JENNIFER BRYCE:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 face-to-face meeting day two. Today is April the 4th. My name is Jennifer Bryce. Thank you for joining us today. I work for ICANN Org. We will do a quick around the table roll call. To my right, please, Sébastien.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Sébastien Bachollet from ALAC.
JACQUES BLANC:	Jacques Blanc from GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group.
JAAP AKKERHUIS:	Jaap Akkerhuis NLnet Labs, representing SSAC.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Cheryl Langdon-Orr from the ALAC, one of the co-chairs for the review team, and offering ... and he's coming in on cue, not quite apology from Pat. If I keep talking long enough, he will get to the microphone as he walks past to report himself in.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Here.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Osvaldo Novoa.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda from ALAC.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Wolfgang Kleinwaechter, Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Demi Getschko, ccNSO.

KC CLAFFY: KC Claffy, SSAC.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel Nanghaka, At-Large.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, board.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everybody. And joining us online, we have Brenda Brewer from ICANN Org and our review team members Erica and Michael, and in the

observers room, we have Jim Prendergast. Also joining us online is Herb Waye, the ombudsman, and I'll just quickly read his comment from the chat.

He says, "Greetings, everyone. I'm in L.A. at the office, but will be busy dealing with ICANN for most of the day. Nice to see some of you this morning. I'll be in and out of the meeting remotely and can drop in in person if you wish to discuss anything."

Michael says, "Hello, everyone. Pleasure to join you again. I'm traveling today, so I expect to be offline much of the late morning and afternoon, but will try to stay online for as much as I can."

And with that, I'll hand over to Cheryl and Pat. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Jennifer. And I know most of you had a very enjoyable evening doing a little bit of bonding and a little well and truly deserved reward last evening for those of us who were in Los Angeles.

For those of you who are joining us remotely, we hope you rested your brain cells and your body so that you're RIPE and ready to go today, especially with the important work we're doing as we kick off today, and that is looking at our prioritization exercise and exercise three.

So we should be looking at any takeaways from yesterday, but of course, one of the things we didn't get to was the completion of our exercise three, so let's post haste on to doing that and catch up with our agenda.

On the matter of the agenda – and someone desperately needs to mute, if Brenda can sort out whatever gremlin that is. The agenda for today is not terribly complicated. It says working session, working session, workplan timeline, and working session. Hopefully, that's really clear to everybody. But is there anyone who wishes to raise anything or add anything as a proposed item for today's meeting?

I'm not seeing anything around the table or in the room, so with that, I recognize Daniel. Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think for other participants who are remotely, [inaudible] recommendation is that we could put at least a description of the working sessions, if we could be able to know them in advance. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay – she says hesitantly in reply to you, Daniel. Of course, the participants should all have the supporting documentation and the material, so when we refer to exercise one, two or three, they will have the support material for exercise one, two and three, and the observers have that displayed. But I hear what you're saying, and a more descriptive agenda for future meetings is something Pat and I will take onboard, won't we, uncle Pat? Good. He's nodding, for everyone's edification.

So, thanks. We can only do better, Daniel. And we assure you we will. Any other comments or criticisms on the agenda?

KC CLAFFY: I just had a question. It's not clear to me, and I missed an area today, I was on a call, so maybe I wasn't here when I should have been. At some point, we're going to say this is the scope and we're not doing anything beyond this. We're not there yet. So that's going to happen today, you think?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [I hope so.]

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Because I feel like maybe there's a couple things – and I'm coming from the SSR, the SSAC perspective that I don't even know where I would put them on the sheets that are on the board right now. So there's going to be some slot where we think about that? Or just tell me when I should bring that [up.] I don't think we're there yet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, KC, and it's where we intend to get with the exercise today, and I don't know whether everyone had the opportunity to run through the survey or not, but to those of you who did have the survey, I'm just queuing you to put your card down, KC, so I don't recognize you continuously. I will recognize you, but only when [your card's up.] And I see Negar, and I suspect Jennifer would be doing some tallying or something out of that survey as well. Negar, over to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:	Thank you, Cheryl. I wanted to address KC's comment as well, and hopefully this will help clarify. So part of the exercise will go through if everyone recalls or has seen it, we sent a survey out yesterday which has the list of all the items that we had prioritized based on one of the five categories as part of exercise two for the review team members one by one to decide the order of priority now for all of those items under each scope bucket.
	The plan for today based on discussions yesterday was to start looking at the results of the survey. The results will be tallied up, we'll look at the results, and then I believe the review team decided to pick the top three items under each scope item to break it down, and if I understand correctly, you're saying there are few items that you still don't know if that's what you want to include in the agenda or under the scope. So I think that should be worthy of a discussion by the whole review team, because yesterday's exercise was to include all the ideas everyone had for subcategories of scope, and that's what we've done all the surveys and the breakdown and discussions on. So if you're bringing additional items to the table for scope, I think that kind of derails that process a tiny bit from my perspective, but of course, it's up to the review team how they want to take new items under consideration.
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah. My thought is that they were covered by the stickies yesterday, and now I'm thinking maybe they're not, and I should have put additional stickies up. So SSR is over here, so you can throw everything under SSR, but it's not clear to me that the transparency, the SSR things

that are in my head are covered by that. maybe we just make them covered by that. I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, did you have your hand up?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. Looking at what we will do in the next part of the meeting, I am not sure that we can stay still or already say, yeah, we will keep with three or with ... because when you look at full range of proposal, we may decide in one specific group to have just two, and another one to have three or four or five. Just let's have some flexibility of what we end up with, what is our priority, not saying because we have already split in, I don't know, seven groups, we have three by seven, 21 items we will cover. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. If I may, I've put myself in the queue. In fact, following on from what you were just saying, one of the things that I think we should be looking at as we go through how each of us have independently ranked – we use the term ranking, perhaps – because we prioritized as in or out of scope already. Now we're going to look at a ranking to see how much of this work can we practically do.

A couple of things occurred to me while I was doing my homework, and that was some of these things I was going to be able to rank quite low, because in my opinion, they're a subset. It's not that they're not worthy of being done, but I believe I could pop them in as a subset activity to

something I was ranking highly. So in that, I'm absolutely supportive of what you were just saying, KC, that some of this stuff, we can make happen under some of these headings, and I think that's also a very important discussion as we take from however many in and of our categories, in any of our objectives we're going to carry forward and make the specific scope. It may be four in one, it may be five in another. It might just be two, yet to be determined. But what is going to be important is that they are very clearly articulated so that they are simply written. They're not complex in their own right, that they can be measurable, that they are definitely achievable. We can do them in a timely manner. All those SMART-type measures as well.

So Daniel, I know, is keen on metrics. We'll be able to associate what type of measurement we're going to be looking at. Is this going to be a data capture exercise? Is this going to be an audit exercise? What is the small team going to do with any of these topics?

We then have to also look at how much time and when some things may need to go before another. There may be something that we may need to finish first because that will feed into another activity. So there's still a little bit of massaging to do, but when we leave here or shortly after, it's the intention to have a well-articulated scope that the community and the board will know by June 3rd, can be in the board's hands as a final, well thought out, plan.

So yeah, not quite there yet, but pretty confident we can get there. We're a whole bunch of smart people, we can do it. Pat.

EN

PATRICK KANE: I think the way that I would take a look at this as what we're going to do today in the next exercise is we're going to take a look at the priorities in one through N in in each of these categories, and then as we break up into the different subteams to work on those categories, we're going to take a look at what work we think we can achieve in those groups, with the focus of being qualitative, not quantitative in terms of we don't need to do nine of them, we need to do three well, not nine sort of well. And I think it's going to be incumbent upon those groups to figure out what they can achieve between now and probably September so we can try to get that finalized report in place so we can actually submit that in an October time frame for its final review outside of our group.

So I think that it might be three, it might be seven, it might be one. And then when Cheryl talks about what has to be done before the next one, that may have to say, "Well, the priority here is one for completion, even though it's not the most important item that we're going to get to, but it is a prerequisite." Does that help?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Yeah.]

PATRICK KANE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. Jump in then.

JENNIFER BRYCE:	Just to say ten people have responded to the survey, so if you've thought about the prioritization but you haven't yet filled out the survey, I just popped a link into the Adobe Connect there.
	what we can do is pull up the result of that.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Yeah.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Okay, let's do it. I think there's 18 total review team members.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Go ahead, Sébastien.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you. Can't we try to embark everybody on this exercise and see who's the one who hasn't done it? Maybe we can wait five minutes to allow them to do that, or ten minutes. I think it's much more preferable to have everybody onboard and to have the result at the end now.
PATRICK KANE:	I'm okay with taking five or seven minutes if the people that have not done it will get it done in that five to seven minutes. Because I do think that 10 or 15, that's two thirds – or [inaudible] 10 of 18, it's closer to half. So I think that –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: Is there anybody online who wants to speak to that who hasn't yet done the survey and thinks you can fill it out in the next five minutes or so?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm finishing mine now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright, so we're forcing confessions here. I'm getting to be almost uncomfortable about making people confess that they haven't done their homework. What do you reckon, five minutes?

PATRICK KANE: I think that's appropriate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so for the record, we are taking – well, it's 17 minutes past the hour by one of my clocks, so let's give people until – we'll be extraordinarily generous and say 23 minutes past the hour, so it's a little over five minutes. So by 23 minutes past the hour, we will reconvene, so for those of you who are listening to the recording now – and I notice a couple of our remote participants are hastily finishing [inaudible] which is good, so all of this incredible pressure has come to pass. Sorry if we're making you feel uncomfortable. I'm feeling uncomfortable making you feel uncomfortable if you feel that makes you feel better.

Anyway –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I don't want to say it, not before coffee. So we will have a little bit of radio silence, dead air, and we will be back at the 23 minutes past the hour mark. Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay, sorry, one is high or low priority? One is high.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thanks, everyone. If you recall, yesterday we had a request to have the Meetings team look into the cost of holding a meeting in Beijing, and they received the request, they are looking into it, but before they proceed any further, they had a couple of notes that they wanted me to mention to the review team to be aware of.

They wanted me to let you know that in general, they try to avoid China proper because they're unable to acquire unfiltered Internet for small meeting. This means there's nothing they can do about it, which means that there are some Internet pages that won't load. So review team members will not be able to access a lot of things, and this is due to the filtering that happens in the region.

So they wanted me to mention this restriction and see if the review team is still interested due to the restrictions for them to look into cost estimates for possibly holding a meeting there. And I'm leaving it for discussion amongst the team now.

PATRICK KANE: The other point that got brought up yesterday as well is there are also visa issues to get into China for many countries as well.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That is correct. So with those two concerns in play, do you want the meetings team to proceed with looking into cost estimates for the meeting, or leave that option out for now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it might also be an idea for us to come back to that as a decision point later, but I see Sébastien, if anybody else would like to make a comment now on this, we may not make a decision now, but it's certainly food for thought. Over to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. In the same vein, I think the discussion would be better if we have our colleague from China in the room to discuss those issues. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The fact that he is, does that help?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Yes.]

JAAP AKKERHUIS: About the network issues, experience learns that even if guarantees are given by the Chinese government, by the firewall maintainers and all these guys, in practice, these are not worth the paper they're written on. I've seen a couple of meetings, people went to China, and all were completely guaranteed, and it just didn't happen. So the risk is very serious about not being able to get unfettered access to the Internet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jaap, and I've got Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to say that whatever we may think or not think about the policies of China, U.S., Russia, Brazil or whatever, I think if our colleague from the Chinese ministry says we welcome you, it's good to know whether facilities are made available, it's good to know whether they also make sure that the ATRT members can come. A government has that power. So it's good to check that. If there's a full yes I would say it's an option.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten. Very much in keeping with my personal thinking. Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. I think it would be much more efficient if we could make our meetings in some of the ICANN's regional offices. We have all the facilities there and it should be less costly than any other [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that, Osvaldo. I'm going to go to Wolfgang, and then if anyone else can let me know if they want to get in the queue.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I would like to see a concrete proposal on the table, which includes also what you just mentioned, space for meetings, financial support, and something else. And if there is a concrete proposal on the table, we can consider this. [So we had] ICANN meetings there, and in particular, the fact that the Chinese member of the ATRT couldn't come to this place. So it would be a second problem if we just rejected the proposal. So we have to see the facts on the table, and we can compare with alternatives and then to make the final decision.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wants to get online? Go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Just going to read a comment from Michael that he posted into the chat. He said that, "This occurred to me yesterday regarding the filtering, and I think it's a concern, though may still be worthwhile looking into cost estimates."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Pat, I don't know about you, but what I'm hearing here is that an exploration of it as an option that has not wholesale but general support. It's worthy of finding out more information. But I would point out that we do have, Wolfgang, we have the information already and we'll just re-present that when we get to this decision node about future meetings, about what the costs are to run in an ICANN office versus an external conference center or a hotel board room or whatever. That is material that we already have, so we will look at that. But we would need some China-specific options.

And might I stretch it a little bit further, I wondered, is there an option for us to look at even though the Singapore office, if memory serves, is a little small for our purposes, is the APAC hub in a position to find a [inaudible] for us that may be appropriate and may be easier to have the APAC RT members get in and out of just as a second possibility? Thanks. Sorry, and now Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thanks, Cheryl. Just on the same issue, I would like to suggest that we also look at even if there's no office in Latin America, if there are no regional organization who can accommodate our participation, the Casa de Internet in Uruguay, the house of the Internet in Uruguay cold be a thing to look at at least, like APAC meeting facilities in Latin American region. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm noting that a discussion is slated for later in our agenda. Not right now for where we will be meeting, how many times and some of those details. The agenda item now which has allowed anyone who hasn't filled out their homework form plenty of time to fill out their homework form. You could have probably done it several times. What we have established is in answer to the question to Meetings, do we want them to look at this further? The answer is yes, and we would also like them to perhaps inquire at the APAC office if there is some closer regional option as well. And then we will use all of that when we come back to this agenda item later. Does that satisfy everybody? Negar, back to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, everyone, for the discussion. We will definitely have the Meetings team look into cost estimates and put together a proposal for Beijing – for China, correct – and we will have the slide deck ready when we get to that part of the discussion. It seems like Singapore office might actually be an option for this size review team, so we'll have more to talk about at that point in time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Where are we on the survey then? Back to the job at hand.

JENNIFER BRYCE: 13 people have filled out the survey now, so that's good. The extra minutes were useful. I have displayed on the screen – and it should be

accessible for those of you in the Adobe Connect room as well – the results of the survey.

The SurveyMonkey tool puts the results into a graph and scores them using a waiting system. So the bar chart that you can see, for example question one, scope item one, this green one here, the effectiveness of the board – and I have to [blow it up] to where I can see this, actually. The ones with the longer lines are the most popular in terms of prioritization items.

KC CLAFFY: While you're doing that, I know we went through a little bit about what we mean by each of these labels, but that's also in the Google doc, I think, or are we going to try to [inaudible] it out a little bit? Because this is where I'm trying to think, oh, should I have added another thing, or is what I'm thinking about covered by one of these?

