

---

PAMELA SMITH:

Hi, everyone. Welcome to the ATRT3 plenary call number 12 on the 15th of May 2019 at 21:00 UTC. Members attending the call are Cheryl, Demi, Erica, Jaap, Jacques, Liu, Osvaldao, Ramet, Sébastien, Vanda, and Wolfgang.

We have a special guest today, Brian Cute. Observers are Herb, our ombudsman, and I believe he's our only observer at present. And then attending from the ICANN Org are Larisa Gurnick, Jennifer Bryce, Pamela Smith, and Yvette Guigneaux, with apologies from Brenda, Daniel, and – I'm sorry, there are some other apologies. Hold on.

At any rate, today's call is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking? Cheryl, I turn the call over to you, and thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much for that, Pamela. Noting Pat, our fellow co-chair, will be joining us shortly. He's indicated he will be delayed for about 10 or 15 minutes more. Brian, yes, feel free to take this personally, I'm sure. That is a joke, for the record, by the way.

With that, I'm going to do the usual administrivia and ask if there's anybody who has an update to their statements of interest. If so, let us know in chat, and obviously, update your statements of interest. If you have a problem doing that, then staff is able to help. Not seeing anybody's hand raised or typing going on, we will take that administration is now complete, and I want to particularly welcome not

---

*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.*

only you all to today's plenary call but also for Brian to be able to join us, noting that we're going to have – and thank you for noting those additional apologies. Maarten, by the way, is also expected to join us once his board meeting wraps up, assuming it wraps up in good time. Thanks for this, Pamela. I appreciate that, as well as apologies listed in the chat now.

So back to my general filibustering style, welcome. I particularly wanted to remind you that today, what we're asking Brian to do is take us a little further along his specific mandate of the evolution of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model work. He's had one of his two current webinars run. His second one will be running in a matter of an hour or so after our call, and I personally would like to encourage you all to join him on that call even if you have joined him on the last one. Excellent session, and we all have a lot to learn from that.

Brian, you're about to, I assume, have a slide or two uploaded. Before we do that, however, I just wanted to ask this group, is there Any Other Business that anyone wanted to flag now? If so, just type it in the chat. And again, because I'm in an amused mood, Brian, I note your image has a camera with a line through it, so people, I suspect Brian doesn't want us to photograph him or his presentation. It's a bit like any good theatre, apparently. No photographs, or perhaps no photographs with flash.

Over to you, Brian.

---

BRIAN CUTE:

Thanks, Cheryl. Greetings, everyone. I'm going to try to keep it to 20 minutes in the interest of your time. I want to give at least two clear updates – hopefully clear – and thank you, Cheryl, for attending the webinar yesterday. As you said, one of two, the second one I'll do in just about two hours' time.

The purpose of the webinar is to stimulate discussion on the conversation that I'm facilitating with the community, and also to stimulate interest hopefully in filing of comments.

So just to give you the high levels, the slide is up – thank you, Yvette. What's going on with this Work Stream, a public comment period was launched on the 25th of April, it's going to be open until the 4th of June. The focus of the public comment period is to develop a final issues list. The issues list as of today has been developed from community inputs from ICANN 63 and ICANN 64. It is a work in progress.

Through the public comment, the community is being prompted to essentially identify and describe the issues, add some more specificity to them so the issues are clear, what is the nature of the challenge, what is the nature of the problem that may be hampering the effectiveness and the efficiency of the multi-stakeholder model, and also being invited to some consolidating, some grouping and some prioritizing of the issues on the list.

Currently, we have 21 issues. I don't anticipate that that's the number that's going to remain after all the public comment's been received and the input from the webinar's been received, and that's precisely what's going on right now.

I'm not going to walk you through – you can breathe a sigh of relief – every slide painfully, but I do want to walk you through what I presented in the webinar so you can see how I'm developing the work. So if you would go to the next slide.

What I've done is again shown everybody on the webinar the list of issues as it is today, just simply [inaudible] if we can go forward two slides. One more, please.

So I've presented the issues list as it exists today, a work in progress. Again, just the high-level phrases or words. [There's] 21. I think you've seen them from prior sharing [that I've] offered to you in terms of the outcomes of the Kobe discussion.

You can see on their face that there are issues where there is or will be some commonality between some of the work that's being done by ATRT3 and evolving MSM. I'll get to some specifics there in a moment, but if you just slowly roll through the next seven slides, what I did for purposes of the webinar was I grouped some of these issues together. There's some interrelationships, similarities in nature, and I did that for that reason, but also to stimulate discourse.

What I offered was, “Here are the issues, I've grouped them together because of some relationships. People can see relationships in other ways and I'm inviting that, but I've also supplied a piece or two of community input that's been received to date about each issue.” So thank you for holding there.

With respect to accountability, here's a piece of input from the community so far that I think is representative of what the thinking is or

---

---

reflective of what the open questions are. So you see that for accountability, you see that for transparency, and you see that for roles and responsibilities.

And in the webinar, what I've been doing is sharing these points with the attendees, and then asking them to add, please describe in greater specifics what is the accountability issue that's hampering effectiveness and efficiency in the working of the model. Provide a specific example, a fact-based example.

If they can offer – if this issue were addressed and a solution could be found or an approach could be found, how would that improve the working of the multi-stakeholder model? Of course, maintaining the open and inclusive nature of the model.

So these are the props that I'm giving to the attendees in the webinar. Cheryl, thank you for your contributions. We had 60 attendees and very good inputs from yesterday's session. And again, this, as well as the public comment that will be received, I will be analyzing, summarizing and producing at the end of the public comment period essentially a proposed final issues list.

