| | |
|---|---|
| BRENDA BREWER: | Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Review Team Plenary call #5, on the 20th of March, 2019 at 1100 UTC. Attending the call today is Jaap Akkerhuis, Vanda Scartezini, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Pat Kane, Jacques Blanc, Demi Getschko, Erica Varlese, Maarten Botterman, Daniel Nanghaka, and Wolfgang Kleinwachter will join us momentarily. Observers joining us, Yang Hunyu, Jim Prendergast, Herb Waye. From ICANN Org. is Jean-Baptiste Deroulez, Negar Farzinnia, and Brenda Brewer. We do have apologies from Sebastien Bachollet, Osvaldo Novoa, KC Claffy, and Geoff Huston. |
| | Today's conference is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to the Co-chairs, thank you. |
| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | Thank you, Brenda. I might jump in and do the beginning. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr here, one of your Co-chairs, along with Pat Kane. And on today's all, we have a relatively brief agenda, but one that we hope will begin our sustentative work ahead of our face-to-face meeting that we have scheduled in April, and more on that later in the agenda. |
| | First of all, we do note the number of apologies for today's call, and that is I believe almost universally because people are returning from their flight and travel commitments after ICANN 64. We do recognize that it's been somewhat of a tradition in ICANN world to not hold meetings the week after an ICANN meeting, but we also recognize two things; first of all, that we have a large amount of work to do and the more pre- |

preparation we can get done before the clock starts running, the better. We did already get commitments to weekly calls on rotating times, and we recognize that nobody is likely to have 100% attendance regardless throughout our processes. And thirdly, that not everyone was able to, for various reasons, be travelling to Kobe, so the buck out rule probably is less for those people.

That's it, that's about as welcome as Pat and I can make here for today. We had our roll call, we may have one or two people added, as I noticed it's crept up to twelve now as we got through, but Brenda will capture that with the roll call being maintained out of the presence in the Adobe connect room, so we'd only need for me to check, if there's anybody on the review team that has an update to their statement for the interest, just reminding you all that you should have lodged your statement of interest. If there is any difficulties with doing so, staff is more than happy to help you. And if you work under continuous disclosure, for you to announce any changes that may occur week by week, briefly wait for any changes, statements of interest?

I'm not hearing anybody. Of course, you can also use Live chat tool. If we not have looked very briefly at the call agenda that we have in front of you in the Adobe Connect room, that we will be moving brief updates on things that occurred that were relevant to use and our work out of ICANN 64. We'll be discussing our face-to-face meeting which is our first substantive meeting, which will be held in Los Angeles, and going over the majority today on committed to identifying the topics of review as we build out our scope, and our specific terms of reference. Then of course, ask for any other business, and we will run our action items and concern and decisions reached. And we have one more

plenary call before we meet face-to-face.  So, with any other business in front of us, can I ask is there anyone who wishes to, at this stage, flag a piece of any other business?  Daniel, I'm noticing your microphone, do you just want to check your audio, because otherwise I'll ask you to mute, we're just hearing background noise.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER:    This is Wolfgang, hello.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Welcome, Wolfgang, we can hear you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER:    I'm on listening mode only because I am travelling and it's difficult to speak for me, but I will listen as long as I can.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you very much, Wolfgang, and please, obviously if you're not in the Adobe Connect room, just make your voice heard and we'll pop in you a speaking queue, don't hold back if you have something to say.  Please just say, "Yeah, pop me in the queue," and we will do so.  And with that, I can then ask Daniel to either test his microphone or mute, and I will send note that his microphone seems to be open as well.  It is a wise practice for us all to mute, unless you're actually speaking.  Okay, all right, well, we may have audio issues later on, but I'm sure Brenda will manage that for us.

# EN

So, with that and a little bit more housekeeping and administration than we would normally need to do, I'm going to ask if we can now move to the next slide, and take a sip of water, and move on after that. Thanks very much. And I'm going to hand over to Pat, while he takes us through what looks like an exciting adventure that some of us had in beautiful Kobe at ICANN 64 and spring was doing its best to make itself known. Over to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:          Good morning, good evening, and thank you, Cheryl. This is Pat for the record. I just wanted to go through briefly a little bit of items that I think were interesting for us at the ICANN 64 meeting. So, we'll start off with our informal meeting. So, I want to apologize again for not getting the phone set up on time in the room so that we could get everybody involved, but I think that we're about ten of us or nine of us that met, and we covered probably three things. The first one that we discussed was the inability for some members of the review team to get into the documents or that there were problems with the distribution of some of the documents.

