
MARRAKECH – ATRT3 [C]
Sunday, June 23, 2019 – 09:00 to 17:30 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, you can test whether you're getting feedback through your computer speakers, because if you are, then you should be muting your computer speaker until you can stop hearing me in stereo in the room. And I can still hear me in stereo in the room. But to let you know we'll get started in about four minutes' time. Thank you.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and just about a minute after the hour, we are about to get going. Today's meeting is an all-day meeting from the accountability and transparency review team number three, holding a face-to-face meeting at ICANN 65 in Marrakech.

We have a Zoom room open, which is of course being occupied not only by people who are able to have been traveling to Marrakech for other reasons. This is not an ATRT-funded exercise, this is an opportunity that we are taking advantage of as a day zero event for those of us who would already be in Marrakech to further our work.

Others of the accountability and transparency review team, in case anyone decides to do a head count on the video and say,

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.

“Why are half of them not there” are logging in remotely, and some of them are actually in air transit where they’ve had flights delayed and would have been with us but are not able to be here until later.

So with that little bit of welcome and preamble, did you want to run a roll call and we’ll get started formally? Thanks, dear.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Cheryl. If we could please go around the room, introduce yourself for the recording. I can start. Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda Scartezini.

ERICA VARLESE: Erica Varlese.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Adetola Sogbesan.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Demi Getschko.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Osvaldo Novoa.

PATRICK KANE: Pat Kane.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just recognizing Jaap is also here. He has stepped away from the microphone.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. And who have we got online that isn't in the room?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel Nanghaka.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Bernard Turcotte, ICANN Org.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: And looks like we have one observer in the room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But no other team members?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No other team members; correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, that's a roll call. We work under a system of continuous disclosure with our statements of interest in this group, and to that end, if anyone has a statement of interest update that they would like to report to the group, please do so now, and if not, we shall assume situation normal. We might just wait until Liu gets settled, and Liu has also joined us. Welcome to you, and other members will be joining us through the day.

With that, I'm going to ask Pat to take us through our objectives and our agenda for today.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. This morning, we want to make certain that we are in alignment with the rest of the week in terms of what our questions and what our meetings will look like with each of the meetings we have set up for the rest of the week. We have some meetings this afternoon with some board members as well as

other people that were participating in previous review teams, so that will be this afternoon. But for this morning, kind of go through where we are, take a look at the workplan, but also prepare for the remainder of the week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there anybody who has any particular business or issues with the agenda that you want to raise now? Not seeing anybody in the room. Negar, I'm unaware of any changes in our timing as advertised. Is that the case?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No changes at the moment. That is correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, good. We will note however in this afternoon's agenda that Brian Cote will need to leave a little bit before the 4:00 PM mark because he's going to be with the AC/SO leadership talking about the evolution of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model in another room by 4:00 PM. So we will obviously understand why he zips away, but he's certainly making himself available to us throughout most of the afternoon and again during the meeting.

We'll be taking these breaks at the same time as the breaks will be normally running during the ICANN meeting. We will also be in

this afternoon trying to get some short consolidation and thinking sessions done, so after we've had interactions with various people who've had recent experience in review teams, and of course also with the board members, we'll take ten-to 20 minutes where we can have a what did we hear, what did we want to note from what we heard, what do we still need to ask about, what do we still need to know, is there any actionable thing from what we've discussed?

What we might do is try and make sure that we go around the table, so we try to run that almost as a round robin, so it'll be, "What do you think? What do you think?" And if we can try and keep our initial observations down to around the two-minute mark, that will mean we should be able to get through it all. But we shall see how that goes from a logistics point of view.

I can't imagine there's any more logistics. We will be taking our coffee and tea breaks here in the room, but we won't be taking them at a different time than we would be normally be doing it for the rest of the week. We will be having our lunch here; correct? And this will be a working lunch, so I know there's not many of us, but we do have a few board members to join us. If we can get our lunch as soon as possible, and possibly eat as quickly and quietly as possible, that will allow us to have a full [frank and fearless] discussion with our visitors over our working lunch. We can catch

them with their mouth full instead of the other way around. It's always much more rewarding.

So that's it for administrivia for today, and I think we've probably got ourselves pretty much – we're ahead of time. We'll have to watch that, Pat, we might finish early if we're not careful. Can't have that happening. So we'll now move to our next agenda item, but that does mean that we can take a little bit more time if needs be.

Now, recognizing as we go through each of the work parties, Michael, I haven't spotted here yet, but he's expected shortly. So hopefully he might be in before we get to communities. We'll do our usual starting with the board and then working our way all the way through to community, and we might just make a note for the record on the IRP.

So with that, let's hand over to Osvaldo and Sébastien for a brief update on where we are with the current state of play on the board working party.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I guess we spent the last couple of days to finalize the questions for the various groups who we'll meet during the meeting, and we will be starting soon to populate a draft draft

report on the same Google doc that we are currently using for the working party.

I hope that more people will participate to the real work, because I think it's one of the necessities to have a good report, and to embrace the various views and diversity of view of this group. Therefore, I hope that the ones who are member of the work party will be participating, maybe this day will help for that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oswaldo, do you have anything to add? No? Okay. Thanks for this. I also think we might decide in our session later today before lunch whether or not you're all going to set now a couple of planned meetings for your work groups. You're going to be moving into data capture and data analysis now, and it might be an idea if each of the work parties fleshes out a more detailed work plan. So that is also going to be hand if we get this done today, because then staff can manage the resources a little bit more carefully so we don't have people that are going to be doing three- and four-hour blocks after hours supporting those calls. So if you'd like to think about that now, and we'll deal with that again in the afternoon. Regarding the questions, we'll also be talking about the questions in this afternoon session. With that, let us move on to reviews next. Over to you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Just a brief about the reviews is that [pleased to have got] some feedback on the works that the GAC and other review work parties working on regarding the mockup of the ATRT2 report, so from here, we should be coming up with appropriate way forward on how to be able to manage the respective reviews that are happening specifically.

So that's just a brief. We shall be getting back into discussion together with our co-lead to discuss the way forward, and also, we shall be calling for a special meeting together with the reviewers work party soon to be able to move forward. Thank you. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Daniel. Of course, reviews is one of the work parties that will benefit greatly out of interactions during the Marrakech meeting, particularly this afternoon.

I think there may be an opportunity for us to even gather again in a group call, not just with your work party but with any key people from any of the review teams if that's something at the end of today you feel you need. So again, if we can look by the end of today on what additional material opportunities you might want to develop, so if you do want to meet again with, say, Jonathan or Alan or whatever, see if we can tie that down today so we've got a more detailed workplan moving on.

With that, I believe our next one will be GAC.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Yesterday we received [inaudible] score cards from Jennifer. I don't know if the others had the opportunity to read it, but I [thank Dan] for that, and I expect to use the opportunity here. I don't know if we're going to have time enough with the members of the group, but at least one or two. Will be interesting to discuss a little bit about those score cards right now, because we didn't have time for that.

The rest of our work have been done beforehand, and we had all the questions selected and distributed, so we're going to have this second meeting at lunchtime with the GAC. Liu asked [Dan] and got the opportunity to us, which is great. Jacques will be here this afternoon. So I believe we'll have opportunity to go deeply on that.

[I've already started] working on the report, and need to talk with the other colleagues to share some opportunities to improve how we'll distribute the work. That's it for us now. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Liu, do you have anything to add?

LIU YUE: Thank you. Very happy to be here with all members, and thank you, Vanda, for the introduction to our progress of GAC work party. GAC [leadership] have sent an e-mail to all the GAC members to ask for volunteers to work with the GAC work party, and all the GAC members have now the question list, and I think we'll have a short interview on Wednesday noon. So I will contact with GAC and also work with Vanda together to organize this interview. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much for that, and I think it's important that we also capture that feedback. Now, most informal lunch meetings wouldn't be recorded, so it might be a good idea if Bernie could capture the highlights and [holiday mentions] during that meeting, and I would note, I believe, Pat, you're going to be available for that time. But I'll only be able to be there for a very short amount of time because of course, the GAC room is one end of the place and I need to be back to the GNSO council pretty much the same time. So I will apologize in advance for disappearing on you at that stage. But that's great.

Did you have any clarifying questions that came back to you from the questions you'd sent to the GAC, or were they all perfectly clear?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I didn't get any, but anyone? I believe it is clear for them, and probably we'll have this opportunity, this informal meeting to get more open up ideas from them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Okay. As we're going around the room, Erica, looks like it's all yours.

ERICA VARLESE: This is Erica for the community update. I guess over the past few weeks, we had two meetings just primarily to focus on terms of reference which delved a little bit into our work plan as well as we were kind of finalizing our objectives and goals there, and also, just a lot of prep for the meeting here and the sessions we'll be having here.

I think following that, we'd probably like to have a meeting to work through all of the information that we gathered during these sessions. I think there's going to be a lot more for us to work through from that, and we'll likely finalize some more of our resource requests, which we had an outline but have been working on clarifying some of them that were a little bit vague. So I think following this meeting, we'll be able to just give some more detail to those and then dive in a little bit more deeply as we start the analysis. So I think that probably covers it for us, but I'm

happy to answer questions, or if anyone else from the group who's here and wants to jump in too, feel free.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Erica. I notice that you're one of the groups that's held a couple of meetings. Did you find those meetings got you further in your work? Was that a worthwhile exercise?

ERICA VARLESE: Yeah. The meetings, I think, for us, have been really helpful in the sense of we've had some discussion on the list, but I think it's been a lot easier for us to coordinate via voice when we had the time to do so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Can I ask a question then of all of the work party leads? And that is, do you believe it's going to be beneficial for you to more formally and regularly hold just short calls as you move to the next phase of your work? Is that something on a perhaps fortnightly basis, so a weekly basis that you believe your groups would be interested in, or not? Have a think about that.

First of all, I see Daniel. Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think that during the meetings, [inaudible] we can get to discuss more compared to all the other channels. The mailing list sometimes becomes a little bit slow or cold, but when you get to interact [inaudible] you can at least get appropriate feedback and input respectively. That's my personal experience that I got after [inaudible] meetings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: For us, there is some difficulties with the commitment of Maarten with the board, and Liu with the GAC. Those are quite difficult to set up a time previously with those commitments. But I do believe that when we need to have something to agree, will be very important to have this call specifically to those points. But just to discuss, I don't believe that will be time enough for most of them to join and discuss. So we can continue to work by doing now, by Skype, by e-mail, and when we need to agree with some point or statement that we have made, maybe it's time to set up some – because we are in many different points, and especially Maarten and Liu have more difficulties to set up time for those calls.

So I do believe that to [previous] set up maybe just a time to redefine and reset again, and waste of time to organizing when we could work together in the other space. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so I think what I'm hearing there, Vanda, is for at least your work party, you'll probably just punctuate the July and August work part with one or two meetings as opposed to what some other work parties may do. Is that what I'm hearing? Okay, fine. But you're getting better response with your Skype chat, etc. Okay, that's great.

What do you feel, Osvaldo and Sébastien, what way forward do you think you're going to be able to perhaps get greater engagement? Sébastien started in his report by saying that more people do need to be engaged. Obviously, [communities have found with their meeting] that was a trigger. Any suggestions from what you might be doing?

OSVALDO NOVOA: I think if we can arrange a meeting during this meeting today or someday during the week, that could be a way to get more people involved and go ahead with our work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. If we pulled up the members of your work party, from memory, you've got Daniel on your group as well, you've got Tola on your group as well I believe. Who else is on your group? Sébastien, have you got the list there?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Wolfgang, Tola, Ramet, Michael, Maarten, Liu, Erica, Demi, and Osvaldo and myself. So [inaudible] some of them are already very occupied with the work party, and the others have difficulty because they are participating to various ones, and others are not available, let's say. They have too much other things to do, and I can understand that. But even if we have a call – last time, we had a call, but nobody showed up, and even the ones who said yes on the Doodle were not participating.

Therefore, my first question is, what is the commitment of all the members of this group? Because I feel that this ATRT is one of the most important review team of ICANN, and if we don't commit to the time, we need to do it, and we are not asking for the EPDP people, we are just asking for some hours per week. If we don't have, how we will fulfill the work? I know that we will have somebody to do all the work in front of us since today, but it's not the deal that we do the work and you will help us, not the reverse.

But I am very concerned with how things are going because of the participation and the nonparticipation to some of us. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, can I ask, do you have an idea that you might want to test for your work party? What sort of solutions would you like to look at?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, I am not sure that the first question is what's happened at the work party. The first question is what happened at the global level of this working group. And then we can go into the work party, because maybe it's because some of the people are not willing to be in various working parties, and it's maybe a good time to review that. Maybe it's because I need to review what they are doing. I don't know, but for me, it's not a question of the working party first. It's a global question of what we want to achieve together. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we have some reactions from some of the others around the table to that? Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Normally, in any work party, there are people that want to participate, others never show up. And the only way to deal with that in our environment of volunteers is just decide that you're

going to do the job if you agree to do that. And if you don't, the others will carry your side. But in the end of the day, I do believe that we need to be more professional in that, and after some time, if people don't participate at all, so they need to be asked to dismiss themselves, because we cannot carry on in many working groups with the same people doing the work, and then just get the label they have been part of this or that.

We need to be more professional. [You are participating, you have done anything,] if you don't, it's six months now, you do nothing, so thank you very much for your participation, you're off. That's my point of view, and not only for this group but as a whole suggestion for ICANN, because there is a lot of people that we all know that just want the label, "I have been in that and that." And never participate.

So that's my view. But until now, in my working group, if something like that happened, the others will take care and we're going to do the work, but in the end, the report will show up that this or that are not participating at all. That's my view.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. Erica, can I get your reaction to that?

ERICA VARLESE:

Yeah. Like I said before, for us having the calls, we've had more substantial discussion on the calls, though I understand the concerns from everyone else as well, because I think most of our calls have had maybe two, maybe three other members at most in addition to myself and Michael.

So I think while it's a good opportunity to have conversations with those people who are attending and that spawns more discussion, we haven't had as much response in other communication methods like the list or Skype. It's still obviously not everyone, and it's been kind of a way to have a substantial discussion and share, and then kind of wait for any more feedback. So yeah, I think we also have some of the same concerns. I don't know if I can speak for Michael, but we have probably some of the same dynamics as other groups as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, I see Osvaldo, and then we'll let Michael speak for himself.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

I agree with Vanda regarding the people that don't participate, but then on the other hand, we have to consider that we are all volunteers, we are taking our time to do the work we do here but we also have other obligations, and then ICANN stands to get you into other things to do. And when I volunteer for the ATRT3, I was

just in one working group. Now I'm in the council and the [NomCom implementation] review work. So you try to give as much time as you can, but you don't usually can give as much as you should. But we are volunteers. I think we have to accept the time we have available. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. So I disagree with any notion of kind of like purging groups of nonactive members. This, I think, is a very common challenge across ICANN, but based on previous experiences in Work Stream 2, I do recall that we had folks that would just disappear for long periods of time, and then suddenly resurface at a meeting and make a bunch of substantive contributions, and that was still valuable and appreciated.

I do agree that folks just sign up and then do nothing a lot of the time, and I do agree that it may seem kind of unfair to have them as a member of the group when they're not really doing anything.

From the perspective of the subteam or this ATRT, it doesn't actually cost us anything to have them doing that. So it may not seem fair, but we don't actually lose anything.

So fundamentally, I think that even if there is only a small chance of a net benefit from keeping people on, there's really no loss to us to having them, to having names on a list. So I would argue against that.

In terms of meeting structures, yeah, I agree with Erica, in terms of the utility of having the meetings, but I would suggest that we need to allow the subgroups a bit of flexibility insofar as it's good to have regular meeting, but I also don't necessarily want to be blocking the time off and forcing people to go through the paces if you don't really have things to discuss, which sometimes comes up in certain weeks, and that in my experience can also chill participation if people are showing up to these meetings and saying, "Wow, we didn't really do anything. Why would you show up next week?"

So regular meetings are good, and certainly there's a lot of value to the meetings, but I would stress that the subteam leaders should have flexibility for when these meetings take place.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Michael. We're going to go to Daniel, back to Sébastien, and then I've got both Bernie and Negar. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: In respect to participation, I think the time when we all signed up to volunteer to the ATRT3, we made at least an obligation. I think let's be truthful to the obligations that we made. If the challenge is assigning time and you see that you're getting so busy to be able to serve on the ATRT3, I think you could at least ask for some time out, because your participation hinders a lot of process and we have a fixed timeline that we have to work on. I think let's be truthful to the values that we contribute to the community. We are all volunteers, we all have a role to play. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. Yeah, we are not a working group, we are not Work Stream 2, we are ATRT, and we have one year to deliver. And it's not just you show up and then you don't show up and you say three words. It's we need to be a team to deliver a report to the whole community of ICANN in one year. Now less than one year, in February next year.

And if we have just half of the people doing a part of the job, that means that we will not be able to deliver to all what we think is important to deliver, because we need to share the load. I know that it was difficult to set up this review team. The question was

asked two years before we start really, but when we signed up at the end, it was to be engaged and participate.

I really think that I would have not any problem for this type of behavior for Work Stream whatever or for another PDP or whatever working group, but not here. Not for that review, and not now. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie, and then Negar. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. There are advantages and disadvantages to having meetings for subgroups scheduled regularly with understanding that the meetings can be cancelled in advance if there's nothing to discuss. The advantage is that it's really hard to find a common time for most everyone to meet, so if the time is blocked out on people's calendars, it's a lot easier to say, "Let's hold this call, attend it, have the discussion and move on," or cancel it in advance.

Also, with regard to the comment that Vanda made, I do understand and agree that oftentimes it's difficult for members like Maarten, Cheryl and Pat given the schedules, and maybe others to attend meetings, but I would suggest for that not to be a hold up, because the way to deal with that is if the rest of the

subgroup team members meet up and you end up with having questions, the questions can be then brought into the regularly scheduled plenary calls, and the members who are there can then help address them, or they can be put into the Skype chat rooms. There are ways to address them that would allow everyone to work and participate the way their schedules allow to do that.

Additionally, one last thing I wanted to point out, the operating standards have a lot of guidelines regarding review team member participation. In all fairness, this team, most of the team has been really responsive and has been participating quite effectively. So I personally don't see a concern with it, having worked with other review team members, but if it ever gets to a point where there are review team members who are not participating effectively and it becomes problematic, there are guidelines in the operating standards that helps the review team think about how to deal with that in the proper way so as to not sidestep procedures, community groups, etc.

So something to keep in mind, but again, this team has been working really well, so kudos to you guys, and I'm hoping to see more of it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, we're all hoping to see more of it. Thanks, Negar. Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thanks. I understand a lot of the comments just from personal experience. A couple of points. Probably the first one is that once we actually start writing things, people reengage. All of a sudden, they have something in front of them and they get more interested. So there may be light at the end of the tunnel when we get into this next phase and start writing. So don't discourage yourselves.

The downside of people not participating for long periods of time, I understand Michael's point of view, but the flipside of his argument is that you will get someone flying in at the last minute when you've written up and the group has done work, and all of a sudden bring in substantial changes. That's part of life in many of our work parties here and outside of the ATRT, but given the schedule here, that can be a significant factor in delivering on time. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, well warned. We've tended to hear from work party leads. I'd like to hear from the others around the table who are work party participants. So I'm just going to arbitrarily start and suggest that we hear from Tola and then Demi, and then over to Jaap. So, Tola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you. I quite appreciate the worrisome comments from Sébastien and Vanda. It can be hard [inaudible] if we think we're about five or six in the work party and the other members seem not to be participating as expected.

Another assignment I've done similar to this, there's something I've come to realize, which is what [inaudible] just mentioned. One is that everybody works differently. There are some people which I've seen in different groups outside ICANN that will not contribute when what they intended to contribute has been contributed. So rather than repeat what somebody else said, they [inaudible] followed through. That's one of the things I've discovered.

Another thing I discovered, in group dynamics, there were three different sides of people. There are people with ideas, there are people that like to just correct things when things are done, they don't have ideas but they know how to correct. And you can't throw them away because they're like quality assurance people. So at every point in time, you rather want to keep them because they probably see [inaudible] that every other contributor has not seen.

And if you asked for a couple of ideas before that time, [inaudible] but we'd need those guys because at some point, if we have done

all the beautiful work, we've probably not see one T that didn't cross at some point, and that guy will see it.

Another set of people that I know I've worked with is that some people are workaholics. Whether you like it or not, they always do the work. It doesn't mean they are better than those guys that are quality assurance, but we just need to understand that people are configured differently.

And from that experience I've had, I don't complain even if I have to do all the work, I just continue to do the work, believing that everybody [is equally] important and at every point in time, even if it's just one word a person mentions, it is valuable to the team. And that's the understanding I've seen. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO. Yeah, just to add some points. I agree with many of the comments. I think all of us have a lot of things to do also, and sometimes we lose some of the meetings. I try to be on the plenary meetings all the time, but I recognize that I lost some of the group meetings, for many reasons. One is probably I have two or three e-mail addresses, different subscribing in the list, and

sometimes I lose the information of the meeting because there is a lot of traffic in the list, and sometimes you overlook something.

But I agree with what Bernie said also, that I'm not very inclined to speak a lot, but if you have something in front of us to write or contribute in some kind of observations, I think it would be easier to include some additional points of view.

And other point is more or less also overburden us is the kind of duplication we have with other works also regarding to ATRT, other contributions, ATRT2 and 1.

Then of course I try to select the issues that are not overlapping with the already seen issues. Anyway, I agree with the comments here and we have to try to cooperate more on this. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Demi. Jaap? Your views?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Do you want me to comment on ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Any comments or criticisms you want to make on what we've been discussing in terms of engagement, how we can better engage, how we can move into this next phase? Is there anything we should be aware of or doing?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: No, I don't have any comments. The idea of purging people seems to be kind of strange to me, but that's for [inaudible]. There are reasons why people don't – as Bernie says – get actively involved. I personally often take nonreactions as being part of the consensus ,and that's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So just to make clear that there is a known benefit in having people's non-input taken as part of a consensus process. Is that what you're saying?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: No, but if it's going to e the problem, we could ask people to downgrade themselves to being observers. That's always something you can do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I see Pat here, but Sébastien wanted to react. But I also want to go to Liu because you haven't had input on this. So if we go Liu, and then Sébastien can react and you can bring it home then, Pat.

LIU YUE:

Okay, thank you. I think the review team is very important work, I agree with Sébastien, and it's very important for the governance improvement of ICANN, and also very important for all the community. But I think most of us here joined not more than one, maybe two or three working groups, so I think we need to have a good schedule for our time, and also for our teamwork.

And I think maybe we can ask Brian Cote to be here and to discuss on how to evolve the MSM. I think since we work for all stakeholders, I think the question of Brian Cote [be met here,] and I think maybe we can work to improve our schedule and also to improve our tools so we can engage all of us to contribute for review team work and to contribute our ideas and energy to make progress of our work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Liu. Sébastien, did you want to read your comment out?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. I guess I have two or three comments. The first one is that my experience or our experience is that we write something and very few comments. Therefore, it's not just because something is written that we have comments. But maybe we can do two things. The first one is to ask the people if they are

still willing to be in the work party, and maybe to use Jaap's proposal, to ask them if they want to be in their working party. I'm not talking about this working group, but the work party, if they want to be participant or observer, because it will help us as leaders of the work party to know at which level of expectation we can have them participating or not.

if they are willing to be there to get the information and they told us "I will just observe and I will not participate," if they decide to participate, that would be good also, but it will help us to figure out how many people will be really wanting to interact with us, and then we will try to reach them today. We have in our work party – I told you the list before – ten people, therefore it's more than half of this review team. Maybe it's too much. That's my proposal. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Pat, you finally get to go.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. I do recognize that we're all volunteers, and I think that when we signed up on the initial application, there was a recognition that this would take a significant amount of time.

And when we take a look at the plenary meetings and we take a look at the leadership meetings, those really are about and

designed about clearing roadblocks, having specific discussions about specific topics, and so that Cheryl and I can figure out how we can help the team become more effective.

As we move from the TOR into the actual writing of the document, having Bernie aboard is going to be fantastic from the standpoint of him putting together what the receptacle looks like, what the report will look like. But it's going to take a lot of work that's going to be outside of the plenary meetings and outside of the leadership meetings, because at this point in time, we've got to do a lot of review, a lot of analysis forming recommendations and putting together theories based upon facts, not just based upon things that we've felt for the last 10 or 15 years, or however long we've been a member of the community.

So to Sébastien's point, we are timebound here, and we've got a lot of work to do between now and when we get the interim report, which is currently scheduled for September 8th to get that done. So there's a lot of work to be done outside of the meetings, and we recognize that there are people that are doing work but we also need to recognize that there's probably a need for some more. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to react to the idea that we don't lose anything. Yes, we lose, because if you have one person that is not working, we could have another one that was in that place working. And we need to think that the first planning, our workplan, is supposed to be done by a bunch of people. If you have half of that, certainly it will be much more difficult to reach the goal. So I do believe that, yes, we lose, and it's important in my view some kind of feedback, because we were selected by our groups. You could apply, and someone will select instead of other people.

so if you come in the place of other that could be more effective, we are losing a lot. So that's my point. I know we are all volunteers, I'm here for 20 years, so it's hard to find time to work and work for ICANN, but anyway, if you apply, you are selected instead of other people, you should do the work. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Does anyone want to make any other comments before we try and have a look at the actual workplan and have a look now at what is ahead of us as we move on from these interactions, and this might help us discover – woah, that's going to be fine print. I hope we can bring that up a bit. Even on screen, I can't see that.

So if we look at this first block, most of that's pretty much done. We're now looking at the subgroup activities. Now, each of your subgroups has gone through this – sorry, go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, can we have the link into the chat room?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, I'll put that in.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem at all. I think the link is on the agenda anyway, so if you've got your agenda open, you should be able to get to the whole suite of documents.

But let's go through some, if not all, of these subgroups in the time we've got left in the allocation for this section of activity today, and see whether there's some obvious things that may point us towards working mechanisms.

If we scroll across, just slightly so we can get a little bit of an idea without losing the words of the percentages completed, it would be lovely. The board work party that was currently on screen, and

most of the early stuff is pretty much done, or substantially done. But we're now getting to these review and analyze relevant documentation, conduct the investigation on the particular objectives. The interviews are happening here in the Marrakech – there's an awful lot of zeroes or very small numbers sitting in the rest, and I guess what Pat and I are keen to do today is get you trying to crystallize your thoughts and help us help you to get all of those percentages start ticking up in short order. And in short order, think about an eight-week timeframe, maybe a nine-week timeframe. What can you do in July and August to further these percentages?

Because by the time we then get into the end of August and the beginning of September, we should be looking at what findings you might be bringing out of your analysis. You should be building consensus and agreement on those findings.

Now, if these dates are unrealistic and unachievable, then tell us now, because this workplan has just been approved, it's a living document, so this session however is an opportunity to look at your work party and say, "There is no way we are going to be doing that work as planned here between the 5th of August and the 30th of June." We'd rather be told about that now than find out on the 28th of August that it's a problem. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. If we take the workplan execution of the work party board, I accept some relevant interview that we will do here except that I don't think anything will be started before the end of this meeting here, therefore the 3rd of June is out, it will be the 3rd of July, and therefore my feeling is the 13th of August will be for this workplan execution. That's the first point.

