
BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much. Good day, everyone. Welcome to ATRT-3 Plenary #20 on 10 July 2019 at 20:00 UTC. Members attending the call today are Cheryl, Pat, Wolfgang, Jacques, Jaap, [inaudible], Vanda, Martin, Daniel, Liu, Erika, and Michael. We have observers, Avri Doria, joining us. Attending from ICANN Organization, Negar, Jennifer, and Bernie, the technical writer. Apologies from Ramet and Osvaldo. Today's call is being recorded. I'd like to please remind you to state your name before speaking. Cheryl and Pat, I will turn the call over to you. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Brenda. I wanted to go ahead and kick off by, again, taking a look at talking about any SOI updates. If we have any, please go ahead and indicate yes. Michael, yes, please.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. I mentioned this in the leadership call and I think someone said that I should do it at the plenary. Yeah. I have an update to my SOI which has been submitted. I'm now employed at Yale Law School. So, that's my new employer.

PAT KANE: So, you're Ivy League now, huh? That's great. Alright. So, if we can [inaudible] move forward and take a look at quick updates from each of the work parties. We'll start off with the board. Do I see Sebastien? I do not. And I don't see Osvaldo. Maarten, are you with us? Yeah, Maarten,

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.

you're with us. Is there anything that you can give us from an update on the board group or anybody else from the board group?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No. I'm not aware of [inaudible].

PAT KANE: Maarten, we're having trouble hearing you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Do you hear me now?

PAT KANE: You're a little better.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: A little better, okay. Basically, I don't have updates.

PAT KANE: Okay. Thank you, Maarten. Does anybody else from the Board Working Party want to weigh in?

Alright. Hearing none, we'll move to the GAC. Vanda or Liu?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I can go. So, I was [inaudible] in the leadership call. Had a very interesting call with Bernard and Jacques, [inaudible] Jacques was

available and Maarten was on vacation. To use this opportunity, we worked with Bernard and Bernard helped a lot to identify some points and [inaudible] everything in our GAC Working Group. So, we are getting feedback from all of the members about the new points for first draft recommendation. After that, we're going to post on the Google Doc. So, I'm waiting for the opportunity for when Maarten will be back and all the others come back from the vacation time. It's [inaudible].

The other issue is topic four. That's [inaudible] come back in that time. Thank you very much. Maybe you have something or if you had an opportunity to read all the issues. Please, Liu, the floor is yours or Maarten or Jacques.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. I don't hear anything or see anybody interjecting or into the group chat. So, let's go ahead and move on then to reviews. Daniel, please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: [inaudible].

BRENDA BREWER: Apologies, but Daniel's line has disconnected.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I have a very poor [network].

BRENDA BREWER: Daniel, just to let you know, we are not able to understand your audio. It's very broken.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Can you hear me now?

BRENDA BREWER: I could hear your question very well, yes. Thank you. Do you want to start at the beginning again, please?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, sure. I can be able to start. So, [inaudible] update is yesterday we had a meeting together with KC as the work party leaders to drive our efforts [inaudible] to recommendations that [inaudible] as a plenary to see how we are going to be able to move forward with the respective changes. So, we agreed and we made a request, copying Negar in the communication, for specific reviews and the cost estimate of implementation of issue recommendations. And then this will help us to be able to dive into analysis of the different respective reviews.

Apart from that, also meeting from ICANN 65, we are still compiling respective report and we shall be sharing it with the GAC [inaudible] since most of the information was related to the GAC. Thank you very much. Back to Jennifer.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Daniel. Whatever you did at the end there, it was so much cleaner to hear you than it was in the first part. It was very, very choppy in the first part, so thank you.

If we could move now to the community group, Erika or Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS:

I'm happy to start off. Erika and I had a chat earlier today in which we sort of compared our notes from the discussions in Marrakech and sent some initial thoughts back and forth. We have asked to schedule a community subgroup discussion for Tuesday at ... I believe it's 2:00 PM Eastern time and I hope you will forgive me if I do not know the UTC but I believe that has been sent around. In advance of that, she and I will circulate some initial takeaways from the discussions to help to guide the conversation on the subgroup and hopefully flowing from that conversation on Tuesday, we can try and populate out some initial – I don't want to say recommendations quite yet, but areas to look into and refine into recommendations.