And that will be the subject of a webinar that I have scheduled for June 12. So prior to going into Marrakech with the community, another opportunity saying, "Here's your inputs, here are your comments, here's how the issues list has integrated, this is what the final list looks like on the basis of your inputs," and then have a good discussion about that. And then set the table for transitioning to phase two, which his where

---

the issues will be mapped into a work plan, and that work plan, once it is completed, becomes part of the operational plan.

So that's where we are. If we could move forward just another couple of slides, please. One more forward. Sorry. And I finished the webinar by providing everybody an update on the activities of the evolving the multi-stakeholder model Work Stream. And those can be found at the site of ICANN Org as well.

So that's what's happening in the webinar, and again, good attendance, good inputs, repeating the process tonight, and then the public comment process remains open until the 4th of June. So that's the first piece I wanted to share with you.

Let me stop and ask if there are any questions before I go to the second point. Are there any questions on what I've shared? Any hands, Cheryl, or shall I move to point number two?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not seeing any hands, Brian. I'm looking, but may as well continue, and I'm sure they'll line up questions as needs be.

BRIAN CUTE: Very good. Okay. So the second point, which is the point that we've talked about the last time I [joined you,] and that's the common interest that we have to ensure that this Work Stream and the work of ATRT3 are compatible, that we're not creating any work that is unnecessary, unnecessarily duplicative, or in some conflict that we want to avoid.

---

And in that vein, I want to offer two thoughts. And I mentioned this on the webinar. Now, this list is being developed by community input. I'm a facilitator. My role is to be neutral. And in that role, I'm also offering observations and thoughts.

One observation I would offer is if you look at the input on accountability – so ATRT3 obviously would look at this list and say, “Oh, accountability, transparency, there's some commonality, there's some overlap. Where is this going, and how do we make sure that there's compatibility, not conflict or unnecessary duplication of effort?”

If you look at the inputs on accountability and transparency so far, the transparency issue that's been raised by community input is around costs, the costs of policymaking processes, the cost of the work of the community. And I could see this list evolving in a way where transparency becomes a subpoint of the cost issued, that the issue to be addressed is cost writ large, and transparency obviously is an important element of that. That's one way, based on the comments, that I could see this list evolving. And accountability in the same vein. If you could go back to that slide, Yvette, so we could look at that. I think it's back one or two. One more I think, or two more. There we go.

So the community input so far is [this comment, I don't think the community is a particularly meaningful point to accountability] for the lack of priority setting. Priority setting itself is an issue that's been identified on the list. there's been a significant amount of input from the community on that issue and the importance of that issue in terms of the effectiveness and efficiency of the multi-stakeholder model, and I

could see that the issue becomes priority setting and accountability is perhaps a subpoint or sub-element of that.

So in the interrelated nature of the issue and how they could be joined and compressed, I see those dynamics emerging. And I wanted to share that with you so you have your own dynamic Work Stream and developing the areas that you're going to focus on. This too is a dynamic Work Stream. So that's one point.

The second point on how we collaborate to ensure the best outcome here, I have created for myself – and I'm happy to share when I have it complete – a mapping tool. So I've been following the work of ATRT3, and I've looked at the work that's been scoped out by the four different work teams, and I've taken for example work team one, the board, and seen the scoping of the work to date and put it into a grid and dropped the pieces of work team one's scoped work that I see commonality with parts of the issues list. And I'm creating a grid for myself, a mapping tool, if you will, so I can, from where I'm working, identify commonalities, and again, I think we're in agreement that commonalities don't mean there's an issue necessarily. But then as you evolve your work and this work evolves, we can work together to make sure that we're going through a process where if there are issues that present unnecessary duplication, then they fall off of this list, or if there's a conflict that we identify and we're able to talk it through and make sure that the work produced by evolving multi-stakeholder model, again, is compatible with ATRT3.



---

So those are the two thoughts I wanted to share with you in terms of how this list evolves and how we work in a compatible way and now I will be quiet and ask for any questions or thoughts on those points.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Everyone, I'm going to ask if people will put their hand up and step forward to this, but I would note that in chat, Wolfgang's comment is worthy of reading to the record. I'll do that in case he has an issue with his audio for whatever reason just so you've heard it.

"Hi, Brian. This is Wolfgang. Yes, it is important that we work hand in hand. Your report and the recommendations will be very useful for us. As I said in Los Angeles, this is the first ATRT after the IANA transition, and we have to review the functioning of the whole new model, and the "community" and the functioning of the multi-stakeholder model is certainly part of our accountability and transparency review."

And that got wholesale agreement from Vanda and Osvaldo. So they're comments rather than questions, but still useful input for you, I believe. Ladies and gentlemen, the floor is open. If you want to interact with Brian on this, this is the ideal opportunity to do so. Obviously, you are more than welcome in your individual capacity to interact with him in the webinars, and of course, during the public comment that he's running now. And I doubt this will be his last public comment.

And if we don't see hands coming up shortly, I'm going to see if you've got any more you want to ask of us or inform us of, Brian. [inaudible].

---

BRIAN CUTE:

Yeah, just a point of process in terms of the mapping that I've started to do for myself, and again, when it's complete, I'm happy to share. I think the more coordination we have, the better, and I don't suggest that the tool I'm developing is the be all end all.