So I'm just wondering, where's going to be the master copy of what the expansion of each of these categories? Is that in the Google doc?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, if I understand you, KC, the final home for what we decide will actually be in what was loaded as an Excel spreadsheet yesterday. It was displayed, I believe, at one point, and it was distributed to the mailing list again. Perhaps if we can put the link into the chat, please. At the moment, it is a draft template. It has a number of times and milestones in it, and we have just placeholders for I think four ABCD-type categories of subteam or work party. So the final home of the pieces of

work would be for them to be inserted in one of these work party [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: But I think I'm more thinking about this two- or three-sentence version of these categories, like what do we mean by ATRT2's need for metrics?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. [Isn't the job that next phase will come on, we have our moment, a very] short sentence or sentences of each of the topics? [When we will select it, we'll have to] also select a team, we'll work on that, and expand this to be sure that we understand the same thing, we agree on. We will not produce to the board from my point of view just the sentence, because they will ask us for rationale, why we have put this sentence. And we have also said yesterday that we have to rewrite some of them because we don't want to leave examples or whatever [is still there.]

The goal, I guess, will be when we will create subgroups work on each issue that the first item will be to write, I don't know, ten lines, half a page, one page on each of these topics, and that will be a good time for you to participate.

KC CLAFFY: I think I get that now. The risk I see is if I saw the three-sentence version of these, I might change my priority. That's a concern, but what can we do?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we need to recognize that what we're operating with in this tool is literally a copy of the very short-form words of [inaudible]. And you all had discussion and a greater understanding of what was meant, and this is just shorthand. So there's no way that these labels can at all capture it.

One of the reasons that this prioritization or ranking exercise has to be done as close as possible to the [wall] exercise is so that you all do remember what you meant by this particular set of words. But as Sébastien said, the group either in part or as a whole fleshes that out, puts it in the master document, that we make sure it's absolutely clear and unambiguous. And indeed, some of these points which may not make the cut under the length of line measurement here could very well end up as subpoints in a final, because they may in some ways be duplicative or complementary.

Okay, back to Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. We're looking at the first scope item here, scope item A, which is 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 allocation structure

meet ICANN's present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for board decisions contained in these bylaws.

And I can read out for you the details here. So according to the prioritization exercise, the effectiveness of the board performance is ranked as the highest priority by the team. ATRT2 need for metrics is the second highest priority. And the election process comes third behind that. Do you want me to read that all in order of the prioritization, all nine items?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: What I will do is in the Google doc that we all worked in yesterday, I will highlight in yellow the top three. You all are in it. If not, please log back into it so you can see the top three items from the survey highlighted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we're just using the top three as an example. we will listen to an argument to make it the top five. There are some that only have two or three. There are some, for example this one where there's nine, and you may wish to make an argument for the top four or five. We're not wedded to the top three, but let's look at the ones that are clearly ahead, and for example some of these you'll see are very close, and any of those that are very close to each other probably need a little discussion. And I guess A is the big one. It's the one with the greatest number of subparts. Arguably, it's the one that probably will have the closest distribution. I'll be pleasantly surprised if it's not the case.

EN

JENNIFER BRYCE:	So we'll go through this exercise and highlight the top three, and then we can come back to each one and have the discussion. Okay, so scope item B, assessing the role and effectiveness of GAC's interaction with the board and with the broader ICANN community, and make recommendations for improvements to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS. And this, again, is one that's quite close results. So the top scope item is evaluate GAC's decision process transparency, and then it looks like these two are tied: how does GAC reach consensus, influences communication to board, and board/GAC communications tools, are they adopted sufficient publicized for transparency?

Any questions, comments before I move on to scope item C? Alright. C, assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input, including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof.

Okay, so item number one, what – in terms of prioritization, this is item number one – 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.

Prioritization number two, assessing and recommending improvements to ICANN's access to information, DIDP and open data systems along with other mechanisms designed to promote transparency or deliver information to the public. And what is the process to prioritize, bundle, fund, or retire recommendations, and what visibility into those [as the] decisions are made?

Okay, I will move on to item D, assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community. Item number one, 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 [inaudible] years? How will competing recommendations from review teams and other working groups be prioritized given the flat budget? And how do budget and resources get rationalized by the community?

Then, let's see. There's two that are equal.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

JENNIFER BRYCE: I know. Alright. So activities concerning the [inaudible] for the five-year plan, ICANN's statement of work with external groups performing these tasks, what are the deliverables? Then addressing the increased scope of regulation on privacy and content, how will global engagement with governments on these topics as a source of information dovetail with ICANN's accountability to no longer lobby? This is still the same thing, what role should the community play in conversations with the government? Etc. [I don't know how that'll all] fit on a post-it note, but anyway.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, as I was filling out the homework last night, I thought I must have missed that part of the meeting, because that looks like more than one

thing. When I think about community role with governments, it's really not GDPR-specific. So I don't know if we mean this thing to be GDPR-specific or we call it out and make it at least two separate things later. I don't know, maybe this can be dealt with later. Where is it on ...

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just for my understanding – I'm allowed to ask stupid questions too, I guess – if I look at the long-term fiancé and in a way also on how regulation affects us, long-term finance in particular, there was an announcement that we will in interaction with the community engage to work an operational plan for the strategic plan, which seems to be very much on top of [inaudible] very difficult for us to say something about it if this process is ongoing and working out. So I'm not sure what we're trying to add here to what's already happening.

And the same for the point on legal developments around the world that may impact how we function. I think there, for both we can loop back and say what went wrong, but also there, there's a clear initiative to set up an inventory of that, collect input and address that.

Now, I know this was presented in Kobe, and the feedback was it's just a list of titles rathe than in-depth assessment of what all these different policies and laws that are coming up, how they will impact the community. So in that sense, I can see we can add to the thinking, but it's really an operation that's already in movement.

So I'm trying to seek, yes, it's important stuff. I'm trying to seek what we can add to that from the ATRT. I'd love to understand that better.

PATRICK KANE: The intention of putting GDPR in there was just to give an example with the DPAs, because there was a lot of conversation from different parties within the GNSO to participate in the process, to say, "Can we come and be engaged in the conversations with the data protection authorities that Göran and staff were engaging in?"

So that was just the example, because looking forward, how should the community be engaged in that process so that it's not just somebody advocating on our behalf as the community or on ICANN Org's behalf so that we can say, "How does this after us?" And be part of that conversation.

So it's not really to take a look and say which ones we want to pick and choose, but what's the process for community involvement in that? Because the outcomes of those conversations affect us all across the community. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: I was addressing the GDPR issue when we talked about –

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I get that, and I appreciate your explanation on the legal part. The long-term finance part, what would we add there? Knowing that with the

EN

community we're talking about operational plan to back up the strategic plan, what would ATRT add to that process? Just for my understanding.

PATRICK KANE: And I think that's the transparency into how decisions are made as to what projects gets funded. How do we evaluate that in terms of participating? What is impactful to the community in terms of how the budget is spent?

KC CLAFFY: Maarten, I'm confused by the proposition that because ICANN is already underway doing something and there's nothing to say with respect to ATRT in that. It might be the perfect time to say something. As you point out, collating a bunch of legislative activity isn't really going to cut it, and we're going to need some more insight into how that impacts what ICANN is trying to do. So I think there's plenty of things to say there, but even trying to match the operating plan to the strategic plan seems to me some of the issue that I think whoever wrote this was trying to draw out is where do all the responses to all the review recommendations fit into the strategic plan, because those aren't listed explicitly. And just doing those would take all the budget of ICANN, never mind the strategic plan.

So I think there's a serious problem here that even transparency and accountability can only go so far to addressing, and we're going to have to confront that in this report. And this again comes back to as I did the homework last night, I thought this is not the right title for this category because it needs to capture this and this. Long-term financial stability

isn't what I would necessarily call that category, but all these things underneath it, I think, need a category.

So we can change the name of the category as we go if it makes us all feel better. I didn't mean to be [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: No, I'm just saying the reason why those [inaudible] categories for the 20 to 25 plan came from was specifically how Cherine and Göran talk about them.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Well, I wrote them down exactly how they talk about them, so the fifth one is always long-term financial stability. So I think you're right, we should change the categories' titles to fit where we need up, but the thinking on those five when they came through was based upon how the board and how Cherine and Göran talk about the objectives for 20 to 25.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. So for now, we'll move on to scope item E, which is assessing the policy development process to facilitate and enhance cross-community deliberations and effective and timely policy development.

For these, there's actually four items. They're all pretty close. I would suggest we just highlight all of those and discuss them. I'll move on unless anybody has concerns. Alright.

The same with F, [inaudible] is actually in this one, assessing and improving the independent review process. So we'll highlight all of those.

Okay, number three, the accountability and transparency review team shall assess the extent to which the prior review recommendations were implemented and how the recommendation implementation has resulted in the intended effect.

Let me have a look at this. The item number – what steps were taken to implement each prior recommendation is the top priority there, and then effectiveness of the implementation plan of the review, and how well did the implementation of each recommendation achieve the previous review team's intended effects. Okay, those are the top three. That's a quite close one as well. I'm sure there'll be some discussion about that, but unless anybody wants to chat now, I'll move on.

KC CLAFFY: I want to say one thing about this. Again, as I was reading it last night, I thought I misread number seven when we talked about it, because so many of the recommendations from all the review teams, not just ATRT2, have been about transparency and accountability. So in my mind, I thought, does any of the category we've covered include reviewing not only previous ATRT but even current – well, each of the review teams including us has had to review the previous rounds, and

EN

speaking as someone who was on SSR2, we're almost done with a draft on assessment of the previous round of SSR recommendations and whether they're implemented. And it's remarkable how many of them, to the extent that we had concerns, were about transparency and accountability of the implementation of the last recommendation.

So I feel it would be remiss if the ATRT3 didn't cover that aspect of the other non-ATRT reviews. Does it fit into here? Does it fit into another one? Do we need a new bullet? I don't know. I'm assuming we can fit it in here somehow, but it's not explicitly in the wording at the top, so I just want to highlight that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back to you, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. Thank you. So Item number roman numeral four, ATRT review team may recommend to the board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by section 4.6 and recommend to the board creation of additional periodic reviews.

This one, the top item is based on the previous work of ATRT 1 and 2. On review of other specific reviews, the opportunity may be agreed to include in our scope in this unusual time in ICANN's evolution an analysis of the effectiveness and actionables from recent reviews.

Okay, and we need to think on how to make reviews more objective, less cost with result that will make a difference, and relevance of the periodic review, whether it has transitioned of the impact.

And that, I believe, is all of the items, so now we can go into this doc and have a look at the ones we had related to each of the items.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So as we're all going back into the doc now and scrolling to the top, Pat, how do you want to approach this next round of analysis? Is now the time for us to decide we've got the top three highlighted, and in at least one case that means everything's looked at because there was only three of them there, but do you want to have a small discussion on any of the very closely supported pieces? Do you want to just in general go, let's make a [inaudible] point? Recognizing that some of these actions may not be as costly in time and energy as others. Some might be much bigger pieces of work, so it might be easy to add another two or three small pieces of work to your identified task. So this is us not having gt deep into the weeds on this, but what's your feeling?

PATRICK KANE: Like you said, Cheryl, this is running with scissors, but it seems to me that as a group, we've now prioritized each of our categories with the topics within that, and I think that it might be a good idea for us to start to look at the teams now and let the teams that are going to take on each of those working groups, so if we have work parties, SSAC terminology here, and have them prioritize that work and see how far they get and how those are interrelated in terms of the work that that work party's going to be doing for the next several months, that that might be a way to take this prioritization and tie together or unwind it

EN

and relabel it, and get the right projections as to how they want to work within those work parties. Thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, thank you. I'm all for we create teams and some group. My question is if the best way is to do it by ABCD or is it to try to see there are some [inaudible] in some subtopics and take them together? When we talk about for example – and sorry if it's not a good example, but about the review, analyze of the reviews and analyze of Work Stream two, it could be in two different places in our overall job, but it could be a good place to put them together for a single team.

I think we need to try to find to not stay in those boundaries because it was given to us at the beginning, and I know that it will be a little bit harder to do, what I suggest, but I think we need to see what could be cross items and put into a single team of work. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I do suggest that while I like small groups to work to, and I do believe that we should pick up the most important issues that we believe each group believes that is connected to their objectives from this task, and put together – and I agree with Sébastien – all the others that are related and make this big list shorter and work on that, because with a lot of things, we'll be repeating points that are already done in another issue.

So we need to try to make it shorter in my opinion to really put together things that are related in some way to have a very clear report on that, because what I see is some repetitive issues that could come out from that analysis. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: I think that that's a useful way to look at things of how we interrelate between the five groups that we have, even if we have to break out into a sixth or combine into four, but in thinking through that, the question I have is, is it the best way to do that by working from within the five groups and going out, or taking a look at the whole thing as we look at it and see how they're interrelated?

What jumps into my mind is some things I've done in the past where putting together system behavior models and trying to identify how one component relates to another component within, and then we start to tie things together by saying all five groups have identified one [– coding days –] data store or entity that we want to approach or task that we want to address that's external to our group, and then how do we tie the list together? Either put them into a single group, create another group. But it seems to me like we have to work from within to identify those touchpoints that are external to each group and then rationalize those if we've identified multiple ones from each of those groups. Thoughts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I agree. We've done this analysis, and that's useful. And I think we should give it back to the groups to say, okay, knowing this, what do you think that is really what you want to focus on, and then get in an iterative process with the plenary? In that way, we can ensure that it fits together, and in that way, we can ensure that not one of the groups is going off to a blind spot approach. And in that way, continue to zoom in rather than assume to get it right in one go.

KC CLAFFY: This is definitely tricky, because I for example feel like my strengths are going to be – which means my weaknesses are everything else – SSR stuff, and I feel like SSR stuff goes across all the groups. There's a little bit here and a little bit here, and I think, am I going to have to be in three work parties? There's no way.

So what Vanda says sort of appeals to me, yeah, let's just get the SSR stuff factored out over here, and I'll go to all those calls. But on the other hand, I worry about a report that isn't pretty explicitly structured, like we did our homework A, we did B, we did C, and here's the responses. Because people are going to say, "God, they went off the rails and just did whatever they want."

So I'm wondering if there's a way to have both somehow. For example, the issue I brought up earlier about going through the other review recommendations to see if they've really been responsive or how could transparency and accountability mechanisms improve that. That's pretty explicitly in there. What transparency and accountability

mechanisms and checks and balances could make sure that ICANN balances all of its interests?

And it's in one of these, but really, it's in all of these, and even making it its own work party is like, well, but that's in every work party. So that's why I think this is really tricky. And maybe it would be a useful exercise to go through these top N that we had before, because I'm worried that there were six in one category that were all higher than all three in another category.

So what do we do about that? Now, some of those six are really the same, so maybe there's only four there, and maybe we only need two in that other category and we cover the bases. Like the bottom category, I think all three were the same thing, and I marked them all the same number. I thought I don't know what the difference is so I have to be consistent and mark them all the same. But maybe that's just one category.

