
BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Review Team Plenary call #3 on the 20th of February, 2019, at 11:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Pat Kane, Vanda Scartezini, Cheryl-Langdon Orr, Jaap Akkerhuis, Osvaldo Novoa, [Remet Kahlui], Maarten Botterman, Sebastien Bachollet, Wolfgang Kleinwaechter, Erica Varlese, and Jacques Blanc.

From ICANN org, we have Jean-Baptiste Deroulez, Brenda Brower, and Herb Waye.

We do have observers of Avri Doria and Yang Hanu. Also, Daniel has just joined us.

I'd like to note that Michael Karanicolas has let us know he'll be delayed today.

Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking. I'll turn the call over to the co-chairs. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Thanks, Brenda. I'll jump in. Just an additional administrative reminder: if you can speak at a reasonable and slow pace and make sure you identify yourself before you take the microphone, that would be appreciated. Also, if you could, as the first slide did indicate, mute your microphone to avoid background noise, that would be a great boon to

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.

us all and indeed for the future record of our call. Seeing as the term “transparency” is in our name, we probably should make sure that what we do is not only there for the record but able to be deciphered.

With that, Pat and I are looking forward to start the more deliberative aspects of our call. We recognize that today we’re building on some of the discussions and decisions we took at last week’s call, including, of course, having weekly calls. We have some additional administrivia that is standard to all our agendas.

The first thing is if anyone has any update to their statement of interest, now is the time to let us all know and to remind you all that, of course, your statements of interest not only need to be lodged but they need to be kept up-to-date under a commitment of continuous disclosure.

On that, if you could just let us know now if there’s any update to your statements of interest or, of course, if any of you had any difficulty lodging your statements of interest, I’m quite sure that staff can assist you with that.

With that, not hearing anyone or seeing anybody raising their hand in the Adobe Connect room, we now will move onto the next slide, and that is the review of the agenda.

The review of the agenda for today’s call. We’ll be looking at our statements of interest and roll call. That’s done. We’re going to discuss the face-to-face meeting, as we agreed last week—

AUTOMATED VOICE: The host has left the meeting to speak with meetings support and will rejoin soon.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: That's just something that happens from time to time, people. I apologize for that. The world will not end and the host will undoubtedly return to us before everything is terminated.

The face-to-face meeting we agreed to at last week's call would be our first substantive meeting. In today's call, we're planning to their terms of reference, the work plan and timeline, our working methodologies and follow it up with opportunity to discuss an informal meeting at ICANN64 in Kobe. We're going to look at Any Other Business and then obviously confirm any decisions reached, any action items, and look at the time and date of the next meeting.

While we're at the review of the agenda, is there anybody who wants to put anything forward to Any Other Business at this stage? I think we will call again for that before the end of the call.

Not seeing anybody or hearing anybody throwing attention to themselves on the Adobe Connect and audio channel. Let's move on then to the face-to-face meeting, which will be our substantive meeting #1, and jump to the next slide, which is the thrill-packed and exciting announcement that, according to the [inaudible], the slides, when Pat and I read them earlier today, the date [for the diaries] and for your travel arrangement pleasure is going to be confirmed at the 3rd [inaudible] of April in Los Angeles. Obviously, this is not going to suit

absolutely everybody, but I gather this is of a majority rule and preference.

As the slide notes – and I’m sure you’re all noting in your calendars now – we will be meeting the full day of the 3rd, the full day of the 4th, and the majority, if not full day, of the 5th. The details of the agenda are yet to be determined, but it is a three-day meeting. So your travel arrangements need to be made in such a way that you are available for full-day meetings on the 3rd, the 4th, and the 5th of April 2019 in Los Angeles.

We note here that ICANN will cover the airfare, hotel, and meals to attend the ATRT3 face-to-face meeting in accordance with the existing ICANN Travel Support guidelines, the constituency travel guidelines. ICANN Travel Support will each out to us all to assist us in our travel arrangements. There is a link of the agenda and the slides to assist with you more ICANN travel support.

