BRENDA BREWER:
Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT-3 Community Work Party Meeting #1 on the 3rd of June 2019 beginning at 15:34 UTC. The members attending the call today are Erica, Michael, Vanda, Jaap. We have observers: Herb Waye and [Sophie Hay]. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, and Brenda. Apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to remind you to please state your name before speaking for the record. I'll turn the call over to Erica. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE:
Thank you. I know Michael and I, I don't think we had a set way for cohosting the meeting, so Michael, if you just want to alternate or if you want to jump in and take over at any time, I guess we can do that.

So, to get started, though, just for a little intro, I know this is our first meeting for the community work group. We have a few things to work through today. I think first order of business, so to speak, is the terms of reference we were working through and our last plenary call on Wednesday. We had put some, primarily the documentation from our scope of work into that terms of reference and thought this would be a good chance, especially considering the deadline for that document for the team to just review that and see if there's any edits we want to make there, which should hopefully feed pretty nicely into the rest of our agenda in terms of refining any requests and prepping for Marrakech. Thank you. Vanda just noted your message. I appreciate you joining.

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.

I think, from here, are we able to pull up the terms of reference link in there? I think that would be good to just kind of work through. I'm just looking at the community work team … If we could scroll down to I think page four has the whole outline, on three and four. That should be [inaudible]. Thanks for sharing that, too, Michael.

Michael, I don't know if you want to jump in at all. I know we had a conversation on the plenary last week that … I think where we left off is potentially wanting to refine some of this to phrase some of it maybe a little bit more like objectives than the planning. But I know we also spoke a little bit to keeping it flexible for the community work party two in terms of how many specifics we want to reference because that's important for clarifying obviously, but also with the type of work we're doing for this work stream in particular, having the flexibility to explore what makes the most sense going forward depending on documents and priorities and everything as we work through all of this.

I know [Mary] kind of dropped this in the doc and I know Michael and I had developed this quite a bit, so I think it would be helpful to hear from any others. I don't know if we want to work through it one by one, if we want to adjust this [inaudible] or if there's just any overall feedback and perhaps Michael and I can work on that a little bit before our call Wednesday. Michael, if you want to jump in at all, too, just in terms of what works best for us in terms of working through these. I don't know if you have anything to add to that.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. Absolutely. Hi, everybody. As you can see, mostly this is kind of – I don't want to say duplicative, but basically from our scoping work to identify areas of examination. We [inaudible] because, as Erica said, we wanted to give ourselves a bit of flexibility. As I think about it now, honestly I would rather in terms of the terms of reference, my preference would be to paint things more broadly, specifically to allow us a bit of freedom to explore additional areas, particularly that given that as the community subgroup, I think that we have a particular responsibility or onus to be a bit more responsive and to allow our consultations to lead the way in terms of areas of prioritization. Maybe more than other groups. I don't want to speak to the other groups, but I would see that as a particular responsibility for us is to talk to folks and [get input]. Develop our areas of prioritization on a more consultative basis or on a strongly consultative basis.

So, that being said, in terms of refining what you see in front of us, my personal inclination would be to push towards more general statements of the types of areas that – general and inclusive statements of the type of areas that we might look into as opposed to really pinning ourselves down and potentially tying our hands going forward, particularly since these terms of reference could … I want to avoid a situation where down the road we end up getting our hands tied by too much [inaudible] terms of reference and not being able to look into areas that we want to look into. That's my concern much more than … That would be my overall concern in designing this.

That being said, that's just an opinion and I do think that what I suggest is maybe to go through these five action areas or exploration areas and

maybe see one by one if anybody has any feedback in terms of how we should revise framing. Does that sound good, Erica?

ERICA VARLESE: That sounds great to me.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Cool. I'd be happy to start off. I can put my hand down since I'm speaking. So, community and long-term planning is the first one of these areas. That includes implementation of the five-year plan, community uptake of the financial plan, and explore ways which [inaudible] needs and demands for more change and increased services will be prioritized as revenue declines.

