

BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to ATRT3 Plenary Call #15 on the 5th of June 2019 at 1100 UTC. Members attending the call today are Cheryl, Liu, Jacque, Vanda, Sébastien, Erika, Daniel, Tola, and Jaap. Observers joining us are Bernie Turcotte, Herb Waye, and Jim Prendergast. Attending from ICANN Organization is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. We do have apologies from Pat, Geoff, and Wolfgang. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking, and mute your audio when not speaking. And Cheryl, you may take over the call. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much for that, Brenda. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Welcome one and all. A few more apologies than usual, we'll work, however, to the best of our ability with Brenda, of course, sharing her screen and running us through. Now, one of the things that we're going to be doing today is focusing on the continuation of the terms of reference and the work plan. So we will have, in fact the majority of today's agenda spending time looking through that document, we'll be looking at that live on screen with the shared screen managed by Brenda.

But those of you wish to, in either the Google doc or the spreadsheet, please look to the agenda and bring that up as a separate document when we get to that part of our agenda. Thank you very much for that Jennifer, and we notice that Pat's commitment looks like it's going to be wrapping up shortly and we also note that Martin will joining us very shortly, too. Apparently Pat is current speaking to the German

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.

government at a function many of you have been involved in, in Berlin at the moment, and Maarten is sort of reporting to us live, so to speak, but they will be coming into our little fold shortly.

So, with that very lengthy welcome compared to normal, and having done the roll call, can I just call for anyone who may have an update to their Statement of Interest, reminding you all of course that we work under continuous disclosure and you are required to let us know at the next available meeting if there has been a change to your commitments and you're reporting of the statement of interest.

A brief moment to see if anyone has anything exciting in their work life and commitments that they might want to report. Sadly, nobody's been offered a new job, but I do note we've got a couple of extra of our team joining, noting Ramet and Osvaldo have also joined since we did roll call, so welcome, gentlemen.

Right, so with that, and updates to Statements of Interest, let's move on to the next almost standing agenda time, but before we do rush into updates from each of the work parties, I'll just ask, is there anyone who has any other business they'd like to flag? We will call again at the end of the agenda for any other business, but if you would like mention any other business at this stage, please do so now. Ah, Jacques, please, go ahead.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yes, Jacques for the record. Just at the end of this call, I'd like to share some live action from ICANN some of you might have followed, which is the draft involving the ICANN multistakeholder model. It's happening

now, so ICANN is communicating how should they evaluate the multistakeholder model and in the points they are mentioning, there are two points which should talk to us, which is accountability and transparency, #11 and 12. So I will, at the end, I will share the link so anyone can see the document, and my feeling was maybe community review group and Board review group could find something to work on in our work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Thanks for that, Jacques, and of course that's the project that we were briefed on in reasonable detail at a previous meeting, and we will also be spending some time in our face-to-face meeting on the 23rd in Marrakech. Talking with Brian Cote not only in his capacity for the reviews work party to interact with him and others from ATRT2, but also in any nexus that we have with that project.

Brian, Pat and I have made sure that we keep each grouping well informed, but that public comment period for the current iteration of input, and this is just an early phase on that project, is closing I believe on the 13th of June and there will be a webinar on the 12th. So we might almost call that as a piece of any other business now dealt with, and thank you for that link. But yes, we certainly do need to keep well apprised of all that. Let me know at the end of the meeting if we need to come back and have further discussion on that as Any Other Business. Okay, so with that, Jacques, your hand is still up, am I to assume you want to say something else?