We will note, of course, it is not compulsory for you to avail yourself of the constituency travel support offered by ICANN. If you so desire to have personally covered the attendance cost, I’m quite sure you’re more than welcome to do so. And of course, to have your sending entity or employer do the same is also perfectly all right. The aim of the game here is to ensure that there is no impediment to anyone to be not able to join the meeting on the 3rd of April, presuming that your other schedule for real world as opposed to voluntary activities allows you to do so.

With that, let's pause for a moment and open the queue on any discussion and interaction on our first face-to-face meeting.

Pat, did you want to follow up with anything here?

PAT KANE: No. Nothing to follow up on this, but everybody should take a look at the travel support guidelines and just familiarize yourself with timeliness and that kind of stuff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. Yes. It is important that, when you do get a contact from ICANN Constituency Travel, particularly since we are already outside of the established norms for deadlines – this is already an exceptional meeting, and we appreciate ICANN's extraordinary efforts to facilitate this meeting – that you are very prompt with your travel arrangements.

Jacques—

[ALBERTA]: Hi. Pardon the interruption. This is the operator. Brenda, I keep calling the number for Tola and I'm getting a busy signal.

BRENDA BREWER: Very good. Thank you for trying. You can stop trying.

[ALBERTA]: Okay, thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, [Alberta]. Jacques, over to you.

JACQUES BLANC: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. I'm sorry. I'm just all new to all this kind of process. Are we going to have a list of preferred hotels or most-close hotels or whatever that we can address the way the ICANN gives us who are new to ICANN meetings?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jacques, that's an excellent question. One assumes with the venue, of course, that we are going to meeting utilizing the ICANN headquarters in Los Angeles facilities. I do know that they do have arrangements with preferred hotels. So let's go back to Jean-Baptiste and see what he'd like to tell us about that.

Over to you, Jean.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Cheryl, and thank you for your question, Jacques. I believe Travel Support will provide you in due time with all that information. And, yes, usually there is a hotel that is provided in their e-mail for this, but again, I would strongly recommend you wait for the e-mail that will be sent. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. Just to read to the record from the chat, and certainly to my living memory and experience, this is normally the DoubleTree Inn in Los Angeles. We will obviously have that confirmed by Constituency Travel.

Perhaps I can ask if we do have staff take a very minor action on that: just to reach out to Constituency Travel and to announce to our e-mail list as soon as practical what the accommodation will be for those who may, perhaps, not be availing themselves of ICANN Constituency Travel Support to ensure that they are aware of the accommodation bookings and indeed that the CT or their own arrangements can be made to take advantage of us all staying in the same hotel because, of course, there will be interaction advantage if that's the case.

[Danny], I note in chat that you don't have any sound. Brenda, are you working with [Danny] to see what's happening with his Adobe Connect audio out?

BRENDA BREWER: Yeah. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Brenda. Okay. Any other questions on that? I guess the other question I suppose we should raise here on the face-to-face meeting is when we expect Constituency Travel to perhaps reach out to us. Should we panic, for example, Jean-Baptiste, if we don't hear in the next [72] hours or what? Noting that, in the not too distant future, many of us will be traveling to Kobe anyway, one probably needs to

know whether one should panic that CT (Constituency Travel) has or has not reached out to us.

Back to you, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I just wanted to reply. So we got confirmation really recently – yesterday [inaudible – so you should be receiving news from them, I expect, before the end of this week. But be sure that we’ll be following up on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thank you very much. We do recognize this is a very busy time for Constituency Travel, and indeed all of ICANN’s volunteers. So it’d just be good to know that we’re not following through the “crack” at all.

Daniel, I saw your hand briefly raised.

Did you wish to speak, Daniel?

No? Okay. I’m assuming not, and I’m delighted to report for the record that [Danny’s] audio is sorted, so we do have everyone clearly connected.

With this, I’m going to ask that – ah, the dreaded upgrades in Adobe. I understand, [Danny]. We all have our preferences [in tools]. If we can move down to the next slide, I’m going to, without [inaudible], ladies and gentlemen – we’re working without nets here – and suggest that

Pat might take the lead on the next slide [inaudible] at the review of the terms of reference and the goals for our work.

Please, if you wouldn't mind, just raise your hand in the Adobe Connect, unless, of course, you are on audio only. If so, feel free to just jump in and we'll put you in the queue.

