BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you, Cheryl, and hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary Call #14 on the 29th of May, 2019 at 21:00 UTC. Members attending the call are Cheryl, Pat, Vanda, [Lou], [Tola], Martin, Erica, Demi, and Sebastien. Observers, Jim Prendergast. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. And we do have apologies from [Ramet], Wolfgang, and [Herb]. And Michael just joined us. Thank you, Michael.
	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 the co-chairs, Cheryl and Pat. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks very much for that. I might get the [administrivia] done if you don't mind. First of all, after the role call, if is there anyone who has an update to their Statements of Interest, please let us know now.
	Not hearing anybody yell out that they've been given a new job or taken on a new contract, we'll take that as nothing exciting since last week has happened [inaudible] last and we will look at it at a very, very brief "Thank you very much today" update from each of the working parties. At this stage, I believe we won't have anything from the Reviews Working Party unless Casey or Daniel join in a short while. But three out of four will have to do us if needs be.

So I don't see [inaudible] on the call, so I'm assuming Sebastien, you will be leading off with a brief update from the [Old] Working Party. Over to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. We had a call last week. I was hoping that some work will be done since we have a Google Doc updated, but updated by myself, therefore, it's a very good job. But I hope that people will comment. I tried to organize the document, as we said, during our group meeting and I hope that one day someone will comment.

And I hope that what I have done will help to finalize [inaudible] to add what [inaudible] Working Team will do. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Sorry. Yes, who said? Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Hello, everybody. So I have my slides on that and Brenda could add this to the … and we finalized the questions to be sent to GAC and we also passed these questions to the Google Doc, GAC, to finalize them and make sure everyone have read and have same agreement with this. As I said, from our review, we would like to have this some time with Chair or Vice-Chair of GAC, maybe after they finish the Communiqué and [Lou] may comment on that. And he said that he can work on that to facilitate this.

And I have done some working in make it more clear on the general [inaudible]. And I'm working now with the work plan for the second semester and maybe one general to add to the [tour]. I don't know if the test for the [tour] will be divided or the test of the [tour] will be just one. That's it from my side. Thank you and maybe [Lou], if he is available, can comment too.

[LOU]:   Yeah. I agree with Vanda [inaudible] Vanda and my teammates [inaudible] and I will facilitate the GAC review, GAC team and GAC leadership. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that. If we can switch back now, I noticed Daniel has joined us but I might give him a breather for a moment while he gets himself organized and we'll put reviews last, and move to community now. So is Michael or Erica going to start off today?

[ERICA VARLESE]:   I think Michael may have stepped away for a minute so I could start and then I guess if there's anything else, he can add later. I guess he'll have to guess what I said though.

In the meantime, I think from our last call, there hasn't been too much additional conversation on the list about, since our last call. However, we have sent out a Doodle poll and now have scheduled it for Monday, a call for just the community work stream. And the idea with that call is to go through and we did submit some resource requests and I think

with this call, we want to go through those one more time with more of a fine-toothed comb, kind of in real time just to see if there's anything else we could further clarify there, especially as staff starts to look into those and also use that time to begin preparing for Marrakech.

I know we've talked about some of the sessions we already have planned and the goal is to get at least some pen to paper, so to speak, on some of the questions and work we'd like to prepare in advance of that. So for this upcoming Monday, hopefully, we will have made a little bit more progress there and we'll share that with the [inaudible] call. But at this point, that's the plan for now and where we are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much for that, Erica. That's terrific. Martin, I see your hand up. Over to you.

[MARTIN]:   Yeah. At some point, we talked, or in the reviews list, there was a talk about the EPDP and wanting to follow that, look at that too. And that list, also the conclusion came that maybe it's best placed in the community group. Did the community group get this message? And do they consider this to be a valuable addition?

[ERICA VARLESE]:   We did get that on the list and added it to our scope of work. And I believe that conversation, I know both Michael and I weren't in L.A., but as far as I know, I think part of that conversation also happened at the face-to-face. But we did add it to our scope of work and I didn't see, at

least there was no objection from the rest of the team, so I do think others found it valuable as well. So that is our plan for that going forward and I do believe, and maybe Daniel, when he jumps on next for Reviews, too, we had spoken about potentially doing a joint Community and Reviews Team call, if I'm remembering right, so that might also be another good place to follow-up on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. And quite a perfect segue, in fact, Erica. Thanks for that, [Christian Martin]. To go to you, Daniel, hopefully, you've got your audio properly connected now and you can give us a very brief update on reviews. Over to you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Hope I can be heard loud and clear.

Currently, on the reviews, we are planning to have a call and a Doodle has been sent, so it will [inaudible] back from the Doodle. And after the Doodle, [she'll] be discussing the work [inaudible] and the various materials, and different [inaudible] views and [inaudible] reviews.

