
BRENDA BREWER:

Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT3 plenary call number 16 on the 12th June 2019, at 21:00 UTC. Members attending the call today are Cheryl, Daniel, Liu, Jaap, Geoff, Erica, Sébastien, Vanda, Pat, Tola and Michael, and Wolfgang. Observers joining in [cross talk]. Pardon me? Thank you. Observers joining us are Bernard Turcotte, Jim Prendergast, and Lars Hoffman. And attending from ICANN Org we have Jennifer and Brenda, and we have no apologies. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record, and I'll hand it over to Pat and Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Brenda. I might jump in and get started. I've donated my right brain to our meeting for the first half hour, then you'll have my full attention after that. But if we can just look for the usual administration. Is there anybody who needs to give us an update on their statements of interest? Please do so now. And I'm looking up and down the list and not seeing anyone wave at me frantically, so if there is an update to a statement of interest, perhaps you can type it into chat. And then I just want to draw your attention to the agenda which is in front of you, looking suspiciously like a rinse and repeat from last week's call, although, of course, the terms of reference document and the work plan are significantly changed from last week as we went through, and Pat and staff and I have gone through those documents today, or yesterday, in my world. And thank you for the musical interlude, but I really don't need the fanfare.

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.

And what we will be seeking is a sign-off on these as final, because we intend to transmit them in the next few hours after this call. With that, I would also mention that under any other business, if any of you have any other business you'd like to flag now, let us know and we'll make sure we leave adequate time. We will call for any other business again, but assuming that we will have time, Pat and I would like to just show you the current state of the planned agenda for the meeting we'll be holding on the [23rd] June. Hopefully, Brenda's managed to find that document to display. But that's about the only other thing I think we wanted to do. Pat, have I missed anything on agenda?

PATRICK KANE:

I don't believe so. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Well, in that case, let's move on to item two, which is our usual updates from work parties, and I want to ... First of all, Pat, I want to thank you all for the work you've all put in on the TOR, and indeed the work plan percentages completed since our last call. We certainly appreciate the input, and also recognize the calls that have been held in the interim as well for some of the work parties. But let's start as we always do in these calls with board. Is it Sébastien or Osvaldo who is going to start off?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I guess I will start. Osvaldo made a lot of progress in the document and I follow him, and therefore I hope that the [latest] version of the document is better. We have added all that on the Google doc and we will

appreciate if there are any feedback from any member of the group. Two things we need to do quite quickly is to be prepared for all the meetings in Marrakech, and the question we may have to ask about is already on the document somewhere else, and we will put in a specific place for that.

And if I can ask staff to send us a mail with a list of the meetings we are supposed to have, and eventually the one we are not yet totally finalized like that, we will know with which group we will meet, and if we have questions, how we organize those questions. And I will be happy to answer any questions if you have, and Osvaldo, if you want to add something, please? Thank you.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Hello. As Sébastien said, we need to prepare the question ... I was told that we would have a lot of common themes with the other working teams, so perhaps we should coordinate some time ... We should dedicate some time to coordinate with different teams to have a one only list of questions. Also, we are studying the ATRT2 recommendations to see which ones we should focus on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Osvaldo, and thank you, Sébastien. A couple of things. I believe that there was an e-mail that came out from Jennifer a little while back listing the various interactions, face-to-face with the different component parts of ICANN. But obviously we can resend that, and we can certainly send them as iCals, or whatever the invitation is of your choice as well. But I'm pretty sure I saw an e-mail with all of those outlined. But if not, we will make sure it's resent or sent, and that that will have all of

the information on it. With reference to, and this goes now to all of the work parties. Yes, we would very much like to have a single set of questions, and when you have a look at the agenda for the 23rd, you will note a couple of things.

First of all, in the morning, there is a block of time to do exactly as Osvaldo and Sébastien have just mentioned, and that the call also was made from the reviews work party, and that is to look at harmonization when necessary, mutualism, interdependencies, etc. So, we will be doing that face-to-face in particular. And the appendix to the agenda is the list of questions. At the moment it only has the GAC ones in. We're expecting the community ones to come across as soon as they're polished up after their recent call, and so we can extract the ones that board work party has prepared as well as any that reviews want to contribute.