Pat, while I have a sip of water, if you want to take the next slide, over to you.

PAT KANE: Yeah. Certainly, Cheryl. Thank you. In the face-to-face meeting, which I guess is now five weeks out – five-and-a-half weeks out? – we'll probably [have] a lot of work done between now and then. The three documents, of course, that we have to get put in place are the terms of reference, the scope, and the work plan.

For staff, is that 60 days calendar days or work days?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's a good question, Patrick. I believe this is calendar days.

PAT KANE: That was my assumption because I think in previous documents it has said 40 days, but [we] got 60 days, calendar. All right.

So one of the things I'd like to ask for staff to provide is the artifacts from ATR1 and ATR2 that are those documents or the package itself that was sent to the Board for review for ATRT1 and ATRT2.

Can we do that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What was said at the beginning? You want what for ATRT1 and ATRT2?
Sorry.

PAT KANE: The artifact documents that were put in a package to the Board when the Board reviewed and confirmed the terms of reference, the work plan, and the scope.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh. [All right].

PAT KANE: I mean, I know they're listed on the web pages, but if you guys could collect them into what the package was that was sent, that would be helpful for the team to take a look and review to get our heads around what the expectations are in terms of the deliverable documents.

Then I'm assuming also that Brenda, you, are Jean-Baptiste, will be distributing the detailed templates?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's correct, Patrick. That stays on our [inaudible], so we'll be providing a [inaudible] that basically can be considered a framework with all the different sections that need to be filled in. Some is general

information that we'll be able to put in, but some of those will be the work of the [inaudible].

PAT KANE: And when do you think you'd have those pushed out, John-Baptiste?

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'll try to send that to the review team before the end of this week or the beginning of next week.

PAT KANE: All right. I'm just taking a note here.

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right.

PATE KANE: Thank you.

JOHN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You're welcome.

PAT KANE: All right. So can we go to the next slide, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: John-Baptiste, being painfully aware, because I listened to all the meetings and was an observer, etc., for ATRT2, MSI was an entity that was brand spanking new during the beginnings of ATRT2. I value the fact that Avri is here as an observer because, of course, she was in the trenches and very active, in fact a lynch pin to the ATRT2 process.

I don't believe there were these templates, etc., utilized in ATRT2, and I can certainly they weren't in ATRT1 because I served on that committee. So are there some other review teams where these templates have been developed that we could perhaps have a little pre-look at? I'm assuming, of course, that, like most living documents, these templates, even if we do look at them as references from other work, are in themselves works in progress [inaudible] as we should in our self-determined nature of what we are going to be doing, very free to use and/or modify them. Just wanted to double-check on that.

Sorry, Pat. It's just I am very aware that, in some ways, we don't have standard operational procedures on things like templates, at this stage at least. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Cheryl, that's fine. I think taking a look at the terms of reference from both [HL] 1 and 2 will also help us from the standpoint of what would fit into a template. So I welcome taking a look at all of them in concert.

So the, on Slides 8 and 9, this is just detailing out what – actually, and 10 – I assume, John-Baptiste, will be in the templates?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Correct.

PAT KANE: Okay. So not to read through these bullet by bullet – I think everybody can go through this on the slides that were distributed last night – did anybody have any specific questions on these areas?

Okay. We can go ahead to Slide 11, please, Brenda.

So I just put together a representative timeline, just to get a feel for one year looks like and how that would line up on ICANN67. I know that the TOR says 60 day we have to get it in place, which is probably about 40 work days in terms of what Microsoft Project would allow me to put in. But essentially we've got a lot of work and a little bit of time in terms of making certain we can make public comment periods.

So, if we need to get to a public comment, we've got to be substantially done by the beginning of October, which would line up with ICANN66. So, hopefully, as a goal, [by] ICANN66, we could be finishing up the document to submit to public comment for the first review.

Any questions there?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, obviously, let's get everybody a couple of days to look over this proposed and representative timeline. I for one very much appreciate this type of structure, but it may not be in everybody's comfort zone.

PAT KANE: True.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So let's give everybody, shall we say, 72 hour or so to look at it and raise questions. And we'll make sure it's on our agenda for next week's call for a more substantive discussion.