But that being said, just a point of process to make sure I am following all the bouncing balls, I was able to see scoping of work points for the board working team, working team number one, and the GAC working team, number three. I wasn't yet able to find – unless I was looking in the wrong place – specific scoping points for either the community – for the reviews, I found – pardon me, I did see the reviews working team scope of work points, and I didn't see any that in that articulation immediately presented specific commonalities to the list, although I'll keep watching.

I didn't see any for the community working team. is that the state of play? I just want to make sure that I'm up to speed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, I'll answer it. I would like the work party leaders to jump in here as well. I think that's a fair estimation, although, Brian, could you restate that question? It appears your audio – you must be using VOIP, and it seems to be cutting in and out slightly for some people. So if you could repeat your question, then I suspect Michael and others will be able to respond to you. But I would note that Vanda's work party, which is Liu and Vanda are doing the Government Advisory Committee stream, they certainly would like to exchange ideas with you as well, so looks like there is certainly opportunity for individual interactions with the work

---

parties in your work, but also, I would suspect, they would like to interact with you on a number of things. So Brian, if you could just repeat, and maybe make sure you're speaking very directly into the microphone. Thanks.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, Cheryl. Is that better? Can you hear me now? Oh dear.

PAMELA SMITH: Yes, Brian, we can hear you.

BRIAN CUTE: Oh, okay. So I am creating a document that allows me to track the work of ATRT3 and to identify work that's being done across the four working teams and to identify commonalities to issues that are part of evolving the multi-stakeholder model.

In doing that, I have been joyfully reading the transcripts of all of your calls, and also reviewing the Google doc that you've been using to develop the work. And the question was, I have seen scoped work, specific work items for the board working group, for the GAC working group, for the reviews working group, but not for the community working group. And it's possible I have been looking in the wrong place, or just haven't found it, and just wanted to confirm if there was scoped work for the community working team. I would love to have access to that so that I can continue mapping and identifying our commonalities.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Brian, Michael who is one of the two co-leads on the community group work track has popped the scoping doc link there. I'll note that there has been some recent updates in all of the documentation, including from this group, so that may also help. But we will also ensure working with you that there's the opportunity to interact and interchange with each of the work parties, because we certainly want to work in collaboration with your efforts.

Did that cover it, Michael? Just say a yay or a nay.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yes. Does Brian have access to the chat? I've been plugging stuff in there, but I could also read it out if he does not.

BRIAN CUTE: Michael, thank you. I actually got the link. I've actually opened it up, and this is precisely what I needed. Thank you for that.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Lovely. Happy to be of help. Let me know if you have questions, and I'd be happy to chat further.

BRIAN CUTE: Absolutely. Thanks.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. Okay, well, looking at the time, we had our allocation to run around 30 minutes, but I only see Vanda's hand up now, so it looks like we will run pretty much to time. If you have additional desires for work party interactions though, Brian, we will definitely set up a call so that we can facilitate that with the work party leads and yourself, and obviously, Pat and I will lurk around the edges because we're busybodies like that. Vanda, over to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hello. My question was exactly what you said right now, Cheryl. That is, how Brian would like to interact more directly with us and to allow us to help their work and for him to help us in our work. So it's exactly as you offered. Now that we have many alternatives, local calls, and specifically Skype groups and anything that he wants to participate. I believe we are eager to have his inputs on that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great, Vanda. Just before Brian responds, remembering of course it would be nice if we can make sure we clearly partition the difference between our assisting him in his work and him assisting us in his capacity as a previous ATRT chair. And that's going to be affecting one of the Work Tracks more than others, but this is why we would like to see the interactions at least managed via staff so we can fully transparent account for and track those interactions. How they occur, we're less fussed about, but the fact that they occur in a transparent manner where others can perhaps leverage off the same opportunity is important. Sorry, Brian, I just wanted to make clear that we need you

---

for so much, but we do need to partition what we're using [inaudible] when and how. Over to you, my friend.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thanks. Very clear. And yes, I'm more than happy to assist in the capacity as the former chair, absolutely and to the fullest extent that you need me.

With respect to your question, Vanda, I'm available and happy to interact with each working team. I'm happy to work with the group in this capacity as a whole.

Honestly, whatever works best for you. What I think is important to note is that, again, by the second week of June, my intention ,expectation is that I'm going to have a list of issues that's final. And final means it has to include that we've had careful coordination here. So that's an important timeframe to note. But I am honestly at your disposal. When it works for you and how often you need to speak is completely up to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Brian. And as ever, we deeply appreciate your generosity with your time, but it's also quite serendipitous that your tracking and ours in terms of critical milestone timings seems to be in sync. So this should all be good.

Again, I remind you all, and I'll ask staff to – if not Brian – to put in the call details for his second and final webinar with regards to this narrowing down of the issues work that he's doing at this stage. It is on

---

in a couple of hours, and I would certainly encourage you all to attend regardless of what other interactions we're doing. Pat, welcome to the call. Sorry, I just thought I'd finish running through this section. Is there anything you'd like to say?

PATRICK KANE: No, I'm good right now, Cheryl. I'll go back and catch up on the transcript of what Brian talked about, [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Thanks, Pat. And if you could prepare to take over the agenda shortly, because I have another requirement of me at the moment that I need to attend to while I am still listening and in the call, obviously, but if you could take over for the rest of these couple of agenda items, I would appreciate that.

Just wanted to pull out for your reference here, Brian, before we wrap up with you from Larisa, that she was flagging that the ATRT3 will be sharing their finalized terms of reference and workplan with the board and the community, and so that's another opportunity that we might find mutualism out of, and that's , I'm sure you agree, a very good thing indeed.