JACQUES BLANC: My bad, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, not at all. Alright then. So, in the way that it's written in the order on the Agenda in front of you, we have both Osvaldo and Sébastien on the call today, but I know Osvaldo has been unwell, so I'm assuming Sébastien the update to the group will be primarily managed by you, so over to you Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much Cheryl, Sébastien Bachollet speaking. There is an updated version since the last meeting of this plenary group on the Google doc, and as Osvaldo was not able to work on that, we plan to have some work together in the next period, this afternoon for me, this morning for him, and we will be able to come back with something more consistent shortly, hopefully. As a reminder, every member of this group are very welcome to make comments on the Google doc if they wish. So, thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Sébastien, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And I'm also assuming that any of these changes have been reflected in the Terms of Reference document in particular, is that the case?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess it's part of the document, it's the same, but I will check again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. As we get to Item #3 on today's agenda, it would just be good to know that what has been going on in your work party is also being fully reflected in the Terms of Reference. Thank you for that, Osvaldo, I am going to assume, seeing as your hand is up and you've been unwell, that you don't have anything else to add, but let me know if you do. And with that, we will move on to GAC. And we have both Liu and Vanda here today as leads from that work party. Vanda, are you going to start it off?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, well, we have finished our work for the Terms of Reference. We put everything inside that document, it's all there. We discussed a little bit one sentence in the objectives, and the new one is there too. I'm working now in the framework for collecting the feedback we're going to have in Marrakech to make our work easier to analyze after the meeting. So, for our side, it's just that. And maybe Liu, or Maarten, or Jacques, everybody is there today, can add something. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Vanda. Anyone else? Liu, or anyone else from the group want to make a comment on the progress of the GAC work party? Maarten is happy, he's saying, "Happy, well said."

Okay. Nobody jumping in. I do want to note, and I think we can confirm, but I'll just double check, Jennifer I am assuming that the

questions to the GAC which was the subject of the special request from the GAC work party last week, noting that the GAC needs additional and advanced time of anything before meeting with us in Marrakech. But those questions did go out and she has confirmed in the chat, that is the case. So let the records show that that is an action item that has been carried out and completed. We look forward to reaction to those questions as posed. Great, that will bring us to reviews.

I noticed that KC isn't with us for today's call, she may be an apology, perhaps Brenda can double check on that, but we do have Daniel as the other Co-Lead, so Daniel, if you would like to bring us up to date with any update from reviews, thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Daniel for the record, hope I can be heard loud and clear. Had a virtual meeting with KC, that was yesterday, to be able to discuss our respective action points and I'm happy to share that from the meeting that we had with KC we had at least some action points in reference to the meeting that we shared before of the review work party.

So, I think based on our work party we shall have feedback report to give you the next call. But we shall be discussing further will be the review of the [inaudible] respective document and then we shall be also reviewing the threads that have been shared on the respective mailing lists and the different respective action points that will be coming in. And then also how are we going to be able to move forward for meetings and recommendations for the work parties, all that will be discussed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thank you very much for that Daniel, glad you and KC had a meeting yesterday, that's great. It is a good practice if the work party leads can interact regularly, and I also am looking forward to the call that your work party will be running in a few hours time, or a day's time. I know it's on my calendar, anyway. Going now to Community, I'm not seeing Michael on the call, but Erika is. So, Erika, I guess it's all over to you.

ERIKA VALESE: Hi Cheryl, thank you, this is Erika. Michael might be running a bit late today, so he may have something to add a little bit later. For the community work stream we had a call earlier this week, I think a very productive call, to talk through what was left of the Terms of Reference for us to finalize and refine the language that we had there. Michael and I had a chance to chat just after that too, based on that discussion, to update the language for that, and sent it around I believe on Monday, I'm afternoon, for the rest of the group to review and give any feedback.

So, we didn't get any other comments and I updated the current text in the Terms of Reference. I guess if there are any pending comments or anything like that, we can bring that up as we get to the next agenda item, I suppose. And from there, we decided on our call we're going to move to Next Steps in terms of further refining resource requests and preparing for Marrakech, and I imagine we'll be working on that throughout this week, too. That's about it, thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, and that's a goodly amount. That's excellent. Yes, if Michael manages to get to us with his other commitment wrapping up in time, we will circle back to him, as well, but I assume it will have direct impact into the Terms of Reference, or the end document, anyway. So, thank you for that. IRP is just sitting there as a place holder. We will be looking at an update from the IRP during our Marrakech interactions, but I also want to note with great pleasure that after the reviews work party has their meeting, the work party meeting, each of the work parties have conducted their own teleconference and we believe that's a great thing and something that we trust as assisted forwarding and furthering all of your work.