Apparently, the information that has been gathered seems to fit also within the respective works of Community and we shall be having that [inaudible] joint call just as we mentioned together with Community after our meeting with the Reviews Work Party, and also shall be still [inaudible] with [copying] more questions which you can send forward.

Also, some, an e-mail was sent to staff regarding some questions. We shall also be compiling the feedback as we progress towards [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect. Perfect. Thank you very much. Are there any questions for any of the updates, noting we aren't going to be doing anything with [IRP] yet today?

Michael, did you want to add anything now, seeing as you're back at the microphone?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No, that's fine. Thanks, Erica, for stepping in there. I thought that was covered very well and [inaudible]. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. Okay, well, I'm going to [inaudible] once my bird chorus starts, which means it's going to get very noisy here very quickly. You know, sun rising, birds screeching. Welcome, [Jacks]. Good to see you hear and perfect timing for moving on to agenda item three, looking at the terms of reference and work plan. So Pat, my friend, over to you.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Cheryl. So we talked last week about trying to go through and use this as a drafting session, but I don't see a whole lot of modifications that we've made in the document between last week and today, so why don't we start specifically in the objective section, which

	would be at the top of page three. So Jennifer or Cheryl or Brenda, or whoever is driving the Zoom, if we could pull up the terms of reference?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Yep. I'm getting it ready. One second, please.
[PAT]:	Thank you.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	You're welcome. There you go. Can you see it?
[PAT]:	I see nothing.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	How's that?
[PAT]:	There we go.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Perfect.

EN

[PAT]:

All right, and if you could scroll down to the section, I think it's the top of page three with the objectives. So if you take a look at this section, do we have … Each working team has put in these objectives, correct? Because the one that we don't have anything in is in the Work Team 2, in the community.

Yes, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Pat. As we are going through this page, the objective of the Board Working Team is be updated. I didn't have done it, but I need to cut and paste what we have done in our work [inaudible]. You want me to do it now or you want to wait to the end of the call or you want to proceed?

[PAT]:

Well, I think we ought to try to make some progress in the document itself today, so if you've got something to cut and paste into this section, I think it'd be helpful for us all to look at it and if we have any questions about wording or what's intended, I think that would be very, very helpful in trying to get through some of the document today.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I don't think there are so much differences between what is on the current Google Doc [inaudible] and what we have, but if it was updated a little, and therefore, I will add that immediately. Okay, it's done. And for the moment, you want me to take off the other, the previous one, or

---

I just put it in? I hope that we are doing the … Yes, okay, whatever you want me to do on that.

[PAT]: So if it's not much different, why don't you just take us through the intention of each of these objectives and let us ask questions as we go through?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, but you know there is no big changes since we discussed that, in fact, during the face-to-face meeting. We just had one or two items and cleaned up the document itself, but there is no big changes. But if you want me to go through, I can. It's really up to you.

[PAT]: Well, I think it would be helpful to go through it today. It's been a while since we were face-to-face, so either call out the areas to where we have made modifications or additions or things that you want to emphasize in terms of these objectives and if anybody has any questions, please raise your hand and Cheryl or I will recognize you and we'll discuss as we go through.

And while you're doing that, Sebastien, if someone could go through into the community section and add the objectives for the community section, that would be very helpful. It will be next. Okay, Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, Pat. Thank you. Can we go to after the [inaudible]? It's a previous [question] and it's one I will want to take off [inaudible] the document. Therefore, I guess we had, in fact, since last time, the election process, it's to see we separate a voting member, the liaison to the Board and we add all the liaison. And we add 7C with Board Organization against reconsiderations.

And since Los Angeles, nothing much added. We had some discussion about what we want to do with the reviews of 1D, 360 reviews. I must say that we have different point of view. I really think that the 360 review was not used in the past just for the Board. It was sent to other committees, and maybe now it's just used by the Board. But if it's not, then as we are in the nondisclosure argument, maybe it could be used so that we get some of them to see how it's organized.

But we have the assessment [inaudible], assessment by the Board, and if we go to the – no, not here in this document, but in our document – we have made the list of what is required and one of them is at least a self-assessment from the Board and we have a link to what the Chair of the Board has a return on that same topic with the reviews, the 360 reviews.

I have read again this document. I think we have all the items we need to look after, but I will be very happy if some of you, one of you, thinks that we are missing something. And last point is that we work on what we ask for, therefore, it's the list of the objective and action needed. For each objective, we have the action needed and I hope that we will be able to cut and paste that on the right place for the staff to act. And we are working, or we will be working, on task and schedule, and hopefully,

on questions we may want to ask to different groups at the Marrakech meeting.

I hope that is helpful. It's where we are today. Thank you.

[PAT]:   [Inaudible] Sebastien. Anybody have any questions for Sebastien?