Well, Brian, we've taken every bit of your allocated time, and we certainly value your commitment to squeezing us in when you probably would prefer to be getting ready for your next call. But I will be joining you at the next call, and I'll try not to be quite so vociferous this next

---

one. But hey, I can only try. At least I'll try to be vociferous on different topics, how's that for a deal?

Alright then, people, thank you. If you could thank Brian virtually in the usual way, there is the ability here under "more" to applaud. I'm certainly doing that in the room. But thank you so much, Brian. And if you want to hang around, feel free. If not, go prepare for your next performance.

Okay, pat, I'm going to hand back to you while I step away from the room, but I will still be on the audio here.

PATRICK KANE:

Alright. Thank you, Cheryl, for that, and the next item we have on the agenda is to go through each of the work parties and get an update on where we are and have any discussion that we'd like to have with the remainder of the team.

So why don't we start off with the board?

OSVALDO NOVOA:

This is Osvaldo.

PATRICK KANE:

Yes, Osvaldo, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

And Sébastien. Go ahead, Osvaldo, please.



OSVALDO NOVOA: Okay. We have advanced on our Google doc regarding our requirements or our objectives of the group, but we still haven't gotten the approval of all the members of the group, so that's what today I ask all for their approval, and if we all approve this document or introduce whatever changes anyone wants, we can then go ahead and establish our resources, what information we need from staff, and also our work plan, our schedule.

Sébastien had the idea of organizing – perhaps staff can help us to organize a Doodle to establish a call of the group so we can finish all the issues and have the documents ready by next week, I hope. That's all from me. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Osvaldo. What is it that specifically how you want to arrange the Doodle for Jennifer to get set up for us would be really helpful if you've got some ideas as to how you want her to structure that. I think she certainly can go ahead and get that done.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Well, I don't know. Perhaps everybody can – I don't know, I would like to have a call, I would say by – I don't know if by this week, perhaps on Friday or perhaps on Monday, and all the group discuss the document and see what changes we have to introduce. So once we have agreed on the document, then we can go ahead and establish all our needs and our work plan.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Osvaldo. So you're going to the registry to have a call on Friday to establish what the final objectives look like, and then you would have Jennifer or staff set up a Doodle poll following that, correct?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yeah, the idea is to see at what time, and if everybody is available on Friday so that we can coordinate the call.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. If you need any help [to import] any of that, let me know or let Jennifer know. Jennifer, your hand's up, so please go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Pat. Thanks, Osvaldo. We're happy to help with circulating a Doodle poll. In terms of the timing, this week, we have a couple of other face-to-face meetings and some staff members out, so it will be difficult for us to support something on Friday or Monday. However, we can get something maybe on Wednesday or Thursday next week. Would that be okay for you?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. I thought the sooner the better, but if it's Wednesday, it's Wednesday. We'll do what we can.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE:                    Okay. We'll take a look at the people who are in the work party and their time zones and pick some sensible slots that we think might be reasonable, and send a Doodle poll out as quickly as possible. Thanks.

OSVALDO NOVOA:                    Thank you very much.

PATRICK KANE:                    Thank you, Jennifer, for that. Sébastien, was there anything that you wanted to add?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:            Thank you, Pat. No, but if staff is too busy, we can do ourselves the Doodle poll and try to find out, because we are slow, and if we add time in-between our slowness, it will be difficult. In the end, we will need two years.

And I understand that staff can be overloaded with other things, and that's okay. Therefore, I will try to organize a Doodle to see if Friday afternoon UTC time or on Monday we can have some time. Of course, I will not do the work that staff will have done. It's where we are, each of us. But I will try to pick up some different hours and send to the group and then see if it works. If it's not working, then staff beginning of next week will handle that [and do that better than us.] Thank you.

---

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. So let's go ahead and move then to the GAC work party. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Well, we have our first GAC group call last Friday, and [agreed with the] terms of agenda. [The TOR,] we posted the final draft to the general Google doc. We agreed with the score cards format that we received was great, and we ask for the two characters or any other [listed but completed] for the score cards. This will go directly to [inaudible] secretariat. So interviews, we are doing the interviews for Marrakech, and next activities, we are finalizing questions to Marrakech. We have two or three [inaudible] and we need to discuss about that.

And about the calls, we agreed that when we feel that we need some other call, we'll send a message to the secretariat for the staff, and just a comment that for now, looks like no other GAC group member but me will participate at face-to-face meeting Singapore. And I feel we're going to be in a huge disadvantage to miss this opportunity to progress our work.

So that's it for us, and I pass to you, to Liu, or Maarten or Wolfgang or any other member that is attending today this call. Thank you. Anyone?

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Maarten, anything you want to add?

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Hi. Just in the call, yeah, just agree with what Vanda said, I think progressing well, and yeah, if – I think what will help is ongoing and more regular calls, and if there's another way of progressing this, that will be good. Maybe we can organize something in Marrakech or whatever. It's a shame that the face-to-face will not serve this for this particular purpose.

And I missed what the rest of the discussion was, so I don't want to preempt too much on that.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Thank you, Maarten. Vanda, if there's anything that you need specifically, I'm sure that Cheryl and I can jump in and help participate with the meetings. So just let us know if there's anything we can do. I'm speaking for you, Cheryl, but I'm sure you don't mind.