And Negar, you were going to take a look at that with Jean-Baptiste to see if we were, at least that's the note that I have here, that I took from the meeting, is we would take a look and make certain that the documents that we were using or distributing were able to be opened up by everyone. So, do we have any update on that?

| NEGAR FARZINNIA: | This is Negar. Yes, we've actually got our IT team involved where it's one of the Review Team members that had experienced the issue. They're currently working on it to determine the root cause of the problem, to ensure everyone has access, so that's work in progress. Please stay tuned, we'll provide you with more updates as our technical hosts are able to resolve it and let us know what the root cause is. |
|---|---|
| PAT KANE: | This is Pat. Negar, thank you very much for that. Glad to hear that we're moving forward on that. The second item that we talked about was one that Cheryl addressed earlier, which was the timing of meetings, the timing of our Review Team meetings post an ICANN meeting. And clearly we've got a few that are travelling today, so I'm curious with the group, either through putting notes into chat, or maybe Jean-Baptiste, we can do a Doodle poll on this, if in the future we're going to be thin following ICANN meetings, we might want to take a look at actually not having a meeting. |
| | So, if there's some discussion now we want to have, great, if not, Jean-Baptiste, if you'll put up a Doodle poll at some point in time on voting on meetings following, that would be helpful. I'm not seeing any hands in the chat room, or any specific conversations other than Jacques saying, "Yes, let's do a Doodle poll," Jean-Baptiste, will you do that for us, please? |
| JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: | Yes, will do. |

PAT KANE: Thank you very much. And then, the third item that we talked about were options for Marrakesh. And it became clear that, at least in the conversation we were having, that really options following Marrakesh were not actually an option, but two things that we did have coming out of that were; one, the request and the execution on request to SOs and ACs for face-to-face discussion with members of the Review Team in Marrakesh, and two, that we still have available to us a day prior to the ICANN meeting in Marrakesh, ICANN 65. And I believe that date is June 23rd, so do we have any updates from staff on where we are on both of those items?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Hi Pat, this is Negar again. Currently I have no updates for the team regarding post the conversation that you and Cheryl had with the committee team. It is still the first week back after the ICANN meeting, and I believe they're still busy with packing and travelling, so I would expect an update from them possibly the following week. We will keep you posted on that.

PAT KANE: Great, thank you. And then the request to also get time with the SOs and ACs?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Oh yes, of course. Allow me to look into that further, I actually haven't done, haven't taken any action on that. I believe the right next step

would be for us to write a note on behalf of the review team to the chairs of this, so when we see them we request time up front, so my suggestion would be for us to draft a note that we will pass on to you and Cheryl for review, to verify that you're okay with the request content, and we will forward that note then to the SOs and ACs and request time with them at the next upcoming ICANN meeting.

PAT KANE:                          Fantastic, thank you very much, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:           No problem at all, we'll take that as an action item.

PAT KANE:                          And then the day before that we have the whole day still on hold for us is actually June 23rd, correct?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:           That would be correct, yes.

PAT KANE:                          Well, thank you very much with that, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:           Of course, of course.

# EN

PAT KANE:                  Any questions, or is there anything that anybody wants to add based upon our informal meeting?  Yes, Maarten, you have your hand up?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:         Yeah, just to say that on the 23rd, obviously I would normally be in a Board Workshop.

PAT KANE:                  No, we just asked- yes, Maarten, we understand that, but we're taking advantage of that particular day to finalize our preparation for interviews and discussions with the SOs and the ACs, so I think that while we will miss you, I think that we still need to take advantage of that day.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:         Yes, I'll get that, just be aware that the Board Workshop is there, some of you may realize.  Obviously, I'll try to deduct as much as I can, if you have a good timed agenda for that day that might help me to join where useful.

PAT KANE:                  Yes, we will certainly do that and have that to you in plenty of time in advance.  All right, so the second item that I wanted to cover from ICANN 64 was on Monday afternoon in Kobe, in the Public Forum #1, there was a conversation between Jonathan Zuck, who was the Chair of the Consumer Trust and Competition, or Competition and Consumer Trust Review Team, and the Board.  And it came down to that there

were 37 recommendations made in CCTRT where 6 were formally adopted, and then the remainder of them were either passed for further discussion, not accepted, and there was confusion as to what the ICANN Board is going to do with all of those recommendations. Now, part of that discussion also included a budgetary component to where there was recognition by the board that moving forward it would probably be impossible to financially implement all Review Team recommendations.