Well, Sebastien, a question that jumps out to me is do we think that this is more than what we can process or handle? It seems like there's a lot here in terms of the objectives and do we think that we can cover this between, or be able to produce something between now and October?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Pat, for the question and I definitely can't answer this question. It depends if people are ready to do some work, if staff will help us, if we will have somebody to help to write on. But I will be coming back in the next, I guess, two weeks with some thought about that. But my feeling is that it will be difficult to take some out, and I would prefer that we go through all that.

And one thing I need to add, taking into account your question, is that there are some place where we have connection with the other groups. For example, if you take the question of election processes, we have the voting member who are all linked with the work team on community. And I don't know. I hear something in my headphone. It's me or we have another people talking at the same time as me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, it's a noise for everybody.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, it's a little bit perturbing. Thank you very much.

And if you take the two liaisons, of course, at least we will have to work with the GAC group with Vanda and you because it's one point, [therefore], I really think there are some places where we need to make some connection and that's a point we will have to think about, how we want to work on that.

Our objective is to work with the idea of what is concerning the Board, but obviously, some of them need to be shared with the other groups.

And we don't have a group to take into account, just staff. It's maybe some over-arching issue that we need to put somewhere to be able to work more broadly on staff issue as it's more and more an important part of the overall ICANN. Thank you.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Sebastien. Martin?

[MARTIN]:   Thanks, Pat. Thanks, Sebastien. The list is a long one as you rightly remarked. It's also how we approach it that may make it more or less doable. It's about getting clarity on all these points, and sorry for missing the last call on the Board, Sebastien. I wasn't available for that.

EN

For instance, on strategy, I can very easily explain how the Board has done it. But other things, I think, like the finance financial processes, my first [talking] with somebody who is very key in that area, like [inaudible], a lot of clarity can already be given. So whereas some will require talking with multiple people or talking with just the Board, etc., that is maybe more easily [pickled]. So I think choosing the [right] way forward will allow to get the long way without overburdening ourselves with too much work.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may, Pat, if you look, Martin, not to this document but to the one on the Google Doc, specifically to our working team, it's exactly what we put into the action needed. Therefore, I think we are aligned with that. The idea it's not for us and not for all of the Board members to do all the work, but it's, for example, if you take the maybe something like finance processes, ten – no, it's not ten; it's finances 3A, for example. We have added a meeting with [Xavier], the same for B, a meeting with [Xavier].

For the moment, we think that [Xavier] can help us. Maybe we will have to go to the Chair of the Board Finance Committee, but for the moment, we want to start with [Xavier] to see if we can have an answer, if there are questions or additional questions or a topic where we need, if I can say not just a technical answer but also a political answer, we will come to you and see if we can have a contact with the Board Finance Committee Chair.

[MARTIN]:	Very good [inaudible] then reflecting your deep understanding of how the Board functions. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	And as I have the floor, if someone can help me with the Google Doc, I don't know how to stop the numbering and to restart the numbering. It's not in this document, but in the Board Working Party document and when I had the same ideas but to add the action needed, the numbering is still going on. If somebody can help with me on that, it will be great. Thank you.

[PAT]:	Thank you, Sebastien. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Most of the feedback that Sebastien has given, and also I think this would also affect other respective working groups, regarding to when a meeting has been scheduled, sometimes as to avoid, I would like to know to how we are going to avoid [inaudible] allocation. For instance, in case like ours, [inaudible] was requested for a meeting with [Xavier] and then probably the reviews would have at [inaudible] discussed with [Xavier]. How can we compile all the respective questions such that during the interview, or probably we have the reviews, the community, the other work parties could also come with different questions. So [inaudible] answer that once. It helps, at least [inaudible].

So also, regarding to [inaudible] here, the Reviews Work party probably will [inaudible] to some of these respective resources. So I think the

idea, we harmonize what they're [tackling] on. I think it will be much better, so I start with all [inaudible] because if you look the review of the ATRT2 document, it cuts across all the respective work parties. But how can we be able to dissect specific issues regarding to key objectives that are coming from the various work parties? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To a great extent, that's what Pat and I will be doing with staff as we organize who wants to speak to who and we then organize when. We definitely know there is going to be a great deal of dependency and nexus between you all. And what we have tried to work with staff at this stage to set up is getting as much as we possibly can without overcrowding the [pre]-day, the Sunday the 23rd in Marrakech. But of course, we have opportunity after the Marrakech meeting as well, so that's very much what our job is. So thank you for reminding us, but that's very much what we're on top of.

Right now, however, I'd really like to see the terms of reference completed. Thank you, my friends.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right, so Brenda, if we could then scroll down now to the community work section. And thank you, Erica, for getting those inserted. So if you or Michael can take us through this section for the time-being, that would be great.