The second is that – and it's more a question, we have set up in one of the documents, maybe we need to transfer it in another document, but what we ask for – and for example we're asking for meeting and face-to-face meeting will be better, but a meeting with the CFO, with Xavier. Is it something already handled? I didn't see anything, but maybe I have lost the e-mail. And maybe there are other groups who need to have such discussion with Xavier and his team, and maybe it's good time to set it up, either for Marrakech or for after if it's not possible during a face-to-face. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. With the exception of the interactions with the ACs and the SOs running through the week, the small blocks of time that we committed for today are all we were able to manage during Marrakech. But there is absolutely no reason why we can't organize a specific telephonic hookups, and as you know, Xavier and his team are always willing to make themselves

available, but unfortunately, not when they're in the depths of their own work with board, and that's where we're clashing with some of today, unfortunately.

It appears to me at least – correct me if I'm wrong – that if the 3rd June date that we're looking at onscreen in terms of workplan execution is wrong for this work party, then it's going to be wrong for all of them. So, is it your will – because it would be my recommendation – that we now just in this work party document change 3rd of June to 23 July and see what happens to either pushing the timelines out or compressing them? Pat, you're frowning at me.

PATRICK KANE: No, I'm looking at the screen. Squinting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, squinting. Sorry. Bernie?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Cheryl, you wanted to say 23 of June, or July?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought I said July.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but that means in one month, you want us to start –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My apologies, it should be this month, June. 2-3 June.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My suggestion is that we say the 3rd of July, because at the end of this meeting, of course we will have done some things [inaudible] but we will really tackle the job in July when we are back from Marrakech. But doesn't matter 23 of June or 3 of July, it's almost the same. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we can do a global replace for June to July if that works for you all. That's fine. I'd like feedback from the other work party leads as well. I've got Daniel, and then I've got Bernie. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: This is one of the documents that is always open on my screen all the time, and I believe also other different respective work party leads are very much aware of this document. Speaking on behalf of the reviews work party, if I'm to recall correctly, right from the start, we have been looking for documents and reviewing documents which happens to go in line with 3rd June.

So when we started the respective analysis of the data, especially coming from the first objective of the reviews work party, we discovered that there was a [inaudible] whereby we need to harmonize the respective works that are happening in other respective work parties.

So regarding that, I think that first bullet point of review, analyze and summarize the respective documentation, I think this is work that is already happening and in progress. So I don't think that we should put the works that we have so far done somewhere on the shelf and begin to recreate the work. Let us be at least a bit realistic with the respective timelines of how far we dug into this respective documentation, how far we have gone on to make the reviews, what is left in the reviews in reference to our respective objectives that were clearly outlined in the other [respective] document of the reviews document? I think that is something that we should really think.

But I still believe that as long as we commit ourselves, we can still achieve that respective deadline such that we don't create a hinderance to process. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Daniel. I'm hearing then there's going to be some divergence in how we approach these dates in the different work parties. Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just some observations from the trenches of having done quite a few of these things. Northern hemisphere summer is a difficult time to get coherence of working groups, it's just the reality. Second thing is to get – I tend to – and I don't know if this applies here, I'll surely make that caveat, but in these huge chunks of work like work party execution and prepare draft report, it's been my experience that they work in three-month chunks. It's just the reality before people get their stuff together, get to understand, have the discussions and get things going, it just seems to be, or has been in the past. Now, this group may be different, but those are my observations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That's going to mean, if that's chunk size is about right, that we're certainly going to have tighter compression up against our face-to-face meeting in Singapore. Not impossible, just an observation that we would need to be aware of and work accordingly. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just a reminder of the 12-month duration and hence the shortened timeframes for most of these tasks as opposed to

other reviews that have a bit more flexibility to conduct their work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. Alright, so what I've seen at this stage is that in the matter of workplan execution for the board working party, there is a good argument to now live edit this document to change 3 June to 3 July. So let's do this now in real time, and then let's go down to the next work party and see what the people here want to or don't want to do with that. So Vanda, that'll be you and the GAC next.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, in my calendar here, we certainly will do this relevant interview as appropriate, is the topic, certainly starting 3 June because we start sending the questions in that time. But we're going to finish this in the end of this meeting. So that is the time when we will really finish the interview. Then analyze documentation. Our group has all the communiques, the review of the implementation of the ATRT2 for the GAC, that is in some way as we have read all the things, but with the interview, we're going to make sure that a lot was implemented. But only after the reviews we can have a clear vision of what will be needed to go deeply inside.

So I will not change the times, because beforehand, we cannot have a clear idea if we need to go deeply into documents that we haven't seen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Vanda. Just hold your thinking on that and let's see if we can maybe settle the board work party to begin with then, because I believe it's going to be variable now work party by work party. And this template was tended to be put together slab by slab, not work party by work party. So, Osvaldo and Sébastien and everyone else who's on your work party in the room, and on Zoom, is it your will that we change 3 June to 3 July under the execution block?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: But for me, yes, because –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, you're GAC. Right? Yes. Demi is saying yes. Okay. So that'll be a “make it so.” Is there anything else now that's on screen that is glaring at you to require adjustment in the board work party? Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess we can't finish the prepare draft report section before we finish the workplan execution. Therefore, we need to move the next one also. But maybe what we – because I heard, and it was one part of the argument at the beginning of the discussion, is that we need to deliver. We have one year. Therefore, maybe 3 of July, and we can try. I know also that in my part of the world, it's summertime and holidays. Not 1st of September, but something like, I don't know, one week in August, like that we can start in August next phase and be ready for middle of September.

We need to compress some work now, because if not, we will not deliver on time. Thank you. In my suggestion, it's 3 July, something like 25 or 23 of August, and 15 of September for the next phase.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Pat.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. If I may make a suggestion, we've already got a fixed date for our next face-to-face meeting in Singapore, which is at the end of October. I think we should take a look at the dates that we need to line up so that we're effective when we get to that meeting. Instead of trying to work that direction, let's work backwards from that fixed date. And the date that I'm focused on

really is the refining of the draft report section on the 9th of September.

We talked about having a report that we can start editing and polishing between then and that next meeting, so what is the last possible date that we can get that delivery done so that we can make our end of October meeting successful? And I think that that's kind of the date – that's probably no later than end of September is what that feels like. So if we make that date and focus on that date, how do we work backwards from that? Again, keeping in mind, how do we be effective in Singapore with a document that we're going to do a lot of editing at that point in time and finalizing so we can make our initial report and review?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Negar, were you putting your hand up there?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah. I've put a suggested date for working on the preparing draft report section, but that is subject to change pending the comment that Pat of course has made, so I'm leaving it for the room to discuss.

-
- CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so the suggested date at the moment is sitting at the July run through to the very beginning of September. Sébastien was saying that could be compressed back a week to end of August. If you're all comfortable with that, then let us know and we'll do that. But you may not need to then move your 9th of September out very much. Sébastien, your card was up.
- SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but I need to write something because I will try to write dates and then come back to you.
- CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, your comment?
- VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just to make sure that we have a drafted template beforehand, everybody to start to draft in the same structure. This is very important, because to redefine, this takes time.
- CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Vanda, part of having the technical writer is the technical writer writes the draft. So he's the living template. So the unification, the harmonization, the look and feel is part of Bernie's job description. So it's not so much us putting out a template to each of the work parties for the work party leads and work parties to

do, it's more making sure everything you want captured is captured accurately and effectively, and then – yeah, so I think hopefully, this will make our job easier. That's the plan, anyway. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just to verify, do I understand correctly that Sébastien, you will be coming back with some suggested dates for the board section of the workplan? Sounds like a yes. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's hopefully live now. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. It's for discussion, but my suggestion is that the first workplan execution, 3rd of July, 23rd of August like it's written, then the 24th of August, 20th of September or 18th of September, and then one month, that means that we will – 18 of September, that means 19th of October. And then we have to discuss with Pat if it's too late, and if it's too late, then we will move it a little bit ahead. But if it's middle of October and we met in November, it's okay or it's too late. That's ...

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. So our meeting is fixed right now in terms of the 27th to 29th. Is that the date?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, the face-to-face meeting in Singapore is October 20th, 21st, 22nd.

PATRICK KANE: Great. Thank you for that correction. So 20th to 21st. We've got to have something done first week of October at the latest. In my mind, it's still the end of September. Maybe there's some overlap that can be done between those two sections so we don't have to go nose to tail in terms of the prepared draft and the refined draft section, do some work overlapping once we get certain sections done, but I think if we wait until the October 16th and we've only got four, five days, we don't really have time to digest it before we get to Singapore. So I think that it's got to be – end of September would be my preference in terms of how I would work it, but no later than the first week of October.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Done deal.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Just with what you've just said, Pat, not all this has to be nose to tail, and that will definitely be the case. There are some parts in the preparing of draft report section that you will probably be able to get done relatively early. Some of them are boilerplate-type stuff. And then you've got a placeholder where this material is still being worked on and it will be plugged in here.

So I'm quite confident that Bernie won't be leaving writing everything to the last minute. Will you, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: [You can only work with what you get.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I have adjusted the dates based on the timeline Pat just pointed out. That puts workplan execution end on 23 August, the preparation of the draft report section 13 of September, that's 20-day duration, and refining the draft report, 4th October as the last date. That also reduces the duration by 20 days. Is everyone in agreement with that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I feel like an auction. Going, going.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So Sébastien and Tola have agreed. Any other comments or questions? Okay, I'll adjust the dates at the break to make sure it applies throughout.

PATRICK KANE: So Negar, just from the standpoint of making sure that we capture the decision, we have consensus from the board work party that those dates are okay? There were no objections?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I guess on behalf of the work party. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Brilliant. Let's scroll down to GAC, and Vanda was already pointing out that these dates may not need adjusting, but Vanda and Liu, now is the time if you want to make any adjustments or modifications to these dates, then now is the time to do so. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. While I'm talking by me, but I don't know if other colleagues have time. Liu is quite involved with the GAC, so it's more easy for him to understand issues. We have Maarten and Jacques. So I don't know if Jacques has been passing through the documents

that we have suggested to read in the beginning of our work, and it will be nice to hear from him, but he's traveling now.

In my view, what we should do is preparing the execution is to alert – and I can do that – in those documents the others in the group which is main points that we should go deeply analyze and get some feedback from those points, after we've interviewed the groups, because we already took into consideration all of those documents to make the questions. So the questions and the answers will help us to go back to those documents and assign what is important and what is not important anymore because it's all done.

So that is our perspectives now, and certainly, we will be more clear in the end of this meeting after the meeting with the – and analyze the questions. But I believe it will work this time. We have all July to do that, and I believe we have all the things. I don't know if Jennifer and Negar will give us other score cards, but I believe with this three of them, we have enough to analyze the flukes and the feedback, and what is working, what is not, between GAC and board.

And I do believe that once we have done that, maybe it would be interesting to share with the board group our finds to then analyze their sides, that's board side, to do things. We are analyzing GAC group, but the interaction among them is really

two sides, and the interaction is very important. So if one does something and the other does not, in the end, the flukes will not work.

So that's the idea, and maybe we will add more [burden] to the board group to analyze. Thank you. Maybe Liu can add something. Liu?

LIU YUE:

Thank you, Vanda, and I think I see [inaudible] that we can get most of the materials in this meeting from GAC, also from the support of ICANN staff ,and also, we can analyze the ATRT2 recommendations [inaudible] And I think GAC is [commenting] that they will support our working group, so I think we can get more information from our lunch with GAC leadership.

And I have recommended GAC staff [inaudible] score card after each GAC communique and also the feedback between GAC and the board. I think maybe staff can add some more information from the GAC communique score card, and maybe with cooperation of the GAC support staff. So maybe we can get more information from our case study.

So I will also work with you and support our team. And I also agree that maybe we can share some information with the board group, since we have analyzed the GAC and the board. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, [series that overlap.] Well, what I'd like to suggest we do now, if you take the time to get up, stretch your legs, grab a coffee, come back to sit down, some of you, if you could gather with members of your own work party that you can recognize – and I know Erica, you and Michael need to have a conversation, I've heard from Daniel that I don't think we're going to get changes of date requirement from you, but just confirm that when we come back from our break. So just do an interaction with anyone who's here from your work party, Daniel, over the break.

Erica, you and Michael do the same thing and get back to us in the first few minutes after the break, and then we will come back from our coffee break at, let's say, 10:35, so we'll just stretch it a little tiny bit, and we'll take the next five to seven minutes at the beginning of the next session to make sure that you're all happy with what the dates are saying, because after today's meeting, it's still able to be changed, but we really shouldn't be changing these plans a great deal.

Alright, take what looks to be about a ten-minute coffee break, a tea break, stretching of legs or whatever makes it work, and we'll reconvene shortly. Thank you.

Okay, Negar. Are we ready? Are we set? Let's go, ladies and gentlemen. In an act of extraordinary kindness, not only did I give

an extra five minutes, I gave an extra eight minutes. Dear me. You can thank Larissa for that, actually. She stole three minutes of our time there, I tell you. Yeah.

Alright, let's spend as short a time as is practical now having some feedback from the other work parties as to whether or not anything needs to change. I believe what I was hearing, Vanda and Liu, is that you two did not need to change any dates in your GAC work party. So, can we have that as confirmed on the record, that you at this stage do not need any changes of the dates in your work party? For the record, Vanda is shaking her head yes, and Liu is not objecting, so I think that's a done deal. That can be recorded as formally as a shake of the head gets.

So let's [pop] down to reviews. Daniel, can you confirm that again with the work party reviews, there is no need or any need for any adjustments? Over to you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Currently, tentatively, the answer is we do not need to change the respective dates, which I'll still follow up with constant assessment of whether any changes will be made. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Excellent. Which, Michael and Erica, brings us back to you two. What about communities?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: What about communities? Communities are important. So we were chatting. Erica and I both are going to face challenges. We both have a decent amount of space to engage on this in July in the beginning of August, but neither one of us is going to be very much around for the end of August.

Additionally, Erica may be transitioning to a – do you want to – yeah. She can speak for herself. I don't know why I'm –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Women are allowed to speak for themselves nowadays.

ERICA VARLESE: I was just explaining to – Michael and I talked with pat and Cheryl earlier. I will be transitioning away from the review team towards the end of August for a role shift at my company, so Michael and I were just discussing, one, how we want to handle that, but in the context of the workplan, also how when and how we want to focus our work, especially since Michael, as he said – now I'll speak for you again – has a [inaudible] engagement in August.

So we were both talking about – I don't know if we want to go through it now. We're trying to focus as much as we can, target our work for July to try to finish as much as possible by the first week or two of August while we're here, and then from there, everything else is kind of feedback and editing and things like that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

So Erica and Michael, does that mean you want to keep the dates as you see them in the workplan right now?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

I think that we would aim to be submitting a draft report by – so in my case, August 10th is the hard stop for me, so we would really aim to have a draft report that we could hand over by August 10th and then editing beyond that is fine, but we would probably be aiming for August 10th.

So that's that in terms of dates. We were also discussing the potential for finding another co-chair after August, if Erica is transitioning to a new position, and whether we would be looking to find someone else from the group who could fill that space or whether it would be appropriate to go back to the GNSO, and if Erica is leaving the review team altogether, to find a replacement candidate in that context.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, based on what Pat and I have discussed in a reaction to Erica's good news – let's not mourn the fact, this is good news for her, let's celebrate the fact that she's got a new opportunity. We would like to be in a position to update the GNSO council in our session with them on Monday. And it is of course the sending body who decides whether or not you get to replace or not, therefore what we can do is give them enough time and a timeline to work with. So that's certainly what we're planning on doing.

With regard to needing another co-chair, by this – when you see the end dates here, around that August and September depending on which work party we're talking about, we're not going to need work parties after that, because we'll all be working in a single document. So I guess I would question whether or not an additional co-chair is needed or whether or not a team that's getting on with their job, even if they're just a small team, will do.

Seems to me, sure, we could appoint, but for what purpose? For three weeks? Because we'll be moving out of work party operation and into drafting operation.

So I personally think that the timing is quite good the way it's written now and what's happening with your commitments and new chapters in working life, but if there's any changes you want to make, for example shifting something back to July, let's do it

now so we capture it now. And Pat and I have another reason for wanting this top happen. So confirm, deny, make the changes? What do you want to do?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Are you asking us whether we want to shift the date back to July?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you want to. You tell us what you want to do which makes sense to you. Leave all the dates as is if you want to, or you could make changes to them. Now is the time.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Looking at this now, I would suggest that we shift the final date of the workplan execution to the end of July, and the draft report to August 9th, if that works. And then for our own purposes, we should probably aim to frontload the workplan execution aspect as much as possible, aiming to get it done before the 31st so that we have a little more time so that that preparing draft report aspect of it isn't as crunched together as it is at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For the record, I'm seeing nodding heads from the two co-leads out of communities. Does anyone want to have a contrary view that's in that work party? If not, then Negar, looks like we make

that so, and we note as formal as we can a bunch of nodding heads around a room that that's consent for those changes.

Now, I was saying to Pat, and he and I were perfectly happy with all of these plans not coming together on single dates. In fact, there is an advantage to them being staggered. So very comfortable with the staggering that's happening here. That's okay.

And in the next part of our next session, which we're going to draw a line under, what was the finishing up of our last session and will now start a new agenda item once those changes are made, one of the things we'll be discussing is how we think we might be able to change our plenary work to best facilitate and meet your needs as well.

So with that, if you're resettled, Pat, I'm going to hand over to you for this next little part, which we can go back to the agenda – just so we can put our workplan to bed once those changes have been made. As soon as Negar exits.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: [inaudible] changes. I'm out. Well, not out, but not in here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. But we've captured all the changes that we've agreed to.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I've captured the highlighted cells in yellow are the changes that have been made. I need to edit some additional cells to match the date changes for the subgroups.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We can come back to it. We've captured what we need to, put it aside, come back to it.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct. The essence has been captured.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so let's [inaudible] agenda so Pat knows what he's dealing with now. Let's switch the screen to the agenda. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: [Did you want a plenary discussion?]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's do that towards the end.

PATRICK KANE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, Mr. Kane, the floor is yours.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, so one of the things we want to take a look at in this particular section is the actual objectives that are in the terms of reference, and kind of take a look at them from a smart perspective in terms of how we measure the goals and what are we going to have as the outcomes in those particular goals. So if we go ahead and pull up the terms of reference, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Pat, what particular section would you like me to display?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, sorry, she was asking you a question.

PATRICK KANE: I'm sorry.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I was just asking what particular section of the document would you like me to ...

PATRICK KANE: Let's start with the board work party. Thank you for sharing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Should be ready to go. Let me know if you need me to move it.

PATRICK KANE: There we go. Alright, so when we take a look at these, we've kind of outlined the areas that we're going to focus on when we take a look at each of the objectives and the goals in the section, how do we want to make certain that we're measuring for something within these? Because we've talked about sections here, for example the criteria, board effectiveness and efficiency criteria.

Is there something that we want to measure deeper in that so that we actually know what our metric is going to be when we have success at the end of this or not? What are we measuring for? What are we taking a look at specifically in terms of the criteria? ATRT2 recommendations, I think that that's fairly clear [inaudible] going through and whether they were met or not, but do we want to further define – I think we should further define here what specifically we're going to address in each of these as

we break down the terms of reference goals into what we're going to reviews by what products we need, what documents we need, and those kinds of things.

So if we could start with the board group, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

When I was working in a company, I always hated this part of the work. Therefore, I don't want to have to do that here, please. Let's do the job, we'll try to do the best we can. I don't like the people who try to measure how much I have done or not done. It's not what I would like to. And if we have something to do really, Pat, we have to take the page before and decide who are really willing to work on each of these work parties. And therefore, we will be able to deliver or not.

But if the question is how long I'm going through this or that, I don't know today. I know what I hope to do. I hope that the group will be able to share with them how we will do that, but which measure I can tell you? If I read 10 page or 15 page, really, I don't know, and I don't want to know. Sorry.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you for that, Sébastien. The objective that I had in mind for this particular area and going through this was to make certain, since we just went through a calendar, the workplan in terms of

dates, to try to get a feel for the scope that we're taking a look at so that we are able to put – not to identify far too much scope for us to be able to make those particular dates.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Pat, as a group, we didn't do this part of the work to try to put date in front of each of the topic. If we don't take this document but the document [of] our subgroup, we have – I will take it, where it is, board work – we have currently six items, the TOR, scope of work, resource requested, task and schedule. Task and schedule we didn't start, question is done, and draft report version 00 is not started. It's what I can tell you. If you want me to tell you [inaudible] task and schedule, it's not done, then I don't want to invent. But something I can tell you is that since two months, part of the resources requested are here, and nothing happened. We are waiting for those resources. We can get and check them, and we can take them by ourselves, but I don't think it's our job. Or tell us you need to find the right documents, you need to ask the board to give you the composition of the board. You need to do whatever we ask for the resource request.

But it's now two months, we start to write this and nothing happen. Therefore, we can spend time on discussing if we will do that at what time, but for the moment, we don't have even started

what is obvious. Give us the document we asked for or the resources we need. Thank you.

And I am sorry, you start with the worst group and with me on that. I am very bad at that, and I know. But sorry. I tell you my truths.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Sébastien. So, do you want to take a look at what documents you don't have and what are the things that you still need? Because at some point in time, there needs to be a date which we can identify with some certainty what the scope is going to look like from a delivery standpoint.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Pat, is it in our hand? Please, can you put on the screen our Google doc? The board work party Google doc, and you scroll down to here, all that is written here, I don't know what I need to do to have them. I don't know. There is only one thing I know, is that I have done pretty hard job about the composition of the board since the beginning of ICANN to 2015. I need to update them with last board member. Therefore, I will do. But I know that the board has a long sheet of paper with all the board members, the time they were there. It was done by Steve Crocker, and I know that it's something existing. I don't know if it's updated, but it's something

who could be very useful. But for the rest, the [inaudible] review process, okay, we have the link, something written by the chair of the board. Do we need something else? Can we have something else? I don't know. Maybe we ask for an interview with Work Stream 2 chair person why it's not done here, some of them are here. Then I can tell you we will do, but we have done, we have asked, and now we are waiting for the answer, or we don't have the right person or we didn't write to the right place or whatever.

PATRICK KANE:

Yes, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Pat. Thank you, Sébastien. So we have a list of resource requests in the Wiki page for ATRT3. We captured the requests that have come in, and the list that we have so far are the requests that have come in through the Skype channel. We interactively see that. If the requests are going through your work party Google docs, we don't necessarily know what you're putting in there if it's a request or if it's just content you're adding in, so it would be very helpful if you can flag that. Now that we know you've put it in there, we can go in and capture those and provide information as best we can. It just wasn't quite clear for us to see which one is request and what is note.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, it was already discussed one month ago. We said that it is what we ask for. Therefore, you can say that it was not at the right place – sorry, but if you want a Wiki, Google doc, and we have the Google doc for each subgroup, we have Google docs for the full group, we have Google doc for ATRT, for TOR – no, simplify the work, please. And that didn't change since I guess one and a half months. Therefore, [inaudible] if it's definitive, yes, it is.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: You're highlighting your challenge too, right? Because the requests are coming through so many different forms and we don't necessarily catch all of them. So if there's a suggestion from the group on a better way of highlighting these requests so we can capture them effectively, we're more than happy to take that on and incorporate it.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Negar. Thank you, Sébastien. So I think one of the objectives that we need to identify before we leave Marrakech, since we're all here, is that we go through and sift through each of these documents and make certain that we pull out what is necessary and put it into the single location that you're working off of, Negar, in terms of getting us the documents that we need,

and I think that that's probably what we need to work on before we leave here so that we can actually start our work in the review process. And that way, we can get to a better definition of scope, at least through the month – at least through the early part of July. Okay. Thank you, Sébastien.

Do we have the same issue with the GAC working group in terms of objectives? So Negar, if you go back to the objectives or the TOR and take a look at the objectives from the GAC work party, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Well, from the GAC, our objectives are there, and we have asked some information, and we got three of them. I don't know – I will ask the group if we need more, because we asked for five, but probably, it's enough, three. And I just discussed with Liu, and we have sent e-mail right now asking for a specific detail on communicate. It's just kind of a score card to make sure the process from the [delivery] of the communicate to the board, the board answer, the board asking for clarification, etc. is following the process that they agreed with.

Because I saw yesterday that Kobe communicate was not published yet into the GAC website, and we are already in another meeting. So it's something that we need to make sure all the dates are clear [inaudible] because they agreed with the process,

and we need to know if they are following this process. It's just that. Okay?

So it's what we are doing that. What we have done is most of the document I have posted to the group, and we repeat again in the Skype for them to remember for this meeting the main documents that we have read, and for us, that's it until this time, because now we need to cross-check with the answers from the GAC. That's from my view. So nothing else to it.

If you need to better detail of what is identified and done for each one of them, I need to ask all the others beforehand.

PATRICK KANE:

Okay. Thank you, Vanda. So I'm hearing kind of the same situation that we're at with the board work party, and that is even though we have all the document requests in the same location, we've not necessarily received all the documents, or we have not reviewed all the documents in a manner that we can actually refine our scope to get goals that have more specificity.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

No. What we have asked them is just to facilitate analysis, not assess the document. the document we already have, and the people agreed in the first meeting, face-to-face, what we're going to do with those documents, and this in the end became

questions for the GAC. So it's all link in that direction. So we don't need any other documents, assessing documents. We already have. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Vanda and Pat. So yeah, for the GAC work party, there were five score cards requested. Three have been delivered already. Two are currently in the process of being finalized and developed so that we can share it with the review team. and I don't have an exact timeline for when the other two will be completed. I'm guessing it'll be sometime after Marrakech with everyone getting back, being able to review the content.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Negar. Vanda, if I may ask you one question, what I think I heard you say is that based upon the conversations we're having this week with the GAC, that will also help you to further refine the scope, and specifically what we're looking at?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. Our scope is done. We are focused on that. It's nothing else to – at least until now that we have discussed, we have nothing else.

Maybe some of the interview will bring something different than we expected, but I don't think so. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. Thank you very much, Vanda. So if we can get go to the reviews and get a picture of the same, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Regarding the reviews work party, currently, we are working on objective on, which is assessment of the implementation of the recommendations of the ARTTR2 report, and after finding that there's a little bit of overlap in the work that we're doing, we had to do a slight hold back and wait for the respective processes, the process that is going on from the other respective work parties. Also, a document was shared with a mock-up of what the other work parties are working on, so when the request was made on what exactly they are doing in the review of the ATRT report, we're waiting for that feedback to come in, and then we shall be able to proceed respectively.

Other respective objectives, we shall be able to handle them respectively as they come along, but then also, I think the second objective, one of them was recommended for an external consultant to work on, shall be able to seek more clarification

how we can be able to go ahead with an external consultant regarding to that specific one.

Then from there, we shall be able to also start on the organization effectiveness reviews. That is objective number three. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Daniel. And I [didn't mean] to skip over community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Yeah, why not.]

PATRICK KANE: So Erica and Michael.

ERICA VARLESE: In terms of the goals, Michael, I don't know if you have anything in mind. I don't have anything off hand in terms of setting up the goals. I [know I feel] our scope of work is comfortable, but in terms of the actual measurable, if you had anything in mind, feel free to jump in ahead of me.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No, we talked this through, including at our meetings. We wanted to design it to give us a fairly detailed kind of scope of work while also allowing us a little bit of flexibility to be guided by what we

hear over the next few days. But no, I don't have too much to add beyond that.