The other issue that we sort of mentioned a bit is just related to the survey which we have some questions about and hopefully we can discuss at some point because – and getting the results back from that are of particular relevance to us since we have I think since ourselves a more aggressive schedule of completion than the others, so we'd like to address that, if possible. Thanks. And obviously, please, if there's anything to add, Erika, feel free to jump in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you're speaking, Pat, we're not hearing you. You might be muted.

PAT KANE: I was absolutely muted. What I said was that Erika had put in the chat, "You've got it all. Thanks, Michael." Then I asked if we had anything to update or report on IRP or workstream 2 and then I saw that Jennifer had her hand raised, so I wanted to go to Jennifer. So, Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Pat. I just had a brief update for Erika and Michael and those in the community work party regarding your request for a briefing on the NomCom review and implementation planning. It's just to let you know that we'll be reaching out to the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group leadership of which Cheryl is part of that team, hopefully, to try and arrange that briefing knowing that your timeline is a little bit tighter than the rest of the work parties. So, we will keep you posted on that briefing. And Vanda notes that she is in the working group, too, and as is Osvaldo. That's all I have. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Jennifer. So, then [inaudible] what I asked at the end there as well, again, do we have anything to report today from anyone on IRP or workstream 2? If so, raise your hand. Jennifer, I'm assuming right now that's an old hand.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes, apologies.

PAT KANE: No need.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, Cheryl here. Sorry, I didn't get around to raising my hand. I suppose the only thing we should mention for the record regarding IRP is the beginnings of activity on a number of fronts. Certainly the GNSO Council has requested repopulation of the group, as per the ANPC's request. And I know that the Consolidated Policy Working Group today, which feeds in of course to At-Large and ALAC decisions on a number of things, and also discussed this matter to [inaudible]. So, there is at least some movement from parts of the community in the effort to repopulate the working group, and of course hand in glove with that is the desirability of finding appropriate people to be put forward to the standing panel. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Thanks for that, Cheryl. I think that the 17th is the date that [the OIs] have to be put in place, the 17th of July I think is the date.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe so, yeah.

PAT KANE: Thank you. So, as we move to the next topic, this is again our first effort that we're going to move towards to our new agenda format, to where

we have a couple of topics that we try to talk in greater detail on, and the one that we're going to tackle first and we've set aside approximately 35 minutes for, is taking a look at the ATRT-2 recommendations and the implementation of those and assign items through the work plan and take a look at who could look at what. And I think, Bernie, you're going to take us through that.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I can. Thank you.

PAT KANE: It's all yours.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright. We can bring up the spreadsheet, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda is working on bringing up the spreadsheet. I just wanted to point out that I posted the link in the chat, for those who want it to be directly on their screen.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright. Thank you. What we did is run through all the ATRT-2 recommendations, the 39 of them, and tried to find a best match from the information that we had. So, these assignees are suggestions. They are not decisions of anyone and we'd like to walk our way through them.

So, we've tried to respect the various work parties and try to get people who have specific experience with specific things to match that up. So, enough background.

The first one is the Board should develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members and successive Board improvement efforts and analyze those findings over time and we're proposing Demi on that. Any questions, thoughts, or comments?

Number two. The Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts and published materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement. We picked Sebastien for that as one of the co-leads of the Board Work Party. It's unfortunate he's not here, so I guess we can assume that he'll be happy to take that on.

The Board should conduct qualitative, quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time and should regularly assess director's compensation levels against prevailing standards. We've suggested Wolfgang for that one. Questions, thoughts? No? Okay.

Number four. The Board should continue supporting cross-community engagement and developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development, policy implementation, develop complementary mechanisms whereby the supporting organizations and advisory committees can consult with the board on matters including but not limited to policy, implementation, and administrative matters on which the Board makes decisions. We've tagged Erika for that one.

I'm not seeing any hands, so I'll just work with hands. If you have something, throw up your hand and we'll get to that.