So I think we have a big decision here about how to structure this thing, but I'm not sure we're ready to make that decision without more discussion, and I don't know the best way to structure that discussion.

PATRICK KANE: I think it's a very good comment and a pretty good perspective to take a look at all of this, because there's got to be a thread even if you work from inside out across all five of the groups and get some recommendations to either collapse one, maybe even eliminate one, but in terms of where we are right now in starting with our terms of reference, I think it's a good marker to put down the five categories

with the priorities in it and then let the work party start to take a look at that.

And we may collapse it, or we may extend it. We may push them all around. But I think the thread between those five groups really has to be Cheryl and I [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: We've already identified that we're going to be part of these, so we'll be – and Maarten will certainly help as well, but we're the ones who've got to rationalize what the groups do so that we're not duplicating effort within each group and so we're actually tying the right things together. So I think we're going to find some bumpiness early on, but once we're able to do that, I think we can start really to perform at that point in time.

KC CLAFFY: What did the previous ATRT teams do? How did they handle this? Because you're our institutional memory, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's scary if you're relying on me as institutional memory. Well, they actually broke into work parties, and they operated relatively independently, but came back to plenary at regular. And that's certainly

the way that I would encourage. It's the way that number one worked, it's the way number two worked. I can suggest that it's a good idea for number three to look at that seriously.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For number one, it was straight out of the affirmation of commitments. There was no latitude, we had no flexibility on what we looked at. There was no choice. NTIA was in the room and we did exactly what the affirmation of commitments said we should do, nothing more, nothing less.

Number two of course had the benefit of having the additional requirement of looking back at what happened with the implementation of number one and of the other review teams that had happened between the affirmation of commitments and then.

So the scope shift is different between one and two, and of course, we find ourselves in an absolutely unique situation as we discussed yesterday in the very beginning, which is ICANN is in an entirely different place now in terms of its accountability and its efforts on transparency, the caucus group that Maarten introduced to us yesterday, where we are with an empowered community, it's a totally different ICANN. It's a big jump in evolution. And so I guess I'm not helping with the answer of they did it this way, therefore we possibly

should. Rather, this is how they did it, we have options and opportunities.

So not overly helpful. Let me see if I've got this order going. I'm going to let Negar jump in because she has been so patient. Then I believe it was Sébastien, then Daniel and Maarten. Okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. I actually prefer that you let me go a little last because there are other comments that I can make at once seeing as how I get the last mic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: You were. Thank you. So two comments I wanted to make. One – and this is something KC touched on early on, that these items that we have listed here are a one-liner, very brief, non-descriptive topics that are making it difficult for the review team as a whole to think through what's included or covered under each topic.

One suggestion would be for the team to proceed to exercise three based on the high-level scope items and your skillsets and areas of interest, determine which discussion topics you want to become a subgroup member of, because then that subgroup can work on developing detailed descriptions of the items that you have now ranked one through three.

The thing is there's for example line item in there called Work Stream 2. What does that even entail? Work Stream 2 has as set of recommendations out. Is the review team going to review their recommendations that haven't been implemented? Is there value to that? What's the point? Right? If you define what everyone meant by that and what you're going to look at, the review team may decide that that item is not even relevant, we're going to take it off and pick something else up to do it. Or not even pick something else up, just stick with two items or whatnot.

So I think breaking down and first defining what you want in detail under each of these bullet items is going to help decide the direction the scope work is going to go, which might help eliminate what's included or whatnot. You can go through that.

The second point I want to make is there is essentially one or two items in the bylaws that are addressed as the review team shall do, and that's scope item three which is assessing the past review implementation.

All of the other seven scope items are review team may look at it. So if you guys realize you obviously have a limited time, there's a lot of items, logically, there's not enough time to do everything. Pick the one that you're the most interested in addressing and have ICANN [inaudible] or whatever the right answer is at this point in time. It doesn't have to be all eight. Only one is mandatory, everything else is optional, and if the review team thinks it's only worth it to look at like two or three other scope items but dive deep into them instead, that is your prerogative and what the review team can do and [inaudible].

If it's best to pick a handful of items that you can do a really detailed job on than to pick 1000 items that you can only briefly look at and not produce anything useful. So with that, I hand it [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I don't think I'm comfortable that we stick with the boundary we have in front of us, ABCD. I really think that we need to see across those questions, because they are not mandatory questions, we don't have to answer the ABCD and so on. We have to do a review, and how we can organize it, I think the question of SSR2, if it's in different arena, we can put them, and maybe with other topic because we hope that you will bring your knowledge in other things than just SSR too. But that's a way to do it, and maybe the first things we need to do before we reorganize and organize subteam, is to have enough page on each of the topics, things we will keep, and that we write that. And maybe it could be the first one is one to three [inaudible] we do that in two people together to write something by, I don't know, beginning of this afternoon just to have a better paper to discuss with the group. I am not comfortable to stay with ABC and so forth.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think I'm becoming more confused here. When I look at the groupings, I believe when we begin to handle these things, we're going to have other topics coming, overlapping with other group discussions. How are we going to be able to harmonize the relationships [when we begin] this process? Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: What that makes me aware of is that, yes it's good to break up in groups and to really get focused discussions on each of the topics to progress it, taking into account what has been said and bringing it back to full group.

At the same time, I'm very conscious of the fact that we are all resource persons in this as well from different backgrounds. So maybe it's good also to identify the specific resource person we can be so groups can call upon resource persons when that comes to bear. On SSR2, I can see KC and Jaap can be that. If it's on current board practice, I'm very happy to do it, but I can't fully participate to all the groups. Yet I'd be happy to be called upon, and I can see there may be more of us to be identified in that way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Perhaps to try and come back to Daniel's point, and I guess top some extent it's why I put my hand up to be in the queue, so I might deal with that issue now.

I think it's very important that even if we are going down a path – and I'm very comfortable to go down a pathway of work parties. Hopefully not too many of them, five, okay-ish, seven if you twist my arm, but let's not go much further than that, please. Three would be delightful. But that's up to you. But the idea of work parties makes sense to me.

But it is essential that you also come back to plenary. So it may be – we agreed to meet weekly. It may be that we actually have a plenary meeting every second week that is purely dedicated to the work parties contributing what they've done in the last seven to ten days, where

EN

they're up to, what the challenges are, what the current thinking is, so that we're all taken on the journey and we have the opportunity to bring in our particular expertise. And for a little bit of risk management, the ability of one work party to say, "Oh, hang on, we actually have a matter that is linked to that," or, "We have something that seems to be dependent upon work someone else is doing," and identify dependencies, codependencies, precursors, conflicts, whatever.

It's very important to do that during the process rather than try and catch it up at the end when someone's looking through an almost finally edited text.

When it comes to developing the text – and I think this is to your point, Daniel, to try and get a coherent documentation out of this at the end, that's where – and you've heard us talk once or twice about the benefits of bringing in a technical writer in this process whose investment is simply to make sure what work product we put out is intelligible, consistent, and ha a look and feel that work is reflective of the work you've done, is accurate, but has a readability that allows people who are not totally invested in this, who are picking this document up either in public comment or some future point in time, and to be able to make sense of it. And also, above all, for it to be a useful thing for the next review team to use, because our report is what they will be obviously looking at as [reference] material.

So we're going to strongly recommend that we do take advantage, as cross-community working groups have lately. It was a tool that was used in the Cross Community Working Group for IANA transition, it was a tool that was used for Cross Community Working Group Work Stream 1 and

2, and the use of a technical writer who just sits with us all through all of our processes and brings things together – Daniel – helps a great deal.

It also allows that person as an external viewer, an almost editor, but that's too powerful a word, to ask of a work party as it goes, "What about this?" And it may be that additional work can come out of that.

So I've primed a few more people. Sorry about that. I think I'll take you up first, [inaudible], because KC, you've been chatty this morning.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: [I'll be short.] Since you mentioned the work party [inaudible] transition IANA stuff, one of the problems [inaudible] one of the problem I found at the end that work parties were starting to get on their own destiny, completely started to get their own meetings without contact with plenary. And they were kept live while they already had delivered a product.

So we should watch that we not fall in the trap that we just create more and more of this stuff. So just a word of caution that I wanted to make.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jaap, and I think Pat and I can be relied upon to kill them off as required. [inaudible]. KC.

KC CLAFFY: The more I listen to the comments since Negar's comment, the more I think we have to do what Negar said next. I think we're losing people. I

see going people into their e-mail now anyways, and I need to stand up and do something. So I wonder if we can try to do that exercise where we flesh out where we go over – I wonder if we can do exercise three now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In fact, I think we've done exercise three. I think it's exercise four we need to do now, because the prioritization and the run through that's in the Google doc is kind of what we've done, and I agree it's a done deal now at this point. But exercise four is where we're actually getting into the workplan, putting the parties together, looking at groups of three or four people. Sounds to me like that's what you want to do. Is that correct?

KC CLAFFY: Well, the way Negar described it, I thought it was a little bit of expansion of what each of these things were, and then maybe the work parties reform based on what Sébastien's saying, because they're not factored right.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So I think you both are saying the same thing just in different ways. I believe, Cheryl – and correct me if I'm wrong, when you're saying put things in work plan, you don't mean let's start putting timelines associate with everything. I think what she's addressing is let's decide who's going to become a subgroup of which of the scope items so that you can start fleshing out the details underneath each scope on each of

these eight scope topics, then try to break down what the details are that you're going to be looking at for each scope item so that we can narrow down what the final outcome is going to be.

Next steps in the process once that is all done is to now morph that into the workplan and determine timelines and all the details that are associated with it. So you're both saying the same thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So just to be clear, in the Google doc, it is the item that is headed exercise four, begin mapping out workplan elements. Step one, review team members to form a temporary subgroup of three to four people focusing on the top four or five objectives. We can make it three, we can make it four, don't really care, just the top objectives based on the results of the exercise which we've just done, we'll select station, focus on and fill in the framework of some workplan elements, which is building the paragraph that [inaudible] you were saying one or two people. If one or two people want to step out of this to do that, that's fine.

And then step two, the full group will review each of the "stations" and will begin shaping the findings of the group back into a [final] document, and rinse and repeat.

That was the proposed exercise. Is there any questions, problems, concerns? It may be that someone can sit down with someone else and do what Sébastien said, and that is perhaps to create a more fulsome set of text associate with some of this as well. That can sit in with that. Go ahead, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I actually just want to hand it over to Jennifer. Michael has put a comment in chat that we wanted to read out for the record.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I think we've moved on a little bit from it, but just to read his comment for the record. To speak specifically of the transparency areas, they're quite broad, but if we split off and discuss in more detail, I'm sure we can pare that down. That was his intent of putting those into the doc.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And Jennifer, could you actually also read to the record what he's also put most recently in chat, please?

JENNIFER BRYCE: He said, "Thanks, I've got to dash off in about five minutes, but I would be happy to volunteer for the group dealing with scope item C.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got a volunteer. He stepped up. Thank you, Michael. Your name is taken down, and we will expect all the work to be done by you. No, not true. Thank you very much for that, Michael. [Good lead.]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So I think at this point in the process, we should all get up, walk around, pick the teams that we wanted to be in. I have sticky notes here, again, with markers. For those that are in the room, we'll have roaming mics as well. For those that are remote, you've seen the eight areas, you've seen the highlighted subcategories under each scope in the Google doc, so please feel free in the chat to chime in which groups you want to subscribe to to be a subgroup member, and we'll have discussion, and if you put comments in chat, we're happy to read it out loud.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, and Pat and I are just going to be disruptive influencers, because hey, if we can't be, who else could be? We'd like you to add in your break to this activity. So we had a planned break that would be starting in some eight minutes' time. You're going to have a working break now, so get up off your chairs as you're preparing to do this exercise, go and grab your coffee and your croissant, and make this a working exercise with caffeinated beverage or hydration fluids to hand.

So rather than take a break I now seven minutes' time, get your coffee, get organized, come back in, get on to exercise four, drink your coffee and that at the same time. Okay? So you're still kind of getting a break, but not. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We have seven or eight groups. We wanted to have less group. How we will fit that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We clearly know what KC wants out of it. Okay, Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: Question from an absolute beginner in these ATRT matters. What's reasonable, how many groups is it feasible to be part of? Is one a lot of work in itself? I know the real answer is, "depends," I'm aware of that, but from your experience, what can be usually handled? You could say, "Well, you know, one, you will have your hands full, or two, an absolute maximum," or whatever.

KC CLAFFY: That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to see if there's a way that we can minimize the number of groups that we're in, but I think Maarten suggested there's also going to be an aspect to which Pat and Cheryl are going to have to say, oh, we need that person's expertise over here and they're going to be the people who see everything. So they're going to be able to do that like they're managing the group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Marten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just a question to the group. Where could I usefully participate? And please, I'm willing to do the work at the same time. I'm really seeing myself as a resource person rather than somebody who puts in to vote for what should be done or not. How do I determine where to contribute best? Should I wait for the invitation, or should I ...

KC CLAFFY: I want him in every group that says "board" at the top, that has the word "board" in it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's your first answer. If the word "board" is involved, you need to be there. That's not an unreasonable response actually seeing as your resource would be from a board perspective, topics that are related to the word "board" would make perfect sense. But we may also find you're needed elsewhere from time to time as well.

PATRICK KANE: Maarten, I would suggest that you start with areas that we need the most clarification on on what it is [inaudible] the current practice on those kind of things so that we can better understand and detail out. Because this exercise is again not to create eight teams but to understand from a detail sense what is it we want to do within these eight categories and then collapse them into a workable number because eight's too many.

So I would start where you can lend most visibility into creating detail around what it is we're trying to do and help that way. That would be best, I think.

JENNIFER BRYCE:	We have another online volunteer, Erica has put her name forward now for topics A, D and F or some combination thereof depending on needs. So we'll write her name on this sticky.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay. So this a mapping out of workplan elements exercise recognizing that the ultimate aim of the game is to make these workplan elements into less than a full list [of eight,] but more like three. If we have to, we might push it to five, but certainly a smaller number of work parties. With that, we will run this exercise through to – says Cheryl checking the time – assuming that we're going to have coffee we can run this exercise ... let's reconvene at the table. We'll use the marks again and the staff will make sure that the remote participants are kept apprised of what's going on in the groupings here. Let's touch base and look at our progress at ... shall we give it 45 minutes or 40 minutes? What do you reckon? 40 minutes works? Okay, in 40 minutes time, which will be at 10 past the hour. I'm going to be generous, 10 minutes past the hour. We'll reconvene. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. You won't have radio silence for long. It's just people will be grabbing their coffee and water and taking bar breaks.
PATRICK KANE:	For those of you that are online, we are still going through putting names on different sections to work through. And we're having staff move the stickies that are the top priorities from each of the sections onto the boards that we're putting our names on so we can get a better

understanding or have a good understanding of what we signed up for. Thank you.

We're going to get started again. So what we've done, we've completed the exercise so far, but we're going to take one last pass and so what Jennifer and Negar have done for us is they've moved the stickies that we had on our boards here for the eight sections that we worked through yesterday and prioritized this morning and put them on the next set of slides which I think are under exercise four in the Google doc. So you take a look and see what we're talking about. Of course, if you're online you won't have the advantage of the stickies on those, but we moved the stickies for the top three priorities for each section to each one.