Because it is important that we try and get those questions out to the people we're interacting with as early as possible. Without garnering what we'll get back to when we look at that agenda then, if there's no questions for Sébastien and Osvaldo, let's move to GAC. And I know Vanda has sent a slide, so if we can show the slide, and over to you Vanda and Liu.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Hi. Well, I believe our main focus being GAC, as Cheryl said, we sent the reviews, the question for them, but I had to ask Liu to help get some more time with chair, vice-chair, or even other members of the GAC to have a more detailed conversation with them to get more feedback from

them. So, we are reviewing an ATRT2 doc. It's a specific section on the ATRT2. I've already sent to Daniel this information to be better prepared.

Nowadays, I'm personally working on the working plan for after Marrakech until Singapore as we did from the previous slice of time from Los Angeles and Marrakech. So that's all for us, and I do believe that if someone can also talk ... I'm seeing Wolfgang and Maarten. I'm not seeing Liu, but anyway, Liu Yue is there if he can add something, I'm open for any questions. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. Liu, did you have anything additional to add?

LIU YUE: Yes, I agree with Vanda, and I will contact with GAC, the leadership, and should find that person from ... To find the member to work with GAC working group and to help us to finish the question and the interview. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I do believe we have an interaction with the GAC, and I had read this, when I saw this from the GAC working party, as an additional informal interaction. If that can't be worked out, of course, during the very busy Marrakech meeting, what we might be able to do is have that as a follow-up from the Marrakech meeting that is formally organized. So, let's see how we go with that over the next little while, see what sort of feedback you get, Liu, that would be great. Okay, then so

let's go back to the agenda and move to reviews. And Daniel, I'm assuming that will be you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, hope I can be heard loud and clear. Can I be heard?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, you can.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. To proceed, we had the meeting for the reviews work party, and at least we looked at the new terms of reference to commit, and some adjustments/amendments were made and updated into the document respectively. And also, one of the outcomes of the meeting was that we requested that the different work parties be able to extract the components of the ATRT2 recommendations that they're working on, and what they'll be focusing on.

And at least the information was sent out respectively and were able to receive appropriate ... We've so far received feedback from Vanda, that they are working on the GAC issues, and also a note from KC. She also sends in her apologies for this call, and also, she highlights that she did another extensive markup on the [inaudible] document from which the ATRT2 and ATRT1 specific basically to the board, the GAC, and the community groups.

And so, they're going to devise appropriate [termings] of how we can able to get feedback from all the respective working groups, and also be able

to proceed with our work respectively. And later shall be able to at least make more updates after the Marrakech meeting. Thank you. That's a brief update from the reviews work party. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much for that, Daniel. And we note KC's apology and thank you for passing that on. Again, just wanted to remind you that you will have this interaction time, workshop time, in the morning on the 23rd as well, so for people to think about that is where nexus and interdependencies is very important. I also would ask if you can start getting any specific questions prepared as well. That would be extremely useful if we get those as early as possible.

And when you have a look at the agenda, you'll see the face-to-face interactions we have planned for the afternoon. Confirmed, I should say, for the afternoon. And that might also inspire some of you. With that, let's move to community. Sorry, Daniel, your hand's back up. Go ahead, sorry.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Yes, we have at least some formal questions that we have extracted, and we shall merge them into the respective discussion that we shall be holding. So, what I'm doing right now is to extract all the questions into one specific page, and then that page will be shared, and then the different work parties will be able to see what we so far have for [inaudible], also with next face-to-face meeting. Thank you, back to you Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, and I appreciate that, Daniel. Particularly since Pat and I would be keen to append all of these questions to our agenda for the 23rd, and also then to get them out to the people we're interacting with as early as possible, as well as, of course, make them public to the wider ICANN community. With that, I'm assuming that Erica is going to pick up the mantle for ... Oh, no, Michael's here as well. So, they can flip a coin! Michael and Erica held a call only a few hours ago, so I'm sure they've got a couple of things to update us with. Whomever wishes to jump in, do so.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Why don't I take it first? Just because you seemed so astonished that I'm here. The community team had a meeting earlier today, which some of you attended. And as part of that, we have essentially finalized our questions for the discussions at Marrakech. They were almost finalized on the call, subject to wordsmithing to one, excuse me ... One final question which has now been revised, and which we are ready to send. Which we can send around right now, actually. So, I think that barring any last-minute objections or additional inputs, we're good to go on that front. We also discussed our contributions, our scope of work. Maybe I'll let Erica take that forward since she led that part of the discussion. Erica, do you want to pick this part up?

ERICA VARLESE: Hey, Michael. I'm sure I'm happy to jump in a little bit there. Essentially, we spent most of our call this morning, like Michael said, working on our

questions, and then as part of that we talked a little bit about some of resource requests that we'd put in, and some edits we'd made to that since our last call, including ... I guess, primarily, I think, we've refined some information we need around the five-year plan that's part of our scope of work. But in addition to that, we also spoke a little bit to some future actions that we might want to take around surveying the community and things like that.

