
BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT-3 Review Team Plenary Call #2 on February 13, 2019, at 21:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Cheryl. I'm going to try to pronounce everyone's last name properly, so excuse me if I do not. So, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jacques Blanc, Pat Kane, Vanda Scartezini, Tola Sogbesan, Jaap Akkerhuis, Osvaldo Novoa, Maarten Botterman, Erica Varlese, Daniel Nanghaka.

From ICANN Org, we have Jean-Baptiste Deroulez, Negar Farzinnia, Brenda Brewer, Herb Wayne.

We do have observers joining us today: Chokri, Yang, and Jim.

Apologies from Sebastien and Liu. We do have Michael joining us at this moment.

Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you all to state your name before speaking and I'll turn the call over to Jean-Baptiste. Wolfgang has also just joined the meeting. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Welcome. And welcome everyone to the second plenary call about the Accountability and Transparency Review. On today's agenda, we have the following suggested topics. So, starting with just a check on whether there was any update to statement of interest, then go through the [inaudible] up on the [inaudible] accountability team. Then,

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.

address when would be the first substantive meeting of the review team. Then, go through the face-to-face meeting options, a discussion on operating standards. And finally a presentation from [inaudible] Charla Shambley on ATRT-3 project timing, cost management, tracking, and reporting. And I just wanted to note that they will be joining the call in a few minutes.

So, starting the call, are there any updates to your statement of interest? Alright. If none, I will move on to the [inaudible] which is [inaudible] leadership.

So, as part of the call for volunteers for leadership positions, during your last meeting, your [inaudible] meeting, we reviewed the leadership structure and had agreed to elect two co-chairs. So, should we call on the [inaudible]. A Doodle poll was sent to you to vote for leadership positions. The Doodle poll included the names of the [inaudible] which were at the time Cheryl, Patrick, and Sebastien. Votes were closed two weeks after on 6th of February and we would like to [inaudible] the votes. Elected co-chairs are Cheryl and Patrick. So, following up on that, there will be leadership calls made [inaudible] be set up.

I'd just like to mention [inaudible] during this call. Are there any comments on the slides? Alright. I see several messages in the chat addressed to Cheryl and Patrick.

Moving on to the next item on the agenda, which is the first substantive meeting. So, if you recall, at the last meeting, there was an action item to add this topic on today's agenda. So, if you look at the current timeline for the review, [inaudible] bylaws and also in the [inaudible].

So, the accountability [inaudible] final report within one year of having its first meeting. The second timeline mentioned in the board resolution is that the ATRT-3 [inaudible] work plans within 60 days of having its first meeting.

So, at this stage, it is up to the review team to decide which meeting would be the starting clock of your one-year review. And just a reminder that the first meeting was an introductory meeting. We also would like to [inaudible] looking at also review team, most of them are [inaudible] the first meeting [inaudible] at a face-to-face meeting to set up [inaudible] such as your terms of reference, [inaudible] work. So, at this stage, I would like to open the floor to you to have a discussion on when should your first substantive meeting be. Thank you. Vanda, you have raised your hand. Please go ahead. And then Patrick.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I believe that the face-to-face meeting should be [inaudible] work plan and so on. [inaudible] work beforehand [inaudible] face-to-face meeting [inaudible]. So, my suggestion [inaudible] meeting [inaudible] first meeting and start the count [inaudible] face-to-face to improve the [inaudible] concrete face-to-face meeting. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Patrick, please.

PAT KANE:

Yeah. Hi. So, I think that when you read the resolution, since it says it should be a year, I think that it doesn't matter when we start as far as

face-to-face goes because we're going to start working right after this is my assumption. So, I think that whether we call this the first face-to-face or whether we call April 1st or the end of March the first face-to-face and that's when we kick off, I don't think it matters. I think what matters most, from what it looks like, to this deck is how do we stay within budget more than do we come in with a year or 14 months, which is in my mind still should be a year.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Patrik. Cheryl, would you like to take the floor?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Thanks very much. I suspect to very slightly differ from Pat inasmuch as I think we do need to recognize that out of all of the specific reviews ATRT is the only one that are limited under the bylaw to the 12-month period. So, it is a relatively perhaps more important matter to discuss and for you all to agree on than it would be for other review teams.

