
BRENDA BREWER: Thank you. Hello, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 review team plenary call number nine on the 17th of April 2019 at 21:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Daniel, Maarten, Erica, Jacques, Cheryl, Vanda, Liu, Michael, Osvaldo, Jaap, and Sébastien.

Observers joining us are Sophie. From ICANN Org we have Jennifer, Negar and Brenda. Apologies from Geoff, KC, and Herb.

Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking, and I'll turn the call over to Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much for that, Brenda. Now, we have to rely on the shared screen moving itself up and down today. We don't have scroll rights unfortunately. That's one of the limitations of Zoom. There's a lot of good things about it, and we will all get used to it, I'm sure. But do remember that we are going to need the shared screen to move up and down as we move through.

So let's get started, and we have a few things to get through today. First of all, on behalf of Pat and I, our usual welcome to you all. The roll call's been done, and we will now ask for any updates of statements of interest. If you have a statement of interest update, reminding you all we are operating under continuous disclosure, you should update your copy of your statement of interest online and advise us at the next practical time, which for us would be the next weekly meeting. If you

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

have difficulty updating your statement of interest at any time, then please do reach out to staff who will help you.

Maarten still has the same interests, so that's good. Let's hope you all still have interest in continuing in ATRT3. Sorry about that levity, I needed some smile this morning. I've been in far too many calls back to back. In fact, several of them overlapping each other totally.

Is there anyone who has Any Other Business they would like to bring forward to let us know about now? Noting we will call for Any Other Business again before we finish today. I'll also do my best to try and keep an eye out for hands raised, but if someone sees a hand raised, do pop it into chat, because that's often easier to catch my eye, especially if I'm looking at the screen.

Okay, not hearing anyone raise Any Other Business as a foreshadowing, let's move on to our agenda item number two, and that is a little bit on work party communication channels. The leadership team's been gathered together into a leadership team Skype channel, and you should all now note that each of the work parties have also been gathered together into a Skype group, and we are very hopeful [that it will be] particularly useful for the different work parties. In particular, we've noted a couple of the work parties have already made good use of that communication as an adjunct to the use of the single e-mail list.

So whatever you do, feel free to use it as a relatively informal or even relatively formal, depending on how you want to play it, channel of communication. However, we'd remind you that the formal repository for all our communications will still be our publicly [inaudible] and we

trust highly transparent Wiki page, so everything we do should end up in the public purview for anyone [inaudible] at any time either through our work or from a historical perspective.

And to that end, I'll open a very short queue – and I don't mean short in number of people, you can all put your hand up, but short in duration of time – if anyone wants to make a comment on work party communication channels.

Excellent. Not hearing anyone or seeing anybody, that means we can move on to our next item, which is something that we would very much like to have finalized today. You'll have all received by now, I believe, and have had time to have a quick look at a fairly standard pro forma for the job description of a technical writer. This is one of the things we discussed at the face-to-face meeting.

It would behoove us to get on with this next phase, because ICANN HR has to then do something with this job description and find the appropriate person, contract with the appropriate person, etc. And the sooner we get the appropriate person to assist all of your work party work to be appropriately and suitably captured as you go through it to make a final drafting of your work and recommendations as easy as possible, the better I would think it would be. So we would like to complete this at today's meeting. So what I'm going to do is call for anybody who feels they haven't had time up until this meeting has started to make a comment or suggest an edit for Pat and I to consider on the job description, please let us know now.

Please also remember that this is planned to be a 15 hour per week position, so we can't ask them to be super person, just perhaps superhuman, and as usual, give everything they possibly can to the work of ICANN, just like they expect from all of us volunteers.

I'm seeing positives in the chat, I've seen some positives in the list. Unless we hear otherwise during this call, we will take silence as assent. I've got some thumbs up happening in the chat as well, and so unless we hear otherwise before the end of this call, we will take that as read, and that we can get the human resources department of ICANN to take that job description and make the magic happen.

Right. Zooming along here, now we get to the exciting part. This is the part that I'm sure [inaudible] disappointed his connectivity is still not good enough to join us. He still may join us during the call. He was away from his normal communications at this time and wasn't sure how quickly he could get back to it.

We're going to hear from each of the leadership teams. At least one representative from each of the leadership teams I think is present from each of the work parties, and if there's more than one of you here, you'll just have to arm wrestle or whatever virtually between each other to see who starts off with the update, and the other one will have to just follow through.

Each work party, just to remind you all, has two nominated leads. Their job is to make sure that the activities happen in a timely manner, the reporting is done effectively and that the work party furthers its activities in such a way as there is as high a degree of accountability and

transparency in our own work as there is in that that we're supposed to be analyzing and commenting on.

We'll be looking at updates from board, updates from GAC, updates from review, and updates from community. And I just wanted to say how pleased Pat and I are, and I'm sure staff who've worked through a number of these review teams are equally pleased and impressed – let me know privately if it's not the case, I'm just going to suggest that you should be, if you're not – with the excellent progress that we've been seeing from each of the work parties.