So, with that, unless there's any questions from anybody regarding any of those updates, or if there is any particular requirement that you need staff in terms of resources and requests, if you just let us know now either in chat or you can put your hand up, we can take that and make that into an action item. I'm not seeing any of that happen, however, let's move on to the substance of today's call, and that is our Terms of Reference and our work plan. With the Terms of Reference and work plan, what I might do is reverse that and we might have a brief look at our work plan first, so Brenda, prepares herself to open up the spreadsheet.

I know most of you have probably focused more on the Terms of Reference which is what Pat and I have been pushing with the deadline, of course. And just on that, the Terms of Reference and Work Plan, our objective was to have those completed and in a form ready to go to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee as of tomorrow's date. But

we've negotiated a few extra days grace so that you can in fact do a little bit more polish and input on this.

And I do want to make a couple of suggestions, if we can go through the work plan, as well, and just make sure that everything particularly to do with your work parties is being reflected accurately because by my reading, I'm not convinced that all of this is a true and accurate record of what's going on.

And so with this, for example, we see some things have already changed, things like role of observers, we're sitting here, which is line #10 on your screen under General Administration to determine role of observers, it's sitting there at 20%. I would argue that the role of observers is quite clear, and it should probably be updated. So that's an example of one of the things that I think before we hand in our homework to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee we need to go through and make some changes.

Now obviously Pat and I will need to look at some of this in detail with Staff, but if I can prevail upon you, and Brenda, if you can just slowly scroll down, just remind everybody that there is general administered, continue going down, here we go, one of the things if we need to identify any resources needed, I suspect we're probably a little further at this stage than the 20% that has been recorded there in terms of identification. They may have already been sourced, but I think we're a bit better than 20%, and under the subgroups you may all wish to look at your various subgroups now and see whether you believe you've got a truer figure to bring through.

There's quite a number of zeros, for example, that I think we can probably start to make some changes. If you scroll down for example to the work party the GAC, we certainly, I think, can look at perhaps some modification of some of these values, but I would like the work party itself and this can just be done on lists, but in the next day or so, if you have a look at this and say, well, in my view, we're listing this at the moment at 20%, but the work party believes it should be 30, or 50, or whatever it is.

And yes, Jenny, line #22 of the work plan dates 2018, not a good look, we certainly need to fix that. So, if I can get all of you to take a very critical view in the next, dare I say, 72 hours or so, of the work plan, and not edit, because we want to control the editing, but propose what changes you would like Staff to make to this. I think that would be a very good thing, indeed. With that, I'm not sure that we need to take much more time on the work plan, but we do have to hand the work plan in along with the Terms of Reference, so we've been doing a lot more than I think is reflected here, so please do get back to us after you've had a good look through.

Alright, with that, Brenda, if you don't mind, in the absence of any questions about work plan, and I'm seeing commitments from a number of you to dig in to it. Let's now go to the Terms of Reference document. Yes, please Jaap, do make sure they use suggest mode, so pop comments in and we can all see it. And you are uncomfortable doing that, then do just put your comments into your Skype channels and of course the email thread.

Okay, now we're going to take it from the top, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, I've had a bit of a fiddle in here in the last couple days. I know Pat has been in there, as well. I've noticed a few of you have also been making edits and comments. In today's call we want to take a from the top review, but we also want to recognize that there is a goodly amount of general toilet that needs to be acquired to this.

For example, I noticed where staff for example have been putting in proposed text based on our meetings, they've been using the short form of ATRT3 all the way through, I've tended to put in text which uses the long form, that's why we've got a professional writer to make a choice and make it read correctly. So let's not worry about the finer wordsmithing on today's call, but let's look in general terms, is there any areas that need specific material and content to be added?