So, that led to a discussion that I had with Russ Housley who is the Chair of SSR2, in where he indicated that there were some concern amongst his Review Team as to work that they were doing since they were starting to finalize their recommendations, and how to move forward. So, part of the things that I've been thinking about that in terms of that is how we package our recommendations coming out of ATRT3. And whether or not those recommendations we would follow traditionally as a list of 1 to end recommendations, or whether we would do something different in terms of how we looked at our recommendations.

Clearly, in my mind, we should look at prioritization, and not just in a high, medium, low, but prioritization in a 1 to end, or do we take a look at bundles of recommendations, and what is required or what is not required. So, I'd like to open it up for some conversation about that, and Maarten, I see that you have your hand up as well?

**EN**

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     Daniel, maybe you can close your microphone?  Yeah, I can talk about what is really driving the Board.  I think you said it well, the first aspect is obviously there is a couple of recommendations we felt free to accept immediately.  They have brought any of the recommendations basically will be said, these are recommendations that we cannot act on or support because of policy recommendations and policies can be acted upon by the GNSOs, ccNSO, ISO.  So, again, we didn't turn those down.

BRENDA BREWER:     Please continue, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     Marrakesh, we will talk further about it, but basically, it's to get some idea of the cost of the recommendations and then an interaction with the CCT Team, how can they plan this.  Now, I guess it's more increasing awareness of the need for fiscal responsibility in an organization that does no longer have always increasing funds to its availability, it's affected us all.  And I think it also reflects on the work of the ICRT itself in a way that it would be good that early on they also consider that something costs money, and what is reasonably prioritized with this at the back of our mind.  So, I think the Board and Org.  would be standing ready to help us in pre-thinking what possible costs are, and the same to SSR2.  This will lead to a literation of prioritization.

So, I hope that perspective helps.  The Board doesn't have the perfect answer, it's just the awareness that some answers are not to be answered by the Board, but look at costs first before we really can prioritize it.  So, I hope that helps.  I'm very happy to answer any

questions there. So, very clearly, we didn't turn down any proposals by CCT. I hope this was understandable.

PAT KANE: Yeah, this is Pat. Maarten, that's very helpful, thank you very much. So, the one thing that I would add is I had a subsequent conversation with Jonathan Zuck at the airport here in Washington, D.C. and we were talking about how ICANN, the Board and the Org. would then prioritize recommendations coming out of all the review teams. So, if we do have a financial issue and we do want to exhibit fiscal responsibility, given that there is a flat budget, at least appearing to be flat budget moving forward, how do we want to take a look at, and should we recommend as part of ATRT3 something to address Review Team recommendations across multiple years, such that were prioritizing the most beneficial recommendations and implementations for the community, and I welcome a discussion or questions on that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, the current thinking sure is that we would always go back to the Review Team, and ask them to prioritize in the light of better understanding of the cost. The second thing is, even the budgets, although much of it is fixed costs more or less, are not determined without interaction to the community, so that is a part too. [Request to speak in French] It is probably better that I speak in English. The third element actually indicated, I would very much appreciate if as ATRT, we can indeed leave this in good practice for reviews, towards the future as well. So, hope this helps, and very open to any discussion.

PAT KANE:                          Yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Thanks Pat.  Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript records.  It also strikes me that it, and I did put a little note to this effect as a square bracket in the shared Google Doc which we'll be moving to in a later agenda point, I've put in a little square bracket G of what we could look at as being in scope and this is what it says; also based on previous work, as both ATRT1 and 2, each of those that, in particular ATRT1, was tasked and scoped at a review of other specific reviews, and so we may have an opportunity here if we were to agree to include in our scope of work, particularly this unusual timing in ICANN's evolution.

In other words, we are unlike ATRT1 with host Jake Wellend [ph.] surely posts [inaudible] affirmation of commitments, we also post IANA transition and the associated work stream 1 and 2, Cross Community Working Group Recommendations, although we do note that the implementation of Work Stream 2 is still on the actions list, not the actioned list for Board and .org, and so we could very well look at a brief analysis of the effectiveness of the actionable or the recommendations from the recent specific reviews.  And so, I would like you all to consider whether or not that might be a [inaudible] piece of work as well, but we will get to that in our later conversations today that I can ask you to think on that while you're concentrating what Pat is taking you through, thank you.