EN

[ERICA VARLESE]:	Hi. Sorry about that. I guess I could use some feedback. I mostly just took what we had in our scope of work so far that we had developed, and I guess my question for you is whether or not this is specific enough or if it's too specific in terms of setting our objectives.

For the most part, I guess there may, I'm wondering from the rest of the team because this is the document that we have been working on. If there is any other feedback, or any other edits we want to make to this as put it in now.

Do you want me to walk through each thing or just kind of … I know that's kind of open-ended. Maybe Michael can jump into, just kind of getting feedback on if that's the format we want, if there is anything that's missing from the others based on this being pulled from that document that we have been working on so far as our team.

[PAT]: Erica, I think as I'm reading through your section, it does feel a little bit accommodation of goals and work plan or objectives and work plan. And so I think that they feel pretty broad right now in terms of what we're trying to achieve.

So for example, in community and long-term planning, I think it's good to focus on the implementation of the five-year plan. By that, I'm assuming that it's the upcoming five-year plan or is it one of the five-year cycles that we're in now? Or how do you see that?

[ERICA VARLESE]:	Dan, I think we had a little bit of a discussion about that on the list. And the team, and maybe this is something for us. Timing-wise I think we might be okay. It might be something for us to flag for our call on Monday. I know we didn't have a chance to meet. I know we had this on the docket, so to speak, for today but we hadn't had a chance to meet until Monday so if that works, it might be something for us to flag as refining that more because, yes, in particular, the five-year plan was something that came up that hasn't been nailed down per se.
	I don't know if anyone has an opinion now or if we feel comfortable just saying for the upcoming five-year plan or anything like that. Again, I think Michael's … Exactly, yeah, if I remember your question.
	So yeah, really, I'd like to ask the community group or if Michael wants to jump in, I know that's something that needs some refinement from us so I don't know if it works to let us kind of work through that on Monday, finalize that or if I know that's what this call is for today. So I could just work on that a bit now too and keep working through that.
MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:	Sorry, can I jump in?
[ERICA VARLESE]:	Yeah.
MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:	So in addition to the community call that we've got coming up, I also think that as a result of the area of focus of this specific sub-group, that

there is value to being a little bit flexible in terms of reflecting any concerns that the community raises through our discussions in Marrakech, insofar as once we open up a particular area of examination, it would be, I think, beneficial to allow a fair bit of flexibility depending on which side concerns are raised.

I think that as regard to the five-year plan issue, specifically, and the financial plan, in terms of their relevance to ATRT specifically, the most relevant aspects of that are going to come in the developmental processes, as well as in community understanding of what's going on, an ability to track implementation. So from that being said, I don't think we necessarily need to limit it to one or the other insofar as to just solicit input on what thoughts are about the process, right? I don't think we're necessarily going to be looking at the outputs as much as the process of developing this stuff.

But that's just some impressions that I had and I'd be happy to adapt that or amend that if people have other thoughts. Thanks.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Michael. Sebastien, you had your hand up next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Yeah. I think here it's an example of what I was saying that there are some maybe duplication or, at least, need to some cross-work on what you call the number two NomCom, review of the NomCom in the election of the Board members.

First of all, I'm sorry to say that but it's not an election. It's a selection. The NomCom is selecting people, but it's really linked with the discussion we will have in the Board about election process or nomination processes and so on where we talk about all the SO/ACs, concern the NomCom and all the liaisons, GAC, the ATF, RSAC, and SSAC.

And my second remark is about the review, the implementation of Board advice to the NomCom as input for the selection of Board members. Do we know what we will be able to get here? Is it something that we will have this information on what the Board sends to the NomCom? Question mark, and my last point not linked with that. It's do we have something specifically with the new role of the community since IANA [inaudible] transition? I think it's something this group must go through and look at how it's working and if there are any [inaudible] possible in that direction. Thank you.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl, do you want to go next?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I found the unmute button. Thank you for that.

I was just going to jump in on the NomCom there for obvious reasons. Because we're at a particular point in the NomCom review process as well, with a detailed implementation plan on the 27 recommendations made after the last independent examiner's review has been accepted by the ICANN Board, it's probably very timely to make sure that those

documents are part of the body of work that we look at, and then it would be of no trouble at all to organize an interact between either the implementation team or the parts thereof, including Vanda who serves on that, as well as a million others, and this group.

Or, of course, to remember that at least one of those question is answerable in the public domain, inasmuch as the advice from the Board to any given NomCom o what they are looking for, at least since 2015, if not earlier, probably '13 or '14, has been published. So it certainly is made public now.

