everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Review Team Plenary Call #1, on January 22, 2019 at 1300 UTC. Attending the call today -- I'm going to use first names by the way until I know you and then I'll use your last names. Attending the call today is Patrick, Sebastien, Vanda, Liu, Daniel, Maarten, Alina, Ramet, Jacques, Erica, Demi, Osvaldo, Michael, Jaap. Observers joining us, Jim Prendergast, John Fanning and Nadira. From ICANN Org we have Jean-Baptiste, Larisa, Theresa, Negar and Brenda. Apologies from Geoff and Wolfgang. I'd like to remind you that today's call is being recorded, please state your name before speaking for the transcript. I'll turn the call over to Theresa Swineheart, thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thanks Brenda, thanks everybody. I just wanted to first welcome everybody to the Review, to thank you very much for taking your time to volunteer to be part of this and in advance also for all the work that you'll be putting into this. It's a really important review as you know, this is the first ATRT Review after the IANA Stewardship Transition and as we call specific reviews these are quite important and this one in particular has a range of areas where this Review Team obviously has the opportunity to take a look at them in the Post IANA Transition environment, including some areas that had been identified with regards to potentially streamlining some of the specific reviews.

---

*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.*

---

We're really looking forward to supporting you, to working with you. My team and I are here and we're available. As you know, we have a good strong team on hand. With that, please don't hesitate to let me know or anybody on the team, if there's anything that we can do to support your work, to make it easier and to help facilitate your discussions in anyway. Again, thanks in advance for volunteering to undertake this and thanks in advance for all your work. With that, I am going to turn it over to Jean-Baptiste to kick this off.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you very much, Theresa, and I'd like to go together over the agenda, the agenda for today. We start with an introduction of Review Team Members, an introduction of ICANN Organization Support Team. We'll cover the specific review processes and the operating standards. Review together the bi-laws and board resolution on ATRT3. Look at the Review Team Leadership Structure and Responsibility. Look at the status of Observers and look at the Next Steps for this review on this day. Start planning for face to face meetings and finally, any other business.

Starting with first agenda item, Review Team Members. We'd like you to shortly introduce yourself and share your hopes for this review. We will follow the order on this slide. So we'll ask you, Sebastien, if you could shortly introduce yourself? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Hello, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I was selected by At-Large and actually I am currently a member of the ALAC. I am coming from

---

France, Europe. I really hope that this ATRT3 will allow ICANN to move forward with the recent [inaudible] accountability and transparency. It's an important step that we are going after the IANA transition as Theresa just said and I am sure that this group will have an important responsibility and task in front of us, and I am really ready to start with that and I hope that we will work together in the right direction. I don't know how many times you want me to speak but I guess I will stop here and maybe if you set up some time, it will be easier because at the end, nothing will have five seconds. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. My domicile is in Australia and I suppose the fastest way for this would be to do a few things. If you're interested in [inaudible], I will put in a link to my profile that I use in the context of ICANN and you can all read till your heart's content or you can always Google me, that's easy enough too as I'm sure some of you have worked me before. My desires for this particular review team is for us to work in a effective and efficient way, get through the development of our scope and then complete the scope of work in a collaborative and collectively productive and timely manner. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Moving on, Daniel?

---

DANIEL KHAUKA NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, I'm Daniel Nanghaka Khauka for the record. I'm from Africa region. Also, from ALAC and I'm very happy to be a member of the ATRT3 review team. And also, I'm actually hoping for the [inaudible] and I look forward to give my utmost [inaudible] to the whole review process. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Daniel. Vanda, please?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, Vanda Scartezini for the record. I'm a member of [inaudible] South America where I represent the Latin America and Caribbean Islands and from the ALAC At-Large group, LACRALO. I'm working with ICANN since 2000 [inaudible] here and I'm very glad to face this challenge because it's a very important issue after the affirmation of commitment [inaudible]. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much. Demi, please? Demi, can you hear us? Alright, Brenda can I ask you to liaise with Demi, and in the interest of time, we will move on to Yui.

YUI LIU: Thank you. This is Yui Liu speaking. I'm from the China of Information, Communication and Technologies, and the Executive Director of the

---

Internet Governance Research Center and have been working in governance since the beginning of the ATRT1. My team and I have engaged with the whole process of the [inaudible] ATRT1 and ATRT2. I was the assistant of Mr. [inaudible] who was a member of those two review teams.

Also, our team put research on the accountability and the transparency of ICANN since the IANA Transition for Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. As the only people endorsed by GAC, I would like to put more efforts on this specific review on GAC related activities. Last but not the least, it's my pleasure to be the member of ATRT3 this time and I can discuss with all the professional people. I really appreciate to spend time with you in this room this whole year. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Liu. Demi, are you in a position to speak now? We don't seem to be hearing you right now. We'll move on to Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, depending on whereabouts you are. My name is Jacques, I am French, my accent might tell you. I live in Bordeaux; it's a nice region to come and visit. I'm part of the GNSO group and more precisely, the registrar. They called a group and I'm very glad to be part of this review team. As you all know, ICANN and its process and transparency, is an integral part of our registrar business and we will have a very good view of what's happening. I will be glad to know you all and work with you for this next session.

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Jacques. Moving on to Patrick.