And I think what might be of most interest to the rest of the group on that topic ... I think Daniel primarily brought up just the need for us all ... We've brought this up in a couple of different ways, too, but the need for us to coordinate on any questions, and things like that. So, I think we've already talked about that a little bit in terms of the plan for the day of the 23rd, but also going forward as the community group starts to talk about any additional surveys and things that we might put to the community, coordinating that with others as well. But I think that just about covers it. I'm happy to answer questions. And thank you, Michael, for jumping in there, too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Great, thank you very much for that. Pat, I'm wondering, with the similarity of some of what we've heard from each of the work parties now on the desirability for some mutual work to start happening, if we might get Brenda to display the proposed agenda for the 23rd now, and they can have a quick look through, so they know ... And this is where they need to put the questions, etc. That'll take it out of AOB. I think it's probably time well spent, it'll only be no more than three to five minutes, I would think.

Look at that, like magic, Brenda has queued, ready to go. Okay, so we'll just scroll down closely. The top is all the usual administration requirements, where we are, etc. How to join in the Zoom link. Whether you're on-site or not, you'll find the Zoom link useful. Please note, we will be starting at 09:00, so we suggest strongly, in bold, that you get there between 08:45 and a few minutes before 09:00. The usual administration stuff will go on through the first 15 minutes.

We will then have another 15 minutes of the updates. Basically, the sorts of things that you've done now. But it would be smart, 'SMART', if you had prepared perhaps a PowerPoint slide from each of your work parties to give a little outline. Just a single slide will be fine, just so we have that as part of the body of work in the record from the face-to-face meeting there. We'll then have our morning break, and the breaks are to align with the breaks that are planned for each day for the rest of the conference, allowing five minutes' worth of lag time.

And then back at 10:35, this is where we're going to be looking at this whole idea of how we're going to look at mutually agreed methodologies. We've already talked about the fact that we'll be using the SMART system. We'll make sure that all of us understand that there are some variabilities in the SMART system, and so we would encourage you, as homework, to look at least at the Wikipedia link there, and go and delve into whether you're keen on SMART or SMARTER, and to make sure you know the difference between SMART goals and SMART objectives. All that sort of thing.

So, a little bit of pre-reading on the plane. Don't want to have you all bored while you're on your planes. But we'll be looking at what type of

methodologies ... Any information and data capture, how you're going to be doing the analysis. And, of course, because we should have our technical writer on board and in the room, then start looking at reporting and what we're going to be doing in terms of all of that. So, that's that block of time. Then this comes into 11:15-12:00, a workshop exercise. And this is where we're going to be looking at interdependencies and dependencies, how we're going to progress your work party activities. Any interactivities and, of course, how we're going to move on with the overall work plan.

Jennifer is now going to make sense of the fact that AM stops at 12:00 and starts becoming PM, thank you, Jennifer. Once we click over the top. And then, of course, we will be spending some time, then, going into greater detail on preparing for the interactions that we'll be running for the rest of that day. And, of course, making sure that everyone, particularly those on site, are absolutely familiar with all of the logistics. Room locations, who we're meeting, when. Any documentation that we'll be running. How we're going to be documenting, recording and minuting our interactions, all of that sort of thing.

Then, of course, we have our thrill-packed and exciting afternoon. Lunch will start at 12:50 promptly, and that will be a working session with the board members as listed. That's Avri Doria, Leon Sanchez, and Martin. We assume you'll be on-deck then as well. We then have confirmed, and there's another name we need to add Jennifer, I'll get that to you after this meeting. The CCTRT group, that group will be meeting with us. Jonathan has invited another one of his co-leads. We'll polish that up and make sure that we've got all of the invitees done shortly. Thank you, my

poor spelling of people's names, I'm glad one of us is looking at the details.

Then what we're going to try and do is, after each of the interactions, or each two interactions, take a little bit of time to discuss and consolidate in our minds and thinking what you've got out of it, what you might need to follow up on, etc., so we don't lose the energy as we move onto and yet another conversation. So, a little moment of 15 minutes or so to discuss and consolidate what you've found in those interactions. Afternoon tea break is there.