So, those are … We were asked in the last I want to say plenary – either the plenary or the leadership call somebody asked us: are we looking at the last five-year plan or the next five-year plan? And I think that we again left things fairly open but really wanted to focus on process. That was kind of what I recall coming out of that discussion. But why don't we turn it over? Because I see Jaap has his hand up. Let's see what our colleagues and team members have to say. Jaap? You may be muted.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Hello?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. We can hear you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Okay. I asked on the mailing list what was meant with looking at the five-year plan because I don't think there is a five-year plan. It's only [inaudible] that's part of the operating plan. I actually tried [inaudible]. If we want to ask for resources, we need to be more specific because this is way too broad to make any specific comment from it, to my opinion. The first time people talk about five-year plan is from the operating plan in 2016 and it's actually extended. Every year it's renewed. It first goes through the empowered community as far as I can see and they actually approve it or not, then it goes to public comment. So, do you want to talk about the process of this mechanism with this actually [inaudible] bylaws or what? I don't get the meaning of what's meant with this. That's basically my problem.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: So, I think that part of the purpose of the call today is to drill down a little more into that and to provide a bit more definition on this. Some of these are a bit [inaudible] because we were not the originators of some of these exploration areas. Some of them were developed in LA. For some of these, it's a little bit tricky to pin down their origin and what the intention underlying them was and I think this is one of those.

But that said, I'd be very open to discussion to try to arrive at that today and I think that's part of the purpose of the meeting. Daniel, I see your hand is up. Do you want to chime in there?

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

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Loud and clear.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. During the scoping exercise in LA, the point I was making the first … Actually, I did the first draft of the objectives and the document was shared. And from the categorization of the different inputs after scoping all the respective ideas what [inaudible] the community can be done, it came up that regarding to the five-year plan, there are two options. One is to review the level of accountability of the previous five-year plan has gone through, and also the fact that also the plan is coming in. How does the new plan result from the [inaudible] five-year plan?

Also, to go a bit further, the financial plan and budgets were also another issue that was discussed in LA and I think that's where that first item of community and long-term planning is coming up. Of course, how does long-term plan affect the budget because of ICANN? Are there any other factors that can come in and do it after operational budgets have been finally concluded and passed on? I think that would give at least a guide on what the first item of community and long-term planning is. Thank you. Back to you, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Can I ask you to repeat that very last bit again? Sorry, I was just trying to type out, trying to capture this as you went and I got the beginning part but not the end regarding financial planning.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes. How does the financial plan that has been set for the five-year be impacted or affected by other resources? [inaudible] change and the like. [inaudible] can change, venues can change, but if already the plan has been set out, then how can it be affected? How can the community be accountable regarding to this long-term planning? That's where the discussion comes in. Thank you. Does that make sense?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yes, it does. I am going to paste something into the chat in just one second, and why doesn't the group review that and see if this provides a little bit more clarity? Just give me one second. Could I ask folks to take a look at the chat? Daniel in particular but everybody else, how does that look in terms of clarifying, providing a little bit more clarity to what we're looking at in this [inaudible]? And please forgive any typos or grammatical problems because I'm just doing this on the fly.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I think it makes a lot of sense. [inaudible]. Thank you very much, Negar, for posting that.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Great. Thanks. That's one. What about other ideas, how it could be improved? Jaap?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: It talks about [inaudible] future. There are no dates. There's no specific [inaudible] look at it. It should be some starting point, some measuring point, reference point. But this is so vague. That's my whole problem with this plan.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: If I understood you correctly, you think it needs to be … You think we need to drill a little more into the specifics?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes. This is so vague. I don't know what's [inaudible] date. It should be really more complete or else there's no reference point at all and doesn't help us [inaudible] point out which resources you want to have. At least that's my opinion.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: So, the resource discussions from staff, I think that's going to be looked into. I don't think we're dealing with the resource requests, the specific resource requests, yet. Right now what we're discussing is just what's going to go under the terms of reference. Certainly we can date the different five-year plans. I don't know. Does anybody have that information offhand of what the dates at the last and current plan are?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: The last plan is from 2016. The next plan will be started next year. The five-year plan for 2016 has been updated every year and it also has some strategic planning attached to it. What I said before, this is really