PATRICK KANE: Hello, this is Pat Kane, I'm with Verisign, I've been here for about 20 years. I'm looking forward to the opportunity to take a look at not just the accountability and transparency mechanisms we have in place today but as ICANN seeks to shape or reshape their organization, take a look at what might work in the future. Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Patrick. Moving on to Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi, this is Michael Karanicolas. I'm with the NCUC, dominated by the GNSO, based in Canada. I've been working on transparency and access to information issues for many years and in a number of different contexts, mostly [inaudible] into governments organizations as well as here at ICANN. Most recently where I was the rapporteur for the Work Stream 2 Transparency Subgroup, so having engaged with ICANN's open data and transparency and DIDP for quite a while. I look forward to trying to improve transparency here. Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much. Wolfgang sent his apologies for today's meeting. We'll move on to Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Hello, good morning, this is Osvaldo Novoa with the ISPCP Constituency, was selected by the GNSO to be a member of this group. I think this work is very important at this moment in ICANN. I'm ready to put as much as I can. I'm sure we will have a very productive work in the group. I work in the telecommunication administration, it's a public government owned company. I'm in charge of the international relationships. I'm open to questions.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Osvaldo. We'll now move on to Adetola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Hi, good afternoon, good evening, morning.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Adetola, we don't seem to hear you anymore.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Can you hear me now?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, thank you.

---

ADETOLA SOGEBSAN: [Inaudible] have sent a message for [inaudible] last call because I know my internet is having issues. I request that [AUDIO BREAK].

JEAN-BAPTISE DEROULEZ: Adetola, we seem to have difficulties to hear you. I will ask Brenda whether she can dial out to you and have the chat ready. Demi, are you in a position to speak? Otherwise, I'm more than happy to read what you have written in the chat.

Alright, so what Demi wrote is from Brazil, Latin America Caribbean. Selected by ccNSO, was a member of ATRT2 and will turn the group to make a strong ICANN. Thank you, Demi. Moving on to Erica.

ERICA VARLESE: Hi everyone, I'm Erica Varlese; as you can probably tell from accent, I'm from the US but I'm based in Brazil, in Rio de Janeiro. I'm here as part of the GNSO, I'm a member of the Registry Stakeholder group. I work for the .blog Registry. I think obviously these review teams are critical to ensuring transparency within the community and I'm very much looking forward to contributing to this effort with everyone. I think post transition this will be a particularly pivotal one and I'm very much looking forward to working with everyone on this and getting to know all of you. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Erica. And Ramet please, if you can introduce yourself.

**RAMET KHALILI:** Hello everyone, I'm Ramet Khalili and I'm from Iran, Asia region. I'm nominated by RSSAC. I'm the CEO of private IT solution for wider company and let's hope for a productive cooperation. Thank you.

**JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:** Thank you very much. Moving on to Jaap.

**JAAP AKKERHUIS:** Hello, this is Jaap Akkerhuis and I hope my microphone is working because it didn't five minutes ago. I'm actually nominated by SSAC, together with Geoff Huston and KC Claffy. Geoff is sound asleep, KC is very busy, so I apologize for them. SSAC since the beginning [inaudible] community, and [inaudible] type of work of various people. I'm talking more for doing this review work. My day job is working for NLnet Labs; this is small security, small issues [inaudible] we have to look at the security of the infrastructure part of the internet [inaudible] and DNS. Thank you.

**JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:** Thank you very much, Jaap. I believe KC is not on the call and Geoff has sent his apologies. We move on to Maarten.

**MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:** Hi there everybody, Maarten Botterman, I'm appointed by the Board. It's a great pleasure for me to be on this. [Inaudible] of ATRT1 and 2 in

---

effect and so the At-Large [inaudible] early 2000. Really believe that what we've done and achieved is great and I'm very much aware that we need to continue to improve. I love this part of the work and I'm really looking forward to working with you on this.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you very much, Maarten, and we welcome you on ATRT3. We would like to just go through with you. The Review Team members as expected are stated in the Operational Standards, and these are the following: to behave in a collegial and constructive way towards the Review Team, the Board and the ICANN Organization in accordance with ICANN expected standards of behavior. To actively participate in Review Team calls and face to face meetings and engage by a relevant mail list and other collaborative tools.

Review Team Members shall provide apologies at least 24 working advance for all meetings. Actively engage with relevant stakeholder groups within the ICANN Community. Individual Review Team Members are encouraged to report back to their nominating entity on the progress of the Review Team. You will provide site-based inputs and comments based on co-expertise and experience and undertake this research as require in accordance with scope of work and participate interest in documents as required.

There are several tools which are available to the Review Team, the first one is the Review Team Mailing List. As part of the questionnaire, you were asked to obtain to be added to this mailing list, this one has been used for this first meeting. The Community will be able to share their

input with the Review Team via their public email list, which is input on this call to atrt3@icann.org. Once the Leadership for the Review Team is selected, the Leadership mailing list and [inaudible] will be set up. There is also a dedicated WIKI space with the link currently on the slide, where we will post the Plenary meeting documents and any supporting documents for this review, information about the Review Team and all the correspondence to the Review Team.

There are trainings available for you on the WIKI and on the Adobe Connect. [Inaudible] in your questionnaire, so we will follow up on that and try to set up those with members who are interested. And per our experience with previous reviews, we would suggest using Google Docs as the collaborative tool for future work. We found that it was a really good tool for review teams when we have many different members [inaudible], so that would be our suggestion for [inaudible].