Can it be better organized? Quite possibly and it might be something that you wish to consider as a recommendation. But we'd also need to make sure it was in keeping with the current list of implementables, which does cross over a lot in this section too. Thank you.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Cheryl. So I had my hand up and I wanted to address a couple of items. I think that, Michael, when you talk about the next five-year plan for ICANN, I think that that's something to really take a look at, and I think this is what you were capturing, is how do we put in place recommendations on how to be transparent for ICANN Board and ICANN Org as they develop this plan because I think we're seeing some evidence that there's some things that are going on that are not necessarily being shared as to what the direction or what the objectives are of the Board or of the organization. So I think that's where you go and I think it's important to call that out for the next five-year plan, not just around the finances, but the evolution of the multi-stakeholder

EN

model. How are they going to address the global changes and regulations as it comes to content and privacy to kind of address the GDPR situation, those types of items. So I think that that would be very good to have in this area.

Something that Sebastien had said in terms of cross-group work and objectives, and overlapping objectives, one of the things that I put in private chat to Jennifer was that we should probably put together a mapping diagram at the end of the objectives to show where there is overlap, so that to address your question, Daniel, in terms of how do we make certain that if we're asking for the same things, if we have an objective to where we want an interview with Xavier, that we can see that that objective maps that's going on in the other work team, and we pick up the phone or Skype or whatever and say, "Hey, come join me on this call or give me some questions you want while I'm having this interview. So I think that would be helpful as a working tool.

And then the last item I've got, Sebastien, and you brought this up as well, we don't really have anything in here that as I read through it, maybe there's something, Erica and Michael, that's supposed to be here specifically, that addresses the Empowered Community, and I admit I read through it really quickly. But the Empowered Community really hasn't been tested to date in terms of how that process works or how we feel or recommendations to make about that. I think that we talked about this probably in the early days that with the SSR2 pause that it seems like we might have gotten out of our bylaws as far as how the Board action was taken and then how the community responded to where we might have had a problem with the Empowered Community from that standpoint and I think that may be the only example we have

right now of when the Empowered Community probably should have taken a step or maybe should have taken a step but didn't. But other than that, I'm not certain how we capture a review within this working team on the Empowered Community. Any thoughts there, Michael or Erica?

Martin, I see your hand is raised.

[MARTIN]: Yeah, just I'm aware that the first bylaw change has already passed, and that falls at least procedure-wise, first, a test of the Empowered Community as well. So it should [inaudible] an example of where the whole bylaw Empowered Community mechanism was triggered. So we can use that to look at.

[PAT]: Any other questions from the group for Michael or for Erica?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sorry. We could also scroll down a bit because I'm not sure if everybody has the whole document in front of them, because there's more.

Pardon me. Right. So I think we could also discuss access to information, transparency policies within SO/ACs if folks have any questions about that. As you see, those are meant to assess different aspects of ICANN Org's own transparency mechanisms, including the DIDP, the open data initiatives, and the information Transparency Initiative.

EN

Certainly, I know that on the noncommercial side, there's been a lot of interest in all three of those as well as, I think there are those that will be fruitful areas to explore to try to find recommendations, and then the last one is to look into transparency policies within SOs and ACs, which kind of flows from that about whether and to what degree there are policies within those different governance structures to make their own decision making transparent.

So I would be happy to listen to any thoughts about that or ideas or otherwise, we can just take things forward.

[PAT]: Thank you, Michael. All right, not seeing additional hands, let's go ahead and move on to the GAC Working Team, but as you have a chance to go through this, fire off any questions to the mailing list. So we've got a very short time to get this document prepared. So Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. I put this in the last bullet point that it was more clear, so we are working, our focus will be assessing the [lies], the role of interaction between GAC/Board, GAC/Community, and vice versa, assessing the effectiveness of that interaction, assessing the [inaudible] status of each ATRT2 recommendation implementation because most of them, a check is done but as [Lou] raised points, probably not so well implemented.

ICANN's consideration of GAC's input on the public policy aspect of the technical coordination of the DNS, assessing the lives in GAC operating principles used for implemented actions. Actions are a key performance

indicator to evaluate GAC interaction with the Board and community, make recommendations for improvements.

And the recommendations shall be set for in priority order, and they're [combined] by a description of prioritization criteria, applied for by the [inaudible] team. That's our general scope on the work on GAC. Thank you. Maybe [Lou] or Martin can add something.

[LOU]:   Thank you, Vanda. [Inaudible] you know any comments. Thank you.

[MARTIN]:   I think you've said it very well, Vanda, and the only thing I'm realizing now in re-reading ICANN's considerations of GAC's input, always good to [inaudible] with ICANN.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Sorry, Martin. I could not hear you. You are fading out.

[MARTIN]:   Sorry. Does this help?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's better now. Can you repeat, please?

[PAT]:   Martin, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you at all.