So, from the top, we've got the usual links which is all just the boring administrivia, the links to various things including the Board resolution. Continue to scroll, thanks Brenda. The mailing lists, so anyone reading this can go to the mailing list, and the material on the background.

The Section 2, Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables. Mission and scope is very much unchanged from what you've seen, it's the boilerplate material and it also goes into the specifics of the actual resolution, which of course outlines what they expect, but we are not limited to this, but these are the expectations, and you've all agreed to incorporate those into your work practices and work parties as you've gone through.

Continue to scroll down to Objectives. Here, I've changed, this is one of those places that I couldn't help myself. In this section those of you who have read it recently, there was boilerplate advice for want of a better word from previous terms of reference that had been popped in here almost as reminders, I guess, or an advisory basis. So it was really text which was outlining how we should be filling in the sections and where possible, I've turned that text into language which reflects what it is. So now it sort of says notes regarding objectives and speaks in a tense which refers to our, and what we believe is consistent with the ICANN mission and bylaws.

I mentioned what we've got is in keeping with the expectations of the Terms of Reference the specific reviews set forth, and that we have set forth the priority order. Now I've stated that, because that's what the material in this section said, but each of you now need to make sure that as your order is in your work parties, that it is in fact the priority order that you are running with. I have no evidence to say it isn't, but please do double check that for example this second paragraph under notes, under the objectives where we say that it is set forth in a priority order, is a true and accurate reminder there.

I also changed the text in the bottom part of this section which indicated that if indeed after the Terms of Reference had been adopted and sent to the Board, we then need to make changes after a consensus discussion and agreement, that such changes to scope is required and amendments will need to be made. But obviously we're up to updating this document and publishing it, and also updating and revising the OAC, and via that channel, submitting to the Board, along with any

explanations, et cetera, this is an example of my terribly clumsy text which desperately needs a professional touch.

And so I wouldn't expect the final document to be as she is written right now, but it will be reflecting as the intentions here that this text is our statement saying what we will do if and when we need to make any changes. Scroll down then until we've got the work tracts. I notice here we've got the terminology here that we're talking about working teams, Work Teams 1 to 4 as listed. The only changes I have made here are formatting ones, so I could try and ensure that most of what you put in was fitted per page, we'll fiddle with pagination later, but please do make sure that everything is reflected. You'll notice this is the Board material going through here.

And then scroll to the next section, the Community Working Team, now this is again one of the stylistic issues. Each of the work teams have put in their text and their points in a format that is slightly unique to their own writing style. I can't establish with you yet which style will make the end cut, but we will look for consistency in style, as we go through. Just hold it there Brenda, because we need to go to Sébastien. Sébastien, over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Cheryl. Two points, the first one, I think, and it's part my fault, because I name working team, but we are now talking about work party, therefore I think it could be better to use one single terminology about how we call our subgroups. And then to make that change here from WT1 to WP1 and so on. That's one point.

The second, if I understand well, and you talk about the priority order, I really don't feel that we never intended to have done the objective in a priority order. We list all the things we wanted to do, it was done mainly after the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles and if we want to do a priority order, it will be I guess a tough job, because I have no idea right now how we want to organize by priority in this section, in this party of setting the objective. When we will discuss how we will work on each topic, maybe we will start to put that in some order, but for the moment, my feeling is that it's not ordered by priority here. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, Sébastien, thanks for that. I was tempted to ask that question of each of you, and I decided to see whether or not you would all be able to do it. If you feel that it is too great a job to do so, then we need to go back up and remove the sentence statement. But, let me remind you that sentence is in fact one that came from the template advice. And so the expectation in the Terms of Reference advice, the note that was there outlining what should go in under the objectives clearly stated that the expectation was for our steps and issues to be outlined, the objectives in a priority order.

However, I certainly understand why it could be a problem to do so. We would then need to pick up this prioritization in some other way. Pat has just mentioned in chat that perhaps we could cover this with how we will prioritize the recommendations as opposed to how we prioritize the objectives. That certainly is one way forward, Pat, I'm not wed to it one way or the other, but I will point out all I did was change the tense

and the parsing of a sentence on instruction of how it was to be done from the template material we were given. So let's work on that.