PATRICK KANE:

Thanks, Michael. And just reading yours, they're pretty scoped as they are right now. So if we can go back to the agenda, please. Cheryl, just to take a look at one thing while you're out of the room that we are going to make certain that we do it from an action item is working with Negar, we will go ahead and sift through the different areas where different documents have some requests for documentation because the board team seems to have some documents they've requested that they've not received, so we're trying to make certain that we get them all located into one place. So that's the action item we've taken from this particular section.

Sébastien, my apologies.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, we can't wait for a face-to-face to find this issue. We have done all what we can. Osvaldo sent a mail to staff with these documents. If there's something that we have not done, please tell us as soon as possible, because now we will be late, and we can't find the time because we don't have the document at hand. Then therefore, if anything comes to mind of somebody, whoever,

any person who has an idea of what is missing, tell us and we will try to fix it. Because if we wait for Singapore, then we will be out of the game. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Sébastien. I think that that's absolutely correct and that's why, before we leave here, Negar and I are going to make certain that we've captured all of the document requests so that you have them as soon as possible and not wait for another face-to-face to have the same conversation. Thank you.

Yes Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Just wanted to confirm that we did receive Osvaldo's e-mail. It was sent on June 10. Those requests are captured. They are in the works, but of course, it's going to take a tiny bit of time to work through and prepare the documentation, but we have received that request. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Negar. So if we want to move on to the next item in terms of dependencies, working through that. Cheryl, if you want to lead us through this, then I'll man the flipchart.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a plan. Sure. You didn't talk about where we might be heading yet with plenary, did you?

PATRICK KANE: I did not do that, no, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Shall we?

PATRICK KANE: We can, of course.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we can do it at the beginning or the end. What do you prefer?

PATRICK KANE: Well, you brought it up now so let's talk about it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] really to tease them. Okay. Just Pat and I very briefly had a conversation over – you can still get ready to man the flipcharts – over what was almost a tea break, and we think we might be able to come up with a way that by changing how we do our plenary meetings, having a standard agenda, which will be

different than what we've done to date, with a couple of blocks of time, a larger block of time and a smaller block of time, and the smaller block of time will be optional. So there'll be the usual minimum administrivia. But what we will do then is ask the work parties to put in bits of work, like reviewing of these documents, or going through the following or discussing because there's a nexus between GAC and board work party on something.

So some of the work that needs to be done that we heard fears on how it's going to be done effectively with or without meetings, on or off lists, too many or too few people, we can perhaps concentrate into that block of time in each of the weekly plenary meetings.

So that will maximize your work party's opportunities for engagement. Obviously, we would hope that when some of the work parties have a look at the details in their little part of the workplan now, you've made adjustments if need be, where we'd like you to be teasing that out now to almost a little mini project plan in its own right that you might say, oh, on this meeting, two meetings away, GAC work party would like that big block of time, because that's when we want to bring our stuff forward. And see if we can progress things that way.

We'll talk about this more on our Monday week leadership team call. [What it'd mean] is instead of getting a fresh agenda out

every week, we'll have a standard agenda, and the only thing that we'll change will be the topic in the big block of topic A or the little block of B, which is really there for urgent things and things that suddenly come up and have to be dealt with. Have I done justice to our fuzzy thinking?

PATRICK KANE:

I think so, Cheryl. So because we get really good participation from the work party leaders on the Monday call, we can make that be exclusively driven towards roadblock removal and follow-up on action items and those kinds of things, and then be able to take some of the time that we heard this morning that people don't really have in-between the plenaries from week to week, and turn the plenary meeting into specific topic discussions as opposed to getting status updates, which we've done previously in the plenary and taking a look at where's the workplan, where's the TOR, etc., that we can take – since we have 90 minutes, take a couple of long blocks like Cheryl had identified and have specific items that we can discuss as a review team coming from the individual work parties as to whether work parties would like input or validation or that type of item. Is that fair, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Seems to be. Thank you. Okay, so now moving on to our next session, what we want to do is see whether we can go through as

interactively as possible to help you identify any particular dependencies – and I know for example that the reviews work party has already started to identify some interdependencies with – heard the same thing from GAC and board as well, but let’s have a look at in what order we can deal with them and how we can best progress them.

one of the ways we think we can progress them now is by this block of time approach in the plenaries, which we will try. It’s worth a try anyway. DO you want us to help by putting together a first draft of a workplan mini project for your work party based on the timings that you settled in the last session? And then you can add in we would like to have this date for the plenary meeting and this date for a conference call. Or how do you think it would be best for us to progress? How can we help you? Floor’s open.
Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I didn't even raise my hand yet, you just saw from my face that I was about to. Yeah, speaking only for myself, I think that would be very helpful, to develop that kind of a template and allow –you have talked a lot about flexibility for the working groups, but that kind of a template, I think, would be very helpful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. If anyone doesn't think it's a good idea, let us know. In the absence of that, then Negar, looks like we've got an action item to do that for each of the work parties and see what they can make with them. Sébastien, did I see your hand raised?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. What I was thinking we will do here is to try to see what are the common topics and then to see where [inaudible]. Yeah, but after we will have to see when we have this common topic, it's to see where we will fit it in our work. I have to impression that we will need to feed first interaction with the community work party because they want to be the first one to finish due to the dates, and then it will take us through how we will organize our work, I guess. I have this impression at least. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I have a reaction from either Erica or Michael? Anyone else in the communities work party? You've got the earlier finish date, but do you have huge interdependencies? [Are there] predecessors to other people's other work party work which reside in your activities? If so, let's identify them now. Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Nothing's jumping to mind at the moment. Reviews is the one that might jump to mind.

ERICA VARLESE: As Michael was saying, reviews. And Daniel has spoken with us and with the team as a whole about this as well. I think reviews is the one that stands out in terms of having interdependencies, but I don't think in the sense that it's interdependent that we need to – what is the timing? They need to finish before us. I think if we have an output before reviews I think that that's helpful for them more so than us needing to wait on needing anything for us to finish.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, did you have a follow-up on that?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, maybe it's not important, but as a board work party, we have to take care of the way the community selects board members. Therefore, maybe it's not in your part of the work, but we will need to have some interaction at least, and it's why I was saying that we need to do that at the beginning, because you wish to be the first one to finish. That was my thinking.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: If I understand you correctly, you're saying that our work on board and nominations will feed into the board's work, so you need that from us, basically. Not need that from us ,but it would be helpful to your work if that was frontloaded on our side. Am I hearing you correctly?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Whoever does the job, we need to do it, and we don't want to duplicate. Therefore, we were thinking to go through the selection process for all the board members, NomCom, community, the liaison and so on. But maybe it must be a joint effort to the work party and not one or the other. But it's exactly what I was thinking that we will be doing now to see what are the topics and how we will handle that. If it's you, us, or both of us, it's a no brainer for me. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think we've had a lot of discussions, certainly at community, but I think more broadly, we've had discussions not as much about dependencies and one type of work feeding into another type of work, but about overlap. And I think this might be one of those

areas where – I'm trying to pull up what our specific scope of work is and whether we can –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I should have that open.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: But I don't think we would fight tooth and nail if there were areas that were more appropriately taken by board. I don't think that we're going to be overly possessive about certain aspects of it if it would more appropriately be handled by the board subgroup.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You remember of the board work party, therefore it's why I say it's not a big deal, but it's useful that we agree on what are those topics, and then we will handle them better, because if we don't

know you will do a job, we will do a job, and [inaudible] we are doing the same thing. That's my only point.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: So, what if looking at the objectives of the community work party right now, this investigation area will review the NomCom selection of board members, including weighting factors such as diversity ,expertise, board advice, etc., as well as transparency and accountability mechanisms for this process and possibilities for community engagement. It will also consider community and stakeholder representation on the NomCom and the selection process of SOs and ACs in terms of their NomCom reps.

Would it make more sense to carve off that first sentence as being done by the board subgroup and leave us only with the second sentence?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's a proposal, and I would say a good proposal. But really, it's what we need to [handle] with this type of discussion. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: We're discussing it now. Everybody is here. I'm not – are there objections on the community side for doing it that way? Community is good. Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Not an objection. It's just what's going to happen with most of – for instance, GAC with community, what is the perspective from community about the GAC interaction? Will be certainly something that we will ask to GAC once we get [this] feedback, we'll certainly [feed out] your group to deal with that, because it's not exactly something that the GAC could resolve if there are some aspects of not agreement with the community. The community need to propose something to GAC to implement it. That's the interaction that I see with the other groups like in the board and the GAC, and community and the GAC. So it is something that sometimes you can reach asking community and they can complain, or for instance I asked GAC to allow us to have a liaison to them, and they said no. Something like that. And maybe it's something that GAC can explain, but most of the time, it's just – I would like to have more access to that information nor something like that. It's something to work with the community to really – capacity people to understand the job and so on.

So those feedbacks need to be shared to the end of our work. That is as I see that between two groups, because if we don't share those feedback that we're going to get, this meeting from questions, we probably will repeat work from each group in the same teams.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This seems to be strengthening the proposal to do a lot of this in blocks of plenary time to minimize this.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael, I saw some very quizzical looks on your face then.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No, that's all good, and certainly, I agree about maintaining robust information flows between the different areas on that issue and others, but I just wanted to resolve – maybe I don't need to say this, but we will amend this objective number two, and I guess just delete that first sentence. And I'm not sure if anything along those lines needs to be added in to the board objective area or if that's kind of implied in what the board already has in their discussion, but that can be looked into. I don't know if that can be done now or that can be done as an action area.

So that can be deleted from ours, and just to make sure that those action areas are in some way expressed in the board examination so that they're not lost.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That's a proposal on the table. I noticed Pat's card going up. Pat.

PATRICK KANE: Yeah, thanks, Cheryl. Just from a standpoint of making sure we document this and we don't carve up the document completely but take notes on this, what I would suggest we do is as opposed to deleting it, Negar, is if we go through this, take that particular section, and note it as recommended for deletion due to coverage by the board work party just so that we document where everything is moving and at the end of the day, we can kind of go through and rationalize where we are in each of those items. Is that acceptable to the group? I see no objections. Thank you.

so from that standpoint, we should probably go through each of the sections of the goals and identify where we do have overlaps and how we want to address those. So if we could start at the top of the goals section in the TOR, Negar.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And while that's getting queued, just to remind you that a change to the TOR does have some formal requirements. So it would be perhaps better for us to annotate the TOR, and in annotation, reallocate or say that "To avoid duplication, this is now being a

focus of ...” than it would be to do things like actually delete and replace text.

Okay, how do you want to approach this, Pat? Do you just want to do it around the table, or do you want to get the flipcharts out? Because I'm not sure the flipcharts are going to be useful.

PATRICK KANE:

No, I agree, Cheryl, the charts probably won't be useful. So what I would like is, again, to start with each of the work parties. So since we're at the board working party, just have Sébastien or someone from that work party just kind of start to walk through that, and as we identify that we've got an overlap in place, either raise a hand in the participation window or go ahead and turn your card up when you identify that your work party has a conflict with that area, and we'll note it and make a suggestion at that point in time. Very good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I can, a conflict, a dependency on even a complement too ,but if there's something that you go, “Okay, we're working in that space as well,” let's hear about it as we go through.

So Osvaldo and Sébastien, are you comfortable with that or do you want to start with another – we can start with another –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, good. Go for it. Excellent.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you. I guess the first question ,but it's for all of us, it's already discussed, it's ATRT2 recommendation, how we will work on that. The review group have already done a very good job in reviewing the document, and we as a board work party are taking – and we will come back to the review work party to tell them which part we think we need to handle. Work Stream 2 recommendation, we didn't start to work. I don't know if we have specific issue with the other work party. If I go to the board composition, we have obviously the discussion we just have with the voting members, and also with the GAC about the liaison to the board. IF you can scroll down.

I don't think about finance we have specific issue, but maybe your working party has specific issue that they want us to handle or we need to discuss.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It strikes me that there may be a nexus with community in as much as the evolution of the budget process in the past few years, one of the most significant of changes – and we've had the general change and evolving of how the cycle goes, but of course, since Work Stream 1, we've had the very significant change of the empowered community having its particular exercise of rights and responsibilities. So it might be worthwhile making sure that when community work party is interacting with our communities in Marrakech, if we can draw them out even informally on any feedback on that and how it's gone, but that might feed into your work, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Definitely. Pat? Is it in the scope of the community work party? It is very relevant, and it's maybe we need to add some question for the community when we will meet them during this week. And we will come back to you. Thank you, Cheryl, for this input. It was very useful. And then about strategic, we will see that from the board point of view, but we need to see that from the GAC point of view, from the community point of view how ICANN is working on the strategy.

You maybe didn't know, but the board just vote for the strategic plan for the 2020-2025 in their meeting just when we were meeting also, and it could be very useful to have this feedback

from all your groups also about what's happened in the previous strategic planning, but also the last one as it's the first one after the IANA stewardship transition.

If we go through – we have again ATRT2, and we have the appeal mechanism. I don't know if it's included in the community [work] but it's something we will need to discuss together, because community has a role in the appeal mechanism in being very often the requester of what is happening. It's maybe not a full group, but it's usually people from one part of the community who are asking for a review of a decision of the board or whatever.

So that's where I see some link with the other group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks for pointing out those two areas. In terms of the first and community thoughts on the empowered community, going back to our own objectives, I see the first one under community and long-term planning, it says that we will consider how financial planning is impacted by external and relational sources and how these changes are communicated to and informed by the community.

It seems like that would be a natural fit to include discussions about the impact of the empowered community or people's thoughts on the empowered community as a mechanism, so we could certainly plug that in there, and maybe, again, take that as a suggested edit to specifically reference the empowered community so that it remains on our radar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sorry, Michael, just a quick point for clarification. Item number one for community and long-term planning, which part of it exactly did you want to be noted?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: We will also consider how financial planning is impacted by external or relational sources, including thoughts on the impact of the empowered community. That's super broad. Thoughts on the functioning of the empowered community as a mechanism for input. I'm sure we can wordsmith that. Something along those lines.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: And that's interdependencies with the board working group?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That is an – well, is it an interdependency, or is it ...

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Just a modification to that content?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: The second one in terms of board reviews and board appeal mechanisms to the needs of the community, that I find more challenging to slot into our current scope of work. And I don't necessarily see a natural nexus to that, unless we were to specifically add that in.

So that I see as a bit more challenging.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It strikes me – and I agree with everything you've just said, and I think the term is corequisite as opposed to interdependent, because it really is a complementary process.

There might also be information that you might seek in your interactions, which do reflect on the review processes, because of course, now with the new model of the IRP, it is the community that populate the standing group that can be drawn upon. And that's a process that only some of the groups – like I know the GNSO council is only just starting to look at that, but that is an effect on community and action by community. Some communities you talk to might not even know it's something that they need to do. But remember, they also need to understand that they're not populating it with themselves, they're making suggestions for appropriately qualified, I assume usually legally trained, individuals who could be on the standing committee for the IRP. At least as I understand it. Have I got that right? Bernie's smiling at me. That's not a bad thing.

Okay, so we might just want to make sure we pick up that as well.

Okay, sorry.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Since you brought up IRP, I noticed it wasn't included in Sébastien's slide on board appeals, and I don't know if that's willful or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, the reason it's not specifically on there is we've actually taken IRP out separately, and it's one of those holistic – so it was never allocated to a particular work party, it's the plenary as a whole, but that's still something that needs to be picked up on. Thanks.

Have we done - [inaudible] mid-page down on the community ones. There's nothing else that anyone wants to jump in and say we're doing something similar, we've got something that is dependent, corequisite, conflicting, complementary? I'm running out of words that start with C.

PATRICK KANE: Complete.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, complete will do. Looking forward to hearing more of that. That would be good. Okay, well, not at this stage. Let's go down to GAC. Vanda, did you want to take us through this? And people can put up their cards and indicate where they believe they're doing work that is similar.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [Let me just complain.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [I didn't want to hear that.]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, I was exchanging some ideas with Maarten here, and what I see is mostly GAC running quite independently, and the liaison now are the main link with the community. And as far as I know, liaisons are doing a good work for the GAC.

I'm not sure if they are doing a good work for the community. And if they give back the information or the alerts, the community need to think or take into consideration what is going on on GAC discussions.

So the only thing I see is we're going to ask this for community, but I don't see that here is something that is interfering with what the others are doing here.

So nothing to do with the review, they are doing a lot of implementation from the ATRT2, and liaisons was recommended, and some of them was put in place. I'm not sure that's a kind of [GAC] question. I'm not sure if all was put in place because it's not put in place because people don't ask, community don't ask, or GAC didn't answer. That's a kind of feedback that we're going to get. But I [don't] see GAC is quite independent. The big relationship is with the board, not really with the community.

It's mostly – but I do believe liaisons could be improved more and more to be more effective for the community, because community normally making aware what's going on on GAC after the communique [freeze.]

So sometimes a lot of things that some community [inaudible] to suggest to be added is not done, because it's that relation is not exactly what it should be. But we need to go deeply on that question, the communities, and I know only about the ALAC, because we are more connected with them. But I don't know SSAC, I don't know GNSO, and what else, if they are using liaisons as they could to make sure issues addressing to the board by the GAC that could be done with the support of the community is [inaudible] or not. That's one issue that I do believe that could be more explored during those days. But I don't see interrelations with others that will really affect. Okay? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do any of the work parties see anything that Vanda didn't see?

LIU YUE: To my knowledge, GAC [start have] a working group on the [inaudible] make the rules of the liaison from GAC to other community. And also, last ICANN meeting in Kobe, a different

liaison from GAC to other community, they report to all GAC members what the progress.

I think this liaison is more and more formal, and can make progress to connect GAC with other communities. And I think maybe I agree with Vanda that the biggest one, the GAC and the board, is mostly important for GAC since we need GAC advice approved by board members.

And another I think is GAC with GNSO [as you know] for the new gTLD. I think there are some concerns from GAC for the IGO/INGO and the two characters, and also [inaudible] I think. And then they maybe lead to the [inaudible] of the next round, the guidebook of application of new gTLD I think maybe. So I think the most important is GAC and the board, then GAC and the GNSO.

And also, for GAC and also with ALAC, and I remember that for the last communique, [inaudible] on the statement of the [new G,] and also for the EPDP. And also, not only for the AC and SO, also GAC have with some working group like UASG, universal acceptance, and GAC also have some connection meeting with [BCG,] brand TLD group. So we can [ask] them what the formal liaison and also the connection between GAC and other community group.

So I think this is maybe helpful for us to analyze for this. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. But there is nothing really in the interaction directly Work Stream the work party that can be repeat or something like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So you're not seeing duplication across [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Maybe I am a little bit late in the game, but [inaudible] number two of the GAC work party may be split into the relationship between GAC and board and the one between GAC and the community. It will be easier for our group to interact. It's not in our scope, therefore I think the GAC will do the interaction between GAC and board. But if the GAC subgroup needs some input from our subgroup, it will be useful, and I take this opportunity to suggest that in looking at the constitution of the work party, I am volunteering to be a member of the GAC work party to ensure this liaison better in the future.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Maarten is in your group too.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Maarten is in our group, but Maarten is for the board, not for the board work party.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: He is working very hard in the [GSE group.]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So we have in fact picked up that then as some shared activities [in two,] and the suggestion is so if we highlight that, Negar, and we may split that sentence up and just make note on that.

What Liu was bringing forward is very important, certainly is what I was going to mention, and it strikes me that we haven't identified in the GAC work party as specific – we've got specific deals with the technical aspects of the DNS and its effectiveness, but we haven't really got anything there more crisp than number six that talks about GAC interactions with the community and how that could be measured.

It is a vastly different GAC in my observation than it was last time an ATRT ran. The number of activities GAC is now engaged with, nearly all of which Liu just mentioned, the PDP processes and new working groups, etc., I think it's important to recognize that. I believe the GAC will recognize that because they're doing the work, but I wonder if community will recognize that, because they're not directly involved, unless the community member happens to be in subsequent procedures Work Track 5 and sees the additional interactions we're getting from individual GAC members, all of which is important and good, and all of which has been hard work getting there, but GAC will know about that work happening and improvements, the GNSO will know about that because they're managing the PDP process, but I'm not totally convinced, Michael and Erica, that the community will understand about that as much. Maybe. I could be wrong. It'd be interesting to find out though.

We also need to recognize that the opacity of GAC activities has changed totally since ATRT2. We now do not have closed GAC meetings, not even communique. Again, huge change that wasn't the situation before.

So I'm not sure – we need to capture it somewhere, and it may have end up to be a footnote out of community or it may end up to be a footnote in GAC, but it needs to be a footnote somewhere.

Alright. In that case, [that leaves us] reviews, and this should be the last one for the last couple of minutes. Daniel, over to you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much. Going through the first objective, which is ATRT2 assessment of implementation of the recommendations, I'll highlight that when the work started, there's something that came up in the discussion regarding the board, especially when it went to the discussion lists, the discussion one on the mailing list which was referring to how the review of the recommendations given to the board from the ATRT2 report.

So during that discussion, there are some key actions that came up, and then we sent it for discussion through the respective threads, and then automatically, we sent it to – I think it was the board work party, and then also another discussion came up, which was sent to the community work party, and we believe that they are working on that, and during this meeting, we're going to be able to analyze the respective data as we shall be gathering all the respective information.

So still, just to get ourselves to where we are right now, we are now looking at how other work parties are doing, and conducting the respective reviews on how they'll be able to feed into what the reviews work party [is doing.]

If you scroll up, you see that there's point number three of the GAC, assessing and analyzing effective statement of each ATRT recommendation. So that happens to overlap with the objectives of the review work party, and that is also something that is happening in other respective work parties. So, what is the way forward regarding the reviews work party? Let the other work parties continue doing their respective work, then we as the review work party will come back, and then we shall be able to do a proper assessment of the implementation as we carry out really deep analysis and insights of what is missing and what has been captured in the different work parties that they have captured. And that is going to apply both for the communities and also for the GAC. And also, different recommendations were made [inaudible] scope the document report, which you happened to put on hold until all the other data that is being gathered, is being updated in the record. So we 're also monitoring the work that is happening regarding other respective reviews.

Just to add on that, I'll just keep it for that at the moment, then probably I'll come back to the specific reviews in case there's a [area of action] that has to be done from other review work parties. Negar, [inaudible]?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, I just wanted to point out that back when we were working on the works of the different subgroups, the assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations was broken out across all work parties, so each work party took the recommendations that applied to them. So this is not necessarily an overlap, it's complementary work across all the work parties.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Negar, on that. In reference to the work of the reviews work party was doing, when the reviews work party leads, KC and I, happened to sit down and look at the work that was being done, there was duplication of the work, and based on the set of questions that were drafted in the reviews work party document, which every member here I believe has access to, when we started the deliberations of the discussion in each of the scoping of these recommendations that came after the Los Angeles meeting, we discovered that when the questions came up, the question that were coming up that arose during the review of the ATRT report, it was giving the reviews work party a very wide scope of work, of which if the reviews work party would proceed with that scope of work, then all the other work parties would be digging deeper into all the other work parties.

And also, if you look at the recommendations that came out from some of the requests that we made, one of them happened to go

directly to the board, especially when we're looking at the reports, the board reports, because the board has this dashboard where they monitor it, and then we happened to discover that these reports are there, but they do not provide full timelines of implementation of the recommendations that have come from the community. So that becomes one of the challenges, and the recommendation came in. But if you see that recommendation is coming from the reviews work party, what about the board work party? How far have they gone in that respective recommendation?

The same thing happens to the GAC. On the platform, when we're trying to still review the documentation, there was a section whereby all the other SOs and ACs who are making recommendations, but then you discover that there's a link that sends one to the GAC communique. It's totally independent of the whole listings that are on the review.

So I think that shows that the way in which communication is enhanced on the platform does not suit the needs of the community. So those are just little examples of what is coming out in the reviews work party. But if you look at the more detailed work of the ATRT recommendations, it's happening right in the reviews – sorry, in the other work parties.

So, as a review work party, what are we doing about it? Let's see how the processes are going in the other work parties. We continue to do our work regarding the scope of the ATRT2 recommendations, and then we draft recommendations appropriately on what is missing out. So we [bunch up] the missing – I hope I'm being understood. Does that help?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I think so. And if I may, Daniel, it sounds like it's not so much complementary work between all work parties on this item, there might be some overlap, because of how the results of the recommendations are analyzed by different work parties on the same topic. And perhaps further discussions during the new plenary sessions are going to be the place to resolve those, but I can note it as such for all work parties on ATRT2 implementation as an area of overlap for everyone.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Absolutely correct for that, Negar. Let me proceed to the part for the specific reviews. So when it comes to specific reviews, I think the first item is to conduct the qualitative and the quantitative assessment of effectiveness of the previous reviews in reference to section 4.6.

So this scope of work would require a lot of input from the reviews work party, and not only reviews but also from all the respective members that are available on the team. So this section, I think we have to devise means on how we're going to outsource it. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm wondering how much of it is going to be as big a digging exercise for that data capture, because you're doing this at a point where the second cycle of all the organizational reviews is, if not complete, about to be completed during your phase of work.

And associated with every one of those organizational reviews, a document which did not exist in the first round of organizational reviews will have been completed in advance and published in advance – correct me if I'm wrong, because I might be out by a couple of weeks, but I think it'll fit in our timeline, which is the feasibility and assessment of implementation from each of the review work parties.

Each of these organizational reviews has an associated review work party and an implementation activity that looks at the independent examiners' work, which includes by definition the qualitative and quantitative assessment of the effectiveness of previous reviews.

So most of any issues are likely to be published, or at least sourced from that authoritative text, may then mean that you may have clarifying questions to ask that group, but I don't think it'll be as big a data capture exercise as it would first appear, at least that's my very biased view. How am I going there, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

Hi. Thanks, Cheryl. Very good. And just to add to maybe help with some context, there's been pretty significant changes in the way organizational reviews are being conducted now, and even though we recognize that more change is needed, and there is a public comment out on streamlining the organizational reviews of the future, but the first cycle of reviews as compared to the second cycle, which as Cheryl said we're about to complete with the ccNSO review nearing in the next couple of months.

So all those documents are available. I think the board just passed a resolution on the completion of the SSAC review, so a lot of progress has been made, for example At-Large just submitted the first implementation –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's the first implementation report.

LARISA GURNICK: Implementation update. Right. So a lot of work has gone on, and if you need any help with all these different materials and also the level of oversight that OEC, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the board provides, and the board as a whole happy to do that at an appropriate time to kind of help you understand all the moving parts. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for this, Larisa. And I think what's important for everyone to understand that hasn't lived and breathed reviews – and why not? I don't understand why you're not doing it, but apparently, there are some people in this room that don't do that.

But these feasibility documents that are now being done with this second round is when the community that has been reviewed, so community input here is very important, says, “No, this is not feasible,” or “In fact, we're already doing this,” or, “No, they've just got it wrong.”

So it's where SSAC would say, “No, we're not going to deal with that. We're not even going to implement it.” So that will give you an opportunity to see how effective, for want of a better word, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, these reviews have been, because if we're paying our independent examiners to give a whole lot of recommendations, which are then rejected by the community that's being reviewed, that's a meaningful

observation. It's also meaningful if independent examiners' recommendations are being adopted wholesale with nothing but undying gratitude, and I've seen that happen.

It has literally just recently happened in one of those reviews. As shocking a piece of information as that is to most of us, it happened. So that date is there, it's in those feasibility packages.