[MARTIN]:	I am typing because she can't hear me, apparently. Am I connected?
[PAT]:	Okay, Martin. Thank you for that. We see your typing. Martin, if you're done, go ahead and click "yes" for us. Very good. Thank you, Martin.
	So Vanda, I have a question. On number six, when you say "use further implemented action as a KPI", what do you mean by further implemented action?
	Vanda?
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Sorry. I was talking with me.
	After the recommendation be done, there will be a work for further implemented those recommendation. And the actions take to those recommendations could be a performance indicator for GAC to be taking into account to see how the performance of the GAC is being after the implementation phase of ATRT3. Well, anyone can write this in better English than myself.
[PAT]:	No, thank you. That is helpful. I just didn't fully understand. But thank you for that. [Jack]?

EN

[JACK]:   Yes, Pat. I'll take it from Vanda here as this was a common work here.

So the rationale behind that is that when you assess accountability, and it's no question that other than accountability than transparency here, you're [lying] to have key performance indicators. And in the case of the GAC, it's difficult to find any performance indicator, the GAC being what it is and the way it works. So the idea behind that was, well, before doing recommendations, let's try to evaluate if previous actions were effective or not and if the communication, for example, was effective or not.

And the key performance indicator we found here was, well, if the recommendation of the GAC or the communication and the communication to the Board and the ideas to the Board have been followed by an action of the Board or of the community, then without ever judging the action, we can say "Yes, the communication has been effective, understood, and followed up upon."

So further implemented actions following GAC recommendations, for example, sounded a good key performance indicator, and an easy one at that. Make sense?

[PAT]:   Yes, that does. Thank you very much. Do we have any other questions in this section?

All right, let's go ahead and move then to the reviews, working team four. Daniel?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Daniel, we may have dropped you. I'm not sure. For whatever reason, we heard you say "Daniel for the record," and then I've certainly heard nothing and none of us are hearing you. So Brenda, can you double-check on what's going on?

BRENDA BREWER: Yep. Thank you. I'm checking. Daniel, I've sent you a private message. If you are able to disconnect. Oops, looks like you did.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record. Can you hear me?

BRENDA BREWER: We hear you, Daniel. Yes.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Sorry, these are [mounting] issues. I'll proceed with our respective objectives.

Right from the start, we categorized our objectives as tasks one, two, three, four, and five. And the first task was to assess the implementation of the ATRT recommendations of which is [cut] out a series of questions and which we are looking at, which are enabling the discussions.

And also, as you have mentioned, as you could have been following the mailing list, the discussions are categorized into discussion one, two, three, four, as follows so it's easier to [inaudible] to keep track of what

EN

issues we are trying to come up with, or respective reviews. Everything that didn't work for us would [inaudible] be recommended to the other respective work party.

The second objective is the qualitative and quantitative assessment of the effectiveness of the previous [inaudible] reviews. Now the [other] side is qualitative and quantitative assessment of effectiveness of the previous organizational reviews. Then to analyze the issues with ongoing reviews focusing on the common challenges with objectivity, efficiency, effectiveness, measurable impacts, like for instance, in the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2, CCT RDS SSR2 [inaudible] estimation.

Then the last recommendation is to investigate the potentiality and proposed systematic reviews of ICANN focusing on impact of current bylaws on the [inaudible] of the mission. So all of these are being done with the reviews of restrictive documentation that has been requested from staff and I think that's the reviews that are taking place.

Because there is any member who would want to add on this, they're all welcome, all of the questions that I've made already. Thank you. Back to you, Pat.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Daniel. So I think that a point that Martin made a little bit earlier is important here as well. On your fifth bullet, when we talk about the systemic review of ICANN, I think we need to be very specific about what part of ICANN that we are, a dressing here and while the

specific area has to do with reviews, we ought to be precise as to what it is that we mean by ICANN in this regard.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think when you come to tackling the Objective 5, regarding o the breakdown as Task 5, we shall have to narrow it down and become more specific because it will become very much challenge in case we look at the whole broad ICANN review. It becomes too much complex and I don't think the time scope of ATRT3 can allow conducting a full general review. Thank you. Back to you, Pat.

[PAT]:   Thank you very much, Daniel, for that. Anybody else have any questions on Working Team 4, the five bullets, five objectives that we have here?

All right, seeing no hands, so just kind of close out the objective section, this is fundamentally about four pages of the entire document. I think that there may be a little bit less than that once we took out the double in the Board section. But there are still a lot of other sections that we need to take a look at and while some of it is boiler plate or directive, I think that we need to focus ourselves in the next week, really, on listing definitions that we have, followed below the objectives, anything that we've identified in here that requires a definition. I think that we use a lot of acronyms in here and I think while many of us inside the community are going to understand exactly what the acronyms are, if there is any confusion, we should do that and we can either have staff do that for us or we can have someone on the team do that.