It might be that some of the priorities are blatantly obvious, and it might be that smart people's thinking, as you all were working on it, might have serendipitously almost organized a reasonable priority, anyway. Maarten has also noted in chat, it's the "what we don't know," and it's too early to prioritize. So let's take that on advice. I'm not hearing any suggestion to the contrary, that it might be a little too problematic to make it so, that the order that things are written in is a priority. So, we'll take the least line of resistance and remove the statement from the introduction and try and pick up prioritization in some other way. Sébastien, your hand is still up, do you want to say something else?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, Cheryl, may I suggest that we say that this objective, there is no priority, but we will try to enter the work with some prioritization, and yes, it will allow some work and learning, and going by iteration, but you want to add something in this sentence, talking about prioritization, it must not be for objective but for how we will enter the work and also finally when we will deliver the work and our recommendation, obviously we will need to put them by priority. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Noted, Sébastien, but as I was also trying to make very clear to you all, the guideline for writing our Terms of Reference specified that the objectives should be prioritized. I'm not going to die in a ditch about saying it has to be done that way. If it isn't done that way, so be it, we'll

pick up prioritization in some other way in the document in some type of form, and we will simply take the least line of resistance and remove the statement about prioritization and make sure it's picked up as best we can. All suggestions as to how we manage that will be welcome and something we can tack onto our list.

Okay, so we're looking at what we're now going to call work party, and I must say I do feel more comfortable with that, it will be Work Party 2 and we'll just make those global changes. You're right, this is more text. Thank you, Brenda, if you can continue to scroll down, this is material that has come in particularly modified, again, since the group's meeting. If we now go to the GAC group, we're back to the style of a numbered list and there is less subpoints here.

So I don't know, Vanda and Liu, whether you might want to look at this now, compared to how the other work parties have outlined their objectives, and look to whether or not there are any subpoints you might wish to add. If so, let us know in comments and we'll see how that works out. Continue scrolling, thank you, Brenda, and it brings us then to the reviews group, noting that we're back to bullet points, slightly different style again, but what we may find is that this section in particular may have additional subpoints as a result of the upcoming meeting.

The Definitions section which follows is apparently a required section. That's almost the last thing we do is go back and due definitions. That's just like a bibliography, a standard part of it. I would also suggest that we make the effort to perhaps put in a link to one of the definitions, I

think the GNSO has a fairly well updated jargon-buster link, we might want to put that in, as well.

That then brings us, if you scroll a bit more, to Deliverables and Timeframes. I would suggest, and this is a change here, you'll notice there is a non-live link, it's underlined, insert link to the WP, here we're putting WP, not work party, that's for us to actually put in a link to the Work Plan, so that the two documents are associated with each other. Because obviously the work plan outlines specific steps in quite finer detail, but also reports on the ongoing progress, and sorry there is an extra 's', it should be progresses towards 100, so that's a typo that needs to be picked up there. And the expected timings of various steps and project activities. The dates, the only changes are where it previously said 7th of June or 6th of June, it now says XX because there's going to be a tiny bit later than that. The other dates have not been altered, and of course the end date is not able to be altered at all.

Scrolling then down to Deliverables, this is simply a statement that has included the listing of what we were advised should go in draft and final report. Just change the text here to undertake that we would be planning to reduce at least one draft and final report. The language there may change to use the terminology, "initial report" but we'll see how we go there. You will notice these bullet points, they are quite literally unchanged, just the advised bits of what people should expect in the report, unless you think that needs to be modified, I would think keeping it as simple as possible here is appropriate.

However, I've mentioned with my fiddling around to lose two footnotes, and so just as an aside, footnote 1 and footnote 2 need to be

reproduced in the bottom of this page, but as actual footnotes, or actually as part of the body text. So, someone with more clever writing skills in Word, rather than my Google world, can fix that, hint, hint.