PAT KANE: Cheryl, thank you very much. One thing that I would call out on the representative timeline is the section that says, which would be line number 5, collection of review items. One of the things that, as we go through this from a methodology standpoint, I'd like to throw out for consideration while you're looking at this, think through it, and give feedback is to break these up into sections and put together work teams that take a discrete piece of work and take a look at different items from either ATRT1 or ATRT2 to include areas into the future based upon where ICANN is going and do we have the right accountability mechanisms in the future from what we hear from the leadership of the organization, ICANN org, where they'd like to go and evolve the community and evolve the DNS, take a look and make certain we have flexible accountability and transparency mechanisms that can shape as we go forward.

So think about how we'd like to break the different work sections, and we can create work parties around that. So just something to consider in this format.

Then, if we go to the next slide, the working methodologies—

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Can I comment?

PAT KANE: Sorry, Maarten, I missed your hand.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No problem. Basically, I just wanted to raise the point that let's not only look at what came out of the 1 and 2 but let's also make sure that we consider, when looking forward, what do we need to take into account. So up and beyond the outcomes of ATRT 1 and 2, which are important.

PAT KANE: So, Maarten, I think that's absolutely correct. When we hear Goran and Cherine talk about the five trends that they're tracking for the future and how that shapes '20-'25, there's certainly things that will change in terms of how ICANN operates, or at least is expected to change, and we need to make certain that we can hold the organization and the community accountable in a transparent so that, as things evolve, they're evolving for the right reasons and we can clearly see what they are.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [Thanks].

PAT KANE:

Then the next slide in terms of working methodologies everybody think through. But the one thing that I want to make certain that we drive towards is inclusion, as well as fairness in the approach that we take. So all of this is based on some good hygiene in terms of how we're going to operate, but we have to remain inclusive and we have to remain fair and we have to remain open to all ideas, I think.

Questions there? Cheryl, you've got your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Pat. Not a question. Just an embellishment. I'll do that a lot [inaudible] [panic]. Obviously, it's important that the Accountability and Transparency Review Team is in fact accountable and transparent. So that's something that you might think is blatantly obvious, but there are many issues between now and even the face-to-face meeting. We might want to consider things that have come up. For example, in the past, is how we and should we – I suppose my bias isn't showing there when I start with the "how we" as opposed to the "should be"; declaring biases is important – have things set up, for example, for anonymized whistle-blowing. Do we have the ability for member or members of the ICANN community to report to the ATRT a matter of extreme concern? [You] and I use the term "ICANN community" [uninclusive] of staff. Where do we take whistle-blowing, for example, into our consideration?

So whilst obviously we will be looking to these generic methodologies as important tools, there's also specifics that will be borne out the scope. But our agreed scope is yet to be determined. We all recognize that. But things like how we take community input prior to any initial reporting,

let alone interaction with the community and formalizing any reporting and recommendations, all needs to be well-presented, well-understood, by the community, and of course, utilize a robust model.

So think if you will over the next few days just how you will intake, appreciate, and deal with commentary from the ICANN community, or criticism of the ICANN community. What weighting are you going to give it? How do you treat anonymized and non-anonymized input?

Here, I would remind you that, in the past, these are matters that have taken considerable time for discussion and deliberation for other review teams. We are under a very tight timeline, so the sooner we can come to our own consensus on some of these matters, the better.

To that end, I'm wondering whether we could poll our group now and see how comfortable everybody might be working with one of the things in our tool kit in terms of collaboration.

Is there anyone who simply cannot or will not interact with Google Docs, for example, if we put up straw person documentation or thought process work in that format? Can we start to deliberate in a transparent way?

AUTOMATED VOICE:

The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting report and will rejoin soon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So these are things that are not going to be answered now, but these are certainly things that I for one would be encouraging us to start contemplating.

Pat, back to you.