# EN

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Do we have any further questions or conversation points? Seeing no hands, I will move onto the third item, which was a conversation that Cheryl and I had with Josh and Tansy [ph.] from staff about the Marrakesh meeting. And one of the things that they are continuing to look into for us, and Negar mentioned this earlier, was that we would look at what we could actually do for space following the ICANN meeting that would be limited to facility Wi-Fi and just typically like we're doing today, and not have the full-blown event networks available. And we're supposed to get something back from them within a week, ten days maybe. Maybe sooner, but probably not until next week.

So, that was the last item that came up, but more to come on that. The only other item that I had that was from ICANN64 was Negar, you had mentioned to me that staff would be preparing an ATRT2 review document and I was just curious as to when we thought we would have that, and would we have that prior to our face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles in two weeks?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thanks, Pat, this is Negar. Yes, we are preparing briefing material for the Review Team on the communication of ATRT2 recommendations as the Review Team is aware. One of the mandatory scope items for the Review Team is to assist the implementation of evaluating the implementation of the prior review recommendations, in this case ATRT2. In an effort to streamline that process, we are preparing briefing materials that go into detail as to how each of the

recommendations were implemented, each of these documents is going to include of course links to additional information for the Review Team.

Our target timing is to have the briefing material ready for right after you finish your face to face meeting and you have your scope finalized. We will be distributing the material to the review team. I would guess about a week at the latest after you have finished your face-to-face meeting here in Los Angeles, which would allow you to begin actually your substance report first scope item, as noted in the bylaws.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Negar. So, that would be probably sometime around April 15th that we would expect to have a document by then, correct?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That is correct, yes.

PAT KANE: Thank you very much. Okay, so that for me was the brief update on what transpired at ICANN 64. Cheryl, is there anything that you would like to add to that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, Cheryl here. Nothing from me, but I think that's a fresh hand from Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     Yes, and just aware that those who were in Kobe may have participated to the meeting on the last day, which was Chaired by Brian Cute on involving the multi-stakeholder model. Now, this is, instead of our work, but it may well compliment our work and it may be good to have a keen eye on how that develops and see what that means for us in our work.

PAT KANE:     This is Pat. Thank you, Maarten, for that. I think that's absolutely correct, since that really leads into one of the five trends that the Board and ICANN .org have been focusing on for the next five-year plan.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     Yes, and just to be very clear on that because words are important here, the five-year plan has also been developed [inaudible] with a lot of input from the community and feedback from the community and feedback from the community on subsequent steps that have been part of a public participation, etcetera. Yes, very much so, so also there I think what's happening there, ATRT is in a unique position to put the dots on the I and it's clear that the community and Board are busy on seeing what better ways forward are. And I think particularly our task as a Review Team, so a very clean and very clean position on that.

PAT KANE:     Yes, thank you Maarten. So, not seeing anything else or hearing anything else for the ICANN 64 update, can we move to the next agenda item, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Cheryl here.  Negar or Jean-Baptiste, did you just want to go through for the record here the logistics of our face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles and if at all possible, if we could confirm with you and/or the people assembled from the Review Team on today's call those who will not be able to attend at all, or any of those that are having any challenges, Visa or travel-wise to join us in this.  So, who wants to jump in, Negar, Jean-Baptiste?  Whomever.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:     Yes, Jean-Baptiste on the phone.  So, yes, we would like to provide you with an update.  So, you should have all received now the e-mail from travel services.  If you still have not, please contact me immediately.  What we have looked at here, so organization, the hotel receipt of confirmation on that as well, so your hotel will be Doubletree by Hilton, it's located [interruption] All right, so the hotel is located [inaudible] by car, so we just wanted to mention that you have several services which are available, like Uber and Lyft.  Those are available in Los Angeles, so you can use these if you want to join the ICANN by car, otherwise this is just 11 minutes walking distance.

We have included a short note just to make things a little bit easier, so you have the address of the hotel and this you will see on the slide, but of course we will share ahead of the meeting a recap of all this information.  The meeting itself will be [inaudible] A.  So, when you enter the building, this is on the left.  Visitor badges will be provided, and security of the building will be informed as well and should provide

some information on what Cheryl requested.  As far as I'm aware, we know that Erica, Josh, Michael and [inaudible] won't be able to attend in person the meeting, and that's what we have so far at least.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thanks, Jean-Baptiste.  Is there anyone who, Cheryl for the record, is there anyone who has any questions or concerns or wants to make any comments on the logistics?  I note Tyler just put in his chats here that he's still obtaining his Visa, so his attendance is still sketchy.  Let's hope that things work out, Tyler, because obviously it is an important thing that if anyone is able and willing to go, that we do our best to help them to get there.  Obviously not everyone, has work commitments or other things that will allow them of course to travel, but you're willing and able, it's just a matter of a Visa issue for you.