Number five. The Board should review redaction standards for Board documents, document information disclosure policy (DIDP) and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy, institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted materials to determine if redactions are still required, and if not, ensure the redactions are removed. There's a note here that this was the subject of workstream 2 recommendations on transparency and we've got Maarten on that one. I see a hand from Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I have some passing familiarity with this recommendation, particularly as it relates to workstream 2 transparency. I will be very interested in looking into this. I understand that Maarten is also well-placed to do it. Maybe we could look into this jointly. Thanks.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah. And you will see as we go through we've got you pegged for a few other things which I think you'll be interested in, Michael. And I thought this one would be rather straightforward which is why we ended up with Maarten. But as we said, absolutely no problem sharing the load on some of these.

Number six. ATRT-2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI Working Group to consider a number of actions to make its deliberations more transparent and better understood to

the ICANN community. Where appropriate, ICANN should provide the necessary resources to facilitate the implementation of specific activities, blah-blah-blah. And on that one, we've got Vanda which I think is a very good candidate for this, given her implication in the GAC Work party.

Number seven. ATRT-2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI to facilitate the GAC formally adopting policy of open meetings to increase transparency into GAC deliberations and to establish and publish clear criteria for closed sessions. We've got Jacques tagged for that one which he is from that work party also. I think we're good there. Alright

Number eight. Only 31 to go. ATRT-2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI to facilitate GAC developing and publishing rationales for GAC advice. At the time advice is provided, such rationale should be recorded in the GAC register. The register should also include a record of how ICANN Board responds to each item of advice. And we've got Liu for that one as one of the co-leads for the GAC group.

Nine. I'm not trying to spend the whole day on this. I'm just really going to keep going. If you have a question, put up your hand. The Board working through the BGRI Working Group should develop and document a formal process for notifying and requesting GAC advice. See ATRT-1 recommendation 10. We've got Liu for that one also.

Number 10. The Board should propose and vote on appropriate bylaw changes to formally implement the documented process for Board-GAC

bylaws. Consultation as developed by the BGRI Working Group as soon as practicable. See ATRT-1 recommendation 11, increase support and research commitments, government. We've got Maarten on that one.

Number 11. ATRT-2 recommends that the Boar work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI Working Group to identify and implement initiatives that can remove barriers for participation including language barriers, improved understanding of the GAC model, and access to relevant groups should consider how the GAC can improve its procedures to ensure more efficient, transparent, inclusive decision-making. I'm not going to read all of that. We get the idea. And we've got Jacques tagged for that one. Still seeing no hands.

Number 12. ATRT-2 recommends the Board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI Working Group to regularize senior officials meetings by asking GAC to convene a high-level meeting on a regular basis, preferably at least once every two years. Countries and territories that do not currently have GAC representatives should also be invited and a stock taking after each high-level meeting should occur. And we've Liu as that one, too. You will note that's three for Liu. We've tried to max it out at three for a participant, so that no one gets a really unfair chunk of this.

13. ATRT-2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI Working Group to work with ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement Group, GSE, to develop guidelines for engaging governments, both current and non-GAC members, to ensure coordination and synergy efforts. We have Vanda for this one.

14. The Board should instruct GSE group to develop with community input, baseline and set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement that address the following. There's a laundry list here. I haven't included that. And we've got Maarten on that one.

15. The Board should explore mechanisms to improve public comment through adjusted time allotments, forward-planning regarding the number of consultation.

BRENDS BREWER: Bernie, we're unable to hear you. Are you able to hear me at all, folks?

PAT KANE: Cheryl, do you want to pick it up or do you want me to pick it up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you can pick it up, I'm still struggling with gremlins here. Thanks, Pat.

PAT KANE: No worries. Bernie, when you get back in, just holler and jump in or raise your hand. Thanks.

We're on 7.1. The Board should explore mechanisms to improve public comment through adjusted time allotments, forward-planning regarding the number of consultations, given anticipated growth [inaudible].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Is my audio back now? Sorry.

PAT KANE: Oh, [inaudible], Bernie. Great.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright. Thank you, Brenda. It got pretty quiet there. Did we get 18 with Daniel? Yes? Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [speaking another language].