Are there any questions or remarks on this section of the agenda? Alright, hearing none, we will move on to the third item, which is your ICANN Organization Support Team. As a core team you have the following members starting with Negar. Negar, I would invite you to say a few words.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Good morning, good afternoon everybody. Welcome to the ATRT3 Review Team. I'm very much looking forward to working with all of you. This is a very important review and we've already had a few exchanges via email. Going forward as Jean-Baptiste has noted, exchanges are going to take place on the mailing list and of

---

course myself, along with the list of the people that you see on this slide, are here to support your work going forward, so please feel free to reach out to us with any needs that you have pertaining to this review and anything we can do to help support your work better and help you do your work more effectively. Back to you, Jean-Baptiste. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTIST DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Negar. I'm Jean-Baptiste Deroulez, I'm also part of the stakeholder strategy and strategy initiative department. I'm based in Brussels and have been involved with two of the review teams, TCT and RDS WHOIS2. I'll turn the mic to Brenda.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Hello, this Brenda Brewer and just want to welcome everyone to the ATRT3 Review Team. We're going to have a great time. I look forward to meeting you all someday in person. Let's get this call going. Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Brenda. There is an email available if you wish you write Staff, it's [ATRT3\\_Staff@ICANN.org](mailto:ATRT3_Staff@ICANN.org). We talked previously about the responsibilities of Review Team Members and here are the responsibilities of ICANN Organization as stated in the Operating Standards, which are to provide project management and administrative support to the Review Team. Provide guidance on processes and useful resources. Provide relevant input to the Review

Teams work if and when requested to do so, this includes relevant input by the ICANN Organization subject matter expert pertaining to issues included in the scope of the review. Finally, to project manage the implementation of Board approved recommendations and provide regular updates to the [inaudible] including the annual review implementation report. Any questions?

Alright, moving on to the Specific Review Processes. There are currently seven phases using the Specific Review Process. The first one is the Pre-Planning Phase, where the organization prepares to support the review. What happens there is that we look at the skills needed for the review as well as the timeline and the potential [inaudible] from the scope. We'll prepare the [inaudible] of the review. So by developing this timeline, [inaudible] to know our resources and explaining the skills and allocating the budget [inaudible].

After that comes the Initialization and Selection Phase. This is where the ICANN Board passes a resolution to initiate the review. The Board Resolution also directs the ICANN Community to establish a Review Team, and once composed, for the Review Team to draft its terms of reference and workplan.

During the second phase, there is a call for [inaudible] that is published. We solicit application from the ICANN Community as you know, and after that the SO and AC will evaluate the application, nominate its candidates based on its own processes. The SO/AC will nominate up to seven applicants and the chairs will then meet and make the final selection of the candidates to the Review Team subject to the relevant provisions of the ICANN Bi-laws under section 4.6. The ICANN Board

---

also selects one director or liaison as a member of the Review Team, Maarten in this case.

Following the selection of the Review Team, we'll announce the Review Team and its members and the Review Team Support.

After that we'll enter the Planning Phase. This is the phase we are currently in. During this phase the Review Team develops its approach to the review. The Review Team prepares the Terms of Reference and Workplan as requested by the ICANN Board. It also prepares its Project Plan [inaudible] the topics to be addressed. The Review Timeline and its budget owner's is usually the designated Review Team Member. For its part in the Planning Phase, the ICANN Org will communicate the project budget [inaudible] ICANN annual budgeting process.

We also coordinate a collection of – we which already done, the collection of your Statement of Interest and Conflict of Interest Policy. At the end of this, the Review Team will deliver its adopted Terms of Reference and Workplan to the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board will receive the report and confirm the adherence to ICANN's Bi-laws and Mission. This step concludes the Planning Phase of the process. This is going to be what we are looking at.

Going back to the other phases for specific review, the first one which is committing the review. This phase begins with the Review Team data collection and analysis, including the assessment of the implementation of the recommendation. You will consult with the ICANN Community during this phase if and when appropriate. You will have option to decide whether third party independent expert is necessary to provide

---

---

advice to the Review Team and if you budget allows; ICANN Organization will follow the procedures to identify and engage the collaboration with the Review Team. The Review Team will provide input into scope, selection criteria and timeline for the intended work during the procurement process. Once the data collection and analysis are completed, the Review Team formulates its findings based on research observations and inputs.

The review team will consult with ICANN organization subject matter experts regarding all initial findings, including feasibility of future implementation, validity of any problems detected, and potential conflicts of the recommendation with existing policies or recommendations. The review team would formulate its recommendation based of the community including subject matter experts, as well as research and analyses, briefings and implementation. Hence, during this phase, please note that the ICANN board and ICANN organization provide feedback to the review team and after the review team has prioritized its recommendations and aligned on its draft report, the ICANN organization will publish the report for public comment. The ICANN organization then compiles the report of public comment coordinates community consultation.

After that, the review team will have a look at the report of public comment and analyze that to update its recommendations before they are written in the final report. Once the final report has been sent to the Board, the review team will disband, and throughout this phase the review team would provide updates to the leaders and the organizational committee of the ICANN Board. Concurrently the ICANN organization would publish quarterly fact sheets which include

---

information on participation, budget phases, review progress, and written information.

Now, the fifth phase of the specific review process which is the Board Consideration. This includes acknowledgement and receipt of the Final RT Report by the ICANN Board which denotes the start of the Board Consideration phase. The Board will direct ICANN Org to post the report for final public comment period. ICANN organization will then manage the public comments and compile a report of public comments following the public comment period.

Tola, if I can ask you to mute your line, please. Thank you very much.

ICANN organization produces an action plan, the action plan will take into consideration feasibility, resources, usefulness, budget and timeline, with input and clarifications provided by one or more designated review team members as needed. The ICANN Board will produce the Action Plan along with the final review team report and report of public comments. The ICANN Board then approves or rejects the recommendation made, providing rationale for its decision and by direction from the Board to ICANN organization for implementation of the recommendations. The Board's decision marks the conclusion of the Board Consideration phase of the review process.