That said, I am not particularly concerned whether you decide to take it from today's meeting onwards or the, I trust, depending on the outcomes of our next agenda item, in fact – perhaps these things are somewhat reversed in order of the agenda. But that isn't the issue now. But if we have our face-to-face meeting in the not too distant future, then I suppose then maybe instead of getting on with our job in terms of preparatory mode and getting ahead of the first deadline which of course is the terms of reference and work plan within [30-60] days. So, that is one of our major milestones.

The only other thing that strikes me as worthy of your consideration while you deliberate this point is that should you decide to have your first substantive, or our first substantive – I’m already in chair mode, sorry. Our first substantive meeting at the face-to-face with the [inaudible] in the past, then you may find the benefit in the ability to report to the ICANN community at next March’s general [inaudible] meeting because we have our 12-month deadline fall in the other side of that meeting.

So, a couple of things for you to consider. I just wanted to make sure that you thought of both short meeting and long term as you kick off the [inaudible]. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. While we wait for comments, I just wanted to read out loud the chat. So, there is coming from Wolfgang saying that one year is a short time. Let’s kickstart the clock at the first face-to-face meeting. Tola agrees to that. Daniel as well. Osvaldo, too. Vanda agrees with Patrick. This is it in terms of comments. Is there anyone else who would like to jump in?

TOLA SOGBESAN: [inaudible] earlier, but I’d like to [inaudible]. Can you hear me now?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, we can hear you.

TOLA SOGBESAN:

Okay. Yeah. Thank you. I had agreed with what Wolfgang has said, meaning that one year is [inaudible] meetings. It's probably not even enough if we started counting from today or next call, for example. I would want to believe sitting face-to-face would achieve more in terms of what we can achieve in agreeing on issues. For me, I wish that we start counting from the first face-to-face meeting. However, I'm taking notes of what Pat said as well. It's not pretty much about the number of months, more than it is budget available. So, whether we are meeting 12 times or 14 times, most [inaudible] is what we're able to complete within the budget allocated to us. That's what I just want to add to what was [inaudible]. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you, Tola. So, from chat and from comments, there seems to be a majority willing to consider the first substantive meeting at the face-to-face. Are there any objections? Should that be marked as a decision reached, then? Alright. We'll add that [inaudible] decisions reached. Perfect. Thank you for your feedback in the chat. I really appreciate it.

Moving on to ... Oh, Pat, please. You have your hand raised.

PAT KANE:

Yeah. Can we go back one slide? So, at the bottom of this resolution, it says to confirm that the team's scope and timeline are consistent with the requirements of the ICANN bylaws and ICANN community expectations. Are there specific citations within the bylaws that this refers to outside of – anything that's outside of 4.6? And what, if any, definition do we have of ICANN community expectations?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Negar, go ahead.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Pat. Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. I wanted to address your comment, Pat, regarding the reference in that resolution. What it's implying is that bylaws mandate this review take one year for completion and when the review team discusses their scope and the amount of work they are undertaking, they need to take into consideration the one-year time limit in association with other elements and processes that go into place. For example, at least one public comment that needs to be conducted on the draft report, etc., that plays into the timing and the work plan that we will resolve for your review.

So, understanding the time duration, the review team should be mindful of the scope items that they [inaudible] and the amount of work that they are undertaking to be able to effectively manage their work within the one-year limit. That statement is under the ATRT review section, section 4.6 of the ICANN bylaws, and we are more than happy to share that via e-mail. But I'm sure you're all familiar with it by now. I hope that's helpful.

PAT KANE: Yeah. It is. Thank you very much. So, it's primarily around the process, not topics, not outcomes, but basically the process itself.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct. It is around the process. Topics are identified in the bylaws, also. Some topics, scope items, are mandatory scope items such as reviewing the implementation of the prior review recommendations and some topics are optional. So, it is up to the review team to decide how much more they can undertake to still meet the timeline and the processes.

PAT KANE: Got it, thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Patrick, for your question. And thank you, Negar, for your answer. And we have Cheryl in the queue now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Just picking up on what Negar was just saying and to follow on from Pat's question, I think one of the things in terms of community expectations, that it's important for us as a review team to manage – and to manage early – is of course because of the somewhat unusual extended delay between what the expectations were of the community for when ATRT-3 would begin, and indeed that was one of the matters that was discussed at some length basically back in 2017 but certainly even before that with the work of CCWG, the cross-community working group work stream two, etc.