Okay, anything else from you then, Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much for those respective insight. I think the reviews work party will still have to dig more deeper into how we're going to be able to carry out classifications of these recommendations. But if you look at section B, that is to analyze still on the same issues of ongoing reviews, still there is need to focus on the common challenges with objectivity, efficiency, effectiveness and measurable impacts, especially looking at the CCWG Accountability Work Stream, CCT RT, RDS 2 and then SSR.

So during this meeting, some interviews are still going to be conducted with all the key persons involved in this, and I think it will be feeding directly into the 2B respectively. And also, since my colleague KC is working on the SSR2, she's also going to be doing some work on the information regarding the SSR 2. So I think that

is one of the things that is happening, that we're also looking into other thing.

So I'll stop there for the moment since all those fit into the organizational reviews who'll be coming in as objective three, and then objective four will, when we come to it, that's when we shall be able to drill down what specifically we are looking at in the systemic review. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. And that's a perfect segue to our next section, and our next section on the agenda will be looking at the interactions and the logistics of what we're doing at this week's meetings – pardon me – and getting ready to have our interaction at 12:50. We would expect our guests to be here, plates in front of them, and ready to have a full, frank and fearless conversation, albeit recorded. So it may not be as frank and fearless as it would be if it wasn't recorded.

So now let's look at who we're meeting with, why we're meeting with them and what that may or may not mean. Just off the top, when we're in a particular space, so for example on Monday, which I think is our first – Negar, correct me if I'm wrong, the GNSO interaction is the earliest of all of our interactions, I believe.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, that is correct, and here's the schedule on Monday June 24th, 14:20 to 14:40.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just using that as an example – leave it there for now – and this is part of your agenda, so you should all have this with you. If you're in another meeting, then join by Zoom. That's fine. But at least we'll make a note that you're there.

With the GNSO council interaction, we would like the members of the ATRT3 from the GNSO to be front and center. So I'll be at the council table in my other role. Obviously, then I couldn't possibly shut up for the whole exercise, so – Pat's giggling away there, but if Michael, you can make sure you're there, obviously, Erica, Osvaldo, you guys and Pat, you're the ones who should be leading the interactions and primary. Same goes when we move then to SSAC on the following day. Then it's members in the review team that were here that were sent by SSAC. They should be front and center, with Pat and I as the support team. Ditto for ccNSO, ALAC, etc.

But it doesn't mean that only the GNSO members need to turn up. You're all encouraged to be in the audience for every one of these things, because you may find something that is relevant to your work party that comes out of that conversation.

So whilst we're obviously going to be showcasing the people that they've sent to join this review team, that doesn't really give you all a get out of jail free card. You should also be in the room seeing whether there's anything that comes up in conversation that is captured.

In terms of logistics, have we confirmed the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group one now? Go ahead.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

I'm a member of the GNSO council, so I will be on both sides of the table. Just to let you know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You have a much harder job than I do. You were sent there by both, so you and I can sit at the table, we'll have our seats, but you will be doing the front and center with the rest of the team from GNSO.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Cheryl, I will reconfirm the room. I believe the room that's listed in the agenda is finalized, but I will double check and let everyone know because of the note in there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And just so everyone does know, do look at your map, and see how very far away the meeting with the GAC will be on Thursday. The Palmeraie Palace. If you haven't gone over there, you are going to have to take some time to transition. If you are not staying at that hotel, then you've practically got to get to the furthest other point in the resort, so if you're at the Hotel Du Golf, you've pretty well got to get the whole way across. So give yourself plenty of time. Go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Just to go back to our meeting with the GNSO, I have a conflict in terms of – I have an NCUC EC meeting that is meant to go from 1:30 to 3:00, and my current participation at this session is supported by the NCUC EC. So just to be mindful of the conversation we had yesterday about the person paying the piper calling the tune and all that, I will do my best to nonetheless attend the GNSO meeting, but we'll have to be mindful of that conflict and cannot commit. But I will try.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I would think that Pat and the rest of the team will note that you are doing your work where you should be at that time. Just one second, Vanda. So Erica, if all else fails, you make sure you pick up that if he's not in the room. Negar, and then Vanda.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just wanted to confirm the room for the NCSG meeting, it is as listed in the agenda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Vanda.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah. Just a question, how we will perform the interaction of the group? Shall we [inaudible] with questions? What is the general idea? Because I personally – our group has questions to GNSO [inaudible] SSAC not so much, but to GNSO. So how you conduct this? Each group will have an opportunity to make questions? What is the idea?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we'll probably build this airplane while we're flying it, and we will probably modify it while it's in the air as well.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [That's right. That's normal.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The only group that has seen the questions in advance of course is the GAC, so the GAC are the only ones who received the questions.

I would suggest that we would still want the primaries from the group we're meeting with to run with the questions. For example, the questions to the GNSO from your GAC work party, I believe that Pat, Erica and Osvaldo should be putting them forward. Otherwise it just gets too messy, we spend more time, "Hello, my name is Cheryl and I'm from ...," as opposed to, "These are the questions from the ATRT3." That would be my recommendation. Pat, you're going to disagree with me?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: So it's just to have a general idea how we're going to behave on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Vanda. And for the record, Pat didn't disagree with me. He could have. It's possible.

PATRICK KANE: For fear of my life.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So that's all the logistics. Is there any issues – we've now noted Michael, is there any issue with anyone else who can't be in any of these places that we can note now? Sébastien, and then Bernie.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah, it's a question about the questions, because we have a long list of questions and I don't think we will have enough time to go through all those questions. Therefore, we have built question each work party how we leave these people from the group who will need to decide which ones they will ask, and we keep the other for another period for sending by mail, or how do we organize that? Because one of my concerns is that if we have one type of question to one group and another type of question to another group, it will be unbalanced the type of response we will get, and the big picture will not be there. Therefore, my advice could be that we pick the more relevant questions, but we do that together and the rest we organize another time to have those questions done. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. You've now done the introduction for what we'll be doing for the next 20 minutes in this session, which is now scrolling down to all of those questions, reminding you all that in fact you had intended and you all agreed to send out a survey, and

you now need to work out based on the time you've got in your interactions, because you've got 20 minutes with some groups and you've got an hour with others, based on the time you've got with each interaction, what questions are you going to actually work with here, and then the rest, how are you going to deal with them? Are you now going to put them into the survey, or as you suggested, some other method? So how long is the GNSO interaction, ten minutes?

PATRICK KANE: 20.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 20 minutes. So let's look at the GNSO. Let's do the first one first. Let's go down to – anything that has to do with the GNSO, so that's about it. Roll back up. There we go.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I? The problem is that, I'm sorry, it's not at all like that. Each work party have done question to the GNSO, and if we want to be efficient, we need to put all the questions from all the work party to the GNSO together. If not here, we are looking at the – I guess the question of the community or the GAC, whatever, and then we have from the board work party – we will ask each work party to

make questions to each group, and we have done that, and we have 20 questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As I said, we're shortlisting from all of these – I don't know why we had to go to the end, because as you said, we have them at each level. Each work party put questions forward, many of them to the GNSO, but we need to go through them and we'll do them GNSO first, because it's the first meeting we have, look at what questions we have listed, and work out how many of them can make the cut for 20 minutes' worth of interaction. in other words, which in 20 minutes, three question and a spare, are you going to use? Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Well, in general, most of each group has different questions for different groups. So I believe that from GAC for instance, I have one question for any group besides GAC. So that question is how they feel the interaction with the GAC is just that. And probably, you can shrink all the questions to one or two for each group, not focus on the main group. So it's not so difficult to get all the general [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So regardless of who you're meeting with, one question that the GAC work party – and that includes to the GNSO – wishes to have asked is a question about interaction with the GAC; is that correct? Fine.

So that's put to the table at the moment to be a standard question for each and every one of your interactions. Okay? Do you want to go back up – did you have anything else to the GNSO, Vanda, if we're going to look at that?

So you had all of those other questions. The one about the board members actually I thought was relevant to the board work party as well.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Cheryl, to clarify, this set of questions are from the board work party for GNSO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So you didn't go up to the GAC then. Go up to the GAC. There we go. Right, now we're seeing what I expected to see. Okay, so Vanda, you're happy if other than the GAC who's got all your questions, every group gets asked one question about interaction with GAC? Have we captured that?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes. The questions for the board on other ACs are listed here, the three questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: She's not going to get three, she's going to get one. Pick one, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, the question for all other groups is just that is question for the board.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Number two.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Anyway, the any other I see is how they feel is going on the interaction –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: – with the GAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So that's number three. IS that what I'm reading? Is your community satisfied with interaction with the GAC?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, the GAC. [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, that's the question going to all groups. Are we all happy with that?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright. So on the GNSO and everyone else, we've got that question. Right, now let's move down to the work party of the board. Which one question would you want to be asking the GNSO council out of the five you've got listed there? Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: I would say number one, do you find the board's accountability and transparency satisfactory? Do you have any suggestion to improve it? This is more the wider one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anybody in the board work party have a problem with that? Tola?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: I'm wondering, if we have 1.1, if we can have 1.2 and include number four as 1.2 to the first question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think it'd be greedy. You've got 20 minutes, which if you're going to have interactions, means you can have three questions and a spare, and you've got four work parties. So ...

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Well, the essence of having number four, it's giving GNSO opportunity to say what favors them, because what I'm looking at, if you look at number one, we're asking GNSO to speak about the board, and at number four, we're asking GNSO if they're satisfied with what [inaudible]. In that case, we want to get some reaction from the GNSO if they're satisfied with what the board is giving.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yeah, I agree with Tola, because we have very short time, and the first one, I think, needs some time to elaborate. So yeah, I would go with number four, or number three. Yeah, I would prefer number three, I think, than number four. I don't know, what do you think?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: I wanted number three, but number four has individual components of GNSO, [will] probably have different interaction with the board. And they probably have their own interesting aspect to give to us. That's why I would pick number four. But if number four is going to take more time, then we go with number three. But my preference would be for number four.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, and then Sébastien.

PATRICK KANE: So Tola, when you say each component, are you breaking it down to contracted parties house and noncontracted parties house, or –

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Exactly.

PATRICK KANE: So you don't want to go down to Registry Stakeholder Group and Registrar Stakeholder Group, you just want to take a look at it from contracted parties, noncontracted parties.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Exactly. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, sorry to make [inaudible] can't we ask the member of the GNSO, member of At-Large and so on to decide which questions we'll ask? Because if we spend the time to each of the group, we have a meeting and go through all the question, we are not well organized for this discussion. I think we will spend two hours, and it's not the best use of our time, I guess. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll try and use our time more wisely, Sébastien, but you've had member of the GNSO council and two of the GNSO-appointed members suggest either number three or number four, with a

preference I believe for number four. Is that correct, Osvaldo?
Michael, did you want to say anything?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: You can see it on my face, I guess. So it strikes me that one, three and four are all – four to a slightly lesser degree, but definitely one and three are very broad questions, and it basically seems to me that those questions are going to the GNSO and saying, “Give us anything that you have.”

And I can see advantages in that approach if you're looking to refine your scope of work, but I feel like that can also result in you getting a whole bunch of stuff back that does not really relate to what your areas of examination are, or a kind of grab bag of pet issues that whoever you're talking to has with the board.

So despite the fact that one, three and four are the areas that we've been discussing, if it were up to me, I would suggest that the two most specific questions that I see among there are not one, three and four. It's two and five, which seemed to target more specific areas of inquiry, particularly around – so you can ask specifically around GNSO policy decisions, and you're getting into a very particular relationship, which is how policy decisions trickle upward – things don't trickle upward. Things also don't flow upward. But how they move upward to the board and are handled, and also specifically around the board members that are

selected by the GNSO. Those are very specific things to address, and given that it's a 20-minute session, I would tend to – as I'm thinking about how community should approach this stuff, I'm thinking about calling out the more general ones and really focusing on the specific, because I think that would be most beneficial, but it also depends on whether those ones that I had suggested, namely two and five, address the areas that you think are most important.

So to sum up, the ones that I like best are two and five, but if you're not going with those, I would suggest that the question that you go with, whether it's one, three or four, should be narrowed substantially to address the area that you feel is most relevant as opposed to just presenting the GNSO folks with, "Hey, we're here, tell us everything you want to tell us," because I think that that would have been useful a month ago, but hopefully now, we're at the point where the scoping is kind of done and we should be narrowing down beyond that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, yeah. Scoping is done. Pat?

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Michael, I agree with getting specific, but one of the things I would caution is that with our specificity in the

question, we don't drive it towards the most recent interaction. So I wouldn't want to hear the feedback from EPDP phase one satisfaction or dissatisfaction. So if we could phrase the question to look at a body of work as opposed to the most recent, I think that would be helpful when we do get specific.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, noting that you did suggest we let the GNSO council people decide and you've just heard from them, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. [inaudible] you didn't understand what I was saying before, but doesn't matter. I heard the discussion, and I think we need to [handle] the question five, because it's one with less interaction with today or yesterday, but it's a situation for a long time, since 2002. The GNSO have two board members therefore, and I know that there are in the evolving the multi-stakeholder model some part of the GNSO saying that two board members are not enough. Then it's maybe a good question.

And if we go like that, I suggest that from our work party, we ask the same question to each and every subgroup. We don't spend time [intruding] the other, we take the same type of question, therefore it happens that it's in red, and I guess it's in red in all the documents there on after. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. And yes, I was hoping that the answer to my question if you have narrowed down on one would be, “Can it be the same question asked to each of the groups?” So, how do you all feel about that? Do you want to actually run with five instead of the others? Go ahead, Tola.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay. Hi. I'm trying to balance the objective of even asking the question [inaudible]. I'm having a rethink when Michael spoke about the being specific on the questions. At the same time, I'm checking which of them addresses accountability and which of the questions addresses transparency, and which of the questions address both.

So I'm looking at number five, and we're trying just to be asking the GNSO on the stewardship of the two people they have on the board whether it is adequate or not adequate, and yes, Sébastien gave a feedback of what the complaint has been over the years, two members [for representing] GNSO council is not enough or not.

We have the answer already, because [why do you say] that two people representing GNSO council is not enough? I don't think we're going to have any other answer. So it's pretty straight

forward, ask the question that we know the answers. And that's what I was thinking. Rather than asking number five, are we really talking about the accountability or transparency rather than picking on that I still wanted to go back to one, two or four. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat. And be cautious of time.

PATRICK KANE: Yes. Thanks, Cheryl. I would agree that number five probably isn't the right one, because if we're going to hear something coming back from the other questions that says the GNSO doesn't have enough input in terms of understanding is what goes on with contracted parties or noncontracted parties, I think that would naturally come up as part of one of the other questions if it was a real problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm not familiar, if you're going to be asking these questions of the whole group, of the GNSO council, so you're going to have the whole council in front of you, are they going to select one person

to ask the question, or are they all going to loop in? Because if you're talking about timeframe I'm looking at here, these things run out real quick when you hit a question that a couple of people find interesting, and next thing you know, you've got all your time lost to a certain extent.

Second comment on some procedures I've seen like this in the government, it's been useful to start by asking a very broad question first of saying, do you, party X, the GNSO council at this point, have anything you want to tell us very specifically about before we start asking you questions? Just a thought. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Particularly like that second suggestion. Pat?

PATRICK KANE: So on your first comment, Bernard, I think that we should address the questions to Keith, and have Keith assign someone to answer them. And I'm [certain] we can have that conversation with Keith prior and just tell him that's how it'll work, and so that we don't get eight answers to one question, we get to have Keith go, "So and so." Okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Negar, but I want to come back to that point, Pat, please.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just a quick clarification that we're going with question number one for the GNSO discussion from the board working group? Everyone in agreement with that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Two was suggested as well.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: After listening this discussion, I think we need not ask any of those questions, and we will organize our work in another way, because we have just 20 minutes, and we already have discussion on which question we will ask, and if we ask one, people are afraid that they will answer that, and there are so many constituencies within the GNSO, the new will do the work from the board work party by other means. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Remember, we have agreed to do the survey, so [could be] a very important part of the survey process. Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. I was just going to say what Sébastien just said. I think with 20 minutes, perhaps what we should do is look at the question of different groups and try to see if we can have one common

question for all the groups, because even four questions, I don't know if we have enough time with 20 minutes. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. You've got longer with some groups, but yeah, that would be wise.

Okay. So we have two definite, one very general, accountability and transparency, "what would you like to tell us about" starter, the ice breaker, we've got the one from the GAC. I don't think reviews needs to get a guernsey on this at all, so I'm going to ask community for the question that you want to ask.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: The one that jumps out at me is regarding PDPs, I would say. In terms of – I think that a lot of the questions that we have – anything related to specific procedures that they do and don't have could be handled via survey, and kind of general feedback of what are your thoughts on this, could also better be handled by survey. I think PDPs is where it would be most useful to have an institutional response from like the GNSO as a group. What would your thoughts be, Erica?

ERICA VARLESE: I agree with [inaudible] looking at this, kind of deciding between the first and second, and I do agree, I think pretty much any of these besides the first one could be followed up with a survey pretty easily. It's more of a specifics and will likely include links and documentation that are much easier shared via survey than speaking. So I'm good with that as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely perfect. Okay, well, at least we've got – yes, go ahead, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I don't want to speak for the reviews committee, but it just struck me when we finished having this conversation and listening to how people treat the reviews sometimes, is there room as a general question for the various groups we're meeting to see how they feel about the whole area of reviews in general at ICANN?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would say yes, but there's also public commentary and MSSJ work going on in that area, and I don't think our 20 minutes is the right value proposition for that. So survey, definitely.

Okay, so we have at least our questions set for the one we deal with tomorrow, and we can send that to Keith and his co-leads,

the two vice chairs, so they at least have five minutes' heads up and we will deal with SSAC a little later on.

So with that, thank you for that session. We now have our board. Hello, what are you hiding over there for? Come. Okay, we will be recorded.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: More colleagues joining shortly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten just comes and sits down because he owns the place. Come on in, Manal. So this needs to be – it's only a short time, but what I'd like you to all do is get up, get something to eat, get yourselves settled back down at the table, and let's talk.

Okay, so if we've got the recording starting – thanks, staff. Good, we're up. Excellent. Continue to eat. We don't mind the background of clacking plates, it is a working lunch. So lunch can continue while we're working. Pat and I would like to welcome the board members, and we're delighted to see such a turnout. We were pretty sure we were going to get Maarten, Avri and León in the room, but obviously, you're all taking accountability and transparency very seriously, and we're very pleased to see that.

What we'll be doing in this next little bit of time that we have is asking you first of all – more to the point, Pat will be asking you – a fairly general, open-ended question which should get our juices going and let the rest of you finish chewing your food before you want to make an intervention of your own.

We're certainly seeking anything that we as community members might be less familiar with or less aware of. We are quite sure the board has been doing a lot in the field of accountability and transparency, certainly since the last ATRT. But we just want to make sure that our work parties know what has been going on.

It's a vastly different ICANN, it's a vastly different set of tools, and I suspect a few projects and priorities have shifted significantly. So this is the opportunity to make sure we don't miss something. Hopefully not going to be our last opportunity to interact. This is just a good opportunity to interact.

Just so you know what we'll be doing for the rest of the afternoon with our interactions, because these may be things that then you don't need to raise with us because it is on our agenda, we're having a block of time with the CCT RT, we're having a block of time with ATRT2, we're having a block of time with RDS RT, and we're having a block of time with SSR2 RT who are meeting as we speak but should be finishing early enough to have people come across.

So that's stuff that we'll be dealing with separately, but our time now is hopefully to help us understand – and not just with the specific questions, because we've got a board work party, we've got a GAC work party, obviously we're going to be looking at interactions between board and GAC, bla bla.

As a board, what do you want to make sure we don't miss? And with that, I think Pat's managed to have half a mouthful of food, so over to him.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl, but I think you've set up the question completely, which is, what is it that we don't know that we should be aware of? And I'd actually like to start with you, Maarten, as our assigned member of the review team. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Sure. Glad [to do it.] And sorry not to be in the room, because I feel fully part of this group as well, yet there's also another group I'm fully part of, and we had board meetings this morning. I think directly relevant is that officially, the board adopted the operating procedures. It won't have a big impact, but just for you to know.

The other thing is that I think you see here a reflection of the interest of the board in ATRT. The terms of reference have been

received, and you will get a formal response, the board will look into how it fits into mission and values and things like that, and come back with any remarks the board deems useful in due time.

Other than that, I think what makes it such a pleasure to be part of this is to see the questions that come up, and also to be able to say a part of these questions have been answered and indeed are already things in place.

This morning, we had an interaction about board-GAC, and I was able to point out on the website where particularly this interaction is very well subscribed. So that means you don't need to waste time on it, and you do note it so it does complete full picture.

Another thing that may help is the board is doing a lot on transparency work, and I would like to ask my colleagues to add to that, but for instance in the session that has been facilitated by BTC via me is that we've been able to set for the third time the beginning of the board priorities for fiscal year 20, and that is also a reflection of understanding that it's good for the community to understand what we do and what we commit to, and it's useful for ourselves as well to be organized and focused.

So with that, and knowing that you can always call upon me, I would rather leave the floor to colleagues here to add whatever they want to add whatever they want to share with ATRT3 team

they think is important to take away. So who can I ask? Cherine, would you be willing to speak first?

CHERINE CHALABY:

Of course. First of all, I want to thank you for the terms of reference, by the way, really appreciate that. I believe we've received them as a board, we're going to be working on them, and we have one of our committees, the OEC, under your guidance, [inaudible] will be looking at that and making recommendations to the board, and we're trying to do this as quick as we can. So I wanted to thank you for all the hard work.

I don't know what you know, what you don't know, so it's hard for me to think of something you're missing, and knowing Pat and you, Cheryl, there's nothing you're going to miss, that's for sure. But I just wanted to talk a little bit about the work that Brian Cute is doing in terms of the improving aspects of our efficiency and effectiveness of our multi-stakeholder model.

I think that despite the title of it, he's going to come up with things that affect our accountability and transparency. And I think it is important that there is some link, and there's no duplication, because that team, the work that Brian's doing, they're not going to implement anything or find solution for anything, but they're identifying issues, they're hoping to identify an owner, a home for

these issues, how long it's going to take and how much resources they need.

I guess quite a lot of this issue will fall back to say, "Oh, that belongs to ATRT3," right? So that's why I want to make sure that this dialog takes place and then nothing drops in-between. That would be my take on that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just in response, be quite confident that Brain has made himself absolutely available to ATRT3 and he's in – I won't say constant contact with Pat and I, but very regular contact with Pat and I, and we're making sure anything we do is complementary and certainly not duplicative, and I think you might see as a result of that close collaboration less surprises and more clear recommendations where what we're saying in our report is highly supportive of what will be coming out of that process. Becky?

BECKY BURR:

So if you don't know what we're doing, then there's an accountability and transparency problem, so I'm hoping you know all of this. But I think that it would be particularly important to hear from Avri about the work that the board is focusing on with respect to understanding, receiving recommendations that come out of the specific reviews and various cross-community

groups, and the prioritization and budgeting, and what kinds of tools can be made available to make that process more streamlined, more transparent, involve the community in those things.

I think we certainly had a realization that there are all of these things coming down the pike, and I think this continues from – and also in Avri’s bucket of responsibilities, the understanding and aligning the timing and the cadence of these very important reviews in a way that makes it possible to digest, act on and move forward with the recommendations to come out of that.

And then the other – I don't know where León is, he's around here somewhere. The other very important work is the bringing full life to the enhancements to the IRP process that are the result of the transition bylaws changes. So finally standing up the standing panel and moving that forward.

So my intervention was just to say we need to hear from Avri, Matt and León on those two things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a good order of business. Go ahead. Who’s first?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Avri, thank you, Cheryl. The BAMC is a relatively newly created committee on accountability mechanisms. It's going to have a session later today, and our main focus will be to find a process by which we can actually revive the IRP IOT. We need to repopulate that group, we need to bring new life to it, because we are convinced that it is the cornerstone of the accountability mechanisms across the [transition.]

So we're going to work on this with the organization and of course with the community, a call for volunteers has been issued as far as I recall, and this is something that we cannot do without the community, so we need to encourage you and ask for your help so that new members and new volunteers come in to the IRP IOT to finish the work that has already been done, but we are just not there yet.

So I would really appreciate if you could all help us in bringing in new experts according to the call for volunteers. There are certain attributes that are desirable for the members to have. So if you could please have a look at that call for volunteers and help us spread the word, and if you know about someone that actually fits into the profile, please do send his or her information to us so that we can actually move forward and invite them to join the IRP IOT. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, let me talk a little bit about the – the OEC, as you probably know, is sort of responsible for oversight over the review mechanisms and such. One of the first things that you'll notice, and I'm sure you're going to have a conversation on it in your next block of time, is when we got the CCT recommendations, it was really good recommendations. Oh my word, how are we going to get all this done? How are we going to pay for it? How are going to schedule it? Where do we have the resources?

And then all of a sudden realizing, SSR2 and the others are also going to be coming with recommendations that need to be scheduled, that needs to be prioritized, and all the rest of the reviews over time just keep sort of building a greater body of work that we need to somehow get done, prioritized, staffed and paid for.

So that is the problem that I've been given a sort of shepherd role in, and we've got a paper now that's almost ready to go out to the community, should be going out relatively soon after this meeting, and we talked to some of the leaders of the reviews on it last week, to basically ask questions of, how do we prioritize? Do we prioritize each of the reviews separately? What about when a new review comes out and you've still got an old set of priorities? How do you fit new things in?

In terms of budget, there's various different kinds of ways of getting budget information. Review teams don't necessarily have the ability to budget. They've been asked to prioritize, but as a member of a past ATRT, I know how resistant we were to prioritizing, because they're all important. And how can we say one is more important than the other?

And then when we start looking at the problem of comparative priorities of the priorities of CCT RT, the priorities of ATRT, the priorities of the IDS, the priorities of SSR2, how do we, when we're looking at the organization, looking at finances and such, determine which one we get done first?

And there's various formulas. I hate these words, but the low-hanging fruit formula, there's the cheapest, the one you can get done quickest, the one with the biggest impact but lowest cost measurements, etc.

So we're going to come out to the community and sort of ask questions about that. When we look at budgeting, we're going to say, one of the suggestions is a chunk of potential money is assigned to a review team and you say, okay, I've got this much money. What are we going to do, how are we going to budget it?

Still, we don't expect the review teams know how much things cost, so there's a staff function that would need to go in to help. But does that then limit what you can – no, we've got to take this

but not that because of financial constraints? Is that the kind of control that the community would want on reviews?

So we've got lots of those kinds of questions in terms of priorities. There's the priority of the review team. Do we go for the priority though of everything that's going along to the full community? Do we go to the community and say we've got this priority from the review, now which do you think is most important? And here's the price tag for each.

And the board has not made any conclusions, decisions, solutioning on this at all. It's more at the point of, "Well, it could be done this way, it could be done that way, it could be done the other way," and go out to the community and find out, so which way is going to work best for people?

And then my favorite problem on all of this is, let's say that we take CCTRT, ATRT, RDS and SSR2 now, get them all prioritized, get them all attached with a price tag, and then the next review comes along and some of these are still pending. How do you then have a sustainable system where you keep your priorities and budgets and schedules and everything, and then you fit new stuff in?

So that's one of the problems that's basically in this prioritization, effectiveness and cost type of paper that we're working on that's going to be coming to all of you, and it sort of relates to not the

doing of reviews but what we do with the output of the reviews once you finished it.