And so what we're going to do right now is we'll take one last pass for everyone who has put their name on and make certain that given the priorities that we have on the boards that they get their names right on what they're going to work on. So let's take five minutes for the folks in the room and do one last pass to make certain that your names are on the right ones that you want to work on and let's get back, sit back down because then we'll go through how we're going to rationalize and reword or repackage each of those areas and see what we can do to collapse that down into three to five work parties so that we can we can make certain that we're not spread too thin in terms of what we're doing.

So the objective again is take these eight, get your names on the correct pages that you want to work on, take those and boil them down either through reworking or rethinking through what they really mean and

then boiling it down by the end of the day into three to five working parties that we can then assign skill sets and interests to work on those parts. Understood?

Alright, so five minutes, we'll be back at the microphones. For all those that are currently online. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Just a quick note that I will start copying and pasting the highlighted yellow items into exercise four tables right under scope ABCD so remove people can see, they have the same experience that you guys are having in the room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I'd just like to read for the record Michael's comment in the chat. He said, "In case I miss the remainder of this discussion on this issue I'd like to express I think we do need to do a dedicated subtopic focusing expressly on transparency and information delivery. I know that can be a cross cutting theme. I'm concerned that if it gets zoomed into another area of discussion it will not be properly examined. Thanks. Hope to join again later today."

EN

KC CLAFFY: Yes that meshes with what I was trying to say earlier a little bit, but from my perspective you could put SSR in front of that and then it would kind of be what I said earlier. But I guess it is it's relevant to other topics too. Indeed I think the CCT report is a really good example of that. But most of the CCT transparency issues were also SSR issues.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So this looks like an example then of where in our blending, which is what we're about to try and look at, we may end up with not so much the removal of one but the creation of a different one that takes a number of the existing pieces into it. So it might be that your desire to have the SSR issues dealt with can come under what Michael was referring to or be part of what Michael was referring to. But let's take the rest of the four minutes of the five minutes given for you to review.

PATRICK KANE: 11:25, folks, is when we're going to reassemble at the table. That's six minutes. Now it's five.

Alright, folks, we're going to get started again. Please return to your seats.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ladies and gentlemen.

PATRICK KANE:	Thank you, Cheryl. Alright, folks, so thank you for going around and readjusting names. We're gonna have another little exercise here because now that we have eight smaller groups on the eight different boards we'd like you to do a couple of things and it's gonna be up and down in the next hour. We're gonna get up on the boards and do a couple items and then sit down and talk about it again.
	Right now in each of your groups I would like you to go and identify each of the items within each of those groups as to what would be a relevant category not areas that we're investigating but relevant categories to what it should look like. Board, GAC, SSR, budget, all others. Think about it in terms of if you've got a pink sticky that looks like an SSR2 or SSR item, re-categorize it into an SSR category. If it feels like –
KC CLAFFY:	[Leave it on the same page] but like label it?
PATRICK KANE:	Label it. And then we're going to readjust. This is my suggestion.
KC CLAFFY:	My concern is that many of these stickies have SSR dimensions but they're not all SSR, like reviewing previous recommendation from something.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Understood, KC. Because what my thought process was that we would recategorize them and then reword them appropriately. So are you suggesting that maybe we should reword them first and break them into component pieces and then recategorize?

KC CLAFFY: No. Maybe we allow there to be multiple tags on the stickies right now, we figure out how many ... Okay, so for example GAC, the GAC Beijing thingy that was put all these public safety things in the agreements and then it got repeated last month in Kobe. That's a GAC thing and that's an SSR thing. What do we tag it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I was just thinking, maybe just having SSR as the issue, maybe if we just use RTs as the issue, because there is going to be review team across a lot, like the CCT or SSR.

                          But there is also going to be things that obviously GAC, obviously board, obvious the other something else as well. If I understand, your concern is is to make sure that things that are very much across sort of [pan] subjects don't get lost. I guess what we're trying to do is get it down to just smaller work party pieces.

                          So your multiple tagging is one way. I'm sure there's other ways. So multiple tagging is fine. But let's look at a way of getting it down to a smaller number of then writing pieces that we're going to do. So in the next few minutes if you can establish what will be blended here, what will be put together, or even what will be cut up and repurposed so

you've got somewhere between three to five work party opportunities, then we can try and make sure that everything that you've identified is either involved or decided to not be expanded.

So you've made a conscious choice to say, " No, we are not going to do that," or "Yes we are, and this is how it's written and expanded."

That's one suggestion. Sébastien, and it looks like the boss up the front's got thing. Sébastien first.

PATRICK KANE: Sébastien made a suggestion that I think might be helpful for us to take a look at this, and this is basically to put together kind of a matrix and kind of think about it this way when we have the organization and then compare it against ...

They only gave me six stickies, but we'll put an SSR one in here for you, KC. But set up a matrix that we have the function or the organization, and then the type of review that we're trying to do. Is it transparency accountability diversity, or board, GAC, reviews, budget, SSR? And start to take these apart and put them into a matrix of that nature. Is there anything else I'm missing on that, Sébastien, that you'd like to talk about?

Great. Does that make sense? Alright, so let's ...

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Let me understand, because we need to shrink in some way for the groups. So in my view it's possible to continue in that direction that we

have done. For instance a four F and three and I is the same context, and after that, we can start a kind of organization like that. Because we need to think more easily things that are together before we divide in order issues that for instance [inaudible] around that, there is in the GAC a specific group treating GAC. Maybe GAC can be around but it will not be easy to define the work afterwards if we divide too much the context inside one or other group. That's my point.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. So what might be interesting to do as we go through each of these boards, so that's A and we've got five of them up there and that's one through five because of the top – it may not be one through five. It might have been – whatever.

So whatever the number that correlates in the prioritization ranking, we'll come and go "Oh that's a board transparency item." So A.4 goes in here. But it also has a component for SSR. We'll put one down here for you, Casey, so you don't feel left out. And we come down here and we say it's a SSR transparency and we say A.4 is also here from that standpoint. Is that helpful in terms of trying to categorize them and then take a look at how we work from there?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry, what is the way that we get out from that? What do we expect from that? Sébastien needs to explain.

EN

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [No, I don't. I don't need, but] I've done excellent job and [inaudible] my suggestion and that's good, that's a collaborative way. My thinking was that if we take the [inaudible] by having fixed group, but it could be also three with two item, one functional and one organizational we take into account. [inaudible] is always a little bit different to work on, but it could be that – I want to be on this line and this line, and when there are topics who are cross of this line and this column, we work together at this point.

I think it's a way for me to go to answer some of the question here how we take transparency, how we take the reviews, and one of them is SSR2. How we take the question link only on the GAC, and to try with that to take out of this bundle that we have worked on since the beginning to create new type of working group. It will not say that with that we are ending to have just two working groups, but I guess we can end up with having three. And taking the proposal of Pat to put A1, A2, [and name those,] it could show how it's possible to reorganize that. I think it's a good idea. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you Sébastien. Because I think that to your point as well, what are we trying to drive towards? What we're trying to get towards is further detail in what it is that we're going to be addressing in terms of putting together what the objectives are but also trying to formulate work teams. So I think that we could either rewrite and then categorize, or we can categorize and rewrite. But at the end of the day we need to figure out what the work parties look like.

And I think that we've got eight categories right now to get down to three to five, and this may be a way for us to take a look at them to say functionally here's a board item and it's got transparency and accountability and diversity issues across the board category, etc. That's kind of what I think we're driving towards. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: How we get there, I'm actually open to any suggestions. But I think I would advise that to do the reduction to three to five before we start doing work within writing, expanding, clarifying, looking at how the work parties are going to be populated and what they're going to do is that's the order of things I would suggest. Otherwise we're going to be working on eight groups of activity and some of that may be duplication, some of that may be even needing to be admitted totally.

So I'd encourage you to do the culling down before we get into what we're hoping was at least a 40-minute session of starting to work as the work party.

PATRICK KANE: I think would also allow people to focus on fewer areas that we're rewriting as opposed to trying to be a part of six or seven of the boards that we have up right now. Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: like the matrix because one thing is that it also solves the challenge of relationships. So in case a team is working for example on transparency and the board issues, during the discussions they're going to reach a

point whereby the team going to [inaudible] transparency together with the GAC. So now that's when the mixing of the team comes together to come up with a solid conclusion opposition regarding to that discussion. So I think it would be good to [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Daniel.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there anyone who objects to having a run through of the matrix concept? You two are okay? [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: As I said before, I do believe shrink a little bit, and then work on that, because makes sense for me.

PATRICK KANE: Alright. So that means everyone's got to get up and go to their boards and start to figure out how to dissect these in terms of how they fit across function and then transparency, accountability, and diversity.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl, just to let everybody know that Erica has stepped out, but we do still have Liu online. So I'd ask that groups that have stickies with Liu's name on, if you wouldn't mind please using the microphone so that he's able to participate. Can you all use the microphone? Because Liu is actually online.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So, what we are doing here is trying to put those points into that matrix, because GAC is specific condition, the B issue is on a specific condition. So [put the line of] the GAC, so how does GAC reach consensus?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I do believe it's accountability.

JACQUES BLANC: And on my part, I think how does any group reach consensus is transparency.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. You're right. We agree. You agree?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, we are agreeing here. So this B1 is in the [order matrix.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm going to put a T for transparency. So that's a T.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: GAC T.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: They have open sessions, right? Open sessions are open.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, but the way they reach consensus, because in the GAC –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's another point. I'd like to raise another point. For instance, [what is the problem into the GAC] is how cultural behavior interferes in your way to get consensus or get –

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think it's institutional behavior because there's many people who don't have the mandate to do anything than their marching orders.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's right. That's a big problem with the GAC.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: There is no really a clear way where they reach consensus.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: But the transparency is not the problem, because everybody can [inaudible] process.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, transparency is not, yeah. But people are there, and they need to go back to their countries and be accountable with their countries. So there is an issue here that most of the representative over there cannot be accountable for that, because they have no power to making positions on one point and get consensus on that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. We're not going to change that either because it's between them and their government.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: That's not for us, yeah.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible] ICANN and GAC. It's between the representative and their government.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So in which case, what I would tend to say is how they reach consensus is transparency. What they do with the consensus when they go back is accountability. That's the way I would see it.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Is it ICANN's or [inaudible]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This is not ICANN [ICANN mission.] This is just a problem. I don't agree with the [inaudible] issue that have nothing to do with this point of view of ICANN mission in any way.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think it's a problem of transparency for ICANN, because you have a comment by the GAC that gets consensus –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Because we're talking about influence, communication to board?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] if anybody – you know that nobody oppose it, but you don't know who supports it except the one that put forward that comment, because one country forwards a comment, nobody oppose it, and it's consensus. You only have one. Where is the transparency there, how many countries support it?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, that is no transparency.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Mostly, there is no consensus on that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Because [inaudible] transparency. Transparency is not only to allow people to see what you are doing, because the way you are doing, you can control your possibility to say something against that. So transparency is much larger than be open, everybody seeing what I'm doing here. So if you don't allow people to have the same condition to express themselves, it's not transparent.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, but ICANN allows it. It's their government that doesn't allow it. So we're not going to influence that part.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, but we can [inaudible] it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But we have a saying for the role of the GAC in ICANN.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. I think one thing is that what people continue to talk about is that if the GAC gives them advice, the board needs to listen to it.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And if we reject it, we need to [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: But if [inaudible] accountability and transparency of the GAC, board-GAC process, I think that one is very crystal clear. So I'm really trying to explore, if you look to the other end a year from now, what can we say that will improve upon that? We cannot say, "Chinese representative can't speak on behalf of the Chinese government."

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We can't say that. That's outside of our –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, but the process, you can recommend for instance if you suggest that the people vote instead of speak.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alright, so what are the items that we have up here? B1, [B2,] B3, right? So as we take B1, [B2,] B3, how are those related to this [inaudible]. These are all GAC, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Absolutely.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

OSVALDO NOVOA:	[inaudible] the priority of the GAC issues with respect to the other issues, because there is very little we can do about it. We can express our opinion, but …
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	It's not within our mandate. Our mandate is on the ICANN community accountability and transparency. Where the outside community liaises to us, we have much less to say. So I'm really trying to seek where we can make a difference.
OSVALDO NOVOA:	This is my point, I don't see where we can make much difference, because it's in the bylaws.
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	[inaudible].
OSVALDO NOVOA:	We can recommend, yes.
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	But we cannot recommend the Chinese government to –
OSVALDO NOVOA:	No, of course.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:	So there is no [inaudible] here because it's government [and they behave the way they want to.] [inaudible] here. So, what do we believe is how they do may make a difference? I don't know [inaudible] is not only [inaudible].

JACQUES BLANC:	A couple of things. And maybe it's my privilege to be new here. You've all done this before. I come directly from the broader ICANN community, even if I've been in domain name for years, I'm brand new in ICANN, only a couple of years. And all the things you know, I'm just discovering. And most of the ICANN community would be discovering too.

So as long as we didn't review the conclusions of ATRT2 and we don't have matter here, I have the feeling you are jumping to conclusions before we ever try to discover what's in there.

Second point, this is new ICANN. You've all been saying that over and over. We've been transitioning. So, is this going to stay the same in the new ICANN [as this one in the old one?] This might be worth studying. My point.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Yeah, I believe [we're fine] because like the beginning, everything closes, and then we open up. So now maybe change the way they get consensus [is] something.

JACQUES BLANC: And one of the aspects maybe with studying would be what would be the difference into the GAC interaction with the board before transition and after transition.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [Probably know.]

JACQUES BLANC: You do. I don't.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: But it's public. You can see it.

JACQUES BLANC: It is public, but how has it been expressed? How has it been analyzed?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's been expressed every time we have an ICANN meeting. There's a meeting between the GAC and the board where it's explained what we do with the communique in which the GAC expresses their advice, and even in which [inaudible] procedure.

Number one is clarifying questions. Number two is responding to those questions prior to the next meeting, and then it's all public record. This is all published. And in combination with all the GAC meetings being public and for the GAC interaction we even have a working group where we talk, we ask every time, every ICANN meeting, "So what can we

improve in our communications to better achieve our ...” So even that’s there, and that’s also a public meeting.

So that’s why that is not the old GAC, this is what's happening right now.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, so when has this new way of communicating been audited? Has it been audited already?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [No.]

JACQUES BLANC: No, so maybe that’s the occasion. You see my point? Things ought to be done here, because what you're describing is brand new; do we agree on that?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [Yes.]

JACQUES BLANC: So back here, back to the audit.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] developed year by year with small steps. In the beginning, all GAC meetings were closed. Then they opened the door a little bit, then

[they had] closed and open meetings. The way how the communique was negotiated has also changed, it's now open. The categories of advice [inaudible] in the beginning, it was, "What is advice?" There was a long discussion within the GAC, the legal meaning of advice. So whether it's because advice is not binding and what you can expect. And now they have various categories, they have [all the register] now, they have the consensus advice or full consensus advice. This is more or less legally binding because you have in the bylaws now a section which states if the full consensus advice is rejected by the board, the board has to give a rationale, and then the GAC can ask for consultation. So then if the consultation fails, then the final decision remains in the hand of the board, but the board have to explain it to the community why it rejected.