So, staff, can I just get, perhaps Jean-Baptiste just to double-check and make sure that we follow up with Tyler about how he's fairing with the Visa issues, and if there's anything we or Constituency Travel could do, writing formal invitation, whatever on letterhead, whatever it is it takes that will make it easier, if he can let us know as early as possible, we will do our best to help him jump through what can be very complicated for some people coming in from other countries.

Jacques, I believe that the travel arrangements for our accommodations is all confirmed in principle at the Doubletree by Hilton, but I believe what you were asking for is specifically an e-mail with a booking number and confirmation, and I'm going to ask staff if they can let us know or follow up to tell us when we will be let know.  I must say, I personally

prefer have seen it all tidily put away in my calendar system as well. And I will send out that we are going to have Visa issues from Louis as well. There is not enough time to apply for the attendance for face-to-face, but obviously we can try, and we can also try and rotate around, hopefully ICANN offers as well ICANN meeting spaces, we will at least share the pain on Visas. And you've got a couple of extra apologies now to note, staff, and we certainly need to see what we can do to assist those that are needing any sort of assistance or double-checking.

If I may, while I've got the microphone Pat, I think the other thing you and I discussed when we had our leadership meeting earlier this week, we'll show everybody in today's call, and distribute it again as soon as it's modified a little bit more, a draft agenda for our face-to-face meeting, we blocked off time as you can see in front of you. What this will do, by running with these suggested times and running through very generally admit agenda highlights or points is hopefully allow those of you who will be attending remotely, that being a Review Team member or a observer, or interested party or stakeholder, to plan your remote participation around those blocks of time and Pat and I will try and make the whole thing to run to timetable, so we minimize any inconvenience for those of you who are forced due to whatever circumstance to attend remotely.

The other thing I would like staff just to do now is just explain to us all, and particularly because we do have some observers on today's call, what the set up will be for observers and remote participation. It'll be slightly different between remote participation for review team members and for observers, so either Negar or Jean-Baptiste, if I could hand that back to you?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:    Thank you, Cheryl, this is Negar.  So, in terms of the set up for your upcoming face-to-face meeting, we are going to have one screen up with the Adobe Room for the Review Team members that are participating remotely, and/or are in the room, everyone is welcome to log into the Adobe room.  There will be microphones set up in the room for all Review Team members, so much like other meetings you've had at ICANN meetings, everything will be recorded, everyone will speak up into microphones for conversations to be captured by remote participants.  There will be a separate screen up in the meeting room that will display the second Adobe Room that is specifically set up for observers.

As a reminder to everyone, observers can hear all the conversation, but they are not able to speak because they do not dial into the room phone bridge so to speak.  That is part of the standard practice that's been included in all the information that's provided to observers on the Wiki Page.  What we will do of course, even though the screen is up for everyone in the room to see, we will continue to monitor the observer Adobe Room and we will read out any comments that observers may have.  They are able to type in their questions and comments in their own Adobe chat room, so we will capture all of those for the record. And if there is anything that comes up that the Review Team wishes to address, the answers can be put into the observer Adobe Room, or we can read the answer out loud.  The observers would be able to hear that as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Negar, Cheryl for the record. And I do apologize, we are getting a little bit [inaudible] but we were briefly while Negar was speaking getting a little bit of background noise from the number ending in 0700, so perhaps Brenda can work on not only watching that line and finding out what name we can attribute to that line as well, that would be great. So yeah, with the rough outline of our timing, that is also a living document for this next week.

Please feel free to make any comments or contributions to it in todays call and as we move to our call next week, which I believe will be, correct me if I'm wrong, staff, I think it's 20:00 UTC on rotation next week on the 27th. But we will finalize the agenda and distribute and have that listed publicly on our Wiki start as well. But what we're trying to do is make our lives for those remote participants as easy as possible.