Continuing down now, until we move to the next section, thanks very much, with this next section here, the text, and this is text we haven't really looked at since we gathered together in Los Angeles, slight rephrasing of the first paragraph so that it mentions in keeping with the guidelines for review teams to develop and follow a clear process when documenting constructive recommendations that undertake to be effect based and clearly articulated, a process that provides all supporting documentation, et cetera, and that we had agreed we would be using this in IRT framework.

Then again we also slightly changed the text in the following paragraph to indicate that we will be shifting where this text said, 'thou shalt inform the community of our recommendations,' I've changed that text to basically say that we will be sharing the proposed recommendations with ICANN Organization in the form of public comments and other interaction opportunities, and the rest of that sentence is pretty much as she was written anyway, although I changed some of the "we will trust" results, et cetera, I would change the tense in that.

Scroll down, thank you Brenda, we'll need to change work track to work party, but those questions, those self check questions are as were presented to us in the template and other than that, turning the introductory paragraph into a better semblance of the English language, I'm not sure that we need to do very much more other than list that from the template, anyway.

And then if we go down, we have administrative staff, we've got list of membership. Continuing down, now here we have a couple sections that we do need to discuss today. Scroll up a little bit, Brenda, if you can, just to catch the top of that. That's it. The language here, Jennifer put in some language which I made some minor modifications to, but this section on roles and responsibilities hopefully reflects our agreement at the second meeting that we will wherever possible and practical adhere to the roles and responsibilities, practices and processes outlined in the current operating standards for specific reviews.

I would be tempted to put 'draft' and I would also be tempted to put the link to the current documentation there, so if any of you object to that, let us know, if you think it's a bad idea let us know what we should be saying instead of that. But that's the type of language you will expect to see there. If you move down to your language here, where staff is pitting ICANN Organization assigned staff to support us in the various work including project management meetings, et cetera.

The language there as it was written was simply ICANN will provide, members of ICANN Organization will be assigned to support, and so I changed that sentence to be a little softer saying ICANN has assigned staff and my question is do we need to list them? I'm tempted to list them, I think they're more than worthy of being named, but again, please put in your comments to let us know if that is a good move forward.

And if you scroll now down to Dependencies and Other Organizations, this is a text that staff had put in and that they were particularly keen to

make sure we had all reviewed and looked at. So let's do so now. I see nothing wrong with this pretty much as it is written. It looks at what the most dependencies are, but do read through this and make sure we've picked up everything. It doesn't mean we can't add some more.

I did wonder, and Maarten can advise us whether or not we should be specifically talking about the Board caucus group. This is just engaged dialogue with the Board. So, Maarten, if you could put your critical eye over that last paragraph in the dependency section, that would be very, very important. Thanks Maarten, noting the chat as well, over to you please, go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: For sure we will do that The plan is to come back after it and prior to Marrakech or sure, to engage with them on where we are. What is not fully clear to me, and I'm working on that, is a caucus group versus OAC the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. There are fortunately [inaudible] in both, so this will help coordinate things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maarten, and my suggestion is we are less specific and we talk about the Board or the relevant board committees rather than picking one over the other. And I did wonder why [inaudible] by the OAC, why this would be specified. So that's the paragraph that I think needs to be worked on. Any input that's needed from you in particular, Maarten, on that, would be work in the short order, thanks very much.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Actually, Cheryl, that makes sense, because I can also see that for some you would want to talk with the Board finance committee, for instance, the governance committee. So I'm follow there and I will come back with a proposal.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so we'll take that as a proposed change in text where we won't be specific, but we'll be general with the Board via the OAC. Thanks very much for that. Okay, Brenda, if we just sort of scroll down there and make sure, Jennifer that we capture that paragraph that we need to modify. A little bit more Staff provided text here, but this is in keeping with what we said earlier on in terms of roles and responsibilities. We'll follow decision making. Procedures and Methodologies listed in brackets there for details, as specified in the most current operating specific reviews. This is basically a repetition of what we said further up in the document and again, if we provide a link to that as a footnote, that's possible.

