

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Brenda. As Negar said, my name is Jennifer Bryce. Some of you know me from SSR-2. Some of you know me from organizational reviews, and I'm excited to be working with you all on this project going forward. I'm based in London, but I spend quite a bit of time here in LA as well. So, nice to meet you all. With that, I'll hand it over to Brenda who will do ... No, I think I'm doing the roll call. Sorry.

So, I'm Jennifer, as I said. We'll do a quick around the table, if everybody could just say their name into the microphone. That would be great. Thank you. Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Good morning, everybody. Larisa Gurnick. I'm part of the ICANN Org team.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet, member of this review team by At-Large. Thank you.

JACQUES BLANC: Good morning, everybody. Jacques Blanc, part of the GNSO and Registrar Stakeholder Group and director of Prodomaines, an accredited ICANN registrar.

---

*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.*

---

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Good morning. I'm Jaap Akkerhuis, [inaudible] from Amsterdam, and purpose here is I'm from the SSAC delegate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good morning, everybody. Cheryl Langdon-Orr from Australia. In this capacity, I'm here by the At-Large Advisory Committee, along with several others around this table and I've got the honor of serving as one of the co-chairs of this review team.

PAT KANE: Pat Kane from GNSO, Registry Stakeholder Group. I'm with Verisign. Also, co-chair.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Osvaldo Novoa from Uruguay. I represent the ISPCP Constituency.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda Scartezini from Brazil. I'm from ALAC here.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Wolfgang Kleinwaechter. I'm representing the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group via the GNSO Council.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Demi Getschko from Brazil, in this meeting representing the ccNSO delegate.

KC CLAFFY: KC Claffy from USC San Diego and representing SSAC.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel Nanghaka from Uganda. I'm [inaudible] At-Large. I'm a member of AFRALO.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, appointed by the board to join you as a team member.

THERESA SWINEHART: Theresa Swinehart, I oversee the strategy and strategic initiative team, so this team here. So, all of their successes are theirs and anything that you have challenges with is my fault. So, with that, thank you all for being here and for coming the distance. Look forward to the work of this group.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you and good morning, everyone. Negar Farzinnia. I'm from ICANN Org as well working on this specific review. Looking forward to working with all of you and a successful meeting. With that, Jennifer I think has a few more remarks.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE:

I do. Thank you. We have a couple of review team members joining us remotely online. We have Erica, Michael, Ramet, and Tola. Hi, everyone online. Hopefully, you can hear us okay and you should be able to speak as well, too, during the meeting. We will be sure to monitor the chatroom as well and read out any remarks that you type in. Additionally, we've got the observers room. At the moment, we have one observer, Jim Prendergast. So, for those of you in the room here, the left-hand screen is the review team Adobe Connect, and on the right-hand side that's the observers. Again, you should be able to see the chat, but we will be sure to read out any comments from observers.

Just remember, please, to state your name before speaking for the record, and remember that the meeting is being recorded. With that, I think I will hand it over to Theresa who has some opening remarks. Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART:

So, first of all, as I said, thank you for volunteering for this. I know it's a lot of work and it's work to be covered in a fairly short period of time, namely [inaudible] timeline that this review has the unique aspect of.

I was reflecting a little bit this morning about why this one is particularly important and it's really the first ATRT Review or specific review after the IANA transition. What's quite unique about it is it's not immediately after the transition, but after some time has passed. So, there's an opportunity also to be seeing from the accountability mechanisms that have been put into place with regards to the transition and everything else. How are things going? We have enough of a window to see how

---

things have operationalized, how they function. Are there some things that could be looked at or gaps or whatever it might be?

Not to ... I know you're going to be discussing your focus area, but from that standpoint, I think it is a unique opportunity to have had that window of time to see how things have been implemented and how things are being effective.

I think it's also a great opportunity to be looking at which recommendations would have the most impact, which ones would be nice, and then which ones might have also interdependencies with other areas of work that occurs within the different accountability structures of the organization that might be able to be leveraged there as part of that work. Certainly, we are very happy to be helpful in any way from an ICANN Org standpoint to help cite any interdependencies or any other work that might be occurring in other accountability mechanisms if that's helpful throughout your discussions and considerations.

There's also some other interdependencies that relate to what you're doing. There's the operating standards that are currently under finalization, so the opportunity to be utilizing those. There's also the workstream two work recommendations that are currently under discussion and then will be looked at towards implementation including the prioritization of implementation discussion with the community, and some of those topics may have interdependencies with some of your discussions.

---

Then, as you're aware, we have engaged Brian Cote to undertake some work on the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model in the context of looking at some very specific issues that the community has identified in looking at possible work plans towards those.

Now, those are very issue specific and identified by the community and those discussions will be occurring over the course of this year. But another example of an interdependency that might be helpful to both inform your discussions but also help with determining where the prioritizations might be or the gaps might be.

So, with that, I do want to thank the team within ICANN Org that's supporting this. While you have this team here, there's very strong coordination across the organization on the internal side with both different subject matter experts as far as helping to inform your discussions as needed and also just helping provide you with any information whether it's estimates on a resourcing issue or anything else around that standpoint.

So, this is your team here but I wanted you to be aware there's strong coordination internally to support this group. There's also – and Maarten I'm sure will touch on this – strong coordination with board caucus group and with Maarten to ensure that this team has the continued support as you undergo your discussions.

With that, thank you very much, and if I can do anything, I think all of you know how to reach me directly and don't hesitate if I can be of any help or do anything. Thanks.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maybe at this point it's useful to tell a little bit about the board support to us. [inaudible] good practice for these kinds of important interaction with the community, [inaudible] caucus group in the board as well. This is the group of board members that will keep me honest and aware of things and also will help to prepare for board meetings when they're there. This consists of Avri Doria, Leon Sanchez, Becky Burr, and one more ... We'll find it.

Board is very much looking forward and aware of the important roles of ATRT and [inaudible] of the other activities. So, very willing to give also advice or guidance at request at any point in time and we'll make sure we continue to be aware of the interactions with other things moving.

MANAL ISMAIL: Maarten, it's Manal.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Manal Ismail [inaudible]. We really have a full set of contracted house non-contracted house, and even the GAC in that. I'm very happy with that support group.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you. Cheryl asked [inaudible] to say some words about the history of ATRT because I think this is important because this review team is a little bit different from the other reviews. People who have been involved years after the World Summit and the Information Society remember, that governments ask the question, "Who oversees ICANN?" So, the idea was even the European Commission proposed an

---

inter-governmental oversight body over ICANN. And the AOC then came up with an alternative proposal and said we organize a multi-stakeholder oversight. There's no need for inter-governmental oversight.

And the oversight for ICANN was defined in the Affirmation of Commitment and there are two innovations in it. The first innovation was we do not need a permanent oversight body. We do it on a rotation basis, so that we do not have another [inaudible] of the board, so that means that's why we have one, two, three. The second thing was we have not a centralized oversight body. It's decentralized, [inaudible] issues, competition, consumer trust, security, and WHOIS. And the ATRT was seen as the oversight body for the board and ICANN as a whole. I think this is important.

This confirms what Theresa has just said. This is the first ATRT after the IANA transition and it's the special responsibility of this review team to look into whether the new model works, so whether the empowered community works. That means we should not go too much into details of other issues because this is covered by other review teams and others. Our main issue is the big questions. Does the model as a whole work? Does the board do a good job? And if not, what can be improved? I think these are the key issues. While in the new bylaws, it's not so clear anymore what was the idea behind the AOC, but more or less, it's still the idea behind the ATRT to have an oversight body decentralized, rotation basis, and ATRT is on the top of all the [review teams].



---

I think one of the questions here is ask also about the hierarchies among the review teams and I think my intervention hopefully clears this a little bit. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It certainly does, and thank you, Wolfgang. You're making an absolutely perfect segue to our next agenda item. Just for the record, I've just typed into the chat and I'd encourage everyone even if you're in the room in Los Angeles to also be in the Adobe Connect and the Adobe Connect chat. If you have an update to your SOIs, I suggest that's where you put it in. And if there is any housekeeping other than of course whether or not we hear an emergency and [inaudible] need to evacuate, in which case you'll do as instructed by staff. I think that covers it. We will also put those housekeeping things in there. I'm trying to buy that time off our agenda. Go ahead, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Tola has a hand raised in the room. Tola, go ahead, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Tola, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Tola, if you could type your intervention and work with Brenda who is the magician on all things backend of AC to make sure that you've got your audio all fine. And anyone else who is in the remote participation situation, I'd encourage you to also work with Brenda to

---

double check, if not now, during our morning break and we will be having a morning break later. Tola, we note your hand up. Type what you need to, so we can move on with our agenda items.

With that, the only other thing out of our introduction administrivia for this morning that we need to do before I give Pat the microphone to do some intelligence opening remarks as opposed to my filibustering is to see if anyone has any issue or suggestion for change for today's agenda, so just asking you all to look to the agenda for today which was discussed at our last meeting and to let us know if there is any additional items anyone wishes to put down. I see Sebastien. [inaudible] on that matter. Sebastien, it's hard to see you in the corner with just your tent card up, so would those around the table also take advantage of raising their hands in the Adobe Connect room as well. Over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. As some of you may know, I have some disagreements with the way this working group has started and [its conduct]. The question for me to know when it could be discussed. And since when I arrived yesterday I learned that the ombudsman may be on the building tomorrow and after tomorrow I would like to suggest that we find a time when he will be here. I didn't ask him to be here, but I think it will be easier if he is in the room and not having feedback on what's happened from different people here [inaudible]. I suggest to postpone my intervention on that when he will be available, if you agree with that. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, I'm quite sure most of the table is unsure what you're referring to but I take it from your intervention that you're asking for time in tomorrow's agenda when the ICANN ombudsman is possibly present to make some sort of intervention based on an issue you raised with the ombud's office which I suspect Pat, myself, and staff are aware of but I do not believe has been publicized for the rest of the team.

In that case, Pat and I will find a spot for that tomorrow and check with [Herb] to ensure that a few minutes of our time is allocated for that. But with that, I would suggest unless there's somebody else who has something for today's agenda as opposed to tomorrow or the next day's agenda, if you want to bring everybody up to speed on where we think we're going to be going in our general objectives which ... And back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I personally have some difficulty. Once again, I [said] that at the last [inaudible] meeting when we're face-to-face, the mail I received from ICANN staff. I can't open the files and sometimes I don't see that it's for me. It is written for somebody from the group and not for the full list. Therefore, I think there is something to save and solve in that issue and some other housekeeping could be taken into account later on, please, regarding the [hotel], for example. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm recognizing Negar, please. Go ahead.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. I just wanted to note Sebastien's comments. Thank you. The [inaudible] issue that you had noted back in Kobe as well. This is something that we've been having our IT team work with, with Jaap as well, to troubleshoot. Hopefully, he can provide an update as to where things are at, but we can definitely continue to look at that to make sure that you get proper access to everything. The hotel issue was also noted by Cheryl yesterday. We are as well looking into that to make sure that we don't have issues like that again in the future. But please, if something does come up, do let us know. We are more than happy to look into it and try to prevent these things from happening if possible. Jaap, go ahead if you have an update.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

I [inaudible] with support staff and [inaudible] to the issue. The problem is caused by two different root problems. One is that the [inaudible] its own file system and the other one is that Jean-Baptiste [inaudible] useless statements about the [Apple] file system. So, if you use [mail app], you are out of luck.

And together with someone from support, he actually is in contact with both of those [inaudible] and he has made some adjustments to Jean-Baptiste's mail so it doesn't spit out this useless [bulk] file system stuff.

So, for the time being, the problem is solved. I haven't seen it happening after that at all. So, I guess the [inaudible] works fine.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am still having trouble.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted, and could I encourage you, then, to continue to work directly with staff and Jaap's expertise to fix that issue, Sebastien. The same goes to anyone else whether they're in the room or remotely. With this, perhaps time has even shrunk more than it was going to be. Let's see if we can frame our agenda and our objective.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. So, for the next three days, really our objective is to frame the terms of reference and put together a work plan by the end of that. So, to that objective, we're focused today really on what the scope of our work is going to look like so we can make some progress on the terms of reference. But I'd also like for us to consider how we want to make our recommendations, given some of the conversation that happened in Kobe around the CCTRT review and the 37 recommendations that they made and recognizing that there's a request to take a look at what can financially be done or what fiscally we can accomplish and how bundles might be interesting or not interesting [inaudible] take a look at line items.

So, for today, I'd like to take a look at scope. I'd like to take a look at how the scope items are related to each other and then take a look at how we want to present our recommendations, so we're driving towards them.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I think that actually very cleverly brings us almost perfectly back on track with having started a little later than we should have to all but five minutes on our schedule. It is perhaps my intention to try and keep to schedule with our sessions over these next three days, which ladies and gentlemen, for those of you in the room, means when you come back from a morning break, we will be starting on time whether you are in the room or not. Therefore, do please your best to be back here in the room. Those who are remote will be expecting us to be doing certain topics at certain times. We may change that we've noticed, but we're going to try and get this train at least to stay on the track, and heaven's forbid, even run on time, all the way through to 12 months down the track.

So, with that, it should bring us in, and I want to thank Wolfgang in particular for the segue material he gave us with the history to looking now at some of the particular items that we had discussed. We now need to agree upon them in terms of where the scope is going to be. We're going to drill down and make sure that we understand the specific review processes. Not everybody on this accountability review team has been part of other specific review processes. Some people in the wild of the community at large don't always understand the difference between an organizational review which takes an enormous amount of ICANN's time, and the specific review processes which is what Wolfgang was indeed referring to.

I hope when I turn my head the mic is still picking up my [inaudible] voice okay. I can project and come back if need be. Just wave at me at need be.

---

To that end, even though it will be a review of what you know for some of you, I believe staff has got a few things to take us through in terms of understanding what the specific review process is and then we're going to jump right into then getting into the work plan. And you'll see some exercises around the wall. I'm not sure how we're going to manage that for the remote participants but we'll sort something out. Negar, you've got a plan there, have you?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I was just going to note that the process has been put out in the presentation slide deck so we'll walk through it and we'll speak to it. It will be easy for remote to follow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Fantastic. Thanks, Negar. There will be a transcript record, by the way, so what you say, do remember will be taken down and can be held against you. So, speak slowly, speak clearly, speak as unambiguously as possible, and try and remember to use your name each time you make an intervention. With that, I think we're up to heading to the next slide and running through understanding the specific review processes. Who's taking that?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Cheryl. I can walk through this. Welcome to the specific reviews. I will talk you through some of the processes, because as Cheryl mentioned, I understand this [inaudible] to some of you.

---

I guess the first most important thing to note is that these specific reviews are mandated by ICANN's bylaws. So, as I think Wolfgang noted, this is the first ATRT review since the new bylaws came into effect in October 2017. So, there are four other – or three other – specific reviews, the SSR-2 which is the security, stability, and resiliency; the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice review which I'm sure you all have heard about, very famously, lots of activity in Kobe; and the Registration Directory Services Review which is the RDS Review.

I should just note, ICANN also has organizational reviews which are run by independent examiners and not volunteer review teams like the specific reviews are. And those reviews look at ICANN's supporting organizations and advisory committees as well as the NomCom.

Please, by the way, feel free to ask questions [inaudible] the review or you can save them to the end if you would prefer.

So, focusing on the specific reviews, there are seven phases for the specific reviews and you'll be glad to know that we're already on phase three. Woo-hoo! So, that was easy, wasn't it? Congratulations. Unfortunately, phase three and phase four are going to be a little bit more work for you all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].



---

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Yeah, exactly. Although saying that, hopefully in the three days, we'll achieve quite a lot of phase three as well and that is planning of the review.

So, quickly, the pre-planning and the initialization and selection, I'm not going to spend any time on those. We've already been through that process whereby you all have been selected for the review team. So, congratulations.

And now phase three is planning. This is where you all will spend time developing your terms of reference, your scope, and how you actually plan to achieve that work in the one year that you have to do it.

Then, conducting the review, once you've laid out the plan, the conducting of the review includes the homework part. So, the research, the analysis, any interviews that you may wish to do with ICANN Organization or anybody else, for that matter, and developing recommendations. Then, phase five, the board consideration of the final report. And phase six and seven is the implementation and ongoing support for the implementation of those recommendations.

So, really, for you all, phase three and four are where the work is and then five and six are more observation exercise, I suppose.

Again, I'm going to skip this slide. This is the pre-planning and the initialization and selection of the review. I think I already covered quite a lot of this in my introduction. Phase three you will spend time on your work plan and the terms of reference, both of which have been asked for in the board resolution. And I believe the third of June is the date for when the review team will be sharing those with the ICANN board.

ICANN Organization's role in the planning process is to work with you all to communicate the project budget envelope which I believe has already happened and coordinate administrative parts of joining the review, the statements of interest, and the confidential disclosure agreement.

So, once you have agreed on your scope of work and your terms of reference, you will share those with the ICANN board and ICANN board's role there is to check that the scope of work and the terms of reference and the work plan are in line with the [inaudible] in the bylaws are achievable and realistic. And then, as Maarten referred to, he is here to help and also the caucus group as well.

So, moving on to phase four which is the conducting the review, ICANN organization's role is to help you all to coordinate your analysis and data collection. Negar and I and the rest of the team can help you to meet with anybody that you wish to speak with within the organization. We will be delivering to you I believe in mid-April [inaudible] second ATRT review which is one item that you'll be looking at as part of your review.

Usually, in phase four, conducting the review, the review team might determine if any external resources are required. You can work with us and the budget there, too, if there's any [inaudible], for example, or somebody else – a third party – that you might want to hire in. At that point, if that's the case, then the review team will have to provide input into what exactly, who exactly, [inaudible] the skill sets that you need.

The SO and ACs throughout the process will be expecting periodic updates from you all and I believe you all are looking at the outreach

---

---

plan as part of today's agenda quickly. All the review team members have been appointed by an SO AC, and so it's expected that you'll report back to your SO or AC during the review.

The OEC, at the same time, will also oversee, make sure that everything is keeping in line with the bylaw requirements, and if anything is veering off course in terms of if it looks like the review team is going outside of its scope, we'll have a conversation with you all. It's a two-way process as well. It's expected that ICANN Organization and the board and you all will have the dialogue [inaudible] to make sure everything stays on track.

So, moving on, then, to formulating your findings. So, after you've done the research, you'll formulate your findings based on your observations and we will – ICANN Organization will – take a role there in coordinating with subject matter experts to share the initial findings and help input to the feasibility, any potential conflicts with any existing policies or recommendations which you know there are some other review teams carrying out their work as well, so we can help there to make sure there is minimal crossover and that the recommendations [inaudible] will be feasible.

So, during all of this, as well, I should say the community will ... Well, I already mentioned you'll be providing updates, but obviously there's ICANN meeting in Marrakech which I understand you will all be meeting with the community, sharing your work, and getting some input from them, too. And in Montreal as well which is in October/November.

---

Then, once you've developed your recommendations and your findings, you should check those against the terms of reference that is supposed to be continually [inaudible] the process and you will draft your report which will actually be published for public comment. And that's a 40-day public comment period for those of you who are not familiar with the ICANN public comment process. It goes on the ICANN website. Anybody is welcome to share their comments there. The review team will then review the public comments that came in and make amendments to the report as necessary.

You can post the report for public comment as many times as you wish, although of course this review is one year, so the time is limited. But one comment public comment is required by the bylaws by the review team should they need to do more.

So, then, the [inaudible] revise your report and ICANN board and the organization will again review the report and provide any feedback, including feasibility of the recommendations. With that, after that, you submit the final report to the board and you can all have a nice cocktail or cup of tea at that period. We certainly will, too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [off mic].

JENNIFER BRYCE: One or two. So, after the final report, after the review team submits its final report to the board, it actually goes to public comment again, and that public comment, the board is putting it out for public comment.

---

So, the ICANN Organization obviously has to facilitate that. Okay, I've lost my little screen.

But, anyway, after that, we will ask for one or two review team members to help to be implementation shepherds I think is what the name of the [inaudible] operating standards, who will be on call, I suppose, to help answer any questions or provide clarifications and obviously you can determine that throughout, further down the line.

I should say, as well, that the operating standards are – I think you all have been shared – I think Lars, our colleague, gave an overview of those. So, they're there, too, to help guide the work and any of these processes. There's more details, steps, for each of them in the operating standards.

And then, the board will accept or reject the recommendations. Obviously, if they reject them, they need to provide a rationale for that and any accepted recommendations, then they'll direct ICANN Org to implement and develop an implementation plan for those within six months I believe is the timeline.

Then, obviously after the implementation plan is accepted by the board, then we go and implement the recommendations. And we'll continue to monitor the implementation as things are implemented.

So, I know that was a very quick overview. Please, if you have any questions, certainly able to help try to answer them. If not, I think I'll pass it back to Maarten.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Jennifer, excellent overview. You've clearly been involved before. I think particularly on the last step where you say board accepts or rejects. And if you look to CCT, what you see is that some of the recommendations we felt we couldn't accept or reject because they were not made to us, so I think it will be good for us to keep in mind during the process to whom are we recommending things and be aware of that beforehand so we don't have to go through all kinds of communications about that after the fact, [inaudible] take that on board right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I expect that we can check against budgets and something all the recommendations beforehand because most of those rejected are based on budget impacts and so on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wolfgang?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: We discussed this already in [inaudible]. Do we have an overview about the status of the recommendations of ATRT 1 and ATRT 2, what was accepted, what was rejected or what is still [throwing in the air]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Negar?

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl and Wolfgang. One thing I want to make clear. Per the bylaws, this review team has to go back and look at the last review implementation only, so you don't have to look at ATRT 1 anymore. That's already been done and reviewed and looked at.

So, this review team needs to go back to ATRT 2 implementation or recommendations only to assess and evaluate the effectiveness or the implementation.

To that end, my team is putting together briefing material for the review team to tell you what was done to implement the recommendations one by one and what's been done since implementation has been completed, so you have an overview with all the resources that you need to refer back to for the implementation of the recommendations. We are expecting to release these documents to you by mid-April. You'll get it to your e-mail, so there will be a briefing for every recommendation.

To that end, once the review team has had a chance to review all the material and content and the ATRT 2 final report for context, then you will let us know if you have any follow-up questions, need clarification, would like any in-person briefings or telephonic meetings to get better understanding of certain aspects of the work that was done and we'll go ahead and arrange that for the team.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Correct. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Vanda, thank you for making your point as well. And yes, it's important to think of things being doable as well and the implementation plan will be important [inaudible] interaction.