The other thing is, if you are unable to attend and you're a Review Team member, if you could let us, the staff, know what time zone in UTC you would all be in. Obviously if there's a section of, for example, small group work or critical discussion on scope and all our remote participants are in a horrendously unfriendly time, at that point we would like to be able to adjust our work to be as kind and considerate for everyone as possible. But being human, we're sure there will be some difficulties that some people will suffer more than others, but we will do our best to minimize that. So, Pat, have we missed anything on that or are we right to moving to our next and more substantive part of the call for the remainder of today's call?

**EN**

PAT KANE:                    Cheryl, this is Pat.  I think we've got it covered.

CHERYL LANDON-ORR:           Excellent.  So, let's hop past this next slide and jump into identifying topics for review.  And here you will see, as you've seen on several occasions there, ladies and gentlemen, what the bylaws are stating is in so forth, this may assess included, not limited to, I believe at this stage we will be considering and perhaps prioritizing differently how much effort we put into each and every one of them.

Though at the moment, we have not told any one of these A-F, so those of you who have contributed to the discussion on the Google Doc as a shared space where these defining objectives and bylaws are also identified, we have had, Brenda, I'm sorry if my audio is becoming distorted, I'm not sure what else I can do about it.  I guess I could try working through the Adobe Connect Room, I guess that's a possibility. If it continues to distort, then let me know.  I'm not sure why, I've got a headset so it's not as if I turn my head, my mic should follow me. Looking at the Connect Room though, and if my audio is a problem, it might be best for Pat, if you take the group through what the current thinking is from the contributors to the Google Doc at this stage and I'll just jump in with perhaps a better audio as need be.

The discussion on this is not a closed one yet, that we do appreciate the efforts that some of you have already made to put prioritization and of course Michael's specific contribution regarding transparency.  Pat, I'm going to stop speaking and just add bits and color to anything you're doing, so I'll try and take the chat over, if you want to lead through the

more deep and meaningful discussion on where we stand on all of these points and what additional ones we may or may not add in.  Over to you, Pat.


PAT KANE:  Thank you, Cheryl, this is Pat.  And while I didn't necessarily, I had planned on going through the items that we had to date, the one thing that I did want to start off with was that I apologize for the confusion that I had apparently created on the March 11th date, which was to try to have an initial review of it.  It wasn't meant to cut off entries into the document, it was just a checkpoint to kind of say; let's take a look before we actually got into Kobe.  But please continue to add to the documentation.  One of the things that I'm going to add is just some of the stuff that came out of ICANN 64 that we talked about earlier, and continue to address and prioritize and put thought into the document so that we can have a substantive discussion when we hit the ground in Los Angeles.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:  Okay, Pat, Cheryl here.  If I'm seeing it correctly, it looks like Ramet's mic is open, are you trying to say something?  No problem, I was actually hoping you were trying to make an intervention because we welcome interventions, we are needing to at this stage start to consider if we are doing each and every one of these things.  Pat and I are working under the assumption that some of these will be able to be done in parallel, small work parties, and so we would be looking to the leading the April meeting in Los Angeles with not only a peer

commitment community on what is our scope, what are we going to be focusing on, how we're going to be focusing on the issues, and in particular is there going to be any particular order or timing in our overall work plan where these topics are being focused on.

The other thing that we would like to have us leading with is for the work parties, the small work teams to be flushed out with volunteers. Some of these would only need, again, one or two people to work together on initial data capture and analysis. Some will need perhaps more substantive numbers of people working in small groups. And of course, in an effort to be fair and reasonable, we'll ask you to step up and volunteer for one or more of those. I think it's a reasonable expectation that each and every one of us will be involved in and committed to working in at least one of these areas.

Some of you may be committed to working in more than one, and some of you, if you've got the energy and the inclination, maybe working in each and every one of these. Pat and I, as crazy as it may seem, will be doing our best to be across all of them in our role as general coordination and facilitation as co-Chairs. So, to that end, you might also now, as you contemplate these and in a more, "We are about to be committed on them or not," mode, also think about which ones excite you in particular.

Michael, seeing as you proposed very specific additional focus on access to information under the [inaudible] and open data system, the capital T transparency aspects of accountability and transparency, I'm happy to give you a couple of minutes in today's call to speak to that. At this stage, no one in the document is certainly, other than supported you in

that, that the suggestion was in the document and I didn't see you reject it. That matter could be, in fact, wrapped up in the item under this slide here, C.