We then have ATRT2 specific review. Avri may be able to be available then, but certainly, Alan will be, and Brian will be. In fact, Brian is probably just going to come for the whole afternoon, I believe. He maintains his dance card may as well be with us. Alan will then stay for the next session, which of course is the RDS review team, he was a chair of that. He's following up with Susan and [Cathrin,] so we will know whether they are confirmed or not before we get there.

And then, of course, we've also managed to find out that the SSRT2, who are meeting, that's their day two of two days' worth of meetings, and yes, it's Russ, not Ross, thank you, will be running that day, but in fact their plan is that they will have an earlier finish. So, Russ is not going to be in Marrakech, but he's hoping to join us via Zoom. But the on-site vice-chairs, who will confirm whom, will hopefully be available, and we assume KC will be able to come across as well. So, they're not meeting at this time, but they are meeting almost up to this time.

And again, and our overall review and discussion and consolidation, followed by a close-of-day wrap-up, etc. Now, if you scroll down now to the appendix, you'll see what we've got in there at the moment is only what we've already sent to the GAC. So, we've got questions to the GAC from the GAC work party, and questions to the board and other ACs, which were actually from the GAC work party. Continue to scroll down.

We've got placeholders for the same stuff from each of the other work parties. So that's the stuff that right now we would like to have filled out. You'll find that the confirmed engagements are listed there for your reminding pleasure. If you want to start putting those into your calendars please use this document, the link to which I'm sure Jennifer will put into chat now, and we'll send out to the list. But there's something that some of you have asked for. And I'm sure we can also send fresh iCals out if that's something you desire as well.

So, with that, Pat, I think that's it for looking at it. It's a busy day, but I think that it'll be a productive day. And I notice some of our guests are on this call, so Avri is hopefully looking at her diary and seeing whether or not she can stay for the post-lunch session or not. With that, I would suggest we won't take questions. If you've got comments on this, let us know about that in our chat here, or on the list. But that's our working agenda at this stage. And let's go back to our previously advertised agenda for today's call, which is going to be terms of reference and work party. Pat, where do you want to start? Work plan or the TOR?

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl, I think we should start with terms of reference.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to do so. You want to run this thing? Seeing as I know you've heard enough of me talking to you about terms of reference in the last 24 hours. Just so you know, Pat and I had a Zoom call that lasted for about three hours, didn't it?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, it was fun. I got to meet your grand-daughter.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I got to meet some of your sons. Okay, can we bring up the terms of reference document, and I'm going to hand over to you, Pat.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, so we can scroll down to just the background section. I'm sorry, section two. And then to the objectives area. And so what you will see in the objectives area is that we took a lot of wording from the blog, the blog posting that we put out several weeks ago, and incorporate a lot of the language used there, because we wanted to document within the terms of reference, the set-up and approach as to how we got to the goals or the objectives that we listed out by work party.

So, you can all take a moment and read through that. Brenda, is there any way that we can make the document bigger on your screen, that we can share? I'm sorry, [inaudible], make more of the document accessible through the window. So not ... Let's go down to 100%, or maybe 90%? Or make your window bigger. So, if people could go through and start to

read through that section and provide any feedback that you might have. I guess scroll down to ... Just read what's visible and then we'll move on in about two minutes, please. And raise your hand if you have any questions as we go through it.

Alright. Anybody still need more time on this section? So, Brenda, if we could scroll down to where it says the main objectives? Pause right there. Everybody keep reading through, please. Alright, Brenda. If you can scroll through then, there's a small sentence and then a table I want everybody to take a look at. So, what we've included here is fundamentally another table that's on the Wiki that lists the actual work party and the members and the leaders of that work party. We can scroll through there, Brenda.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: A quick question from my side on a little bit back to the objectives?

PATRICK KANE: Yes, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, here. And if I missed it, I'm very sorry, but on the board we just look at the board governance, and not at board community interaction? Because I thought that was within scope as well, but I may have missed something. Sébastien? Anyone off the board group who would like to comment on that? Or ...

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I guess you're right, Maarten. We need to ... We didn't write this sentence, but it's already difficult to summarize what we are doing because we have much more than that. We have board effectiveness and inefficiency, board composition, question about finance, strategy, transparency and then the [APL] mechanism. But I guess your suggestion about add improving board governance and interaction with the rest of the community, the rest of ICANN, could be a good idea. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks, if we can add that, that may be a good thing.

PATRICK KANE: You got that, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I'm just in the document at the moment, so can you just repeat exactly what you would like me to put in here, please?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Who'd need to do that? Assessing and improving governance and the relation ... I don't like 'its relationship', but the relation between the board and the rest of ICANN and the community.