So, anything else from the GAC group?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe the idea of Maarten to have a meeting for our group, maybe in some place, I don't know if we're going to have room for that, but anyway, we can agree with the [empty space,] maybe we'll help if the staff makes a doodle for Marrakech stating the free slots that we can have, and then let's see what our colleagues can do during Marrakech. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, just to draw attention to – for the GAC working group, work party, you do have 30 minutes face-to-face time with the GAC in Marrakech. So you are having a good value proposition. You're in a unique position, in fact, because other interactions with the ACs and the SOs that we've lined up don't necessarily map as perfectly to your work product as your maps almost ideally, where the same can't be necessarily said – I suppose community would be the next one. Their work product probably maps fairly closely. But the board work party and the reviews work party, that doesn't map anywhere near as clearly.

So you guys do have advantages as well as all these apparent disadvantages. Just remembering that. That's all.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: May I, Pat?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Vanda. Please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Well, what I was thinking – and I believe Maarten was talking to – is not the interaction with the GAC itself but the progress we should do after those interviews that using the face-to-face opportunity inside Marrakech may help us with the disadvantage that we're going to have to not be in Singapore. That was the main point, it's not the time that we will share with the GAC and other groups. It's just the work to do

---

further this opportunity to talk with these community issues in Marrakech. That's something that maybe in the end of the meeting, maybe at night of Thursday – I don't know – it's just to have opportunity to our group to get face-to-face and progress more easily than in the calls around that sometimes people don't have sounds, sometimes people are not able to join.

So that's the idea. I don't know if it's possible or not, but will be great for our group. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Vanda. Anything else for the GAC work party? If not, let's go ahead and move to reviews. I think both the review leaders did not make it today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Correct. They have apologies, unfortunately. This is regrettable, but we were of course updated on our leadership team call on Monday, Pat, and so we can report on behalf of this particular work party that you can see the materials now being displayed in front of you. Thank you very much, staff, for that, that they have made some additional progress working intersessionally between our plenary calls, and that we will perhaps give them a larger share of next week's agenda to bring us all back up to date. Does that work for you, Pat?

PATRICK KANE:

I think that's great, Cheryl. Thank you very much. And then finally, the community work party, Michael or Erica.

ERICA VERLASE:

Hi. Just going to jump in. Michael, if you want to chime in after, feel free. I think where we last left off – I wasn't on the call last week, I unfortunately missed it. We had sent out last week to the full list kind of where we were with our scope of work and scope of work resource requests and the beginning of a work plan. Thank you for putting that up.

And I think it's still a bit of a living document, I think in particular for our group or anyone really if – I'd love for us to be able to finalize the resource requests in particular, maybe this week or early next week, so if there's any feedback or thoughts on that in the meantime, that would be great.

And I think what would be next for us too is – and I can start this on an e-mail [inaudible] we can talk amongst ourselves, or go from there. But looking into how we want to prepare for Marrakech too, just planning our own agenda and how we want to work from there, and if we want to do it, just setting up another draft document or e-mail thread, or if we end up setting up a call or anything like that within the next week or so, obviously, planning as we need and everything like that.

But that's where I think we are at this moment. Michael, I don't know if you wanted to jump in with anything else, especially if I happen to miss anything from last week too. And sorry for not being able to be here. But thank you.



---

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No, I think that covers it. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael and Erica, I just wanted to make sure that you've got in your diaries – assuming you're both going to be in Marrakech, but you and your work party members have already gotten in your calendars when current interactions with the various component parts of ICANN are occurring going back to what I said to Vanda and the GAC group, your work product maps next closely, I think, to what we may hear in those interactions. And it would be very important, if at all humanly possible, for you to be in those rooms in each one of those interactions, and to that end, there has been a change in the timing of the ALAC one. But Jennifer will resend out I'm sure iCals or whatever so we all know what's going on when for those of us who are going to be in Marrakech, which of course is not all of us.

ERICA VERLASE: Cheryl – I think Michael too, but I guess we both got the e-mails that had the schedule so far, and that's Liu speaking about Vanda and the overlap there is what kind of what I had it on in my mind, but wanted to bring it up even more so just because that is a good chance for us and starting to prep as soon as we can to make the most of our time will be helpful. So thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, if you're talking, we're not hearing you.

---

PATRICK KANE: No, I had my head turned in a different direction. I apologize for that. So, anything else then for the work parties, any questions across the rest of the review team? If not, let's move over to the terms of reference and the work plan [inaudible].

PAMELA SMITH: Pat, I apologize, Jennifer has her hand raised.

PATRICK KANE: Yes. Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Pamela. So I just wanted to reiterate something that [Theresa and I] had mentioned to those who are on the leadership call on Monday, that staff will help to coordinate requests that come in from the work parties. So if you could keep in mind to keep those requests as clear as you can and highlight them for staff so that we can keep them tracked on the Wiki page, we also want to reinforce as those requests come through there might be some responses from staff for perhaps some clarification or additional information that will be needed. We'll highlight that for you all at the time as necessary, and we may also highlight any additional information for the review team to consider that might help to provide more information or help to formulate the requests to make sure that you're getting the most complete information that will help you progress your work.

So it's just a flag. And I sent an e-mail to the board work party today. A lot of the requests are still in draft format, which is absolutely fine, but

---

as soon as they are formalized, please do send them on to staff. Thanks a lot.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Jennifer. So then as we move to the next section which is the terms of reference and the workplan – if we could bring that up, Jennifer, or whoever’s controlling the – there we go, thank you.

So there are about three weeks left before we submit the document, so we probably need to start putting some stuff into the document itself. Now, one of the areas that I’d like to focus on – if we could bring it to the section, I think it’s around page seven, the considerations with regard to review team recommendations.