But just to correct one thing. The board didn't reject CCT recommendations, also not finance. We just say let's look at the finance first. But this is really what we want.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten, because of course, how we say things and the specificity and accuracy of how things are said is vital and something we need to pay very close attention to because what happens is in five years down the track, someone – group – will be looking, as an ATRT 4, everything we do or say, so let's remember not to have ambiguous statements as a result of anything we do. Over to you, Larisa. I think you were next. Yes?

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Cheryl. I think Vanda asked a question, so I want to make sure to give a very clear, direct answer. Of ATRT 1 and 2 recommendations, all were accepted. There were no recommendations rejected in that grouping. When ATRT 2 considered ATRT 1 recommendations to amplify what the point that Negar made, they looked at how ATRT 1 recommendations have been implemented and in areas where they weren't satisfied that the implementation hit the mark, they issued new recommendations. So, those became ATRT 2

---



---

recommendations and that is the grouping of recommendations that you will be looking at.

Also, the team will be able to share with you additional useful resources, not to distract you, because there's actually quite a bit of material, including the flow charts that you're looking at. There's handbooks to put better explanations to the pictures for those of you that are not visual users of information. So, we'll make sure to get all that to you.

Also, starting with ATRT 2, time. We've been producing public quarterly updates on the status of implementation work, so there's quite a bit of material. Then, with the new bylaws, once ATRT accountability and transparency reviews and the AOC reviews as a whole were brought into the bylaws, there is now a new requirement that we're working toward which is to produce an annual review implementation report. So, while it hasn't happened yet because no recommendations had been issued up until CCT, but that is in the works and that is something that will continue. We endeavor to make as much information in this area public. Well, it's all public. Whatever there is, is usually all public and there's quite a bit of material to review for those that want that kind of history and detail. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Larisa. Is there anyone else around the table or in the room?  
Pat?

---

PAT KANE: So, I have two questions. One for Maarten and one for Negar. So, Negar, on the documents that we're going to get mid-April around ATRT 2, is your team looking at the outcomes and what was done based upon – through the lens of what the ATRT 2 timeframe was or are we looking at it through the lens of today?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Pat. That's a great question. So, the documents start with looking at what was done at the time ATRT 2 recommendations were accepted and implemented, and to a large degree, we are covering what's been done since then. So, the changes that have taken place obviously after the recommendations have been implemented.

Again, as Larisa pointed out, there is a lot of content and material available, so if you feel like the briefings do not cover everything up to date, we can always substantiate it and provide more information to the degree possible to the review team.

PAT KANE: Great. Thank you, Negar. Maarten, you said that the recommendations that were not accepted and were pushed out for financial consideration on CCTRT, whose responsibility? Who's picked up that in terms of addressing the financial issues on those that were not accepted?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's [inaudible] reject it. Of course, that's not what happened. Thank you for your careful choice of wording. In the end, it's the responsibility of the community what's accepted and not and what's financed or not,

---

because even the finance process is a community process. So, that's one thing.

I think that an important step in that is that we did agree with the former CCT review members to sit together in Marrakech in an open meeting and really discuss because it's our intent to get the best out of it. We're not trying to push anything back or reject or whatever. It's really how do we get this done properly and transparently in interaction with the community? So, in the end, I think it will be a very transparent process where the costs will be clear which will lead to a discussion with the CCT team and I can imagine if it really leaves a shocking impact on what happens with the recommendations. We may even go back into community consultation or whatever. So, by no means the board intends to just take decisions based on what staff says what the costs are, to be very clear. Does that help?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. More than helpful, actually. Refreshingly so. Jennifer is just going to read to our record in this room and for the transcript some input from the observatory.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Cheryl. So, Jim has commented in the observer's room. He says, "As a follow-on to Wolfgang's question, even though ATRT 1 is not under purview of this review team, it would be beneficial for them to know if there are any suggestions from ATRT 1 that have not been fully implemented and why to help inform the future recommendations."

---

Sorry, just one more comment while I have the mic. I wanted to let you know that our review team member, Liu, has joined the team line.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Jennifer. Liu, welcome. I know you were hearing us because you were in the observer's room, and thank you, Brenda, for as ever working with all the communication gremlins to make sure we're all in the right place at the right time and hopefully even able to be heard.

What I might do is, during our mid-morning break, if anyone who's on remote participation can take the time to work with Brenda and staff to double check audio and to make sure that any interventions from our review team members is not going to be held up with, "Hello, can you hear me?" and we'll give back to you time. That would be excellent.

The other thing, not having spoken to Pat about this yet, but Pat and I don't speak very much anyway. But when we do we try and be polit – is whether or not we might have at least one, if not two, roaming mics as we do the exercises so we can make sure the people in the room are fairly engaged with conversation as we go around the walls. Just a thought. Hopefully not an irrational one.

With that, hopefully Pat is ready to rock and roll on the specifics of the timeline. I'm guessing Jennifer, but whoever is doing the magic in the AC room, if we could perhaps show the work plan deliverables, and indeed we would be referring to the spreadsheet document that I know the review team members have all got. But it might be worthwhile providing those small edits I suggested have been made. Just double

---

check that they have been. There we go. I'm certainly happy for that to be labeled draft and go out to public as well. Obviously, this is a living document we will be working on in the next few days. It will become a final document shortly after we close our proceedings here, if all the good graces work together to make that happen. But I certainly have no objections. If anyone does, they can drop it in chat, to this as a draft template becoming a public document. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Yes. To reiterate the comment you just made, this certainly is a draft document, a template. It could be [inaudible] because as you guys look around the room, you see a lot of big posters posted on the windows. These are exercises to help you work through your scope, and of course as you work through the details of your scope and what you want the review team to consider, it will impact the timeline in your work plan and the number of subgroups you're going to have in all those details. So, we'll start with this of course, and I know we will revisit it later after scope is finalized to try to edit it as much as possible.

PAT KANE:

So, in terms of the timeline that was sent out and modified a little bit, is there any other questions or concerns or objectives around the timeline? Dates all are fine, achievable.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

[off mic], next.

PAT KANE:

That was really it. [inaudible] before that, Cheryl. Alright. So, again, by June 3<sup>rd</sup> we expect to have the terms of reference and work plan put in place so we can send that to the board, get some feedback from that. At the Marrakech meeting, we requested – I don't think we've got any feedback yet on whether we're going to have actual one-on-ones between this review team and the SOs and ACs so that we can get their feedback because they will have it in that point in time so that we can make modifications accordingly. Negar, I see you've put your tent up sideways, so please.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Pat. I'm just going to keep it sideways for now. Kidding. So, the request has been sent to SOs/ACs for Marrakech. They have a select date that they will look at all the requests coming in for the Marrakech meeting, so hopefully we'll have some confirmation from SOs and ACs soon for the one-on-one meetings you've requested.

In addition to that, I know that – I'm going to mention this now because you're going to have a discussion coming up. I know you had requested to have us look into the possibility of a face-to-face meeting right after Marrakech meeting. We collectively looked into that possibility. Unfortunately, the answer is that is not going to be feasible to do so. So, as part of the planning that you will do for the planning out of the face-to-face meetings for the duration of the review, let's consider that and determine the next best time to meet after Marrakech to substantiate that, because I know you have concerns about being able to in detail

---

capture notes and comments and discussions that are you going to have with SOs and ACs in Marrakech. We'll be on hand to help support you and make sure you get everything captured, so that when you do have your face-to-face meeting, all the materials at hand to be able to partake for the review team and distributed amongst everyone for consideration.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Negar. So, the other item for Marrakech was the day before we were offered a room for the day so that we could collectively get together and prepare for our SO and AC discussions for those that will be in Marrakech. And I know, Maarten, you've already indicated that you will likely be in and out and less than fully available because of the board meetings. But is that still available to us?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Yes. So, you are scheduled to meet on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. You have the full day. That's good to go. And everything for those that are going to be in Marrakech, the room will be set up and we'll have proper support much like you have in this room for that meeting for your planning purposes.

PAT KANE:

Great. Thank you, Negar. So then I would like to have at least at some point in time put together a Doodle poll or request to find out who will already be in attendance in Marrakech so that we can make plans for the number of people that we would have on site. Will we have available to us, Adobe chat?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes. You will have a proper meeting just like this with Adobe rooms, observer room, everything as we do for normal face-to-face meetings. And yes, we will take that as an action item to set up a Doodle poll to see who's going to be there.

PAT KANE: Excellent, Negar. Thank you. Then the challenge will be, given that July and August, tend to be more of vacation months for folks around the globe is putting together the follow-up meeting. So, we'll need to have a Doodle poll that we'll be able to identify when people would be available between July, August, and I guess I would put the first couple of weeks of September. Take a look at what calendars are for that point in time as well.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sounds great. Action item noted. We'll do that as well.

PAT KANE: Thank you. And then once we have that particular meeting, again take feedback. We'll, of course, be meeting throughout that period, but take the feedback face-to-face, work on additional updates to, hopefully at that point in time, recommendations because we'll have broken out separate work groups and what's been accepted from the terms of reference. We will have some ability to work through the recommendations together with the subteams and prepare for a final



---

report which will be delivered in October so that we can have our conversation again with the community in Montreal.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Very good.

PAT KANE: Questions, concerns?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I think we have to organize a mechanism for feedback from the community. So, my proposal is that we probably draft a questionnaire. What are the questions we want to ask to community so that we get feedback?

I remember that in previous ATRTs there was interviews with members from the community. If I see the schedule, there will be no chance to have face-to-face interviews because Marrakech, it's limited, and Montreal is too late. So far, you know we need to organize certain flow of communication to where we get as much as possible input from the broader community so that we have our findings and recommendations based on a certain substance which comes back from the community, or we changing a little bit the plan and we use Montreal for a series of interviews. This would be another option.

---

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Wolfgang. I think that the meeting in Marrakech for the face-to-face is really our chance to meet and interview with the SOs and ACs as collectives. Are you suggesting that we do a survey or a questionnaire to specific folks prior to the publication of the terms of reference or as a subsequent input? Because the terms of reference will be accepted by the board hopefully after we submit it to them but it doesn't mean that it's not a living document [inaudible] that we can modify as we move forward.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I had a lot of discussion with Kobe with various members of the community and they were asking questions of what you are doing and where is the channel. We can – we, as members of the community – put our satisfaction or dissatisfaction with ICANN as a whole or with the performance of the board. So, that means we should open such a channel and invite questions or whatever, and probably not just to say, “Please send your comments or ideas to the ATRT,” probably we could formulate two or three questions where we have a special interest and to say [inaudible] it would be good to get opinions from the broader community.

So, this would just enrich our basis, so that means – it doesn't mean that we have to comment, send back to the community on all the comments. But otherwise, we are just dependent from the, let's say, very limited individual presentations we have here in the group of the 16 and to make it more substantial. It's the proposal to organize a mechanism. It could be a questionnaire. It could be ... I think face-to-

---

face is wonderful in Marrakech, but only a small number of people will be in Marrakech, not the full team.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Wolfgang. I'm happy to put it to the group to decide whether we want to do a survey for the submission of the terms of reference. [inaudible] do that. But I also would suggest that if we're going to open it up for a broad solicitation of ideas for us to review and take a look at, that we have an adjudication process as to how we prioritize them, how we decide to – we have to be very transparent as to what we choose not to pursue because we, too, are limited in the amount of hours that we have to put to this. So, to make certain that we're very clearly calling out what we're not going to chase and why and prioritize those items that we are going to pursue from the community and compare those against what we collectively would like to take a look at. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. Even I agree with Wolfgang, I believe that there will be not open time for review what can come from the community. My worry is about to receive too much comments and open too much and not have adequate time to do so. So, I believe that we here intend to represent in some way our communities. So, I suggest we address directly to our communities in some way and talk with them and get some feedback, and each of us review this small group of feedback and give to the whole group.

---

For instance, I am from Latin American area end users, so we have a normal meeting, so we can get those feedback and get together and give it to the whole team, a resume of that. Okay. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

I think here we're looking at how we are going to be engaging with the community because the meeting in Marrakech is a good [scoping] point for us but also we should put into consideration the community working sessions, whereby if the review team members can come together to the community [inaudible] discuss the work that we have done and then we put in their comments and their feedback I think is a very good point.

And also, [Vanda] previously mentioned about after the face-to-face meeting, how are we going to be able to come up with concrete analysis of the work that we would have scoped? I think that should be at the back of our minds that we need to clearly analyze this data and see how it fits within our framework of operation. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you. Just from my experience with [inaudible], not from a board position. But I think the points that are made here are very good and also complementary. Wolfgang says we need to have a clear channel for people to liaise with us. To also make clear we cannot just wait and sit until flux of input coming over to us. So, we need to also be clear what kind of information we can handle and how we can handle this.

---

I would say that next to face-to-face meetings both in Marrakech and Montreal, with different focus, would be important but also to point out that we as members are approachable as well, and preferably that we are always open to input and make that an important channel into our group.

So, I think for us all, it's a task to take that. [inaudible] next to that, we need to have specific questions for which we want a broad input beyond SO/AC engagement. We should identify that and then set it up explicitly. But I would say [inaudible] for any input to [inaudible] members. And if there are specific requests, let's make that a specific subject that we reach out for, as was discussed before. There may even be budget to have it done professionally rather than by us on a volunteer basis.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you. Wolfgang, you make two points that I wanted to comment on. One about distributing the terms of reference, work plan, scope of work, etc., to not just the board but making sure that you can get community input on it, as has been noted in the operating standards. The review team is actually encouraged to share that information, work plan, terms of reference, scope of work with the SO/ACs informationally and that gives them the opportunity to provide feedback if they wish to do so, if they have any concerns.

You also encourage that you guys are planning to have engagement sessions with the community when you go into Marrakech meeting, but engagement sessions are not limited to just face-to-face meetings. We

---

can certainly send requests to different community groups to hop on a telephonic meeting with the review team to discuss certain things, to exchange ideas, to get information from them. That can happen during plenary calls when we know review team is available or we can schedule a separate time. It could be a subset of the review team, as it's always challenging to get a large group of people together. And then the subgroup of the review team can pass the information along to the rest of the team, so we can certainly arrange for that.

When you do engagement with the community, you can make it targeted so that you do ask specific questions, and Maarten suggests that so you can focus the sort of input you want to receive from the community on different parts of your work, not leave it open-ended which may or may not result in the answers you're looking to get.

PAT KANE:

Vanda, I think that your suggestion on us going back and talking to our groups is really a good one. I know that I've asked the chair of the GNSO for some time to have that conversation specifically with the GNSO. Then, Erica and I have also had this conversation within the Registry Stakeholder Group itself. I know Erica has been carrying that conversation. Erica, is there anything that you would like to add based upon the requests and conversations that we've had in the Registry Stakeholder Group?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

As Erica is typing, I suspect her audio may not be connected just yet, but we'll read to the record anything that she responds to in this. Yes, she's

---

confirming she doesn't have microphone access. Erica, we'll try and fix that up during the break then, shall we? Pat?

PAT KANE:

So, I guess I carry this up to the Montreal meeting but put it out to the group. Do we want to put together some specific questions, to Maarten's point, that we would take back to our stakeholder groups and our supporting organizations and advisory committees? Do we want to talk about that at some point in time today and is now the right time to do that or shortly? I'm sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

To be honest, Pat, I suspect we ... [inaudible] microphone in the room will pick up my voice. Maarten's microphone will pick up my voice. It's okay.

I suspect that these questions may fall out of our exercises in work today. You'll notice there's a couple of whiteboards. Can we dedicate one of those whiteboards for questions, and while you're thinking of questions – and I'm sure Demi's got some, KC is bound to have some. Think of them, put them up there, and at the end of the day as we wrap up, let's see if we can narrow it down to three or five – please, no more than seven questions – that we will make public and will be the core speaking points as we go forward in community outreach and engagement because it should have a solid nexus to what we do with developing our scope today.

---

PAT KANE: Thank you for that suggestion. Jennifer, will you capture that as an action item, please? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to suggest any mic in the room open. As we head to break – and I have no problem, I’m sure Pat doesn’t either – if we break five minutes early, but we will have a problem if we don’t start on time. Let me see if I can recap what I’ve heard.

What I’ve heard is, in terms of outreach and our outreach plan because this is what we are talking about. Agenda item number five on the agenda, that we are going to create a small set of key talking points/questions that the community at-large will be able to engage with us on. We are going to give the community at-large the opportunity to interact with us in several ways. We will be available individuals to be approached. Therefore, we need to make it publicly known that that is the case.

As individuals, if we are approached, we each need therefore to undertake that we will bring that back to the next plenary meeting. We are not going to sit on a deep and meaningful discussion and bring it in five minutes before the final documentation is [brought] just to be disruptive and difficult. If you hear from your Aunt Mary or the cleaner in the building that they have a problem with accountability and transparency and it fits with our scope, we meet weekly. Therefore, within seven days, you get the information, you share it with us. Then it becomes a standing agenda item in our weekly meeting to see what individual input people may have.



Might I suggest that as previous ATRTs have done, we also ask staff to set up an e-mail address whereby anybody from the community at-large or out there in the wider world – there is a world beyond ICANN, so I hear. And so, anybody who, dare I say, wishes to make an opinion and it is in our scope, could e-mail us, anonymously or not I guess, or request anonymity if they want to, and that e-mail is shared with the review team with the same timeliness that we are going to expect individual input. So, we've got that personal outreach.

Vanda pointed out the opportunity for each and every one of us as review team members to also do proactively undertake local outreach. Look for opportunities – correct me if I'm wrong, Vanda. Look for opportunities within your local region community or part of ICANN from which you come to this table, where you can be a conduit – hopefully, not a filter, a conduit – of input and information about what we're doing out to community and what community is interested in to get back into us.

Again, that is reportable. Your undertaking will need to be to share in a timely manner, preferably at the following meeting. Let us know you are talking to the Canberra meeting of Diversity Action Group and then once you talk to the Canberra meeting of Diversity Action Group, you get back to us all with what they said or what they didn't say.

We also have the zero-day opportunities which I've listed here, and that is [flagged] and more formal meetings with ICANN, and that doesn't just mean part of the icann.org, but the SO and the AC infrastructures. That is exactly what the letter that Negar indicated has gone out to the AC/SO chairs. So, Wolfgang, we would expect most of the AC/SOs to

---

---

take us up on the opportunity in Marrakech to have a block of time on their agenda for who amongst us is there and their communities to have a fearless and frank interaction but that shouldn't be limited to that. The other opportunity was suggested, I believe that we could run some webinar opportunity, so one or more of our regular meetings could be dedicated to community or other group input. So, we have that as well.

I also heard that when we have got a set of questions/speaking points – correct me if I'm wrong, Wolfgang, here – that it would be very useful to have a publicly available survey on those questions, so we would need to set up some form of Survey Monkey or similar tool, whatever ICANN is using this week, so that that can be perhaps a pre-public comment call for input. So, a request for comments from community on these questions and that might seed the conversation and also give us the opportunity to make sure that individuals or groups are aware of, as Maarten was saying, our openness and our availability. That's what I've heard so far and hopefully Daniel isn't going to make too many more points because I'm running out of space on my piece of paper. Daniel, over to you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Mine is just a very simple question. [inaudible] documented the outreach here, but if the [inaudible] been documented I would like to take part in having the proper documentation of this. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Daniel, you know I love the fact that you like data, you like working with data points, you like qualitative and quantitative analysis with a focus

---

---

on the quantitative analysis and you like pre-planning to prevent a poor performance, so thank you for that. We have not got a documented outreach plan. One of the outcomes of today would be – oh, sorry, not today – this meeting, would be that we should be in a position to work with staff to do one and to have that published. With that, I believe we've got Sebastien. Over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. I would like to suggest or ask if we can have all the same type of PowerPoint to make any presentation at the local level. I think that we don't have to reinvent the wheel to present that. I think it's a good idea if we can do that when we are on the road or somewhere in our country to make this presentation.

My second point is that we may also encourage people, individual people, not just to write and to use the e-mail address you suggested but also to come to the grassroots people who are already involved within ICANN and to come from this to you, to us, if I can say we [inaudible], not sure – but like that it will involve more people and be more a bottom-up process and just sending a question to e-mail address. I agree with we need to have two. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sebastien. I think you were agreeing with what we heard from Maarten and from Vanda and Wolfgang that the ability to have that individuals, anyone amongst the team, approached by anyone in the community is important but the additional piece that you were presenting – and unless anyone objects, I don't think ... I think that's an

---

excellent idea is that a standardized presentation is made available for any of us to use in outreach. Can I suggest if I may embellish slightly, that we have it in two forms – a long form and a short form – so that if we are over dinner speakers which are trying to fill in 30 minutes of people’s time while they’re carving through their steak, chicken, and fish that’s one thing. But we also probably need the three-minute version with almost a single slide, the sort of thing you can do in the [inaudible] and while you’re walking between rooms, just to help. But it should be a unified approach. Have I got that correct? I have got that correct. Thank you. And back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

So, before we break, if we could just use the agree or disagree button inside Adobe Connect. It’s where your raise hand or lower hand is. Just to either accept or agree with what the generalization was of the first session or put a disagreement on generalization where we were on the first session, just to record our agreement or disagreement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Do you agree with everything that we captured as our way forward or not? If you agree with it, put a great big green mark up and if you disagree with it, we’ll talk later.

PAT KANE:

It’s general agreement, yes, Maarten.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, maybe you can ask the ones who are not in the Adobe Connect to do something to tell you they agree with.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, if you put up your cards, if you're in the room and you're unable to join the Adobe Connect and we were encouraging everyone even in the room to join the Adobe Connect because it does make managing the queue much more easy. Sebastien, are you indicating you're agreeing or disagreeing in addition to the room?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm sorry, Cheryl. Sometimes I am not talking about me, but something I thought for the community. I am on the Adobe. I put my green tick. But I'm suggesting to you, as the co-chair, that you may ask the others who are not to make a sign that they agree or disagree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I will now ask if there is anybody who is not in the Adobe Connect room and is in this room who is not able to put a green check up in the Adobe Connect room to raise your hand so we can all glare at you now. Or disagree, let us know, and I'll do a check instead of having coffee to see that everyone is or is not in the room with staff.