We've had some fabulous efforts started in the Los Angeles meeting and continued, and in fact in the last 24 to 36 hours, we've seen considerable additional work come, I think, from each and every one of the work parties.

So we're going to start with the order that is in our working document. this is the order we will probably stick with until someone convinces us otherwise. So we will, under normal circumstances, have this as a standing agenda item where we hear from board, GAC, reviews and community. For today, we'll also have a very brief couple of words, independent review process. And remember, please, that the independent review process is in fact something – not the only thing, but at least one of the things that we'll be dealing with as a full plenary, not within a work party as such.

Thanks to Jennifer there for popping in the Google doc link, appreciate that. And I guess just before I move on to ask [inaudible] Sébastien who's going to lead off on updating us on activities in the last week

from the board work party, do all make sure that you can get into the Google doc and have the appropriate edit rights in the Google doc, and let us know during this call if that is not the case.

So with that, please try and keep this update to somewhere around five to seven minutes. If you need to extend, then obviously, we will do so. But if we can keep to sort of five to seven minutes on each of these, that will be great.

So, who's leading off? Sébastien or Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: If Sébastien could do it, because I wasn't in the group last week. I was traveling. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a problem, and I hope you made all of your family commitments without too much drama. Over to you, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Maybe it's not good to start with me, because during the meeting in Los Angeles, it was decided that all the new versions must be in the ToR draft. It's why I was asking to get access again to this document. And now we are coming back to the old document, and I don't understand why. We can go back and forth in different documents, but that's not the best way.

I think that the last version from our group is in the ToR document, and in this document, I have tried when I am working on that to put different working team with a number and with order by alphabetical order, but it seems that you decide to go in another way, and that's it what I can say. We don't have done anything since Los Angeles. But first, I was struggling to get the last version of the documentation, and now it's okay, so we'll be able to start work again. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Certainly, the Google doc, as I listened in Los Angeles, was still going to be a living working document that many of you can use as a scratchpad and a work party interaction space, but that as you come to any full agreement or consensus on any particular thing that, yes, it should be put across to the terms of reference document.

The terms of reference document, of course, needs to hold the final, even in the pre-draft phase, because that is what the eventual report will be going to the board from us in. So I'm delighted to hear that you've managed to get all of the work out of the Google doc and across – don't think any of us are particularly wedded to any particular order in the terms of reference document as yet. I would however suggest that we'll all have to agree on the way in which the terms of reference document is going to be structured. That's another good reason to get a technical writer on as soon as possible, so consistency is key here. Maarten, I see your hand. Over to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, and unmuted now. Just to raise, I've seen the list. I wasn't in Los Angeles discussion, because I was mainly in the GAC discussion, and I can't be in four places at the same time. But if I see the list, I think it's pretty complete. It's also very [wide.] And I see an opportunity to zoom in on those areas that are maybe of most concern. I think that would be a very useful next step, and I'm very willing to contribute to that by generally commenting on where I think the things are very obvious and where maybe less so.

And it's important for me to say that that is not to steer the group to explore or review something of the board or not. It's just, I think, priority setting will help us to do a good and deep job rather than a general and superficial job on many points. So my commitment to the board group is to come back with comments in that respect.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thanks for this, Maarten, and I'm sure the board group will welcome you along with the rest of the team getting down now and fleshing out and giving depth and color to what they've already managed to get done in Los Angeles. I just want to note for the record that Demi has now joined us, and no problem for being late, Demi, we're just glad you could join us.

Let's move on to GAC. Who's going to take the lead here? Is it Liu or Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I can do, but Liu, feel free to join.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Over to you then.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. So, we had a very interesting change of e-mails. All those I put together into the Google doc so to make it easy for everybody to see it also, and we started the work suggestion and the how to divide the initial work that we started defining during LA. Liu joined and asked to include very important topic that we forgot to put there. That was GAC operating principles. So we add this to the work done in LA.

[Maarten] has suggested, and we asked staff to see feasibility on [inaudible] and to ask for score cards with reference to public record to work, and to have those more organized in some way that we could divide our work more easily. And Jacques also suggested some criteria to our assessment exercise to put accessibility, publicity, intelligibility on the analysis that we'll do after we start to assess all the topics that we decide to do. so we post everything in the Google doc, and I believe that I haven't heard from Wolfgang, but among us, I believe we are working well, it's oiled, so it's starting to make it possible to go further in this process, and also, I guess I got [Jennifer's] feedback that they will talk with the staff and see if it's possible and when they can work on those score cards.

Now, for the GAC side, there is quite organized website where you can really reach those information about the communiques, about the feedback from the board itself as Maarten said. There is a very clear

process over the table now that you can follow up what was behind any decision done by board related to the communique.