And we now reach the final phase, which is the Implementation and Ongoing Support, where ICANN organization initiates the implementation phase of the review and we do that by determining the detailed implementation timeline, budget, and resources and then drafting the Implementation Plan. ICANN organization and ICANN

---

---

community begin the implementation of recommendations and continue with the implementation until it is completed. If there are any issues identified during the implementation, the ICANN Board and ICANN organization assess the situation and determine the next course of action. Ongoing in both a quarterly basis and an annual basis, ICANN organization reports on the implementation progress to the Board and the community. ICANN organization follows Standard operating procedures, to monitor, maintain, and measure implementation progress and to provide continuous management.

If you are interested in a more visual aspect of this review process there is a flow chart that is available, it is on this slide at the bottom, and we invite you, if you are interested, to review it, and we will refer to it later on during this review. Are there any questions or comments on this slide?

Alright, we move on to the fifth agenda item, which is Operating Standards. The Operating Standards aim to ensure that ICANN's Specific Reviews are conducted in a transparent, consistent, efficient, and predictable manner, while supporting the community's work to derive the expected benefit and value from review processes. The Operating Standards are subject to the relevant provisions in the ICANN Bylaws that govern Specific Reviews (see Article IV, Section 4.6(a)(i)).

The Operating Standards were recently updated and there was public comment proceeding on those, and it is currently open until February 11, 2019, at 23:59 UTC. The public comment is there and we hope you will be reviewing those. And the reason I'm saying that is the review

---

team and the ICANN organization will use the latest draft Operating Standards as authoritative guidance for all support and review activities.

And please note that the Operating Standard addresses, among other things, review team candidate nomination and member selection, the scope setting, roles and responsibilities, the review team working methods, dispute resolution, review output, and amending the Operating Standard. Are there any questions or comments on this section?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes, thank you, Jean-Baptiste. I just wanted to hold for a moment and explore this last paragraph on the staff designed presentation for today's call. You seem to be making it that we will be working under the draft operating standard as an authoritative guide. Now, let me declare, I have no problem with us utilizing the very best of a draft set of standards that is still under our public comment and has not been adopted, but I think it's a tad presumptuous to assume that we as a community led review team would adopt it en toto as an authoritative guide, particularly in the current state that it is in.

As I and many others are well aware, things like scope, roles and responsibilities under the new standards will already have been done. So this would be great for ATRT4, but there are aspects of this particular draft operating standards document that are simply not applicable; desirable, but not applicable, because of where we are. So I just wanted to make sure that those members of this ATRT are not loitering onto the

premise that we are just taking this as she is writ, and handed to us by NSSI staff and ICANN.org.

I would believe that there is a huge amount in the draft Operating Standards that will ideal as an authoritative guide, but I think we need to be just a little cautious about what it says on your power point presentation, simply because people often just look at power point presentations and think that they themselves, because it is written, one, and two, they are meeting occasionally, are somehow authorities. Thank you. More of a clarification than a question. And I see Larisa is going to respond to me. Terrific.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for clarification. And indeed, Larisa has her hand raised.

LARISA GURNICK: Hi, everybody, this is Larisa Gurnick. Thank you, Cheryl, for your observation. You're quite right, the operating standards are still in draft form. Public comment is scheduled to close very shortly, and of course, pending the feedback and the next steps, we are targeting to have operating standards adopted by the Board shortly after the Kobe meeting. Having said that, at this point we invite the review team to use these operating standards as guidance. It's our hope that you will find the operating standards helpful in your work for all the reasons that have already been mentioned, and clearly some of the sections of the operating standards would no longer be applicable with ATRT3, since you are beyond this point.

---

---

But it does, as I see Vanda suggested in the chat, operating standards are intended to be useful and help the review team work more effectively under a set of guidelines that are applied consistently through the different reviews. So it's in that spirit that we highlight for you that the operating standards draft is available as a resource. But with extensive engagement with the community that we've had over the course of the last year-and-a-half that this has been in the works, we have made a lot of progress in the operating standards, much of it had been revised and adjusted based on very useful feedback from the community. So the draft that is posted for public comment currently has gone through several iterations with extensive community input, as well. So, I hope that you find that clarification helpful. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thanks very much Larisa. We move now to the next agenda item, which is the By-Laws and Board Resolutions. So, having a look at the By-Laws section, as I mentioned before during this phase the review team found it's important to look at what's contained in the by-laws. So, starting with the Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN's execution of its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision making reflect the public interest and are accountable to the Internet community ("Accountability and Transparency Review").

The issues that the review team for the Accountability and Transparency Review (the "Accountability and Transparency Review Team") may assess include, but are not limited to, the following: (A) assessing and

---

improving Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which the Board's composition and allocation structure meets ICANN's present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for Board decisions contained in these Bylaws;

(B) assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the Board and with the broader ICANN community, and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS; (C) assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof); (D) assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community; (E) assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development; and (F) assessing and improving the Independent Review Process. The Accountability and Transparency Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect. The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by this Section 4.6, and may recommend to the Board the creation of additional periodic reviews. Finally, Five, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team should issue its final report within one year of convening its first meeting.

---

On this last item, it is up to the review team to decide what is considered a first meeting. Is it the face-to-face meeting? Is it a plenary meeting? There were other teams that have an issue that the clock should start from their first substantive meeting. We'll therefore let you decide what meeting should be the starting clock of your review, and just want you to know that today is considered, of course, an introductory meeting.

Moving on to the ATRT3 related ICANN Board Resolution, we have Resolved (2018.10.25.14), the Board hereby appoints Maarten Bottermanto to serve as a member of ATRT3.