PAT KANE: I think Wolfgang is the only one.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wolfgang is the only one not logged in, thank you. Jacques it not. And you agree? Thank you, Jacques, I appreciate that.

JACQUES BLANC: I'm logging in now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are you logging in now? Jacques, you're going to be logging in now, too. Thank you. Excellent. Ladies and gentlemen, we are on almost time, within 60 seconds for our coffee break. Negar, is this essential now? Because we're going to be—

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes. Just noting that two members did not put a green check but added in chat that they agree, so I wanted to add their names, Ramet and Michael, to the list of agreements.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I did note that as we were going through, and thank you very much, and thank you very much to staff for watching those rooms. Thank you very much for such a collaborative and collegiate start to our day. We will be reconvening at 45 minutes past the hour wherever you are in the world. Do have a quick coffee. You are our audience. Do return. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Brenda, can you pause the recording, please? Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright. Ladies and gentlemen, we are beginning our next session again now. Thank you, Brenda. I don't know, Brenda, whether you can take away everybody's green ticks. We've got a few people in the room who are still agreeing with everything I say, which I personally think is unlikely especially because some of them are no longer in the room.

One of the things we're going to be doing in this next session which will be running us through to the lunchtime session is our working session where we will be running through the exercises that are around the wall, for those of us who are physically in the room here in Los Angeles at ICANN headquarters. But we will be putting them up in the Adobe Connect room for those of you who are joining us remotely. We recognize that we are getting into some rather late night times for some of you. Ramet, we are not trying to have an exercise in sleep deprivation, although volunteering with ICANN often does result in sleep deprivation and other human rights violations as well, I might add. We do understand if some of you do have to go to bed. Just mention that you are leaving now when you do leave the room. The same I would suggest if you are in the room and you are also now all logged into the Adobe Connect room, if you need to take a bio break, just say, "Leaving now." And say, "Back." I would also ask that you recognize that there are time stamps going into the chat for at least the accountability and transparency review team chat.

I suspect also for the chat, but I'm not sure because I've got it running in a different system, for the observer's room. Those time stamps will help you if you are having to leave. Take a note of the time when you leave

---

---

and then when you go back, as we would expect any review team member to do, when you go back to listen to the tape or to listen to the transcript, you will find tracking down where you are that you will need to go and listen to without running through, especially when you've got three days of event. You don't want to be listening to the first three hours of conversation to get to the part that you'd have to step away from.

So, with that, we will be breaking promptly at 12:30 for a lunch break of 60 minutes to 13:30 local time which will be half past an hour for an hour's break. When we get to that, we will be ... Are we planning on actually going to the walls and writing on the walls and doing all of this? Thank you. I like interaction. Because we're going to be moving away from our desks now, I believe we have been successful, Negar. Yea or nay? Yes, we have been successful. We've got a couple of walking mics. Well, the mics don't walk. You can walk with them. But you can make sure that what we're saying as we go through any of these exercises will be coming through to the observer's room and to the room for remote participants. I believe that Brenda, if not someone else, will be able to have – keeping an eye on any of the ... It's interesting to hear myself in stereo, or [inaudible] actually. Will be able to make sure anybody in remote participation who wants to put in an intervention can do. And I think Brenda did audio checks with everyone as well, so we should be able to ... Brenda, if you just break in and say someone wants to speak and manage the queue for us, because we'll be stepping away. We may be able to see in the fine print on the display Adobe Connect but I'm not promising that if we're focusing on the wall. So, just jump in audio as need be, Brenda. I appreciate that.

---



---

So, with that, do you want to set up the exercise now? I think we've got the workers back in the room which is great. Who is going to take that, Negar or Jennifer? Negar, it's all yours.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. So, the exercises that are coming up are intended to focus everyone's attention on the scope items that are listed in the bylaws and from there to step through the details that the review team members think should be included under each scope item. That's exercise one. We have different steps listed here. I'm just going to quickly advance through these slides and get you set up with this work. Some of this content is hard to see in the light of the room. I'm going to just read it out loud for everyone in the room and in the Adobe participating remotely.

For ease of the work that we're going to be doing, standing up to interact, we are asking the members that are in the room physically to put one idea per Post-It Note. Print clearly, please. We are providing Sharpies and Post-Its. We are asking you to break out into groups of three or four to make the work more effective, but if you'd rather work together as one on each scope item, that's your prerogative as well.

For the participants that are joining us remotely, we are going to be hearing the posters that you have posted up on the wall here with you in a Word format document and I ask that you please also enter information in the document and send it to us individually or post it in the Adobe room chat. We will capture your comments and ideas as well for these exercises.

Okay. So with that, I would like to start exercise one. The goal of this exercise is to ask each and every review team member, similar to what you did in the Google Doc over the past few weeks to come up with ideas that will fit under each of the scope items listed in the bylaws. At this point, you're just collecting ideas for sub scope items, if I may call it that.

For, again, those in the room, I'm asking you to please walk to the different poster. Each poster contains one scope item as listed in the bylaws. For the ones that you have already provided input to us in the Google Doc, we've listed the sub-items in that section under the appropriate scope heading and I will ask the remote participants to please do so either via chat, identifying the scope item by the letter that we have included in the Word document or filling out the Word document and e-mailing it to us, Jennifer and myself. We're happy to hear you input with everyone else who is in the room.

So, with that, we are getting up using remote microphones. Let me hand it over Cheryl. She has a comment to make.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Negar. I will ask the questions from any of the remote participants, or of course from the room now on that process. Pat and I would like to strongly recommend – is that clear enough guidance for you? Strongly recommend that we actually do these exercises as a whole org group per exercise rather than [inaudible] group. We are not such a large and unwieldy group I think to not manage that. I think, at least at the beginning of this, Pat and I would

---

---

feel a lot more comfortable bringing everyone at least through the first exercise, see how long it takes. Maybe [inaudible] works. We may break after that. But for right now, let's do it as a full group exercise.

Again, remote participants, please remember you are part of this. Just butt in and we will hear you. Make your microphone open and say, "I think this," or, "I'd like to say something," and we'll make sure that your voice is heard. [Jim], we haven't forgotten about you, and again, staff will be making sure any comments that you have as you listen to us are put in a timely manner.

So, not wanting to be radical, I guess we should start with exercise one, not exercise two or three.

PAT KANE: Brilliant.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a plan. That means we get up and we go to the corner of the room that you found your coffee at and we'll be using the roaming mics – I've got the right word now, not walking mic, roaming mic – and running through that. Okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Jennifer I know will hold the mic, so you guys can concentrate on holding your stickies and pen. We'll walk around with you.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Testing the microphone. Brenda, can you hear us?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, I do hear you very well.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Great, thanks. Alright, everybody, we're over in exercise one looking at the draft scope topic A, assessing and improving board governance, which will include an ongoing evaluation of board performance, the board selection process, the extent to which the board's composition and allocations [inaudible] ICANN's present and future needs and the appeal mechanisms for board decisions contained in these bylaws. And then there's some draft objective text to be refined as a result of this exercise.

Okay. Consistent with ICANN's mission and bylaws, section 4.6b2a, the review team will assess and [inaudible] board governance which will include an ongoing evaluation of board performance, assess the board selection process, evaluate the extent to which the board composition and allocation structure meets ICANN's present and future needs and assess the appeal mechanisms for board decisions contained in the bylaws.

So, the questions are: what specifically does the review team need to address in this area? What questions will the review team need to ask and answer, and what should not be in scope for the review in this area? Anything worth noting?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I can't hear you back here without the microphone, you're not speaking loudly enough.

OSVALDO NOVOA: I said that the appeal mechanism has to be studied, at least. Be sure that it meets the needs of the board.

BRENDA BREWER: Whoever is speaking, we're not able to hear you.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Oh, sorry. Osvaldo. Sorry.

BRENDA BREWER: That's better. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that we just finished the selection, the NomCom [inaudible], so the selection is done and we should just see what happens in the conclusions of that to analyze if it's needed to be anything else on that scope.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Let me get the other microphone, too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Vanda is putting it here.

PAT KANE: So, a question along those lines that I've got is do the diversity requirements actually build a board that is effective from a skill set standpoint in addressing certain issues?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can we reword the question? Is the diversity enough [in the scope of] ICANN to fulfill the mission of ICANN? Thank you very much. We have to take that ... I just want to say that it seems that the battle is between the skill and diversity. As I write in my e-mails very often, you can always learn. You can't change your character. You can't change where you are coming from, the color of your skin. You can change [inaudible] diversity. Then, I would like to put that on the table because I think ... Sorry to be late, but I had in the Google Doc some of this idea about diversity. It's important that we have so much [inaudible] that we are doing [inaudible] same thing. Why we can't put what is on the Google Doc here directly and not have to rewrite it again? It could be useful and short on our time. Sorry. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Sebastien, thank you for that. I know you put your comments in today, correct? So, no one has had a chance to look at those, so I understand that. But I think that the way that you rephrased it is exactly right. What additional diversity items do we need for that discussion?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a thought here. I'm not having a lot of feedback here, but one of the opportunities to question would be for us board members what they think is working or not working.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So, just for the record, the comments that Sebastien had made recently, we are trying to print those out so we can put that on the note and capture it here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will photograph these, so everyone will distribute it in a raw form. But this is also an opportunity for you to have discussion and interaction with each other about the points you're raising. This is an interactive exercise, people. At the end of this, we'll be settling on outcomes. We'll be finalizing scope. So, a month and a half dead on the track is not the time to say, "Oh, but we've missed something," or, "Oh no, I disagree." Now is the time to say, "Have we missed something and have you thought about the following?" Please use your microphones. Remember, many of your associates are not in this room. Staff may have to do an oration I suspect of who is writing what. At the moment, we've got pens all down on brightly colored pieces of sticky paper and we promise we will read them all into the record as we go around the exercises.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Of course, this is obvious, but we'll capture all of these and type them all up so we have them for record. We'll add them back into the ... Actually, we'll capture in the format that you're seeing now so it's very clear where things are [inaudible]. Yes, please only focus on exercise one which is the first eight posters here.

[crosstalk, off mic]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I wonder if ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All you need to do is copy ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't understand what the issue is because I ... I already did that, though. [off mic]. But Sebastien [inaudible] is different.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's not a [misuse of time], I think. I [inaudible] comment. [inaudible]. How can that be [inaudible] in a way that does not devalue [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm trying to be useful. I'm being subtle. One of those paparazzi that are trying not to show they're taking pictures of people.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, I agree. This is helpful. I don't have any ...



---

[off mic crosstalk]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, when you say this is actually [inaudible] until this period, what is after this period in the five-year plan instead of this stuff? What does ICANN think [inaudible]?

PAT KANE: That's a great question. So, it comes down to—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But we can find that out, right?

PAT KANE: So, there's a draft document for the 20-25 that was published in and accepted in December, I think. So, what are we driving toward and what does it mean to say global unique identifiers? Now, it's a term that's being used more and more from the standpoint of describing what ICANN is supposed to be looking at. Is it just domains and [not] IPs? And then some of the configuration table type stuff that we're talking about from the IETF in terms of [inaudible], but is it something else? Because it's being used more specifically in language and because language matters, I'm trying to figure out what that means. That's my question on that.

[crosstalk, off mic].

---

PAT KANE: So, this comes with DAR, DNS abuse, and trying to track, spam issues, command and control issues, all right things that are DNS issues. But what are we solving for from a next five-year standpoint? Is it try to put contracted parties under the same microscope in terms of how we report out? What is that? So, it's not clear to me what these tools are being used for. It's clear what they're measuring but what is the result? So that's the questions I have around that specific item.

And the next one really has to do with ICANN announcing that there's [inaudible]. So, Cherine and Goran talking specifically around not being lobbyists anymore.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Anymore?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: They [inaudible].

PAT KANE: So, Jamie Hedlund is a registered lobbyist. They engage lobbyists. So, what does that mean from the standpoint of saying we're going to go inform governments on positions, which that's lobbying.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And why [inaudible]?

---

PAT KANE: That's a great question. So, why did we want to not [inaudible]?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: You can have a [inaudible] different way, [inaudible].

[off mic, crosstalk]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: If I may make a quick note for the room, the remote participants are having issues hearing the individuals speaking into the roaming mics.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. I'll go [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please use your microphones more. People are having trouble hearing you.

PAT KANE: I've got the microphone right in the middle of the conversation. So, if we believe that these are actual problems, we've got more content regulation around the globe, we've got more privacy regulation around the globe. What is our strategy to participate in that or not? So, that's kind of what this one is here about. And this one specifically is when it came to the conversations that Goran had with the DPAs in Europe, there was nobody from the community. It was all ICANN Org that was engaged in that. So, what role should the community have played as part of that? So, that's a process that, for whatever reason, was not as transparent as I think people would like. So, what is our role?

---

[crosstalk, off mic]

So, I think this also comes up in terms of when you take a look at what's going on with [inaudible], the Amazon community. So, now you've got a whole organization that can't communicate very well with ICANN because Venezuela is in disarray. So, how does Goran work with them and how [inaudible] participate in that particular process if that [inaudible] so it may not be [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

This particular issue is a new [inaudible] in South America, [inaudible] engaged in that discussion [inaudible]. They are engaged because they are together working with the GAC representatives. For instance, an ambassador from Brazil, from Argentina, [inaudible]. So, together, [inaudible] reach out together with those guys and discuss the position what we should do or not but it's a particular issue. But in general, what I'm afraid of is not have [inaudible] in some way together with ICANN, not only to avoid those [inaudible] at some point [inaudible] interest of one or two countries, not the general community. That's just the main point. The main point is to avoid particular [inaudible] of one or two countries together that can face and impact the board in [inaudible].

PAT KANE:

Yeah.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I believe this is something that ... I don't know how to put it in words, but maybe I can try to [inaudible].

---

PAT KANE: I think that would be good. Then, the last one, they always talk about long-term – we’re talking about long-term [inaudible] stability. What does that mean? I think we saw part of that with CCTRT recommendations, that we only have so much money so let’s prioritize or let’s bundle. Let’s take a look at what can be done. But does it mean that we’re going to take on more? And if we’re going to take one, two, three and four as changes, what doesn’t get done that gets done today or is there a new revenue stream?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Or how [inaudible].

PAT KANE: Right.

[cross talk, off mic]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So, it is not [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] in certain [inaudible].

PAT KANE: But six months of budget today is a big number. [inaudible] six months set years ago, it was not the big number that it is today.

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I have been here since 1999, so it's something that we change so much and I don't see how they will in five years, how they [inaudible] the budget of ICANN, how [inaudible] for domains, how domains are going to be stable or dropping.

BRENDA BREWER: Excuse me. May I please ask that you speak into the microphone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will do our best, Brenda. Ladies and gentlemen, I'll remind you again, use the microphones. Swallow it if you have to.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's impossible. We put all the microphones together.

PAT KANE: We do have an issue where we've got multiple conversations going on in front of multiple exercise papers on the walls and windows, so it's really difficult. I've just been informed to control my group. So, there may be some overlapping conversations that you're going to hear. They'll be muddled, but we'll do our best to get everything done.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Patrick.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that the only way is—

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But they probably see that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, they see this.

PAT KANE: They don't see it in this format.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: They put their own comments on that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: If I may make a correction, they actually do see this format, too. We shared a document that contains these tables. We will take pictures of the sticky pads and post it for everyone, also. And then we'll type all of those in in that big document so everything will be shared with everyone shortly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, thank you.

[crosstalk, off mic].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was appointed to ATRT 1. I attended so many of the ATRT 2 meetings that the chair forgot I wasn't a full member. And [inaudible]. He actually forgot I wasn't [inaudible].

---

[crosstalk, off mic].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's important [inaudible]. Your homework will [inaudible] recommendations that need to be analyzed [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We are hearing a lot of background noise in the room. If you are not speaking in the Adobe room, would you please mute your lines?

PAT KANE: [off mic].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. ICANN itself does not represent anything, so ...

[crosstalk, off mic]

So, we should, in my opinion, review the work [inaudible] and a lot of our recommendations [inaudible] was rejected by budget [inaudible] but some of them may be considered in our ...

PAT KANE: I think that's a right topic for us to take a look at from the standpoint of how [inaudible] all of the recommendations that come out of either review teams or working groups [inaudible] budget. So, what role does the community play from a transparency standpoint to say the community says out of these 100 things that we have to get done, we've got money for 40 of them. What are the right 40? And is the



---

number one item so expensive that I can do 20 more by pushing that one down?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible], in my opinion, [inaudible] because it's hard to expect that there's a [inaudible] of each budget issue like that. But when you are in the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I remember the day when Steve Crocker was chair of the board and [inaudible] GNSO wanted to move some of the decision-making capacity from the board to the GNSO Council, in particular with regard to gTLDs because this is the place where you have all the competences on gTLDs. So, it's more in the GNSO Council than in the board. And this was a question of distribution of decision-making power. And the board was really against [inaudible] any decision-making capacity from the board back to the GNSO Council.

On the other hand, I think this is a problem. I'm still undecided about it. Originally, the role of the board was to coordinate. The decision-making power should be very close to the issues, so that [inaudible] address community. So the board has no decision-making capacity if it comes to addresses. So, it's in the ASO Council or [inaudible] community.

Similar with the GNSO. That means certainly the board decides as an update or delegation, re-delegation for ccTLDs. But if it comes to policy, it's there. In the [inaudible], it's different. If you speak about the GAC, it's more really on the gTLD issue. It's a very clear issue in the GAC, and

---

so far the relationship between the GNSO Council and the GAC needs some adjustment I would say to find [inaudible] between board, GAC, and GNSO. You should have more clarity. I would not be now in a position to say you have to [inaudible] some capacities or responsibilities from one body to another or introduce a special reporting system.

But this is an issue which needs further explanation to relationship between GAC, GNSO Council, and the board.

JACQUES BLANC:

I think one of the points that has been made clear was – one process where it was made clear that the decision process between GAC and the other body, GNSO and board included, was [inaudible] as not completely aligned with the geo-TLDs. [inaudible] geo-TLD [inaudible] Amazon put up there [inaudible] part of the GAC said, “No way, sir. We will not accept that.” So then you’ve got an overall community trying to move forward with an extension and [inaudible] saying we cannot accept this. And at the moment [inaudible] decision is to be [inaudible]. So, it could be good to see how this process can go so we can reach something.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Well, one case we have that [inaudible] is the IGO, INGO working group. They have been working for six years. They have presented several policies to the board that were in fact accepted by the GAC, so the board didn’t ratify them. So, they chose it’s not working [inaudible].

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: What you said brings us to another issue and this is the lengths of PDP. That means we have seen with the EPDP that it's possible. If it's at a deadline and you push community to work hard, they can achieve the result in a pre-determined timeframe. I think it's totally unacceptable that you have PDPs mainly in the g space which go for six years, eight years, or ten years. [inaudible] PDP [inaudible] no consensus is achievable, but to continue in endless meetings for years and years and years is a waste of energy and resources, or finally the board says, "It's okay. We do not get a policy from the PDP, then we decide." But to leave a question open for years without any decision, this is very counter-productive.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is a second subject for the record, that the length of PDPs, maybe we can stick that somewhere as well. Post-It is already there, okay.

JACQUES BLANC: What you just said about EPDP and the data protection thing, it's another sign that something hasn't worked, because it's a [inaudible] decision that every European country was aware from, the governments knew, we, private companies knew this was coming our way and [inaudible] the lack of either communication or decision process that has been made for the communities and the board not to act before six month between the train coming our way? So, that's something we could [inaudible] I feel.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, just for the record, GDPR was underestimated by many companies around the world in and outside of the ICANN community.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The whole [inaudible] first time to [inaudible] privacy [inaudible] completely and the community completely. [inaudible] only decided to panic when people got [inaudible] personal liable for it and that was when they got scared.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, point maybe somewhere to put this, if issues come up that will touch the ICANN community, how we will tackle those?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Just a five-minute time check, everyone. We are going to wrap up by 15 to noon and roll into exercise number two.

[crosstalk, off mic]

We've covered exercise one right now. All the scope items have been discussed. I'm going to take a couple of minutes to take pictures of each poster and then you're going to roll into exercise number two. The goal of exercise number two is to go through all the items that are listed

---

here and prioritize them with consensus from the whole review team in terms of the level of importance for the work that you're going to do to help narrow down your scope because there are a lot of items here for discussion. So, give me a few minutes please to take pictures and then we'll start reading the items one by one out loud.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Negar. Can I ask the group while Negar is doing that if you can start contemplating your personal prioritization? You want to use a one to five scale or a one to three scale? As long as it's an odd number, what we should be using as we move towards exercise two. And if you want to get up and stretch, take a three-and-a-half minute bio break or grab yourself a bit of hydration fluids, that would be wise, too. [inaudible] remote participants, and Ramet, we do recognize this is hard to follow. It's actually why we do try and get everyone who possibly can together in a face-to-face meeting. But, as we know, things like other real life and difficulties with visas do play a role in all of that.

We will read out to the record what is captured out of exercise one. Negar will do that I'm expecting about now. She's queued and ready to go. My filibustering work is done. And then she'll intro us back into exercise two and the first thing will be whether or not we're going to use – I'm going to suggest a one to five priority. I like five. It's not a bad number. If not, three or seven. But five is not bad. It gives you flexibility.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Actually, the priority level that we've incorporated here, it is five categories. I'm going to read them out loud before we get

---

into the details. First category is the suggested scope item is important but not valuable at this time. It is important but not feasible at this time. Should be reviewed at this time, so an item the review team wants to undertake. Unimportant, don't include for review. Too soon to make a conclusion, so it becomes your [inaudible] category.

With that in place, thank you all for sitting down. Please take your mic because I'm going to be reading the items one by one, and as I read them one by one, I will ask for the review team's input as to which of these five categories we want to put each item in. And for those are remote, Jennifer has shared the format of the exercise tables with you, so please scroll down to exercise number two that includes a table like I read out loud. Maarten, go ahead, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Question. Just to understand, for instance, work stream two recommendation that needs to be implemented still, would that be a category two or category five [inaudible]? Important but not feasible or too soon to make ... Just to understand.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: My suggestion would be to actually put it on the category two because of the possibility of duplication, but of course if there are elements that the review team thinks will not be covered by work stream two, it might go under category five to say too soon to determine until we see how the implementation in work stream two progresses. Sebastien, go ahead.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I guess there is somebody online who wants to talk, too. May I suggest that you read the sticky notes and we discuss it but we don't do this final [inaudible] to put in the one column here but we do a personal [inaudible] on that and we come back with that? Because I have a fear that the strong voice will win.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I hear you correctly, Sebastien, what you'd like us to do is after Negar reads through your collaborative document with exercise one that you all take a pen – there's plenty of them over there – and put a mark. How did you want to do this, individual or [inaudible]? You can put a priority or classification up there and then we can discuss it again as a group activity. Negar, go ahead.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. In light of the comments Sebastien has made, one suggestion would be since everyone has access to the Google Doc [inaudible] this exercise, I can read the Post-Its out loud, and in the remaining time, have the entire review team log into the Google Doc and type out which item falls where, so that after lunch break, we can come back and designate the right spot as a collective input. Would that work for everyone? Daniel, go ahead, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He gave a thumbs up, just for the record.