JENNIFER BRYCE: How does it look at the moment?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Seems to be okay for me, but ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maarten, if you're happy with that, to me, board community interaction does include, or can include, board-GAC interaction. I don't think that's excluding that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think we consider GAC to be part of the community too, and that's why I think if you don't want to single out GAC either, other than it's done in the bylaws. It's part of the community, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent, looks like that sentence is good. Good catch, people. Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The only question is that, is staff or ICANN Org, whatever you want to call them, are included or not and if we need to include it. But I think for a summary like that, it's okay. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: On that, I think it's part of the board fiduciary duties to provide oversight to ICANN Org as well. So, it's part of board governance as such.

PATRICK KANE: Alright, thank you, Maarten. So, if you want to scroll down, then, to the section below the table. And this basically describes taking a look at how

we've come to the objectives, and then what we'll do with the objectives. But let's go back up to those three paragraphs in between. So fundamentally, this is kind of an intro that Cheryl and I worked on this morning and last night, depending on where we were, introducing the objectives and why they're in different formats.

We decided that last night we didn't really want to go through and try to put it all into one format, since Bernie's not completely on board yet. And we will just introduce it as a process to where we're all having our own work process, which really are, and how the work parties have different formats to their objectives. So, if you can read through those three paragraphs, and if we have any issues, questions, please raise your hand. Maarten, is that an old hand or a new hand?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Old hand. Very much support the [text sentence] here. Looks very good. I also agree very much of the need to move SMART.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, if there's no questions on these three paragraphs. As we scrolled through the objectives, we did not touch or modify any of the objectives. Cheryl did go through and handle some pagination due to her OCD. We can keep scrolling down, please. Brenda, we're not going to read through these, since these have been pretty much stable in the document for a period of time.

Unless somebody would like to, and then please raise your hand, but my objective would be to go to the bottom of the objectives section. Let's go

to the top of the definitions. And so, basically what we did is, wherever we had identified an acronym within the document itself, we put the acronym and the definition in here. Sébastien, I see that you have your hand raised.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes Pat, thank you very much. Just to be sure, because you say that you don't change something, but it came to my eyes that you may have changed a little bit, not of the substance but of the wording. For example, the objective for the community or the board work party, the last one, the number seven. It seems that something were changed here.

PATRICK KANE: Sébastien, you're absolutely correct. We did change 7b. 7b, we took out ... Cheryl, if I remember correctly, the IRP for work-stream two was listed here specifically? And we had identified that as a broad ATRT3 review item, and we actually [cross talk].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is correct.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, my apologies, Sébastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is correct.

PATRICK KANE: That's the one thing that we did change.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: At least my eyes didn't make a mistake. Thank you, and I will update our document accordingly. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you. Alright, so, Brenda, if we could go to the bottom of the definitions section, where we have deliverables and timeframes? And the one change that we made here, that wasn't making certain that we had consistent terms throughout the document, was we filled in the timeline for deliverable terms of reference and work plan to the board, and that date we put in as the 13th of June. So basically tomorrow, except for Cheryl, I guess it's today for you. And Geoff, I guess that it's today for you as well. Alright. So, if you guys give a read through that real quickly. Sébastien, is that a new hand?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, sorry. I was trying to change the document. I'm sorry.

PATRICK KANE: No worries. You can scroll down, Brenda. Not too far, I want people to be able to read through that. Guys, we need to stop there, 'considerations with regards to review team recommendation', please. This was not changed, either, from previous sections, except for the very last

paragraph in this section. Cheryl had put this in here last night based upon some of the feedback that was received by CCTRT from the ICANN board in terms of priorities, in terms of high-level costing, who would actually get assignment, be able to implement certain of the recommendations.

And we thought to give a notion that we would identify those recommendations that are required to be bundled, or were precursors or dependencies on others, such that we could help with the prioritization in helping the board to consume and digest the items that we find of the most importance once we get to that point in time. Yes, Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to highlight that I'm very happy with how this is developing, and I think this is a key part ... This is one of the challenges we really need to tackle as a community together in this upcoming period. And I think this will also be useful for me to take back to the board caucus group and explore there because the board is also very interested in seeing how this can be resolved even better than it has been in the past. So, thanks for this.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you very much, Maarten. So, that comes to the end of section two. Is there anyone, by show ... [put no] in your participant window that is not supportive of sending section two as it is, as part of the terms of reference to the board. Alright, seeing no objections ...