So this is a section I've been thinking about recently, and I want to try to start a thread this week on how want to format our recommendations, and again, this is going to go back to what we saw in Kobe around the discussion from the CCT RT in terms of how they were taking a look at the recommendations and feedback they received from the board about some financial considerations as well as items that were specifically for the board to act upon and how they deferred some.

So one of the things that we should think about this week and start to formulate something next week is how do we want the recommendations to be either bundled or standalone or prioritized in how we want to display the recommendations, and we do them within the work parties or across work parties and trying to prioritize the set.

---

So if anybody has any ideas, I'd welcome that now, but if not, what I'll do after this meeting is start a thread on the e-mail list that starts to kick off some of these questions so we can think about it over the week.

Yes, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Just as a kind of initial thought about this, it strikes me that the divisions – as I think it's been discussed previously, the group divisions are not necessarily intuitive in terms of every issue that comes up, and I think it was also discussed that there were going to be cost cutting issues, issues that get raised that don't necessarily belong in any group but are things we want to talk about.

So I would suggest that we should be consolidating the recommendations together for that reason, because I think that there may be challenges coming up with those kinds of divisions and with the overlapping areas and areas that might not fit properly into one specific group. So I think that it might lead to challenges to think about that as kind of a bright line between the different groups of recommendations and that we should be consolidating them together. Thanks. I think you're muted.

PAMELA SMITH: Pat, we can't hear you if you're speaking.

---

PATRICK KANE: Sorry about that. So Michael, I tend to agree with that comment. I think that's the right way to look at it. And then I was going to go to Larisa whose hand was up next.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Pat. Hi, everybody. [Just to make a recommendation,] the bullet points that Pat highlighted are those that we've had as part of the template for terms of reference for the last several review teams. So as many of you probably know coming out of Kobe, there's been discussions at the board level and with community around prioritization of recommendations and costing and things like that.

So those concepts or those ideas that are being consider or [inaudible] and more discussions will be had, I know the board is looking forward to scheduling a call with all the active review team leadership in short order, there will be webinars and sessions and whatnot leading up to Marrakech, so I just wanted to flag that possibly, those discussions will lead to ideas and agreements and thoughts on how to formulate recommendations that haven't been captured in the bullet points that you see on the screen. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. Just to make sure that it's well understood that it is really – to find the best way forward in areas where we haven't done that yet before, and that the constructive nature of this is in the interest of everybody to

---

find a good way where we do get the real priorities as they come up from the reviews addressed. And nobody says that how much it costs is the most important thing. Whether we can afford it as ICANN as a whole is obviously important.

So yeah, I'd like to go in with the spirit of finding a solution together and a way forward.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Maarten. Michael, is that a new hand?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sorry, old hand.

PATRICK KANE: So Larisa, this is Pat. I do have a question for you in terms of timing. Since we're trying to get a document out by the 5th of June, do you believe that we're going to have any kind of direction or interaction between now and that point in time [so we've been shaped] how we intend to approach our recommendations so that we can include that in the term of reference?

LARISA GURNICK. Thanks for the question, Pat, and I note that Avri [inaudible] also in the room, so she might have a response because she's one of the board members that's working on some of this. The plan, I believe, is to have at least a conversation between the board and the leadership team

leadership to gather some input and information. Most likely, that will happen by the date, but there will be additional discussions with the community, the webinars, and hopefully a session in Marrakech, although that's not totally clear at this point.

So this is an area that will continue to evolve, so I guess my suggestion, my recommendation for you to include in your terms of reference, just an acknowledgement that that dialog continues in the spirit of producing useful and prioritized and implementable recommendations that the board can act on. I hope that helps.

PATRICK KANE:

Yes, Larisa. I think that does help, because we've always talked about the terms of reference being a living document anyway. So to call that out and note that in this section, that would be appropriate. But I think if we don't have that discussion, I think that we as the review team should probably put some in place in this section that kind of fits what we'd like to do in terms of taking a look at it.

And I think starting with Michael's recommendation and looking at them across the board holistically and kind of [called out,] agreed to by other folks in the chat, it is probably the right way to go. But I think that, to your point, or to Maarten's point, one of the things that would be interesting is how to approach the notion of a budget, because certainly, we're not going to do a detailed requirements analysis on each one of them so that we can get a granularized budget or expense estimate, but we certainly want to be able to say, is it a mouse, a horse or an elephant in terms of what we think the costs are?

---

I see Cheryl, you have agreed with that. So, any other questions on that particular area? Like I said, I'll start a thread after this meeting that we can chime in on.

So other than that, that's all I really wanted to bring up around the terms of reference. Any other questions or concerns or issues? Cheryl, do you have anything? Michael, I see you've got your hand raised.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, just one other thing, which may or may not be in scope at the moment, but sort of grows out of the experiences of the Work Stream 2. In considering the recommendations, cost is certainly a factor, but ease of implementation is another just when you think about prioritization. So I think that – and my understanding of how implementation Work Stream 2 is going is shakier than it should be, but as far as I understand it, the recommendations there were considered according to speed of implementation, ease of implementation and cost, as well as importance. So the idea was to frontload the kind of stuff that was highly impactful and also easy and cheap to do. So if it's checking those boxes, then it makes sense to frontload it, and the stuff that's going to take a little bit longer, or is going to be more expensive that would be pushed back – and again, don't quote me on that, because I could be messing up some of the parameters. But my only point is if we're thinking forwards towards implementation and prioritization, those should be additional factors that should be part of the conversation, potentially from the get go because that would maybe make for a better process of implementation down the line. Thanks.