PAT KANE: Thanks, Cheryl. When you were speaking about whistleblowers, the thing that popped into my head was, were you considering or suggesting that we put together the ability to submit anonymously for us to review from a community suggestion as to where accountability and transparency can be approved?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Pat, that is certainly a matter that has been not only deliberated and considered in the past by previous accountability and transparency review teams, but it's a tool that has been agreed to. I know that ATRT1 used an anonymized e-mail address, which was a catch-all for such things, and came to the attention of the ATRT team. I believe that perhaps Avri or someone else from MSSSI could confirm that ATRT2 certainly contemplated it but I believe they probably also set that up. That's just one example.

So it's more than just, if we come to poll or vote on something, what sort of threshold comes to play on decision making. It also needs to include, in terms of our methodologies, a clear and unambiguous guideline for community on how they can interact. Note I didn't actually say "ICANN community" there. I meant community because there are

actors outside of the normal boundary census of ICANN that may also wish to contribute commentary from time to time. Who knows? Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So outside of that section, I've got nothing else to add. Staff, anything we should think of in this area?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Patrick. No. Maybe what I just wanted to emphasize is that this [inaudible] is one part of your terms of reference, so some time should be spent on that on two items that are listed on this slide. Again, if we can support your discussions, just let us know how we can help. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Okay, great. Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. All right. Then the last slide in this particular deck talks about ICANN64, an informal meeting opportunity.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Patrick, just before we move to that, I just would like to help Brenda with something. There is someone on the phone with the number ending with 6420. Could that person identify herself or himself? Thank you. So the number ending with 6420.

All right. Let's move on. Back to you, Patrick.

PAT KANE: All right. Sorry, my Internet dropped for a moment, so I'm just logging back in. All right. So ICANN64. It appears from the poll that Brenda took – and I know that this was privately sent to Brenda – that there'll be eight of us at ICANN64. If staff could take a look and see if there's a room available. If not, as a sponsor, Verisign has a room as well that we could use. I could find some time on either of those days.

Brenda, was there any preference for time of day suggested to you in the responses?

BRENDA BREWER: No, Patrick. That wasn't part of my question. I apologies.

PAT KANE: No worries.

BRENDA BREWER: Yeah.

PAT KANE: I see Cheryl has a preference for the 12th. And Martin has suggested, "Let's Doodle for times." So can we set up a Doodle for that?

And I know that we had some privacy questions in terms of when people were arriving and flights and those kinds of things, so I think we

still have a question out to staff as to what the guidelines are for privacy protection for the participants of the group.

BRENDA BREWER:

We can send a Doodle out to the whole review team, so they can reply however it suits them. If they're not attending, there's no need to reply. So that'll work out fine. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Okay. Thank you, Brenda. All right. So—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Pat, Cheryl here. Just double-checking. I note the generosity of your corporation that you just mentioned. But regardless, I would think it's pretty important that, if we possibly can, having some form of remote participation for members of the review team who are not able to attend Kobe is going to be fairly important, still recognizing the informal nature of this gathering, still seeing it as simply a way of the prior preparations that we're hoping to get particularly on the terms of reference and scoping work done. Obviously, we don't want to disadvantage any of our review team members just because they haven't already decided to travel to an [icy] Kobe on an island in the middle of Japan Harbor. [Note] an accessibility issue might [inaudible].

Yeah, I just think it's important that, while staff is looking at ICANN-provided opportunities in case we don't have to prevail upon Verisign, we do remember that people may be able to dial in if possible. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So that brings us to the end of the prepared slides for today. Anybody want to throw in Any Other Business?

John-Baptiste, you have your hand raised?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. I just wanted to get back to you on the action item for the ICANN64 [inaudible] opportunity. So we set up a Doodle for times, but would you like set it up for either the 11th or the 12th? Because I took the [raw] comments in the chat saying that the 12th would be ideal.

PAT KANE: Why don't we put times for both of those days?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. Will do so. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, I think it's important for the Doodle poll to be very clear perhaps about the time commitment. Are we talking about a two-hour block, a three-hour block, or the whole damned day? Again, notice my biases. But it does make a difference to already – and Maarten is also picking that up. Aa Board member, his life is definitely not his own. To be able to carve out one or two hours might be far different to trying to carve out three or four on any one of those days. Just an important point.

Jaap, good question. Why be so formal about an informal meeting? Basically, from my perspective, because we're trying to be as inclusive as possible and simply leverage on the opportunity for a number of us to be face-to-face, yourself included.