Resolved (2018.10.25.15), the Board requests that ATRT3 adopt its Terms of Reference and Work Plan within 60 days of convening its first meeting, and submit these documents to the Board and to the leadership of the Supporting Organizations and the Advisory Committees, to confirm that the team's scope and timeline are consistent with the requirements of the ICANN Bylaws and ICANN community expectations.

Are there any questions or comments on this section? Larisa, you have your hand raised.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Jean-Baptiste, this is Larisa. Cheryl, I see that you posted into the chat that January is already gone, so I just wanted to make sure that everybody understood Jean-Baptiste's point that given that this review is the only one within the Bylaws that is given a timeline to complete your work within 12 months. We thought it ought to be up to

---

the review team's discretion to figure out when the clock should start ticking.

In the past some review teams have interpreted the starting point as the first face-to-face meeting, some interpreted it as the kickoff call, which is what today is. Certainly, you could interpret as the kickoff of the review team or as the announcement of the review team, which happened a month ago, but that wouldn't seem fair to the review team. But we thought that decision ought to be something that the review team would discuss and agree on. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Larisa. Sebastian, you have your hand raised, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Just a question regarding this discussion about when the clock will start to tick. Do we need to discuss that now? Or can we discuss that at a later stage when we convene, either a plenary meeting or a face-to-face meeting? Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sebastian, this needs to be discussed soon, and maybe we can have a discussion on that on the next call, in the interest of time. Go ahead, Sebastien.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I agree with you, we need to discuss that at the next call, I think it would be better than today. I think it must be one of the topics of the next call agenda. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alright, thank you. So, we'll move on to the next agenda item, which is the Review Team Leadership Structure and Responsibilities. So we're probably there on this slide, the currently leadership structure of the review team. And the reason behind this is that the review team will decide the format of the leadership position, so, a chair, a chair and vice chair, multiple co-chairs. All review team members, with the exception of the Board Designee, are eligible and can nominate themselves for a leadership position. It is encouraged that leadership members reside in different times zones and have been appointed to the Review Team by different SO/ACs.

So, before we move on to a call for leadership position, first we wanted to raise the different responsibilities, as per the operating standards, which are: Behave in a neutral, collegial, and constructive way towards the review team, the Board, and the ICANN organization, in accordance with ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior. Drive the review team towards the timely delivery of key milestones according to the work plan, maintaining standards of focus on the goals of the review team, as established in the Terms of Reference. Facilitate consensus among the review team members, as well as determine levels of consensus once achieved. Prudently manage the review team's budget, and work with the ICANN organization. Within the bylaws, the designated Review

Team leadership will have responsibilities for managing the work of the review team and will also be responsible for determining consensus.

So, now is a time for a call for interested review team members to volunteer for a leadership position. And please note that the nominations for leadership positions shall remain open for two calendar weeks. We will let the review team decide what should be the voting process, should it be via Doodle, should it be done at a face-to-face meeting? I see Cheryl has her hand raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Jean-Baptiste. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm a little unconvinced, no, actually I'm very unconvinced that we need to hold up the process to follow this particular mechanism of leadership selection. A particular reason, I actually have no idea where this supposed practice comes from. However, from a democratic point of view, a point important for this kickoff call, the discussion that did happen on our informal mailing list, noting if we can't really set up the formal one until we've got the leadership organized, apparently, because it was short of a few people, can be discussed.

As you and others, I think the majority, will know, both Pat Kane and myself stepped forward to act as co-leaders, giving both gender diversity, geographic diversity, from whence we come in ICANN, from a [inaudible] society and a domain name industry perspective diversity, and time zone diversity, plus both of us having extensive experience in running and managing meetings, and to say the least, a fair tad of experience in accountability and transparency reviews, along with other

---

reviews in some cases. Unless there were objections to that, or we had a vast number of other people wanting to step forward, I think we could perhaps expedite this.

But it's important that this kickoff meeting takes the opportunity to open that up to discussion and to formalize it. I'd not, for example, with both Geoff and Wolfgang, were on that list, and they're the only apologies for today's call. So I'd like to suggest that we probably can save ourselves two weeks, almost a month into the 2019 calendar year, by not taking this somewhat very democratic, but terribly laborious time, because two weeks ago we already had the discussion.

So, unless we have huge objections, you've got Pat and I willing to step forward and start getting the main work done so we can all get underway. We can then get our other admins set up and I would certainly be encouraging you all to consider that as a smart way forward. Let's open the floor for probably the next three to five minutes to see if that's a good idea. Certainly it's what I would be suggesting. You can either put extra names up and then we can sort it out, or you can ask Pat and I any questions, but you've got two willing leaders. What do you want to do with us? Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl. We have two people with their hands raised, Sebastien and Negar.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I was waiting for the official starting of the call for candidates to declare my candidacy. I don't think that the previous discussion was conclusive, it was interesting to get them, I maybe missed one of the candidates, but sorry for that. I think the process at least needs to be open, that's why I declare my candidacy now. Thank you very much.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Sebastien. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste, thank you Cheryl and Sebastien for your comments. What we have listed here on is the suggestion, practices from the past reviews, best practices, but of course the review team can decide collectively how you choose to go about collecting your leadership. And as Sebastien pointed out, and I see in the chat that Cheryl and others have also pointed this out, as well, that a lot of the discussion in the past took place via email, and not everybody on the review team was included in that collective email.