So the process is clear, so we need to see better this process, and we also decide that Maarten and Liu will be a resource for us, so the mostly hard work will be done by the others, Jacques, myself and Wolfgang, and Maarten and Liu will help us to understand behind the curtains that we can see when you assess the information.

So I believe we are going well, and I personally start and the others [send] feedback, and at the Skype one, and again, I just put another information that can be used by the other groups too to the leadership group, a link for the survey about registry and registrars and how they are well served by ICANN and so on.

So the new one that was posted yesterday. So I put the link in the Skype that can be used by the others. There is a metric about marketplace and how they are feeling well served or not.

So I believe that is all. Not so much, but at least we start exchanging quite well the first steps. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Vanda. I see Maarten's hand, but before I hand to him, I want to, on behalf of Pat and I – and indeed, I'm going to add staff in again here – compliment you as a group. You're a small group, but you certainly hit the ground running in Los Angeles, and you've certainly continued to do so. But now you've given the secret away, that you've got the secret weapons of Liu as a serving GAC member and Maarten as

a serving board member getting you all the insider information. You see, this might be, ladies and gentlemen, how GAC is currently pulling a nose in front of the rest of the work parties. So beware, they'll catch up to you shortly, I'm sure, Vanda and Liu. Thanks for this. Maarten, over to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to say that [the less] secret weapon, but not everybody is aware. For all those with interest to the GAC work, please do check the GAC pages, because they are very transparent and very good tracking of process. And of course, that makes our lives easier and allows us to focus on things that are still to be usefully further developed. But yes, [with you,] and with Vanda, I'm very happy with the progress we made already and I've seen some of the direction on aiming at the sensitive points where we can make a difference already visible. So, thanks for all that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maarten. And I also wanted to point out that what Vanda has done by sharing the marketplace health report with you all even though it's not her work party's bailiwick to be looking at, that's exactly the sort of collaborative and cooperative way forward I think all of you will benefit from if you find something in your research, your readings or your travels that you see has an ATRT3 nexus, pass it along and make

sure everyone benefits by finding out about it as a resource sooner rather than later.

The other thing I think would be worthwhile mentioning is the various significant leaps ahead. I was trying not to wax too lyrical. But I'd like to remind especially those of you who haven't been deeply engaged in accountability and transparency review teams in the past how far the GAC and the GAC board interactions have come since we convened ATRT1. It is an almost unrecognizable set of circumstances from where we were back in ATRT1 days and where we are now.

Does it still need to evolve? Obviously. Your recommendations and reviews will help in that process, but it would be good, as you are drafting and as you are thinking, if you are also cognizant of exactly how far these two entities have come working with each other, and indeed how far ICANN has come in itself.

With that, let's move now to – seeing as KC's away, that's going to be Daniel reporting on reviews. Over to you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Hope I can be heard loud and clear. So far, the work that has been done by the reviews team started by extracting from the Los Angeles meeting the key action points that we need to look forward, and so it looks like a [form of a] document that has been shared already on the chat, and it was mainly divided into four sections.

Task one, which was called [quantitative] assessment of utility, effectiveness and efficiency of the previous reviews.

Task two, which is quantitative assessment of the progress review reports, and the action point is from the Los Angeles meeting that since this will be so much intensive work, it will need to be outsourced to an external party.

And task three is for the review of the CCWG, the outputs related to accountability and transparency.

Task four is to analyze the issues with ongoing reviews, challenges with [objective efficiency,] effectiveness and impacts.

And then task five, request a systematic review of the ICANN bylaws and impact of the bylaws on the process.

So this document has already been shared with the work party team on how we tend to proceed with the review process, and already, you can see there are some bit of action points for the review work party and some action points for staff as they come along, and so intend to handle them in step by step manner that comes in.

I'll also be happy to share that from the communication, that we as the liaison team, that is KC and I, have been having, is that we need to be at least more granular in the work party section, and also looking at the workplan, and then also considering so much the ATRT2 recommendations that cut across, whereby those that apply to the board, which [are salient] to the board, those that [go] to the GAC, [further] to the GAC and goes on to the community, [refer] them to the community.

So we're looking at dividing up the recommendations and then assigning them to the appropriate groups for discussion [inaudible] reviews.

On top of that, KC did some interesting work whereby she did a mockup of the ATRT2 recommendations which has been also shared to the reviews work party, and then we need also to highlight so much on the ICANN self-assessment of the implementation of the recommendations. And at this point, as I previously had been promised by Jennifer and Negar, whether the review is complete, because it was mentioned to me complete by April, so probably, we shall require an update regarding whether it is complete or not complete.

Also, one of the things we are looking at is to have at least an intensive two weeks to discuss the document, and what do the members of the review working party understand the ATRT2 final report, and then from there, probably within early May, [we can] probably have a plenary call whereby we shall go through all the respective recommendations one by one and discuss what we want to say about whether the recommendations are implemented or whether they require any additional interviews or briefings that might be needed.