The last input formally from one of the last pieces of input formally from the community in terms of the recommendations from the advisory committees and the support organizations, and this has all been

provided on the Wiki space for your reading pleasure, since we've had both pages open [inaudible] staff for that. But of course the [inaudible] made comments on scope limitation. But of course that was still up to us when ATRT-3 was convened. But of course the circumstances regarding the community's proposal for scope limitation has been affected by time. So, regardless of what details in the scope you all decide upon, it's probably pretty darn important that we also close that loop on why or if we [inaudible] a scope that is not in absolute keeping with the specific limited scope that was recommended from written advice from the advisory committees and support organizations. So, that's really a bit of administrivia but it's not a piece that I suggest we should lose. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you, Cheryl. I just wanted to read out loud the comment from Maarten in the chat, what he says exactly, Cheryl. "It's important for ATRT-3 to [inaudible] the community on what it can [inaudible] and living up to what we communicate." Alright. Are there any questions or comments on this?

Moving on to the next item, which is the face-to-face meeting, you should all have received from Brenda yesterday a Doodle poll for your first face-to-face meeting for two locations, Los Angeles and Istanbul ICANN offices with several dates. So there we just wanted to mention again we are seeing three replies and the Doodle poll for this tomorrow at 21:59 UTC.

One question was whether you would prefer to start discussions on scope at the face-to-face meeting or on the coming plenary call. Yes, Negar, you have your hand raised.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Jean-Baptiste, go ahead and finish. I can go after. No worries.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure. I just wanted to add that based on your previous discussion on the first substantive meeting, you made a point to have [inaudible] to have your discussions on the scope during the face-to-face meeting. So, Negar, please go ahead.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. I actually just wanted to comment on an e-mail we had received from Vanda I believe earlier today regarding the face-to-face meeting. She had made a really good point and I actually encouraged the review team to consider that as part of your planning. As you're planning out your scope of work and build your work plan around it, it would be really beneficial to also build in tentative times for your face-to-face meetings in advance if you can, even if it's just tentative because it allows us to go ahead and try to target particular timelines and allow for better options, better locations, more dates and availability to schedule your face-to-face meetings. So, I just wanted to thank Vanda for her suggestion. It was very much in line with what we were thinking about discussing on this call. As you as a team work towards building your plan, these will be discussed further, I'm sure.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Negar. If I can just add to that, also the work plan takes also part of the [inaudible] identify [inaudible]. There is a question from Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Thanks. Just a quick question [inaudible]. Are we planning on having, incorporating face-to-face meetings as well into ICANN meetings or having discussions as part of ICANN meetings or is this to be used as a totally separate process? Just wondering. Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I hope you can still hear me. I've been kicked out of Adobe Connect. Oh, Negar might be able to [inaudible]. Your hand is raised.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Happy for you to do the same. Yes, Michael. In answer to your question, ICANN meetings are of course an option. One thing that really makes it difficult to meet at ICANN meetings is a very busy schedule for most members of the review team, and not just this review team. All review teams have this challenge. Everyone's calendars are pretty full at ICANN meetings and their attention is needed at a lot of different sessions and discussion points. So it's really hard to conduct a meaningful face-to-face meeting during ICANN meetings. It comes with its own challenges, of course.

We've had discussions about having review team meetings prior to the ICANN meetings starting. That also comes with challenges, of course, because a lot of members of the review team could also possibly have meetings prior to ICANN meeting, so that would prevent them from participating fully.

As just a point to note for the review team's information, after an ICANN meeting ends, the venue is not available for any further meetings beyond that point, because contractually, we are basically wrapping up the meeting, discussion meeting place, facilities. We won't have technical support at that point in time. So meetings after an ICANN meeting are not an option. Of course, the review team could also informally meet if they choose to, but again that would not allow for discussions to be captured, recorded, and for remote participants to be able to take advantage of those discussions.

So, while ICANN meetings are an option, they perhaps are not the best options. So, something for the review team to consider.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Negar. I just wanted to comment as well the different notes in the chat where there was a question from Maarten on the need for [inaudible] for either USA or Turkey. On that, we just wanted to mention that we had done a quick analysis on where this would be an issue. For US territories, there are several members where [inaudible] correctly there are less for [inaudible] go to Turkey than USA. There was also a comment from Cheryl. There may be [inaudible] meetings to be determined and several [inaudible] visa for those.