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And I wasn't suggesting to have a board decision or opinion about it, it's merely to explore it now if the board caucus group is part of the process that you're in, not as a formal submission. But thanks for checking with other people [for an issue with this.] I see none so far, either.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Maarten. So, if we can scroll up to section three then, Brenda, please. So, the first part of this is the table. This just has all of us and where we're from. Cheryl, did we change anything in this section last night? I can't recall.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We didn't make many changes from last week. We can continue to scroll down, please, Brenda, because obviously, we know who we are. We did change the language very briefly under roles and responsibilities, just to note that of course when we hand this into the organization at the head of this committee, the current operating standards for specific reviews will still be in draft. It will be until the Marrakech meeting as we understand it. The board will be considering the current draft, so we've just made that in brackets there, 'currently in draft'.

And we also modified from last week the part ... Very minor modifications, just a thought from ICANN Organization. It was very minor wordsmithing if you can read it, but there was certainly nothing substantial. We did, however, make sure that the dependencies on other organizations was a little bit clearer. So, if we can scroll down on that, just making sure that we have no intention to overlap or duplicate any work,

and that it is our intention to of course make sure that we keep apprised of the efforts and activities going on in these other areas.

And, of course, some of these things are specifically something that we're going to be looking at but looking at it in a complimentary way. The requirement in terms of ICANN Org to alert us of any developments which might be changed [– make a change to this list] is something that I believe was there last week, but we might have adjusted the sentence to be more like a semblance of the English language, rather than how we'd written it. And so I guess you can take a poll after you get feedback from Maarten on that section, and move on to our decision-making methodology. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Very good. Maarten? Hold on Brenda. Hold on. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes.

PATRICK KANE: Your hand's up.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sorry, old hand. That is related to the old point. I fully agree with what Cheryl just said.

PATRICK KANE:

Okay. Sébastien, I see that your hand is raised as well?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. Two points. The first one is that there is currently a comment period open about how the board seat number 14 is selected, and one of my questions ... How we link that with our work? Not to duplicate, but in the same time, we need to take that into account in the work of ATRT3. And the second, just a reminder for the recording, I didn't feel that we follow the operating standard for specific reviews, and you know why, and I will not add anything now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that, Sébastien. That doesn't change anything we've dated in the terms of reference document. Fine to have it on the record, that's absolutely no problem at all. Can you articulate exactly what the comment is that should be added to this list on dependencies? Pop it in the chat and then Jennifer can add it as a bullet point.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, there is a comment period open, how the board 14 by the GNSO, one of the house, the noncontracted party house will select, and there is a comment period of it. Therefore, I don't know if we want to add it, but at least we need to take that into account. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Is that beyond, or a different matter, to general board governance and the accountability associated with that?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It is just because we [need the] work down in parallel with our work, I was just ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you could put six or seven words together, we'll make it a separate bullet point there. Pop it into chat, and Jennifer will pop it in as a ... We've got room for the bullet point. That's fine. Okay, Pat. Back to you.

PATRICK KANE: Okay, thank you, Cheryl. And then, Sébastien, while you're putting together what that bullet point should look like, is there anyone who does not believe that we should forward the terms of reference with this section three as it is, barring whatever bullet we're going to add in for Sébastien? Please select 'no' in the participant window. Alright, so I will assume that we have consensus on section three. And then section four is a short section which I don't recall making any changes on this last night, Cheryl.

But if everyone could take a quick read through it, because this is how we're going to go through and document our decisions on how we're going to work through the process, so please take a quick read on that just to remind yourselves, and then I'll ask the same question when we get done with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, just while they're reading that, it strikes me that you and I did discuss the benefit of having, at least on the landing Wiki page, our staff recognized and listed, and then the link in this document to that Wiki page can be put into the section that is relating to ICANN Org support of our endeavor. Pat and I thought it was quite reasonable to have our hard-working and valuable staff recognized, but obviously we wanted to float that with you, including the staff.

It seems to me that we can click on those landing pages and find out who the members of the review teams, and indeed if needs be, the individual work parties, from that page. But we have absolutely no idea who staff support is on any of the review teams, and we think that would be a useful change to that Wiki. It shouldn't take a lot of time to do, Jennifer, so if you could think about that. And if no one objects, that would be a ... We may make that change if time allows. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Cheryl, we had talked about doing that in section three, in the subsection, that 'support for ICANN Organization' [cross talk] in the TOR. I know that we've got – who's on from staff right now? Jennifer and Brenda, is that something that you all are opposed to, or that you need to check to see what we do with that? We've talked last night that we'd like to have you included in the terms of reference.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is this a privacy risk, or whatever? I've no idea. But whatever it is, we don't need to ... Other than link to it from the TOR, so whatever it is, if we are going to do it, it can be done off the main Wiki landing page.