Pat's saying, "One hour? Far more manageable." Pat, I'm relieved to see that.

John-Baptiste, your hand is still up. Go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, that's an old hand. But just wanted to comment that we have reported that [could] be a one-hour block. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. So does anyone have anything else? I know that this was going to be kind of a short meeting since it's just getting started, really. Cheryl, anything else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. I just wondered, whether utilizing our e-mail list, whether people might want to start putting up their hands already to see whether or not they want to step up to proactively work on things in the preparatory phase before our face-to-face meeting. By "things," I mean Pat's exploring the timeline and project management details, exploring the specifics of the scope.

There, just to warn you all, those of you who want to dig in deep to the development of our scope, there is considerable material for reference. It would be nice to have some high-level text that the whole review team can contemplate and consider in advance of any informal gathering in Kobe, certainly in the next week or so but before our face-to-face meeting, where, obviously, we'll be having far more detailed and deliberative discussions. But there is quite a body of work to review, so some suggestions and synthesis documentation on how we might approach our scope could be useful. Thanks.

PAT KANE:

Hello, Herb. I see you have your hand up?

HERB WAYE:

Yes. Good morning, Pat and Cheryl and everybody else. I just want to take a brief moment here and clarify my presence, I guess, with this review team. I'm basically looking at this as a learning opportunity for me. I had an opportunity, being an old-timer in ICANN, to experience from the outside both ATRT1 and 2, and specifically the impact it had on the Office of the Ombudsman with many of the recommendations.

So I'm here as an observer. I was identified as ICANN org staff at the beginning there. I just want to make sure that everybody understands that I'm not here in an official capacity, other than being the ombudsman as a resource person for the group.

But I'm here, more importantly, to learn about how the ATRT process works, participate as a resource for any information for any comments or questions you may have about the Office of the Ombudsman.

Qualifying that, if at any time during the year when I'm attending a meeting or if something arises that you feel is more appropriate or that you'd be more comfortable discussing in my absence, please do not hesitate in the least bit. I will not be offended at all if I am asked to step out the meeting or not attend a specific meeting because you will be discussing something you wish to discuss in camera, away from the Office of the Ombudsman, with any information that you wish to share amongst yourselves or comments you wish to make that you are uncomfortable sharing or having me in the room.

So please – I'll probably mention this again if I ever see conversation going on – I'll be more than happy to step out or skip meetings if anything pops up that you wish to discuss more in a private manner. As much as it is all published online and in the transcripts, etc., sometimes having me in the room may make some people uncomfortable. So please don't, at any time, feel uncomfortable in asking me to step aside.

I look forward to watching and learning over the coming year, and I wish you all the very best of luck as you proceed through this. I am hoping to be able to make the last day of your L.A. meeting. I will be attending a conference in the States for the first part of that week but should be able to make it to L.A. for the 5th to drop in and say hello and meet you all face-to-face.

Finally, at Kobe, if you're putting together informal meetings, or if any of you wish to get the other specifically-discussed ATRT – I do have an office, though generally share it with the Complaints Officer. We do have days – but I don't know how big it is or whether it can accommodate a larger group, but please don't hesitate, if you need a place to set up a meeting for an hour. I'd be more than happy to offer my workspace if it's appropriate and there are no issues with timing and so on.

So thank you very much. I'll let you get back to your meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Herb, thank you very much for that. I just want to jump in before we go to Brenda. I recognize your hand up, Brenda. You raised an important point, that it's probably worth staff just highlighting here. In my experience, and I suspect Pat's as well, it's very handy that, if anyone in our group, simply based on previous groups I've been involved with, believes that something needs to be taken "in camera" – it's kind of a reverse technology when you're not an English-as-a-first-language speaker – what we mean is that the official recording, the audio recording, of our meeting would be suspended. Only members of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, those formally appointed, would remain. A conversation and deliberation or discussion would occur, and then one would come to a recording state where, without any attribution, a general record of discussion was made.