Patrick said that optimization of interactions with focused outcomes and Cheryl said that we need to look at the cost as well, often expensive at certain venues, but all needs full consideration and analysis. Are there any comments or questions on this?

So, we move to the operating standards. So, if you recall, we had a discussion on operating standards on the last call, just as a reminder for those who were not on the call. Operating standards and to ensure that ICANN specific reviews are [inaudible] in a transparent [inaudible] efficient and predictable manner, [inaudible] supporting the [inaudible] effective benefits and values from [inaudible] processes. The operating standards are subjected to relevant provisions in the ICANN bylaws that [inaudible] article 4 section 4.6ai.

On that, if you recall, there is currently a [inaudible] open on [inaudible] operating standards for specific reviews which was open until the [inaudible] of February and we wanted to raise that this has been extended until the 20th of February [inaudible]. Patrick, you have your hand raised and then Maarten is [inaudible] you.

PATRICK KANE:

Yeah. Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. The question I've got is when do we expect ... And I know this is not crystal ball reading, but when do we expect the updated operating standards to actually be voted on by the board or accepted by the board? Is it going to be halfway through our process, the beginning of the process? Because the question I would have is if they're going to change or not be accepted, we probably ought to use the current set, not the new set.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Patrick, let me check whether there is [inaudible] your question.

PATRICK KANE: Okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Apologies, Patrick. I missed your question and didn't quite capture what you were asking. Would you mind repeating it again, please?

PATRICK KANE: Sure. I was curious as to when we would expect the draft operating procedures, the ones that are being publicly commented on right now, when would we expect those to be adopted by the board? Because if we're going to end up with a new set of standards that is in the middle of our process or at the end of our process, it might be better if we used the current set of operating standards as opposed to the proposed set of standards.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Let me actually turn it over to Lars. He has just joined the call and he is in front of the operating standards process, so I'm sure he's going to be able to provide some information to you. Lars, if you are on the call and able to, please go ahead and let us know what the update is.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Negar. Thank you, Pat. My name is Lars Hoffmann, as Negar just said. I'm the point person in the organization on the operating standards. That's a very good question.

I would suggest that you currently use the [inaudible] public comment at the moment as it's indicated here. It's been extended until next week. We do expect to provide some updates on the document based on feedback. Similarly, though, we would be very keen to hear from you, the ATRT-3 group and any other specific review group for the matter. If you have any concerns or issues with the current version because something is not working for you. Even if and when the board has adopted a version that is updated maybe slightly different from what is put out for public comment. We still regard the operating standard as a living document. So, if you say, look, this timeline doesn't make sense or this procedure doesn't make sense for ATRT-3, we would expect that that would essentially feed into an updated version.

So, use the current version that is there, and if you can, then switch to the version that is adopted by the board. We expect at the moment for the board to adopt this maybe during its early May meeting, but that is subject to both the result of the public comment as well as the public session that we are going to run on the operating standards in Kobe. With that lengthy answer, I'm going to pass it back. Yes, Cheryl, exactly as you put it. We are, in fact, in the test version, so to speak. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Lars, that's very helpful. And early May I think would be fine. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you for your question, Patrick, and thank you, Lars, for answering that. Before we move on to Maarten, I just wanted to ask whether the number starting with 33 and ending with 242 is the one from Jacques. Can you confirm whether this is your number, the one ending with 6242?

JACQUES BLANC: I'm sorry, guys. I was on mute.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Is that you, Jacques? Is this Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: Yes. Can you hear me?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, perfect. Maarten, please?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just [inaudible] fully aware that the operating standards are part of the public consultation and that the board has to ultimately decide on it, but they're always intended to serve us and to help us. So, I think most of my fire has been stolen already by Lars.

I fully agree that if there's anything in it that doesn't support us, whether it's before or after board decision, we can always raise that. So, I'm saying that let's work with it, with the best we have, and the best

we have is the one on the current public review. And if there's anything in that that stops us from using it, let's make that explicit rather than not use anything at all. And if we already [inaudible] public comment period, obviously we can share that. But rather have to use this and to try it out to see how it fits us than move to use anything at all. [inaudible].