JENNIFER BRYCE: We have no problem with that. Thanks for your comments. I've put into the terms of reference, I'll link to the page that's on the Wiki at the moment that flags the ICANN support team. I put that into the relevant section of the terms of reference, so unless anyone objects, then we've added that already.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you very much, Jennifer. Alright. Have we gotten to the bottom? Let's go to the closure and reviews team self-assessment, and read that last section, please. Since we have now gone through four of the terms of reference, is there anyone on the call today that has an issue with submitting this section as-is, as part of the terms of reference to the board? Go ahead and select 'no' in the participant window, please.

Okay, then saying that we've gotten through four sections when the first section is really introductory about stuff that's already been done anyway, and we have not ... And nobody has 'disagree', going from the document, I think we go ahead and, Cheryl, declare that we have consensus on the terms of reference. And let's move to the work plan. For the work plan, Cheryl and I made a couple of modifications last night. We changed some of the percentages, 'complete', given where we are in the initial portions of the work plan. But one of the things that I want to call to everyone's attention is the center section of the work plan, which, Brenda, if we can scroll down to the areas that are in the sub-groups.

We'll use the board work party section as representative, because everything is the same in the five sub-group areas, and we'll talk about

the fifth one here in a second. But what we've done is we've moved the dates out on work plan execution, re May as the beginning of the work plan execution. We've moved that to a June start, given ourselves a couple of months to get through that, and then leave the month of August and the first part of September to prepare the initial draft that we can actually put in to do some refinement and then work together as a complete document after that.

And then taking into consideration when our fall face-to-face is at the end of October, for when we submit for public comment, which would be right before the Montreal meeting in November. So if everyone can take a look at these dates, it's pretty aggressive in terms of getting a lot of work done over the next three and a quarter months. I want to make sure that we've got buy-in on this schedule. So if you have any issues or concerns with the timing, please go ahead and raise your hand. Alright, thank you.

And then, Brenda, if you can scroll down to the yellow section, says 'other as needed'. So this section follows on the same timelines, and doesn't necessarily have actual work assigned to it at this point in time, largely because Cheryl and I thought that we would leave this section in, so that if anything calls out that we need to do a separate section with that other sub-work party, another work party, that we could catch that in this and have its own timeline if we identified another area in the next two and a half months or so that we wanted to also address. So this is a catch-all. There's no tasks or no research actually assigned to this section at this time.

And then, Brenda, if you'll scroll down to 'review team and draft report'. So that essentially what we would do here is, while we're going through the sub-group work party for the two and a half months, we can go ahead and take a look at format over the next couple of months, what makes sense. And then starting in August, rolling into September, we will actually produce the draft report such that we could publish it for public comment on the 30th October.

Again, that's going to be in between our review meeting, our face-to-face in Singapore, and it's also the week before ICANN66 in Montreal, so that we can at least have it out and have some discussions at ICANN, if people are so inclined to read it between that point in time we meet in Montreal. We can discuss it, but it'll certainly still be out for public comment at that point in time.

And then the final report, no dates were changed on that. We took into account the ICANN stats review period when they take a look at the public comments and put out a summary publication. We took into account that they shut down the factory for a week in December over the holidays, and to produce something by mid-January, so we could fundamentally meet a March close on the process. Any questions, concerns?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Not a question or concern, Pat, but it just seems that this time refers to flight for consideration. We don't actually have to have the answers yet, but I think it's timely, while we're looking at the face-to-face meetings listing here, that we're not suggesting we would be meeting from the

2nd November to the 7th November in Montréal. That would be an extremely long face-to-face meeting for ATRT3. But as you know, there is not a particular impediment for us to have a pre-meeting opportunity, the same as we're doing in Marrakech.

I guess the question for you all to consider from Pat and I at this stage is the desire – [inaudible] or otherwise – of it being a one-day before the meeting starts, or a two-days before the formal meeting starts. I think we're open to either, but if you can start thinking about that, then we can put that to bed as an item in our administration during the Marrakech meeting. That's about it, isn't it, Pat?

PATRICK KANE:

I think so, but that's the long meeting, so two days is going to be ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I know. One day's fine, I think we'll need the one day, but if there's an argument out there for more, let us know now. Particularly because travel needs to be organized very soon, as in days from the Marrakech meeting, so we need to get on to letting Constituency Travel know whether or not a zero-day is going to be running for us.