So that means there's a lot of improvements in the interaction between GAC and ICANN board.

JACQUES BLANC: Okay, so that's accountability, and then we've got another one. See, we're just covering things. Just by talking. I really feel this new interaction process and transparency and accountability is worth being audited. We don't have all the answers there. Maybe we have elements. You've got so many. But I'm discovering things. As much as you speak, as much I discover.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If you would have been in the room when the board and the GAC meet, which is open for everybody, you can witness the process and you may

find, "Okay, it's an open process which is transparent, where accountability is well codified in the bylaws right now, and [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But it's a problem within the GAC that the GAC is 165 sovereign nations, and if the interaction is between the chair of the GAC and the CEO and president of ICANN, not all 163 sovereign nations feel represented adequately by the GAC chair. So that means even if you have let's say a nice consensus between the ICANN board and the GAC ... so there is a handful of governments which are totally unsatisfied with their outcome because they were unable to get their special position into the GAC communique, because this is an intergovernmental negotiation.

PATRICK KANE: I would suggest that B is all going to be on a GAC line, so we probably –

JACQUES BLANC: Nice suggestion.

PATRICK KANE: So we probably [don't want to spend] a whole lot of time on debating where B1, B2, B3 goes, because it's all on the GAC line. So –

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: [inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: I would suggest that we let the team figure out what that is together as opposed to one individual putting what they think –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: I think so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

EN

PATRICK KANE: Okay, we're back. Team – alright, so we didn't get to every single board of the eight. We actually focused on I think probably three of them, and so there's still some work to do with that, so I'd like to get some impressions from the team as to how we went through this, as to whether this works, whether this isn't working, what have we identified in the process.

Let's start with the B board that you guys were talking about, which is the GAC item. It is all the GAC, but the B item is assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the board and the broader ICANN community and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspect of the technical coordination of the DNS.

We had three items out of that one that we prioritized.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: We put T as transparency and we were discussing if there is accountability issues on that, because it's quite difficult to separate those things in that group, and there is nothing to do with diversity or others.

so all the three are related to both transparency and accountability. So there is no way to really divide completely those things into this. And the others, you can put [an X,] there is nothing to do with that. Okay, done.

EN

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. So it sounds like from that perspective, the matrix worked on that topic.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: The other one that got a lot of attention, I think, was D. Is that there? Or did you just find a whiteboard in the corner and have a conversation? KC. Okay, so KC, if you could share your experience with this process.

KC CLAFFY: I was thinking before this last breakout that I wish I could have whta every single individual thought if they had to pick three work parties, what would they be. And then I thought, okay, what would mine be?

I was first trying to figure out if I could do it by just merging some of the posters, like A and B, merge C and D, and I sort of got there by merging A, B and E into something like balancing the relationship between ICANN and GAC interest. It's not an exact fit, but we talked about that.

The second one was merging C and D into transparency and accountability with respect to the community-driven process and public comment stuff. Again, not a prefect fit, but it got me there, and then the last one would be just F, which is all the reviews, which isn't that far from what you had here. But I thought the board is really in both one and two of mine in that it's balancing the relationship between ICANN as represented by the board and these other constituencies. So I don't

have a strong feeling yet on how to break that up. And indeed, I felt like the whole exercise was a failure because I ended up in all three of these work parties, whcih was exactly the opposite of what my goal was.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. again, it's not so far from – and then I wanted the exercise to be "Let's take all the stickies and put them in the work parties," which is kind of what you're doing here. And then if you find out, "Look, all the A stickies are in the top work party, then that tells us something.

PATRICK KANE: So, KC, what was your conclusion about SSR?

KC CLAFFY: And then I realized I couldn't really make SSR its own role because SSR cuts across all these three, which maybe would make it a column, but honestly, I'm not sure we have the right columns. In some cases, the line between transparency and accountability is fuzzy to me. But maybe the exact column labels don't matter yet.

PATRICK KANE: I think I would agree with that, because I think what we'll have is work teams that'll go [rows.]

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: That's correct. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think we ran into a slightly other issue that relates t o our scope, which is, where does our mandate stop, in a way? Do we focus on the whole world, or only the ICANN community and what's happening there? Particularly in the context of GAC.

                             GAC community interaction is clearly within scope, but how GAC members liaise with their governments and how governments make their opinion seems to be out of scope.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Maybe we can divide these issues in two or three. One is the structural, internal form of ICANN work. This involves the board. We have the relations between the internal structures and the external world. This can be tackled by the way ICANN communicates with its public, with Internet community, and we have also the external bodies. We can see this in the ICANN perspective if they are well formulated or not, but I think we cannot go beyond that for example. We can argue if GAC is a

good structure for ICANN, but we cannot argue how GAC is working toward their internal members. More or less the same with other support organizations and ACs.

Then maybe we have to have three blocks, the internal block, the communication block, and the external structures, which includes the review process. so maybe it's a way to make things easier.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Demi. So remember, the items that we said we were going to take a look at, we went through all day yesterday and said, "Here's the topics, we threw out the ones we didn't think were appropriate or we didn't want to do at this time, or we took too much time or whatever or too soon," and then this morning we prioritized those.

So I think the topics that we've identified, unless we believe the topics that we prioritized our outside of the remit, to your point, Maarten, I'm worried about that at this point, but what we're trying to do here is to categorize them in ways that we can put together work teams.

So if we think through that, clearly, B is going to all end up in the GAC because it's specifically about the GAC, and I don't think we had any priorities that we said we're going to go analyze how GAC members engage with their countries, it's about the transparency of the decision making process around the GAC, and I think that's what we talked about in B. Correct me if I'm wrong, anybody.

So as we go through and take a look at all those – and I think that KC has done a good job of taking a look at which of the eight categories boiled

down into the subject categories, but within those, there's still items that will be across multiple categories, and that's what we're trying to break down and put into workstreams so work parties can work on those items and reword those items into smart goals.

Yes, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We're trying to find a way [inaudible] somewhere. I think also, this does help to put things in categories. The first two columns make a lot of sense. The column diversity is already less so, and I could think that accountability and transparency, if you would add two columns, it would be like efficiency and effectiveness or something rather than – so how can accountability and transparency go hand in hand with efficiency and effectiveness in that way may be a better way forward, because at the end, what we want to do is advice that will help the community to better deal with this. And just a fault that maybe the columns in that way should be rethought as accountability, transparency, effectiveness, efficiency.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I agree with Maarten, because the other columns make no sense for many of those issues, and what we are looking for in the end, what is our goal is to make it more effective and make work better. So that's the goal we need to reach. So they need to show up in some way. So I

agree that these two columns could bring more information for the group if we analyze under this point of view.

PATRICK KANE: Then maybe what we do is we have each row make their own columns. Pick which columns are appropriate for each row. But each of these rows, the way that we've talked about them so far, are feeling a little bit like work teams and work parties, because we're focused on KC's point about interaction between the board and the GAC, separate reviews, interaction between board and the policy process and the accountability mechanisms. So those end up being the three teams. Yes, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: What we're discussing in the GAC previously was that put together in the same group the one and two could not analyze better the interface among them, so if you analyze this one and analyze this one and br9ing for the whole group the points that each [inaudible] group make, you can better understand the connection in the interface and interference among them. So that's why I'm not agreeing with the board and GAC in one group, because they are two different kind of animals, and those animals need to be in the first moment analyzed separately, looking for those things, we need to analyze and to prepare the recommendation, and when we put together, we can see how the interference among them could result in a better recommendation if we look for the columns like Maarten said, if it [inaudible] on the work done. So that's my point.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. I'm not sure what to do with that, but are we saying that we're going to have a team – oh, sorry, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Oh, no, don't apologize, please. Thank you. As you may expect, I still feel when you take the elements here that [inaudible] diversity, I tried to [inaudible] that for A and F, and there are topics who are linked with that, and then we can agree that we disagree that the fact that it's an important topic. The way we will handle it will depend on each one of us. I agree with Vanda that we need to leave separate board and GAC. Not to say that we don't have one moment the necessity to work on the interaction of both, and that may be a cross working group at that moment, but it will be the same from if we do for example the community one, and I think it's a good idea. We will have also to have cross-meeting about board and community and GAC and community. Therefore, if I understand what you were saying, Pat, we can end up with four different subgroup, one board, one GAC, one reviews, and one community. And with that, we will have to organize interconnection between those and what is happening in this [inaudible] will be up to the grop.

Taking that into account, taking what Maarten say, and it could be a lot of different topics here. But I think it's a good way to go. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: So then how should we think about the work teams? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You saw my sigh.

PATRICK KANE: I felt it all the way over here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. Okay, I'm trying to not to look back to ATRT1, because it was such a different ICANN and it was limited under what we were doing the affirmation of commitments at the time.

But I would note for your edification it operated with four work teams. Just saying. One of them focused on GAC, one of them focused on board, one of them focused on policy development and community input into ICANN. So this is where the transparency aspects came in.

So I can drill down and get them, but I'm just noting that it was a very different ICANN.

So I've now looked back to make sure that I'm not fuzzy thinking about what ATRT2 did, and ATT2 made in general 12 buckets of recommendations, and these were, of the 12, there were three that were specific to board, board performance and work practices were covered in those three recommendations. There was one that was specific to GAC operation sand interactions, so that kind of leads me to think that there is a board bucket and a GAC bucket. There was – let me read them out, there's a bunch of – I'm thinking should be maybe – we could put it under "other," but it could be community, it could be

operations, but let me tell you what the titles were. Policy implementation, executive functions, decision making, transparency and appeal, decision making transparency and appeals with relationship to access to information. That is this is the access to documentation to even have standing, etc., to make [bills.]

Multilingualism, there was also recommendations made under the title of cross-community deliberations, and there was four – only four – recommendations made – I think actually less than that – under financial accountability and transparency.

So there seemed to be a board bundling recommendations, there seemed to be a GAC bundling of recommendations, there seemed to be a general transparency, operational, right to appeals sort of bundle of recommendations. And of course, the analysis also was looking at the affirmation of commitments and where there was a nexus with what the Cross Community Working Group was doing at the time.

So I'm not sure that helps, but it's to me leaning it towards a boarding group, a GACing group, a reviews group, and SSR might just have to sit in with the reviews group there, and something else. Just whether that's community and something else, I'm not sure. Still fuzzy thinking, but wanted to share.

KC CLAFFY: That is helpful, and I'm a little [sour] thinking alright, I'm just going to be in the reviews group and I'll just like help out if people want in the other two groups, but laws of physics are involved, my schedule. I wonder if other people can do that exercise too over lunch after we've thought

about this. How many groups of these three do you see yourself in? There's three now, or are there four? Is community one?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Okay, so if these are the three or four groups, how many do you see yourselves in?

PATRICK KANE: I think what we come down to is four. We've taken SSR out. I think community, we've got enough around empowered community and policy development that I think we should have a community, and maybe it's called the empowered community, I don't know, but I think that board, GAC, reviews and empowered community is what we've kind of settled on as far as groups go.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe that the thinking was so far the specific reviews – in other words what the bylaws ask us to look at – not organizational reviews.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay, because there's another one which is also the IRPs, which is certainly something that we've been developing under the new bylaws but hasn't been reviewed yet, and we find new lessons every time we do one.

KC CLAFFY:	Is that what you mean, the independent review process? I'm not exactly sure the difference between IRP, organizational reviews and periodic reviews.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	It's two different things. I think what is not optional is that we look at ATRT2. That's a given. That's a shall also assess. And I think the IRPs are optional. But if I look from a board perspective, I see indeed board always of interest to the community. Yes, I know [inaudible] about it, but that doesn't mean it shouldn't be reviewed.

GAC, same thing, a lot of improvements, a lot of things that work, and as Jacques said, but let's look at it. So the discovery phase for tall these is justified. I would think that IRPs might be another area, but you know that too.

KC CLAFFY:	[inaudible].

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	It's if decisions are taken and they're challenged.

PATRICK KANE:	It's the independent review panel. So when somebody says something happened with dot-Africa, [what is that process that we go –] the adjudication process. So that's something that we should look at, but

where does that fit into? Is that part of the reviews? Is that part of the board? Is that community? And we've got to put them into a category. It's got to be looked at. You think IRP is a completely separate one. I think it's community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's put community in square brackets. There may be another word that comes out of that for labeling. But yeah, it's another thing.

PATRICK KANE: And then your ATRT2 review is a review item, not necessarily how they fit into board or GAC or community, is that correct? No? Yeah? Yes. Okay.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If you look to the ATRT2 recommendations, they may apply to board or GAC or whatever, but –

PATRICK KANE: But from our work process, ATRT2 and the effectiveness and whatever happened with the recommendations there is part of the review category, not part of the board, the GAC, or the community. Is that correct? Cheryl, is that how you guys did ATRT1 when you did ATRT2?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, we didn't, but I'll just pull up what we did and get back to you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If I may say, if there's ATRT2 recommendations that are specifically to do with the board functioning, I would use them in the discovery phase for the board rather than in the discovery phase for the reviews working group.

PATRICK KANE: And I'm not wired one way or the other, I'm just trying to make certain that we put it in a place, so that would mean that we would have to dissect the ATRT2 recommendations and apply them to other categories then, right? So when we get the paper mid-April about what happened through the ATRT2 recommendations, some element or some group would have to go through that and categorize it. So I've got Jacques –

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sorry, just want to read out the subgroups for ATRT2. I think, Cheryl, you were looking for that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Do you want me to read it out now, or later?

PATRICK KANE: Yeah, please do.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. So the subgroups for ATRT2 are as follows: Work Stream 1, looking at the implementation of ATRT1 implementation recommendations. Subgroup 2, security, stability and resiliency, review of implementation of SSR review team recommendations. Subgroup 3, WHOIS review of implementation of WHOIS review team recommendations, and subgroup 4, consider the extent to which assessments and actions undertaken by ICANN have been successfully ensuring that ICANN is acting transparently, I accountable for decision making and acts in the public interest.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. Jacques?

JACQUES BLANC: So, the way I see it – and that's what we were discussing with Maarten and Vanda and the group for when we're studying the possible GAC review – between ATRT2 and now, there has been a transition, so I don't see how we can avoid the fact that studying ATRT2 recommendations and how they went and what they did recommend, and comparing to what is existing now, my feeling is we will not avoid studying ATRT2 in every review we will do to compare what was and what kind of conclusions or recommendations we could reach now. So

it's a category that goes to every other part of the reviews as far as I see it.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I understand that ATRT2 is just [inaudible]. That's the way we reach information. The way you get one of those points, how you get information, how you use information. So resource is not a point itself, it's something that we're going to use wherever we need in board and GAC and [inaudible] whatever. But it's not a line [inaudible] to analyze just that. It's something that we will use as a base for analyze and get recommendations for each one of those lines.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Yes, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: If it's helpful, I also have the breakdown of ATRT1 subgroups if the team –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alright, no worries. Subgroup one, their scope was board performance, including governance, selection, composition (necessary skillset mix) accessibility, decision making, and dispute resolution and complaint handling.