EN

under [inaudible] empowered community which is supposed to sign off on this. I'm afraid that if we don't [inaudible], we are actually running straight into the [path] of what empowered community is supposed to do. So, that was my earlier question in do we look to just the process or what's exactly [inaudible]?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: This came in as a [strong] recommendation from the empowered community which went into adoption and implementation. I think if we're to look at the process, then we are going to be checking off for the effectiveness of the strategic plan and the implementation plan [inaudible] plan. So, I think we need more time to discuss how we're going to be able to move along [from that] in the review, conducting the review of this specific item. I don't know what other members think. Thank you. Back to Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. Thank you for that, both of you. I don't necessarily … If I'm understanding the scope of it, [current back and forth] correctly, I don't think the fact that the empowered community is taking this up precludes our own examination of it, just like as came up in previous discussions, the fact that work stream two dealt with stuff shouldn't preclude our own examination of stuff.

For me, it would be more about ensuring that we're not duplicating examination but we can offer our own perspectives and our own insights on that.

so, that being said, to try to bring us back to something that's a little more operational.

If we sort of amended that paragraph that I put into the chat to include specific dates and more specific dates or examination clarifying which processes we're looking at, would that improve it or should we be taking it in a different direction? Or should we abandon it, scrapping that and trying to do something different? I guess I'm just trying to push us towards operationalizing this into something that we can … Something that's a complete or semi-complete product that we can have at the end of the day. Are there any thoughts about how we could refine this further?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: You bring an interesting point to include specific dates [inaudible], but also part of the challenges that I encountered in trying to review some of this document is that when I would go into the exact implementation plan, some do not identify specific dates that they have to start or end it. They just have a general [course direction] of the respective FY.

So, if we are to look at probably [inaudible] the timelines in terms of months and years, that could be possible. But in case you're going to look for a specific date that a process is touching, I think that [inaudible]. I think that would be one of our recommendations whereby [inaudible] specific timeline and appropriate project deliverable are set within a given period of time.

I'll give an example. Sorry to bring an example, but when I was looking at some of the board advisors, the board advisors have this interesting

dashboard where they show what they are working on, whether it has been accomplished or not, but they do not provide appropriate time [inaudible] to be able to solve the problem and I think that becomes one of the challenges that we have in ATRT-3. And I think it also applies in reference to community. Thank you. Back to Michael. So, let's think in those lines.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thank you for that. I do want to be a bit mindful of the clock because there's five of these to go through and we're also just at our first agenda item. Why don't we sidebar this conversation and maybe we can take something to the list to try to flesh this out a little bit more and move on to the next one? Does that sound good, Erica?

ERICA VARLESE: Yeah. That works good for me.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Okay. So, the next one, the next section is about the NomCom and that includes reviewing the NomCom in the selection of board members, as we were corrected last time – not the election of board members. Review the selection process of other SOs and ACs. Review the implementation of the board advice to the NomCom as input for the selection of board members. And review the practice and the election of board members by different appointing bodies by definition.

So, that is I think more specific than the last one. What do people think about those as areas of exploration and is there anything that we've left out or anything that should be further clarified or added in?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: When it comes to the issue of the NomCom, there were key specific factors that we have to look at, especially in the selection process or election of the board members with consideration to … I think they mentioned something regarding diversity of the board members, the skill set. It was quite a wide range.

So, in this section, it would be good to review all the respective – the selection process and the election. I think that provides more of a community input. Thank you. Back to you, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Another hand from Jaap. Do you want to go ahead?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes. I'm a bit confused by using the term election. I don't think … If the NomCom is [inaudible], it's probably [inaudible] but it's [inaudible] private, so we don't know how this [election is]. The outcome of the NomCom is the selection of the board members and how they're selected, it's really behind closed doors. It's supposed to be very confidential. So, I wonder how much we could say about that part. I wanted to [remark] that. Everything that the NomCom does is very private and [inaudible] that they are having sometimes to give out so many information to the public but that's not a lot.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: So, if there is a lack of information or transparency around this process, that certainly seems like it could be germane to our examination. We could consider that.