Going to Outreach; now this I have flagged here, this particular paragraph, this is the one where I've seen most of the remaining work that still needs to be done. This is almost virgin material here. This is the type of 'thou shalt' language that was in the template when we first got it. To me, this needs the Marrakech planning and other material in it. This is one of those sections that I think needs a well written and professional touch. Outreach is something the community is very keen to know about, but we certainly want to mention things like your planned surveys and questionnaires, et cetera, so any comments you

can put into this section as comments will be greatly appreciated within the next 72 hours or so.

With that, it brings us blessedly almost to the end, while my voice is still working before I throw over to Pat, with the closure and review teams. So, I made a few tiny tweaks with the language here and recognize that I've tended to use the long form of our name, Accountability And Transparency Review Team, where existing language and Staff for example tended to use the short form ATRT. With that, I'm noting Maarten, thanks very much, your suggesting chat confirmed referring the Board in general, that would be a good guideline for us.

With that, that's our run through of where we are in Terms of Reference. As you can see there is initial work to be done, but not in insurmountable amount of it, and certainly something that we would think is a matter of getting the input in and some days of work, so only a small extension of time should be required. With that, thank you Brenda for scrolling through all of that, you did a great job of keeping up. I'm going to say to Pat now, seeing as he sitting opposite Maarten, listening to all of the language, I'm sure it is confusing, probably in stereo. What is it that he would like to mention? I'm sure I've missed heaps of things. He's been delving into the Terms of Reference far more deeply than I have up until now, and he certainly will be working with me on the work plan adjustments as well.

Thanks for joining us Herb. Okay, Pat says I covered it all well, that's good to hear. So let's see if there's anybody that wants to make any general comments now. Not seeing anyone. Okay, well ladies and gentlemen, Pat and I are going to ask you to make whatever comments

and language suggestions on the Terms of Reference document and the work plan within the next 72 hours. We will then take the Terms of Reference and work plan document off comment and edit mode. It will be snapshotted at that point in time and it will go into a final draft and general toilet to get something that's more polished and professional but in general will be reflecting of the language and the intent that we went through today.

Pat, do you want to say anything, my friend? No? Got it covered, good heavens, alright then. Jacques you mentioned earlier on in terms of any other business, the work being done on the development and evolution of the multistakeholder model. I said we'd loop back to that, so let's do that now. Is there anything else you want to pick up on noting the link that you in? Jacques, over to you.

JACQUES BLANC:

Yes, Jacques for the record. Well, in fact the only note, I mean it's worth reading because it is a very good overall communication exercise from ICANN Org to community in the larger sense. And most interesting is we have the advice not to replicate the work which is going to be done through this multistakeholder evolution work in our assessment. So it will be more like, my feeling is it's more like getting a better view on the kind of methodology and principles that is used by ICANN Org and communicating in general, but once more, we are advised in the document not to duplicate the work which is done here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Jacques. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yes, we seek to be complementary and that's why we're trying to work very, very closely with each other. Alright, well it seems to me that the only thing that Pat and I wanted to mention to you on today's call is two things, really. We are perilously close to having the formalization of our technical writer being contracted fully and we're trying to get the ink dry on the paper.

The amount of administration, it reminds me of the days in the dim distant past when I used to work with emergency services and provision of medical services and first aid in the field, and we often used to say it would be easy to save the patient excepting for all of the paperwork. So I think that is a reflection of what this is like in terms of hiring for contract as well. But you may note one the observers today is a familiar name to those of you who worked with the Workstream 1 and 2 and the cross community working group on both ICANN accountability and other cross community working group leading up to the IANA transition.

A familiar name is there, you might find that that name is a name that is more formally associated with this in the not too distant future. Who would dare advertise such a thing in advance. Certainly not me. We are looking forward to having the formal and official welcoming of our assistants, and we believe that will help us get these documents into good working order and short order, as well.