So, in agreement with what you have stated in the chat room, the discussion can certainly be taken to the mailing list where everyone is included, to have a productive discussion on nominations and selecting leadership. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: We have Cheryl and Daniel. Cheryl, can you talk, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, I can indeed. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Now that Sebastien has stepped forward, it's a pity you didn't step forward earlier, because we could have been actually running our online vote by now, or shortly after this call, but never mind. If we have a shorter than two week opening for nominations or self nominations, since we have had the conversation informally started, I think that would be -- again, I'm looking at trying to expedite things, and then set up, be it with Doodle, or any other form of online voting, as soon as practical, I think that would be a perfectly reasonable way forward.

We have a majority of the group here today and other than Geoff and Wolfgang, I don't believe we have many, if not any of the review time who aren't present in today's call. So self nominations could be declared open as of this time, and nominations, of course providing someone who is nominated accept the opportunity. It's something we could do now, but I think taking two weeks out of our very valuable time in 2019 to mull it over [background noise], probably seven days or so, or by the end of the seven day period, at least, once the mailing list is operational and we're all using it, [background noise] as others are keen to get started. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Daniel?

---

DANIEL KHAUKA NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, it's Daniel for the record. One thing, looking at the fact that already we're in January and there is need to move forward and a limited time of one year to be able to conduct the process, I'm a bit worried of how we're going to end up losing a lot of time in different processes like leadership. To be able to also add on is that we already have a quorum, and the other two members who are missing, probably we could contact them on their final decisions. I think this process should be able to go ahead and select the leadership so we can go to the next steps. Because that will end a lot of discussions coming ahead on the timeline. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Daniel. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I would like to apologize. I think I understand what's happened when the first mail was sent. A very unused email address for me was used at that time. I was able to find that first mail, but I didn't follow on it, that's my fault, I know, and therefore I don't know what happened on this meeting at all, and I am sorry for that, once again. That's why I was waiting for mention of request for candidates. The other point, Daniel, I don't think that the clock is already ticking, and I don't see why we can't follow some process and now we have a mailing list and we can use it, and I am sure that everybody will get it right. Thank you very much.

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Sebastien. Alright, Cheryl, you have your hand raised, and oh, Daniel, you have your hand raised again. So, Daniel first, and then Cheryl.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Just to react a little to what Sebastien said. Time is not so much of a priority, I think what we should probably ask for the members on the call, if we are to have the selection of the leadership during this call, if not, then probably I think we are able to get consensus from this. Let's put it to the members. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Daniel. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I think it's important that we get past this, which is not an impasse to the process. So, perhaps, unless there are objections, we can move forward. Yes, we do note that we have three members not on today's call, but I believe it was only KC, and I'm not sure if KC was on my informal list or not, but Geoff and Wolfgang certainly were. And I work closely with Geoff, he would have told me very quickly if he had a problem, I can assure you.

But anyway, that aside, we have three names that have put themselves forward. So, those three names for a co-chair and balanced leadership team should go to our list now, and not two weeks, but as early as practical, perhaps even as early as within the next 72 hours or so, a poll or vote should be taken and then we can get on with the job that after

---

all is the primary purpose of us getting here, to do the review team work. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And in the meantime I've been kicked out, so I can't see if there are any other hands raised. Brenda, if you can just let me know by the time I come back. Alright. There are no hands raised. Any comments on the suggested approach from Cheryl? Maarten, you have your hand raised.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thank you. Sebastien, I do agree that earlier discussions delivered to part of the list is not representative. At the same time, we need to move. Overall, I would like to discuss the leadership structure with one chair and vice chair, or the co-chairs. I think I really like the idea of the co-chairs. If that's the way forward we choose, then the next step is who should those people be?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Maarten. Alright, and I see the different comments in the chat. So unless there are any other comments, suggestions, we'll send out an email with the different candidates for leadership position and the information related. Alright.

Moving on to the eighth agenda item, which is Observers. Some information, review teams will include both a limited number of members and an open number of observers. As you have seen, there are several observers which are at this meeting. All meetings, whether

in person or online, will have a dedicated Adobe Connect room for observers to participate. They have the option to subscribe to the observers' email list. They can attend a meeting in person.

When review team members gather for public face-to-face meetings, observers may attend to share their input and questions with the review team, subject to any applicable space limitation. The calendar of scheduled calls and meetings is published on the review team's wiki page. ICANN will not cover any expenses incurred by observers.

As previously mentioned, there is an email input to the review team: Observers may send an email to the review team to share input on their work. Having received input from observers via email, the review team is encouraged to respond, if appropriate, and ensure that a record of the submission is posted on the review wiki page.

Observers can provide input during Public Comment proceedings: Observers may contribute their views via the standard Public Comment process and during public consultations.

Moving on to the Next Steps. The near-term actions for this Review Team include: Determine the schedule of calls and meetings. Elect key leadership position(s). Determine scope and focus of this review (RT decision about scope to be recorded in Terms of Reference and factored into work plan and schedule). Consider ICANN Mission and Bylaws Requirements for this review. Note CCWG-Accountability WG proposed Limited Scope for ATRT3 with some community members expressing agreements. And this is available to the correspondence section of your wiki.

---

---

Some ongoing work related to the scope of the ATRT3 includes Work Stream 2 efforts of the Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG-WS2) on Enhancing ICANN Accountability. The CCWG-WS2 noted that there was overlap between the potential topics for ATRT3 and the topics reserved to the CCWG-WS2.