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Maarten. I see that there are several people writing in the chat. Are there any comments or reactions to what Maarten has said? Yes, Herb. Your hand is raised. Go ahead.

HERB WAYE: Yes. Thank you, Lars. One of the reasons I'm popping into this working group and trying to get in right at the start is exactly true for things like this that can pop up that may create a little bit of confusion or ambiguity or whatever. Please don't hesitate to reach out to me if there's anything that does come up as we apply these operating standards or issues that you may be worried may create some form of unfairness or confusion. Please just reach out. Drop me an e-mail or send me a message and I'll be more than happy to look at things with you from an independent observer type of status. Thank you very much.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Herb, for your input. I see that there are several comments in the chat. From Cheryl, "To treat it as guideline not 'Gospel.'" Vanda, "I

believe we can use it as a bases. Agree with Maarten.” Daniel, “Let’s use what we have.” Osvaldo agrees with Maarten.

Is there a general agreement that the operating standard will be followed as guidelines? Is that a correct assumption from your input? Alright. Thank you very much for your feedback. I see green checks. Thank you for that. That makes things easier.

The next agenda item is ATRT-3 project planning, cost management, tracking and reporting. I see that Charla has joined the call already. I can’t see Xavier yet. Charla, do you have any updates from Xavier?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY:

I just [inaudible], so we can go ahead and skip the next two slides, and if he joins, we can go back and he can talk to these slides, if you want to skip ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

All right. Sure.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY:

Okay. Right there. So, hi. My name is Charla Shambley and I oversee operations for the MSSl team. As part of our ongoing improvements to reviews, fact sheets were introduced during the CCT Review a couple of years ago. Since then, we’ve had [inaudible] in both the RDS and SSR-2 review team members and made some great improvement because of that.

So, back when we started CCT, we've been capturing data in an Excel document, and as you can imagine, the process is pretty labor intensive. We have to manually check formulas and data to ensure that it's behaving properly and reporting out properly.

So, over the past several months, we've been working on developing a new reporting tool using Salesforce. So, what you see right here is an example of what we're developing for ATRT-3. So, it kind of looks a little different than if you've been following the prior reviews fact sheets that have been posted on the Wiki.

So, if you look at this slide – again, don't look at the numbers. This is just my team playing around with numbers to make sure that the recording looks correct. These numbers will change.

On this slide, this is the expenses that are going to be shown. The budget will be in the center of that bubble. So in the example, it showed the \$107,000. That is not your budget. Xavier will talk to that later.

But then it's broken down within that circle, that ring, and it will provide information on the total for consulting and other professional services, air fare, and hotel and lodging. So, this information will be reported out on a quarterly basis.

Hi, Xavier! How about I just skip through to my next couple of slides? Mine won't take very long, if you want to go to the next slide.

So, on this sheet, you can see that there are categories for milestones. This is how it is set up right now. Obviously, your work plans have been

developed, so there's nothing to report out on. But once your work plan is developed, you'll be able to progress towards your milestones.

If you go to the next slide, you can see how we've been doing that for the SSR-2 review as an example. So, it's broken down into four categories. The first category is review planning and you can see that the SSR Review Team is at about ... I can't read the number. It's kind of small on my screen. In the 70s. They're almost done with that category. And they've been working towards ... They've been doing their research, so they're a little more than halfway through that phase of the work. Then they'll start working on their draft report and eventually the final report. So, this milestone report that you see here will be reported out on a monthly basis of the review team. Thank you for reading that very small number. Apparently, I need to get my old lady glasses on. So, if you want to go to the next sheet.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Charla, I just wanted to ... [inaudible] already in the chat, but there was a question from Wolfgang. "What consulting service is needed for ATRT-3?"

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. I can address that. Regarding consulting services, Wolfgang, it's up to the review team. In the past, we've had review teams that have been interested in having a technical writer join the team. We've had review teams that may have had an interest in hiring a consultant to perform gap analysis. So, if there is subject matter expertise needed or any sort of consultation in terms of surveys or

some particular data management. It really depends on the scope of the review.

And this is not a decision that the review team needs to make at the very beginning of the review. As you work through your scope items and as you progress through your work, that's a discussion we can have about what kind of external help the review team thinks is needed to be brought on board to help move the work of the review team forward and provide any additional support that either the review team can't do or the Org can't do in order to help conduct the review.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Negar. There is Patrick in the queue. Go ahead, Patrick.