---

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I said yes, that probably it would be good to put in writing because [inaudible] get that and prioritize [inaudible] be more effective because if many are typing in the Google Doc, it would be so much [inaudible]. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: [off mic].

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think [inaudible] to think about it deeply how a possible outcome [inaudible]. I can't give a concrete answer right now. Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I'll defer to Cheryl and Pat on this for the way forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I must say I do hear your concern and everyone typing in on the document will also require everyone to request edit access and be granted it which I just did. So, if you don't already have ... If you haven't already put in edit access, you, like me, will be in view-only mode which will make actually typing into it challenging indeed.

So, how one's individual voice for the fear of being drowned out by the [inaudible] and verbally dexterous amongst us is done, I don't really care. But I hear the cry to do so, and whether that's done with a stripe up there or a sticky label or into the Google Doc I don't much mind. But



---

let's get you thinking on that while you go around and read to the record exercise one, and then perhaps, Daniel, you'll have thought of it further on your ways and we can hear from the other voices around the table. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

That sounds great. We will use the remaining time to read through the material and then we'll move on to exercise number two after lunch. Scope topic A, I'll read that out loud for the group. Assessing and improving board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of board performance, the board selection process, the extent to which the board's composition and allocation structure meets ICANN's present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for board decisions contained in these bylaws.

Comments that we have had people put on the document is: how is this whole community feeling about board governance? NomCom review must be analyzed to see if there are any points to address. Does the board have the ability to balance community oversight and org fiscal oversight or should we – I'm sorry, I can't read the rest of this. I will ask the person. Consider two boards, thank you. Just a wild guess, right, Pat?

Next comment is election process. Do we need to add skill set diversity to the board selection? Should diversity be a board interview topic? Voice of ICANN. ATRT 2 asks for metrics ... Just making it an open-ended comment. Thank you. Effectiveness of board performance. Review the regional diversity of the board's decision-making process. Are the board

---

appeal mechanisms adequate for the needs of the community? Analyze skill set need and impact on board decision. Okay? Proportion of elected versus nominated members. Diversity. Shall I pause right here?

We've got a few comments here. Under diversity, the comments are: how to measure diversity in leadership team in all ICANN bodies, country of reference (birth, living, etc.), composition of the board. Each region must not have more than five board members, what about five from the same country? Number of terms. Number of leadership positions.

With regards to voice of ICANN, who is the voice or voices of ICANN? Election processes. How can we ensure that election selection processes are fair, equitable, open, and deliver an acceptable result at a broader global level?

With regards to the scope items, there are two items noted that should not be ... Sorry, Jennifer, go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Before you move on to that, there's an online comment which I'll transcribe into a Post-It and stick up there from Liu. She said, "Providing multi-language version of the board's decisions. For example, the board resolution, minutes, and ensuring the quality of translation."

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Jennifer. There are two comments under the section that says what should not be included in scope for the review in this area and those are we should not focus on the past, before the IANA

---

transition review in 2012. Let's focus on the future. The second item is we should not analyze ... Actually, I'm going to try to read that out. Daniel, you have a comment. Go ahead, please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Looking at the comment made from Avri, I think we should take note of that comment and probably feed it respectively where it belongs. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Can someone identify who wrote this note under the should not be included in the scope that starts with "we should not analyze under" ... And I'm unable to read the rest. Is that you, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We should not analyze individuals or constituencies that [inaudible] what we do not. Okay. We should not analyze individuals' or constituencies' performance when at the board.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you very much. Any comments from anyone on the items? We have Daniel. Go ahead, please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think ... Is it allowed to [inaudible] to discuss each of those individuals? Because I would like to react to that last comment that has been read by Vanda. I think it's best to ensure that effectiveness of the board, then

---

we should be able to [inaudible] conducting their decisions because we can just simply come with a [inaudible] decision from nowhere and then decision is going to [inaudible]. There should be a reason as to Y is X or X is Y.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The rationale.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Any reactions? Okay. If there are no other comments on scope item A, I'm going to read out scope item B. It is regarding assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the board and with the broader ICANN community and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS.

Items included here are what are the communication tools? Evaluate their effectiveness. Evaluate GAC decision process. How does GAC reach consensus? Influence communication to the board.

With regards to improvement, improvement is should GAC be able to advise other communities, bodies beyond the board, and expect response? Quicken decision process with direct stakeholders.

---

Next item is board-GAC communication tools. Are they adopted? Sufficient, publicized for transparency. Examine the board-GAC communication process through GDPR issues (see EPDP issue).

And this one says other AC. Does anyone want to elaborate on this item? Go ahead, please, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess it is written B, adding a B prime or a B whatever to take care of the other ACs, because in B we just talk about GAC, how we [inaudible] and the role they have in this whole process.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible] for clarification. It should say [inaudible] before but the GAC can also advise other bodies to the board and expect response.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I think it's a complementary question. The GAC is referred in the bylaws when the comment – sorry – advice is sent to the board. The board must answer. The other AC may also advise and there is no provision on how to be [inaudible] the board for the other ACs and it's a question we may take into account to see if there are some duties from the board to answer those questions and how it could be done.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I think I can read this one but please correct me if I'm not reading it correctly, Vanda. Thank you. The next item is: is GAC focusing in its

---

recommendations to the board, the board interest of the wider Internet community or individual Internet community?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [If] GAC [focuses] its recommendations to the board in the broad interest of the worldwide Internet community. Yeah. Analyze and recommendation its regional, political interference from GAC have impact board decision.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you very much, Vanda. There is nothing listed for the scope item in the category of what not to include under this topic. Any comments from the review team? Anything in the Adobe room?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So, basically, we're going to talk in the next round of what is the most important. I can also see that some of these points may be less well-informed than other of the points [inaudible] is already there. How are we going to deal with that? Are we going to discuss that prior to prioritization or after prioritization or during?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Suggestions. Which would you prefer, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Well, I think [inaudible] contribute when we talk about prioritization. These issues actually have been addressed. Some of these issues may be

---

complemented by staff. Actually, this has been dealt with in this and this way. I think that's the right thing and advice [inaudible] linger on and take time that they don't need to take. Even when it's genuine issues, maybe the answer is already there and we don't need to talk about it and I would vote for not talking about it if it's not necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. There is a comment in the chatroom that I want to read out. It's from Liu. It says, "Evaluate the interaction between GAC and the board such as reply from the board on two-character country code open for second domain name registration and other issues. For example, jurisdiction in the GAC communique."

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, topic C, assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input including adequate explanation of decisions taken on the rationale thereof. Draft objective text to be refined as a result of this exercise consistent with ICANN's mission and bylaws, section 4.6b2c, the review team will assess and improve the processes by which ICANN receives public input.

So, what specifically does the review team need to address in this area and what questions need to be asked. So, assessing and recommending improvements to ICANN's access to information [inaudible] and open

---

data systems along with other mechanisms designed to promote transparency or deliberate information to the public.

Then there's another comment. [inaudible] must be linked with the work on workstream two.

Second comment. What transparency mechanisms and checks and balances need to be put in place such that ICANN can achieve its mission while remaining accountable to the community? What is the process to prioritize, bundle, fund or retire recommendations and what is the feasibility into how those decisions are made? And how does the decision to be an ITUD member support the five-year plan? How was this decision made? Who decides what must or could be put in a public comment process?

Then, there's another sticky that says "public comment process?" I don't know if anybody wants to elaborate on that one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Same].

JENNIFER BRYCE: [Same]. Okay, thank you. And there is nothing in the second section, what should not be in scope for the review in this area. So, before I move on to the next item, does anybody have any further comments, questions, clarifications?



---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We have a raised hand in the room from Michael. Michael, go ahead, please.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thank you. You can hear me? I'll assume you can hear me unless I see otherwise. Just to comment briefly on the relationship between our examination and workstream two, I think it would be good ... I saw that was posted in the Google Doc as well. I think it would be good to have a bit more clarification on that. I do agree that we should be mindful of the review that took place in workstream two, but I don't necessarily agree that the fact that certain aspects of this issue were reviewed in workstream two should be considered determinative, insofar as, for example, in the discussion with regards to sub-part A, I think that there were a lot of questions raised by Pat and by Sebastien among others about diversity on the board.

Now, there was a workstream two subgroup who voted to diversity. That doesn't mean that we can't touch this issue because diversity was looked at previously.

I think it is certainly useful to consider the workstream two recommendations but I guess it was a little bit ambiguous in terms of how things were phrased [inaudible]. Maybe that was what was meant. Maybe we should aim to complement those recommendations. But I definitely don't think we should take an approach that because aspects of this issue were looked at as part of the work stream two process that places them off limits where we should [inaudible]. Thanks.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Cheryl looks me in the eye. I agree. We need to be aware of what workstream two is talking about at the moment and not to double down on things that they're working on or doing, but we can't consider that. No doubt about it. As far as the don't ignore it, I think we are within our remit.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. My comment was just to be sure that we all in this review team are aware of what's happening in work stream two and maybe to have an explanation where the workstream two is at the current stage and to see how we can leverage on what was done and not to reinvent the wheel, but at the same time not closing any doors or windows. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Of course, workstream two as such has completed one of its major milestones, and as an entity, is not continuing to function, rather the leads of workstream two's subteams from [inaudible] recommendations that are now being looked at as part of an implementation plan – so we know what their recommendations are. They're now up to, with dot-org, looking at implementation thereof and the implementation review team has already been set to be the leads of the various work tracks. That has not as yet convened. That has not yet started its work. But there is a high degree of predictability that

---

we can work with as to what the probabilities are for recommendations to be implemented early or not, and if not we can ask the questions.

So, I believe – and perhaps we can take an action item to ask Theresa for a relatively narrow bend of dates as to when the implementation review team process and implementation of work stream two recommendations is planned because that is going to be important for our work program and when we can get to this regardless of what its priority is once you decide. Back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. It was exactly my point. I think all the members of this review team need to be on the same page and I am not sure that everybody knows as much as you know about workstream two but even enough knowledge about where we are. It's a good idea if we can ask staff to give us where it is and when could we expect the next phase.

It may be ears who are really working not well, but I have the impression that you have said dot-org and you wanted to say ICANN Org, but it may be my ear and not your tongue. Sorry for that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sebastien, I can assure you it will be my shorthand, not your hearing, which is perfectly competent. It's me taking a shortcut. I'm not talking about the PIR board, I'm talking about a specific dot-org. Please do assume that unless I put a name in front of the term, dot-org in this context in this room in this work, I'm probably going to be referring to

---

icann.org. However, duly respect, I will do my very best to make it clearer for you.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Cherine is on? Okay. Draft scope topic D, assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community. Draft objective text to be refined consistent with ICANN's mission and bylaws, section 4.6 [inaudible]. The review team will assess the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community.

So, what does specifically need to be addressed in this area? There's five points on here under this umbrella. Activities concerning the five trends for the five-year plan. One, evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. Two, evolution of the global unique set of identifiers. What has been the impetus to from the community to dig deeper on blockchain alternate routes [NDOA]. Three, expansion of role in addressing security and stability. Four, addressing the increased global regulation on privacy and content. How will the global engagement with governments on these topics as a source of information dovetail with ICANN's announcement to no longer lobby? And then underneath that, what role should the community play in conversations with governments? Are staff resources leveraged for the benefit of ICANN Org as well as the community?

Then, I think this sticky note is attached to this. We should avoid to [inaudible] lobby to allow information related to governments, not to the ... Something. Sorry. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They should all be [inaudible] no chance of reading.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. We should [inaudible] because we need this to allow information related to governance, not depend upon a person inside the GAC and [inaudible] in the GAC's position.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, thank you. Five, long-term financial stability. How will the demand for more changes and increased services balance with ICANN's projections for flat revenues over the next few years? How will competing recommendations from review teams and other working groups be prioritized given a flat budget? And there's a sticky note. Should working group review team recommendations be used as capital projects? How do budget and projects get rationalized by community? And examine the work of At-Large and its role in representing the interests of Internet end users, efficacy of processes connected to representing the interests of end users, and potential areas of improvement in this task would fall squarely within [D] and would be a beneficial area of examination.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. At-Large has a role to defend the interests but the [inaudible] end users about security, stability has become [inaudible] nowadays.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: There's a couple more. Apologies. I think they're connected to these. So, ICANN's scope of work with external groups performing those tasks. What are the deliverables? Does this create a revenue stream and should ICANN be operational here or monitoring? That's maybe a bit disjointed. Does anyone have any clarifications or comments, questions? Online comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, go ahead. Thank you. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: There's a comment there regarding two recommendations that came from the reviews to be taken up as [inaudible] something. Can someone just clarify more on that?

JENNIFER BRYCE: That's should working group review team recommendations be viewed as capital projects?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, that's [inaudible] expand more because [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll have him mic'd up.

PAT KANE:

So, one of the things that I hadn't noticed until just now. The way that we, at least in our company, we take a look projects. We have an operating expense that says, "Here's what every day looks like," but then when we are doing improvement projects, either hardware based or capitalizable software projects, we have a different set, a different bucket of money, that's geared towards those kinds of projects.

So, if we think about there's a certain amount of the ICANN budget that is already dedicated to staff, meetings, and a whole bunch of things like that, is that money that's out of the whole budget instead of over here? Then there's a percentage of the budget or a certain set of dollars that says these go to improvement projects. And when I use "capital" I use capital in quotes because typically, from a financial standpoint, stuff that you can spend money on and then defer the cost over three or five years or whatever. So, should we look at it as a separate set – a separate bucket of budget that we apply to review team and working group recommendations such that we, as a community, when we rationalize those projects and prioritize them, we know how much money we have to play with or to use for those types of projects.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I agree it makes sense. The problem is prioritization makes sense, estimating how much it costs makes sense, and how do we consider that to how it leading to additional delays in acting? That's a challenge. A problem [inaudible] to have a budget for financing is that part of the financing may be done within the budget already by using it in a

---

different way. So, I just wanted to make sure that a separate budget for implementation doesn't work. To have some flex in the budget to do additional things, that may be reasonable. The other challenge is to make sure it doesn't lead to additional delays.

PAT KANE:

When we talk about additional delays, the first thing that pops into my head is that we're looking at recommendations as first in, first out because at some point in time, you've got to say if I have 100 items that I'm working on, I only have budget for 30 of them, and the next year when I'm going through, the ones at the bottom of the 30 that we had budget for may not be the right ones anymore. So, from a process standpoint, how do you have a rationalization process that allows you to come in and say this is what the community should work on, [inaudible] down. And if the 100 are there, the bottom 20 we're never going to get to, so let's not even keep track of them. They're not as impactful as other items. And if you want to do everything, then you've got to go get more budget. If you want to have a flat budget, you've got to figure out what to work on and what not to work on. So, that's the rationalization process I'm referring to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Very brief intervention because [inaudible].



---

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just to discuss this because I believe that in the budget discussion that we should analyze the process, it's not clear for the community to [inaudible] on prioritizing items for external views. Just that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Very, very briefly.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Just from the issues, too, of budget, there are times whereby projects have come in, like from pilot program, and then they are transferred into the core budget. So, all of a sudden if the program has been finished with a core budget, all of a sudden it either gets depleted or probably cut into half, affecting the actual program. Could it be possible to review some of the prioritization of these key projects before they transition from priority A to priority B or from priority Z? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think the short answer is yes and the long answer is and that's not our job to decide. Can we continue on?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Draft scope topic E, assessing a policy development process to facilitate, enhance cross-community deliberations and effective and timely policy development. What specifically does the review team need to address? GDPR and its impact on ICANN. This affected some working groups. For example, the GNSO RDS working group, and led to the rise of the EPDP. GDPR announcement came five years earlier, and by the time it was

---

effective, ICANN was not GDPR compliant leading to the creation of the EPDP. A new comment, workstream two. Different policy development processes in each SO. Role of the AC, role of other partners. Community feedback evaluation on respective PDPs. PDP from SO. Role of others, role of AC. And there is a need for [inaudible] for PDPs. Okay, thank you. Any comments, clarifications, before we move on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Move on.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Draft scope topic F, assessing and improving the independent review process. Consistent with ICANN's mission and bylaws [inaudible]. SSR-2 [pause], lack of participation of review team members. Planning. Usefulness of all of the reviews. A systemic review. Who, how, when? Brian Cote mission. [inaudible] systemic review. I'm not sure if anybody has any additions to that. If not, I'm going to move on.

The accountability and transparency review team also assessed the extent to which prior accountability and transparency review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of the recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

Questions the review team needs to ask: what steps were taken to implement each prior recommendation? How well did the implementation of each recommendation achieve the previous review team's intended effect? What were the intended effects envisioned by

---

previous review teams? And how might we enhance results achieved through implementation of the prior review team's recommendations? Do not forget to analyze workstream two recommendations reflected to see if there are key issues to be prioritized.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [off mic].

JENNIFER BRYCE: Effectiveness of the implementation plan of the reviews. Also consider affordability and effectiveness of the implemented recommendations. There's nothing in the scope area. Questions, comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [off mic].

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Finally, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by section 4.6 and may recommend to the board the creation of additional periodic reviews what questions need to be asked. Based on the previous work of ATRT 1 and 2 on review of other specific reviews an opportunity may be agreed to include in our scope at this unusual time [inaudible] evolution, a post [JPA], AOC, and IANA transition, associated workstreams one and two, cross-community working groups on accountability. Analysis of the effectiveness and actionables from recent specific reviews. Is there other bodies to act on

---

review findings other than the board? We need to think on how to make reviews more objective, less costly, and with a result that will make a difference. Relevance of the periodic review, whether it's valid or transitioned on the impact. Finding review team board [inaudible] other? Cost-effectiveness of the reviews and impact on ICANN budget. And that's got a negative one I think next to it. And then what should not be in scope, auction proceeds plus one, plus one, plus one. That's very popular.

Alright. I'm at 28 minutes past. I think I did okay. Anything else before we ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. We won't break just yet because we need to know what we'll be doing when we come back and there's still a question on the table, which is the one that Maarten raised and that was as we go into the exercise two, which is what we will be doing when we come back from lunch, just so you're all clear what you should be contemplating as you are digesting, you should be thinking about how now you are all going to be working together to agree on a classification under the exercise two guidelines over there. You may of course, as Sebastien suggested, put things into the Google Doc and I trust that everyone has edit rights now into the Google Doc. Certainly, it did for me and I'm assuming it's now for everybody. Thank you very much, staff, for that.

Maarten's question, however, was should we not discuss – or one of the options was should we discuss as we prioritize? And I must say that both Pat and I in our little huddle over here thought the ability to discuss as

we prioritize would be very useful to take a purely tallying approach if we just put in stripes on this matrix in front of us and said three for one and two for the other, therefore it gets with the one that's got three [inaudible] in two may not be as productive, may not be as useful, and will not get us to that end game as fast as if we take some time to discuss.

But to make that time effective, we will have an intervention time limit. And so, as we discuss we'll have an intervention time limit. Because it's work you've all had an opportunity to have a little bit of a huddle on, can I suggest we start it at three minutes for time? So, if you are bringing forward a point to argue or discuss about any of these issues after lunch that you try and formulate your intervention to fit within no more than a three-minute timeframe. If you have a reply or a second intervention on the same topic, that will drop to 90 seconds. So, it'll be at Pat's pleasure whether or not you get more than that because I won't be pleased if it happens, so it can be his pleasure that way.

So, with that, there must be logistics to get to lunch and to do whatever. Indeed, there are other [inaudible] things. Over to ... Everybody, please pay attention. It will be an hour break, but we do have a couple of things we need to do. Over to you, staff.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Sorry. If you don't mind, Cheryl, before we close out the discussion on these items, we are transcribing all the sticky notes into the Google Doc that I see everyone is in right now, so hopefully you'll be able to read

---

out in order to help you with prioritization on scope, or on exercise number two. [inaudible]. I see Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks. Lunch is going to be served where the coffee was this morning. If you need to go downstairs and get some fresh air, let us know. We've got badges that can help you get down and back up again. Before we break, if you wouldn't mind, let's take a group photograph that will be used on the Wiki and then we'll probably do a social media post to the world. If anybody has any objections to being in that photograph knowing that it will be used on social media and on the Wiki, please let us know. You can step out. With that, let's break for lunch and take the photograph before you all go and get food. Thank you. Brenda, can you pause the recording, please? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Hello, ladies and gentleman. Can we start the recording again, please?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Okay. The recording is on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Pat Kane again, back after the lunch break here in Los Angeles in whatever time of day it is. For those of the review team that are attending remotely, we do recognize that some of you will have difficulty for the rest of the session

---

depending on where in the world you are. Just note when you leave in the chat, please.

Just for your information, I'm going to hand over now to Negar and she's going to take us through a proposed methodology for how we will be working through our exercise two, noting of course that you've all been thinking deeply about exercise two as of the last 45 minutes. You took 15 minutes to get to dinner and you spent the rest of the time really contemplating how you wanted to prioritize all these questions. Over to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. My proposal is in order to work for exercise two, effectively, number one we have entered all the comments received from the room, from Adobe Chat, into the Google Doc that I see a lot of you in. The Google Doc is HRT 3 Scope Exercises for remote participants. We've entered all the comments in. For exercise two, the table has five categories, if you scroll down to the prioritization table.

Category one – and I'm going to number then in the document. Category one, important but not valuable at this time. Category two, important but not feasible at this time. Category three, should be reviewed at this time. Category four, unimportant, don't include for review. And category five, too soon to make a conclusion.

With that said, my suggestion is for all review team members that are available, to start with the first table in this document under scope item number one, and where we have captured everyone's input and

---

comments in the document, go ahead and add one through five in front of each of those items.