Then from there, we shall proceed to make a draft report, and also add in subsequent plans to the respective spreadsheet that was shared. So this is one of the work plans that is to be considered by the review work party, and we are looking forward to getting more feedback. And also to reply back to the review work party document, already we shall be scoping for questionnaires for questions, for interviews as we keep on gather information which will be put directly into the appendix.

As you can see, the first appendix is a draft questionnaire guideline by which we shall be interviewing respective ICANN staff on the specific implementation of ATRT2 implementation report. I hope that is enough for the moment. Thank you. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Daniel. Yes, it certainly is enough for the moment, and again, I think everyone will be as appreciative as Pat and I and staff are on how much progress is in fact being made by the work parties between leaving Los Angeles and convening in today's call. It's quite impressive. You're setting a cracking pace. Do keep it up.

I would also note that some of you are still looking towards having some plenary calls, and you're welcome to use either Skype for that type of interaction or if you need staff to help us set up Zoom meetings, just let us know, but the earlier you can let us know, the better, because it may come to pass that three of the four work parties all want it at the same time and the same place on the same date. So the sooner you get in with your potential bookings, and perhaps at least one alternate, the better.

I'd also encourage you to try and get those on everyone's calendars as well in advance as you possibly can. You're all busy people, and your calendars, I'm sure, bulk up very quickly.

With that, I'm now going to move towards community and ask who is going to step up. Is it going to be Erica or Michael to start us off?

ERICA VARLESE: Hi, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go for it, my friend.

ERICA VARLESE: Great. So I'll give a little bit of an overview, and I think Michael will probably want to add a little bit after me as well. So I'll at least start us off and then we'll go from there. So over the past week, we've had a little bit of conversation within our group. I don't know if others have done this as well, kind of just while we were working out the scope document that came out of LA, we just kind of restricted it to the community group to kick off that discussion before sharing with the full list.

So the point right now is we've worked through that a little bit and provided some preliminary either request for resources that we might need and some action items that will come out of that just to start planning ahead with that workplan, and I think we're also kind of just refining the scope of that document as well.

So I don't know how much detail you want me to go in there, but if you're in the document, you could see what we have added along with a few comments. And I think from here, our plan is to just over the next week just refine that a little bit further, refine the scope, and once we refine the scope, finalize what we're going to need from there and really start that discussion a little bit more in-depth. And yeah, just get everything nailed down more.

So that's where we're at now, and I don't know if there's any more detail you want. I'm happy to answer questions. Otherwise, Michael, if you want to jump in with some of the questions that you brought up in the document as well, feel free to chime in.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Hi. Thanks for that. Thanks for that summary as well. I would encourage the members of the group to go back to the Google document and check out the progress that we've made to try to expand on and to refine the areas of investigation.

I did want to mention at the outset in terms of just scope that compared to the other working groups, community is a little bit more challenging to nail down, particularly since the board and the GAC are part of the community. So what I was thinking – and I haven't run this past anyone, but I did want to mention just as a sort of advance in the conversation in terms of scope, that we might look at these issues relatively expansively. And I think some of that is [inaudible] look at our mandate relatively broadly. And I think some of that is in line with what we see in the areas of investigation that have been handed over where it sort of seems like the stuff that didn't go well kind of got lumped in here.

So we've been going through and trying to narrow it down a little bit, refine and develop kind of action areas forward. I did want to draw attention to two specific questions. And again, this is just me talking, not something that I've cleared with folks. But with regard to two areas that we have to look at, specifically action area three, which is to review the prioritization process if any exists regarding the recommendations

given by the community and review the community input process into the recommendations, and then also reviewing investigation area five, which is reviewing the impact of periodic review and review the cost effectiveness of reviews.

Reading both of these investigative areas, it struck me that they might be better placed with the reviews group. In terms of the latter, I think it's fairly self-explanatory, because we're looking at the impact of periodic review and the effectiveness of reviews, and there is a specialized reviews group. So I'm not sure why that was handed over to us.

And in terms of the first one in terms of recommendations given by the community, I guess that that has a nexus on both sides, but at the same time, the source of a lot of these recommendations, I think, is the review process. Although I guess it could come back to PDPs as well, but again, it strikes me that for the most part, this is a question of the reviews.

So on both sides, I was hoping, if we have a moment – and I defer to the chairs if this is not the right time, but I wondered if there might be a moment to chat about whether we think it is appropriate for the community group to have those two areas of investigation or whether they're more appropriately delegated to the reviews subgroup.