PAT KANE: So, the question I have for this particular report is how do those percentages complete get reported and then recorded?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: So, we work with Jean-Baptiste and he'll work with the finance liaison, whether that be an individual selected from the review team or perhaps the leadership would like to do it as a small subgroup of the review team. But we'll get feedback on the milestones and progress you're making to date.

And each milestone has a certain weight to it. So, some milestones may not carry the equivalent of other work. Some work obviously requires more effort on the review team's part, so those are weighted

accordingly and obviously you guys will have input into those weights and what we determine. Then that all rolls up to this overall percentage.

PAT KANE: Okay, thank you.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Negar, you are next in the queue. Go ahead.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Pat, to build up on that, one of the elements that the review team will help put together is a work plan. It is essentially a project plan for completion of the work of the review and we, as you MSSI support staff, will help oversee the work plan to [mark] completion of the elements of your work as you progress through your work and get through different stages. Every time one of those items gets marked off, that adds to the percentage of the work completion. As Charla noted, it gets captured on the fact sheet that gets reported out to the community.

In the past, we've suggested we oversee the work plan progress on a monthly basis just to keep it updated and share the progress of the work. The frequency can change and be updated as the review team seems fit, though.

PAT KANE: As a follow-up, so we would develop the project plan with the individual tasks that would roll up into these four categories and then your team would manage that?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct. Of course, we are involving the review team. So, every time we go through a task that we think has been completed or a percentage of completion has gone up, we will be consulting the leadership and the review team to oversee that work and just make sure that the documents reflect the work that's done by the review team.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Negar. Patrick, I believe this is an old hand in the chat. Thank you. Charla, shall we move to the next slide?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Okay. Yeah. Please. So, on this slide, you can see the participation for each review team member. Obviously, we've only had one plenary call prior to this one, so it's reporting out that you either attended or did not attend, so it's either 0% or 100%. So, once we've continued to have more plenary calls, the status can change and this report will be published on a monthly basis as well. Next slide.

Then, this slide shows the overall percentage of the entire review team during the last plenary call. So, right now, there are 18 review team members, 15 people attended from the last call which equals 83%

which is what's shown here. This report will also be reported on a monthly basis.

So, this is the last graph I have to share. My team is putting together some final touches to make sure that these reports are accurate and report out properly. I'm looking to have them finalized by around the end of February, early March, and we actually have a dedicated Wiki page. I don't know if Jean-Baptiste has shared that, but I'll post the link to that Wiki page in the chat for everyone. That's where you can find the most recent monthly and quarterly [inaudible].

So, just to briefly mention my team has found it beneficial to work with a dedicated review team member or perhaps a leadership team as the finance liaison. I believe Xavier will speak a little bit more to that. So, I encourage you to consider that. It just helps us ensure that we can address your questions quickly and provide timely reporting. Any more questions on the fact sheet? Thank you, Jean-Baptiste, for posting the link in the chat.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Any questions for Charla?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Cheryl is typing. Thank you, Cheryl. I think, with that, I can turn it over to Xavier, so if you want to back track a few slides to his. Thank you. Xavier?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I can see your microphone active but I can't hear you. Is there a possibility we dial out to you? No, we can't hear you, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Can you hear me now?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, that is much better. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I don't know what happened, but I muted and then re-muted my microphone.

Thank you for allowing me to speak for a minute. Thank you for participating to the ATRT-3 Review Team. This is important work for ICANN and you having the work in front of you.

In order to support that work, of course ICANN will want to put in place the resources that are necessary for the work of the review team to be as effective as possible. While every review is specific and independent from the previous ones, when we do [inaudible] simply try to [inaudible] estimates of the costs simply by working in [inaudible] for similar types of reviews and the team that supports [inaudible] MSSl has a lot of experience with other reviews as well, including the previous ATRT-2 review work. And [inaudible] simply using this experience to develop an estimate of expected costs associated with the review, which of course without taking into account any specificity of the work that is yet to come that will trigger potential needs that are not known today.

We generally encourage for defining what the budget is for the review is, simply, what do we need? What is required for the team to be able to conduct its work to completion?