At the end of the exercise, we should have a number designated by each of you for each line item. We will do a tally to see where that item on the list will fall so that we can have further discussions on the scope item and what the final results are going to be. Is that clear to everyone? Is there something I can help elaborate on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, does that satisfy your individual input or not, [inaudible]?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, still to see how I will use it but I think it's a good way forward. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: So, the only thing that I'm looking at is, in this perspective, when you say you're going to do a tally, does that mean that you will have to review each items and look how many items are ranked three which would be the highest and so on? Okay. So, that means we must be careful, because instinctively, if I think that something is very important I would tend to rank it five which is at the other end of the scope. That's



---

the only thing. We must be conscious that the numbers do not reflect the importance we give to the items versus the highest they are.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

That is correct. The one through five doesn't signify that one is the highest priority and five is the lowest. The numbers just correspond to the box descriptions that we have under exercise two and it's just for ease of reference, just to correlate the boxes and the values to each item that you've [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Is anyone going to have a difficulty with that? I would suggest it's a good way to keep you awake and on task. In fact, I'd like to randomly assign ... No, I won't do that. But you can't just think five is the most or least important. In fact, three would be the number we would perhaps see in far too many places at the end of this exercise. Alright, go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I made a table, importance with relevance for the group, so we have both. I shared with the group in the Google Docs. But because it's more easy to do if I have a one is three, two is – no. The importance of that and the relevancy. We're going to review that or not [inaudible]. So, because just to have this, you don't have the priority and if you have the priority, you don't have the importance.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Vanda. Again, my suggestion would be to categorize based on these values first and then you can prioritize within the categories as a second round of prioritization so you know the relevance of the items and prioritization that way as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, the advantage of doing the second pass to do that, just as Negar [inaudible], you'll then see if all of us, with keenness or enthusiasm - or justifiable, I'm sure - have put so many things into number three, either something has got to give or the job description has to change. So, we'll be able to look at that again in a second pass. With that, any other concerns, comments, or objections? I'm seeing people fill things in. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Cheryl. I have trouble, for example, to answer something. It must not be into the review. We should not analyze individual or constituency performance at the board. If we want to have this included and in a [policy manner], we should have analyze individual or constituency performance. How do we answer this question? Because I don't know. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Maarten.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maybe you should just start and then see how it goes, and after half-an-hour in the process, see whether we are in the right way, on the right track or not. But let's start doing.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Is there anyone who has problems accessing the Google Doc? Okay, we will send a link out via the Adobe chatroom again. Please, log in or click on it and see if it's ... Actually, Jennifer just sent it. It's at the very bottom of the chatroom in the Adobe room. Yes. If you click on the link and scroll down to where you see draft scope topic A and start typing in your numbers in front of each item and see how it goes. I'll continue to monitor the chatroom for any questions that may come up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's time bind this activity, shall we, Pat? What do you think? Should seven to ten minutes do it for them, you reckon?

PAT KANE: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Let's time bind this. We'll give you a three-minute warning seven minutes out from now. Hopefully, most of you will have completed this exercise by then, and if need be, we'll run it through another ten. Brenda, there will be a scary audio silence. People can mentally play music if they're listening to the recording now and we will note in the chat when we come back into audio with a timestamp as well. So, those

---

of us in the room and remote we'll be now allocating numbers with sadly no comments between them. So, we're going to end up with some really, really large numbers at the end. I might go in and put comments between them.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No worries, we'll edit as you guys go through it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In seven minutes' time, we'll see how much more time you might need. Thanks.

Just to let people know what's going on while they're listening to all of this empty air, dead air, in the recording at some later point in time, we have had a couple of technical challenges here with the simplicity of the collaborative workspace. We'll probably add another five minutes or so from now to everyone to catch up. Some people have completed, some are only just beginning. And some of us have just thrown up our hands in horror and just given up. Okay.

Alright. Ladies and gentlemen, I realize that this has taken more time than we had thought in our idealistic time bounding, but we do have some people who are only partially through the document through absolutely no fault of their own. But I am seeing more and more coming towards completion, so we will be giving this another three to five minutes and then we'll start from the top and those who haven't finished will just have to multi-task and catch up.

---

BRENDA BREWER: Michael has rejoined and he's asking for an explanation in chat for the numbers.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Brenda. Michael, I hope you can hear me. What we have done for exercise two, as you can see from the table that was in the document, there are five categories listed in the table for exercise two. Category one, important but not valuable at this time. Category two, important but not feasible at this time, so on and so forth, for categories three through five. Given the large number of items we have listed under each scope item at the top of the document, we assigned numbers one through five to the categories in the table for exercise two and we are asking the review team members to start with the table with scope item A and for each line item, designate one through five, whichever category they think fits that item best from the categories that are listed in exercise two.

After this exercise is done, we will tally up the numbers to see which category number has one out, so to speak, for each scope item that's been discussed and then we will do a second pass prioritization level within each of the scope items that have made it to the list. I hope that makes sense, but if not, please do let me know and I'll try to explain differently.

I have added the numbers, Michael. If you scroll down in the Google Doc to where exercise two table is listed, you will see that there is a number in front of each category for ... There is a number in front of each category in the box. I can hear you, go ahead, please.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I see the numbers. You've told me what one and two stands for. I don't see any explanation for what three, four, and five stand for. Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So, category three is for items that should be reviewed at this time, so it's must-review items. Category four is for unimportant, don't include for review. And category five is too soon to make a conclusion. Wonderful. Thanks, Michael.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Michael, while you're going through, I'm sure that if you're starting from the top, your scores will be coming into the tallying that we'll run through now anyway. If you can possibly scoot through to the best of your ability and try and keep ahead of us in the putting of your scores in for the tally, that would be great. But as we get to each piece, you can also just make your opinion known and we'll add it in as we go, because what we're going to start doing now is also a discussion on each piece. Not a long discussion but a discussion opportunity for each of the pieces as we go through. Most people will probably not have more than three minutes of intervention to make on any particular piece but we will limit you to a maximum of a three-minute intervention on any one piece. And as we discussed before lunch, we will also be allowing people to have a right of reply and a further intervention on any particular issue but it will be with a reduced time to 90 seconds.

I've noticed Liu, you have just joined us. Yes, please do mark in the online document. Try and note that the one, two, three, four, five we're using is not a sliding scale. Please think of it as a bell curve, where number three in fact is the one that indicates your belief that we should be looking at this activity or this issue at this time in the review. Number two indicates that it is important but not feasible for this review team to do. Number one recognizes it's important but you might believe that it is out of scope. Number four recognizes it's important but not to be included in our work. And number five means you're as confused as everyone else and don't know what to do with it at this time.

Again, rather than go through, as I said to Michael, and try and get you to multi-task, feel free to indicate which of these you would like to have tallied as we go through. It looks like Negar simply needs a microphone and she's ready to go. Okay, we're going into silence for a moment.

I'm shocked and horrified. You mean humans do what humans do? We're seeing an awful lot of threes as we suspected. There will be many of these things that everybody thinks is in scope. And that's fine. Being in scope means they're in scope. Next pass, which is what we will be doing once we discuss where these tallies are taking us, the next pass we will do will be to, following on your suggestion, Wolfgang, is to look at them as a priority on the larger pieces.

We did think that it would be most unusual for all the sub-points to be very misaligned with the overall priority, and so we probably can just go through at the first run and see what the tallies are. If the tallying shows that there are some outliers when we look at each of the larger points, it may be that you modify or you decide to modify one of the sub-

---

points. So, it may be that a larger item, the overall item, remains in scope but you remove a sub-point because there's just too great a diversity on opinion on whether or not it's a priority. So, that's just the wonder of the numbers working together.

So, staff are currently running a tally at the moment. Anybody who is on the review team and has not contributed their points into the tally now, just let staff know. You can do that by private chat if you want some anonymity as those of us in the Google Doc had. Everything will be discussed.

Some people will have, perhaps, a desire to be part of the discussion and not part of the tallying because that's kind of like a vote and that's fine, too. So, I'm not going to go through this and I don't suppose anybody else is going to bother to go through this and go, "Oh, good heaven's above, we only have six numbers next to one of these sub-points." If only six of you could put a number next to it, then so be it. If they're all fives, well, we know what that means. If they're all ones, we know what that means. If they're all threes, we know what that means. If they're all over the place, we'll have to discuss it further.

So, with that, a little bit of feedback from the hardworking staff on how the tallying is going, so I know how much longer I need to fill in. A little bit longer they're telling me. I'm almost close to doing a song and dance act now, or at least a song. I could do a cheer if you wanted me to. But remember, what we're going to be doing at this stage is spending around the next 45-50 minutes going through this, hopefully at least twice, looking first of all at what the tallies are telling us and discussing it. That may encourage some of you to change where you think it should

---



---

be in a tally. One or more of you think, no, I think I'm going to change my three to a four. That's okay as well. This is not locked in and never to be ... This is part of a discourse. It's not part of a decision at this point in time.

So, now is your time to influence others and see if your views, if they are different to the rest of the group, may or may not prevail and then we will, based on what ends up with threes and fours or twos – in other words, what we believe needs to be recognized publicly is or is not important to our scope, and explain that, unfortunately, it's important but it's just not feasible for us to do right now and what indeed is in scope and that we are going to focus on we will then be prioritizing. Have I danced long enough? Yay me! Over to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Nicely done, Cheryl. So, yes, we are done tallying up the numbers and I will explain what we've done. If you guys all scroll back into the Google Doc, you will see in front of each line item there is a red arrow with a category picked as the most winning category. If there is one that has equal counts on multiple categories, I have noted it as ... For example, item number two under scope A, three and four have the same number of votes, so I've put both down worth a discussion. The rest of them are clear wins. So, the red number with the arrow before it is the finalized category that everyone – majority – have voted on. And it's now open for discussion amongst the review team.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: A point that Daniel just made here. For me, five means it may still come back to be included, and four is in principle must be coming back. Okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Allow me to go back and read the items one by one. Cheryl, would you like me to go item by item and have discussions after each?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alright.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Very good. I do not doubt that for a second. Under scope A, the line item reads proportion of elected versus nominated members, majority of the review team members has voted that this should be reviewed at this time. Please discuss.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No one in the AC room? No? Okay. Well, that sounds like unanimity. Very good.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Well, the second item is going to require a discussion. The second item is review the regional diversity of the board's decision-making process. Categories three and four had equal number of votes. Category three, should be reviewed at this time, and four says unimportant, do not include in the review. This is obviously a tie, so please go ahead and have a discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At least half of those of you who scored, scored this as important and wanting it to be in scope. The other half of you scored it as unimportant. Now, if we were looking at a 2/3 split, then that would be giving certain information and we'd be having a different type of discussion. Here, ladies and gentlemen, we are looking at a 3/4 split. In other words, important versus not important. So, if you believe it is not important or if you firmly believe it is important, this is the ideal time in discussion for you to bring forth your arguments. I believe, was it Jacques first and then Sebastien?

JACQUES BLAC: I guess we can disclose who has been putting the marks here, but I'd like to understand better what review of the regional diversity of the board's decision-making process means. I fail to understand what a decision-making process diversity is. Can someone explain a bit?

DEMI GETSCHKO: Not to answer, but just to add something. I think we have to decide this more or less together with the other proportions or something like that,

---

because in the election process of each SOs, the process is bottom-up. It's very difficult to make some kind of mandatory decision for some SO to have a member of that region or another region. The bottom-up process will be deliver elected board that is [inaudible] and probably the NomCom has the mission to try to balance this a little bit more. Then it's important to maybe define what we want from the nominated part of the board and what will be the proportion because the election is of course a bottom-up process. We have very few things to do in that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Demi. That didn't really answer your question, Jacques, so we'll come back to it. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. My understanding was – and I didn't write it. It was to see if there is a regional [inaudible] in major decision of ICANN, of board of ICANN of course. The answer will be we decide always. We are all together and there is no [distant voice]. That is not totally true. But I guess if we can find some important decision and see if there is this regional imbalance. But from my memory and my feeling, it's not too much at stake here. Therefore, I was for having that into the review, but it may be not so useful at that moment of the work of ICANN. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Wolfgang, please, go ahead.

---

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: To be frank, I have some problems with the diversity. Diversity is a key issue. On the other hand, the board can't do anything about diversity. It's about the NomCom. It's about the [inaudible] organization, that means the supporting organizations. That means if we have recommendation with regards to diversity, we should send this to the appropriate bodies and not to the board.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I believe that is not our focus here, so it's not completely important. It's important, but not [inaudible] for here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Coming back to you, Jacques, your question hasn't been answered and whoever put this set of words together is obviously not going to fess up about it. I'm going to be very transparent and say reading that I went for because I didn't see where diversity comes into board decision-making processes. How a board caucuses, how a board develops its opinions, the right for any board member to be publicly on the record whether they don't know or abstain and for them to put into the public record statements and speak to a motion and an item seem to be a very transparent method of knowing who says what and how. So, I was in the for camp and I'll declare that.

If it simply said diversity, not diversity of decision-making, then I would definitely be saying it is ... I'd be actually in the two camp. I'd be saying

---

it's important but it's not feasible for us to deal with under this particular line item. That's why I didn't give it a three. I'm not sure that helps you understand the question anymore but that's the rationalization that I used in how I approached it which was four. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think [inaudible] board decision-making is that all the board members in the room are heard, no matter from which region they come and we are not the ones who determine who is in the room. It's the empowered community in a way. So, from that perspective, I can see the point that Cheryl is making.

What we do see in the board is that sometimes it's really looking for regional perspectives and we sometimes really reach out for that because diversity reflected in decision-making is not only by having diverse people in the room but also having an understanding of the fact that there is diversity and how that works. So, that's my ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So, in this case, the question would read review of the regional diversity importance in the board decision-making process. Then I could understand it. We could imagine if all the board members were from one region. I mean, then they could have decisions influenced by what the region wants. So, I could understand that, but [inaudible] was written, that's why I went to a four.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, Negar, I'm going to suggest when we get into this type of – and I'm glad we've done it earlier in our exercise – discussion, some of us may now be thinking about our tally score. So, I'd like to offer anyone the opportunity to change their record from a three to four, from a four to a three. You can put a five or a one in there, it doesn't matter. But let's now see whether this, as a 50/50 split, stays as in scope or goes to unimportant – remember, what it's saying. Unimportant. That's a big call, that word. Unimportant and not to be included. Or, in scope or something else. So, how do you want to deal with this, ladies and gentlemen? Do you want to deal with this live now or do you want to take that on the next run through? Jacques you've got your ... No? Okay. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Just [the vote is what it is], whatever the word, you have two people who have put another answer. Therefore, there is no really majority for three over four. Therefore, I think the majority is not to include that in the review, whatever the decision – whatever is [inaudible], two or four. We need at least to take that into account in our decision. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. So, in that case, I'll make it even easier and rather than have any form of retallying, does anyone have an objection then to us making a call to have this based on two twos, I think it is – two twos and the same number of fours and threes, where four would say unimportant and therefore not in scope, twos would say it's important

---

but not feasible, and if we were to add those together, yes, obviously there is a weight in one direction. Is there anyone who objects strongly and wishes to speak to try and convince us otherwise to keep this in scope? This is an opportunity to keep it in scope. Otherwise, we will be saying it is not in scope. Am I clear? Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

I was looking at the analysis of this result and trying to review. If you look two, there are two twos, which stands for important but not feasible at this time. Then, three should be reviews at this time. So, if I'm trying to put it on a chart, try to see the strength that outweighs the decision-making of the members who are current right now. I think that would be one of the key issues that could be pushed to a later review point based on the feedback. But if we follow the discussions regarding to this, it probably could be helpful. So, are we looking at the feedback based on the tally sheets or are we going to look at the discussions that are coming in? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

My personal reaction is that the reason we're having discussions is to offer the opportunity for fresh thinking and influencing of others. That is kind of what discussion and discourse is meant to do in these circumstances. There are other reasons for taking up air time but hopefully that's not going to be happening around this table. So, yes, your analysis is absolutely correct.

We should also note that it is not unreasonable or impossible, albeit it may be unlikely, for us to bring something back in that at this point we



---

have not got through. So, nothing is culled and killed but we will certainly cull. What we're looking for is a cull list at this point but we won't actually be slaughtering it and never seeing it again. If you want to make a strong case later, you may very well be able to do so.

So, at the moment, what is on the table at this point is not included. Now, why am I laboring this? Why am I saying this is as important as I think it is? Because we may find there are sub-points here that do stay in scope. And some points which are not, by the look of it, going to be in scope.

So, what we will have under our draft objective is a smaller list of sub-points. We're still going to go ahead with the objective as being in scope, but the specifics we're going to be looking at within that objective is going to be narrower. Anyone want to argue to keep it in scope? Going once, going twice, going thrice. Culled.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Very good. Thank you, Cheryl. So, the rest of the items that we have for all of the scope items are a clear selection for the tally. There is no equal counts on different categories. Would you like me to go through and just cull them and tell you what they are? Perfect.

Next item on the list is effectiveness of the board performance, category three. ATRT 2 need for metrics has been selected as category three. Does the board have the ability to balance community oversight and Org fiscal oversight or should we consider two boards? It has become a category three. Jacques, is that a raised hand? Oh, okay. Go ahead, Pat.

---

PAT KANE: I think there's enough all over the board on [inaudible]. We've got some fives and some twos. Even though there's a lot of threes in there, there is a big spread. So, maybe if anybody would like to have conversation on that one, we should throw that one out for discussion.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I'm sorry, I didn't quite understand that. Do you mean that you want us to skip the threes and go over the ones that have a different category instead?

PAT KANE: No, I'm saying that even though there's a lot of threes, there's bookends there. So, there are some twos that are saying five is too soon, two is important but not feasible. So, maybe that warrants a discussion because there is such a big spread.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Fair enough, Pat. That's a really fair point. And with that, actually, let's go back to the previous item as well. By that, I'm referring to the third bullet point under scope A because it has a lot of twos and fours as well. Effectiveness of board performance. Clearly, the majority of the numbers tallied up to three but there are a number of twos and one four. I'm opening it up for discussion for the people that specifically said this is important but not feasible at this time.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just a general point. If we're belaboring every point, I know we're now getting in [inaudible], but we'll never get there. I think if there's a lot of threes, it means it should be a scope even if some thinks it's not. That's why we can move quicker through this exercise.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And putting in an opinion there, not acting as cochair. Just to I think be a support to what you've just said, looking at this particular number spread, there is a goodly number of important but is it feasible, important and we need to do it. Clustering those together still gives it strength to do, right? And the number five which is unsure whether we can [inaudible] this time, again the biasing, if I was looking at the bias here, is towards keeping it in scope.

DEMI GETSCHKO: [inaudible] makes sense.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. But a two, three discussion is leaning towards leaving something in scope. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: One thing is that if we were to look at coming up with solid metrics of the results that we are given, I think there is a [inaudible] somewhere. Looking at number three, number three, I would take number three as a one. Number two, it is important but not feasible at this time, I'll take it

---

as a [inaudible]. So, where the feedback is three and two, it puts a very strong [path] to lean on two to be included into the review.

But, for the issue of number five, I think let us put that list whereby we can always go back to it and see whether it matches any of the points that were given for reviews where it matches. We can always include it in with a remark. I think that makes it much better. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Daniel. I certainly don't disagree with anything you just said, and in fact remembering we can always come back to anything. Maybe what we might do is anything that we find has a preponderance of five – at the moment, we just have the odd little five poking around. But if we find a preponderance of fives, we might pick a color – puce will do, I don't care. A color and highlight it so we know, if we do revisit, that is one that we need to keep pinned to the corner, a little sticky note on the corner of your screen that we have to come back to that one.

So, it would appear to me that this point is in scope and we can hand it back to you to move on.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Next item, does the board have the ability to balance community oversight and/or fiscal responsibility oversight? The number of twos and threes were off by just one. There is one vote for four and one vote for five. Given that the proximity of the tally count, it might bear some discussion.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Does anyone object to us treating that in the same way as we just did the last one?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You object? Please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. You're agreeing with it, not objecting to it. Okay. Phew. You're allowed to object, Vanda, but you're going to have to tell us why. Vanda, never let it be said that you jump too early. You'll always be perfectly timed, my dear. Okay, so that looks like it goes [inaudible]. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Next item is should diversity be a board interview topic? Majority three.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [off mic].

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Next item is do we need to add skill set diversity to the ... Oh.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible] as I am currently in the NomCom process. I know it's part of the interview already. So, I don't know whether we need to discuss it then if it's part of the interview already.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten, there is a difference of course between people who have gone through either as a NomComer and someone who is a NomComee as to what knowledge they have. A lot of people assume what goes on in a NomCom as opposed to know what goes on in a NomCom interview process. So, thank you for sharing from your experience, but it's clearly saying it should be in scope. So, how do we come to terms with all of us thinking it should be in scope and you sharing with us that it's a question that's already raised?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just from my perspective, one of the things we said was really let's also reality check of what's going on or not and inform the group about that which may be grounds to review the vote on that. By no means am I against diversity. I'm just adding a point of practice.

PAT KANE: So, I wrote that sticky. My intention was that we had just talked about interviewing – us, as a team, interviewing the board – and that really

---

was intended to be interviewing the board about how they felt about diversity. That was the intent of that sticky.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah-ha! Ladies and gentlemen, this is why we need to be clear when we articulate and not ambiguous when we write things down. To that end, can I just say, Pat, if I had read it that way, my four would not have been a four because knowing how a NomCom works, I went, “Nope.”

PAT KANE: I apologize.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, based on that discussion and Pat’s very particular clarification, I certainly would be changing my four to a three and I don’t know whether anyone else wants to declare any shift in opinion. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: I mean, with what Pat just said, it’s now clear that if we consider that we will have to interview the board on diversity, but on the other hand diversity is not a subject for board decision, then we will certainly have to tune our questions right.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have a comment. If we start to have a discussion of the topic, agree or disagree, I have plenty of things to say about two previous topics. But I refrain to say something here because I think if it’s included in the

---

review, we will have plenty of time to discuss it. May I suggest that we try not to use [that's a good] topic because it seems that for the previous speaker, it was not a good topic or it was not a good intervention. I [find trouble with that]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sebastien. Regardless of that, all we have in terms of our tallying is an indication that most people wanted it to be in scope. We now have a clarification that makes at least one person – myself – take it from unimportant and not in scope back to being in scope. So, all we're doing is strengthening the argument to keep it in scope. So, unless I'm crazy, which is absolutely possible, we are just keeping this in scope and making sure that we have, as Jacques has said, carefully articulated and properly prepared questions which are absolutely clear and unambiguous. Can't be confused or confusing. Not even me. Okay. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Next question. Do we need to add skill set diversity to the board selection? Unanimous three, so I think we'll just move past this.