So with that being said, I think open it up, if I may, and maybe go to the chairs first and ask if this conversation would be out of scope or inappropriate at this point, or if not, if people have thoughts.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In fact, Michael, it may have happened late on our final day in Los Angeles, but I was under the impression that we felt that it wasn't appropriate for the periodic reviews and the general concept of their effectiveness, etc., the whole reviews bundle to go back to the reviews team work party, only in as much as their mandates we're very much tied to reviewing the ATRT2 and the other specific reviews.

That said, I'm not quite sure how it ended up with community, because by my reckoning, along with the independent review process, I believe that we thought we would be better off dealing with that as a plenary subject. And hopefully, that will relieve you greatly when you hear me say that.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. I don't feel strongly either way so far as we're happy to take it as well, again only speaking for myself. I don't have an objection to a statement, it just seemed an odd organization.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I believe that that was where our organizational fit was at the end of the meeting. If not, unless Pat disagrees vehemently with me – I'll have a chat with him later if he does – then I think we can sort of go along that way, unless we wish to turn around later. And that, I think, makes a good deal of sense in terms of distributing the workload.

With regards to the input and the timeliness and effectiveness of the input, and what prioritization the input's been given, I'd be tempted to ask your group to discuss that further first, particularly because it would

be perfectly reasonable for you to include the input from community on the policy development process and public comment process, just as the board has its particular requirements to respond and react to GAC Advice – capital A Advice. The GAC has also not only through ATRT1 and 2, but in its own evolution, tried to become more involved and engaged in that policy development process, and certainly in cross-community working groups, as I know you're well aware. And that, of course, may be seen as allowing then that GAC working party to look to the effectiveness and efficiency of that input. But that would leave the effectiveness and efficiency and prioritization of the rest of the rest of the ICANN community's input sort of not picked up.

And if that's the case – and that's where I'm encouraging your group to talk on that and us to take that as an item for next week's agenda, then it's based on your feedback next week, then community would be a still reasonable home for that, remembering of course that an enormous amount of time in ATRT1 and a lesser amount in ATRT2, not only because it was reviewing the recommendations and implementation of the recommendations from ATRT1, was spent on looking at how some of [the now assumed to have always been there,] but back then, basic changes that happened to public comments happened out of ATRT1. So it's probably not unreasonable to keep your community finger on the pulse of that. But happy to take that as an item for next week. But please do have a little small group discussion first.

With that, just before we move on to move away from community, I would also like to do what Michael's encouraged you to do, and that is to go in and have a look at the Google doc, because something that I was very pleased and impressed was the approach that they have taken

having the very clearly defined requests or what is desired from staff in terms of actionable or action items and what is desired or planned from the work party on each of their sections. And I think that's [a to be encouraged] approach. You might have a different approach. That's fine too. But I thought the clarity in that approach the community working party is taking there was refreshing and very easily reportable.

Just before I move on to independent review processes, assuming that there's no one in the queue with their hand up, I would also want to suggest that with each of these – sorry, I see Sébastien. I had to scroll up to see you, Sébastien. I will stop now and I will go to you. Sébastien. My apologies for not noticing your hand. I do wish someone had mentioned it to me in chat as I requested they do so.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

That's okay, Cheryl. Thank you very much. Yeah, I know that those four groups, we will have trouble at the border, I will say, because for one, it's an output, and for the other, it's an input. But I am wondering if what is linked with the board election must not be [inaudible] the board group and not in the community group.

My thinking was that community was more to work about what's the new power of the empowered community gets and how it's working since IANA stewardship transition. But if those two groups made some work on the issue of the election, why not? But I was really thinking that what is concerning the board as an input or as an output will be in the board working group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Sébastien. I'm sure that the community group has heard you there. I must say my personal thinking is that of course all of the board members, including those from the Nominating Committee, are appointed by someone, and those someones are the community. I won't say any more than that, just worthwhile considering while they consider your comments as well.

What I was going to say was I would like to respectfully request that all of the work parties do keep up with as sort of a continuous process of letting staff and us know as soon as you possibly can if there is any material, documents, reports, background briefings, whatever, that you think you might need. Please let us know as early as is practical and possible so that we can in some cases prioritize those and get you whatever discoverables you need.

I would also encourage you to not forget that we have some excellent resources that are on the Wikis and the websites, and certainly, GAC work parties made very good use of those already. I suspect the board work party will also do the same, because the transparency of the work product of the board has undergone a number of evolutions in recent times as well. But do remember that from each of the work parties, without having to wait for a meeting, use your Skype connects, make sure your leadership puts forward anything that you think you might need access to, and the sooner the better.

With that, I don't think I'm seeing any more hands. Just a couple of minutes – and it really will only be a couple of minutes on independent review process, which is certainly one of the things we thought we would deal with at the plenary.