EN

But I think it's important that we be very precise and agree on what we're doing in terms of some of the definitions. But we've got some other sections to clean up between now and if we're going to make the 5th, then I think Cheryl, you and I probably have to go through together and either the whole thing's out or I don't know if we got an update on getting a writer to help here.

So Jennifer, is there an update on the writer?

[JENNIFER]:   So as far as the writer is concerned, I know that we are working to get this person on board as soon as possible in terms of if they will be able to b eon board in the next week, I don't have that information to hand but we can certainly get some more detailed information and get back to you and show with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to, the reason I put my hand up was exactly that point. My understanding is that things have, indeed, progressed to a point where you and I should indeed be able to take the advantage of doing some initial work with the now contracted writer. And Jen, if you should be able to get that confirmation sometime today and let us know formally who that is. But it appears to me that the staff may just be aligning for you and I to work with that person to make sure we're all singing from the same tune, and then leave a lot of the dotting of the Is and crossing of the Ts in terms of getting it into appropriate language and the general twilight to that individual. So we just need to carve out some time once Jennifer gets back to us with confirmation. Thanks.

[PAT]:   All right, well, thank you, Cheryl. So Jennifer, I have another question for you and that is I don't have the document up except for what's being displayed. Do we have any other sections that we've had significant work done on in the last couple of weeks that we could go through today?

[JENNIFER]:   Thanks. So in terms of updates that have been made in the past weeks, there are no updates that I can flag that have been made in the document. However, I think it would be useful to look at the reporting section which is on page 14. That has some text in it that was copied from or used, sorry, from a template that the review team may be able to make some edits to today, to see this review. Thanks, Brenda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not hearing anything. Whoever is speaking is muted.

[PAT]:   So Jennifer, this field, the highlighted piece feels like instructions to the team more than something we put into the document unless this is something that we're saying we all sign up to, which I think we have, but is this something that we really want to put additional requirements on, that we're putting on, or just saying that this is what we're stepping up to. Cheryl, have you done something like this in the past as well?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for the question. Look, it's all very boilerplate and I, personally, it's the type of thing that could be enshrined in a traditional charter or code of practice document should we need to.

I think they're not reportables here. I think we need to work on this and I would suggest whilst that text may end up being enshrined, perhaps on one of our Wiki pages just so everyone knows we're playing nicely together, then that's kind of where that belongs. But happy to hear from others.

[PAT]:   Jennifer, since you pointed us there, what have you seen or what has staff seen that are the dialogues or the discussions in this particular session?

[JENNIFER]:   Thanks. So this is text that I believe other review teams have included in their terms of reference just to, as you said, kind of explain what everybody in the Review team would be sailing up to do and expected to do. Whether or not you include it, is up to yourselves and whether it goes somewhere else, that's fine too. This document, remember, will be a living document and anything that is posted on the Wiki, we can always include links later to those particular pages from the terms of reference document.

The reason that I pointed you to it was because it was text that we had highlighted early on that came from a template that we thought, for this reason, it might be worth having a discussion of whether or not you

would like to include it or edit it. There are other sections that are similar. So for example, the decision-making methodologies in terms of consensus-building and designating each decision and the level of consensus which is on page 11, and then dependencies on other organizations, which is where the Review Team will put in any work that you're considering the work that's already going on in terms of there ICANN community.

So I just wanted to flag those highlighted yellow sections as sections that the Review Team should look at and confirm and agree to before it's provided to the Board. And staff is happy to help. We can have discu4ssions with yourself and Cheryl separately if that would be useful to give a bit more guidance in these, and perhaps provide some proposed text in there. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I can jump in again, Pat, I appreciate all of that and I appreciate that it may have been material that existed in other terms of reference documents in the days prior to having the draft and now second degree of draft for standardized procedures for specific reviews.

But we agreed at the outset of our very first meeting that we would take as guidelines and use as a beta testing exercise, the proposals that are currently enshrined in the second version, albeit draft, where they are applicable of those guidelines and so I think from our perspective, we can probably get away with having less in our [TORs] documentation and simply cross-reference to the material that is out and has been at

least subject to a couple of public comment interactions with the wider ICANN community.

So let's take this part of this into the discussion with staff and ourselves and get back to the rest of the group on the list and bring up the matter again in our leadership team meeting on Monday. And again, hopefully, we may also have already got the writer on board as well. There may be aspects, of course, that as we go through probably do belong in our TOR. But I'm always cautious of just doing things because others have done it before us. That's all. Thank you.

[PAT]:   Vanda, your hand was raised.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I just want to say that while most of those yellow tests, it's interesting to be part of but in my view, does not respond to the proposition that this section [inaudible], so we should inform more in a state way that we will do this, we'll use this, use this format. You're report in such a way, we should make more clear to think about the community reading this.