PATRICK KANE:

Very good. [inaudible] point. Sébastien, your hand is raised?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Pat. I just want to be sure that I understood what you say about the document we will produce with our Singapore meeting, and how you want to handle that after. Because there's a written rule that any document need to be sent three weeks in advance to the ICANN meeting and we will be [inaudible] three weeks, and therefore will have trouble to use the output of our Singapore meeting to the discussion during the Montréal meeting. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you, Sébastien. That's absolutely correct, that for consideration via board, or consideration by the community, we do have to have that three-week lead time. But our intention is to get a posting for public comment right before the ICANN66 meeting so that if people are so inclined to have a conversation about it, the document's out. Those who are in attendance are available, but it's not for a formal consideration, because we'll actually be in, from an intent standpoint, in the public comment period, since it's in that 40- or 41-day window to where it's out for the community to provide comments, not for formal consideration at any meeting, at the meeting.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, I'm okay with that. If I recall well, I didn't check the last version of that, but the 40 days or 41 days are not taking into account the ICANN meetings, therefore we need to be sure what is the time we include in our draft work plan. Thank you.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, thank you for that, Sébastien. We'll make sure we consider that time. Okay, so if there are no objections to this being considered for submission to the ICANN board, or actually being linked to from the terms of reference document for the board's review, along with the terms of reference, I think please go ahead and say no if you have objections to that, from the participation window. And seeing none at this time, Cheryl, I think we declare that we have consensus on the draft work plan, version two.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. And the only very minor, is it may be that we make it clear at the top of this document that the work plan is, in fact, a living document. I mean, you'd have to be crazy to realize that something with percentages that is constantly being updated is not, but we will make it blatantly obvious to the casual reader that the work plan is a living document.

PATRICK KANE: Very good. Jennifer, if we can go ahead and do that, that would be fantastic. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I will add something in there. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE: Thank you very much. Alright, so I think we're done with that section of the agenda, Cheryl. So if we could go back to the full agenda for today? And we are now ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We certainly are, and we can get it off as soon as possible then, Pat. It might even sneak in somewhere in earlier than the 13th, if we're lucky.

PATRICK KANE: Alright.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat knows why, because when it was 13 pages long, I argued that we should hand it in on the 13th, and now it's 12 pages long, I'm going to argue that we should try and hand it in on the 12th.

PATRICK KANE: Argue away.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I like symmetry, what can I say?

PATRICK KANE: Alright. So, for the section of any other business, anybody have anything else to bring up? Please raise your hand in the participant window. Vanda is applauding, excellent. Cheryl, did you have anything else that you wanted to bring up today?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Other than my thanks for the amount of work that's been going on? For the observers on these weekly calls, there are the calls that the work parties are doing in between the weekly calls. And of course, the offline work that they're doing on list and in their Skype chats, etc. So yes, we're a bit late handing in this homework. In fact, we will be a whole ten days late handing in our homework. We want to thank Avri and her Organizational Effectiveness Committee for allowing Pat and I to get down on bended knee and say the dog ate our homework, and could we re-write it out again?

But no, she understands that in the absence of having our technical writer fully on board, we're running a little bit behind. So he was able to exercise a little bit of flexibility. But we're quite happy with his document, and we hope it will be well received by the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and for the relevant parts of the board. But it's all your good work, people. So thank you, one and all. You might even give them an early mark today, Pat.

PATRICK KANE: Yes, I want to amplify Cheryl's comments. I think it's a lot of good work, and we should be proud of the document and proud of that. It's going to be a busy summer, though. A lot to get done, too. So, okay. Thank you, and with nothing else for any other business, Jennifer, if you could read back to us the confirmed actions, decisions reached?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi. Thank you, Pat. The action item that I captured first is for staff to resend the list of engagement sessions during Marrakech to the team list,

which I believe Brenda has efficiently already completed. And then decisions reached, the team reached consensus on the terms of reference document and on the work plan, so congratulations, and thank you for your work on that.

And as an action item out of that, staff will send that to the board, and SO and ACs. And so, I'll send a note just to yourself, Pat, and Cheryl, just to confirm that the language in it is ... You're okay with that, and then we'll get that off first thing my morning, tomorrow. And please do let me know if I missed anything, or any other updates, actions, decisions reached. Thanks.

PATRICK KANE:

Thank you, Jennifer. And Cheryl, if there's nothing else you want to close with, I think we're done for the day. Thank you all very much. [cross talk].

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]