I'll be very blunt. There is no license to spend because you are part of a review team that has a [inaudible] to what can we spend something on is required, [inaudible] for all of us. And now [inaudible] ATRT team to be very responsible and accountable to the public funds that we manage and ensure that the costs that are incurred are worthwhile, are necessary, are activities that need to be carried out. For example, if consulting or advice is needed, is it [inaudible]? Can it be solved internally first and then complemented externally if necessary? So, [inaudible] critical thinking on the necessity of incurring resources is what is required.

Of course, there [inaudible] tool to guide the [inaudible] of the resources and guide the work to be planned. If those budgets [inaudible] result of estimates will not be sufficient, then there is a process to request the board to allocate more resources and that will be the result on the basis of identified and justified need that would be necessary to provide to the board so that the board can then consider allocating more resources to the group. The need of course would require to explain what is perceived to be the benefit of [inaudible] the costs by carrying out the activity in question.

The MSSI team and the finance team work in collaboration to provide support both in the reporting on the ongoing costs that are incurred as a result of the review team work [inaudible] that's on an ongoing basis. And from that perspective, the financial information about the expenses

incurs feeds into the fact sheet reporting process that Charla has presented to you earlier. And if there would be need for cost estimates or evaluation for the purpose of requests to the board for more resources, that's also something that in coordination together with MSSI and finance would work to support.

Let me make sure I stop here to see if there is any questions or comments or clarification that would be useful to anyone. I don't see any [inaudible]. Just an illustration of how the financial monitoring and reporting relative to the costs of the review [inaudible] fact sheet [inaudible] administration if you would have [inaudible] that 80% of the budget has been spent when 20% of the milestones have been met, that would be an illustration of an issue. Either there's been a lot more activity or smaller projects or there was not enough budget to do the work or obviously a discrepancy between the amount of resources consumed and the amount of work accomplished.

My point there is that this spreadsheet provides visibility to you but also to the public as to the progress of the work, of the team, which is why it's a big responsibility that you are taking on.

Obviously, with this specific review, there's no question that accountability and transparency is paramount, I suppose. With that, I'll stop here. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Is there anything on the second slide that you would like to raise as well?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I think it's very self-explanatory but here on this slide, you can see the current estimates that are being used for the purpose of setting aside resources for the review team. Just so that you know, for clarity, the monitoring of the costs will be done for the entire review team's work, even if it would explain, which is it likely to [occur], across several different fiscal years.

So, as you know, ICANN manages its budgeting process on an annual basis fiscal year by fiscal year which runs from the first of July with one year to the 30th of June of the following year. However, your work is not fitting within necessarily a fiscal year schedule but it's simply the schedule [inaudible], and as a result your work may span across a couple of fiscal years. So [inaudible] budget of the review across any fiscal year, we'll make sure that [inaudible] fiscal year is finished but the work is not finished and the entire budget has not been consumed that we monitor that budget across fiscal years, in case that would be a question that you may have. So, the fact that the fiscal year is finishing, for example, should not trigger anxiety about the resources assigned to the review team that may not have yet been consumed. We are looking at it for the review team for the end-to-end, beginning to end work of the review team, not on a fiscal year basis.

I think that otherwise it's fairly straightforward. If I indicated earlier that more resources would be needed than what the budget contains, then board approval would be required and we would support that process to facilitate it, and of course any expressed, incurred, including for example travel, is the subject of publication and reporting. Those of you

who are supported travelers already know that we publish every ICANN meeting, for example, of the costs incurred for the travel support that has been provided. So that would be the way it would come across as well. I think that's it, Jean-Baptiste, on this slide unless of course there are any questions that I'm happy to answer. I think Cheryl has a question.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Thank you, Xavier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Xavier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, and of course as usual, delightfully clear and concise from you and your team. I just wanted to point one aspect out regarding travel and expectations as expenses. You do, of course, have what might be an unusual circumstance in this review team where two of us are coming from Australia, and of course unless we're meeting in New Zealand, our travel from Australia might be unexpectedly [inaudible] compared to previous review team expenditures.