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Pardon me?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Vanda, I think your microphone is unmuted.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I see a hand from Michael.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: I think you trailed off a little earlier, closer to 14 and 15, but definitely before 16 because I was waiting for that one. Yes. My comment is on 16, which is just to say if that seems like kind of a random one for me to do and I'm not sure what the [inaudible]. I'm happy to do that but that

seems ... I'm not sure why that was assigned to me. So, we could potentially just switch that one around with the previous one if that makes more sense, but I'm also fine with doing both.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: The thinking behind this one, Michael, was that this is how community provides input and that's why you ended up on that one.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: That's fine. I'm 100% fine with taking it.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay, great. Thank you. 17 was Jacques on the language services and 18 was Daniel on the bylaws change.

Alright, 19. Implementation focused to review ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms through a community comprised group. We've got Cheryl on that and that will probably impact [inaudible] around workstream 1 and workstream 2.

20, implementation of a review of the office of the ombudsman, the role within ICANN and whether to do these in scope [inaudible] ombudsman should the expanded change in line with suggestions from ATRT-2. Of course, this was a topic for workstream 2 which was led by Sebastien in workstream 2, so we've tagged him with that one and it touches relative to the Board since the ombudsman's report to the Board.

21, the implementation focused on developing a full set of statistical data that would be published annually with each fiscal year annual report and we've got Tola on that one.

22, implementation [will] conduct a review of the anonymous hotline policy and process and implementation, etc. Workstream 2 had a section on that in its transparency section. Transparency was led by Michael and we've got Michael tagged for that one.

23, to enhance GNSO policy development process and methodologies, to better meet community needs and be more suitable to addressing complex problems, ICANN should again – there's a laundry list. I've not included this here. We've tagged Pat with that one.

24, the GAC in conjunction with the GNSO must develop methodologies to ensure the GAC and government input is provided to ICANN policy development processes and that the GAC has effective opportunities to provide input and guidance on draft policy development outcomes. Such opportunities could be entirely new mechanisms or utilization of those already used by other stakeholders in the ICANN environment. Such interaction should encourage the information exchanges and sharing of ideas, opinions, both in face-to-face meetings, intersessionally, and should be institutionalized across community deliberations foreseen by the GAC. We've got Vanda on that since we're talking very much in the GAC.

Alright. We're about two-thirds of the way through.

25, the Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need for ensuring more global participation in GNSO

policy development processes as well as other GNSO processes. The focus should be on the visibility and methodology of having the opportunity for equitable, substantive, and robust participation from and representing – again, laundry list included here. We’ve got Erika here. This sounds like a community participation thing and a GNSO thing. I’m not seeing any hands. We’ll move on.

26, to improve the transparency and predictability of the policy development process, the Board should clearly state to what degree it believes that it may establish gTLD policy in the event that the GNSO cannot come to closure on a specific issue in a specified timeframe if applicable and to the extent that it may do so, the process for establishing such gTLD policies. This statement should also note that under the Board, the [inaudible] may alter GNSO policy recommendations either before or after the Board acceptance. We’ve got Pat tagged on that one.

27, the Board must facilitate equitable participation and applicable ICANN activities of those ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players. I believe this is the one we received a comment from Alan Greenberg when talking about the ATRT-2 team and we have Tola with that one.

28, institutionalization of the review process. The Board should ensure that the ongoing work of the AOC reviews, including implementation [inaudible] into the work of other ICANN strategic activities wherever appropriate. We have Osvaldo tagged with that one as Board Working Group. I seem to have faded out there.

Coordination of reviews, 29. The Board should ensure strict coordination of the various review processes, so as to have all reviews complete before next ATRT review begins and with the proper linkage of issues as framed by the AOC, RDS Review not yet published, SSR-2 Review still ongoing. And we've got KC on that one.

30. Appointment of review teams. The Board should ensure that AOC review teams are appointed in a timely fashion, allowing them to complete their work in the minimum one-year period that the review is supposed to take place. Regardless of the time when the team is established, it is important for ICANN to factor in the cycle of AOC reviews. The review team selection process should begin at the earliest point in time possible, given its mandate. We've got Sebastien for that one.