I just want to read out Vanda in the chat saying, "Distribution of NomCom is not better the review since NomCom just finished its review and is in the implementation phase." Vanda, do I understand your comment is suggesting that because there is a bunch of changes happening to it as a result of a NomCom review we should be looking to the implementation of those changes or holding off? Can you clarify, please?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, two things in this point. One, that certainly reviews group – our reviews group – should go into this review of NomCom and analyze all the aspects in [inaudible] community participation and selection process. But still, we are part of NomCom implementation group and we are in the middle of the process of implementation. So, I don't know if we're going to have time enough to see those things implemented to analyze their impact on the community. Anyway, it's important to raise the point but I don't know if we're going to have opportunity to really assess, analyze, and the impact into the community. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think this has been helpful. I'm going to paste a revised and expanded bullet point into the chat. What do people think about that, if they want

to take a look? Maybe it would be more efficient, just in terms of timeframe, to carry out this actual wordsmithing by email but paste into the chat what I have so far to try to capture the substance of some of these discussions. Why don't we keep moving? But if people have comments on that, they can move that into the chat. Is there anything that we want to say regarding selection process for other SOs and ACs or the implementation of board advice?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm not sure who was talking there just now, but I see Tola's hand up, so I'm going to hand it over to him, if that's alright.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Hello?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: We can hear you.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Good discussion so far. I appreciate how far we've gone with all the objectives and it's well-covered. I just want to ask if it is possible for during the meeting in Marrakech if we have [inaudible] open doors to receive any members of the community that want to come in and give one or two suggestions to whatever we're doing. Granted, I expect anybody that is interested in the review team work to either be observer following whatever we're doing and make suggestions online. But is it possible for us to keep an open door policy so that we are

meeting with communities, we're meeting with each of the SOs and ACs [inaudible] and interested members of the community can come in and drop whatever suggestion they have. That's what I just want to include. Thank you. Back to you, Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Thanks for that. We're going to be doing a lot of consultations in Marrakech but I think that we have to have this finalized before that which is why we're trying to hammer this down now. It also speaks to why I … Because we're doing this in advance of the consultations, why I wanted to leave this with a bit of flexibility. But I also understand that the document is there for a reason and we need to provide sufficient clarity. Jaap, I see your hand is up. Do you want to add something?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah. Thank you. This is a clarification question. [inaudible] selection process of the other SO and ACs, do we [need to be pointed] at SO and ACs or can they each [inaudible] SOs and ACs to the board? It's ambiguous, so maybe we should clarify that in the next version of the document.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. I agree that that's ambiguous. I was reading that as being the internal election processes of SOs and ACs and not necessarily about the board. But as I look at it now, the other three bullets are all about the board, so that's tricky. Wait. But it's under the heading of NomCom, so

it must be about the selections to the Nominations Committee. Is that correct? Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm sorry. I jumped of the call briefly because of a little problem but I would like to ask you what Vanda had mentioned earlier on. And since the NomCom has completed their review, I suggest [inaudible] that we can handle that subsequently. So, I think that's one of the things that you can do.

Then, regarding to the community aspect of the NomCom, you could end up looking at the community aspect as the [inaudible]. Right now, I'm speaking in my capacity as a member of the community work party, not as my other hat. Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Alright. Jaap has also posted in the chat suggesting that we sort the rest out by mail which I think is a good idea because I certainly think that through this discussion, we've clarified things a bit. Erica, what are your thoughts about the time? I think that four and five are a little clearer. Or certainly I think that there's more specificity personally. Maybe that's just my bias because I think I was the one that entered those in, so I'm more comfortable around those. But I do think that three is a bit more open-ended. Erica, what do you think about moving to three, just very quickly going through three, four, and five just briefly and then moving on to the future action areas? Or do you want to try to hammer these out as robustly as we can because the terms of reference are due in soon?