As you may very well know, the IRP is a very key accountability mechanism that's provided for in the ICANN bylaws. It is important that we do have the allowance for third-party review of actions or inactions by the board or staff in their decision making process, etc. More importantly, the IRP itself has undergone its own not quite revolution, but definitely evolution over the last few years, running throughout the time spent in both the accountability Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 days, and I believe final report, if memory serves, was June or July 24th 2018 on that material work. It is still being refined, and we did agree in Los Angeles that we would ask to have David, who is chairing up the IRP working group, come and give us a brief bringing us all up to speed.

I would like to suggest that we try and do that, if not next week, the week after if that suits you all. We'll get back to you on that. obviously, we have to find out when David McAuley's own work commitments will allow for that, and I would be suggesting that pat and I allow probably about 15 minutes of our time, perhaps up to 20 with any conversation that might need to go along with it to make sure we all have a good grasp and understanding of not only what we think the IRP is, but so that we all actually know the difference between what it was and what it is now.

But on the matter of discovery – and here, I'm quite sure most of you are well aware of the blog post that came out not that long ago – I can't even remember when it was, sometime in early April, which also – might have been end of March – titled independent review process standing panel call to action. That blog post did get some action and reaction from community, dare I say [not at all but good.]

I think it's important we all take the time to read that blog post, to read the questions being posed, and to avail ourselves of any of the comments and letters that have come in. For example, I'm aware that certainly the chair of the ccNSO has written in response to this call to action. So [to that end,] if staff could accumulate in a little folder place or space that sort of resource material so that when we dig into IRP world, that we have all of those in a single spot. So just [as there's] a place for the board work party, GAC, review and community work party, we may as well pop a little home up somewhere in the Wiki world for our IRP space, and if we could have our links to the regional blog, or if not, the transcript of the blog, any correspondence in any form of it is going to the board regarding that. I think that could be quite handy. I'm pretty sure that's all Pat and I had on that.

With that, I am now going to stop talking for a few moments and hand over to staff to look at what we asked them to do as an action item, which is get some input from the Meetings team on future meetings. Ladies and gentlemen, I am not suggesting that we settle dates and times, etc., now. I am suggesting we now have the blackout dates, we need to look at our own calendars and poll, what may or may not be possible, and would work for the majority of us, getting to a place which is going to be not as problematic as some countries in terms of both travel and visa, and convenience to gather in another face-to-face meeting.

So, who's got this one? Jennifer, Negar?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, Cheryl. Hi, everyone. I'm happy to take it. So as Cheryl had said, the purpose – really, the action items that we as staff would hope to get out of this discussion is a clear action item for us in terms of circulating a Doodle poll for dates and also for locations, and so we provided some information on list in terms of the blackout dates that the Meetings team have provided us, and I do have a quick update on that, which is happy news, that for 2020, there are no blackout dates as far as they are concerned.

So I know that you are all keen to do as much forward planning as possible, so if you're thinking to plan the meetings through to 2020, then just keep that in mind.

I do not want to go through all the information that is shared via e-mail again, but do please feel free to raise your hand and ask any questions that you might have. I'll just ask Brenda to please skip to the next slide, which provides some information on the costs for meetings in Beijing and for Hong Kong and also for Singapore.

And just to be clear, because there was some confusion on the list – and apologies for that – we provided these cost estimates because we had been specifically asked to do so, so it does not mean that any of the other meeting locations have been ruled out or that any decisions have been made, but you see here the information that we were provided by the Meetings team.

And just for some helpful context, the recent face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles was around the \$47,000 mark, so the cost of these two meetings comparatively, hopefully that will help give some context.

So Brenda – does anybody have any questions or comments on this information before I move on to the next slide? I'm seeing no hands raised, but please feel free to just jump in. Otherwise, we'll move on to the next slide, please, Brenda.

So as I said, per our Meetings team, the important thing will be for them to have dates from you all first so that they can start to prepare the meeting, and so as you all know, the cost increases, as does the complexity the closer that we get to the meeting date.

So the date important to note here is the 90 days to submit a request for face-to-face meetings. So it's a little bit of time, but we're in good shape for anything after Marrakech, which I believe is the first face-to-face meeting that you all are planning. And I note Cheryl's comments that she wants to go back to the blackout dates in a minute, and we can certainly do that.

But in terms of decisions [on what needs to be on the poll] for the action item coming out of this, I think it would be helpful for us to get a clear date or set of dates that you wish to pull for your first meeting at least so that we can get that one meeting as quickly as possible. Any questions before I move on to the next slide? And I'll just do the next slide and then we can go back to the blackout dates.