PATRICK KANE: Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Pat. Here, we could perhaps bring in some of the experiences in terms of not recent specific reviews but more recent organizational reviews where the ICANN board in their formulation of the implementation review process and the mandate for the then created implementation review working groups, the matter very much along the lines that Michael outlined, and I hope, I, with all my typos, managed to reiterate in agreement in chat as well where you need to almost look at a prioritization matrix, and the sooner we can at least roughly draft those and obviously come back and review them as we go while we are drafting any and all of our recommendations, the better. So it might be a good idea for us to also start thinking about what type of matrix we want to use. Here for example, it doesn't matter whether it's color coding, alphanumeric, numeric or alpha, but to be able to say this is a matter of deep importance, extremely critical issue, but it is going to be horrendously expensive, and therefore we will need to put it in a future budget cycle, is different than saying this is an almost no cost recommendation that has little or no impediments to being fast tracked or effectively implemented with existing resources and it should be being done as soon as possible without – unless there was some interrelations with other recommendation without any hold up.

---

So I've seen one to one in sort of a ratio is one way of doing it, but perhaps we can start thinking about that as well while we're doing this work. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Michael, is there something else you wanted to add?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sorry, old hand.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Alright, so anything else on terms of reference for work plan? Very good, so seeing as nothing, let's move to Any Other Business.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, because you weren't on the call at the very beginning, we had two pieces of Any Other Business, one of which I hope I've interacted sufficiently with in chat and that we can perhaps take first the two pieces of Any Other Business that we had flagged by our members. The first one, although I think that's probably the one we need to spend some time on now, was the issue of is there any latitude regarding discussion on the face-to-face meeting in Singapore, not its venue but whether it could in fact be later in October date. And we've heard a bit from Vanda on that from the GAC work party perspective, but that was one raised by Wolfgang, and let's just put that as a topic and come back to that in a moment.

---

And the other one was Sébastien asked about the ombuds report back to him from the complaint he raised early on in the life of our review team. As I have had made very clear to me, the off-list responses to that being distributed in everyone else's yesterday but my overnight was a call to see whether anyone objected to it being in the public record.

When I checked all of those responses earlier on in this call, there was no objections, and I suggested that perhaps what we could do is if we have no objections in this meeting then is make that publication so, and then assuming people then take the time to read and digest it if they have any further inquiries or clarifying questions they want to have the ombuds react to that we set some agenda time apart at it at a future meeting for that to happen.

So that was my kneejerk reaction trying to save us some time today, but Pat, I first of all value your input, and then of course, Sébastien's reaction to that, because if he did that in the chat, I missed it. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. So, do we want to address the date first and then Sébastien?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

To be honest, I think if we can get Sébastien's reaction to asking if there's any objections to it becoming part of the public record, and then that is an action item for the report for him, which is currently privileged and confidential to be reclassified and be able to be put out to the public record, obviously with his permission, then that can be one of

---

those “make it so” things and we can come back to it if it needs to have further agenda time at a future meeting. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE:

Sébastien, I see that your hand is raised.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I know that it happens very often that [inaudible] of your night when you have a call, but it's now in the middle of my night, and I asked for an Any Other Business, and you talk about it during a few minutes, and now you're ask me to give my feedback on what you say. I am sorry, but I would like to have the floor to put my topic on the floor, and then you can argue on that. Now she's dropped and I can't talk anymore about that.

I already gave my agreement to have this document publicly available. [What it's done is to] ask the members of this group if they agree. If they agree, then let's go and publish it, and as I have already asked for it to schedule a time with the group to discuss issue of this document, and I hope that it will be – I was hoping to do that today, but obviously, we have too much on our plate today. Then I hope that we can schedule that for next week's call. That was my topic for Any Other Business. It was not to discuss it now but to have time to discuss it next week, and hopefully, the members of the group will read the document and we can have an action on that. Thank you very much.

---

PATRICK KANE: Very good, Sébastien. Thank you very much. So what we'll do then is we will find some time. We'll put this as the first topic that we have in next week's agenda. So we'll put 20 minutes into the beginning of the agenda for this particular topic so you can present, and then we can have a discussion if necessary, or if anybody wants to, and we'll go from there. Okay? Very good. Thank you so much, Sébastien.

Alright, and then since Cheryl's not on, she's dropped, the topic of the dates for the October face-to-face. Staff, could we pull up the results of the SurveyMonkey? Because I have [inaudible] but if I recall correctly, the dates were fairly even, or we could make an argument that one was just as good or just as bad as the other.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Give us one minute. We'll pull that up.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Jennifer. So while staff is doing that, the one thing from a calendar standpoint, we had targeted to have the document substantially complete for discussion in Montréal by October 21st. [inaudible] using the second October date or even the November date that we had talked about as well, kind of puts that in jeopardy if we wanted to have anything that we wanted to submit for review of the parties to give them some time to see things ahead of time. That would be the one thing that jumped out to me as a benefit to having it earlier in the month of October as opposed to later, but we'll take a look at those results for one second.

---

And Wolfgang, just from my apology standpoint, I still had on my calendar September 2nd through 4th for [inaudible]. Alright, so we'll take a look at the dates, what we have here from staff. If we were to take a look at the overall score, from a first choice, clearly October 7th through 9th was much preferred, and October 7th through 9th was the least preferred also, so it's kind of interesting that it was both the most interesting and least interesting, and that the later October dates were fairly consistent across the board for all of that.

So I'm not sure what we can determine from this other than either October date is as bad or as good as each other. Cheryl, anything that you want to weigh in on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Pat. I am absolutely ambivalent as to when it's run as long as it's in a timely manner to get our reporting done, so I can certainly flip a coin in between the October dates.