With that, the only other thing Pat and I wanted to mention to you today was current thinking of the agenda and the organizing for our interactions on the 23rd of June in Marrakech. We believe we will be doing most of our redirections, we set up in the block of the afternoon,

so it will be the PM that we will be interacting with other leads from reviews, et cetera, et cetera and with those Board members from various capability mechanisms and the caucus and the OAC and all that sort of thing. Hopefully that will also work for Maarten when he can sneak away from his committee duties, as well.

We note that there is a bit of a need for us to work in whole group activities, so we will be doing a little bit of white board or flip chart as a group in the morning and we will be running through our preparation for our interactions with other parts of the community, as well as more administrativia in the morning sessions. So you can still think about a business part meeting in the mornings, a little bit workshopping in the morning, and then interaction and getting yourselves those first phases of direction with key people in the afternoon. So that's our thinking so far, and there will be more on that once times start to get time down. Jennifer, did you find out where this room is?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi Cheryl, this is Jennifer. So room is called the Rosary Room and it's on I believe the Minus One level of the convention center. So, in terms of logistics, I'm not quite clear on how you access that room, but we will put together a map and share that in the agenda and we'll also include per your request Cheryl and Pat, information on where each of the engagements are throughout the week, so everybody is clear on where they need to go, because I understand it's not a great venue. So, we'll do our best to help there. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Thank you very much for that, Jennifer. So, what Jennifer is referring to is in our meeting on the morning of the 23rd, we'll also have useful material such as here is where all of our interactions are in terms of where is the GAC room, where is the ALAC room, et cetera. But our room, thanks for finding that out, Jennifer.

Rosary on the Minus One level. For those of you who have been to this convention center before, there is a main conference building and an awful lot of out buildings, at least we're in the main conference building by the sound of it. There is stairwells which is such a joy for someone like me, and there is a lift which will take about 1-1/2 people. So give yourself plenty of time to get to and from your room. With that, I'm going to ask Jennifer now, unless anybody has got any questions about the venue, if we can just run through any confirmed actions and decisions reached.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, this is Jennifer. The action items I noted for confirmation are review teams to do critical review of the work plan and terms of reference documents within the next 72 hours and propose an changes to the email lists or Skype, or in suggest mode in the Google Docs. And then particularly, please add suggestions to outreach section #2 to include your plans for Marrakech.

I noted a couple of modifications for Staff, one on the paragraph regarding the review team's engagement to the Board to change that to Board, rather than the Board caucus group and just to check on the footnotes to be added to the Deliverables section. Then, in terms of

decisions, the review team discussed the extension for a couple of days in terms of submitting the work plan and Terms of Reference to the Board. So that will no longer be on the 5th of June, but will be sometime in the near future. Please let me know if I missed anything or need to correct anything. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Jennifer, that seems fine by me. Pat, have we missed anything? Type away. I gather there's all sorts of feedback if you try and speak because you're all sitting together in a room in Berlin. He thinks we're good, excellent. Well, if there is nothing else that anyone needs to raise in today's call, I'm perfectly happy to end this agenda a little bit ahead of time, and you can spend the additional 20 minutes making the comments in the documents. Excellent, you can get ahead of the game.

So, thank you ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for the work you have already done on these documents and the work that you will be doing in the 72 hours before we take it off and make the magic happen to polish it up and be something that we're proud of. The sooner you hand in your homework, that better, it does make it easier for everybody else.

Don't forget the work plan, look at those percentages and make sure that is a true and accurate report, as well. Jennifer, it just strikes me that you do need to make sure that we've got a way of linking the work plan document to the reference to the work plan in the Terms of Reference document. So that means that the work plan and the Terms

of Reference document need to be housed appropriately on the wiki space so we can link properly.

Okay, with that, thank you one and all, 20 minutes of time that you can do your homework, and we can stop recording now, Brenda, and we will meet again, of course, next week as usual and that will a 2000 UTC call. With that, bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]