Next item is voice of ICANN. Majority almost all of it are fours. And that is the category of unimportant, don't include in the review.

Moving down to next item. Go ahead, please.



---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to be sure that you understand what was at stake here, today we don't have anymore voice of ICANN. With the new CEO, the voice of ICANN disappeared. With the new CEO – no bylaws. With the new CEO, the voice of ICANN disappeared. We have the voice of ICANN Org and it's not the same thing as the voice of ICANN. And I consider personally that it's a very important topic of this organization. Who must be the one to talk on behalf of the world organization, not what they call ICANN Org? It was a discussion when I a member of the board to say that it could be a good idea that it's become the chair to do that because he is the one elected and not the one selected. Of course, the US company or the US organization, they [inaudible] CEO. But now we don't have enough – even we don't have the CEO doing that because when he talks, he is not talking on behalf of ICANN, he is talking on behalf of ICANN Org. Think about that and maybe one day – you don't need to change your mind today, but one day you will consider that it could be a good topic to discuss in this review team. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Let me see if I understand you, Sebastien. You are saying that ICANN is not, no one around the world. So, used to be more talking with the governments and talking in the international sessions and this is what the voice is recognizing or ... Because, for me, there is different interpretations on that. One is the voice of the community and think about the voice of the community to be discussed in this review, there

---

is another point that where we consider this more important or not. If it's the voice of ICANN Organization as a whole, I do agree. I did understand that. I understood that was the voice of community and there is other points where it's more clear, the issue to discuss. So, I need some explanation to really understand which two points are on the stake here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, did you want to try and answer Vanda's question more or leave it to later as you suggested?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I suggest that we leave that aside? Because it's not the purpose of this exercise now. I just wanted to raise the issue that it may be more concern that it was a result of the tally but [inaudible] participation of the board [inaudible]. But I don't think we need to discuss that now anymore. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Well, will it help you to clarify that if there is a position ICANN needs to take in the world, it's always discussed with the board first and if the board feels [unsecure] about it, they'll discuss it with SOs/ACs first. If it's about implementation and having an active voice in the world, we are called upon that and we need to answer that. I think the CEO in

---

interaction with the board may be the best option we have to act rapidly and respond actively in this world where a lot is moving fast.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten. Wolfgang?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I agree with Sebastien. We should not discuss this further in detail. But I think it's part of a bigger problem how far ICANN should become involved in issues which are outside of the very narrow defined mandate of ICANN. Do we move to one extreme and [inaudible] what we had a strong voice in the world? And the question is now whether ICANN should, first of all, bring its own house in order or, on the other hand, if there are some issues which are relevant for ICANN, then ICANN certainly has to raise its voice. But to anything which is taking place in the broader world and then we should not forget it's the CEO and President. It's not only the CEO, it's also the President. So, he has two titles and I would agree with Maarten that the CEO and President is the first option to tell the rest of the world what ICANN thinks about an issue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Wolfgang. Anyone else want to make an intervention on this? At the moment, it is sitting as not making our scope, but obviously could be brought back later. Back to you, Negar.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. Next item on the list is diversity. The majority of the votes are four, meaning it's unimportant. I want to draw your attention to the previous two diversity related items that we have because now there is a conflict and discrepancy.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. When you see what we were discussing this, in the previous, say that diversity is totally unimportant is some saying that I believe we should take out this, not because it's unimportant but because it's too much. The other issues in the same contest, it's more clear for vote and that we already agreed to put the vote. So, I will just eliminate that just because the others is more clear in addressing the same issue. Because if you put against this and keep [inaudible], it's a known thing in some way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Wolfgang, is that a new card? No? Okay. Negar, back to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I just want to address Vanda's comment in that we need to keep in mind these items that are listed here are pertaining to the scope item and the scope item is talking about assisting the board selection process, evaluating board's composition and allocation of the [inaudible] and the future needs, mechanisms for board decisions, etc. So, diversity falls in that category not as a generic diversity, which is why

---

now there's a discrepancy. I'm okay with obviously eliminating this but it's up to the review team on how to move forward on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: Would it be possible eventually to have more precision about it? Because I agree with Negar here. I don't feel ... I put a three. I'm a three, [inaudible]. I put a three and I don't see how we can eliminate diversity as a whole from the scope. At the same time, I don't see how we can include it. As a whole, it's too vast. It's too big. What are we to discuss here? So, either we feel that it has been treated in the previous items and I'm okay with that, or maybe there's some revisions to be made here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jacques. I think what I'm hearing is that whilst the all-encompassing topic that would be underneath a single word, diversity, would be a little bit like trying to boil the ocean and therefore may have given the score four from as many people as it did. There are aspects of diversity specific to the overall draft objective which is, let me remind you, to look specifically at how we can improve board governance, how we can assess board selection process, and looking at evaluating to what extent the board's composition and allocation meets ICANN's present and future needs, also in any appeals mechanism. And bound by those particular terms, I think that's where diversity did get in as

---

scoped but as a just uber term – so, it's not that we're not doing diversity. We're doing diversity in the specific confines of those overall objectives. Is that in everybody's comfort zone? Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think diversity is a very wide scope for this moment. It will take us more time to be able to pick out what exactly we need in diversity. So, for the moment, I suggest that probably let's [inaudible]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Daniel. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much. Maybe you don't know but now you will know it's [the heart] of my question within ICANN. What is diversity and how we can enhance it? May I suggest that during one – not during this face-to-face meeting because I have some additional work to do, but during the next face-to-face meeting, I give you a presentation of what is the history of diversity into the board of ICANN and come with some figures, that you will be able to make your own point of view. If you allow me, I will give you my point of view, but the goal will be to give you the basic – not so basic, but some information about diversity historically for the board of ICANN. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. Unsurprisingly and publicly, ratifiably a longstanding worker in the matters of inclusion and diversity in a

---

number of areas, including the [inaudible] and Internet industry, so I'm certainly supportive of all things diverse and inclusive but I do personally believe that we have got it scoped in and scoped in sufficiently bound by those specific points in our overall objective. I would also recommend, Sebastien, then of course, in addition to your generous offer which we'll probably discuss at one of our future planning meetings for one of the weekly meetings, but regardless of that, it would be wise for everybody – I think you would probably agree – to read the recommendations out of workstream two on the matters of diversity. Workstream two did make recommendations regarding diversity, and Sebastien amongst others were instrumental in that output. And one of the things I think Sebastien was referring to in terms of the study, I know he's been highly contributive and supportive of also was discussed during that process. So, it's in, unless anybody ... Sorry, it's already covered by what is already in, so we will just literally delete that – not because we don't care about it, but because we think we've got it covered anyway. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Next item is election process. Majority threes. Very simple.

Next item is how is the whole community feeling about board governance? Majority two, not feasible at this time.

Next item is NomCom review must be analyzed to see if there are any points to add. Unanimously, it's a four, to be eliminated.

---

Going down the list, are the board appeal mechanisms adequate for the needs of the community? Majority three.

Next line item. Analyze skill set needs and impact on board decisions. Majority two.

Do I need to pause here for any discussions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there someone online trying to ... Okay, no.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just, one of the recommendations from ATRT 2 I think was the board to consider this and we are working on [inaudible] skills [need] program to match that against what we foresee to be needed. In that, we looked to our experience, but also for instance, a strategic plan to see which [inaudible] we need to have covered. So, I can imagine that two is pretty appropriate. There is [something] happening and, [yes], it deserves attention, [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten, and thank you for sharing that. That is important information, and of course the other thing is the Nominating Committee review process and where it is up to at the moment has reaffirmed the desirability of good interaction between any given sitting board and their ability to advise any given Nominating Committee on what they believe is a gap analysis regarding skill set as well. So, there's a bit of a [pincer] approach on this topic. So, it seems that two is perfectly



---

reasonable if someone were to argue otherwise now. Negar, back to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Moving down to the next item and the last item under scope A, providing multi-language version of the board's decisions. For example, the board's resolution and minutes and assuring translation qualities are adequate. Majority are threes and three votes for five. So, I would imagine there are no discussion points here. This will pass through for now. Okay. Any questions on scope item A before we move on to the next ... Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. You probably didn't think you'd have a question from me on this. I just wanted to make it clear, for the listening public and for anyone else even in this room or the AC room, the reason that we're not going to go through the other column which was overwhelmingly suggested – there's a bunch of threes here. The other column under each of these was what should not be in scope for the review in this area and anything worth noting. And at the moment under A, it's not that people are seeing that these things should go back in scope. What this information is saying is it should be noted. So, I think we might just need to annotate that so we know what's going on. That was what I wanted to say.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Very good, Cheryl. Thank you. There are no comments in the room as well, so let's proceed with scope item B. The scope item says assessing the role and effectiveness of GAC's interactions with the board and with the broader ICANN community and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS. Wow, that's a mouthful.

Alright. Moving on with the next item here listed, unanimous three. What are the communication tools? Evaluate their effectiveness.

Next item on the list, also unanimous three. Evaluate GAC decision process transparency.

The third item on the list is how does GAC reach consensus, influences communication to the board? Majority three with a couple of twos in there.

Next item on the list, improvement. Should GAC be able to advise other communities, bodies, beyond the board and expect responses, quicken decisions process with respect to stakeholders? Majority two with two people having voted three on this. Any discussions, any concerns?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I can just give a little bit of factual information here. In the board-GAC communication, we talk a lot about, "So, who are you advising here?" and if you're [inaudible] for GNSO, do you need to tell us?

One of the things that happens there is, according to the bylaws, we're the only body in ICANN that needs to respond or take into account the

---

GAC advise. Therefore, the GAC is inclined to give us the advice even if it's not for us. So, that's not always very effective and we're seeking more effective ways [for that]. That's where we are at this moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten. I'm not sure that would change anyone's opinion to say that it is implement but not really feasible for us to pop in scope at this time. I think it's actually underlining the fact that stuff is happening with it and we recognize it as important.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [off mic].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Next item on the list, board-GAC communication tools. Sorry, someone's pointer is on the line and I can't read it. Are they adopted, sufficient, publicized for transparency? Majority threes.

Evaluate the interaction between GAC and the board, such as reply from the board on two-character country code open for second domain name registration and other issues such as jurisdiction in the GAC communicate? Majority twos. Any comments on this? Any discussion points?

---

Okay. Moving on to the next item, analyze and recommend if regional and political interference from GAC impacts board decisions. Majority three with actually a handful of twos.

Moving on to the next, is GAC focusing in its recommendations to the board the broad interests of the worldwide Internet community? Majority fours. Everyone okay with eliminating this item? Very good.

Examine the board-GAC communication process through GDPR issues. For example, see EPDP issues. Majority fours. Any concerns or comments? Alright.

The last item is including other ACs under this scope category.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And we should note that, at this stage, that looks like it's in the parking area. Overwhelmingly, with the exception of one who says it's in scope, it's not really in a position to make a decision at this time. So, whatever pretty color we make it, this is one of those.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Surprisingly enough, you're done with bucket B. Moving down to bucket C of scope. No, I like the excitement. Let's keep it moving.

Alright. Scope item reads: assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input. First item on the list is assessing and recommending improvements to ICANN's access to information, the [DP] process, and open data systems, along with other mechanisms

---

designed to promote transparency or deliver information to the public.  
Majority three.

Moving on to the next item, what transparency mechanisms and checks and balances need to be put in place so that ICANN can achieve its mission while remaining accountable to the community? Unanimous three, no comments here.

Next line item. What is the process to prioritize bundle, fund, or retire recommendations and what is the feasibility into how those decisions are made? Unanimous three.

Next item is how does the decision to be an ITU-D member support the five-year plan? How is this decision made? Majority four. So, please, discuss.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Or not.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Or not. I like the “or not” part. We’ll just cross it out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Consensus by exhaustion is [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That’s why you make the meetings face-to-face long, so that ... Go ahead, Pat.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's always one. Go ahead, Pat.

PAT KANE: So, I didn't think about this four, but when I read this, this really two separate questions. How does the decision to be an ITU-D member support the five-year plan? And, how is the decision made? I don't think it was transparent as to how the decision actually was made and what the reasoning behind that was. So, is this two, separate? Because I think that, for the first question, I would keep with the four. But when I think about the second question, I'm delving into is this a long line of items like DPAs, conversations on GDPR with European data protection authorities? Is this really a transparency issue to the point almost where Sebastien was talking that we lost ICANN's voice because the voice has become the CEO and president?

So, I think that I would split that into two and maybe have the second be a three and the first one be a four. Does anybody ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda and then Maarten.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I do agree because I have the same [inaudible] about that because if it's something that if used to go to the ITU and debate something and [inaudible], I believe we should recognize in some way that kind of

---

voice, because it's something that may impact our community. So, I agree with your point to divide this and put in three, the second.

JACQUES BLANC:

So, in this case, we should, before saying anything to Maarten, the way I see it, we formulate the question because how was this economic made seems non-relevant because we just eliminated a question about which [decision was].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yeah. One element that [inaudible] strategic plan. Strategic plan has been developed in interaction with the community based on input from the community, has been fed back to the community. The board has been taking a leadership role there and formulating that, etc. And one of the elements is in that. Yes, we cannot do this alone. We need to work with other parties to be able to [inaudible]. So, that was happening on one side. So, I think in that way, we have been interacting with ITU-D for quite a while, actually. Only [inaudible] behind the flag of ISOC or a country or whatever. And what the staff on the ground [inaudible] to implement this interaction says it might make more sense if we have our own flag and some pushback in the community that has been discussed at the board is some people thinks that means we [give] ITU legitimacy.

---

Other countries think ITU already has legitimacy and what we think doesn't matter. Being at the table, we felt also gives us the opportunity to say what we like and we don't like. Being not at the table is a nice statement, but after that, you're not at the table. That was the thinking there. This has been discussed with us, but ultimately it's been a practical issue rather than a strategic issue. A strategic issue that makes it [to] strategic plan is we cannot do this alone and how it's been implemented has been acted out in this way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. The world is changing. We used to have ... Thank you. We used to have ITU member of the board each every three years. Now ICANN is member of one subdivision of ITU. Is it the way you want to have the discussion, we can have, but don't say it's because we need a flag. I remember discussion directly between the CEO of ICANN and the CEO of ITU going on and having a good result. Therefore, I don't take the argument and I think the way the decision was taken, it's a very important topic for the transparency of ICANN in general. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wolfgang?



---

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: It's not really at the place now to discuss the relationship between ICANN and ITU. But if it's [inaudible], I just want to make the point that the war we had ten years ago between ITU and ICANN was counter-productive for all sides. And in particular, if you look into Africa, so government first choice is always ITU because there they have a vote and I remember when [Amatu Toray] came to Egypt, to Cairo, and said, "Why are you all [inaudible] to the governments? Why are you [sitting] there? They have only an advisory role. Come to the ITU. There, you'll have a vote, not only a voice." This is a big step forward. For many, many years you could not mention even the acronym ICANN in ITU discussions and now, just six weeks ago on the—[audio cuts abruptly]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: One and all, there is activity.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Just one sentence. Because this was nearly unnoticed. For the first time, an ITU body has sent ICANN for the support in the ITU Council working group. This is a big piece between ICANN and ITU. It's a very good thing for all [sides]. And ITU-D is a very clever move. It's better than ITU-T.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. There is some cleverness. Vanda, you want to speak?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. We can consider this done.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Your card is up? Your card is not up? Okay. Maarten, back to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Also, just one step back from what we're talking about here. My interventions here are not meant to take anything off the table or on the table. I'm just asking, trying to bring [fact] or developments that you may not be aware of. That's one.

The second thing is the question wasn't really clear to me. Maybe that's clear as well. So, if there's a clear question, let's consider it. And it's not about the yes or no ITU decision here. That's very clear.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten. Before I go back to Negar, let me see if I have heard correctly. What I believe I've heard is that the matter of hand is if we were to split the question, a very perhaps or slightly different response to if we leave it as she's writ, that there doesn't seem to be a rationale for in-scope on the specificity of the decision regarding ITU-D. I think it's been a useful and interesting conversation and we all have a greater understanding, but what there may be, based on the [inaudible] suggested by Pat is a newly formulated question – and I think this is something we might need to consider as a sidebar conversation now – as to whether or not the matter of transparency in general of board decisions is satisfying the needs and expectations of the ICANN community. And that may be a different result. Have I paraphrased the thinking around the table correctly? Pat, you want to jump in there?

PAT KANE: I believe that you have, Cheryl. Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, with that, if we were to pose a question yet to be formulated, but a subpoint under here, which looks at the clarity, consistency, and trust in the transparency of ICANN board decision-making or some such set of words, that that would be in scope. It seems to be, for example, a question, Wolfgang, that we might ask in a survey or interact with community on.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, that's a good one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm hoping, then, Vanda and Wolfgang and anyone else looking around, that you might put some words together in that and we'll come back perhaps at the end of the exercise today and see whether or not that new set of words can get some scope. Back to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. The question is not just the board because here the answer will be it's a decision of staff. Therefore, it's also how the decisions are taken, the transparency. We may not just put the board as the one who decides on such decisions. Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Sebastien. Leaving that question under this particular scope objective would therefore fit. We wouldn't need to move such a question I think to A. We can leave it in D, because D of course is referring just to ICANN, ICANN's decision-making, to what extent ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community. So, by leaving such a yet-to-be-worded subpoint in here, that would satisfy your concerns? Excellent. Let's move on, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay, thank you. Next item on the list is the DIDP process must be linked with the work on workstream two. Majority is four. Any concerns or comments?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just one comment. I guess it's the same thing that when Cheryl was talking about we need to know what was happening in the workstream two about the item of diversity, I think it's important for us to know what was happening in the workstream two regarding the DIDP. That's it. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I have my hand up.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Go ahead, please.

---

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Sorry to butt in. I actually had it up on the previous point on something that relates to this one as well. So, just on the previous point, I would also mention that as part of the workstream two transparency subgroup, we had a specific set of recommendations on transparency for deliberations. So, there are a package of recommendations on that issue specifically.

Now, that does not mean that we should not also be looking at [inaudible] deliberations. To reiterate what I said previously, the fact that it's been examined in a previous process does not limit us and I don't think we need to be wedded to that. But just to bring it back to this specific subpoint on linking it to workstream two, I think it's a little bit odd because I'm not sure that that intervention was intended to be a separate area of inquiry. In fact, based on Sebastien's descriptions, I feel confident that it was meant to be a specific area of inquiry but more a consideration.

So, I think that on the DIDP issue as well as potentially on the board transparency issue as well as on diversity issues, stuff that was addressed on previous processes, obviously in my opinion, we would be a little bit silly to be kind of blind to the fact that these processes happened and have examined these issues. And obviously we should be informing our work based on research and recommendations that have been done previously and it would be a little bit silly for us to pretend that this stuff didn't happen.

So, from my perspective at least, I would say that intervention, while not an individual area of inquiry, is probably something that should be well-taken as we consider our current process of recommendations

---

which is in some ways building on processes that have been done previously. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Michael. Can I ask, because I guess this is something that I was a tad confused about – not that that’s unusual, I’m kind of a steady state something – I wondered why this particular subpoint on DIDP and perhaps you can help me here, was sitting under the draft scope topic C instead of the draft scope topic D. But that just might be my lack of understanding. I would have thought that the support of the Internet community, etc., probably would have teased this out rather than public input. Happy for you to educate me later, but I guess that was why I certainly polled it as I did. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just to confirm, you’re keeping this item marked as four, and therefore not included in the scope. Okay.

Moving onto the next item on the list, who decides what must or could be put in a public comment process? ICANN reference to governments in Internet governance is how I read this. Majority are three with a few number of fives. Any comments or questions on this? Okay.

This wraps up bucket C. Going back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: People, we are on a roll. I’m not overly fearful that we won’t be able to complete D relatively promptly. It’s not the shortest section but I want

---

to ask you: do you now want to have your coffee break and then come back and do D and E before we move on to exercise three rather than power on? I personally think you will benefit from standing up and walking around, clearing your heads, re-caffeinating and hydrating and then getting into the next two sections. There are an awful lot of threes in there but it might be a good idea to take our break on time. So, with that, you're going to get three more minutes on your break. Wow. See what happens when we all work collaboratively together? We will be coming back at 45 minutes past the hour. Ladies and gentlemen, that means we will be starting at 45 minutes past the hour. Thank you one and all and we'll be starting with D.

Ladies and gentlemen, for those of you in the room, we will be beginning. Tasks, tasks, and more tasks. They will learn, just like everyone else.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are back at 15 seconds or so after we said we would be. Apologies. Pat and I will only do better, we promise. To that end, we're going to be starting back ... Do I look like I care, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [off mic].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you start the recording or not? I have started, in fact. I have already started. Thank you, Brenda. Brenda now has the recording going, so all is well in the world. It's already going. Thank you, Jaap, I appreciate you

---

double checking that for us. Fear not. Everything I said was recorded and of course it should be. Right.

We are back to continue with our draft scope on section D and just while Negar gets herself settled, the objective, the draft text for this objective, is that we are assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community. With that, we have a reference here that this needs to be consistent with ICANN's missions and bylaws. This would be section 4.6B to D. It states, "The review team will assess the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported by the Internet community in that bylaw section." So, overall, this is kind of a non-negotiable, but as we refine it, let's look at the subpoints to see what does or doesn't stay in scope. With that, Negar, back to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. You read out the scope items, so I will bypass that. Moving to item number one, evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. Majority have said two. There were quite a few three categories. Any concerns with not considering this element for this review?