ERICA VARLESE: I'm inclined to use the majority … I mean, I know we have already used the majority of our time for this since it is due so soon. I'd say I have a feeling if we moved relatively quickly through three, four, five that would still take up the bulk of the call which I'm comfortable with. And I think from there just finalizing the language via email. That will also feed into the second discussion point about any resource request that we want to refine. Then, from there, maybe later this week or also via the list we can decide if we want to have another call to prep for Marrakech or if we can just move into maybe having discussion on the list about any prep work or questions that we want to prepare in advance of that meeting, too, if that works for everyone else.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That sounds good for me. Do you want to take over on three? Just because I've been talking a lot. I don't want to dominate the call.

ERICA VARLESE: Sure. Yeah. It's totally up to you. I'm happy to jump in and field that, though I might not be as quick to write up such a succinct statement but I know we can do that on the list, so that's totally fine. Alright then.

So, moving into three, we have areas and methods of community input. So, just reading through those, reviewing the prioritization process, if any exists, regarding recommendations given by the community, reviewing the community input process into the recommendations. Assessment of the PDP and SO and ACs in their respective roles and the

process, reviewing the public comment process regarding PDPs and then reviewing timelines, methodologies, and resources of recent PDP processes including specifically the EPDP to better understand what tools are available to utilize, volunteer time more effectively. I feel like E is pretty … It's one line but it's pretty substantial. But like Michael said, I think this one is a little bit more … These last ones are a little bit more specific. But I know there's a lot in the community input. Does anyone have any feedback on how we want to revise this to approach this area specifically? Jaap, go ahead.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I was wondering about the EPDP because that's in process. It's still in process and it seems a little bit too early to start reviewing it now.

ERICA VARLESE: That's a good point. My thought – and then, Daniel, I don't know if you feel comfortable jumping in because I know this came a little bit from the Reviews Working Group as well. I think maybe we need to specify EPDP Phase 1 with the information we have available so far, since that's relatively closed. I know it's still a little finalization still. That might make a little bit more sense to put brackets, so to speak, on what we're looking at. But Daniel, if you had anything to share about just the conversation either in LA or in the working party to [inaudible] that, too. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm happy to share one thing about the EPDP. With the reference to the EPDP is they have just finished [inaudible] EPDP. But regarding to the respective timeline, they're expediting the process. And regarding to the discussions [inaudible] review, the respective processes regarding the EPDP, how the selection was done and how the work is being done, the fact that the process has been assigned a one-year timeframe and out of the one-year timeframe, they have just only finished the first part and what is in scope for the second part.

So, when [we] went into the discussions on the mailing list, there are some few questions that came up and when we went to the Skype chat of the Review Working Party it was suggested that the EPDP can be best handled from the community perspective.

But I'm happy to share that in our next call, these are some of the issues that we can be able to discuss together with – that is the community work party together with the review work party – on how we can jointly collaborate on some of these cross-cutting issues in the reviews and EPDP is one of them.

Also, from there, we can also be able to review some of the questions such that those questions can be answered during the meeting and then we can slot them where exactly they fit, either in the review or in the community. I think that works best. So, I suggest this for an action point would be to discuss during the inter-collaborative meeting between the Reviews Work Party and the Community Work Party. Hope that works. Thank you. Back to you, Erica.

ERICA VARLESE: Thank you, Daniel. That's helpful. I just made a note for an action item. I think that will be useful for us. Michael, I see your hand is raised, too, if you want to jump in.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. Just with regards to EPDP, I think that if you talk to folks in the community, there's going to be a lot of opinions about how that went. I think we'll get a lot of feedback on that, and certainly we can definitely clarity to say that we're looking specifically at phase one, but I definitely think it's – especially now that memories of that are still so fresh, I think that's going to be a very good area to talk to people about what happened and what their thoughts about it and how it could have been done better next time.

I did want to kind of clarify, what is this … Yeah. That's all I wanted to add. I'm not sure about what this joint discussion that we're having this with the reviews work team. Do we have something scheduled for that? I guess I should know that. But otherwise … I do generally agree that it would be good to discuss with them, too, because again this is one of those areas [we overlap]. Thanks.