And we don't want another case where people say, "Oh, you talked about money, therefore it means that our review recommendations weren't important. And no, it doesn't mean that. It means, "Oops, we didn't really know how to pay for it or schedule it."

So those are the kinds of things, and whether ATRT can make recommendations on some of that once you've seen the paper and such would be a good thing, how it fits into making your recommendation – and I must say, I've read through your TOR and your workplan, it was really quite well done, and certainly a lot of good goals, a lot of good terms of reference and a very detailed workplan that I wish you great luck with. Having worked with some of you before on putting together workplans, I really admire it.

But how do we make that? So that's one of the things that we're working on. We're also working on the reasons the thing's [inaudible]. We have this bottom-up multi-stakeholder process, our core values, we need to do things that are in the public interest. Oops, how do we define that public interest? How do the review recommendations apply to the public interest? How would ATRT or any of the others sort of say, "We have these

recommendations, and these recommendations pertain to the public interest.” Well, what do you mean?

Now at the moment we’re looking at it and there’ll be another paper on this coming to the community at some point, of saying, “Well, you map them to the core values.” If you could find one of the core values that we are committed to, then that’s a hook to hang the public interest concern to, etc.

So I don't know if I covered everything, but those are two of the big areas that are related to [all this.] The other thing we’re looking at that is on your list also is we’re coming to a pause. All these reviews are ending, all the organizational review pass is sort of ending. We want to try and understand how to sequence the specific reviews and organizational reviews such that we don’t end up in last year’s nine reviews going on at the same time. How are we going to live with that? And that’s a problem that the OEC has, and it’s going to be coming out to the community also for clues on how we really crack that particular nut in terms of get all the reviews done, don’t shrink on the number of reviews you're doing, don’t put them off, and yet [don’t get everything stuck.]

One of the things for example that we like – I particularly like – about ATRTs is you’ve got a year to do it, you bite off what you can chew in a year, hopefully, and you're done, as opposed to all the rest of the reviews don't have a deadline. They basically can take

as big a pile of stuff as they feel needs to be done, and then work on it for years.

Now, if reviews are repeating reliably, if the work of improvements is getting done reliably, can all reviews be – and this is just one of those possibilities – can all reviews be restricted to that same sort of ATRT single-year, bite off what you can get done in a year type of schedule? Is this a good thing?

So ATRT could come back and say, “You know, this biting off what you can chew in a year is hard. It’s deadly. Don’t ever put this on other people.” Or it could say, “No, it’s something that can be worked with, and think about it for others.” I’ll stop now, I think I’ve gone on. But those are the things that I think sort of relate to where you’re at.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Avri. One of the things that you said about review teams adding additional work to the list of recommendations that we’re accomplishing, on the other side of that, we’ve got to figure out how to take out recommendations that we’re never going to get to because of the new items or the new priorities. So that’s a rationalization process that I’m not certain we have a way to handle within the community. So thank you for that.

Cherine, I have one for you. I'm glad you brought up the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model that Brian Cote is driving towards, but that's just one of five pillars that we have in terms of the next five-year strategic plan, so one of the questions that I have is when we think about a review team and recommendations on accountability and transparency, how do we help going forward in terms of those five areas that we're taking a look at, and putting things in place and recommendations that help the accountability and transparency of that process itself?

CHERINE CHALABY:

Funny enough, I was going to ask you that same question, but I'll respond to you. So the strategic plan is probably the one document that glues together the community, the board and ICANN Org, in addition to our bylaws and mission, but in terms of operational things. It's the one thing that binds us all together.

We had a long discussion about that on how we're going to successfully implement that, because the three groups, community, the board and ICANN Org, we all have a role to play, right?

We know that Org and the board are accountable to the community in actually doing our work. Who's the community accountable to? And who is going to oversee that? So I think it is important for ATRT to address this issue.

Secondly, we said to ourselves that that strategic plan, for it to be truly a living document, two things have to happen. One is we all have to get the buy-in to it. The community participated extensively, but does everyone get the buy-in? Does everybody believe in those five pillars and we're going to put all our energy, commitment and will to make it happen? How do we make that happen?

The last strategic plan was developed, and I suspect most of us did not, after a short period of time, put it in a drawer and left it aside. And if I ask anybody, do you remember the five pillars of the last strategic plan, you'd probably not remember those, right?

We left it all to ICANN Org on an annual basis to sort of say, "Oh, this was in the operating plan and so on and so forth. Let's review the operating plan on an annual basis." But none of us really took the strategic plan out and say, "Is this connected, this changed?" Haven't done that. We can't repeat that. So I think it was one shortcoming, and I think we can't repeat that shortcoming, so we have to make sure we repeat that.

And the other thing which I think is important is, how do you put in a process for all of us to make sure that at regular interval – and we're accountable to that – the direction of the strategic plan is still valid, that it doesn't need an update?

And the board cannot do this on its own. And yet we cannot have a big production like we had with the strategic plan, so there has to be a way where we together, the board, the community and Org, have an opportunity to review the plan at regular intervals.

Whether it's a year or two years, I don't know, but someone will need to think about that. But we cannot also have it as a big and heavy production, because it will not happen.

So we haven't got that process in place given the multi-stakeholder environment we have to achieve that in a nimble way, if you see what I mean. And if it's going to take us a year to do an update of the plan, by the time that year passes, new trends have come up and that update will be probably not valid.

So we need to find a mechanism for those three things. Sorry, Becky, you wanted to ...

BECKY BURR:

Just to follow up on this, this is an issue that the board spent a considerable time talking about at this workshop, and as we have in the past with sort of trying out things and modeling behaviors for the community, so for example the board now in its resolutions and justifications always says, "This is why what we're doing is in our mission," and we've asked the community to do that.

At the same time, we're looking within our own processes and saying, "Every committee on the board owns a piece of responsibility for the strategic plan," and we've asked every committee to go and report back at our next workshop about what piece of it they own and what they're going to do about it. We're talking about amending the committee charters to reflect that, and I think we'll be coming to the community to ask the community what kinds of things GNSO council, ccNSO, what are the pieces where you have some ownership, and what can you do to make sure we're all really moving forward in delivering on the strategic plan, and as Cherine said, not just blindly following a strategic plan but also making sure as we go through that it's valid, that it's up to date, that we don't need a tweak in the course of it.

CHERINE CHALABY: You made me think of something else, Becky. So we're now, as Becky said, going to change the charter of the board committee to say that anything they do has to be aligned to the strategic plan. Right? And this is just thinking out loud now. Do we do the same for the community in terms of advice, recommendation to the board? Should we also make sure that any advice or recommendation or anything coming up from the community bottom-up to the board is aligned to the strategic plan? And if it's not, what do we do with that?

So it has to work across all level of the multi-stakeholder model. We either believe in that direction, that strategic plan, because this time the strategic plan is really bold and decisive. We identified in it together with the community some four or five very strong existential threats to ICANN, whether it is security issues, whether it is cyber sovereignty issues, whether it is fragmentation of the domain names, of the Internet and so on and so forth.

So if we believe in those, and if we believe in this plan, and we believe that ICANN legitimacy has to continue, that the multi-stakeholder model, we have to protect it, enhance it, improve it so that it serves us well for the next 20 years. We need to follow this plan and implement it successfully.

That's very key for us. If we do that, who is accountable to making sure that all of this happens and gets implemented well? Is the board accountable for everybody, or we all are accountable for each other? In that case, how is the community accountable? Who's holding the community's checks and balances? You are holding us. You are observing everything we do, you're observing everything ICANN Org we do, and we know we're accountable to you. But who are you accountable to? And how are you accountable to each other?

Because there's no point one part of the community implementing one part of the plan, the other community is not.

So food for thought. I'm not saying [this is everything should do,] but food for thought.

Another issue that again you reminded me, Becky and Avri indeed, when you talk about priorities, if you remember some three years ago – I don't remember where we were. There was a community-wide discussion on who sets ICANN priorities. Does anybody remember that discussion? I think Jordan Carter started it, and then we went on and we had a panel or a top table and we had discussions.

And the reason for that discussion at the time is that the SOs and ACs, the board, ICANN Org, everybody has their own priorities, but we seem to be all calling on a very small pool of resources to achieve our priorities, whether they are the volunteers or ICANN Org.

And we said, we can't continue like this because we don't know, are the GNSO priorities higher than the ccNSO priorities or the GAC priorities or [inaudible]? And we said we need to find a way of having those priorities discussed in some form so that the allocation of resources is done in an equitable way [inaudible] and then the whole conversation vanished. It was too difficult to address. Right?

And I wonder if that's something you might want to think of as the ATRT3 group. Who sets ICANN priorities? And there was a

discussion that said the board should do that. And then I pushed back at the time, I said, well, the board is not going to tell the GNSO or ccNSO what their priorities are. That is not the issue. The issue is that in everybody setting their priorities in silos, how do we make sure that the optimum use of the very limited resources for us so that everybody achieves their priorities? And we have no answer to that, and then it was too difficult, it was parked away.

But it's going to come back to us again, because again, as we know, the funding for ICANN Org is plateauing. Everybody is trying to tighten their belt, which means that the availability of resources is limited too.

So how do we know that the priorities are also getting, in a way, more reasonable in line with the resources we have? A question for you to think of. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. We've noted that. I'm taking a queue as we go, so we'll be going to Sébastien next, but of course, we also have as part of our workplan to look at Work Stream 2, and a goodly amount of Work Stream 2 recommendations and outcomes did have to do directly with the accountability of the SOs and ACs, and considerable discussion went on-- worthwhile revisiting, no doubt – at that time regarding accountability between ACs and

SOs as opposed to within ACs and SOs. But the foundation work is there for us to deal with.

I've got Sébastien and then I've got Tola. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Cherine, I think I would like you to be more, I will say, precise. Do you think that it's an ATRT3 responsibility to look at that? Is it a question from the board to us as a group to put that into our workplan? And I have no problem with you saying yes or no, but I think you can't just say – think about if you think that it's an important topic and we need to prioritize that in our work, we need to know, because the next ATRT is in five years.

The second point is that I am a little bit puzzled that you say that the board working group or whatever the name you gave it will need to work within the strategic planning, because the role of any board – but ICANN board also – is to look at the future, to look at the strategy for the future, not just the strategy we already set up. Therefore, if you bound the thinking, the discussion and the reflection of all the board working group to the current strategy, you are not fulfilling what I think is one of the most important roles of a board, is to look at strategy for the future.

And the question about who is accountable to whom, it's a discussion we have since Work Stream 2, and I still feel that the

only body in this organization who are members from all parts of the community and part selected by the NomCom to be short is the board, therefore the board needs to have some responsibility in defining the priority, because if not, we will end up to set up another board with community and only the community, and to do the same job. Then I don't think you can just say, "Hey, I will not fix any priority for GNSO."

You as the board are the only body who have a global view of this organization with participation from all parts of the community, and it must be your responsibility. You like or not, I think you must take it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cherine, if I may, can we just take Tola's question? And then you might answer very briefly, because I'm aware of your time. Tola, very quickly.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay. You need some time to write this down?

PATRICK KANE: Go ahead.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay. Two things. Sébastien has talked on one part of what I wanted to talk about, and I'll talk on the second one. The first part which Sébastien mentioned has to do with who the community is accountable to. My thinking is it's a difficult question in fairness. I know multi-stakeholder approach is bottom-up, and we never know what each of the constituencies are coming up with.

But I'm thinking [human beings set up] system for human beings to respect the system eventually. So we see in corporate world, in every part of our lives, on the roadside you see traffic lights and you stop. Some human beings put the traffic light there for human beings to respect the traffic light.

So I'm thinking for community to be accountable to be each other, a system must be put in place. When a system is put in place by the same community, every constituency of the community becomes accountable to that system. How does it come up, how do they come together to put up that system, I don't know how that's going to work out, but maybe the board can [inaudible] community for every constituency to come together, put up a document to [inaudible] system, and everybody becomes accountable to whatever system is put in place. That's the first point I want to say.

The second point is you did mention we have a couple of reviews, like last year like Avri mentioned, about nine of them come

together, and you're wondering which one do we respond to at some point.

My thought is each of those review teams have recommendations, and perhaps what we should be looking at is, do we transform KPIs out of those recommendations?

Now, if we transform KPIs out of those recommendations, the board needs to now sit [and check, out of] these KPIs, which part of them are we able to actualize, and why don't we actualize the remaining parts?

And whilst we were able to implement what is a compliance? If the recommendation says do certain things, you convert it to KPIs, what is the compliance of what you have achieved?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tola, time, please.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Yeah, so if we're able to aggregate these, then I don't see where there'll be conflict. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure that the second – the question – I mean you've presented information. It's not really a question for the board to

be answering, it's more something that you might end up having raised in one of our reports [inaudible].

Very aware of your time, Cherine and board members. We're a couple minutes over. If you can answer anything, please do. If not, we're more than happy to take things as on notice.

CHERINE CHALABY:

No, I'm very happy. First of all, I'll answer all of Sébastien's three points, because they are important.

The way we're thinking about it is that we always have in the back of my mind that this is a bottom-up multi-stakeholder model where things come from the bottom up to board, not top down from the board. So that's number one.

The board does have a leadership role, because the community asked us to do things, but not leadership role in terms of command and control, leadership role in terms of facilitating processes, in terms of thinking ahead and helping the community come along with that thinking ahead.

So when I talked about the future thinking regarding strategic plan, you should know that today, we passed a resolution asking the board to annually review the trends and annually making sure that on behalf of the community, we are thinking about the issues and how it impacts and how it evolves the strategic plan.

That is given, and the community expects us to do this and expects us to share this with the community and be convincing the community. The question that I was really raising is not this. The question is, when you want to implement changes to the plan, and that plan is not the board's plan, it's not ICANN Org's plan, it's all of our plan. This is one plan for all of us. How do you make sure that everybody buys into the change, and whoever's responsible does their own bit as well? And who's accountable?

I know that the board is accountable to the community and the board will do its work. I know ICANN Org is accountable to the board and the community, and we have oversight. I don't know today who's the community accountable to and how. I know how the board is accountable, I know you have the empowered community and you have seven powers in your hand to make us really – there are no reverse powers in the other direction. And I'm not advocating for it, but you mentioned revisiting Work Stream 2. I think that issue was not solved in Work Stream 2 in my view. It needs to, otherwise the strategic plan, there's no real guarantee that it's going to be implemented successfully. That's point number one.

On who sets the priorities, Sébastien, the board doesn't have a mandate to tell the ccNSO what their priorities are, nor the GNSO. We're not going to tell the GNSO how to do their work or ALAC. We don't have that mandate.

So the priorities are – there are two sets of priorities. There are priorities set by the strategic plan, which we all bought into, so those are overarching priority for all of us.

Then each stakeholder group has their own priorities. My point about these, each stakeholder group have their own priorities, those separate priorities demand help and resources, and there's a finite group of resources, volunteers or ICANN Org people. How do you then coordinate these priorities so that equitably, all these priorities get served with that finite group?

That's the discussion we started, and if you want the board to make that decision, you need to mandate the board to make that decision. But I don't think it is right. I think the community with the board have to get together in striking a balance between these priorities so that the resources are used efficiently.

I think I've addressed – Avri, do you want to say something?

AVRI DORIA:

Just a few words, not too many because do have to move on and you have a schedule that moves on.

I think that the passage isn't just form bottom up, because when the board gets this aggregation of the bottom-up demands, the bottom-up priorities and issues, it then comes back and asks questions. It asks questions to how to understands them. It

juxtaposes the priorities of one against the others and says, “But wait, what do we do?”

The board also has a responsibility to sort of maybe not send down priorities to groups but to say, “Hey, have you noticed what's happening in the world here? Is this something that's yours? How are you going to take care of it?”

In terms of a solution space that includes things like KPIs, I think that at the end, once you get all the way down to how the organization is going to implement things, yes, they'll fit into that kind of pattern, and then they'll fit into that so that you can see them on the dashboards and you can track them.

One of the things about reviews is that those things that are getting done are supposed to get on dashboards. You guys will get to evaluate how good the dashboards were, how accurate, how up to date. That's besides the point, but they're a mechanism. The KPI is a mechanism.

So bottom-up doesn't mean that it starts at the bottom, goes up and that's where it ends. There's a constant flow of, “Well, this is what the bottom-up said, but how do we do it? How do we put these things together?” And that's part of the mechanism, part of the things I can talk about forever. But León wants to put in a couple words, and then –

CHERINE CHALABY: I have to apologize, I have to go. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah, I'm sorry I have to leave too for the same meeting, but we're looking forward to our GAC discussion on Thursday. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: So just to add to what Cherine said and to elaborate a little bit more on Sébastien's question and concern about the board strategizing for the future and not just getting stalled in the current strategy, I guess the intent or the spirit of saying the committee should focus on the current strategies more to respond to many comments that we received in the public comment period on the strategy, on the publication for the strategy.

We receive many comments asking us to be clear as to map our actions to the strategic plan, so it would be best if the board was able to say, "Okay, so we are doing X because it maps or ties to strategic objective Y or Z."

So I guess that is what Cherine meant saying, "Okay, committees should map the reactions to corresponding strategic objectives in our strategic plan. But that doesn't mean that we are not going to

continue reviewing our strategic plan and adjusting as it fits as time comes. And of course, we'll be doing a continuous strategic planning to help the organization and the community adapt to the upcoming challenges.

AVRI DORIA:

And I should probably get my mouth washed out with soap for what I'm going to say next, but the strategic plan is not a dead document that's written once and that's the end of it. What's happened in the past is it's been written once, people like me in the GNSO said, "Eh, board fluff, who cares?" I can't get away with saying that anymore.

And to say it's a living document would be going too far, because it's periodic. It's on the year, it's on the review. But basically, a notion of constantly reviewing our priorities, and that is something that brings in the new priorities because something has happened in the last year and that forces you to think about your priorities continuing on and into the future.

I've got to run to another meeting. I'll be back wearing a different hat in a couple of hours. And I'm happy to talk about more of this anytime you find me. I talk too much, so anytime.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: And I just want to thank the ATRT3 team for having us and providing us with the opportunity to actually come to you and exchange points.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The beginning of many interactions, but a very valuable one. So thank you. And if I can get the team to do the normal. Thanks very much. Okay, get up, stretch your legs. I don't see [JZ] walking in the door yet, but he will soon. If you wanted to grab a pastry or something, now is the time to do it, and we'll get started as soon as our next guest arrives. And if he doesn't, we'll go over what we've just learned. Yes, Mr. Ombuds. Would you like to talk? Either that, or you're [Ood] –

HERB WAYE: I need a drink, my mouth is [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I think – isn't that the [Ood] from Dr. Who?

HERB WAYE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to just take a moment to introduce you all to Barbara Curwin, my adjunct who will be with me and possibly attending some of your – you may see her name on some of the chat rooms and the online meetings you have as

she familiarizes herself more and more with the organization and the various working groups and stuff. So she's here with me in the back of the room, and just wanted to say a quick hello from both of us. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And welcome, Barbara. It's good to put faces with names. I know you've met a few of us, but it's great to have you all taking such an interest in our ongoing work.

Okay, so up, stretch your legs, and we'll start our next session when we can. There's a little bit of wiggle room. I'm just going to stick my nose out the door and see if I can see someone familiar.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, folks, if we could go ahead and kind of go through the questions for the SSAC, because that's our first session on Tuesday, correct? So if we can look at the questions that we have for the SSAC, same thing we did for the GNSO questions, I think that'd be helpful while we take advantage of the time that we don't have anything going on, that has been handed back to us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Generously returned.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Since we have the GNSO questions highlighted, which other group do you want to move to next? Do you want to look at –

PATRICK KANE: SSAC next, please, just because that's our first session on Tuesday. Then we'll kind of go in order because we need to pick up some more time during the week, we can do that, but let's get SSAC knocked out first.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I was just going to note that the questions from the GAC working group is the same for all the [SC,] so we can just move past it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I think what we might do is move our final selected questions up underneath each of the actual – where we're going and whens, and if possible, we can distribute that block separately to everyone, and other than the GNSO questions, if we have time, we can polish them if needs be now. But then we can just get a little bit of feedback overnight and then make sure we send them out.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Great suggestion, Cheryl. Will do. So the first block of questions for SSAC are from the board working group, four questions listed here.

PATRICK KANE: So Sébastien is not in the room, so Osvaldo, can you take those, please?

OSVALDO NOVOA: I would say number four – sorry, how long do we have for the SAC? Yes, so it’s a short session. I would say I would go for number four [inaudible] SAC feedback regarding the [presence] of the liaison to the board.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I ask why?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Well, we are going to start the SAC process for selecting the liaison to the board, and we would like to know also how the SAC feels about – if it ‘s useful or not to have a liaison of the SSAC in the in the board and what is the benefit of it.

PATRICK KANE: So just to maybe granularize the question that Cheryl asked, how does this lead to an accountability and transparency issue? Because I think that with one of the missions being the security and stability of the DNS and identifiers, it seems to me that that might be kind of a motherhood and apple pie type question

where we're like, "How do you feel about it?" "Well, we like it." Right? So I think it's appropriate to ask the questions around the liaison in terms of their role as a full board member without the right to vote, maybe along those lines, because it seems to me that until they implemented term limits that it really could have ended up being a for life-type position, and therefore, what influence does a person have in that advisory role when they're a member of all these different committees, traditional board committees like compensation and those kinds of things in an advisory role when you're not really in an elected or identified through the normal board process and have into those areas?

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Well, what we discuss about this is that the liaison members in general fulfill a communication function from the board to its electing body, in this case SSAC. So the SSAC would see the board work from a more near point of view through their liaison. That's what we thought. And the liaison also serves to bring these SSAC technical opinions to the board. I think it's a technical assistance also.

PATRICK KANE:

Bernard?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Osvaldo, just from my personal experience, being the two, liaison and board member, the liaison has the advantage to be independent and the liaison represents the interest of the community inside the board, and the member just is the whole entire organization that is taken into account.

So you have advantage, more than disadvantage, sometimes, because of this particular issue to be liaison, you maybe not vote, but you influence as much as any member, and by the other side, you can defend and apologize and/or explain and have all the independent position defend your community inside the board. That's the advantage of being liaison inside the board.

The member is for the whole community. The member does not represent the community that has elected him. So it's two different positions, but both have advantage, and the SSAC always – [I have been in the SSAC sometime] – think that liaison for them is more comfort than a member itself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I guess that's part of the reason I asked why; because in all of my interactions with them over the years, the advantages that Vanda has outlined have been a core principle. They are an advisory committee on a very important function, and this setup is exactly how they want it to be. So it could be a very short answer, we'll gain [inaudible] minutes back and we can put in

more questions from other groups. But we also don't have to ask one of the board work party questions. That's fine too.

PATRICK KANE: Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Sort of getting my sea legs on this now, so I'll pick up on something Osvaldo said. After the GAC, the SSAC is the group in ICANN that can provide policy that is close to scripture here, and if we're talking about evaluating accountability and transparency, it seems we might want to think about touching on the fact of how that advice gets generated to have such an impact on the whole community, because let's be clear, that advice will reach down all the way to the gTLDs and the people who are actually using domain names. So I think that's an interesting angle.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Bernie. I think that's absolutely correct, but I think that's kind of the question from the community. That would be a community question, I would believe, because the example I would have here, I know it's fine line, but the question that I would have here, an example for number two, which is kind of where I would go on this, is if you take a look at the new gTLD program

and the SSAC offered a program around name collisions, and there was nothing done – I know it's a painful topic.

So the name collision advice was not accepted, it was not talked about why it wasn't for a great period of time, and it delayed quite frankly the new gTLD program, and as a competitor in that marketplace, I won't say a whole lot, except that we probably have a budget problem today because of –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible]

PATRICK KANE: Correct. So there's real implications to the community on not following specific advice unless we have specific reasons why.

OSVALDO NOVOA: The only problem I saw with that question is that I was afraid, first, the time it would take for them to answer, and also, that there are several cases where there might be some misunderstanding between the board and the SSAC, and it could take some time.

I think our idea was to do a survey with the rest of the questions, because some of them we need their answers, but I don't know how long it would take to get an answer if we put the problem you had with the board. That's the issue. But we would like to have an

answer on that also. So if you think that's more useful, I could agree with you on that, but I don't know how long it would take to answer.

PATRICK KANE:

So Osvaldo, I think that that's right, and maybe it's how we phrase the question and say through the use of an example – not give us every single thing that we think is a problem, but an example, at most two examples, where have you been dissatisfied with the response? Yes, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes, just a suggestion. I believe that maybe the problem is not to have a more clear process to send the advice, get the feedback, how to have this feedback clearly understood and imposed or not imposed for the community – those kind of things may be the problems with process, and we need to try to get this feedback from them, because it cannot be ignored sometimes.

PATRICK KANE:

So again, Vanda, I think that's accurate, but through the answers, while they may address specific examples of advice, we can certainly use that and derive root causes in our analysis of that as well to inform our recommendations.

Thank you. Let's go to the next section, Negar. And this is community; correct?

ERICA VARLESE:

Correct. I know I said this on the last one, but it still kind of holds true here: I would say I would think it's most useful for us to focus on either the first or second question there, and I'd kind of leave that up to the rest of the group. I just think in terms of the amount of time we have and what we want to dig into with the different groups, those two still stand out to me as being the most relevant and the ones that we could probably make the most use of in this time.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

You said PDPs, right? The first one? Yeah, I think that in terms of the transparency processes for every SO and AC, not to say that that's necessarily a survey question, but that's something that we can get back from the leadership by following up directly.

So I agree with you that PDPs is the way to go, because that's the one that I think would potentially lead to an interesting exchange. That's not a yes or no question, the way the second one is. That's the kind of question where you get all the leadership together and make them chat about it and give you some interesting feedback. The question about transparency processes within the SOs and

ACs, we do need to get back, I think from the leadership, but that might be better if we went directly to them via e-mail to get that if that was an option that's on the table, which presumably it is.

And I can actually potentially save us a bit of time if you agree with this. I would say that we should be focusing on that same PDP question for all of the different groups, except for ALAC. I would say for the ALAC, we have that specific question about accountability, and that's the one that we should go to. But for all the others, I think we can just stick with the PDP and policy development question.

PATRICK KANE: Alright. Thank you, Michael. Negar, do we have another section of the SSAC questions?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: This is the last of it.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. So the one I would add – I know it's not been typed up – is how does the SSAC rationalize the diversity requirement – because they tend to be not a diverse group – with the lack of term limits, and size limitations with the number of people that are a member of the SSAC?

So how does SSAC turn over its – if it's going to be a constrained number of participants, how do they get turnover in that environment to create more diversity or to bring in new ideas and new thoughts so it doesn't become an advisory committee for life? Yes, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Just to remember, SSAC is a group of very deeply technical aspects, and to make it more diverse in gender for instance will face the difficulty to find more people, more women, focus on that kind of interest.

Second, the process that the group agreed – I was working on that at that time – to be the best solution for them to not put people there that have no clue about what is going on is to have reference from the others in the group. So it's for indication, and after the indication for one member of the group, the people are interviewed, analyzed and there are records in this area, and then accepted or not.

So it's a restricted group because their responsibility to address recommendation demands a very deep knowledge of the issue. So it's impossible to demand that more women or more South American or more Russian guys, whatever, goes there without that kind of selection that is capacity.