So, for example, in other meetings, a member can say, "I'd like to take that in camera." The meeting agrees that that would happen either then

or at the end of the meeting or whenever. When that occurs, staff ensures that only the review team members remain. The transcription and recording is suspended briefly. And then, after whatever has happened has happened – that is sometimes necessary and very valuable – it is good practice – dare I say accountable and transparent practice – to have for the record a note that says, for example, “ATRT3 went into a short in-camera session, where they discussed a confidential report. That will have been taken into account in future recommendations.” Something very high-level, but it [inaudible] into the record why, what the gory details of, an in-camera session with [inaudible].

So just for those you who may not have done that very much, it’s important to make sure we all have a clear understanding.

With that, I’ll stop filibustering and go to Brenda. Thanks.

BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you, Cheryl. Again, we have a phone number that’s joined. I have disconnected it twice and it continues to dial back in. We have an area code of 860, which I believe in Connecticut. If could just identify your name for the attendance record, we’d appreciate it. Area code 860, ending in the last four digits of 6420.

I’m not hearing any reply. If your line in muted, could you please unmute?

Okay. I’ll disconnect the line again. I’m sorry for interrupting the meeting with that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem at all, Brenda. I appreciate your efforts to keep us all identified and honest.

At this stage, we also haven't agreed on whether or not we should identify the appointing bodies that we have come from. I personally, in our Adobe Connect records, am almost less than ambivalent about that. I think we're a small enough group and we can get to know real quick who's from what sector of the ICANN community. I'm happy, and I'm sure that Pat is as well, to entertain a different standard, should you so desire. But it is important that, as we do take attendance records and they do become a public record, Brenda does exactly what she's done there, and that is try and ascertain who has joined our call.

To that end, one of the things you probably need to decide very early on is how public you want your regular weekly calls to be. My personal view is that, if an accountability and transparency review team can't do everything transparently, then we have a problem. So I'm all for everything being in the public record, unless an exceptional justification is made for a short or small and specific in-camera session.

But perhaps we can take that as a piece of homework because I like getting homework. We can discuss that in the coming weeks on our e-mail list. Perhaps a question to all of you is, do any of you object to future calls being open to other people to join in a listen-only mode? Then please raise the basis for that concern. It could be very valid. Then we will decide at next week's call whether that is how we proceed. You all know my biases. If in doubt, make it transparent.

But with that, Pat, did you want to say anything before we go back to Brenda to remind us about the date and time of our next meeting and for us to look at any particular action items that may or may not have been captured in the discussion notes?

PAT KANE: No, I'm good, Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. Jean-Baptiste, do you want to just quickly review any AIs or significant decisions that you believe is needing review so we can all agree on them?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Cheryl. [inaudible]. So the identified actions for today's call are the following. I [can] reach out to Constituency Travel to confirm what recommendation will be for the face-to-face meeting. I [can reach out] to Constituency Travel [inaudible], and I can also provide [inaudible] ATRT 2 and ATRT 1 artifact documents. Terms of reference [inaudible] that were sent out to [inaudible]. We [agree] to look at [inaudible] sent out by Patrick and send any questions via e-mail. [inaudible] agenda. For ICANN64's formal meeting, I can set up a Doodle for times. It would be a one-hour block, and that would be for the 11th or the 12th of March. Finally, Patrick and [inaudible] transparency [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. I might modify that last one slightly. “After any input from review team members in the coming week to our e-mail list, we will address transparency standards on our next plenary call,” because it is important that our review team members can contemplate and formulate any concern or opinions.

So, Pat, I think, seeing how I started it off, you can wrap it up and take us to our next slide and when our next thrill-packed and exciting episode is going to be.

PAT KANE: Thanks for the drama, Cheryl. Okay. So we are going to be on the 27th of February at 21:00 UTC, which is next Wednesday.

Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. So, with that, Brenda, is your hand an old one?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, it is an old one. Thank you for reminding me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, dear. Okay. Well, thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, and do not forget, as I often do, to disconnect your phones. Operating through a headset, you’d be surprised at how many 60-minute calls take 140 minutes off my timed callings from my phone.

Thank you, one and all. Bye for now. And don't forget we do have an e-mail list. Let's make good use of it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Patrick. Thank you, all.

PAT KANE: Bye now. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]