PAT KANE:

While specifically here it's not the actual evolution of a multi-stakeholder model, because I think that's really being covered by the exercise that Brian Cote is chairing and running with, this the transparency mechanisms around that process. So, the two examples that we threw out earlier that I'll just throw out again are taking a look at the statement of work that Mr. Cote has with ICANN and what the



---

deliverables are I think are important to understand where we're driving towards with that exercise. So, the transparency of those types of items and not specifically what Brian is working on. I think there's a fairly bright line between the two and I think they're complementary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just again, for your information, not leading either way, the [inaudible] exercises is a clear point. The fact that we need to work on it was clearly recognized by the community in the five-year plan and I think the work we do will be an important contribution to that. That's why I see interaction. At the same time, yes, it's underway, so these are two things to consider whether it's in scope or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, what I've heard so far is a great deal of complementarity, the fact that we see it as important. We're marking it in terms of not feasible because not feasible for us because if it was going to be part of our feasibility work, it would perhaps be duplicative and we want to be aware of that complementary with the other work. Have I got that correct? Okay. Next.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Next item. Evolution of the global unique set of identifiers. What has been the impetus to and from the community to dig deeper on

---

blockchain alternate roots and DOA? Majority has said two on this. And we had a comment here, a question asking: does this create a revenue system and is that something worth looking into? Any concerns or questions with a category that identifies this as important but not feasible to consider at this time?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sorry. Here I think the issue is, so how did we get to the strategic plan? That has been following a very clearly transparency process in Internet. I'm not sure the point itself is subject for discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, moving on to the next point. Expansion or role in addressing security and stability. This has been marked as three for majority of the votes. Leaving it open for discussion as there were three members that have voted four, calling it unimportant. I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that, of course we have a security, stability, and resiliency review of the domain name system, that review doesn't look into expanding the role of ICANN in that area but there might be some correlations. So, leaving it open to discussion.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I believe I can understand this in two ways and may need more explanation because extending the role in [inaudible] security, stability

---

is one thing. Expanding the role of stability means that, in my opinion, it means that should it expand from the mission of security. But what I can read here is in addressing the need of stability and security, and the need of that, expanding this, I believe is very important to be addressed. But if there's other interpretation that I cannot get, I don't know if it's relevant or not for us. I would like to have a more clear explanation if the addressing security, stability is only for have the mission that we already have or is addressing to the others ... So, I don't know. I would like to have this more clear, please.

PAT KANE:

I think this is not about trying to change the mission of ICANN because the security and stability of the DNS is one of the key missions of ICANN. The question here is how should ICANN expand ICANN board, and [inaudible] ICANN board approving of ICANN Org expanding their mission to become more operational and take on a stronger role in being operational towards addressing security and stability or should it continue to be more of a monitoring organization of what contracted parties do within the space and do their job? So, I think that's the question that I read into this – not necessarily do we change the mission, because the mission is very clear. So ...

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, at this stage, it is in scope and nobody has persuaded us to shift that. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Next item is addressing the increased global regulation on privacy and content. How will the global engagement of governments on this topic as a source of information dovetail with ICANN's announcement to no longer lobby? Majority three. Any comments or concerns?

Next item is what role should the community play with conversations with governments? Are staff resources leveraged for the benefit of ICANN Org as well as the community? Unanimous three.

Moving down to the next item. Long-term financial stability. How will the demand for more changes and increased services balance with ICANN's projections for flat revenues over the next few years? How will competing recommendations from review teams and other working groups be prioritized given a flat budget? Almost a unanimous three. Any comments or questions here?

Moving on to the next item. Examine the work of At-Large and its role in representing the interests of Internet end users. Efficacy or processes connected to the representing of the interest of end users and potential areas of improvement in this task would fall squarely within scope item D and would be a beneficial area of examination. Majority three. Go ahead, Cheryl.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I was rather expecting one of my other compatriots from the At-Large Advisory Committee appointments to raise their hands on this but in the absence of that, I'm taking off my co-chair hat and I'm going to just raise a point of clarification, perhaps.

I think it is important as we are keeping this in scope, and it appears that we are definitely keeping this in scope, that we are not duplicative of the recent organizational review. This is not an organizational review exercise. This is a specific review with the particular limitations of looking at the role of At-Large and I only would assume from that the At-Large Advisory Committee in how it works within having ICANN's decisions supported by the Internet community. So, just so we're painfully clear on that. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. Moving down to the next item on the list. Providing multi-language version of ICANN's important documents such as the bylaws. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My hand was not up. I was thinking that there will be some discussion after what you say. My conclusion after what Cheryl says rightly is it's out of scope. Therefore, we need to cancel it and not to have it supported by three. Maybe I didn't understand.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Michael has his hand raised.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say I saw Michael typing and now his hand up. Speak Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks. Yeah. I was just typing in response to your intervention. I think I'm the one who – I know I'm the one who – originally inserted that as no. That point is an area of examination. Speaking for myself, I would say that Cheryl's point [inaudible] the scope and parameters of the examination is well taken from my own perspective. I think it should be kept in there. I wouldn't go back to the result that we have. But I do think that the clarification that Cheryl offered, for my own perspective, would be well taken in terms of how to [inaudible] the scope of the examination. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Michael. Cheryl for the record, and still speaking as one of the appointees from the ALAC, not having caucus with any of my other appointees from the ALAC. I am more than happy for it to stay in scope. I just wanted to make sure that we were clear what the [inaudible] fences were and how electrified they need to be. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Now moving on ... Or?

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am sorry. Maybe it's because it's late but I didn't understand at all what the two last speakers wanted to say. It is, it is not, it may be. If I can have some explanation ... Sorry. Understandable English at this time of the day for me, it would be great. Thank you. Sorry for that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien, and perhaps I can ask one of the other French speakers who think they understand what we're talking about to help you because I do understand with travel and time zones it can be a challenge for many of us, even an Australian has an issue with English at times.

The point was here that the numbers are saying it should be in scope. However, at least three people indicated that they didn't think it should be in scope, based on how we did things for other issues, if it should be left in. But I pointed out a particular matter which Michael understood and he raised this point that was this is not a re-litigation of the organizational review. It was a look at the work of At-Large in the context of this particular exercise about how the Internet community supports or does not support ICANN's decisions. And if someone can take my appalling English and put it into something very briefly – perhaps, Jacques, you could help me.

JACQUES BLANC: Just from what I understand, let's keep it in scope but let's define the scope very precisely.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Even in English that makes sense to me. Thank you so much. Any other points on it? Can we agree to agree that we've agreed to agree to keep it in scope? Great. Next, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. Now finally moving to the next item. Providing multi-language version of ICANN's important documents such as the bylaws. There is not any other language except for English. Majority has categorized it as two. Any concerns with moving this out? Okay.

Moving on to the next item. Making sure the documents with different versions of language with the same content – for example, it happened that documents were different within two different languages in IANA transition process. So, I guess this is just making sure that when translated the content remains unchanged, of course. Majority called it two. There were a few threes in there. Any concerns with moving this out of scope for this review? Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just a comment because these issues demanded for our region, for instance, a lot of discussion and the mediation process that costs a lot to ICANN to put together. So, it's an important issue because the weak translation generates a lot of not clear information and can bring a lot of misunderstanding and fight against people that is from different capacities of language. So, that's why I believe it's quite important issue.



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda, and I believe the importance is well-recognized by the scoring. But the feasibility of us doing it right now is the issue. Back to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, everyone. Moving on to the next item. How to support ICANN PDP with multi-language services in the early stages of planning. May ICANN use some advanced technology like AI translation? Majority have called it out as a three. There are good number of twos and a four categorization. Any points for discussion here?

Okay, next item. Should ICANN be operational here or monetary? That's also been categorized as three and it's a subpoint of the same item. Moving on.

How to involve broader Internet community into the developing process of enhancing governance root server and root zone with new structure, new mode, and new technology as well as PTI's accountability and transparency. Majority have called it a five. We can come back to this later, of course.

Next item on the list. ICANN's statement of work with external groups performing these tasks. Majority, five. A couple of threes.

I think this could be a sub-question about asking what are the deliverables, also categorized as five. Pat, go ahead.

---

PAT KANE: So, these last two statements are actually sub-bullets of a previous one which we eliminated which was number one. That was directly to Brian Cute's statement of work. I'm not sure how it got out of order but those two were specifically for that one. And then subsequently, when we talk about should ICANN be operational [inaudible] monitoring, that was a subset of what is now the expansion of the role in addressing security and stability or the new number one. So, that was supposed to be a subset of that one.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Pat, with that in mind, given that item number one which Brian Cute is leading has been marked as two, so we will not consider in this review, do we want the subcategories to be considered or do we want to leave them at five?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just jump in while Pat's considering his answer? From my perspective, I'm almost tempted, because they're fives, which is too early to tell yet, I'd be tempted to leave them on the table as fives because until we actually do a bit of work with Brian and see what's happening with the initial outcomes of what's happening with this evolution of the multi-stakeholder work that's being done, have a greater understanding of what the depth and color and total scoping of what he's going to be doing is, we could find value in having this entire back to these subpoints if we leave it as a five. That is how I would like to have my cake and eat it, too, for what it's worth. Thanks.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Any objection to that? Okay. So, to make the list clear, I'll move these two items under item one for clarity so we can make sense of it later on. Just give me one minute, please, to do that.

PAT KANE: To be clear, it's the crossed-out number ... Yeah, right there. Yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: [off mic].

BRENDA BREWER: This is Brenda testing audio.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: [off mic]. Scope item reads assessing the policy development process, facilitating [inaudible] and effective and timely [inaudible].

First item on the list, is [inaudible] impact on ICANN?

[off mic]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just while we're having a timely, not, gremlin of reloading the file, I should note for those of you not watching the Adobe room that there has been some audio issues. Brenda is also working on it. I don't know if she's going to boosting our volume up as much as humanly possible from her end. I know Jennifer is doing her best as well with the tech. Jim is telling me we are back with a go. Well, all we needed to do is get tech support to walk into this room. This magical thing happens when they

---

arrive. That was very impressive. I'm not seeing a document yet, but that might just be me. I'll reload. Back to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, please do. The document, at least for me, has reloaded. Are you okay for me to continue?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alright. GDPR and its impact on ICANN. [inaudible] working groups – for example, the GNSO RDS working group – and led to the rise of the EPDP. GDPR announcement came five years earlier and by the time it was affected by ICANN was not GDPR compliant leading to the creation of the EPDP. Unanimous three. I'm guessing no comments here, so moving on.

Workstream two. This is not fully defined. Unanimous three. Does anyone want to expand on what we mean by workstream two here before we move on?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, what I read this as, which is why it got a three for me, is that within the confines of where we are with workstream two, having made its recommendations and having yet to be implemented, nor having had its implementation review team convened, that it should be in scope for

---

us to look at the issues raised and recommendations made by workstream two in the context of those activities and the implementation of them being consistent with ICANN's missions and bylaws as defined in the draft objectives for the text. Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Very good, thank you. Seeing as there's no comments, we'll move on to the next item. Different policy development process in each supporting organization, role of the advisory committee, role of other partners. Unanimous three.

Moving on. Community feedback evaluation on respective PDPs. Again, a unanimous three.

PDPs from supporting organizations, majority three. No comments, moving on.

Role of others. Majority four which puts this out of the scope of the review. Any comments or concerns?

Next item is role of advisory committees. Unanimous three.

Last on the list, there is a need for datelines for PDPs. Majority fours. Out of scope by that categorization. Any concerns? Go ahead, Jacques, please.

JACQUES BLANC:

It's more a comment than a concern. Maybe if the question would have been drafted a bit differently, we would have had a different result

---

because I don't see this as a question. I see this as an affirmation. So, I don't see much to [inaudible] really.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Jacques, I'm not sure what hat she's wearing right now. I think I'll just talk in the third person and keep myself suitably confused. Where I live in the PDP world of at least the GNSO, I am painfully aware that of course the GNSO is the manager of the PDP process for generic names. And from my old ancient history within the ccNSO, I am equally aware that the ccNSO and its members and non-members are in a more or less binding way agree on PDP processes and manage the PDP process when they bother to have one for ccTLDs. So, from my perspective, that is why it is in our context – and only in our context – out of scope. Is it important? Hell yeah. Do we need to do better? Absolutely. Is it our work? Not in my view.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. In fact, there is a repetition because the way [we have worked have] done this repetition. But this is sometimes different policy development [inaudible] three buckets here. We can take them off, from my point of view, because all that was written by the same person, me. Therefore, I think it's [inaudible] role of others and role of ACs but put it in a different way. One was written in a sentence, the other was just a [inaudible]. Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, would you be suggesting that we make some of those subpoints then of the [inaudible] sentence?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But the [inaudible] sentence, that's a role of the AC, that's a role of [inaudible]. It's the same thing. It's a repetition.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, you're saying delete all of those because they've just been duplicated inadvertently. Good catch. Thank you very much. Go ahead, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Very good. Thank you, Sebastien. This marks the end of this bucket. We are moving down to bucket F.

Scope item reads assessing and improving the independent review process. First item on the list is SSR 2 pause. Majority three. Any comments or questions here?

Okay, moving on. Lack of participation of review team members. Majority, three. Seeing as there are no comments, moving on.

Planning usefulness of all the reviews, a systematic review. Who, how, when, and the Brian Cute mission. Unanimous three.

There are sub-categories which I personally don't understand. I guess I do. Closed review versus open review. Both have been put into category three. Any comments or questions?

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Once again, it's a repetition. I don't think those three last bullet points are really useful here. But if you want to keep it ... The only thing is that [inaudible] of all the reviews is equal to closing review or opening reviews.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I ask, is everyone comfortable with the removal of the sub-points, closed review, open review, and systemic review and leaving those as simply part of the [higher] sentence, which I believe is what Sebastien was saying should happen. No objections to that? Let's make it [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Very good. This wraps up scope item F. We're moving down to roman numerical scope item three now. This is just to make it very confusing as to what scope item you referred to. We changed the numbering. Absolutely. No need for napping right now.

Scope item three reads the Accountability and Transparency Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior accountability and transparency review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended affect.

Item number one. What steps were taken to implement each prior recommendation? Unanimous three.



---

How well did the implementation of each recommendation achieve the previous review team's intended affect? Majority three.

What were the intended affects envisioned by the previous review team? This is also majority three. It seems to be like it's a repeat of the previous bullet point in a lot of ways. Of course, we can leave it, but [inaudible]. Jacques, go ahead, please.

JACQUES BLANC:

Quick point. How can we [inaudible] the intended effect of a previous review team? By interviews, I guess.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

To add on to that, Jacques, sometimes in the final report, the review team does indicate in the details and explanations what it is they're hoping to achieve.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And if I may, just to make sure that everyone knows and that it's on the record, even before Brian Cute was publicly given his mission for the work that we all know he's doing, as the chair of the last two ATRTs, he had made himself available to us for Skyping in, joining a meeting telephonically, turning up here or wherever else we are when we gather together. So, we should be able to literally get it from the horse's mouth if need be. But a good question, Jacques. Thanks.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you. Moving on to the next item. How might we enhance results achieved through implementation of the prior review team's recommendations? Majority three.

Checking the efficiency of the specific review process, which is important to make a reasonable mechanism to ensure the recommendation's feasibility. It is crucial to make feasible recommendations and try to avoid the CCT Review problems happening again. Almost unanimous, three. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record, not talking as co-chair at all. Absolute personal and un-caucused gut reaction. More than happy to keep this in scope. Desperately want the whole thing tidied up in terms of what we will be publishing in the words there. I would encourage us to avoid specificity on criticizing particular examples. I would rather have a box with a hypothetical or a stress test set up than I would to go to press scoping what could be an implied criticism, let alone look like we have already made up our minds on an outcome of something we're supposed to be reviewing. So, happy for it to be in scope. Would just want to make sure what we put together has everyone's support to do it. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I totally agree, Cheryl. I think this whole exercise is not a publication exercise because there is a lot of things that we need to change. There are examples will not need to stay and their way of expressing, just to [inaudible] idea here and discussion but I think that somebody will have

---

to rewrite all that in a good an understandable English and with no contention for others reading that. I agree with you. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you. Effectiveness of the implementation plan of the review, unanimous three. Effectiveness of the implementation of the recommendations – so, I guess last point refers to planning, this one refers to implementation itself. Majority three.

The last one is also consider affordability. This is a split between four and five category with a couple of threes thrown in. I'm leaving it open for discussion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, personal opinion here. I think it's important that this does sort of stay as a five. We're talking three fives and two threes here as opposed to three fours. I know that's pretty close to a split but let me see if I can explain why I think we should not take off but rather just park – in other words, leave it as a five – this matter of affordability.

I would be devastated and disappointed and disillusioned in a multi-stakeholder model that was so busy looking at its bottom line – singular, the one with dollar signs associated with it – that it isn't going to be looking at what the community would expect in terms of accountability and transparency. So, the review team and the important function that the review team [inaudible] specific review's purpose. I think we should never say we can't afford to do it. We should say we are thinking about the affordability of what is implemented. We may have to do stage

---

work but to ... I think considering affordability is a viable part of ongoing and future organizational evolution. Obviously, I'm biased, but that needed to be said from my perspective anyway.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Is everyone in agreement with changing this category to five? I'm sorry, Sebastien. Did you have your hand up?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Here I would like to say very clearly that I don't think that it's a good idea to push everything under dollars. I hear the board, I hear the CEO and president, about that. "You need to, you need to." No. We need to first decide what is good for the community, and after – and only after – see how we deal with the finance. Therefore, I agree that we keep that aside and it's not our main target. If not, we will not fulfill our mission to say what is good for the organization, and good for the organization, it's not just how much dollars we spend or we will not spend. It's how the multi-stakeholder organization will work in the future better. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sebastien. We have Maarten and then Jacques.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks for this discussion. I think just like the SSR 2 [inaudible] about the CCT review response, also here there may be a communication issue which is crucial. I mean, if you look back to the essence, then SSR 2 was

---

[something happening where something needed to happen]. CCT was considered like, hey, the board is not accepting some of the issues whereas it was really about thinking how this needed to be handled.

I think for finance, as [itself], yes this is a broader issue that [inaudible] for the community as well as for work and board. It's not like we're trying to stop things happening with financial arguments. We want to be conscious about cost, feed that back, and then with the community decide how to [go on]. I think that if that's well understood, that's important.

If it's not likely well-understood yet, let's bring it back in [inaudible] and make sure it's well-understood and following that. So, that's why five makes perfect sense, in my perspective.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jacques and then Pat.

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah. Now I realize I should have voted two, but it's [inaudible]. I have issues with the term affordability because as a private company person, I know what profitability is or is not. I know what economic neutral is. I don't know what affordable is. I mean, it seems to be highly subjective. It seems that if we wanted to [inaudible] such a term, first thing is we would have to define key performance indicators, and very frankly, I don't see that in the scope or I don't see how we could do it with the tools we have and the timings we have. So, that's why I could have put it in two, but anyway, I can't see it in our scope.

PAT KANE: I think that this really is the new reality, though, in terms of how we're looking at recommendations that come from not just ATRT 3 or ATRT 2 in this one but across the board. Maybe affordability is the wrong word, Jacques. But what we have to think about is how do recommendations get prioritized. How do we say what are must-haves? How do we say these things go together or they don't go at all? So, this actually may be a topic for us in terms of how we take a look at the recommendations we make and how those recommendations come across because I think the reality is budget is not growing. The domain name space is – there's not more domains. Unless you're going to introduce a new taxing structure, well, you've got ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Only on dot-com.

PAT KANE: You've got four for contracts that just got renewed that have no pricing increases in them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was a joke.

PAT KANE: Just pointing that out. But, if that's what we're looking at, we've got to figure out how to make the recommendations in such a manner that are

---

meaningful and digestible given the constraints around budget that we do have.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, of course. I think that's why, because we are very [inaudible] and clearly on the move there as the actions also demonstrated, that's why it's five. Like, let's keep it [inaudible]. And we may not be able to do something to do something about it as [accurately] because it's handled clear and well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In light of those discussions, perhaps the way to word this is not so much affordability but cost versus benefit analysis that has to go into recommendations because if we are going to be recommending something, collectively as a group, that has a high dollar amount associated with it but the net result or the benefit perceived from it is very, very little, that could not only help in prioritization but determining if the recommendation is indeed something that should be undertaken by the community and staff, everyone collectively.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl now speaking again from a very personal capacity. No, I'll wait for Sebastien. Go ahead, Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. I don't think we have time to do the budget of what we want to achieve here during the one-year period. We have to decide

---

what is in the scope and what's outside of the scope. And from my point of view, the question linked with finance, with budget, is something outside of the scope and we have no time for that.

But I am happy that you use [inaudible]. I would have used another word. And we can answer to this discussion. But just, if we can try to be fair with each other ...

I will just say one thing. At the end of the day, the one who pays is the user. With a business user or end user, any money gets into this organization or to your organization is coming from us. And when I say us, it's not just the end user individual, but it's also association, all the ones using domain name system. Therefore, I heard you saying that it's a tax. Heard me that it could be something else to help the multi-stakeholder to [leave]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Sebastien. Back to the point I was going to make in a purely personal capacity but one that was paid to do a bit of this sort of stuff in her working life a million years ago. I have no problem rewriting the words, remembering we're putting it in the car park, taking it away from the term affordability and looking at cost-benefit, but I would prefer – and strongly encourage – you to consider a trilogy there. It should be cost, benefit, and risk analysis because there is sometimes a very great cost if you identify a risk that will [inaudible] you through a legal, for example, result of a certain action. So, cost-benefit is a little too narrow. Pop risk in there, it's back in my comfort zone. My space comes from food and pharmaceutical industry experience, putting in quality



---

systems. And you could make a cost-benefit analysis which would give you a very different outcome than once you looked at the risk of getting it wrong even once.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. [inaudible] but just as a business economist, I would consider risk to be part of cost.

PAT KANE: I might consider to make it a little bit broader and say also consider the packaging of recommendations.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So, is everyone in agreement that we do a cost, benefit, and risk analysis and a packaging or grouping of the recommendations?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Recognizing it's still in the parking lot.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I was understanding the last sentence of parked as an alternative proposal not an additional one. If that's a proposal made by Pat, I would support it. But I don't support the way it was presented [at last]. Thank you.

---

If you want me to be clear, if we just put packaging, it's okay. If we put cost, benefit, risk, I disagree. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

So, you would pick one or the other is I think what Sebastien is suggesting. He is saying do the packing of recommendations is a better approach than saying cost, benefit, risk because it broadens the view of what we're looking at because it also says how do you prioritize, how do you make certain people understand what are tied together and what may be nice to have but not necessary. So, would we consider using just packaging of recommends and not say cost-benefit-risk and get away from the financial aspect of it is what I think Sebastien, if I'm speaking for you, is suggesting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No problem one way or the other. I'm not invested in this particular piece of work of this term. It's going to be in the parking lot. I may get more invested if we ever take it back out of the parking lot. But I'd like to know whoever put the question into our discussion, whether the removal of any financial reference is an issue for them. So, let's leave it in five. Let's leave it open enough, so the preference at the moment, because nobody has objected, is to look at the "packaging" of the recommendations and perhaps have in square brackets something to do with a dollar. I'll let someone else work that out seeing as I clearly don't speak clear enough English. Just, if we can get whoever put this together to make sure they're also happy with the words, that would be wise. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

So, for now, I've changed the wording to packaging and in brackets I put could incorporate cost until further discussion. Category has been changed to five.