ERICA VARLESE: Great. Thanks, Michael. Yeah. I think we certainly get a lot f feedback on this. Daniel, correct me. I think I may have misunderstood as well for the joint call. I know we got – at least I got an invite [inaudible] for the reviews call on Wednesday. Is that one that you're planning to do as the joint one or are we thinking of setting up a separate one? I wasn't quite sure.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: First, this call that is coming up on Wednesday is only for the Review Working Party members. Then, after this, a call is going to be sent whereby we shall be having a joint meeting between the reviews work party and the community work party. Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE: Great. Thanks for clarifying. Okay. I think that conversation is helpful. There's a few more clarifications we can add. But again, going back to the list, I can write something up and we'll send that out with the other language that Michael has already proposed as well I think for this later today if that works for anyone – well, hopefully for someone, but if it works for everyone. And if not, feel free to drop that in the chat.

If there's nothing else so far for this third area, I think we can move into four and five. This should be pretty quick.

Four, community access to information, assessing the efficacy and performance of the DIDP system and delivering relevant, timely, and accurate information to the community and assess the efficacy and performance of ICANN's open data initiative and information transparency initiative.

I'm inclined to say, just from the language that we have in there now we can refine it a little bit but that seems pretty clear to me. If anyone has any feedback or input on that, please jump in or raise your hand. I'm not seeing anything. I'm going to take that as everyone feeling pretty comfortable with that language so far.

So, we can move into the transparency process, section five. Transparency processes within SO/ACs. What are the transparency or access to information policies enforced among the various SO and ACs? Do any such processes exist, and if so, what sort of standards do they follow? Again, I think this one is also pretty clear and we can send just a modified – [inaudible] modified language out later today for everyone to review this in time for the call on Wednesday with a deadline for this section specifically. But is there any feedback for section five or point five specifically that we want to add?

Alright. I'm going to take that as a no for now also. Great. So, what I'm thinking from here – and Michael, let me know if this sounds to you. For three, four, and five, maybe you and I can just spend a moment after the call just writing those out and then send that out to the list as a whole to confirm the language that we want to include in this terms of reference specifically. But I feel like the discussions we've had so far have clarified what we've needed to clarify for this right now. So, maybe aim to get think about tout later today and have folks review tomorrow if they need that extra time.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. I was going to suggest that we hammer together all five of these, a revised version of it to circulate after the call today, just so that we can have a bit of discussion before Wednesday.

ERICA VARLESE: Perfect. That sounds great. From here, I think if we go back to the agenda … I guess, Michael and others, if you want to give me a little

feedback regarding here, too. We have two other points with just refining our resource requests and preparing for Marrakech. I feel like the resource requests in particular, especially the clarifications that we've just had now, tie into update the terms of reference. So, I'm inclined to … I don't know if folks want to hash that out now on this call or if we want to take that to the listserv while we're having this discussion around the terms of reference since I feel like they're separate but they are related. Is that a preference for folks? Michael, do you have an opinion on how you want to approach that?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No. I think that strategy sounds good.

ERICA VARLESE: Great. That sounds good, then. So, I know we only have about ten minutes left. Maybe we could just pull up … I don't know if this is how folks are going to want to work here but this is [all we have] to start. If we go to preparing for Marrakech, I had created a small Google Doc that we could potentially use for brainstorming. We can use whatever people feel most comfortable with. I believe [Pat] and [Charla] were working on the agenda for our meeting day I think on the 22nd – I don't know if I'm remembering the dates right – in Marrakech. I feel like maybe it might be a bit premature to focus on our own agenda for that day, depending on how that pans out for the group as a whole.

But we have these four sessions set up with the community and I know it's an opportunity for us to ask questions. I take input from anyone on how we want to work through this. I think it will be helpful to do a bit of

pre-planning in terms of if there is any questions in particular you want to ask, getting those prepared ahead of time so we can share with communities and things like that.