I'm just cognizant of two things that I'd like you all to consider, that is the particular plea that Vanda has made regarding the GAC work party work product, but then again, that would [inaudible] the work parties is in many ways the most advanced. So that also needs to be considered, but she has pointed out her work party in particular is disadvantaged by the c choice of these dates and the fact – and this is not an insurmountable problem, but we have literally I think almost during our call if not minutes before our call had the e-mails come out from constituency travel.

---

Now, I sincerely hope no one has rushed off and actually booked their flights while they've been on this call, but we do probably need to keep those things in mind. So I'm going to be very hand off, dare I say, on this, Pat, but certainly, only either of the October dates would be what could possibly be [inaudible] as far as I'm concerned.

PATRICK KANE:

Thanks for this. And I also agree. I'm ambivalent on the October dates, but I do believe that November from a calendaring standpoint is pretty late. So if there's anybody that wants to weigh in on what we want to do here in terms of having one last little poll between those two dates and have it be near instantaneous so that we can make a determination and put some concrete down at least, I'm okay with that. So if anybody would like to weigh in, that would be great.

Yes, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Well, if there's really ambivalence, obviously, I'd love to do the October 2022, because I could be there. Otherwise, if there's a good reason why 7th through 9th is better, obviously, I'll just comply. But I'm just eager to contribute and it's easier when I'm in the room.

PATRICK KANE:

There's ambivalence on mine and Cheryl's part. I wouldn't dare to speak that there's ambivalence on everybody's part.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I was going to say almost identically. I think it's Pat and I that are being ambivalent, and deliberately so. We're trying to make sure that the rest of the review team has the optimal outcomes. And Pat, what I am seeing is that it would certainly suit Maarten more. That's important from Vanda's point of view, because he's a very active part of her working party and the work product there, and I would like to have confirmation that that would assist Wolfgang and anyone else. If those of you who have raised it as an issue can make it known now – Wolfgang, if the poll can happen now, as in right now in this call, then yes, sure. But I'm not going to run another 72 hours' worth of polling. It really needs to be settled as soon as humanly possible. So people who were on this call can probably carry sway, because we would need to get back to CT almost instantaneously. Constituency Travel has, as I said, sent out the welcome to travel mode.

So, happy to poll as long as – if you object – what do you want to do, Pat? Do you want to call for making the change and see if anyone objects to making the change? Or do you want to do it the other way around? I'm going to leave that absolutely up to you.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Sébastien, I'll get to you in one second. What I think we should probably do is just by show of a yes or no on it is to kind of say throw out October 7 through 9, see how many yeses we get, and October 20 through 22, how many yeses we get right here. So I think we've got quite a few of us on here, and I think you can go back and take a look at some of the results and determine where everybody else is. But I think you're right, we need to get it done today. But that's what



---

I would suggest that we do, is just use the tool here in Zoom to make that determination, those who are here.

We've got five minutes left on our call. So Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Pat. I was looking at the Doodle poll, and one of the persons who is not here and who will not be if we change that is KC. But I think if you have [inaudible] with this, the later date of October, we will have other people who will have [inaudible].

But nevertheless, I agree with your proposal that the persons who are in the call already tell you what they can do or not and when you can maybe gather the information from the other. I am afraid that the known participants of today will not be available, but you can try, and I hope that we will sort out, because we already received mail from the Constituency Travel to send our wishes for the trip. Thank you very much.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. So let's go ahead and do this. And what I would say up front is you don't have to vote for one or the other. You can vote for both if you're available for both dates. So you can choose one, October 7 to 9, one October 20 to 22, or you can choose both and we'll just have two different selections [in terms of what we'll do] and I'll count the green dots.

---

So let's start off by who is in favor of October 7th through 9th or ambivalent to the date 7th through 9th. Alright, hands down. That's eight. Alright, clear.

Alright, who was in favor of October 20th through 22nd or ambivalent to 20th through 22nd? And Cheryl, if I'm not blind, I'm counting 10.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And did you include Wolfgang's verbal in the chat in that as well?

PATRICK KANE: I did not .So I count 11. Thank you very much for that. So we have 11. So staff, we're going to have to do a quick 180 here with travel, and indicate that our dates are now going to be October 20 through 22.

Are we good, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible] challenges with my Zoom. Yeah, it's all good. We can do that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for doing that so promptly, people. It really is almost a perfect storm of both good and bad timing. So glad we've got that sorted. We won't be revisiting this again. Will we, Pat? Pat, I see we've got just a couple of minutes in our call time left, and I noted Sébastien's request to have the ombuds present his report to Sébastien's complaint. Herb, I'm going to toss that to you. Perhaps you could

---

answer any questions if any exist, but let's give – Pat, can we just give Herb the floor briefly?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Cheryl, it was sorted out when you were not there. It's not this time. We will not discuss that. It was Any Other Business to be able to set up this item on the next call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent, even better.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It is done. Everything is done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, thank you. When I asked someone to appraise me of what I missed, Sébastien, they failed to inform me of that. My humblest apologies. I'm delighted to hear that's done, and we'll deal with it at our next leadership call and at a future meeting. So we're on perfect time, Pat. Excellent. You can wrap it up then.

PATRICK KANE: So I want to thank you [inaudible] and we will talk to you all next Wednesday. And be on the lookout for an e-mail on the thread so that we can start talking about how we're going to put our recommendations together. Alright?

---

Thank you very much, and have a great day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everybody. Bye for now.

PATRICK KANE: Bye.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Bye. See you next week.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**