That said, obviously we'll manage this aspect as much as we possibly can, but it is taken into of course in your presentation that there are a bunch of variables [inaudible] two people from probably the furthest point possible to anywhere you're likely to meet. That may have an affect as well.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Cheryl. I'm glad you pointed out that topic. Of course, the natural response to that is we are concerned with resources and therefore we're expecting the two of you to travel by boat, and preferably if you could use the same boat, that would be really helpful. Joke aside, of course the approved [inaudible] the budget that is defined up front is, as I said, based on estimates using prior review teams. If there are specific circumstances [inaudible] normal schedule of work of the review team to be potentially driving higher costs, for example, because of what you just mentioned, I don't believe it would be a limitation that we should impose, so of course we would accommodate support travel that is required and noting that some participant's costs may be higher simply because of the region where they're coming from and depend on where the meetings are.

What we would want to do is ensure that those numbers are not impairing your ability to participate simply because their travel costs more money. I think that in defining where the meetings happen, we would like to organize, therefore minimize, the costs of the entire meeting, but it wouldn't be resulting in [inaudible] either the entire group or some specific members of the group in their ability to travel appropriately simply because it's a driver for higher costs based on locations of the participants. That would seem unfair. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you. I just noted there was a comment from Charla in the chat to your answer. Yes, it is all about options and good planning. Are there any other questions for Xavier? All right. So, if there are no other comments or questions to Xavier or maybe Charla, we'll move on to the

last item which is any other business. We don't have any at this stage. Is there any other business? If no, we will move on to ... Oh, yes, Cheryl. You have your hand raised. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. Not actually new business but perhaps an extension of the business that was being discussed in the chat and after Xavier and Charla's presentation. I just want to share that and perhaps encourage others to contemplate the aspects as well. Because I'm a known expensive traveler because I'm [inaudible], looking at the dates and the venue options which have been given in the Doodle, I've already asked for rough quotes on the differences between air fare costs for those dates at the different venues and there are marked differences. There are some value opportunities, for example. But they may be offset by quite the opposite from other travelers, so I wondered if that analysis where possible could be done by the review team members. So, if you have access to a tool or a vice where as you're filling out your Doodle your preferences could also be biased by the lease expensive fare option, that might be very useful as well. Thanks.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you, Cheryl. So, I see there are several comments in the chat. Yes, thank you, again, very much for attending and presenting to this call. As Xavier mentioned, if there are any questions, please feel free to address them.

I would just like to go back to several comments. The first one from Wolfgang, "Is there any other Telco between now and the face-to-face

meeting?” I will open the floor to the review team for that question. Daniel, you have your hand raised. Go ahead. You seem to be muted. Daniel, we’re not able to hear you. Are there any other communities in reply to Wolfgang’s question on the need to schedule calls before the face-to-face meeting?

All right. So, I see a comment from Vanda which says, “We need to proceed with the work to go more prepared to our work when meeting face-to-face.” Patrick, “We should have regular cadence.” I see that Cheryl is typing. All right. Indeed to Vanda and Wolfgang.

So, maybe if there is no ... Maybe we can ask this question. Is there any phone call next week or would you like maybe to discuss with the leadership? I don’t see any hands or questions on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought the plan was agreed to be meeting weekly and that we had established rotation of times to do so.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right. If that works of all to have brief meetings [inaudible] face-to-face meeting, we will certainly do so. I see agreement from Patrick as well. So, we move forward on that. So, next plenary meeting will be next Wednesday at 11:00 UTC as identified in the Doodle poll that was shared with the review team.

I believe there was another question in the chat. Let me just get back to that. I see that there was a question on will we be meeting in Kobe and there were replies on that.

Is there any other business? All right. So, really quickly, we'll go through the decisions reached and action items.

So, decisions reached on today's call, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Patrick Kane were elected as co-chairs. First face-to-face meeting will be considered the first substantive meeting of the review. The review team will follow the operating standards as a guideline document and provide feedback [inaudible] identify issues.

And action items. For the first substantive meeting, we share quotes from ICANN bylaws in reply to Patrick's question.

The other action item is that we'll forward invitation for the plenary call next week. And as written, our [inaudible] regarding the leadership selection. We will follow-up with the creation of the mailing list [inaudible]. I believe that's it for the list of action items.

Thank you for your participation today. Again, if you have any questions, please reach out to us. I would just invite [inaudible] review team members to [inaudible] Doodle poll by the location and date of your face-to-face meeting.

Thank you, all, and have a nice day. Bye!

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye for now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]