So, it could be a particular action and focal point under C, which reads; assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input including additive explanation of position taken and the rationale thereof. By the same token, it could be a standalone issue, so if Michael, if you've got a microphone connected, did you want to speak to that briefly?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:     Yes, can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Yes, we can.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:     Yeah, thanks. Thanks so much for that. I was just meaning to pop in a comment. This is Michael Karanicolas for the record. I feel as an accountability and transparency review, we should be looking at ICANN's transparency policy. I think that's instrumental to our work and quite frankly, I think that there's going to be a serious loss of credibility if transparency is not significantly considered as part of an accountability and transparency review.

Now in terms of that, just to elaborate briefly, I think that in terms of including it within category C, I do think that it connects with category C

# EN

to a certain degree, in so far as explanations of decisions and the rationale kind of relates to transparency. But if, when you talk about including it within that, I think that it would be good if that was included as a specific subheading, within topic C, and so far as- but I do think that it would need to be specifically flagged within that.

I don't think it would be [inaudible] to say that looking at topic C therefore covers transparency because while I think that transparency can be connected to it, it's not necessarily intuitively consumed within that. So, what I would say is that I would be happy personally if these were the topics that we highlighted, I wouldn't necessarily object but I would hope that as these topics were codefined, transparency would be specifically flagged as a sort of sub-topic within topic C.

And the one other thing I did want to mention, just with regard to the topics, is looking at the language of the bylaws, I don't see these examination areas as being prescriptive. The bylaw suggested that our examination can include these areas, but they specifically say it's not limited to them. So, I view these topics that are in the bylaws as kind of suggested areas of inquiry that are included as part of our work, or are potentially included as part of our work. But certainly, they're not limiting in terms of what we can look into. So, I guess I'll stop there. I'm happy to chat further.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. Thanks for that, Michael. Hopefully I can still be heard. Is there any questions or comments to Michael's intervention? And I'm quite sure that several of us would be happy to bring everyone

# EN

up to speed on where the stake of transparency and the recommendations out of the transparency review works in out of the CCWG on ICANN accountability. There was a large, well I don't know about large, but a number of significant recommendations that came out of that process, but more importantly, there was considerable community interaction in the development of those recommendations, so that's the backstory of why Michael is suggesting a closer look. A focus on this matter would be well worth our while. So, I'll open the queue if anyone is wanting to raise anything?

Vanda, I note your microphone is open, did you want to say something? Okay, perhaps not, you've now muted, sorry. I just wanted to make sure if you're trying to make your voices heard that we could do. Gee, Pat, they're a quiet lot tonight. We're doing our best to try and draw them out. Is there anything that anyone would like to say on any of these not being worthy of further discussion? Is there one of these, that because as Michael points out, the bylaws are clear, this is not a prescriptive list, but it certainly is a list of things that we may indeed find in scope.

So, let's move to the next slide if we're unable to rally much input, we can march on. There was some additional topics that were suggested. The list is here, things that some of you thought would be worthy of our time and energy, and that is a piece of analysis, which obviously includes data capture. This is evidential, there is nothing wrong with both looking at quantitative and qualitative material, but it certainly is, I would hope, that the intention of this review team, as it has been in the ATRT1 and 2's that have gone before us that we wouldn't be, whilst we would listen to hearsay and conjecture and assumptive concerns, we

# EN

would be keen to actually find out facts and base any discourse and recommendations that we would be having, base that on analytical points or data points that were unambiguous. So, keep that in mind as we are looking at all of these things.

So, suggestions, as I said, there could be an analysis on the impact of the implementation of recommendations out of both ATRT1 and 2, the suggestion was also made specifically about looking into the CCT review and Pat did cover, there is some concern in Community, which both the Board and Community will be working towards to improve their communication and clarity and qualifications and understanding as to why various decisions are being made, and how we can avoid any confusion and misunderstandings in future specific reviews. And of course, as I mentioned early on in the call, it has been something that has been done in the past. In fact, in ATRT1, it was part of our mandated work and ATRT1 did have mandated work. But that was a very different time of course, to look at specific Review Team actions and review activities.

So, to that end, we also have a suggestion, which I must say, has me somewhat curious, and that is the words, "Sub-pro recommendation," that the accountability and transparency Review Team, third version, should look at sub-pro recommendations. I could see sub-pro as one of the long-standing and large GNSO PDPs that is not only recently running, but is still running as a useful case study, which of course subsequent procedures hasn't made any recommendations yet, so not quite sure that actually is risk. That makes total sense to me, but I would certainly see it as an ideal case study, if that's a part of the approach for them to have.