So I don't believe that we'll change this way to select the people to be more diverse, because diversity is, for them, limited for the pool of the people that they can select with. It's not so far, so big one.

PATRICK KANE:

And I understand that. And thank you, Vanda. I think the diversity in this scenario goes beyond gender and geography, because it also goes into skillset. I would contend that there's not enough members of SSAC who have registry operations experience. We have a lot of security researchers, a lot of networking-type people, so from skillset that you can draw from, I think it could use some more diversity.

I also believe that if you look at the RSSAC model to where you have a caucus where they can pull form to have additional people because of skillsets to participate in work parties in the RSSAC, that might be interesting for the SSAC to take a look at as well to increase the number of people available to work on specific items.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

So maybe suggest skillsets, because they will diverse for the gender and regions and geography and so [on.]

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Bernie, you had a question?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You said everything I wanted to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But not everything I wanted to say. Definitely want to say that that needs to be narrowed down with skillset diversity. And it's important that we probably phrase the question that makes it very clear, recognizing the unique purpose, structure and function of the SSAC, given lack of term limits, how does SSAC think it may be able to deal with skillset diversity and create a more – so leave it almost more open, but I think I need to remind you all, we're not an organizational review. Just saying. [inaudible] organizational reviews.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Cheryl, could I ask you to please repeat the first part? You said recognizing what?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Unique [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: The next item is ccNSO, so I'll just move us to the board questions.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah. Since we didn't deal with it under community and I'm going back to SSAC advice, and maybe another angle on it for accountability and transparency goes to how to select the topics on which to give advice.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I think let's capture that. It does sound surveyable to me, but anyway. Daniel, there was a huge sigh and a raise of your card.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think that [analyzing] the process, does it mean that you want to check the process with which they get the key topics they come across? Because most of the topics come from recommendations based on an occurrence that has happened.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the ccNSO. We've got the standing question from the GAC, we've now got the proposal for the standing PDPs question from community, noting you're asking them about all PDPs, not just country code-based ones, so you'll need to make sure that that's obviously when you frame that question. So we'll just need to tweak that question a little bit to make sure it's clear what we're asking.

That's two questions. How long have we got with them?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: 30 minutes. You're correct, Bernie, it is 20 minutes only.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are we going to start with this as another SO? Are we going to start with one of those warm-up questions about what we would seek, general information and opinion on the ccNSO council's view on current state of accountability and transparency of the organization? Something along those lines, something very generic? Or what? Go ahead, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: If they get this cold –and they won't have time to deal with it even if you send it to them at this point – they will not answer in the name of the council. I can tell you that right now. But I think it's worthwhile just sending up the question to get the conversation going. But if we've only got 20 minutes, we're going to be limited to two or three questions at most, and this is probably one group where you will get multiple people wanting to answer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've got which two questions now, We've got GAC standard policy development process standard. Do we want to just say, "Is

there anything else you'd like to share with the ATRT about accountability and transparency from your perspective?" It works? Yes, Bernie?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I know Work Stream 2 is in reviews, but given the comments we got from the board members on accountability of the SOs and ACs, are we asking how they feel about the SO and AC recommendations that came out of Work Stream 2 and if they're doing anything with them?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we hadn't lined that up for these interactions. We certainly can and should with later interactions, including the survey, but because the implementation of Work Stream 2 is simply not started, it's almost early. I know that seems bizarre for something that's taken that long.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's a bit of a loaded question, because I'm aware of certain activities that are going on, and I think that certain SOs and ACs are thinking about those recommendations, because they see them as a little bit different than the other recommendations which affect the Org mostly while this one is [so just] start getting

a feeling, if you will, about moving that chess piece one more piece ahead. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I think it's one of those, "Yes, we should, but not in the 20 minutes we've got." That's all. Are we settled for SSAC? Moving right along –

PATRICK KANE: ccNSO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ccNSO. One behind.

PATRICK KANE: The answer to your question is yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Thank you, Pat. How about the next one? Is that settled too now? Good. Yes.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Next session is on ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've got an hour with ALAC so you can squeeze in more questions, but again, you'll get more people interacting out of ALAC.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Next session is the board working group questions, and then we can move on to community afterwards.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noting we've got the standard one from GAC. What's the feelings?

PATRICK KANE: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Board work party, yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: The standard question is a question from the GAC work party regarding whether the community is satisfied with interactions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And there was other groups getting the standard question from communities to do with PDPs, but in the ALAC, it was the question

relating to the accountability, so we'll have a different one. Do we want to go down to that now and come back to this one?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think we will treat all the SO and ACs the same, and if we do by questionnaire, we will do those questions by questionnaire also. Therefore, don't take the board working party question into account for this discussion. I think it's better equality of treatment. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine, Sébastien. I appreciate that. And certainly, the one that almost sounds like a pop quiz as to whether or not the people sitting around the table understand the board member selection process would definitely be more of a survey and less of a Q&A around the table even in an hour.

So you've got time possibly for another two questions, but why don't we just run with one and have a spare rather than wedge it in? What do you think? So the question you want to add from the community, the ALAC group, is number three; correct? Formalized transfer policy process; is that correct? Is that what you wanted, Michael? Erica?

ERICA VARLESE: I believe the one that Michael was referring to was the second one since that's the only ones that's different and specific to the ALAC that we had in our questions. So that's what I understood him to mean as well, and then that's also what I would go for unless he disagrees later. But that's what I was thinking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, he's not here, you can make the executive decision, Erica. Go for it. Okay, and we have these with us anyway, but we just want to be able to send a few primers to everybody. Again, do we do the generic, "What would you like to tell us about?"

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I was thinking or suggesting that we could also include question number three and the follow-up of question number four. I think that would be very good, especially in looking at the transparency process. I think it's an interesting one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll have to go back and check, but I think they answered question three in our Work Stream 2 work when they replied, if I recall

correctly. So we've got that actually formally documented. And question four, that's an interesting one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] gets very short answer. Could be yes or no, but could be they don't know, which is equally possible. So yeah, I'm not convinced that there's a benefit for asking those questions, Daniel. As Bernie said, we do need to – before we put out the survey, remember, we've now then got a larger selection of questions.

When we are then culling those questions to make an intelligible, harmonized survey, then we will also look at recent, if not current, documented evidence to see whether or not the answer will be, “Go look it up, we answered that last week to the other survey with the other group.” So in the case of Work Stream 2, that's what you get back on this one. So we also need to do a general tidy and make sure that we're not asking things that we, to be honest, if we had done our homework, should know.

So let's move then to our NCSG – and if memory serves, they asked us for something specific. We didn't ask to talk to them at all. So, can you bring up that e-mail?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: While Negar's doing that, there's one question I wanted to ask about the ALAC set of questions from the community. Erica, what were you guys hoping to pull out with the information, transparency and the open data initiatives question?

ERICA VARLESE: I know Michael was working on that one, it was based on the language in our scope of work that I can pull up really quick just to reference just so I'm stating it correct. Let me just see real quick. What do we have?

Yeah, so I think that was part of the objective number four in our terms of reference, and I'm kind of reiterating what we already said, but basically, we were focusing on community access to information in that one, so just looking to understand people's access and the efficacy of these processes. So I think we just wanted to dig in a little bit more to if people had used those and what their experiences – sorry, you meant the transparency initiative, right?

Okay, sorry, I totally jumped over that. Yeah, I'm going not sure myself. I kind of want to let Michael answer that. I know that he had worked through that a little bit more and came up with the language for that. But again, I do think we were looking more into the transparency – it would fall under the community access, but I'm failing to draw the link at the moment.

PATRICK KANE: That's okay. I'll catch up with Michael. Thank you very much though.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have posted the e-mail from the NCSG in the chat room. Essentially, they're asking for the review team to brief them on the status of the review, as opposed to asking questions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we didn't have a time. They gave us a block. Have they given us a narrow zone in? We've got the full half hour? Are we sure about that?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct. They came back with specific time after some discussions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright. Well, we can certainly brief them on this is where we're up to with the ToRs, this is where we're up to with the workplan, this is what we've done in our face-to-face, this is what we're planning to do in the near future, and while we're here, is there anything you'd like to talk to us about in terms of accountability and transparency? And I think that could put that one to bed. So we

don't need to send anything to them, because they're expecting a briefing, and we can do a briefing and say, "And we've got a little question for you if any of you would like to answer."

So that seems to be fine, leaving us to GAC, who we know we have already sent the questions to, so they should be prepared. That's alright.

Okay, so we're now looking at just a couple minutes ahead of our normal break time. Bernie, go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Did I hear correctly –I was listening to Vanda earlier this morning. She said they're meeting the GAC at noon on Wednesday for lunch anyways and we're meeting them on Thursday? Are those two things? Yeah, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, the lunch is a sort of deep dive opportunity with leadership, so more of an in-depth discourse, correct me if I'm wrong, Vanda and Liu, and the other is the usual dog and pony show.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, Bernie, it's a second opportunity that GAC opened to us, to our group, to go deeply into some points that like [inaudible] not

so easy to do formal things. It's better to have informal meeting to allow them to talk more freely about that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: There is an official calendar invite that was sent out. If you don't have it, I'll forward it to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So Sébastien, but I also notice Michael's back, so before we go to break, we might just ask him that question that your fellow co-lead was unable to answer on your behalf. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Just to know, who are supposed to be in this GAC meeting or meetings? Is it the same meeting for the two meetings? Is it different? From our side, from ATRT3 team.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that was of course [open.] The idea is to have the GAC group together with them to make sure they will feel comfort to discuss issues, but I don't know, it's lunch time, I don't know how they organized that. so I do believe that we should have leader team and just GAC to not make a lot of people. So in my point of view, if you'll put much people together, we get no answer at all. So nobody knows, nobody knows who is who in that room, so

they don't speak. So I do prefer to restrict for the GAC group. They already have the names, and they are setting that. The group agreed. So GAC is more formal issue, need to respect the way they behave.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So Vanda, just to make sure I've got it clear and we all understand, the GAC work party as you've just articulated it is happy to have any and all of us in the room for the main GAC interaction in the GAC room on Thursday, but for the Wednesday lunchtime deep dive meeting –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: They selected some people.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Selected. So if you haven't got an invitation from Vanda, you're not getting one. I think that's the short story there.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, it's for Liu –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No offense, but if you don't have the e-mail, don't bother. But everybody should – by the way, just for the transcript, we are all smiling here. This is a joke.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, In the short, it's like that. You're not invited. Okay?

PATRICK KANE: So Michael, the question we had earlier as it came up taking a look at the questions for the ALAC, one of the questions from the community team had to do with the open or the transparent – where is it? It's two down from the blue one. What were you trying to pull out from the information, transparency or open data initiatives? What were you after with that question?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: You mean the fifth question?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, two below the blue.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I'm thrown off. There's a highlighted one and a blue one, and we're going blue one. Alright. Yeah, so that question was one of the potential questions that we included for each of the sessions,

and the idea was as it sort of says, just to try to solicit general feedback on the ITI and the ODI to see what people's thoughts are. That wasn't directed specifically at ALAC. That's just kind of polling people about what they think about different transparency processes. That's kind of why the DIDP one is up there as well.

But given that those are processes that there's going to be differing levels of engagement on, it's potentially not necessarily the best candidate to approach the leadership about, because when you have that small cross section of folks, maybe they've engaged with these programs, maybe they have zero experience with them and have no thoughts whatsoever on them. But there's going to be some folks among the membership who have engaged with them, and I guarantee you a few people will have very strong thoughts. So that's why that, in my mind, would be a better fit for the survey, is you need to find those people within each community that have very distinct thoughts on those different programs, because they've engaged with them.

The reason why I would suggest the second question is because that's the one that we have that's drafted specifically for ALAC. I think there's a lot to dig into there, and I think that the PDP question is still relevant, and if we had like one and a half or two, I would have added the PDP one as well. But we're going to get a

lot of feedback on PDPs from all the other groups. So that would be why my prioritization would be to the second one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We did say we'd have a spare because we've got the extra time for that. I can only think the PDP question is the ideal spare. It seems to make perfect sense to me. Pat, we're going to wrap this up for the 15-minute break?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, I just want to say one thing, Michael. The only reason it came up under ALAC was because we had an hour with them and I was looking at other questions. But I think you're right, it's a survey question, but I was just trying to get what you're trying to poll for. So we're good. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just wanted to confirm that what's highlighted blue right now, we do want to add that to the list of ALAC questions and then put the PDP as a spare? Not add it? Okay.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: The yellow highlighted one will be our primary. The first one would I guess be our secondary.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, so let's go ahead and take a 15-minute break, start back up here at 3:17.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Precisely.

PATRICK KANE: Precisely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'll give you a one-minute warning. Get yourselves sat back down and comfortable. We're going to start our next session in a moment or two.

Okay ladies and gentlemen, we're obviously still recording, so we're ready to go for our next interaction. Pat has had a call from the office. He'll be a few minutes late, so you get to play with me as the MC for the beginning of today's thrill-packed and exciting adventure.

Now, we've pretty much got everybody excepting Pat at the table. A couple missing, so a couple of people may still walk in. We did say we'd break to 3:17, and people eventually learn that if we say 3:17, we usually mean 3:17. But hopefully they'll be back shortly.

First of all, this afternoon we've got a very valuable opportunity, and that is to have the leadership team of ATRT2 in the hot seat

up there, the grill pan up there, and ATRT3, this is our opportunity to interact with and get the low down from ATRT2 leadership.

This should have aspects of every work party. As you all know, there are bits and sections of the recommendations from the ATRT2 work that go across each and every one of your work parties, so each and every one of your work parties should benefit by today's interactions, not just the review work party, although obviously we know the review work party will benefit as well.

So let's try this a fairly freeform way to begin with, and then we'll start asking specific questions if the work party would like. Brian, as a veteran from not only two but one, did you want to put any sort of general care and feeding of an ATRT and why it is what we do what we do so well when we do it at all? Okay, [when you two] decide.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thank you, Cheryl, and thank you everyone for your time today and inviting us today. I have the utmost respect for the work that you're doing. Needless to say, we understand – and I feel comfortable speaking for us – the amount of time, focus and investment of work it takes to do one of these reviews.

So coming from a position of great respect for what you've undertaken, available today and until the end of your work, if

there's any way we can be of assistance, I'm here, and I know that my colleagues are here too.

I do want to offer a few thoughts, because I was thinking how can I be helpful, and I won't try to take up too much time, but this is what I'd offer: first of all, happy to answer any questions you have. I also don't view myself as any particular expert in how ICANN has implemented the recommendations. I think you'll be speaking to the community members. I may have some views to offer, but I thought this might be helpful, and it's more how I approach the work and how I think you might approach the work in certain ways that can be helpful.

Obviously, a piece of what you're going to do is to assess how or whether ICANN board, ICANN Org implemented recommendations from ATRT2, and in doing so, I've reviewed some of the implementation reports that staff has made available to you, and I think there's two pieces to keep in mind there.

Number one, there is a question; was the recommendation implemented? And there's kind of a yes, no, or partially answer to that. And that's an important step of your analysis. It's a very important step of your analysis.

What I want to offer is that while it's important, at every step of this, I think what we tried to do is be mindful of bias creeping in. Be mindful of your own assumptions and bias creeping in.

If it was not implemented, the question is forensic. It's not, "Oh, they didn't implement it, this is a problem." The question is forensic: "Why?" Look at it from an evidence standpoint. And each step of the way, try to be mindful of the bias, because there is a lot of bias that exists here in ICANN, community, board ,org, things take too long, they never do what we say, whatever it is. So that's one observation.

And remember, was it implemented is an important piece, but the most important piece is, did it have an effect? Did it have impact? Recommendations are made for a purpose. It's to hopefully assist ICANN in improving. And to me, the more important analysis is, did this recommendation, if implemented, have the intended effect? I have an example for you.

And have a critical eye not just on, "Was it implemented, did it have an effect?" But also have a critical eye on the work of ATRT2. Were our recommendations clear enough, specific enough, actionable enough? Take a critical look at the work of ATRT2 in considering the effect and the implementation.

I'll give you a couple of examples, and then I'll be quiet. Just for fun, I went to the implementation reports for recommendation number one and two. Recommendation number one, the board should develop objective measures for determining the quality of

board members and the success of board improvement efforts and analyze those findings over time.

Recommendation number two, the board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement efforts and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.

Now, when I look at those recommendations, I can check a box of, did they implement these things? I focus on the phrase, "Analyze those findings over time" at the end of recommendation 1.

The gold is the effect, and is there improvement? I look at the phrase, "Gauge levels of improvement over time." It's easy enough to say, "Did they, didn't they implement?" The gold is in the impact and the effect.

Just for fun, I looked at the project status write-up in the status report for recommendation one and two, and the implementation notes of the staff report for recommendation one, recommendation two. I copied and pasted them and did a compare. Guess what? They're virtually identical. I don't know you did that. They're virtually identical. There's very little text difference between the two.

Stop. For me. I'm just modeling my process. No bias. No assumption. Why? And this is where I would drill in. Is it possible

that the ARTR2 recommendation number one and two were not clear enough as between the two? Was there some overlap? Was the staff reporting the same progress for both of them inaccurately or for some other reason?

I just am offering you examples of ways to approach the work, and for me, the most important thing is at each step of the way, check for bias, check for assumption, and the most important thing is, did this have the intended effect? Was improvement realized? And how do you measure that and report on that?

And the last thing I'll offer is, we had a recommendation about creating reply comments. We have a comment period, right? So we thought reply comments, which are a common tool in a lot of governance and decision making processes, can be a very useful tool, because when you have different advocates advocating for different points of view and you give them the opportunity to reply, you then have a body of argumentation that's created where the decision maker, if it's the community, the board, the Org, whoever, now has all the arguments and counterarguments, and it really creates a wonderful foundation to make a well-informed decision, policy or otherwise.

Guess what? They tried reply comments, nobody used them. Good recommendation, good intention, could have had a good

effect. Nobody used them. That's unfortunate. Do away with them. Move on.

Those are my observations. I hope in some way they're helpful.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. I'm not as diligent as he was. I did not go back to ATRT2 and read the stuff. But I think it was actually okay, because I was sitting here listening – I was thinking first of all of the difference between the two. It's pre-transition. We had Larry, and we had Steve. That already makes it a very different type of thing.

But also, the first instinct I had when Brian was saying one and two, I was saying, "We didn't do that." And then I started thinking about it and saying, "Well, wait a second. We do specific reviews of each of us before we go up to the NomCom that are specific appraisals. We have matrices of skillsets."

So the way I would have conceived of doing it when we made the recommendation does not match, in many ways, what is the case now, and yet one can argue that indeed, there were ways. Were they metrics the way I thought of them at the time, little numbers? No. But was there a skill matrix that tracks the skills we've got, the things that were in recommendations about training, that's certainly for real. Having a board governance committee that tracks our progress in terms of learning new things, that's done.

So you may find – and this is one of the things – sometimes that the recommendations were kind of fulfilled but in a different way than just the reading. And as I said, the two instincts I had as I was listening to them, “No, we didn't do that. Oh, well, yeah, kind of, we did.”

So that was interesting, but I was also thinking back to it, how very different it was, because we had two authorities in the room. We had two people that could say, “No, that’s not happening.” And we had certain tussles that came out of that that fortunately I don’t believe you guys have. I don't know for sure, but Maarten is nothing like Steve. And I don’t see anybody here that reminds me of Larry.

But the environment of the two is something that I didn't think about until sitting there today looking at the difference, looking at the atmospheric difference of those, and so I think that your analysis is actually going to be interesting, and I look forward to it, because especially that yes/no, “sort of yeah maybe you're not quite” sure type of answer – and I think you'll probably find that one in many cases, and that just comes of implementation, of how it goes over time, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG:

A couple of comments. The comment on recommendation number one and the changes in the board – and I look at the

things you two said, and what struck me most from what Brian said, the way he repeated it, was there was a public aspect of demonstrating to the community that the board is improving, and yet most of what you're talking about are in private pieces of paper that no one ever sees.

That's a real substantive difference in my mind, because it comes back to what Brian was saying of what we're trying to achieve. It wasn't only board improvement, but it was also a public view of board improvement. That part disappeared.

This ATRT is very different from the last one, and having almost finished my term as chair of the RDS WHOIS review team, I can tell you that they bear the same name with a two changed to a three. Almost everything else is different.

Part of it is the participation of the US government and the participation of the board, which is different. Part is the overall environment in which review teams are working right now. They're not the same. How much staff support did we have? We had some people who were staff in the room, but not providing the kind of infrastructure and support – we did everything ourselves. It was all drafted by us or whoever we could Shanghai into doing it, and the rigor and rigidity that certainly was presented to the RDS review bore no resemblance at all to what

we did. We basically came in and started working, and there was no one giving us infrastructure, superstructure, constraints.

That's a good and bad thing. Again, putting on my RDS hat for a moment. I'll be back here wearing that hat later on. But it's night and day, and it's an interesting and it's very much a two-edged sword. So a couple of comments on that.

The other thing I have, again, it's an aspect of looking at the staff reports on the implementation. There has been very much an attitude or a position taken that we need to put green ticks on everything. And indeed, there are green ticks on most everything.

You've got to look at it very carefully and understand if you're disagreeing with whether there's a green tick or not – I'm echoing Brian again – you have to try to understand why.

The exercise should be to try to implement the recommendations to better ICANN, not to create green ticks. And the focus within ICANN, I think, has been far too much on, "Can we get a green tick there by hell or high water?" Not so much, "Can we implement the intention of what they were trying to do?" So I think you've got to look at it perhaps a little bit cynically and try to understand how we got from here to there, because someone's going to treat your recommendations the same way.

I have, again, some particular comments on individual recommendations. The ones I re-read and the reports I read were of course the recommendations that I had the largest hand in. One of them in particular has a green tick, and I can't understand why it's not completely red. We'll talk about that a little bit later.

I can talk about that now or talk about it when you meet with the ALAC, because it's very much in the ALAC's area.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, can we draw you out on that now? Because it may be that other things take over in the conversation with the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. 10.3.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's a huge difference between red and green.

ALAN GREENBERG: 10.3 essentially says, find ways to get the people involved who are not well able at that point and still now to participate.

So looking at everything from language issues, training issues, money, and how do we make sure that the multi-stakeholder model is just a little bit more equal than it would be if we let

nature take its course. And if you look at what has justified the green ticks, it's not really there. And I can go into much more detail if you want. But I'll give an example.

The one example of an actual act that ICANN took to alleviate the problem, they claim, is the CROP program, a program which is designed for outreach. So number one, the CROP program existed before ATRT2 did, before our recommendation. Number two, it was designed for outreach and not to do the kind of things that we were looking for, and number three, it's now to a large extent being partially abolished.

When you put all that together, how is that a justification that you did something? There's more, but that's one little tiny recommendation. You're going to have to look at all of them, so good luck.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Brian.

BRIAN CUTE: Just a brief follow-up on two things that Alan said. The first with respect to the board improvements and things being done in public view versus done in private view.

I think this is another great example – I'll just beat this drum again – of guarding against bias and guarding against assumption. Just because something is in private view doesn't mean ICANN's not being transparent. Among our recommendations, we were focused on training board members to up their skills, and training materials, making those available where possible. You hire a third-party training company, they have proprietary working methods that they use and come and apply. There can be very good reasons why certain documentation doesn't come out in the light of day.

So it's just an example that in public view, out of public view, at each step of the way, try to check that bias and hold it at bay, and just do a forensic inquiry as to the whys.

And I think there was one more. Staff support, I think it's a good thing. Staff support from ATRT1 to what you have now is a proof point of maturation of this process of the organization stepping up and providing the type of support that this type of process requires.

AVRI DORIA:

I'll add one thing. The transparency is an interesting issue, and how that reflects bias. For years before getting into the board, I was definitely one of the outliers of default transparency. And the board isn't there yet. The board still struggles with how much

they can make transparent and when, and I still basically am pushing for it, but I've gotten slightly better or slightly worse depending on how you're judging it, and understanding why people don't want it sometimes and why they resisted me previously.

Now, that's definitely bias, or could well be bias, of being outside the window wanting to see everything that was going on inside, and inside, and go like, "I still don't mind if everybody sees it." But I understand why they don't.

So I had many years of GNSO where we got totally trained to walking around totally exposed, but to get a board to actually do that and feel comfortable with it is not an easy thing. So as I say, I understand it better. And yes, the staff that you have now was – I think those people were just first hired for two, and that's where they started to learn many of them. I'm not talking about Bernie there, but some of the MSSI folks that help and such, they were new to ATRT2, they were just figuring out how you could possibly support this strange thing.

And I'll be curious to hear how it worked. It's interesting for us to look now and say, "Wow, you guys have staff support." But I could almost feel some of you going, "What are you talking about?" So I don't know if I was correct in my impression.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, and then I've got Maarten. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. It's quite interesting that when you talk about [leader of the group,] you didn't talk about GAC. And I know in ATRT2, it was not a GAC chair but a GAC representative, but the GAC chair and the –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You know better than me. I don't know, maybe it was ATRT1 when it was Manal who was – but the fact that the chair of the GAC and the chair of the board were supposed to be the ones to select the group, it's interesting that those two people were supposed to be the ones who take a lot of decisions at the beginning, and you switched to the chair of the board, and the representative of the NTIA.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but – sorry, you know that it’s something I think useful to share, because I feel it’s quite interesting. And I have a question about the way both in ATRT1 and ATRT2, did you get good participation to all the member of the ATRT, or it’s like any group in this organization where you have 20 people nominated and ten doing the work or five doing the work? How it was in ATRT1 and 2? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Looks like Alan wants to respond, and then we’ll move to Maarten.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’ll respond to both of those very quickly. Heather was one of the selectors, and she was nominally on the group. She wasn’t very active in it. So that’s perhaps one of the reasons that she wasn’t a focal point. She certainly wasn’t a leading – a very strong voice during the discussions, with the exception of one or two discussions very focused on the GAC.

And in terms of who did the work, I would guess half the people probably did virtually all of the work, with a few exceptions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I’ve got Maarten, and then I’ve got Jacques.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you. Just saying that I have not been in ATRT 1 and 2. Immediately impressed by the approach in ATRT3 where we knew what we're going to do, where staff was prepared, we had at that time draft operating procedures that have been built on the earlier experiences, and I must say that for me, the feedback and support of staff has been very visible and pointed, and very professional. They're not trying to tell us what we need to say, but they make us aware of what we need to talk about, and that helps a lot. Having some experience in the leadership helps too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Brian, you want to respond? And then we'll go to Jacques.

BRIAN CUTE: Yeah, I just want to speak to the work getting done piece of it, and going back to ATRT1 for example. The truth is we had a full team. The truth in any working group you've all been in, there's a certain number of folks who really carry a lot of water, and there's others who carry some water. That's just human dynamics.

ATRT1, it really came down to, near the end of our process, four people who squirreled away for the better part of a day or two who put pen to paper and wrote furiously and got the output and helped move the report to a finished product.

ATRT2, we had a little experience, because ATRT1 we were making it up as we went along, we then took the more structured approach which I think you're modeling, which is the different working groups and a designated head who owns a working group and you take on that topic area and it's on you and your group to deliver that piece of the report in draft and do the work to do so. So we used that method, and that method serves us very well.

What we did coming out of our terms of reference period, which is phase one, and you've completed that [chapeau,] is we knew we wanted to do a survey, we knew we wanted an outside expert to help us with the PDP analysis, and we really leaned on the engagement with the community at each of the ICANN meetings.