And finally, on the Consultation Paper on Next Steps on Reviews: ATRT3 to consider undertaking a discussion on how to streamline Specific Reviews to make them more effective and impactful. ATRT3 could explore relevant input from: ICANN community (public comments on Long-term options and additional consultations), ICANN organization via observed best practices and opportunities for efficiencies from specific reviews conducted in the past year, and ICANN Board, via observations from OEC. In terms of other steps, the review team will develop Terms of Reference, workplan and schedule. Determine the outreach plan. Meaning how the review team will communicate with the stakeholders. Prepare division of work (subgroups), checklists and tools.

And so going back to the Terms of Reference, Scope, and Work Plan, those are the first work products each review team must develop. The three items must clearly lay out which topic areas the review team plans to address, the objectives, and how it plans to complete the review. This needs to be in place to supplement the broad list of topics referred to in the Bylaws. All three documents must be adopted by consensus and submitted to the Board as a package. The Board has the responsibility to assure that:

1. The Terms of Reference and work plan provide a clear articulation of work to be done and a basis for how the success of the review will be

---

measured. 2. The scope of the review does not violate the Bylaws. If the Board considers the scope to violate the Bylaws, it will return the scope to the review team with a clear rationale for its assessment. The review team will then revise the scope to assure full compliance with the Bylaws. 3. In addition, the Board may also provide feedback on the feasibility of the proposed review scope, the intended use of resources, the proposed timeline, or any other issue contained in the terms of reference, work plan, or scope. The review shall duly consider any such feedback offered by the Board.

As mentioned earlier in this section, the review teams shall decide on their own meeting schedule. There must be a sufficient number of meetings to assure that review teams meet their milestones as set out in the work plan. The review team will determine and set its meetings schedule for Weekly Plenary Calls. And here on the slide we have listed the different time zones in which we are, and we made an analysis based on your time zone of the most popular times for a meeting. So, with 94% would be at 11:00 UTC; 14:00 UTC (89%); 19:00 UTC (89%); 21:00 UTC (89%). So, the next step forward will be for you to identify the day of week where the team could meet. Consider call duration (60 min, 90 min, 120 min). Decide whether it will be a set time every week, or if there will be a rotation. Yes Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Jean-Baptiste, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record again. I think many of us have the experience, especially on weekly calls, for a rotating time schedule which shares the pain. I think that is the most reasonable. For example, if you continue to have your meetings at this

---

time of day, you will never get Geoff Huston here, because he won't be on a call at midnight and 1 AM in his morning when he's residing in Australia. And so by doing a rotation through the post popular times, I think you will see it fairest, and the most reasonable way forward.

I would also like to suggest that at least as we begin our work, we should have our first few calls allocated for at least 90 minutes. We can always cut back to 60 minutes, or increase to 120, as need be. But officially, as at the beginning of the year people's calendars tend to get populated fairly quickly, if we start getting 90 minute blocks blacked out for our purposes in people's calendars, then they probably won't be doing back to back meetings on the ATRT3 meeting. And so if we need to move up by 30 minutes, we should be able to do so. Anyway, that's my proposal.

In terms of what day of the week, as long as it's not crushing with other calls, I'm utterly ambivalent, and I do see that there are a few "not this day's" in the chat. Did you Doodle or request information from us on the day of the call, or just the time of the call? Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

No, Cheryl. At this stage what we need is to look at the different time zones, and have a look at what is the most preferred time. We haven't looked at days, but if that helps the discussion and if everyone is in favor of a rotation, we can circulate a Doodle with different days of the week and the different times, to see what would be best for everyone. And I noted your comment and looking at the chat it looks like most of the review team are in agreement with rotation and avoiding Monday,

---

Friday, apparently. But if anyone wants to jump in, please do so. Alright, hearing no comments on the suggested approach, what we'll do is we'll circulate a Doodle poll. Oh, Cheryl, you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

So, if we've agreed on rotation, and we've agreed on duration, then it seems that we could start with 11:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC, or 19:00 if 21:00 is a problem for people, 19:00 and 21:00 were absolutely equal. That spreads it out as far as possible across the time zones. If we need to swap in a 14:00 UTC later, I guess we always can. But why don't we start out now a rotation plan for 11:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC, meaning our next call which is the kickoff call to follow this one would be 11:00 UTC time, and you Doodle the day.

But it would application that Wednesday seems to be getting less concern. So if we put out a Doodle for the day rather more than the time, so the 11:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC for a Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and see how we go, we should get that sorted out in the next 36 hours. Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you, Cheryl. If there are any comments on that? If not, I'm more than happy to circulate a Doodle. So as you mentioned, with Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, with time of 11:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC. Alright, perfect.

So, we move on to the next action item, which is planning for face-to-face meetings, and we still have 6 minutes, so I will try to be short as

---

possible on that. So, we have prepared for you several slides just to let you know how to have pre-planning success. This includes select meeting dates, select destination, determine agenda and requirements. Then we will submit a Global Event Request Form and a Travel Request, and then finally meetings team will coordinate for this meeting. With regard to selecting the meeting date, Meetings Team deadlines to request meetings are usually 90 days to submit a request for a face-to-face meeting.

Notifications, requests less than 90 days are not guaranteed to be supported and will be handled on a case-by-case basis, and require Executive Team approval. In terms of travel deadlines, 120 days to submit travel request. Notifications, requests less than 120 days are not guaranteed to be supported, and will be handled on a case-by-case basis, and require Executive Team approval, just like for meeting team deadlines. Required actions by review team is to select primary meeting date(s), select alternative meeting date, and confirm stakeholder agreement on chosen dates, and that obviously can be done via Doodle.