So, I don't know how we want to approach that, if we want to just kind of use this and you can share notes and ideas and Michael and I can work on formulating those into questions or if we want to work one-on-one, just touch on any key points we're going to want to highlight with each of these groups. Does anyone have a preference for that? Michael, too, if you have a preference for how you want to approach that just in terms of planning since they always come up so quickly.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. Certainly we can start brainstorming. Just to kick things off a bit. I think that for all four of these groups, for each of these groups, I do think that we can … If I could start at number four and five just because those are the two that I'm closest to. I think that for all four of these groups we can ask a general question about whether they've used the DIDP or other ICANN transparency mechanisms, like their open data mechanisms, what they used them for, what their experiences with these processes have been like and any positive or negative feedback about these processes. That's kind of a general open-ended stuff about ICANN's transparency process connected with four and five that I think we could just send out to everybody there because we talked to everybody who are members of the community. And I think that if we use that as a way to open up that conversation, that might lead us to some interesting places. How does that sound for a start?

ERICA VARLESE: That sounds good to me, Michael. I think that makes a lot of sense and is an easy tie-in with each of the groups, really. So, that makes sense to me. I'm just looking at notes from what we've reviewed before. I'm just going to think of anything else. But does anyone immediate first thoughts – Daniel, Jaap, Tola. I was just checking who's on the call. I think that's everyone. Is there any other questions or thoughts that immediately come to mind for you for any of these in particular or is this another thing? Again, we'll have more conversation on the list [inaudible] anything in particular. Jaap, go ahead. I just saw your hand. Apologies.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah. I just typed to the chat that when SSAC, as the group SSAC, [inaudible] DIDP. I know [inaudible] if you start with it. But we can take these questions to the list and discuss this further.

ERICA VARLESE: Great. Thank you. That's helpful to know going into this. I know we still have five minutes left but it sounds like …. And I also know we've covered quite a lot today. Again, Michael, let me know what you think of this. I'm thinking perhaps while you and I kind of refine the language that we have for the terms of reference and the resource requests, as we go through that maybe just drop any elements that make sense as a question for any of these groups in particular in this doc as something that others can review perhaps later this week, so we have something prepared and just kind of … I mean, all of it so inter-related I feel like it

will be pretty easy to pull those things out as we work through that today. Does that make sense to you or do you have any other thoughts on that?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: No. That sounds good.

ERICA VARLESE: Great. Thank you, Daniel. I see you put a checkmark. Alright then. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I'm not sure who was talking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are we all going to be in Marrakech?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'll be [inaudible].

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think most of us will be. I know Erica and myself will be and I think most of the folks on this call will be.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Just curious.

ERICA VARLESE: Alright. That was our agenda for the day. If anyone has anything else to add, of course, in addition to that, just raise your hand. Let me know. If not, I think we've had a full discussion. We have plenty to take to the list and we'll get that out today because I know timeliness in terms of just when things are due, but also our time zones. We'll aim to get that out as soon as possible today.

But if no one has anything else at the moment, I think we can probably wrap up. Michael, anything on your end or does that sound good?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That sounds good. I think that there's been some robust discussions, particularly around the first two aspects of this but I think that it's been very helpful towards refining and finalizing or getting close to a final version of that, and I think that with a little bit of wordsmithing hopefully we can finish it on the list.

ERICA VARLESE: Perfect. That sounds great. Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: [inaudible] are we having the work party leaders call today, like in the next two hours?

ERICA VARLESE: Yeah. I'll be there. Michael, I'm not sure if you'll be there, too. I know we occasionally both have been there. But I know I ill be

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah, I'll be there.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you.

ERICA VARLESE: Great. Perfect. After that, Michael and I will send something out today and then, aside from that, just the other thing to keep an eye out for is I assume once the Doodle poll goes out after the reviews party has their meeting so we can have that collaborative session we talked about. In the meantime, I think we can wrap up from here and we'll definitely see each other on the list, so to speak, and have a little more conversation. But just wanted to thank everyone for the input and feedback you guys gave today. That was really helpful for me, and I know for Michael as well I think, if you don't mind me speaking for you, Michael. Much appreciated.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you, all. Bye.

ERICA VARLESE: I think we can end the recording, if we haven't already.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]