Maarten, I notice in the chat you said, and I'll read it to the record if it stops jumping; just wanted a challenge, that it would be good to ensure we're also forward looking, not just looking backwards at things. That being aware of the changing world and the need, we're just coming out of a very volatile and very agile development for ICANN in its evolution, but also noting that the 2020 and Tech 2020-2025 strategic plan is being currently formulated, and of course whilst it's important to build on the past as you said, it might be very, very useful to make sure we capture some of the thinking about the future. I also note from Maarten, that…have I missed anything? I don't think so, nope. Sorry, Maarten, I was going to misquote you. You did say you'd come back to the topic in the Google Doc, so thanks for that.

Just to read to the record that you said in chat, I somewhat appreciate the suggestions of Michael to draw from the CCWG for any other related review, and then we should especially as accountability and transparency cover ICANN.org operations and Community Responsibility.

Vanda, in chat, she agrees with Maarten on the looking forward as well as analysis of what's happened in recent times with specific and organizational reviews as effect, but certainly specific reviews, because she has noted she sees huge changes on the Internet world in a year or so and the next five years is going to be a very important time as well.

To that end, I think we've probably captured pretty much everything that is on the slide that for tonight is duplicated or is echoed out of the document. I'll go back to, sorry Michael, I was actually scanning down the chat and didn't see your hand raised, so we'll come back to you. But

just before we do, that the other points about accountability and transparency Review Team looking at work stream 2 recommendations and we'd obviously note two things; previously when ATRT3 was scheduled to start earlier, it was given a limited scope suggestion by Community, the time has moved on since then and we would need to note that with the work we do on anything out of work stream 2, and also that we would need to contemplate review and recommended appropriate anything about the latest operating standards document which of course we assume is going to not only be attested by us, but we'll also be having some additional review by the community where it is in the scheme of things.  So, with that Michael, back over to you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:     Thanks, Michael Karanicolas for the record.  I just wanted to briefly clarify what I had said earlier.  I didn't take a position regarding the relationship of our work for the CCWG.  Obviously, we've been burned from [inaudible] processes, but the point of my [inaudible] is specifically related to what we're doing to the previous recommendations.  I was just saying that we should also be examining transparency.  Sorry to [inaudible] but I just wanted to clarify.  Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     I think it was already said in today's call by Maarten that words matter, so what I'm seeing is we are in ATRT, a bit of focus on the T would be very wise indeed, from my personal perspective.  But never apologize for giving greater clarity, and focus on what you said for the record.

**EN**

All right, let me have a sip of water, and not only say what you're wanting to say on this, but take us through to the next bit? Thanks.

PAT KANE:                    Thanks Cheryl. Just one question I had on this slide, and this is a conversation that Negar and I had in Kobe, and Negar, if you could again clarify this, we are required to review ATRT2, but not ATRT1, is that correct?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:            Hi Pat, yes, that is correct. The requirement is to look at the last review implementation which would be ATRT2 only in this case.

PAT KANE:                    Okay, thank you Negar for that clarification. And then, if we could go to the last slide, which is All Other Business. Does anyone have anything they would like to add before we close out today? Seeing no hands…Jean-Baptiste, would you take us through our identified action items for today?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:     Yes, Pat. Thank you very much. So, as identified action items, for us ICAAN to set up the Doodle poll regarding face-to-face meetings, then I can open up the notes for Co-Chairs to [inaudible] and I see that on ICANN 65. I can also add the [inaudible] reference from Jonathan back to the ICANN Board to mailing list and documents archives. ICANN [inaudible] with travel services regarding Visa issues, and regarding the

hotel information.  On the face-to-face meetings, remote participants to let ICANN or Co-Chairs know in which time zone they would be at the time of the meeting, and we have no feedback so far; as remote participants we have [inaudible], Michael and Ramet.  And finally, [inaudible] numbers to continue populating the Google Doc on these topics for review at the face-to-face meeting.

PAT KANE: This is Pat.  Anybody have anything to add or clarify or object to on the action items?  Not seeing any, so thank you, Jean-Baptiste for that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You're welcome.

PAT KANE: So, our next call if we could forward two slides.  It will be the 27th of March, 2019, so next Wednesday, at 21:00 UTC.  Thank you all very much for participating, and we will talk to you in a week, and we'll engage back and forth on the mailing list throughout this week.  Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**