Subgroup two looked at GAC role, including interactions with board and community. The existence of shared and clearly understood expectations with respect to the GAC's role in ICANN decision making processes, the quality and actionability of GAC input and ICANN's responsiveness to that input.

Subgroup three is community stakeholder engagement. Community stakeholder engagement including effectiveness and quality of ICANN support for the policy development process, the quality of PDP output and the extent to which the ICANN PDP develops consensus, including across stakeholder groups. The level and quality of public input into the ICANN processes and the extent to which such input is reflected in ICANN decision making.

The last subgroup focused on independent review of ICANN board.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that was unique as a requirement for where we were in ICANN's evolution at the time.

PATRICK KANE: Right, so I recognize it's 12:30 and it's time for the lunch break. But I just want to close this out, and it sounds like we've got four categories. We've got the board, we've got the GAC, we've got the community, whether that's empowered community, the process developed by and for the community, and taking a look at specific reviews itself. What I thought I heard was ATRT2 were looking at all of those but we may apply those outcomes to one of those other four categories, so we've

got to go dissect that and put that in the four categories. Is that a good start?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Well, maybe not happy but at least we have a direction. So what I would like to do after lunch is to finish the exercise to where we identify each of the A, B, C, D, all the way through H, is it? And the items that we have prioritized from this morning, and put them into one of these four categories, not ATRT2 but one of these four categories so that the priorities we've identified for the last day and a half will fit into a work row and that will be the basis for how we form our work teams. Fair enough? Alright, thank you all very much. This has been a pleasure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Half past the hour when we finish our lunch break, so we will be starting at half past the hour. Thank you, everybody.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda, can you start the recording, please?

PATRICK KANE: Alright, welcome back, everybody. We finished up with really kind of identifying at the last moment before we broke, we identified four work parties or work streams and we determined that following a lunch what

EN

we would do is we'd take a look at each of the prioritized items that we had from this morning in each of the A through H categories and start to put those into the work teams based upon what's there. So what I would ask everyone to do is to take a look at the boards that are up on the walls and the windows and identify where those priorities that we [inaudible] for this morning fall into the board, GAC, reviews, or the community. So we could go ahead and do that with everyone. That would be a first step and then we'll talk about putting those teams together, signing up the teams, seeing which teams everybody wants to be a part of. And then from there we'll break down and start to detail out the priority items so that they make clear, smart goals and objectives. Any questions? Any questions in the Adobe chat?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maybe a question for good practice for running the teams themselves. I think there's recommendations of how to most effectively run the teams and make them interact, or you say everybody has to invent it all by themselves all over again when we go in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I haven't had a sip of my coffee yet so it might not be quite correct. It is good coffee. If I heard you correctly, you are asking can we establish norms for how the teams, the work parties should be run rather than have the work parties all independently take the time to get their own guidelines etc. put together. Have I paraphrased you correctly? That's a very good conversation to have.

EN

PATRICK KANE: Alright, so I understand this. So let's go ahead and let's do that after we put the teams together if we can because I think we want to put the teams together based upon skills and interests. So when we take a look at those four areas after we put the priorities in those areas, let's take a look at who's going to do what, and if we need certain skills added to it. So for example in KC's not here right now that there are elements of SSR in all of these and so she will need to be at least a resource to some of these if not a member of most of the groups. So we'll take it from there. It is an example of what we'll do when we when we start to sign up.

So if you would go to your boards on the walls and windows, take the priorities that are left and assign them to a work team, work party. And be some priorities may end up in multiple parties, which is fine. We have to dissect some of those out and have it be appropriate for the board or the GAC or whatever. So if we can go and get that started and take about 20 minutes to do that. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The idea is to write them what we think which one and bring back or what we think that belongs to?

PATRICK KANE: Thank you for the question, Vanda. So I would say that the sticky itself falls into one category, move the sticky. If the sticky involves two work parties, put yet another sticky that has the number and put that into that stream. So you would just duplicate it, put it into that work party on that matrix over there.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: If there is a lot of people doing the same thing I will suggest each one put your ideas in a different [card] and not take out the sticker, because the sticker may be other person that does not have the same idea.

PATRICK KANE: Excellent thought, Vanda. Thank you. And then if there are multiple ones, we'll rationalize from there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Bingo. We've got about six minutes till we finish this particular exercise. And for those who've joined late – Erica I saw your note – what we've done is we've had to go through and given the decision that we made around the four work parties around GAC, board, community and reviews, take a look at all the prioritized items that we had on the wall and on the windows and basically push that towards the matrix or the sort of matrix we've got put together. And then from there we're going to have people self-select which teams they wanted to work on and then we may have to do some balancing and certainly assign some skill sets as at least resources to the different groups. So we'll be done. We'll start again with the broader team and broader conversations in about five minutes. Thank you.

Alright, we're at the top of the hour. It's 2:00 here in beautiful sunny California. Thank you everyone for going through the exercise and moving the priorities into the work parties. So it looks like we've got a good number here and I know that multiple people did some of those items. Now is the chance to really we came here to find out what our work parties are going to be. So just by show of hands or if you want to write your name someplace. And hands in the room as well. If we could put the Adobe chat up on the screen on the left and take down the Google doc so we could see who's in the room for the Adobe chat.

Thank you. We'll take a look at raised hands for folks that are not here. So again we have four teams, the board, the GAC, looking at reviews, and the community. We still have this in brackets because it could be empowered community, processes for the community and by the community. Who would like to be on the board team?

So for those of you in the chat room – oh, we do have one, Sébastien. So we have one person on the board team. Demi on the board team. Alright, you're writing these down. Great. Alright. Wolfgang on the board team. Excellent. Alright, anybody in the – Erica has volunteered for the board team. Fantastic. Alright. Martin, you're on the board. You're going to evaluate yourself. I like that. Alright. Osvaldo as well. On the GAC team, Vanda, Jacques, Wolfgang, Martin. Anybody in the room? No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: I'm sorry. You and I are floating through. Liu, yes. I thought you said "you." So yes, Liu will be on the GAC. He's not in the room right now but we'll assign him that. All right. If not, he's at least going to be a resource for that group. All right. And then for reviews. Vanda, KC, Demi, Daniel, Jacques, Sébastien. And then last is the community, Osvaldo, Daniel, Jaap. Anybody else in the room? Erica has signed up for that one as well. Thank you, Erica.

So great. So we've got those put together. Can we take a – go ahead, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. My comment pertains to the review team members that are not able to participate due to time difference or whatnot, remote ones. At some point I'm hoping we can discuss how to get them involved and see what the teams they want to volunteer for.

PATRICK KANE: So let's take let's take an action item, Jennifer, if we can, to send out a note to the entire team to remind those people that did not sign up for a work party, and what the work parties are and ask them to send their preferences as soon as possible, hopefully before we have the next meeting which will be next Wednesday for the plenary. So is that in the Google doc? And they'll put in the Google doc, we'll put it up and take a look at the teams because the next step will be for each of the work parties – and I know that people are multiple work parties – to take those items that are now priorities within your work party and start to detail out and actually write some smart goals and objectives and by

smart we mean what Cheryl? Microphone, please. Very rarely I get to tell you what to do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very rarely I do what you tell me.

PATRICK KANE: You never do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Simple, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound. Sounds about right from memory. That's the SMART system. And it is, I will note, the system that was utilized for ATRT2, so we are exercising consistency here.

PATRICK KANE: Very good. Thank you very much. So what I'd like to do at this point in time is to get to the work parties. Again, since you're part of many of them or multiple, you may have to float between the two. But if we could have – can we rearrange these tables if we want to?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Oh, no, thank you very much, Cheryl, for that. That's right. Alright, so let's have board, let's have GAC, let's have reviews and then let's have

community up front. Alright. Again that's board, GAC, reviews, community. It's 2:10, roughly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 2:05.

PATRICK KANE: 2:05, that's awesome. And what's our next break?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 15:30.

PATRICK KANE: 3:30, [inaudible]. Okay, so why don't we take a checkpoint at 3:00 so it gives us 55 minutes to work through. Yes Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Just a simple comment, there are people that are in multiple groups. Is there a preference as to how they rotate between teams during this working exercise?

PATRICK KANE: I think we have to flow through and start with your primary preference and move from there. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: One of the points I think about the way we make decisions is that I really feel that we need to have a second reading. My suggestion is that we go, we follow what you say but we have a time tomorrow morning to review what we have decided today to be sure that we are still aligned with what we said yesterday. And I think it must be one of the process that we need to take into account in our work. It's not to have decision taken just in one instance but to have a second reading. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: I think that's fair. Sébastien, if you take a look at the agenda we do have an end of the day review and at the beginning the next day we review what happened the next day, so that that is part of the process. And I think that that's really fair because especially since we're going to write more detailed goals and objectives, we may find that some of these have to flow to other areas or move into complete other teams. So thank you for that. Yes, Martin.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just a technicality. Many of us might be floating, but it may be good to have some anchor point for each of the four streams if we have volunteers to be an anchor point for each of the stream staff will help the floating to be still effective.

PATRICK KANE: That's a great point and brings us to work party leadership. So we really ought to have one work party leader, one or two, but we should have

work party leadership and identified work party leaders who are that anchor. So thank you for that. Maarten.

Questions, concerns, and I'll let each of the teams figure out who that work party leadership is amongst that team. Alright. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What will happen in my experience at least is in the first few minutes of your interaction, someone is going to claim to start acting as scribe and someone is going to tend to start acting as a facilitator and you're to kind of start falling into some natural roles, so then you should ad organize and allocate who's who for today. It may be different next week, but at least for today's exercise. That doesn't mean that if you happen to be the anchor point today, you will be the anointed leader for this work party going on, because you may not stay in that work party, or we might make some changes germane to what Sébastien just said, needing to confirm. So someone should float to the top today and act as an anchor point, and obviously you'll be in good running to be part of the process going forward, but not assuming.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi, Erica. We're now talking, this is the small group working on the community. Only one puts A1, A5 and A4 in community. I don't know what we should do, because only one is – okay, only one person

[inaudible] in community. [inaudible] each community. For me, it's [odd.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I thought our idea was also to prioritize. So we have for example –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, those who are the one that – yeah, those, A1, A2 are over there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So probably I think it would be good if we could [inaudible] reference to those respective ones. A1 is the effectiveness of the board performance. Then we have A2, A5, A6.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If we just simply press them in order of [Thursday] session, something like this. This is D2. [inaudible].

We need some bit of clarification on the respective [task] that we are going to be doing with this respective point.

PATRICK KANE: [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What we're meant to be doing with this [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Right now, what we want to be able to do is take A1 from over there, from a community perspective, what should we be evaluating around A1? Same thing for each one of those. [inaudible] community investigation, is it a process, is it consensus policy development? Is it interaction with the board? It's a lot of the ones when you've seen [like the orange ones are me,] what I've done is anytime we talked about board composition [I made that a] community item, because it's not the board that makes the composition, it's the community that either elects or nominates through NomCom [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think if we look [inaudible] effectiveness of the board performance, right? [inaudible] then we have to review the feedback that the board [inaudible] to the community.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Okay, it's 3:00. I'd like to take just a quick checkpoint if we could break for one minute and look up. Daniel. Okay. I just want – shall we take a break at 3:00? I don't think – yeah, so everyone has got to ask questions about what we're doing and where we are. I think we're okay. Are there any questions still in the room? Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess going through and we just start to go through the list, we have question about is it the right place and we want to put some of them to other tracks. Therefore I don't know. We just go to four and we have 20. Therefore we need more time. But it could be done later on. It's difficult to do that. For example I spend all my time here and I'm a member of another group and I didn't went to the other group.

PATRICK KANE: Nobody's been in that group.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. That's okay. Board, we don't care. It's the most important one, we don't care. It's a joke. But that aside, I don't know what would be the most efficient way to do it, because the fact is that we put – and we could be one of us, I don't know who was except me, we put something about what was E2 and E1. And in fact now we have created a community one, it fits better in there. We need to make this a change.

PATRICK KANE: And I think that's what we should do. We get all back together. So do we still need more time to go through the items? It looks to me like the GAC group is done because we've kind of disbanded. Is that true, Jacques? Vanda? The GAC group is done? Okay, so that's a nod from Vanda on the GAC group being done.

Well, they were self-contained, it's pretty easy to have like four item. So alright, not to be little anything that you guys achieved or accomplished. That's not the point at all. So how are we doing when it comes to reviews? We still have some time for review. We still have some things to do on reviews?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We have a lot. But I don't think it will be done in five minutes or in the short term. The second point is that when we talk about ATRT2, our suggestion is that we go through the report and we report to the other tracks what is belong to them when there is the matrix link with the board to the board group and so on and so forth.

PATRICK KANE: So Cheryl and I have talked about this a little bit earlier is that once we get the teams going and once we get the report from the staff on ATRT2 and what happened post [ATRT2] with all the recommendations, that we get one person from each of the four teams to kind of sift through that and dole out to which group each of those recommendations belong to. And so that was something we talked about that I was going to bring up a little bit later, but that's kind of our thinking in terms of how it goes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I understood well, therefore it's not belonging to us as a review but it will belong to the group in general, and we can put that outside of our scope even if there may be some of the items will come back on ATRT2 after the work of the full group.

PATRICK KANE: That's correct.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, so yes, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Also, in our list, [we also have] that issue of ATRT2. So, should we just simply kick it off?

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

DANIEL NANGHAKA: KC, I'm coming back to my group. Please [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: I would say that the ATRT2 topic, yes, we'll take care of it, because about April 19th is I think the date that we've got on the work plan to get the work product from staff. So we'll take a look at that at that point. But I would say don't do ATRT2 right now. But do you still have items to achieve in the community priorities that we've identified? Is that a yes or no? Yes, there's still work to do. And there's still work to do reviews? And we've not done any work with board. Is that correct?

All right. So what I would suggest that we do, – hold on guys, don't get lost yet. What I suggest we do is we continue to move forward on this because I'd like to get at least a little dent in the board before we leave for today. Let's keep going through that. Let's get everybody back together and if we need to start swapping objectives, we should do that at that point in time. So let's keep working. We have a break scheduled at 3:30. So let's work until 3:30, take another checkpoint and see where we go from there. Okay? Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So, is this the point where all the people who are on the board list come to the board table?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, everyone.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: The people in the board group are Demi, Sébastien, Wolfgang, Erica, Osvaldo, Michael who is not online right now, and Martin. Sébastien,

I'm not sure, but it might be ATRT2 need for metrics. Either that or election process.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: There's also effectiveness of board performance. I just don't know what order they were on the ...

PATRICK KANE: Alright, folks, it's 3:30, so let's go ahead and take a 15-minute break. If you want to keep talking, that's fine, but let's take a 15-minute break, be back here at 3:45 to start horse trading.