Alright, so as well as the dates for the first meeting, it would be helpful for us to have an idea of destinations. We already provided the information for the APAC region, but there's other locations that of course you can choose from. So instead of polling for however many locations, it would be helpful if we could narrow to at least two or

maybe three so that at least we're not taking everybody's time to fill out an extensive Doodle poll. However, that's just a suggestion, and obviously, I'm open to discussion. And I see that Maarten has his hand raised, so Maarten, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. Thank you. Excellent preparatory work. I'm just wondering again, are we only looking at the Asia region, or – because, I don't see the prices for Istanbul, Brussels, LA. I do remember we talked about where to go, but I thought we weren't fully firm on that either. Just try to find out where we are. Maybe Cheryl, are we fixed on Asia, or are we looking at all locations? I really don't remember. I know we talked about it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to respond to your question, no, the reason we got the additional costs for things in the APAC region is because obviously, APAC people were disadvantaged going to Los Angeles. In, of course, the case of Liu, he wasn't even able to get a visa in the time we had for preparation for the meeting, and he had also asked whether or not we would consider holding a meeting in China.

So whilst we were looking at trying to cost things and assuming that it may be markedly easier to get into another Asian country than it would be perhaps to try and get back into the Americas, that we did look at comparative costings there.

That by no means is saying that any one of these ICANN offices with delightfully similar – with the exception of Istanbul by the seems of it – capacity to hold us, by the way, it’s a pleasant surprise, none of those are off the table. And in fact, whilst we would encourage you, because it is a cheaper option to do things in an ICANN office, the cost at each of these offices is different. We did have previous presentations, and I'm sure staff can pull that up again for us and send it to the list if not display it now. I think Los Angeles happened to be one of the cheaper ones to run, but that’s neither here nor there. We certainly can also do it not in an office run by ICANN, but that is, experience has told Meetings teams over the years, a more expensive and in some cases significantly more expensive option than running it at an ICANN office. And that makes sense.

So nothing’s off the table now. The other APAC sites were simply listed because we wanted to, shall we say, be a little kinder to our APAC friends.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Okay. Thank you for that. That helps. And I do agree that it’s crucial for ATRT meetings that at least people can come if their work and other commitments allow them and are not held back by visa. So I can see that’s an important factor. But Negar, if it isn't too much trouble, maybe not for this meeting, but also for the next, if you have a kind of overview easily, [inaudible] per office, we can consider that.

So two elements: one is how many of us would need a visa, how difficult is that. I guess that’s partly qualitative, partly quantitative. But the other

one is an indication of costs. So we can make these choices fully informed. But yeah, I'm 100% with you, Cheryl, that visas shouldn't keep us from coming together.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you for that, Maarten. And indeed, we will recognize, of course, that it'll be a very rare circumstance where absolutely everybody will be able to make a meeting. Wouldn't it be lovely if that was the case? But that's probably not going to be the case. But we want to minimize the barriers to full participation and maximize the opportunities. But more importantly, when we have people willing to travel as we did, willing to put in the time as we did, able to, but not be able to be visa-ed, be it because of the amount of time in the planning, or at all, I find that – and I'm sure most of you will agree – something that we should avoid in the future. And of course, to that end, one would assume that if you're denied a visa – and some of us were, [didn't have] visas to attend Los Angeles in April, you probably will be in October as well.

Now, if we can briefly go back to the blackout dates slide, please. Thank you very much for that. I just have a question. And it may be one that we actually need to ask Meetings. I note that the IGF in Berlin is listed here as blackout dates. That's fine, I can live with that.

Obviously, we would want people to be able to be engaged in other things in the Internet ecosystem, and IGF at a global level is a very important thing. But I thought that most of these blackout dates, in fact every one of them I'm reading, with the exception of that one, I could rationalize that there were resources, equipment, right down to the IT

stuff that were being dedicated to these other meetings, I didn't realize that ICANN was providing the ICT and communications support for the Berlin IGF.

Interesting to hear if that is the case. Otherwise, I guess I was somewhat curious as to why meeting around that would have the same resource impost as meeting around any of these other ICANN meetings with all of the resources that are tied up, and that includes human resources of staff that are tied up in them. So not asking you to answer unless you know the answer, Negar and Jennifer, but I would personally be fascinated to know if ICANN is sponsoring the IGF to that extent, because there's other conversations to have if that's the case.

The reason I'm asking that is we did hear from at least a couple of people that they would already be in Berlin on those IGF dates and a colocation there, not competing with the IGF dates but complementary to it, may be cost effective because what we would be paying for for hiring a room, we may be saving on airfares we wouldn't have to spend. Over to you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Cheryl. We'll refrain from answering your question about ICANN's level of support for IGF on the merit that I actually don't know the answer, but we're happy to take it back and see if we can provide you with a reasonable feedback from the Meetings team on that. And also, we can certainly look into, as you just put it so succinctly, the possibility of having a meeting that complements for example IGF or some of the other ones that are more reasonable in terms of time.

Obviously, not happening at the same time but happening either before or after, that meetings might end up being more cost effective. We can certainly look into that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Negar. I appreciate that. Because obviously, the logistics were the major stumbling block for all of these other ones. It's why we're not meeting after Marrakech. And we understand that, and we accept and respect that. But I just went, "Huh, why is that the case for IGF in Berlin?" And I am keen, as is Pat, to spend the allocated dollars wisely. But if that means that we can save more because people will be in a single space already on someone else's dime, perfectly happy to explore that as well.