It don't make much sense to not address clear information here. That's my point. Thank you.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Vanda. So Cheryl, if I could go back to your suggestion, the one thing that I would point to the team right now since a lot of us have

EN

spoken about some of the dependencies that we have on our own objective in each of the working teams is to go ahead in the section that is highlighted at the top of page 11. If we could scroll there, Brenda. A little bit more. There we go. Bottom of page ten, sorry.

Dependencies on other organizations. If we already know because we talked about some of them today, I think it would be helpful to plug those in here now and basically, I think what I would do is break it up at least as we're getting it in there, getting the propensities into the document, break them out by working team right now so that we can at least capture them and then we'll figure out with the writer or between Cheryl and I, we'll figure out how we want to package that and then have the review team take a look at that and make other suggestions. But I think if we can capture the known dependencies in this section over the next couple of days, that would be helpful. Everyone good with that?

Go ahead and put "no" if you have a concern about that. All right, I'll see no "nos" so I'll be looking. Cheryl and I will look for that, some updates in that section in the next couple of days. So Cheryl, we're getting to the end of the 90 minutes, so I think that I want to emphasize that we've still got a lot of work to do in the document and I guess, Cheryl, we probably shouldn't wait until Monday to have another conversation. But I guess we want to go ahead and close out our agenda. I don't know what else we have left on the [inaudible].

I guess we can go ahead and move to "all other business" or "any other business". We didn't talk about anything at the beginning of the

EN

meeting, but is there anything else that we want to address today? Yes, Jennifer?

[JENNIFER]: thanks, Pat. So just one thing to keep in mind is that the work plan also is part of the submission to the Board, and so that, I know that there is, work parties have been working on timelines in their Google Docs as well, and so it's just to make sure that we consider that in the coming week in terms of finalizing. I know we did some work on it early on and we can certainly recirculate that to the team to take a look at and make any updates. I'll leave it to you, Pat and Cheryl, to decide how you would like to do that in the coming days, but just to not forget about the work plan. Thanks.

[PAT]: Thank you, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We promise [inaudible].

[PAT]: Thank you, Jennifer. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. Just a question. Should we send independently to the staff, to the GAC, our questions? Because I believe that we are lack enough time for the GAC to respond, so we finish, we have this little adjustment from

EN

Martin, but it's quite easy. So my question is can we send the questions to Missy and ask them to send to the GAC right away?

[PAT]: Vanda, I think that we ought to send the questions as a package. So if we want to use staff as a central location, I think that that's fine. Or on the Wiki page.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. My question is GAC demands much more time than other communities. So I believe we are in the limit of time to allow GAC to have responses in time for us in Marrakech. That's my concern about that. That's why I'm asking if staff can send our questions immediately to GAC, just to GAC.

[PAT]: I think that's probably fine. Okay, thank you. I will send out tomorrow to the group, to Jennifer and the group of staff, and ask then, specifically, to send just to the GAC. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that, Vanda, and I believe that all of the community, the AC and the SOs that we're meeting with in Marrakech would appreciate questions in a timely manner. But yes, let's get GAC done but then let's follow-up with the questions from the others, and if needs be, let's try and package them together because with the rest of the questions, there's probably a good likelihood of overlap and interdependency.

EN

So let's make sure that they go to the list and to staff and we can package them together and send them out as promptly as possible. Thanks.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, Cheryl.

[PAT]:   Thank you, Cheryl. So Jennifer, can we run through any action items, any decisions that we've reached?

[JENNIFER]:   Sure. Thanks, Pat. So the action items that I captured, staff is going to create a draft mapping diagram for the Review Team to include in the terms of reference document regarding overlapping items in the scope for each work party.

Staff is going to work with the leadership on the highlighted sections of the terms of reference in the upcoming leadership call to get the content for those determined. Team agreed to input dependencies on the other organizations in the coming days and to the terms of reference document which is the section on the bottom of page ten, top of page 11. And Vanda is going to send the GAC questions to staff tomorrow for sharing with the GAC ahead of the rest of the questions.

And then I see Cheryl typed in the chat "before the upcoming leadership call" and I'm assuming that's regarding the highlighted sections of the terms of reference.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct. Yeah, we need to do work in advance of the Monday call. Pat made that very clear.

[JENNIFER]:   I updated the action items, so thanks for that. That's all I have. Thanks.

[PAT]:   Thank you for that, Jennifer, and Cheryl, if we have nothing else, I think we can declare today's session completed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think so, too. And just so everyone knows, we'll update everyone as soon as possible with whatever we're doing, but do remember that you all have access to this Google Doc. You'll get notices if you've logged in, in the right way when changes are made to the Google Doc. So when things are updated, you should be updated and you can browse at your leisure. Thank you all.

[PAT]:   Thank you, everyone. Good day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye for now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]