Okay folks, it's 3:45. You've got to improvise. The next step that we want to progress here is taking a look at as we went through the last exercise identifying the objectives that we prioritized this morning and put into the different work parties, have a conversation as to ones you identify that don't belong in your work party and should be in another party.

So I'd like to go ahead and start with GAC since you guys got done first. Were there items in the GAC priorities that you felt didn't belong inside the work party for GAC?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No.

PATRICK KANE: Vanda says no. Alright, GAC is done. Alright, next one would be – thank you very much, Vanda, I'm glad, spoke with authority. Reviews next. What items did we have in reviews that we thought should be someplace else?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible] maybe you have found other, but at the beginning, there were – wait a second, I'll take the right [document, it should be] easier for me to answer your question. Reviews. We think that the different policy development process in each SO, role of the AC and role of the other partner needs to belong to community and community feedback and evaluation on respective PDPs must belong to community also.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. What numbers were those?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: E1 and E2. Sorry, it's difficult. I never remember how to say [inaudible] in English and how to say E in French.

PATRICK KANE: Right so that's E1 E2 that we're going to move to community.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And there were two other topic we already discussed. It's ATRT2 need for metrics. We need to split that into the various group, and it was A2, and I guess we will have to do something similar about E4, who was dealing with Work Stream 2.

PATRICK KANE: So E1 and E2, we've heard that the community team already has those in there. So good, we're good with that. The ATRT2 metrics item, the suggestion is to split that and we probably ought to do that as part of the ATRT2 recommendations disposition document that we're going to receive on or about April 19th. So I'll break that up at that point in time. And the third one was E4 which was what again Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Work Stream 2. What is inside it? It says there's nothing, it's written post-transition, it doesn't mean anything. But I guess we need to – I will not talk on behalf of the group because we didn't discuss that, but I think the idea is to see where Work Stream 2 is a process and if there are topics that could be relevant to one or the other group to be taken into account or to send it to this other group when we are at that time of the work in our working group. I give you the baton. I try to do without you but now it's your turn.

KC CLAFFY: [Give me context.] We're just saying what we came up with? Just specific to the Work Stream 2 item, or all of them?

EN

PATRICK KANE:	Right now we're talking about moving the priorities around from group to group. And so from the E4 what I think I'm hearing is that there needs to be more analysis done on what's in E4, which is the Work Stream 2 to be able to figure out where that belongs.
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah but I want to be a little more precise. From our quick reading – and Vanda's actually read it before, I haven't read it but I see the categories of the recommendations. I think there are a few sections but not that many that are going to be relevant to ATRT issues unless the group thinks we need to have a really overarching ATRT assessment of all 100 plus recommendations, and I would like to not, because this may come up later when we say usefulness of all reviews. We have a DOS attack using review recommendations as a vector.
	But that wasn't really a review. That was some other special animal in the context of the transition. So I don't know how people want to think about that specific WS2 report. I mean it was about accountability transparency, and section six is specifically about recommendations are pertinent to the transparency and accountability of the SOs and ACs and recommending Section 8 is accountability and transparency of ICANN.
	So I don't think we can blow all that off. But maybe we can blow the rest of it off. But when we get to usefulness of all the reviews, we might want to mention that the WS2 document is an example of this becomes intractable if you're going to throw 150 recommendations that span the gamut.

PATRICK KANE: Okay so you're saying we should take specific items out and distribute that out and then take a look and make a comment about Work Stream 2 within the reviews section but take out specific items to either be board or community.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. What we take a look around was which part of this Work Stream review makes sense for us to analyze in depth is section six seven eight or six eight, something like that because it's into the scope.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, it's into the scope of this work here, because a lot of things in that report is too much over the place for our limited scope. That's what we mean with that.

KC CLAFFY: But this is tricky. I didn't have a front row seat for the whole transition exercise, but my understanding is that Work Stream 2 report was one of the promises for the transition but we ran out of time so we're gonna do it after the transition and we're going to be good for it. Okay? So I think we have to be careful about just saying okay there's too many recommendations in there, we're not going to look at them, even though we as ATRT3 are not going to be able to look at everything. So we're gonna have to find a way to talk about that in the context of –

because that was specifically the Work Stream about accountability and transparency, in the context of the transition, and we're supposed to review accountability and transparency so we can't – I don't think we can even blow off most of it except section six through eight.

I think we have to figure out a way to talk about that without reviewing every single recommendation in there. It's not clear to me even ICANN board reviewed every recommendation there.

PATRICK KANE: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think that's correct. We're not about to review the impact of the Work Stream 2 activities, because that's still ongoing and underway. That will be category two or something in our thing yesterday.

PATRICK KANE: Too soon would be five.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [Unfeasible] at this time.

PATRICK KANE: Five would be too soon.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible] and five is too soon to [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Is there a timeline for implementation of Work Stream 2? Like this century?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's exactly why it must be in our scope, because we need to look at the process, if the process was followed, not followed, and if it was tweaked by the board or not, or by staff. But I agree with you that there is no reason for us to go to the 100 and something recommendation. It's not our task at all. I think so.

PATRICK KANE: Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. That's a very important point because it isn't a review of recommendations. And even if it was, part of our role as an ATRT to review, we wouldn't be reviewing the recommendations, we'd be reviewing the implementation of the recommendations made.

So on that, the implementation is still at a very early stage. The implementation review team which has been defined has not even been convened.

So there are a number of points that this group may very well be able to make in terms of timeliness, measurable, all that sort of thing on how

even between the publication of Work Stream 2 that and implied criticisms of where all that may or may not have occurred and why they may not have occurred, why we have a reasonably large air gap between the publication of the documents, the adoption and any attempt to look at even implementation planning.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Basically we'll be looking at the [meta] impact, not the recommendations for how they impact themselves. That makes more sense also in line with what Sébastien said as well, I think. Right?

PATRICK KANE: KC.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So I heard Cheryl say we're not looking at the recommendations, theoretically somebody in the future would look at the implementation of those recommendations, but I'm actually concerned about the recommendations or the mechanism for getting them, as a failed accountability and transparency mechanism. Because it's just not tractable, or maybe I'm wrong.

I mean I think that we should at least consider that, because it seems like it took a really long time to get there and it seems like it's maybe biting off more than can be chewed. And again in the context of – there's something up here, it's not on our team but it was checks and balance mechanism to manage transparency and accountability. I forget whose team that was.

Maybe this falls under that. Was Work Stream 2 intended to be a check and balance mechanism on the transition process and making sure that accountability and transparency sort of survived the process. No?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Maarten, mic, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sorry. My impression was a more specific task because had not been solved yet and were not deemed as essential for making the transition but still important to happen afterwards.

PATRICK KANE: So those were like human rights was one of the topics in Work Stream 2, the IRP was a Work Stream 2 topic. Right. So you're right, they weren't necessary checks and balances, they were additional tasks that couldn't be accomplished in time to make – jurisdiction, yes – it in time for the September 2016 date that was put before the community.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry to interrupt. We've got some observers in the room. If everybody could just remember to state their name the before speaking into the microphone. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Jennifer.

KC CLAFFY: The title of the CCWG Work Stream document is accountability. That's why I got – I assumed that all fell into under accountability, but I think you're right that they do not. Maybe accountability is [a meta comment] over human rights and jurisdiction and diversity.

PATRICK KANE: So what do want to do with E4 at that point then? Because we don't want to look at 100 recommendations that don't have implementations. [Is there a process question?]

KC CLAFFY: Right. So what we've said, in here our SMART thing was find recommendations that are under ATRT3 scope. But again, I think that's a problem that we haven't resolved yet. And then consider them. That's it. And then we didn't commit to doing anything else with that document.

PATRICK KANE: So would we have the action item then be to further review Work Stream 2 to see if there are any accountability items that we want to flow back into any one of the four work parties?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Well, no, I think Pat's right. I think some of those recommendations are going to be about other – I don't know, I haven't read that report.

PATRICK KANE: Okay so let's take that as an action item. We need to assign that action item, but we won't do that necessarily right now. But that's something that we'll have to do maybe by the end of the day or at least by the end of tomorrow. You got that one Jennifer?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I did not. Would you mind repeating item again please?

PATRICK KANE: So the action item will be to further review the work stream 2 process and recommendations to identify any additional ATRT3 review items and assign them accordingly to any one of the four work parties. Is there anything else in reviews to move to other organizations or other work parties? Very good. Community.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think under community, we didn't have much [inaudible] but I think there is one recommendation that was to go to the GAC, and [inaudible] for the whole group to discuss. [inaudible]. Thank you. Talk about the

[inaudible] Kobe that especially [inaudible] the GAC discussion, because there are only two issues.

PATRICK KANE: What are you wanting to move from the community designation to another work party? Which item? D2 is 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? Sub-bullet one is, 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? Sub-bullet two, we should avoid to quit lobbying to allow information related to governments not be dependent upon a person inside the GAC and influence the GAC's position.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: Fantastic.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Move to there, because –

PATRICK KANE: Vanda just informed that that was actually analyzed as part of the GAC, so sub-bullet 2 in that is clearly GAC. Is that the one we're talking about?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Thank you, Daniel. Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: For the moment before any additional discussion, it was also on the list of the board work stream sub group whatever name we went to give.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. Anything else, Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Nothing more. Everything was perfect.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. That means that this is a very interesting example that for the moment it's in two subgroup, how we deal with that? We decided

just in one we keep it in two and we coordinate. and I am not asking for an answer now but maybe to open an action item that we need to review that, because maybe we will go through and say, oh finally it's not in the board remit. Or we will say something else and we need to review that when we would be ready. Not yet.

PATRICK KANE:

So Sebastian, if I may suggest as an action item to capture what you just said, is that at some point in time before the terms of reference are published and finalized for review by the board, we analyze the location of priorities that span multiple work parties. And Sébastien has indicated okay. Thank you.

Alright, so the last group is board. So who's got the lead on board? Sébastien, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I guess I already say that something is in another group. We don't see yet something to take out, and for the rest we have just one list with around 12 items. I will send it to you. That's my question. Do you want me to send it just for this subgroup, or you want me to send the full group? If I have a preference, I think it's better for the moment that we keep only one mailing list and I send to the overall group, but we have to discuss that, how we will go and working with sub group in the future.

PATRICK KANE: I think that right now what you want to do is capture where we are and put it in the google doc under exercise number four, because we're still under exercise number four. So it should go to staff so that we can get it in one location. And work from that source of truth. So we've got one source of truth.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I get your point, but my caveat here is that even if it's published in the Google doc, the subgroup member need to review it and make any proposed changes they wish. My thinking was to go before we go in an official Google Docs to some exchange with the subgroup. But it could be done like say just – what I understand is just where we are and we have still work to do within the subgroup. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: May I ask one question? Is that something that you think that your subgroup or your work party can achieve between now and when we leave? Los Angeles?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I really think it depends on what will be the schedule for this work. We will definitely not do that if there is no time slot for doing that. But even if we have some slot to work on that, if yes, we may advance the work, but anyway, I will send it to staff and we will put it as a reminder somewhere in the google doc. That will be a good step. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know if you have read the mail, but there is a comment from Michael in the mail. I think it could be useful to read it in our group. You want me to do that? I defer that to Jennifer.

PATRICK KANE: Jennifer can you read that for us please?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's on the mail, comment from Michael, could be useful to read it please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: So Michael sent a mail to the list and he's saying – this is in response to their community scope items that were sent out and he said, "Can someone offer any clarification as to what this is? Is this representing the scope?" And Daniel responded. "This is the discussion that has taken place." And so Michael is asking, "In other words there is no discussion of transparency in the community Work Stream. All we're looking at is what is here. Do I have that correct?" Is the question that he is asking.

PATRICK KANE: So I think that there are transparency items throughout, and these are the specific priorities that we put in place, again through yesterday and

prioritized this morning, and we just put them into specific work streams, work parties to take a look from a basis of the community or the board or the GAC. These are all transparency items throughout.

And if there's a specific one that he's looking for, it may be in the board item or it may be in the GAC item. So he's only got what was apparently said I'm assuming is the community items specifically and that there are other ones other places.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Michael's in the Adobe Connect room now and he's got his hand raise, so Michael, I'll hand over to you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks very much. The reason why I was sending this around on list was because I realize I wasn't here and I don't want to move us backwards, so I was hoping to seek clarification as to what I missed and what the [inaudible].

I have to take issue with the last comments in so far as I looked down that list of what concluded on the community site, and I don't see anything to do with transparency. Virtually nothing. I see a lot of review of procedural questions, honestly no transparency, no discussion of how information is delivered to the community, no discussion about openness at ICANN Org or among any of the constituent parts.

I'd very welcome to be corrected on this, but it looks like that aspect has been excised entirely. So if that's incorrect, I'd be happy to be corrected, but if that's entirely absent from the discussion in

community, I think that's a problem insofar as the GAC reviews and board aspects are much more narrow and focused, so without a discussion of transparency more broadly, I think that's a significant problem. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Jaap.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: If I may comment on that, this [inaudible] by accident sent to the list. This was not supposed to be anything like a complete report or to be any conclusions being drawn from. It's way too early to do that. It's just a random note which went to the mailing list and meant for the staff. That's all.

PATRICK KANE: So Jaap, you're saying that the list that was there was not complete in terms of what the community work the group was looking at?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: This was a list of what we had at that time when we finished out. It's not really [inaudible]. Like all the other things, this is the result of 20 minutes conversation, and this is incomplete by nature.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. So Michael, I think that what will be captured will be in the Google doc, and that should be complete from what I'm understanding. Yes, Jacques.

JACQUES BLANC: Yeah, Michael, I get that knowing the name is accountability and transparency review team, we cannot avoid transparency, and I don't think that we're trying to do that. But if I check the [inaudible] group example, some of the transparency review we're gonna do is in fact hidden inside the [tight hold] of the topics we have decided to review. But at each step we go, there is a transparency review of for example either a decision process or a communication process. So I don't know, maybe it's because from far away and on the phone it's harder to see. But I didn't feel at any time that we did try to excise.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Jacques. Michael, do you have any further questions? Michael, are you there?