In terms of destination, often dates will determine the destination based on availability of venue space, which is why having primary and alternative selections is so important to the meeting planning process. Considerations for selecting the location should include geographically central for most attendees, easily accessible and cost effective for international travelers, are there visa requirements, and I'll get back to that, we did a short analysis on that. Suitable, safe and environmentally conducive for a productive meeting. Economical and cost effective for your budget and attendees. Availability of hotels and meeting venues.

---

And here the required actions by review team are to select a primary destination and an alternative destination. So, here on this slide you have just an overview of the different costs per city, but those do not include air transportation obviously, since that can vary depending on the review team member's location.

So, moving onto the next one, here we just wanted to point out that there is a possibility to use ICANN offices meeting rooms for meetings, as well, and so we had an analysis based on ICANN offices where that would be feasible, and Singapore is the first option, Brussels the second one, Istanbul the third one.

Then you may decide on the room setup, who many people are expected to attend. In terms of agenda requirements, you need to decide what is the general idea of the meeting agenda, how many meeting rooms in total will you need, will you utilize a plenary room for the entire meeting, will you need to have breakout sessions in different rooms, what is the overall budget allocation for this meeting. So here the action is really for you to see how many attendees are anticipated, how many meeting rooms and setup of locations for each, and the budget of the meeting.

So here is another review with estimated costs between a meeting at an ICANN office or an outside venue, so the idea behind that, there will be less charges if you do that at an ICANN office, and you will see that there are services that are not available or not charged when we did it at an ICANN office, like room rental there was no charge, and supporting tools are not included as cost. And interpretation obviously is not available is the meeting is held at the ICANN office.

---

So then we will submit a Global Event Request, that will be up to the MSSI Team to submit a request to the Meetings Team. The review team members will respond to the ICANN travel support emails in a timely manner, and the MSSI Meetings Team will coordinate all logistics on behalf of the Review Team to ensure a productive face-to-face meeting. MSSI Staff will distribute a doodle poll with suggested dates and location for a potential first face-to-face meeting. Are there any questions on those steps? Yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Jean-Baptiste, Cheryl again. I just wanted to make sure we touch in the audio record of today's call, the very important interaction that's going on in chat, noting that Kobe is only 45 days away, so it is already under the 90 day minimum for travel support. Some people have noted that many people will already be in Kobe, so those few who have already traveled to Kobe could gather in a same place context, and that's fine.

I should note here from Wolfgang, who is not in today's call because of another commitment in Geneva, his preference, he gave a black out date in February, but he was saying if we meet, then back to back in Kobe would work for him, so that should be noted while we're discussing this. There is of course the Friday in Kobe, providing we could find a venue that was cost effective, and I would suggest it would probably need to be a meeting room in one of the hotels. We may be able to manage a hybrid plenary of people dialing in and those already in Kobe sitting around a table.

But I would remind everybody that Kobe, Japan in general is hardly a cheap venue to run anything in. Thank you Michael, glad you could join us for this length of time. I'm very supportive of doing something on the Friday, if we have to change people who are already supported for constituency travel at this stage, there may be considerable cost, even just changing their flights back to stay the extra day.

So we should certainly explore doing something probably on the Friday in Kobe, and see if that is practical and cost effective. If not, I would certainly encourage us to do be doing something at the minimum of time after today's date, so that would be looking somewhere around 90 days from here on, which would take us into April somewhere for a face-to-face.

The advantages of having futures meetings, face-to-face meetings planned back to back with the ICANN meetings and particularly the policy meeting in Marrakesh in the middle of the year is an ideal opportunity for engagement in the ICANN community and the advantage of having that run in the policy meeting which is the shortest meeting of the year in terms of agenda.

So the ICANN meeting needs to be considered as well. Obviously it would mean the travel commitment times for all of us would be less, because you would just be adding on a day or two on the side of a shorter meeting. There is also the question of whether or not engagement with ICANN community during a policy meeting is the ideal thing to do.

---

---

But seeing as part of our job description and I presume then what will be part of our future scope is to ensure that the policy process is effective and efficient, I think we can certainly argue the point for already organizing to set up something either before or after Marrakesh, I would suggest in the case of Marrakesh, it should be before, so that we get a day for ourselves or whatever before, and then outreach and engagement during the Marrakesh meeting.

I just wanted to make sure that the team is to take the opportunity of having at least a first day, a single day of face to face, immediately after Kobe, so that would be the Friday, is one that seems to be getting some carriage in the chat. And pick up on anything offered that I've missed, obviously. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. And just to react quickly to your point on the engagement session and later face-to-face meeting, that will part of your discussion, so thank you for mentioning that. And in terms of your first face-to-face, we would recommend having it in an environment that would not be as demanding on everyone staying, as ICANN meetings tend to be, especially for your first face-to-face meeting, considering you had a lot to discuss for your terms of reference, planning, and so on. So we take your comments on board and for those in the chat. Thank you very much for that. Alright, any other business? Yes, Sebastien?

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I wanted to know if we have any news from possible member of the review team from the [inaudible] supporting organization. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Can you hear me, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I can hear you, definitely, no problem.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, perfect. The [naudible] indicated that they will not at this stage nominate anyone on the ATRT3.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Any other business? Alright, so we'll go quickly to Decisions Reached & Action Items. There was an agreement for plenary calls on 90 minute plenary call including rotation of plenary calls and the times for the calls would be 11:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC. Action items we will add to the next agenda, discussion on what will be the first substantive meeting. We will circulate an email regarding the call for leadership position. And we will circulate a Doodle poll for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday between 11:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC, all to be decided on your next call.

---

Thank you very much. We hope you had no difficulty in hearing this call. If you have any issues in the future, please contact us. We are here to support the team and we would be more than happy. We wish you all a productive day. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**