So when we did what I understand you're about to do, the roundabout with the ACs and the SOs and the board, for us in terms of the data input, the data dump, that was the driver for us. And I think that's what helped us push the work forward fairly well.

I will say this: in terms of developing the report, we had someone in Paul Diaz who was helping to draft along the way when the pieces came in from the respective working groups, but I will also say, do not underestimate the amount of work and effort that this is going to take.

Phase two, which you're heading into, is really perhaps the most critical in terms of getting the work done. Phase one is critical because you have to define and scope your terms of reference. Well done again. This really is where the rubber hits the road, and if you – I would not want to repeat ATRT1. We're at the 11th hour. Thankfully, we had four folks who were capable of willing to throw in, but that's not the model for doing it.

Even ATRT2, using the working group model that you used, believe me, there was still a lot of editing and tidying and tying of the report too close to the finish line. So all I want to emphasize is this really is where for better or for worse, you need to lean in.

And lean on staff. Maarten, I appreciate your comments. There was a tension in ATRT1. This felt like a review, this felt somewhat confrontational, and there were some tensions between the review team and staff. The review team made it very clear at the outset that we were going to be independent and we're going to exercise our independence.

And I think that a very nice relationship has developed between the review team and staff over time. I for one – it's my view – believe that you can lean very heavily on staff with confidence and that they're not trying to put their thumb on the scale of your work. But you need to get your work developed now, have those draft reports in, lean on the staff, lean on the experts, but most

importantly, listen to the community. If you ask the right questions and you do your round the horn with the ACs, SOs and board, you'll get 90% of what you need.

AVRI DORIA: And one thing, be very grateful that your deadline is not 1st of January.

BRIAN CUTE: Yes, we did complete the work in 11 months. We started late and had to [hue] to the deadline, and we did. We made a conscious decision, “Okay, that’s unfortunate, we’re going to get it done anyway.” And if there's any way that we can help in that piece of it again, happy to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Jacques?]

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it was closer to nine months.

[JACQUES:] My couple of questions are going to be more a question of – not so much of methodology, but – you're going to understand, I guess. First might be because I'm not English language native. So

I've got a question which would be assessment versus judgment. Did you [meet] that, that some kind of assessing something, you feel that it's driving you to judging? Which I feel is something completely different. And if you felt it at some moment, how did you manage to get away from that?

My feeling – and it's personal – we're not here to judge at any point, but to assess, and I'd like to know if you've found some limit here. The second limit would be about the goal of the whole exercise, meaning, how did you tune your ambitious? Because sometimes you push a recommendation, you're about to push it, and you know, you do know it's not feasible. It might be feasible half of it, two thirds of it, but you do know that 100% it will not be done. But you say, "You know what? Even if I push it this way, then someone is going to pick the flag later." It flags something, a point where you can push leverage. That's the first solution.

The other one is say, "No, we will not go so far, because we've shown that this recommendation is never going to be applied this way. So what we're going to do is restrict our ambition a bit more, but what we are going to recommend, we think it could be implemented, not as is, but nearly completely."

AVRI DORIA:

Give you time to think. I think partially, we're more into assessment than judging, but of course, you cannot escape a certain amount of judgment.

I think on pushing things, I remember one particular set of cases – and this is one where heather was an instrumental part of the discussions – is there were certain things that we wanted either in terms of transparency or responsiveness from GAC, participation from GAC, or we wanted to give certain levels of right to other SOs and ACs.

For example, we wanted to have ALAC for example have the same ability of negotiation with the board that the GAC did. And we're immediately told that if you do that, you'll have to give the GAC more, that you may not go for parity there.

And we thought about pushing it and saying, no, we're going to – but at a certain point, we said no because of the reflex.

So I don't think that we actually often went beyond what people thought we could get away with. I think that we would start there, but then – and that's a place where somebody like Larry and somebody like Steve came in and basically tempered those of us that wanted more than we could get, because they were in the business of being pragmatic, and I wasn't.

BRIAN CUTE:

Let me use an example. In ATRT1, as we were really beginning our work in Brussels in earnest, the ICANN CEO at the time regrettably made a public statement that called into question our credibility and our motives as a team in beginning this work.

We judged that that was unacceptable. We judged that that was poisonous to the process, and we got together in a room and came up with a draft statement that we all voted on and approved unanimously, and issued a public statement rebuking the CEO of ICANN for making those statements about the work of the review team.

That was judgment. Reserve judgment for where judgment is appropriate. I think staying in the realm of assessment is the best, staying in the realm of forensic approach, staying in the realm of unbiased to the extent you can, and providing facts and holding a mirror back to the organization is the best thing you can do. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we did a moderately good job of separating judgment from assessment. Where the two integrated, I'm not sure you can separate them completely, and each of us have our own pet projects and things we want to push and things we want to judge and say that it wasn't done properly, but I think as a group, we tempered that reasonably well.

In terms of setting recommendations that are achievable, I think we in general did that. There were some exceptions. 10.3, which I mentioned, was clearly one which was never going to be achieved. We cannot make the world equal, we cannot eradicate the fact that some people don't speak English. We're not going to fix it. But we did feel that if we don't put a target out there which is where we need to go, and start making little improvement, we're never going to get there. And something that had been given melt surface but never was ever acted on, and we felt we had to put a target out there. The results, as I said, were a little bit underwhelming, but nevertheless, that was one that was clearly unrealistic, but we had to put the words there.

I think we may have done it in one or two other places, but in general, I think we tried to be careful.

BRIAN CUTE:

I want to add something because I really didn't address your question about the stretch recommendation. It's an excellent question. I would think of that in this way, at least this way, if not others. I would focus on behavior.

So if I saw behavior in the board or behavior in the Org that was so below, so far below the standard of behavior that one would expect [in a given way,] then I – just speaking for myself – might

be tempted to draft that stretch recommendation. It's just one example of how to think about it.

The other thing I would caution is I know you're aware of the ongoing discussion that was triggered in part by ATRT and other review teams with the board about, do we have the moneys to implement all of these implementations that are sitting on our desk? This is an ongoing discussion, and if you know that you're going to issue a recommendation that is not achievable, not implementable, you're just throwing more fuel on that fire, and since you are as a team very aware – we're all aware of this dynamic that the board is trying to address right now. We've got all these implementation recommendations.

We as a team did not say, "Here's X number of recommendations and we think they're going to cost Y." This is an issue. So proceed thoughtfully, and maybe part of your work can address that topic itself. It's a critical topic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got Maarten, then Tola, and I note Brian has to leave in five and a half minutes' time.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay, gentlemen, thanks for all your service. You're aware of the fact that we now as a board have been saying maybe we need to

do something about prioritization and budgeting. Did that guidance inform the way you worked? And how did you deal with that, or what would you do differently if you would take that in the back of your mind?

AVRI DORIA:

I start to giggle when you say the prioritization, one, because of my responsibilities, but two, because I was the one that fought most strongly against prioritization, because I believed that we couldn't do it. I believed that that would be too much fighting, too much preference and "Why my thing over your thing?" And that the whole thing had to exist as a balance.

I know my job now is to work on prioritizations of all things, but at that point, I remembered I really pushed against the notion of coming out with priorities, and we we're being asked for them and I basically said no, we can't, because – that just made me giggle, thinking about prioritization, made me remember who I was.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And made the gentleman next to you giggle too.

BRIAN CUTE:

So yes, we did obviously try prioritization. Look, I think in the context of the dynamic right now across this organization on this question of cost of implementation of all these recommendations, including the ones that you're developing, there's an opportunity – and it could take the form of a recommendation, it could take the form of your view that you can incorporate into your report.

It doesn't have to be a recommendation. We did that in ATRT1. We gave a view of the process itself for the board to take into account. At the minimum, it can be an active conversation that you engage in with the board. So I think there's a number of ways that this team can positively contribute to try to break this log jam issue that we have, and you could do it a number of different ways.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just very briefly, Alan, because we've got to move.

ALAN GREENBERG:

One of the reasons I've also fought against prioritization is we were comparing apples and oranges. TO try to say which of these is more important when they were going to be working in completely different areas, done by completely different people, and not necessarily being resource intensive in some of these cases, it was a very difficult job and it's just gotten worse as time

goes on and the money has gotten constrained. So overall, we need to somehow decide where we're going to put our resources, but I don't think it's as simple a game as each review team prioritizing its recommendations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Noted. Thank you, Brian. Appreciate you being here, but our other two victims are able to stay. Tola?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay. Thank you. I would have loved him to [answer a few.] Anyway, it's okay, I think Avri and Alan would be able to do the same. I understand ATRT1 was a guinea pig of this assignment, and listened to the challenges you've faced, but I equally understand that ICANN at that time is not the same ICANN of today. The community is not the same, the awareness, the understanding, the contribution is not the same.

Now, looking at that and knowing fully well that the next round of ATRT is going to be about five years, and having this possibility of a new second-level or multi-level stakeholder approach, we don't know the form it's going to take, but we know it's hanging around the corner.

Now, while reviewing the accountability and transparency now, would any of the recommendations be taken into consideration

this possibility in the next couple of years, or just put this recommendation, knowing fully well that if the new model of multi-stakeholder approach comes out, the recommendation becomes null and void? How do we handle that kind of situation? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

I'm not sure I understood the question about something changing in the multi-stakeholder –I apologize. You understood?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I understood, but I'm not sure I have the same conviction as you do that we are going to have a completely new and revamped multi-stakeholder model between now and five years. Do parts of me believe we absolutely dreadfully need it? Yes. Do I see a mechanism by which it can actually happen? No.

So I have less worry that you're making recommendations that will no longer be applicable, because I don't see the way that we're going to go forward to completely rebuild ICANN in a different model such that these recommendations are not relevant anymore. Maybe you know something I don't know, or maybe you've been briefed on the ICANN3.9 or whatever it is that I'm not aware of, but I have less worry about that.

There are people who have said that ATRT3 should be the mechanism by which we have, we create a new ICANN. There are also many people saying that's not going to happen.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Now I think I understand better. So you're actually almost referring to Brian's project of redefining –

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Brian's project is specifically not changing the organization.

AVRI DORIA: Not to redefine. Right. But anyway, five years, first of all, goes by a whole lot quicker than you think it will. And the amount that gets done is significant, but the process of this multi-stakeholder paradigm, these models that we're working with, are both – they evolve constantly, but they evolve slowly.

There really is an inertial part of it, because you're doing all the work. You're not spending all your time focused on maturing the model. You're spending most of your time trying to get this, that or the other thing done, pragmatically using the model you've got, and then periodically changing it, fixing it, tweaking it and such.

So I definitely see that some of the things may not be as relevant five years, but also, partially what becomes is some of them will get implemented, they will change things, and all of a sudden when you look back at the recommendation, it won't seem relevant.

So I don't believe you're wasting your time. I don't believe that coming up with ways to evolve it and improve it in a constant improvement cycle is at all a waste of time, and I don't think you'll look back in five years – hopefully – and see a discontinuity, unless we fall apart.

But you won't see a discontinuity in the model, you'll be able to look back and say, “Yes, I could see how we got from here to there.” And it's perhaps surprising sometimes and not – obviously, we did not predict the transition. The transition was not on our minds at the time, and it changed us, but it didn't totally throw away the old model. It change it somewhat, but ...

ALAN GREENBERG: But I'll note the transition and the accountability was something that put almost everything on hold for three years. I'm not sure we want to do that again, no matter how much we may need a new multi-stakeholder model.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Thank you. Just for clarity, I don't know what you don't know. If there's anything at all, you probably know what I don't know. However, the example of the transition [Alan just] spoken to what I had in mind, because we're talking about some recommendations that were not implemented or there were, in your words, yes no or partially. And what I was having in mind is if you have some of these things that may likely change somewhere along the line and ATRT4, we now say, "Well, did it not implement?" That was [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Avri, I don't think anybody's actually fond of rationalization and prioritization, but it is a penalty of leadership. But I think Tola's question, and one of the things that Brian said earlier, I want to be clear with the group that I think it's important for us to make the recommendations that we see fit to recommend regardless of where the money line stops or regardless of what we think is going to happen into the future, because I have a lot of faith, Avri, in the project that you're taking up right now, and helping us do that rationalization and prioritization across the community regardless of where the recommendation comes from, whether it's a review team, a

working group or whatever, because I think that's the right place for us to get to. But I don't want us to hamper our recommendations because we see a change in the environment or we see a budgetary line, because I think that your process will help develop all of that over time.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. And that's why when I mentioned in the earlier meeting that one suggestion that we got of saying "Here's your maximum budget for changes" was something that I really did not look on very kindly, because that's exactly what it would do. You would say, "This one's really important, but too expensive. Let's take these two cheaper ones instead." And no, that's just the wrong mentality to get into.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

There'd be an economic rationalist somewhere in the organization that would disagree, but I certainly wouldn't be amongst that pile.

AVRI DORIA:

Nobody has called me an economic rationalist in my life.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That’s probably a very good thing, actually. Right, last call for specific ATRT2 interaction questions, for at least this interaction.

AVRI DORIA: I want to tell you something slightly anecdotal.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please do.

AVRI DORIA: One of the things that I was very at the time of ATRT2 uncertain of is whether we would find out what was really bothering people, what were the real issues that we would get politeness and we would get all the things that you’d expect to be seen.

So I decided to create something that I didn't know would work, and I'm not sure it worked all that well at the time, but I created Facebook Bad Attitude as a way to collect, to basically put out a box in the world and say, “Tell me what you don’t like about ICANN so we could look at it.”

Now, it didn't really work, but it may have interesting content in it now many years later, as people have used it. So if you're ever in that notion of just what are the things that bother people at ICANN that nobody talks about, it may be worth peeking at. It was created very strangely, it was created totally on my own instinct

and playing around and such, but I've watched it develop over the years, and I've actually gotten to see certain trends and things that are important to people. Not suggesting that one should use it, but it can be interesting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just one quick comment. We were talking about finance and prioritization. I think the word that we were living in at the time of ATRT1 and 2, and the other reviews of the time where we had this concept that the board would accept everything and ICANN Organization would implement everything, without even thinking about prioritization or real value for cost, was a euphoric world that was rather immature.

The fact that we're now talking about putting everything together, whether it's from the accountability exercise or one of the specific reviews, and trying to judge what are the things we should be investing our money in and what's going to have real value and benefit to the organization is a sign of maturity.

So the fact that you're probably looking at your recommendations and knowing that not all of them will be implemented, and still doing the work anyway, I think, is a sign of

maturity that we're getting to a point that we're going to do good stuff. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. And I'm not seeing anybody else wanting to raise anything with you, so don't run away. At least you, Alan, are glued to the seat for this next session as well. Avri, thank you very much for joining us. Always appreciated. So we'll thank you in the normal way. And we'll keep Alan.

AVRI DORIA: And good luck to you all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, thank you, ma'am. It won't be our last interaction, I trust.

AVRI DORIA: I'm sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we do look forward to working with you, and of course, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee along the way as well. Right, with that, Alan, you're up next with the wonderful world of RDS. Apparently, you're coming towards the end of this experience.

I'm going to hand it over to Pat, because I have a bio break requirement, and I'll be back.

PATRICK KANE: She's assigned me work while she leaves. So Alan, will anybody else be joining you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Cathrin said she would try to be here, so she may wander in. Susan I haven't heard from.

PATRICK KANE: Okay. So I guess we'll go ahead and get started then. The RDS review has been quite an experience from what I can tell, so we'd love it if you could share some thoughts about it and what will help us and what some of the things are that will help us avoid other things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll give you a preview of a message I'm about to send out to the RDS review team that we have now conclusively proven that the Newton's Laws of Motion apply to ICANN policy and other initiatives.

We worked hard and long and got to the point where we finished our recommendations either very early January, and then for

various reasons, things slowed down to a snail's pace for a month or so. And getting started again has proven almost impossible, because other things take over.

So the report, I hope, will be out of my hands by today or tomorrow. But we've done almost nothing for the last number of months. So it's lasted overall longer than it should have, but it is almost out. Negar will be delighted to hear that.

But that's not really relevant to the overall thing. It's been an interesting exercise. Those of you who were around a year or so ago or two years ago now will recall we had a debate on should we have the review or not. We were just entering the glorious world of GDPR, before we came up with the EPDP acronym, and so much about WHOIS was in flux that the question is, "Should we have the review?"

For better or worse, when the accountability work was done, the particular bylaw which moved the specific reviews from the AOC into the bylaws did not provide any wiggle room for the board.

If you look at the organizational reviews, it says they will be held every three years or five years, if we can. And there's a judgment call there. Under the AOC, it didn't seem there was any flexibility, but there was, because the board could talk to the NTIA and say, "Let's defer it."

We wrote the bylaws so that there was no deferring, and therefore, the decision was made is “We can't defer it.” And it was already late as soon as the bylaws were adopted.

So we were stuck in this interesting place of many people were saying we shouldn't hold the review at all, but we're going to have to hold it. We're going to be commenting on things which are in great flux as we were talking, and so it put us in an interesting environment.

We had proposals on the table to say only review WHOIS1. We had other proposals on the table saying we should review everything and the kitchen sink over and above what was in the bylaws.

So it was an interesting exercise. I talked about the staff support. You're now probably in, I'm guessing, a pretty good world, because ATRT2 had very little infrastructure imposed upon it. There was some staff support. It was largely in providing briefings and things like that, and not actually for the review itself, actually managing the review itself, other than doing the staff work of arranging a face-to-face meeting or making sure we had a meeting room with microphones in it.

The world I went into, to my great shock, when I started chairing the RDS review, was MSSI had grown into its own organization and we were presented with all sorts of things that were, “These are the rules under how we do these reviews.” And some of it was

very helpful, and some of it was a pain in the butt. And I'll use the actual report which will be coming out as an example: it's close to 200 pages long, largely because we were told this is how it must look.

And if you are dedicated enough to read it, you will be bored out of your mind, because in each section, we repeat the same things about three times, because we were told you have to repeat this in the section on recommendations, even if you just said it three paragraphs before.

We're now in a world where if we had had the strength, we could have rewritten the report and made it a lot simpler. There's personalities involved and various things that I think you're in a much better world than we were at that point, because we were given an awful lot of rigidity and rules, and it took us probably the first four months to simply meet the rules before we actually started talking about substance.

So it was an interesting exercise. It's not going to be repeated by anyone, because it was a learning experience for both the MSSJ staff and us. So I'll say that.

One of the things we took out of it, which if you recall, ATRT was supposed to be not only reviewing ATRT's past recommendations, but all of the other reviews. One of the recommendations of ATRT2 was individual review should be

assessed by their successor review. So a major part of WHOIS 2 was to look at WHOIS 1.

You still have a component that has to do with assessing the other reviews, but it's really a measure of not where the recommendations followed, but are they working well?

And one of the things that came out of our review that's just about publishing but was in the draft is, of the 16 recommendations made by WHOIS 1, staff assessed all of them to be fully implemented.

We assessed half of them to be fully implemented, and the others partially to some extent, including one that wasn't implemented at all. So I think you need to be looking a little bit about how does this interaction work with the implementation and how it's reported to say, are we really presenting an exercise in how to tick boxes, or how to actually fulfill the intent of the recommendations? Or sometimes even just the wording of the recommendations.

And I think that's a significant issue that I don't think there should be such a disparity between how staff assesses the implementation and what you do. Yes, you're the external review team that's assessing it, but it shouldn't be that different. And we found it was very different, and that concerns me, and that, I think, is an ATRT3 issue. With that, I'll stop talking.

PATRICK KANE: Thanks, Alan. Do we have any questions for Alan? Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thanks for this, Alan. Question on your last part there. I'm not familiar with the WHOIS1 review, but were their evaluation criteria tied to the recommendations?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're asking, were they all done in such a way that you could assign a metric and measure it, no. Partially because some of their things were – I don't think you could assign measurements to them quite clearly, and I don't think they were working in a world where they felt they had to do it.

On top of that, you will recall – you may not recall – typically, what comes out of one of these reviews is the board spends six months looking at it, staff evaluates the work, and in the past, up until CCT review, with one exception, they said, “Yes, we're going to implement them all.”

That is not what they did on WHOIS. The board claimed they did, but if you actually read their motions, that is not what they did. They chartered an expert working group, which was not

mentioned at all in the review, they instructed staff to implement some of the recommendations but not all of them.

Ultimately, they did attempt to implement all of them, but that isn't what the board told them to do. So among other things, there was a feeling among the WHOIS one review team that they had been shafted. They worked for a year and a half and the board did not say, "Okay, we'll do it." They didn't even say "Thank you," effectively.

So there was a lot of ill will that was floating around this whole thing that we had to try to fix as we went forward. But no, I don't think they were all that measurable, because in many cases – I take that back. There were some that were very measurable, but the numbers that were presented in the review were completely unrealistic. "You will fix half – get the accuracy rate up by 50% within six months." Well, it wasn't going to happen.

PATRICK KANE:

Maybe it's just me, you're talking about numbers, and I think in my mind – I probably didn't specify this, but I see two aspects to this. A, you can define criteria which will help guide what an implementation should be, and B, then you have units to measure how successfully you've done that. So just I don't know if that makes a difference in what you were responding to.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, not really. As I said, there were ways you could measure some of it clearly. The ones they did it most clearly on were the least realistic. The ones they did it most clearly on were the least realistic. So it makes it sort of hard to judge, but there were a lot of others that were much more touchy feely. “Do more outreach.”

One of them said, “Do more outreach to people you don’t normally talk to in ICANN.” And that was one that was ticked off, and yet there was no demonstrable action at all within ICANN to do outreach regarding WHOIS to people who we don’t normally talk to.

So essentially, by any measure, zero was done, and yet it was marked as complete. So some of them were easy to do, but the evaluation that was published was not necessarily in line with the actual recommendation.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Let me just change it up a bit. Do you think, given your comment you just made, it would have been useful if you had provided some guidance with the recommendation as to some possibilities of things that could be done to accomplish it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it wasn't me who did it. I was the first WHOIS review team. Probably. But even when there were examples – I think it's very much an attitude of the recommendation said do outreach. Do we do a lot of outreach? Yeah. So we'll take it off without looking at exactly what was being requested. So it's a philosophy of how do we show that the work has been done.

And to be honest, all of that was done by people, most of whom aren't even working for ICANN anymore. So it's not a matter of pointing a finger at somebody there today.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to understand better, because I was at African Internet Summit, and I saw there a room full of people very attentive on the ICANN day, and for sure half of them were under 35. I would think that would be an audience that we used not to talk with. That's not the people that normally come.

So, do you think things have changed over time and now it may be fulfilled, or would you still feel that the global outreach for which the program is set up is not reaching its objectives, the objectives that you intended at that time?

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I'm not sure I want to take responsibility for what I intended when I wasn't on the review team.

One of the examples that we came up with in this review team for what should have been done was, what would have happened if seven years ago, we would have started regularly talking to data commissioners in Europe about WHOIS. There's someone we don't talk to. They were already sending us letters. Should we perhaps have talked to them? One could ask.

PATRICK KANE:

Yes, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Pat. I wanted to mention two points. One, to build on what Alan said, in the case of the WHOIS review, there was a specific action plan issued by the board at the time for implementation of their recommendation. So there are variations from what the action plan instructed staff to do at the time, and what some of the recommendations asked for, hence there are discrepancies between assessment of the implementation of the recommendations. And Alan talked about that briefly.

That is not something that's been done since, but it is, I think, pertinent to keep that in mind when evaluating the work that was done and some of the reasoning behind it.

The second point is – and we have said this to other review teams as well – part of the problem with implementation of the

recommendations has been that if the recommendation itself is not providing the right level of details, AKA it's not smart, it leaves a lot of things up to interpretation, and my interpretation will be different than Bernie's, Cheryl's and everybody else's. And of course, it makes assessment of the implementation quite difficult.

We had that issue with the SSR1 recommendations. We had that issue with WHOIS1 recommendations, and ever since then, we've been talking to the community and the review teams about the importance of smart recommendations for that purpose and defining measures of success from the perspective of the people who are developing recommendations to help staff, when implementing the recommendation, be able to understand what the ultimate objective is and how they can reach that.

And I think a lot of great work is getting done to that regard in the ongoing work of the reviews now, and we're just looking forward to more of that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We were still working in a world then where we tossed documents over brick walls. The review team would toss something over, the board tossed something back. No one would ever contemplate talking to the people and trying to make sure that what they're

doing was any way related to what was being asked for, even if the words were the same.

I don't think we're quite there anymore. I think we understand that we cannot just toss documents over walls and spend two or three years implementing something, and then find out we'd misunderstood what you wanted. It's a bloody waste of time on everyone's part, both the people creating the recommendations and those implementing it. And I hope we've learned something from that. Well, I think we have, but we'll see.

PATRICK KANE:

So Alan, I can only assume that there's some conflict between what's in the report you're about to issue and what came out of the EPDP phase one recommendations. Did you address that with the team, or the team talk about that or consider that in the final report?

I know that we're timebound, so we may not have the same issue between now and March in terms of the things that come up, but as we move forward, it'd be helpful to understand how we should think about that or address that as we see those things if you in fact addressed that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there's a lot of conflict. There are some things in our report that some people on the EPDP don't want to see happen, but it's not necessarily a conflict that can't happen. We did have some privacy people on our group, and we had to make them happy, and we have full consensus on all the recommendations. So I don't think there's anything that is in conflict.

Are there things that don't happen because of how the EPDP unfolds? Maybe. If that is, there are going to be things which I think ICANN will be the worse for, but we'll see.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Liu.

LIU YUE: Thank you. Since we [inaudible] for the ICANN Org, they have set up a dashboard of the accountability and the transparency with [the launch of] indicators. So, do you think we have any potential to set up some indicators of framework or metrics for the specific review and maybe annual or period to monitoring the recommendation improvement?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm assuming that the same infrastructure that is being used for that will be used for the specific reviews going forward. The part

that is potentially missing is interaction of – especially since we're in a world where we're not likely to see the implementation of every single one of the accountability ones or every single recommendation from the RDS2 review team, or every recommendation from your review team.

And the question is, how do we make those decisions, and how do we try to target the intent if not the wording of all these multitude of recommendations we have floating at us? So I assume the same structure will be used. I'll repeat the words I just said before, I think we need more interactivity, and not necessarily through public comments, but talking to the people who were involved in the various areas – some of them are still around – and trying to make sure that intents are satisfied if we can't satisfy all the words.

PATRICK KANE: Anyone else? Well, Alan, thank you very much for your time today in both sessions. Greatly appreciated.

ALAN GREENBERG: My pleasure. Thank you. Thank you for asking me, and I'll end with what Brian said, I'm around. If anything else comes up, as formally or informally as you like, feel free to get a hold of me.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm just confirming with the SSR2 people who have our 4:45 slot in their calendars. I'm just confirming with them now, so one assumes that we will have them here promptly on time. So Pat, you've got some minutes to play with.

PATRICK KANE: Do we have anything left open to do?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's see. Review what we've heard, what we've talked. [inaudible].

PATRICK KANE: So based upon what we've heard so far to date from our guest this afternoon, any recommendations or discussion items we want to have about how we're progressing and moving forward in terms of our processes? Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Two things. The first one, it's I guess the question from the chair of the board if we are taking onboard some of the

questions will be useful to be written somewhere and take into account if possible.