KC CLAFFY: I'll talk while he's typing. I guess I thought transparency just permeated everything so much that I forgot to use the word. Is Michael saying that he wants another group on transparency?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:	Michael just typed a comment saying, "Apologies, I missed the end of that as Adobe disconnected." So Jacques, could you repeat what you we resaying, please? Or at least the end of it.
JACQUES BLANC:	At what time did it cut? [inaudible]. Michael, so what I was saying is my feeling and the feeling for the two groups I've been participating in is the transparency review is in fact maybe not obvious enough but hidden into the titles of the topic we are reviewing as a team, and I took for example the [GAC] group where we'll be reviewing transparency more than accountability. I have to say transparency of the decision process and how they are communicated both to the board and to the community. But that's just an example once more.
PATRICK KANE:	Yes, Osvaldo.
OSVALDO NOVOA:	My idea was that at this stage we were going to examine each topic from the point of view of our groups. And then in the following stage we would look at the accountability, transparency and diversity for each of the topics from the each of the groups' view. In the case of community from the community point of view.
PATRICK KANE:	Thank you. I think that's correct. But we are trying to make certain that when we define our scope and put it in the terms of reference that it is

very clear that we are addressing accountability and transparency issues. And so it may be a use of wording at this point in time. There may be some cleaning up that has to be done because right now the focus is the terms of reference, getting that done so that we can express our scope and then move forward from there. So if we've got the wording wrong, let's get the wording sharpened up. And if we're missing something, let's make certain that we get it in there. So thank you for the comment.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: He's typing something. I can read his comments. He says, "So, transparency often gets stretched in this way and particularly at ICANN. I'm not expecting to treat transparency as a kind of magic word, but I don't see an obvious nexus in the document as circulated." And he's still typing more.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just want to repeat what Jaap – who was part of this group this very early form of partial work went out from – this was meant to be an update on how far they'd got on looking at what did, didn't, doesn't, will, won't or may fit in or be traded with another group to go to staff. It went to the list. And so there's been an assumption – a not unreasonable assumption – that this was in some way a more completed point in the process. Jaap was trying to make clear that it's a very embryonic phase, and part of what I've been typing with Michael in the Adobe Connect room has also been an attempt to make that try to be clear as well. But that certainly I think should only be giving hope

rather than anything else. But hopefully I've done decent on paraphrasing you, Jaap.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. just want to read Michael's last comment. He says "but at the same time I understand this is a working document and look forward to engaging to improve it."

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Michael. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I have the impression that Michael may have missed one part of our meeting and it may be [what] he's questioning, because if we start with the matrix and on the column of the matrix we add transparency and accountability, diversity, others and we decide to organize a work to do it by organization, the board, the GAC, the community and the reviews, but we don't put in the garbage the columns, we think that maybe the columns will be not the same for every subgroup, but nevertheless I am also sure that transparency will be in the four groups, and we may need that one moment to be consistent, to have some discussion about transparency across groups or working groups we are setting up, but it's not that's all to put them

out of the scope. It's just a way to organize our work. I hope it helps. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. Alright, so that was a conversation about trading places with priorities. So I think we're done with that. Alright, so what is our next step?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If one is listening and wondering why we're having a little giggle, there was a suggestion here that the next step should be the final report. It was probably a little bit preemptive to get to that. Thanks, Wolfgang.

Well, it seems to me that if you've finished your horse trading, you've got a couple of options. You can work further through your current work plan. Looking at where things fit or do not fit, which could be quite productive. That I think goes to Sébastien's point earlier of if there is time made then more progress can be done on the work in the board work party for example, noting that that doesn't mean that most of the room is going to be unoccupied, because the work parties that have not completed, have been repopulated with other people.

So I think there's plenty of work to go around if that's what you want to do. We could also, if you wanted to, take a mental health moment break and very briefly look at what the Work Stream 2 recommendations were coming back to the questions that were raised out of the reviews working party earlier.

So you can see that all of these recommendations, here are a few that have a clear nexus or not, but what is going to be hopefully clear out of that is as none of it has been even planned to be implemented, we really shouldn't – doesn't mean we can't, but I would argue probably shouldn't – focus on review of recommendations per say but rather review or opinion or a recommendation about enhancement on our process, and that may also allow for some contextual stuff which I think is what I was hearing from KC earlier. And again this is a very unique situation with Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 and how it was worked in or not an overburdened volunteer world at the time.

That's just two things off the top of the head. Plus you've got a whole bunch of clever people who could help you for more.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Sébastien? Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank, Pat. Another item that you might want to consider perhaps is ranking the items that you've discussed under each scope, in order of priority for this subgroup to look at.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My gut feeling to that, Negar, is I think we're a little too early on that, especially for some of the work parties because they need to re-rank anyway. That's just my gut reaction on that one.

PATRICK KANE:
We did talk about re-ranking within the within the work parties themselves, but I think that since we were still making some progress on fleshing out the priorities and rewording, does anyone disagree with it would be a good exercise to continue the process since we didn't really make it that far on the board items? Or are we done? I mean I think the GAC stuff is fundamentally done or at least it's good enough to put into the terms of reference for further review. I think we still have some work to do with the community, and reviews, I think we're in good shape, or not?

Okay, so then why don't we do that for the next – unless Sébastien, you have another suggestion.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:
Not another suggestion but I know that we are very happy with laptop, but can I suggest that we get on a paper the four working group items? I think it will be good for us to share and we know what is happening in the other group, once, and the second, for me it would be a little bit easier to have the paper to play with that on the board items, and I guess the other eight maybe also. I know that the trees are good for the earth, but I would like very much to have a paper on this now where we are in the work. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE:
You mean paper as in the stuff we have on the walls, or a paper in your hand? Got it. Great. Thank you. Paper in hand. Before we do that, why don't we take a little bit more time and flesh further out so that we do have some further definition to share around? Because I think that

again the board group got to taking a look at the items themselves. Maybe we can get some better definition in terms of how that's written. Take one more [cut at] community and also take us another look at reviews for another 30 minutes, and then get something printed out if we can, Negar, and then we can hand it out at that point in time. Is that fair?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, I just had a clarification question. So at the moment I have two documents, the community group and the board have sent me information which I put into the Google doc, and it sounds like that it's premature and needs to come out while this discussion takes place and then paste it back in.

PATRICK KANE: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As I understand it, I think it's not that it's premature, it's that it's only the beginning. There will be more coming to you as I understood. There will be more coming from those work parties to put into that space. But the reason I raised my hand was after this next little additional exercise, I suspect that is when the Google doc will be in a better position to have that part of it printed out as a piece of paper that I'm not sure that printing it out now is going to work. What are we printing out now?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. We'll talk about the board group. I would be happy to have one page printed now to help me for the next phase of the work. Thank you. You didn't have it because it was – I was asked to send to staff only this page. It was a result of the work of the subgroup that's –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In which case, Sébastien, it will be transcribed already or is about to be transcribed into the Google doc under exercise four. Staff are nodding, they're telling me yes, so that's fine. We can print out that page, and that will satisfy your needs right now, and everybody else's will also be satisfied if we print that and distribute to everybody. And it will be updated at the end of this exercise as well.

PATRICK KANE: Alright. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: So my only request is to have it for the subgroup who will work on that item. We don't need to have it distributed to others. But if others want, I have no problem with that.

PATRICK KANE: So if we could get a printout of that, that'd be great. Let's take another 30 minutes to try to flesh things further out for the day and maybe we call it a little early today. Instead of going to 5:30, we do that for about 30 minutes. Take a look at that. And then first thing tomorrow, have each of the work parties talk through where they are and read through

what we think we've got on the page. Is that fair? Does everyone think it's a good use of our time?

Alright. Yes, Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Just to let you know unfortunately I won't be able to stay tomorrow. I'm leaving tomorrow morning and I have to be back at home by Saturday.

PATRICK KANE: So then you can stay here later this evening and present to everyone here via some mechanism. Alright, no, understood. Thank you very much. But what I would ask is that if you are leaving tomorrow or whatever, is that you think through you would walk away with, whether it be paper, whether it be online, take a look at the Google doc. And we'll have a discussion at the plenary meeting next Wednesday. Are we morning? Are we 06:00? 18:00, right. What UTC time are we next week?

JENNIFER BRYCE: 11:00 UTC on the 10th of April.

PATRICK KANE: So next week, Wednesday at 11:00 UTC we'll have a catch up, because we'll all have a chance to spend several days looking at this and we'll go from there. Okay. Thank you, Oswaldo. Yes, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It seems that we start on the wrong foot and I will be on my plane to come back from here at that time. Therefore once again I will miss the call. It was the 13th of February, it was again when I came back from Tokyo, and it will be again when I come back from here. That's life.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. I didn't realize that people were staying longer in Los Angeles between now and next Wednesday. But we've already agreed to have a weekly cadence, so we will miss you, Sébsatien, but we're going to go ahead and have that meeting on Wednesday.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am sorry but I would say once again, why you don't try to have as much as possible people? Why you don't ask if we can switch the time? Because if another time, even middle of my night, I will be there. I will not be on my plane. Therefore there are solutions while not jeopardizing everything. Just a little question to people. Are you agreed that we change from one slot to the other? It could be a good way to trying to have more people on the call.

PATRICK KANE: Sébastien, when we set it up in the very beginning, we said our cadence was going to be weekly and we're going to switch between 11:00 and whatever the time was in the evening. That was what we agreed upon at the beginning. I'm just now finding out that you have a conflict, and so it's very difficult to make any modifications without understanding what the conflicts are. So I understand what you're saying, but I'm just

now hearing that we've got a conflict for next Wednesday. And it's already on the calendar.

So I understand and hear you, but it's scheduled. We're gonna go ahead and meet at that point in time. Unless the group decides that that's not what we want to do. Alright. So let's go ahead and work through our group's – I'm sorry, Sebastian. Okay, right. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're perilously close to our advertised time of 15 minutes past the hour for doing a wrap for today. And in our attempt to give you just a few minutes more in your day, we will stop that summation work now if you don't mind. Sébastien, you've mentioned you've got an update from the board group. If you'd like to briefly take us through that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes thank you very much. I have just published in the Google doc the results of the work of the group. I have additional to two items. The D2 seems to be better in the GAC group, they may already have taken that into account, and [four one] has been through the review more than in the board questions. And we have done a very short document with seven items. One of them is the ATRT2 metrics you know already.

The other one, I'm not sure that it needs to stay in the work. Is the board appeal mechanism adequate for the needs of the community? For the moment, it's there, and I just as a request of the group put the title of the items. There is no meat on the bones. It will be the next

phase. If we agree on these seven items, it would be a good step forward. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Is there any other group that wants to give a brief update? Let us know now. If not that's okay too. I gathered that D2 has in fact been taken care of by GAC, so Sébastien should note that, that that is already absorbed, done, into GAC. And I'll just ask that the reviews work party are aware that 4.1 is being tossed across to you and you may or may not want to catch it. Let us know what the response is to that perhaps in the morning.

That said, we're going to have a better than average attempt to have the work plan as our major exercise for tomorrow morning. In other words we're going to start putting more of these details that Sébastien just mentioned into the work plan in our morning session.

We will recap today in the morning, so you will have if you wake up at 3:00 in the morning and go "oh hang on I really am not comfortable with this" or "I want to renegotiate that," there will be time to do that. The Google doc will however by morning or mid-morning become the authoritative text that will be the repository of truth to quote Pat. Am I quoting you correctly? Just nod or shake your head.

That's great. And we will be going through the work plan up until 10:15 in the morning. At 10:15 in the morning, at 15 minutes past the hour, we will be taking our break slightly ahead of our advertised time in the agenda. So please prepare yourselves for that. That is a change to the agenda. At 10:30, which is when your scheduled mid-morning break will

complete, you'll need to be back in this room promptly. In fact we might even squeeze our 10:15 to a 10:10 to make sure you are all back in the room and attentive by 10:30 because at 10:30 we'll be having Brian Cute come in via hopefully video as well as audio into the Adobe Connect room. I've asked him to moisturize tonight so he's looking his absolute best for us, and he'll sleep well on that, I'm sure. The purpose obviously there is to spend about half an hour with him making sure you're all clear and fully understanding what the scope of work is that he's working on now. We'd also like to encourage you to think positively about using the work he's doing as perhaps a case study in some of your work. So we've asked him to talk to you a little bit about how it came to pass that the work he's doing is being done from his perspective, and then we'll have at least 15 minutes or half of that time as an interactive session between you and he. That however is not the end of it.

Brian has of course served as the chair, the sole chair of ATRT 1 and 2, and he has made himself well and truly available for all of us, and the work parties where relevant, and probably in particular where we're looking at the ATRT2 recommendations and what we do or don't do with it. So it would be perhaps wise for us to get used to working with him a little bit so we can get it from the horse's mouth, so to speak, when we are getting to that part of our work.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can we can discuss those sorts of things with him as we'll say tomorrow what we don't want to be with with the work he's currently doing is duplicative. We want to be complimentary. We don't want to be tripping over each other, but we certainly don't want to be duplicative. But that's tomorrow's work.

I remind you that the Google Doc will come out with more depth and color in it than you will have seen if you've looked at it recently, because staff – and they are absolutely fabulous. And again, I want to do a vote of thanks. I did it yesterday and I certainly want to do it again today. You ladies are keeping up with us. How you're doing it, I don't know, but credit where credit's due. You are doing a fantastic job and they will have turned around stuff again for us by morning, which is just wow, really worth their weight in gold is all I can say. And I'm sure, Pat, you'd agree with me on that. He concurs this is a good thing. So we'll have an even more interesting document to work with tomorrow, but we will also have the parking lot. So there'll be sort of like an other, not really working party yet but it's a place where there's other stuff that we might find that just has the orphaned or that comes up in your work plan discussion. And we will have a particular discussion about the parking lot and any items for further discussion after we wrap from the work with Brian.

With that we'll then go through the thrill-packed and exciting time after we finish any of that, looking at our schedule going forward, options for face to face meetings. There's lots of administrivia that we'd like to tie up between now and when most of you have to leave.

After that we will be looking towards having a document that is well and truly towards not a final but a well-established draft for our scoping and our milestones, which is what's probably even more important that goes with the scoping. So we'll be coming from the Google doc back into that Excel spreadsheet that you were introduced to yesterday. We will start populating the bottom part of that spreadsheet which has got, as it happens, four sections. We could always copy and paste another one, but it just happens to have, I wonder why, four sections there.

And then that will be built into the material that we need to give the board. With that I think worthy work will have been done over the three days together, and tonight of course is basically your own. Good heavens above. Pat's convinced us that we shouldn't do homework so unless he wants us to write out 100 lines of something – he's not gonna do that. Okay. That's good. It will be your own. Obviously, you're more than encouraged to look at the Google doc at any time. It's a living document. I'd like to thank everybody who's put up with the remote participation today. It has been a lot of silence and we do apologize if it's been too much silence. I also note that [Tola] came back on towards the end of the call.

So with that, over to Nagar for any other final housekeeping, and bidding of a fond farewell after that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. I actually just wanted to highlight one more item that after the face to face meeting wraps up, nothing we need to discuss tomorrow, but we do recommend issuing a blog to inform the

community of all the progress that you've made. This will go out to everyone. We will of course draft it, send it around to you all for review to add in any comments that you have, and then we will post it a few days after the face-to-face meeting wraps up to let everyone know what wonderful work you've been doing here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So obviously we're not writing the blog. Negar must be writing the blog because she thinks it's wonderful work we're doing. No, you were unplugging, you weren't trying to get attention. That's great and there are a couple of things in administration tomorrow that we might want to talk about such as other methods that we may want to do about reporting. You know, some dashboard stuff and those sorts of things. Think about how we're also going to promote our work because we need to be transparent in what we do as well. So with that, I believe one and all, you've not gained much of your day back but it's been a hugely productive one. And we couldn't help ourselves but let you run longer because you were doing such great work in that last session. So thank you. And that will be closing off of the recordings, and we will see you early if not bright a little before 9:00 for a 9:00 a.m. start. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]