So it seems to me that our action items now are going to [inaudible]

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I don't hear anything anymore. Am I the only one?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Maarten, I'm not hearing Cheryl either. Otherwise, I have no issues, I can hear you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Cheryl disappeared.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I guess we lost Cheryl. The others are still online. I guess it's maybe it's better to keep talking. Like that, when she is back, she'll know that we're still here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm here. I've had to come back in via my mobile phone.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I was just about to start singing here.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I think you heard where I was heading. Unfortunately, I'm only here via my mobile phone, which will definitely encourage me to wrap this call up as soon as possible, particularly because I'm standing in my driveway where I can get mobile service, and it's cold here in autumn.

So the action item, we probably will not be in a position to do a full Doodle polling of the where type options just yet, Jennifer, but perhaps we might be able to be in a position after this meeting to Doodle poll some dates or spaces of time around that are not in those blackout dates, noting that something may or may not happen closer to Berlin as a possibility. If not, we'll take this up in next week's agenda based on Maarten's requests.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Cheryl. I've noted that, and we can certainly work to put together a Doodle poll and see what information we can get on the IGF from Meetings team too. That's a helpful sigh. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we still aren't in a bad time crunch position, but we do want to get ahead of it. You're right.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe we're up to Any Other Business at this point in time.

JENNIFER BRYCE: That's correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Is there Any Other Business? And I have no ability to see hands or anything with my mobile phone at this stage, so you'll just have to yell at me if there is.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sébastien's hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, it was about the previous topic. We talk about possible meeting in July, August and September. Is it still the case we are looking for this time frame? Or we are looking for a longer period to find the right time to travel to the face-to-face meeting together?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, the whole point of the poll is to find those dates and all the way out to 2020 before our final report goes in, so that we can plan all our way out. So we need to find out now knowing what the limitations are from ICANN's perspective, we now need to ascertain what the limitations and preferences are from each of the participants.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alright then. And Any Other Business? Looking at participants again, I don't think so. Not seeing anything. None from Vanda's side. Terrific. Okay. Well, then because I'm now looking at the world's tiniest screen, I'm going to actually ask – assuming Jennifer, if Negar's only on the phone – to take us through any of the decisions made today so we can confirm those and also confirm the time in our rotation things for

our call next week and remind you all, those of you who are part of the leadership of the working parties, that at 20:00 UTC on a Monday, there is a leadership team meeting that you are all expected to have one or other of you, if not both of you attend wherever humanly possible. I'd also note that I certainly have no objection. I doubt Pat would either. If anyone else wants to join that, these meetings are recorded and will be published, and you're more than welcome to join. No secret business going on, we can assure you. But I do note that for those who are followers of certain religious observances at this time of year, Monday may in fact be a day that they are not planning on being available for a call. If that is the case, we'll discuss in the leadership team chat. If that is the case, then we may put it forward by 24 hours perhaps, and that, I don't think will be too problematic because we already have a couple of substantive agenda items for next week's call anyway.

So, over to you, Jennifer, and then we can wrap.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Great. Thanks very much, Cheryl. So the decision that was captured was that the team finalized the technical writer job description, and therefore staff are going to proceed with the process to hire this person.

An action item for staff to put together resources for the IRP scope item and file those on the Wiki. We're also going to put together some information on how many people would need a visa and cost for each of the ICANN locations that were shared on list and determine the Meetings team level of support for the IGF in Berlin, particularly if there's a possibility to have a meeting either before or after that

meeting there in November, and then staff are going to Doodle poll the dates, and during the times that are not in the blackout dates through early 2020.

Those are the action items that I captured. Please let me know if I missed anything or if anyone needs any clarifications. Other than that, I will hand it back to Cheryl to close. Thank you, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Jennifer. If you can just refresh us for the time of next week's call. If this is the 20:00, then I'm assuming next one is 14. Or is it 13?

BRENDA BREWER: Thanks. It's at 11:00 UTC, and that's on the 24th of April.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Yeah, 24th at 11:00 UTC. Yes, it's in the calendar, so iCals have already gone out. That hopefully will be something that we will not have too many apologies for. We do note however that KC is running work-related activities in the next couple of weeks, and she will be unavailable for these plenary calls, but she's working with Daniel – asynchronously, I think, is the best way to describe that.

So with that, thank you, one and all, and I do appreciate the huge amount of progress that you've all managed with your work parties. Keep up the good work, and do use your Skype channels. Don't forget to get requests for resources over to staff as soon as possible. And with

that, I'd like to say bye for now, and for those of you who are traveling over the next week or so for family or other purposes, I wish you safe travels. And thanks, staff, for the fabulous support, as ever. Thanks, everybody, and bye for now.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]