Second, I heard Cheryl saying a few times that we are supposed to have a questionnaire, and I may be very disturbed because I never heard about that, but that's my fault totally. I tried to find out in the list of the things we have to do, and I didn't find it. Therefore, I would like very much to have guidance of how we want to do that, if it's work party, if we do one single for the overall working group, and if one or the other, what are the deadline and how we organize that, and who can help us, because building a questionnaire, building a question is okay, but building a questionnaire, it's another stuff. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE:

Thanks, Sébastien. Let's address the first one. When you say the questions of the chairman of the board, so are you talking about Cherine's commentary about other items that might be interesting for us to work on? Is that correct?

So I think that part of this conversation with them today, while it was with the board, I think that those came as thoughts of his, not prepared items for us to come and to work on. So I would suggest – and I would turn to the group for confirmation on this or agreement on this, is that we wait until we get the response from the terms of reference before we add additional work items to our

plan, because I think we've got a lot going on right now, and I think that it was thoughts he was having, not necessarily directions he was providing us.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If I may add to that, Pat, yes I think it is the intent to come with thoughtful response to the terms of reference, not so much saying, “Well, we don’t like it” or whatever. First confirming it’s in line with the mission, etc., but secondly also come with additional remarks that we think may be of value to the group. So any points that we would want to come [give along,] I think that would be in that, and that would be – today was really free thinking based on what we’re currently doing as we were invited to contribute from that place as well over lunch informally.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, so Sébastien, you have a follow-up?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. No problem with that process. The only point is that if we wait for the answer of the board, even if they will do it quite quickly, it will take two weeks, and therefore if there's something – and I get this impression, that there is something they want us to take onboard this morning or beginning of the afternoon [during the lunch,] it will be better if we at least start to think

about it, because if not, we will be out of schedule very soon.
Thank you.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you for that, Sébastien. I would suggest that we think about it informally, because I would hate to say us spend a significant number of cycles on the discussion and have it come back to where that's not really what we're being asked about. So if there's no objections to thinking about it informally but not having formal discussions on it until we receive the terms of reference, there's objections, please either turn your card up, or respond by raising your hand in the participant window.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Just to be clear, if the board would have a formal request, we would always bring that in writing as well. I would talk about it, because [inaudible], but if it's a formal request, it would always be in writing. Also [because of] transparency and because we also value the independence of ATRT, so we would not want to be misunderstood for telling ATRT what to do.

PATRICK KANE:

So not [saying as] Maarten's comments there were an objection, but additional information to the process, I would contend that we have no objections and therefore consensus to the process

that we outlined. [Quit touching.] That was for you, Maarten. Alright. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I like your humor.

PATRICK KANE: Cheryl, I'd like you to take the second one, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Sébastien, the discussion and agreement by those who were gathered and in the room during the Los Angeles face-to-face meeting regarding using the survey was we knew we would be generating questions for interactions with the Marrakech meeting. We recognize that we would undoubtedly generate more questions than would be useful in such interactions, and indeed some would be more appropriate to do in some form of survey tool.

So that was where that's come from. And we also agreed that instead of having multiple surveys going to the same ACs and SOs from component parts of our review team, we'd be doing a single ATRT3 set of questionnaires, which is why I referred to earlier our need to look at the questions, look where those questions can be modified into a particularly well-written one that allows

appropriate reaction and response depending, of course, on the tool we use. If we're using something like BigPulse versus SurveyMonkey versus Freeform text, that's all very different.

But what we would also want to be doing – and yes, we can get relatively professional assistance on this as well– is make sure that whatever we're getting the survey response in as, be it short form answer, pulldown, checklist, whatever, is that it's coming to us in a style of data that is going to be meaningful and easy for you to analyze and compare apples and apples, not apples and oranges. Did I miss anything? No? Looking around the room. Okay, alright then.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Any other comments from the guests that we've had today that we should think about in terms of our moving forward on our work processes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, I actually think that the opportunity – and I know we've got another one coming up shortly with a couple of people coming in from SSR2, but I think we're actually the first of the review teams to have this block of interaction with the other review team leads. And I personally think this is a quite helpful set of interactions. Sometimes they're built on each other, comments from one have

sparked a similar or complementary – although not all of them are complementary comments. But you know what I mean. The information we’re getting from them is complementary with each other.

So I’d almost be suggesting that this is when ATRT4, or to the power of whatever number it might be, is considering their requirement to look at other specific reviews, that we should be recording somewhere as one of the toolkit pieces that seem to be useful.

We've done community interactions, which you're now going to be moving into for the rest of the week since the very first ATRT. ATRT1 had no other way. We were writing it at the same time as we were trying to work out what direction to go. And we did this around and around the AC/SO and said, “Talk to us about accountability and transparency.”

And what was quite amazing then was how very uniform some of the issues were between the different ACs and SOs. So when you get that type of information where you’ve got similarity upon similarity of issue, then that’s very meaningful for a review team.

I'm not predicting what we may or may not find out with the questions you’ve put together to ask our ACs and SOs, but I just want to say I'm very happy that there's strong similarity in the questions you're asking, because that will help us discover if there

is also any similarity in issues that might be identified. So I'm feeling quite comfortable.

Negar, do you want to let everyone know what the plan is now with those questions, please?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Yes, Cheryl. Thank you. I have created a separate document with the list of the sessions, all the information you see in the agenda in terms of timeline and meeting rooms, etc., for all of your engagement sessions.

Under each of the SOs and AC names, the list of questions you agreed upon as a group has been added. The list has been cleaned up. I have emailed the preliminary list to Pat and Cheryl for their thumbs up and approval, and once I get the approval, I will e-mail it to the whole review team today.

I have also requested, if the review team is okay with it, for us to share the questions with SOs and ACs ahead of time to give them an opportunity to provide – look into their answers if they choose to do so, and you should have that information by the end of today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That will be shortly after we wrap up, and in many ways, because we're doing a bit of a wrap-up now, I'm almost tempted to say that that's one of the few action items on us all, and you might all get a little extra early mark of a few minutes, hopefully.

We do know that we are expecting SSR2, and they're only wrapping up their own work.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: They're on their way now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, that's great. And so once we've interacted with SSR2 in the same way as we've interacted with the other specific review teams, unless you want other business you want us to look at, we can call it a day then if you are all happy to do that. I'm not seeing anyone telling me that's a really bad idea. Well, I'm surprised. So we will take our thanks for all the effort and attention, especially after many hours for many of you for traveling. Your bodies will be going, "Why are you doing this to me?" By about now in the day. So as soon as we've got SSR2 done and dusted, we'll call this a day, but do look out for the e-mail, and we will take a lack of response as agreement. In other words, if you've got a problem with what is writ, let us know as soon as possible. Otherwise, it'll be going out.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: If I may add to that, especially GNSO because the session is on Monday and I need to e-mail them the list before the end of day today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. So come on in. And the other thing is, of course, even the dotting of the I, the crossing of the T, all the parsing of the sentence isn't perfect, that doesn't matter. You can restate it when [we're verbalizing] the questions on the day. Have we forgotten anything, Mr. Kane?

PATRICK KANE: I might have forgotten. No, I don't think so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so as soon as our next guests arrive – I think we're expecting more than one.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We don't see him in the room just yet, but we're keeping an eye open to make sure audio is okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Welcome. We're recording, we're on the record, but we would still like a frank and fearless conversation, which I don't think we'll have any problems having with the current assemblage. But we are recording.

We've really benefited from talking to the leads where they've been available, and luckily, we've had at least one available from each of the other specific reviews that have been going on. So we've talked to ATRT2, we've talked to RDS, we would like to talk to you, obviously.

Each specific review team is giving us their own perspective on how their review has or hasn't gone, and also, the comparison between what their review discovered on looking at analysis of the review prior to them. So that's the type of conversation and interaction we would like to have.

We have obviously KC in our review team, so we're feeling pretty privileged, because she's one of ours, but it also means that she wants to be very careful that SSR2 is not the only focus that our reviews work party has. So going to treat you equitably. But you are the very last [inaudible] our day, and we're the very last thing after your horrendously long day. So it's really up to you.

Okay. So, did you want to make any general statements? Do you just want us to open up the floor? We're just looking for a frank and fearless conversation. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: What would work best for you? We're happy to do it either way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think if you can give us some of the points of interest, points of concern, the highlights and holidays.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. So I think the SSR review team plans to provide a sort of lessons learned, suggestion section, or annex, in our report to make sure that we capture and reflect the full perspectives of all of the review team members. So this is informal feedback from a couple of the vice chairs. So take that with that caveat.

I think a few areas that I think merit attention by the ATRT3 team includes sort of a fresh look at whether improvements and clarifications need to be made to this area of the review section of ICANN's responsibilities and the bylaws since these reviews were intended to be the main sort of accountability and transparency tool that the community has. So I think they're quite important.

I think SSR2 in my perspective – and Laurin will give his as well – suffered from a broad and somewhat vague mandate in the bylaws. We also suffered from the fact that the first SSR review recommendations that were unanimously adopted by the board

were not fully implemented. A complete report was not done by the time our team started its work. That's over five years after the board directed that it be implemented. That caused a substantial delay, a lot of work. There was something like six recommendations that had to be fully assessed for implementation and impact. That's a significant amount of work for the team. And then of course, there was that somewhat mystifying pause.

So the board suspended the team without actually talking to the team, really at all, and so there's a lot of process issues around that that we'd want to look at and unpack, and make sure that it doesn't happen again.

We also suffered from not having operating standards for the reviews. There's been, I think, a long-running discussion and several drafts of operating standards for these reviews, which the bylaws, I think, intended to be done before these reviews started. So we don't have agreed upon rules and processes for these reviews. And that, I think, has hurt various reviews in different ways.

One of the problems we've run into more recently and that we've had problems with is getting the right type of support so the team can carry out its mandate.

We had a technical writer for a few weeks. It took a while to get them, and then all of a sudden, we didn't have a technical writer, at quite a critical time in our work. It's going to push out, again, our deadline for preparing and delivering a draft report.

At this point, we have volunteers on the team who have been volunteering their time for over two years, and we have another six months or more left in our workplan. That's unreasonable for volunteers.

So those are challenges as well. And then when the board did not approve a majority of the CCT team's recommendations, that was another very concerning incident for this SSR review team, and I think others as well, asking volunteers to spend so many years doing this work and providing recommendations that they then don't – they now – I think many of us have concerns that they will not be taken seriously and accepted by the board. It certainly was viewed as demotivating by many of the review team members.

So those are some of the highlights. I'll let Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

So I'm just thinking about what to add to Denise's account. What can be said for sure is that there wasn't one single incident that broke this or that led to the significant delay for dealing with or that led to the fact that now some of our volunteers are struggling

or are simply at a point where they don't have the energy anymore, it seems.

So just to give a quick example, the removal of our technical writer, essentially, we spent most of this face-to-face to reorganize the stuff that the technical writer had started helping us to organize, and we just had to redo this. It was pretty difficult too, because some of it had been done and she was literally leaving us as our support during the process of that.

So some stuff was already merged, already dealt with. Some stuff wasn't, so we had to redo it, just to give an example. Also, the hiring process of the technical writer, I think, was an issue because there was a disconnect between what was expected by us, the leadership team, and the team as a whole, in how this hiring would function and what the timeline would be. It just turned out very differently.

It's a very long story, I don't want to bore you with this right now, but essentially, the hiring took much longer than we thought, then we had someone, she was flown in last-minute into our face-to-face in Brussels, which was about a month ago, and I'm not 100% sure on the timeline, so please don't quote me, but in a matter of weeks, the person was then terminated, and a new –

DENISE MICHEL: Which was a surprise to us.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Which was a surprise to us. So we hadn't been told. We got an e-mail saying she's gone. Now a new technical writer, we had one single CV offered to us. Very qualified person, so we accepted. So currently, this person is in the contracting process.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I hope you don't finish before you get them then, if it's starting the contracting [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [We don't know how long the process is going to take.]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So again, we're not clear what's happening. And you can imagine that apart from setting us back, the impact this has on the team's psychology. So we really had momentum in Brussels for example, and now you can imagine where that momentum went. Just to give the most recent example, and I think there were things like the pause. I wasn't on the team at that point, so I did not experience that. But I'm glad I didn't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I did put it in the chat, and obviously you guys aren't in the chat, therefore, but the operating standards [for] specific reviews was adopted earlier today by the ICANN board. So at least that's –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Didn't help you or us at all, but there is a possibility in the future that it will be helping others. So that's fine. But yes, it is no longer draft, it has been adopted. See, that's good progress.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just before I forget to mention, another big challenge to us as a team, particularly during the assessment of the SSR1 recommendations, is that finding information about ICANN on ICANN processes on the ICANN homepage is pretty tricky. And we also, I think I can say that without taking too much out of the report, some of the documentation we've received was not particularly satisfying in terms of assessing what was happening. So that's maybe another one for the ATRT to look at.

And one of the suggestions that kind of came out of our process where we kind of see, “Okay, this is a problem,” is exactly that, that it's very difficult to identify for example the public comments,

when did what happen, what is the outcome document, what is the input. It's pretty difficult to find, and that's obviously a challenge for everybody.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think also in many instances, it took months and months to get answers – questions were posed to ICANN Org, to get answers back. So the impression, rightly or wrongly, that the SSR2 team has is that the security review is not a priority for ICANN Org. The actions indicate this time and again. And that's concerning. Especially the ICANN veterans around the table, there is the level of support and attention that ICANN gives to things it wants done, and then there's the support that the SSR2 has. There is quite a delta between the two.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Pat, you can almost manage your own queue.

PATRICK KANE:

Well, I like people to recognize me. Are you recognizing me, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just this once.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you. Alright, so a question I have based upon that, Denise, is, do you think that there would be a more beneficial review or an easier time of conducting the review if you were to ringfence certain aspects of ICANN Org in terms of the things that they do for the organization as opposed to things that they do for, say, the root server operations or things that they do for the community in support of, say, the new gTLD program, like the trademark clearinghouse and some of those items? So, was some of the frustration that you experienced based upon looking deep into what the OCTO organization is doing, or looking at things in general?

DENISE MICHEL:

I'm not sure I fully understand your question. I'll give it a shot, and maybe Laurin as well. I think part of the challenge for the SSR review is it is a mile wide. It covers way too much territory. And we're obligated by the bylaws to do an assessment of SSR2, which had over 2 recommendations. That in and of itself is a large thing to handle.

I think the team did its best to follow the bylaws and do the assessments that we were mandated to do as well as what we felt were the obvious SSR areas and remit of ICANN. I think this review space certainly deserves sort of a critical eye on whether it makes sense to divide up these responsibilities some more.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

I think the other issue that at least I think I saw and that we encountered is you have the problem that we have a massive issue space that we're supposed to deal with, and then we pose question to staff and we get multiple replies. Some might be, "Oh, we can't actually tell you this. This is confidential."

So the question is, how do we assess something if we cannot see evidence? We had answers from staff that were pretty evasive, let's call them. We had issues about – this was mostly before my time – NDA signing. So obviously, for a security review, it is very clear that security is an area where you have to be careful. At the same time, you cannot ask people to assess something if they're not able to access the pertinent information and data to assess what you're supposed to assess.

And I think that is also a considerable problem going forward, because again, you need certain input to do a review, and if you don't get that, it's really questionable what your review will look like. To this point, there are certain elements where we have close to no usable information.

To give you an example, we ask, "Have you done A?" The answer is, "Yes, but we cannot show you." What do we recommend or assess based on that? We cannot look at the document to confirm if we think it's in line with what they should be doing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks. I wanted to drill a little more deeply into what you mentioned about NDAs. Were you asked to sign NDAs, and did you sign them, and was that part of the issue? I'm just curious as to how that might relate to access to information.

DENISE MICHEL: My experience was that confidential information, I do not feel that confidential information has been a barrier to conducting this review, personally. There are a few areas where the answer we got from staff was that this is confidential and we can't share it with you, but broadly, I think that was not an issue for a large majority of the issues that are being addressed by the team. Just to clarify that.

Yeah, the review team members were asked to sign an NDA, and none of us did. I think maybe one of us did. Many found that the NDA was not something that individual's legal counsel, the company's legal counsel found to be appropriately worded, and we as team members also did not find it to be necessary to conduct the review.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Because I was commenting on this in detail, definitely, in comparison with the multiple delays, answers not coming in, our technical writer issue, etc., these were definitely a smaller issue. I just thought I would mention them, because this is something that going forward, will remain a problem.

But again, it's definitely not one of the high-ranking problems that we were facing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Was that you, Tola? Are you putting up – no? I saw you move. I was poised, ready. [Heavens,] people. You've put them into stunned silence. I guess one of the questions I would like to ask is how much -and this is purely just a feeling answer, there's no fact basing on this, but how much do you feel it is the unique nature of the specific review you're involved in, in other words, the fact that it is the security and stability work that is contributory to some of these challenges? And how much of it was just really bad timing with an awful lot of things going one after another? Almost a domino thing seemed to be happening. You've had the most extraordinary set of bad luck, for want of a better term. Is there any part of it which would just be unique to a future SSR, or is some of this risk we need to be aware of for specific reviews across the board?

DENISE MICHEL:

That's a good question. I would have to say both. I think the lack of clear process and accountability, the lack of appropriate support, the lack of clarity and mandate, those will be shared with subsequent reviews and other reviews.

I think the security review in particular, in my view, has an extremely broad mandate, probably too large for one group to get done within a year or so. And I think that's perhaps unique, although accountability and transparency is quite a broad area as well, so I think we share that.

I think another issue that all the reviews now share is the quandary of how the board treated the CCT review and all the CCT recommendations that are sort of in limbo, and how to square that with very clear – what I thought were clear – rules in the bylaws about if you do not approve a recommendation that comes out of one of these reviews, if you fail to approve it, then you need to articulate why, and there's that type of accountability built into how the board treats these recommendations and to neither approve or disapprove and put this whole slew of recommendations in a bucket that is to be addressed in some fashion is very confusing, on top of the fact that six months after the board had received the CCT review, they had not conducted an analysis, cost analysis, implementation analysis.

That's quite concerning, that that's how the board would treat a body of review work, let alone not having that interaction with a review team that has gone on in CCT's case for two years so that they have lots of questions and opposition to most of what the team is recommending. I think that's a very concerning dynamic that should be shared by all teams and certainly needs to be addressed, I think.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Just to add my perspective here quickly, security might have a little bit of an impact, but as Denise said, delays, not getting answers from staff, issues with getting appropriate support, being paused for no clear reason, that has nothing to do with security. The only challenge that I mentioned is essentially certain things you cannot really talk about in public.

Everything else is general.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

Sure. In terms of some of the issues that you've mentioned, some of the challenges, listening to this, I do see that we might be on a better footing in certain ways in terms of – certainly, we have a

very broad mandate, but at the same time, we also have, I think, quite a bit more flexibility. Partly because of the breadth of our mandate, we sort of have a clearer ability to pick and choose the issues that we focus on.

in terms of challenges of board buy-in, I'm not sure that this differentiates our process from yours, but we certainly have a strong degree of engagement and have had that with board members from the outset, which will hopefully make it easier to get that kind of buy-in.

But there is something that you mention in terms of – it sounds like you're describing a degree of institutional resistance, and in terms of the challenges of getting information and all the other stuff that you mentioned, and that, I would imagine, is certainly not going to be specific to security and stability, or at the very least, what I would say is that it's something that's very likely to be common to transparency, because in terms of challenges around transparency, in terms of my experience, both here at ICANN and globally in virtually every institution that I've tried to address this problem in, transparency virtually universally meets resistance. It's a very tough sell, and you very commonly get pushback.

So I kind of wanted to ask in terms of ways around this institutional resistance or ways to mitigate this, are there

additional strategies that you would suggest that you haven't, beyond the things you'd mentioned already? Or is this just sort of the nature of the beast and you've already gone through the areas that you think would be the potential ways to mitigate that?

DENISE MICHEL:

That's a really tough question. I don't have any ready answers to how you get around institutional resistance, but I think it's a really big challenge for all of us, and I think especially ATRT3. Before the IANA transition, every review team [set of] recommendation really were unanimously accepted by the board.

The first review team after the IANA transition was complete, the CCT review, a majority of the recommendations were denied. I think it's something that deserves careful thought and reflection, particularly since the community is hanging its hat on these reviews as the key tool to hold ICANN Org and the board accountable. But I don't know.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

I feel that there are two cases here. One is if information is in some way available, that means that if volunteers put a lot of work in, they can find and analyze them. In some cases, when you do actually require information from specific parties that they don't

want to give you, you're in tough luck. However, even the first one for a team of volunteers is a huge challenge.

So I don't think we have any good recommendations on how to deal with this, apart from make sure you're really good at documenting stuff like that so that you don't have to do double work, because that is usually demotivating us. We can see [after this weekend.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sébastien, and then Pat.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. One question. Do you think that Work Stream 2, when they decide to take all the review [wherein] the affirmation of commitment to put it in the bylaw could have done a better job to allow our review teams to facilitate the work and that we are facing today? Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: I think the dedicated volunteers that worked on Work Stream 2, I suspect, did the best that they could. But like so many things, once you start working under the new processes and protocols, you learn a lot. And I think this area is ripe for consideration and

perhaps a refresh on how the reviews are conducted, what ICANN Org and the board’s obligations are.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: One of these that hopefully what was decided today and we haven't read might help. For example, one of the things we were clearly missing for example during the hiring process was a statement, “This is what we’re going to do, this is what's going to happen when,” etc. So as a review team, we know what we’re dealing with, which as we mentioned before, was quite a bit of trouble for us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, are you going to wrap it up then?

PATRICK KANE: So Denise, I think it’s interesting, the comment you made or the observation you made right before in terms of post-transition the first review team to go through the whole process, CCTRT, and the whole thing is not accepted. I think it'll be interesting to see what they do with your recommendations, given that the mission, 1.1 section A is security and stability, and section B is, “Shall not get outside of this mission.”

So I think it'll be telling as to what happens with your recommendations. So, when should we expect to see responses from the board? Do we know from a timeline standpoint what you're planning or what you're estimating? For the board to make commentary on your recommendations that you're making from SSR2.

DENISE MICHEL:

We don't have our recommendations completed. We don't have a technical writer to help put our draft report together. We don't know when we'll get a technical writer. We need to have more information about that before we can update our workplan and have an idea of when the draft report will be done.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

In addition to that, as we have seen, an accepted recommendation does not mean an implemented recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes. Something we've heard from other groups as well. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Maybe what we can ask the SSR2 is to give us what they told us today, but in writing, what could be useful for our

analyze of the reviews, what they faced as problem, what are the issues, and like that, we can include that in our report. Even if you didn't finalize your report, even if you change part of what you will send to us, but it will really help, I think, the work party on reviews to take that into account.

And some of the question you raise, we face the same or with less pain, obviously, but the question of delay to receive document, the question of NDA, and it's maybe something we need to add in our work, because I have the feeling that – we, some of us signed NDA because it was – [they] told us that it was the only way to participate fully to the group. Some of us didn't sign, therefore, we have a split group here. But maybe we need to have a more deep discussion on that, because for the future, it's not good, and I had this feeling since years in ICANN: you have a large organization with a legal team, very strong, and you are alone to decide to sign or not sign a document.

Therefore, there is an unbalance in this discussion. And if we can take that onboard of ATRT3, it will be less unbalanced, and we will help the future people participating to any review team on how to deal with that, and maybe ask the ICANN Legal to change NDA part if it's needed.

When I say it's not the first time I have this – sorry I take two minutes, but when I was board member, I got exactly the same

thing. Everything was – I had to say what I was doing, if I was in conflict of interest, to sign a document, and in front of me, I was alone, and you have two or three people from Legal, from whatever part of ICANN, and you have to discuss with them. Of course, they have the power, because they have the money, the knowledge, and you have to be very strong to refuse to sign something or to not do something.

It's maybe why I'm not any more board member. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Could I quickly respond? I think the NDA discussion is a discussion that actually has to do with a larger issue, and that is, what power is given to the review teams? Because there's a lot of ways to simplify or make more complex the process of doing a review.

So I think the NDA part might just be a symptom of a larger issue, and that is about, do certain parties want to be reviewed?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just Pat and I want to make very clear that with regards to NDAs, we thought we were clear enough, and we certainly were clear enough for probably more than two thirds of our group, that if you didn't feel comfortable signing the NDA, that was not going to be any impost to your continued activity in ATRT3. It may however, if it was deemed that an NDA was absolutely essential for viewing

of some items, that you would need to be withdrawn from working on those documents. Which is a very simple, very sensible, very normal way of doing it. and I don't believe we even hit one third. Yes, [inaudible] confirming it.

So not even one third of the 17-person group we have here signed the NDAs. So I think the power balance is not the issue there. It is a clear understanding of what it does or doesn't do in terms of aids – or does not – the work of any particular review team.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think – I want to say only one person, maybe two, signed the NDA out of 15 or 16 on the SSR. We have not needed to have NDA-only people review any of our content. We've managed to move forward with our work without exercising the NDAs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And of course, if by some chance it was absolutely essential that six people were able to be available to do something that required NDAs, then you could reconsider that at the time. You don't have to have signed them before you start on the team. They can be acted, if needs be, when needs be.

Last possible word on it, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I did just want to add that in my mind, there's much more of a clear nexus between a need for an NDA on security and stability issues than there is in reviewing accountability and transparency. And we are reviewing transparency, which I find it very ironic that one of the first things that comes out is, "Please sign this NDA."

That was what motivated my decision not to sign it, but perhaps one thing to consider is that I think it is noteworthy that it was frontloaded so early in the process to try to get us to sign this thing before we knew if it was necessary for any documentation.

And I'm not blaming our chairs for that, obviously. I'm assuming that that was something that was fed into the process by ICANN Legal or ICANN Org or whoever. But I think that it would have been more positive if the decision for all of us had been put off until we got to the point where it was decided whether or not it was necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To be absolutely clear, that documentation was part of the pre-packaged documentation which was distributed to all of the ATRT members in advance of our first meeting at all. So it was just part of the packaging. And remember, that is also a risk when you start having standard operational procedures, that standard operational procedures often come along with, "And here's the expected sets of documents." So you need to be very careful that

it's not just the documents but everybody who is asked to interact with the documents is clear on the purposes for and usage of and options associated with all such documents. So that's a little extra work that might need to be done. We might need to look at that.

Okay. We've taken more of your time than we thought we'd asked for, but obviously, it was harrowing at times, distressing at other times, but nowhere near as tough as you having actually lived it. I think this is the first time I want to say "Good luck." But I do want to say thank you, and thank you at the end of a very long day of your own work. So we really appreciate your time. Thanks so much.

And with that, ladies and gentlemen, unless one of you has some overwhelming urge to put something else on our table –

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible] just a comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: And we were here complaining about persons that are not working too much. So after listening to what they complain about, our problems are [light.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fair enough. We all need to only have small problems. Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we know where we have to be on Monday. That's the next time we formally need to gather. GNSO meeting room is open, so you can file in and listen to the thrill-packed and exciting things that are going on before. It's not a closed meeting. And as always, plenty of room with seats around.

Some of us, Osvaldo, will be sitting at the table. We've already been locked in, and we look forward to looking up and seeing the rest of you friends join us. Skype, respond, e-mail, respond, and if you don't respond, the documents will be going out later this evening. So if we can just take a quick look at those before we leave, Pat. That's you and me for homework.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Cheryl, can we stop the recording now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can indeed. So as far as I'm concerned, we only have this one outstanding action item, which we can deal with right now. Okay. Right. Let's have a look at this.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]