Moving down to the very last bucket of scope items. The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the board the termination or amendment of other specific reviews required by section 4.6 of the bylaws and may recommend to the board the creation of additional periodic reviews. Items incorporated are based on the previous work of ATRT 1 and 2 on review of other specific reviews, opportunity may be agreed to include in our scope at this unusual time in ICANN's evolution post-transition, post everything else, an analysis of the effectiveness and actionables from recent specific reviews and this has majority three. Any comments or questions on this item?

Okay, moving on to the next item. We need to think on how to make reviews more objective, less cost, and with results that will make a difference. Majority three. No comments? Go ahead, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Oh, just one. I think this is the one where we also need to consider the community pressure of doing all this work and this could be considered part of costs but it's next to the [inaudible] people.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Moving on to the next item. Relevance of the periodic review, whether it is transitioned and impact. Only two votes, all threes. Any comments or questions on this? Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a question, just a comment. I am a little concerned that there was only two scores on this. I guess my comfort of seeing a three – and I’m not suggesting it shouldn’t stay in as a three. I think you’ll find one of those threes is one of mine. But I am concerned that there is only a few of you who have put a tally point in here, so let’s just make sure before we move on that we are in fact very happy for it to be in scope and not that it was skipped over because it was at the end of the document and people were trying to finish it. Not that any of you would have done that, I’m sure. So, as long as the [inaudible] was deliberate. Okay, looks like it stays as [inaudible]. I tried.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, because we have a lot of problems with the [inaudible] and there is no time enough for her to make all the little—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. I just wanted to double check because I don’t want to open this up for criticism of our process, part of our transparency. Back to you.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. Next item on the list is finding review team or GAC others. I'm not quite clear what this means, majority of four. Not sure we need clarification. Any comments on this or can it be removed from scope? Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Once again, it's quite interesting because the [two way] I write the same idea, it's two different results. You can even keep it out of the document. It was just my sticky points, but it's already there. You don't need it.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay Thank you, Sebastien. Moving on to the last item I believe on the list. Yes. Cost-effectiveness of the reviews and impact on ICANN bylaws. Majority three with one five which is supportive of the same category. Any questions or comments on this?

Okay. I'm happy to announce that this wraps up the scope discussion for exercise two, or at least a subset of exercise two. There are a couple of items in this document that we said we will go back to after the discussions were over. So, if everyone is in agreement, let's go back to them and have further discussions on them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just remind us? We're looking at about 30 minutes left in our work time together today and it would behoove us just to only really spend 20 in this next part of our exercise. So, just keep an eye on your timing. Thank you.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you. The items we wanted to go back to to discuss further is under scope item C. We had an item about ITU-D and we had a discussion about separating the two questions into two different categories with the first question about participation and the membership in the five-year plan to be removed from the scope. But the second question was about the transparency of how the decision made and we were going to discuss making that into a separate sub-category and maybe try to reword the scope item. Anyone wants to speak up on this and suggest rewording and category?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Michael, do you want to – being one of the work track leaders as a transparency in workstream one and two, I wondered whether you have any thoughts on should we decide. Let me start that again.

If we decide, as I suspect we may, to split this and deal with a more general transparency question, if that comes to pass, Michael I wondered if I could forewarn you that anything in terms of proposed text, just early draft text, on what type of question we could ask to tease out these transparency aspects because your unique positions in those work tracks. If you could pop that into chat, that might be useful. If I can get you to start thinking about that while we deliberate on the splitting in the first place, that would be great. Just, rather than [inaudible].

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Meanwhile, Michael is contemplating that, since he's gone and rated all of the items in the scope discussion, we should now look at prioritization under each bucket of scope for the relevance of work. So, if everyone is agreement let's start with bucket A. We have ... Everything that has been crossed out is obviously out of scope. For the remaining items, let's discuss priorities one through whatever, and this time when we say one through whatever it is a scale measurement. One being the highest, ten being the lowest priority. Let's go ahead and look at these items and decide where it falls.

I'm going to read them one by one and tell me which one you think is the highest so we go with the process of elimination – unless you have a suggestion, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No, I want a clarification. I paled when you said one to ten. You might have noticed the drainage of blood from my [inaudible] because I'll spend too much time working out between my 7.5 and my 6.5. Can we just agree on a scale before we get into that? And maybe less is more. In twelve-month's time, do we need – that's not a lot of time to get our work done. Should we not just look at a one, two, three here and if we can't split it more effectively think about refining it but just give it a priority one top, two is a must-have, should have, could have. One, we must do. Two, we should do. Three, we could do. Does that work? Just for simplicity sake?

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah. For clarification, ten was just a number thrown out there for scale, so don't panic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Exactly. Not that anyone can. I believe Sebastien has a comment. Go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I was trying to find if we can't [inaudible] the list of the items and just ask as to [inaudible]. And we will take that home and [inaudible]. But if you want to do it [inaudible] let's go.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm not sure which of us is unhappy or appearing to be unhappy with anyone's comments here today. I'm going to apologize on behalf of Pat and/or I if we have in any way, shape, or form indicated any type of disappointment or otherwise with anybody's interventions. It's our intention to make sure everyone's voice is heard, heard fairly, and heard with respect. Pat and I are certainly trying to do our best to behave in the way that the expected standards of behavior behoove on all of us. So, if we've fallen out of that, you can take our humblest apologies as read and for the record.



---

I don't believe Negar and Jennifer did it with an intention to make this a final but rather a first run of prioritization so that we could think further on it, but please do correct me if I'm wrong.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

No, Cheryl, you are correct. The idea was to go through a first round of prioritization right now while the discussions are fresh in everyone's mind. Jennifer and I are going to look into actually using a tool like SurveyMonkey that Maarten had recommended, suggested to us earlier, to allow everyone to think about this later on as well and re-prioritize again and we can see if the results are different. It might be good practice to just [inaudible] them now while again while the discussions are fresh, but of course it's up to the review team how you would like to proceed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Negar. And just to make it very clear, the design of this part of the exercise has come from certainly the leadership team but under the general guidance of what staff has put together. This is not Pat and I in a huddle steering you. Far from it. We worked out what was going on when we had it introduced to us this morning, a moment or two's more preparation than you all had.

So, with that said and very much for the record, let us put it to the table, noting that we do have one of the questions that we need to come back to to deal with as well. Do you want to have a clean break as we've had a call for it? It's on the table, where we don't go through a run, a shared exercise, of any form of ranking for prioritization and that this is done

---

very much as an individual input into a survey-style tool which is fine. We may have to do more than one run of that. That is also fine. That's a question that's been raised, a suggestion made. Time is ticking so you need to decide one way or the other and I don't think Pat and I are invested one way or the other. Staff may be. They may have wanted to know how far they would like us to have got today through [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

No, we are okay with whatever the review team decides.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. I'm sure you'll have plenty to do. I'm wondering if we could just put a pin in that for a moment while you think on that because I wouldn't like to suggest to you all that you make that decision on the fly, either, and perhaps you could come back to the question that you have had some time to contemplate, and that is whether or not we can delete back up in – what was it? Section C if memory serves me correct. And it does. If we can delete the specific reference to the part of the question referring to ITU-D membership out of the document and that we do consider then if we decide to delete it whether or not we do something about a more general transparency question in it. So, Pat, would you like to conduct that poll? Thank you.

PAT KANE:

So, on the topic of the first one, which is deletion of the specific question around the decision to be an ITU-D member within the five-

---

year plan is currently at a four. By show of either agree inside of the Adobe or hands in the room, delete it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Delete? Delete, delete, delete. Good. Well, that was simple.

PAT KANE: Okay. So, the hands in the room showed that [near] unanimous to delete. Are there any objections that would like to be heard before we move on on that? None offered in the room, so we will delete that. Thank you.

Then, the second one, how was this decision made? The one thing I would add before we talk about that specifically, from a transparency standpoint, is Maarten offered that this was in fact part of the plan that was accepted on the 20-25 year – the year 2020 to 2025, I get that tied up sometimes – was already part of that plan and had been already reviewed by the community, so therefore may not be a transparency issue, although I think specifically it wasn't called out to do that. Do we leave that in as a transparency question or do we think that that's covered based upon Maarten's suggestion?

So, hands again in the room if we want to retain it, green, I agree in the chatroom please to say, yes, we leave it. Red, if you disagree and we think it is covered by the draft plan. I say we leave it as a transparency item. I'm the only hand in the room.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, in the room, we're in this room.

PAT KANE: No, I'm the only hand in this room, I didn't change anything in the chatroom and I can't see what the chatroom is as far as green.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: [off mic].

PAT KANE: Okay. I know we have a lot that hasn't weighed in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, they're coming. They're coming. It seems a little bit [inaudible] still when we consider the number of people we have on the review team. So, can we be radical and suggest that transparency, generically transparency question, might be drafted and that we put it in the parking lot for now and come back to it? So, give it a five at this point.

PAT KANE: I think that's a fair position to take. Thank you for the suggestion, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just want to look to staff now as well as to anyone in the Adobe Connect rooms. I was looking at the time and I doubt that anything productive at all can happen in the time left. I've noted from some

---

private messages I've been receiving and some public messages from others that perhaps some of us are flagging. So, it seems to me that it would be unproductive, counterproductive, to push it through anymore of the agenda today. But I want to give Pat an opportunity to do some summation just as I did at our earlier morning session. Obviously, we're [inaudible] whoever talks more does one job and whoever talks less does the other.

But I think you've actually managed to do an extraordinary amount today and I hope you're well-pleased with yourselves both individually and as a group in the progress you have made. We do, however, need to take a minute or two on looking at what we are doing tomorrow. So, Pat is going to do the review of the day and provide whatever closing remarks, and hopefully you're all going to get about 20 minutes of your lives back.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think that as far as getting through a lot of the suggestions we've collected in the last couple of weeks in the Google Doc and then getting them up and working through the definitions and having a conversation and [inaudible] what it is we will work on has been really helpful in leading us to what will be next which will be prioritized within each of the categories.

I do want to thank staff for setting up the room, to set up the exercises, because I think the way that we used the whiteboard, the virtual whiteboards, was very, very helpful in helping us to arrive to decisions. So, thank you very much.

---

Second, I also want to make certain that as we think through these tonight that we can get a start in getting that prioritized first thing tomorrow, so please take ... This will all be available to us tonight. Take a look through this and come prepared with your one to nine, one to four, one to three, whatever it is within each group to kind of think through how that looks and whether we rank them high, medium, low, one, two, three. Let's put them into buckets as to how we think [inaudible] ready to go first thing out of the gate tomorrow morning. Fair enough? Okay.

And then the last item is ... Actually, Jennifer, can you take us through the action items that we've captured throughout the day, the morning, please?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So, the action items from the day – and please feel free to chime in and correct me and add anything that I may have missed. So, the first item that you took was staff to work with the co-chairs and the ombudsman to find time on the agenda for [inaudible]. Review team members with issues accessing—

PAT KANE: Jennifer, if I could interrupt on that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure.

---

PAT KANE: We're going to find a private time for that, so that won't be something that we do as part of the group discussion unless that's specifically requested. But I think that because it is an ombudsman item, I think we should talk to Herb first on that before we make a final decision [inaudible]. Sebastien, will that suffice to start? I got an affirmative from Sebastien, so thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. I'll change the action item then just to find time to meet outside of the review team's time.

Review team members with issues accessing files via e-mail. I think there's still a few people having issues, so please work with staff and Jaap on that one.

Staff to send a Doodle poll to determine [who of the team] will be in Marrakech and then a Doodle poll for possible face-to-face meeting time availability in August or early September for the review team's next face-to-face meeting.

The review team to think about key talking points or questions for the community to engage with the team on. We have boards up there for people to write their thoughts on and anybody remote obviously can share those, too, through e-mail or however.

Staff to provide information to the team regarding expected timeline of the workstream two implementation.

---

Then, a final action items we can discuss was potentially putting together a survey that we can share this evening to do this prioritization. Alright. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jennifer, very much. The one thing ... Sorry. Yes, Jaap?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I just want to [inaudible] workaround has been found. It's only waiting for final solution. So, [inaudible] already in place.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: To clarify, for the record, Jaap, you're referring to the file issues that some members are having issues accessing. Okay, thank you.

PAT KANE: Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just a question. Can we add in our work in one moment? Maybe it's on the agenda, but we are talking about the date. We may be also talking about place of the meeting. [inaudible] action item, I don't know. But thank you.

PAT KANE: So, Sebastien, I was just about to ask that question because we want to make certain that we have the rest of colleagues able to join us that



---

were unable to get visas to come to the United States. So, I would strongly consider we look at locations outside of the United States to include Brussels or the office in Istanbul. But I think that's a very good suggestion, Sebastien. I prefer to have as many people available to participate as possible.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can I [inaudible]?

PAT KANE: My recollection is the Singapore office is actually a very small office in terms of space, so while we should not close it out immediately, that would be one consideration and that's why I did not suggest it initially.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just before we go back to Sebastien, in preparation for having this conversation, can we pull back up the [inaudible] project the slide that shows the different offices and the costs of the different way? Because that's obviously something we'll have to look at.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Absolutely, Cheryl. We have the information. We'll have it ready for tomorrow to present at that part of the agenda.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Also, during an informal discussion during the last meeting, somebody suggests to invite the group in his country. Maybe it's needed to be considered. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To not be obtuse, I did mention in the last meeting that the GAC representative on this team, Liu, is obviously from China, did say that we would be welcome to meet in China. I mentioned that to you all. I believe that's what Sebastien is referring to. The matter of cost and the issue of how much it would cost and where we could meet and how we could meet and who would be sponsoring and who would be paying for what, where and how, I said at the time was an important consideration and one that when we get to that agenda item later on in the next couple of days perhaps we could have asked some questions as constituency travel or meetings with some indicative figures. They will know, for example, how much it costs in some of the Beijing meeting and Beijing meeting rooms, the most recent Beijing meeting room.

I doubt that they would have to hand the cost of what we did for ATRT 1 because we met solely as ATRT in ATRT 1. We also met as ATRT 2 but that was part of the Beijing meeting – two very different setups. But what material we possibly can access so you can be making informed conversation and decision on that would be very handy, if we can make that a possibility [inaudible]. Miracles will be [inaudible] tomorrow. Impossible will need to be done the day after.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I love that you used the word miracle. All jokes aside, we will send a request internally to have them look into possible cost estimates for a possible meeting in Beijing. I'm not sure we will have something by tomorrow, but hopefully we'll get something soon that we can ...

I believe Liu made a private comment to Brenda today suggesting Beijing again as an option. We had told him that there is going to be a discussion on this topic tomorrow and I believe he is going to bring it up again, to extend the offer one more time.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I probably pay not enough attention but what is our task for tonight after the dinner that you mentioned? What do we need to do?

PAT KANE: So that we can get started right off the bat is to take a look at all of the remaining topics within each of the sections within the Google Doc and in our minds prioritize them in either high, medium, low or if you want to go one to N for the number of items that are in there, please do that. But take a look and have some idea as to how you will rank sub-items within each of the sections so that we can start immediately tomorrow by going through and having some ideas. I think that will expedite the process when we begin in the morning and we can ourselves back on the calendar.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Pat, I just want to check, Sebastien, your concerns about doing or ranking in terms of the prioritization on the fly. Would doing it

---

tomorrow morning in the way Pat has just proposed, recognizing that staff will be putting together a survey to assist us in that anyway? Is that still going to be on the fly? Because I don't want to just put it off and then have the same issue later. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

In fact, more it's explained, more I don't understand how you want us to work on. Then it's different to answer. My dream would have to be to have a list, whatever tools you use, a list where we can rank them either manually either to a two, whatever. But here we have a full list of things with three, three, four or whatever and how we can rank them efficiently, us and then collectively, I don't see how we will do it now or [inaudible] didn't want to do it, to do it right now, but if it can be done prior or during the morning tomorrow, it's okay. We will either have time after dinner if we don't go to sleep or because we wake up very early tomorrow morning. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Sebastien, I will try to be very clear as to what I'm asking. Exercise number three is a prioritization of the scope elements and it was in schedule today for us to achieve some portion or complete exercise number three so that we could prioritize those elements that remain. So, what I have asked is so that we can get back on schedule where we have for the remaining two days. It's a suggestion but I'm asking that we look at the remaining items tonight in each of the sections and come equipped in the morning, and whether we do that tonight after dinner or in the morning when we wake, to have some idea as to how you

---

would rank those items so that we can have a fulsome discussion and not be cold, necessarily, as we begin. So, that's my request.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [off mic].

PAT KANE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. What are the remaining issues? We have gone through all the issues this afternoon and we have put a number in front of them and we have decided which ones are on scope, the ones who are not on scope. Which one we are missing? If we are not missing, we need to run the one who wants them to stay on scope and rank them how we want them to do to work with them priority wise. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Sebastien, thank you. If I can tell you what I would be doing tonight after dinner, is if I take a look at draft scope topic A and I take a look at all the items that have not been crossed out – in terms of the section, there are nine of them – I will be going through and from one to nine, ranking each one of those items that remain. So, I'll make a determination that says, personally from my standpoint, of what I think

---

coming in tomorrow is proportion of elected versus nominated members. Is that one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, or nine as I would compare them against all nine within that category? That's what I intend to do, so that tomorrow morning when we come in, I already have an idea in my head as to what the most important item in that group is – not whether we should throw it back out, put it back in, change it from a three to something else. But of those nine items, what do I believe as a representative of the GNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group, are the most important items for us to address as the review team? That's what I intend to do. Yes, Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC:

I don't want to push more work than you have already right now on anybody, but from my point of view, if we have to review this after dinner – and I'm more than willing to do it, sleep notwithstanding – it would be very useful to have a summary list of the items that stay there, so we can go quickly through a summary list and not go back to the whole Google Doc trying to [inaudible] what has been kept and so on. Maybe I'm asking too much, in which case I'm sorry.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

KC, I think I agree but what is the alternative? You're going to go write it on a piece of paper your priority list? What's the mechanism by which we execute this [inaudible]?

---

PAT KANE: I don't think there's any mechanism to do the exercise other than to familiarize ourselves with what we think so that tomorrow when we do kick off exercise number three led by staff, we'll already have some idea about what we think, so that's all I'm asking. I'm not asking to have ... Or sleep if you want to. I mean, I'm not ... Come prepared, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's not a matter of homework to do to hand in. It's a matter of prior preparation so exercise three will be as effective and as efficient as possible and perhaps before we go to Negar, I think – no, Vanda, you've got your card still up. It might be a good idea, also, before you leave here today to look at exercise three on the wall so you're thinking about what is going to be expected of all of us when we do gather tomorrow morning as well. So, sorry Negar, but we're going to go to Vanda and then back to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry. I asked—[audio cuts abruptly].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got to stop Vanda asking questions late in the day forevermore. It's a joke. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl, and thank you everyone. So, tomorrow morning, we will send a survey to everyone to help you easily prioritize the items we have under each bucket of scope. So, tonight if you can look at what's

---

been left under each bucket so you're familiar with it so that when we do send the survey tomorrow morning, everyone can easily select the priority for each of the sub-categorized scope item.

The result of that survey is going to help us start exercise three. The goal of exercise three is to help define what you need to look at, what interviews you need to run. Which groups do you need to speak with? What subgroups are you going to have? Because the most efficient way of doing the work, of course, is to break out into subgroups, breakout the work, determine whose skill set is most suitable to each scope item.

And if we know the priority level of each of the sub-categories, you can pick the top three for each bucket of scope and say for category scope A, we are going to do items one, two, and three. You have the three sub-items you're looking at. These are the people we need to talk to. For as much as we know about it right now, these are the documents we need to look at. These are the subgroups we're going to have. These are the members of the review team that are going to be under each subgroup so that you can plan out your work so that you can map out the rest of the review work for the end of the one-year period. I hope that provides a little clarity. So, the idea tonight is just familiarize yourself with what's left under each scope bucket and then we'll do the survey tomorrow and categorize.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Negar, and hopefully that is clear to everybody. The other thing I would suggest is we will be starting tomorrow morning with another little recap. The survey that staff is going to extraordinarily



---

produce overnight will also act – so, the earlier can come out, the better is what I’m saying – will also act as that ready reckoner of what’s stayed in because I’m assuming you’ll just [transfer] the cross to a new document format, so that the survey can be populated. So, just think about that.

Also, note in exercise three, we should also have opportunity for those of you who feel deeply about being part of that small team or work party to put your hand up and make yourself known.

So, feel free to come in with a sticky label in the morning and say, “I want this.” Daniel is going to write this, this, and this. His initials are going to be over it. That’s okay, too.

Don’t forget the questions for community that we should be developing. People, you’re all clever. [Start some out of that]. And maybe the “I want this” list because I don’t think we actually have a box on the wall, maybe the authorship and team membership, if we can head that one up on that, that flip-chart tomorrow you can start being ready to sign up, because I know, KC, you asked. Where amongst this do you say I want to do this bit? Well, over there at either the whiteboard or flip-board, if you know you want to do something about diversity in the board, then stick your name up there saying, “I want to be part of that work party.” Pat, take us home.

PAT KANE:

Dinner tonight.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:           Where?

PAT KANE:                       Where is this dinner?

JENNIFER BRYCE:               Dinner is very close by. It's at a restaurant called [Soul]. It's a Mexican restaurant, so it's about five minutes in an Uber. You all should [inaudible]. It should have the address on the calendar invite that Brenda sent. I recommend people gathering maybe in the lobby. You can figure it all out, but a hotel and sharing Ubers to this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       From the hotel.

JENNIFER BRYCE:               Yeah. Exactly.

PAT KANE:                       So, it's about five minutes, so why don't we meet at 18:45, 6:45 in the lobby of the hotel, the Double Tree, and we will order up Ubers, however many we need. We'll go to have dinner and margaritas at a Mexican restaurant.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       Well, that will help you prepare for tomorrow.