31. Complete implementation reports. The Board should prepare a complete implementation report to be ready by review kickoff. This report should be submitted for public consultation and relevant benchmarks and metrics must be incorporated in the report. We've got Ramet on that one. I realize Ramet is not here. We had discussed the possibility of if Ramet was not [handy], Jaap, could you take that on? Yeah? Okay. So, we'll change that in the spreadsheet.

32, budget transparency and accountability. The ICANN Board should ensure in its budget that sufficient resources are allocated for review teams to fulfill their mandates. This should include, but is not limited to, accommodation of review team requests to appoint independent expert consultants to deem necessary by the teams. Before a review is commenced, ICANN should publish the budget for the review together

with a rationale for the amount allocated that is based on the experiences of the previous teams, including ensuring continuous assessment and adjustments of the budget, according to the needs of the different reviews. We've got KC lined up for that one as part of the reviews work party.

33, Board action recommendation. The Board should address all AOC Review Team recommendations in a clear and unambiguous matter indicating to what extent they are accepting each recommendation. We've got Cheryl tagged on that one.

Implementation timeframes, 34. In responding to review team recommendations, the Board should provide an expected timeframe for implementation, and if that timeframe is different from one given by the review team, the rationale should address the difference. We've got Demi lined up for that one.

35, the Board should implement new financial procedures in ICANN that can effectively ensure that the ICANN community, including all SOs and ACs, can participate and assist the ICANN Board in planning and prioritizing the work and development of the organization. We've got Wolfgang tagged for that one.

36. We're getting there. The Board should explicitly consider the cost-effectiveness of ICANN's operations when preparing its budget for the coming year. In keeping with ICANN's status as a non-profit organization, operating and delivering services in a non-competitive environment, this should include how expected increases and the income of ICANN could be reflected in the priority of activities and

pricing of services. These considerations should be the subject of separate consultation. We've got Pat lined up for that one.

37. Every three years, the Board should conduct a benchmark study of relevant parameters [inaudible] organizational levels, staff, compensation, and benefits, cost of living adjustments, etc., suitable for a non-profit organization. The result of the benchmark is that ICANN, as an organization, is not in line with the standards of comparable organizations, the Board should consider aligning the deviation. In cases where the Board chooses not to align, this has to be reasoned in the Board decision and published to the Internet community. We've got Cheryl tagged on that one.

38. In order to improve accountability and transparency, ICANN's Board should base the yearly budgets on multi-year strategic plan, [inaudible] and framework should reflect planning activities, etc. We've got Wolfgang tagged for that one.

And 39, our last one. In order to ensure that the budget reflects the views of the ICANN community, the Board shall improve the budget consultation process by i.e. ensuring that sufficient time is given to the community to provide their views on the proposed budgets and sufficient times allocated for the Board to take into account all input before approving the budget. The budget consultation process shall also include time for an open meeting amongst the Board and the supporting organization and advisory committees to discuss the proposed budget. We've got Erika tagged on that one.

That's it. Back over to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Bernie, for walking us through that. I think we've got two other items that we should talk about in this particular section. One is, is there a format that we want to approach the review of these in terms of identifying what the recommendation was and then how we present our analysis and how we measure at the end our picture of whether it was actually implemented, implemented partially, implemented not at all, not effective? Do you have any ideas around that aspect of it, Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

In the discussions that we had, given there have been so many things which have in some ways overtaken a number of ATRT-2 recommendations, I think we were trying to keep this to be a lighter touch, unless there were significant issues with a recommendation. If we can go back to the top of the page, please, Brenda. Top of the whole spreadsheet, sorry.

What you'll see is that what we are asked to do on evaluating ATRT-2 recommendations is an assessment of the implementation. Was it implemented? Now, the ICANN assessment, if you walk through the various documents, says that everything has been implemented 100%. So, the first review of it is that if it's been implemented according to your looking at this, then fine. If you have questions, you can ask them. And if you think it's not been implemented, then maybe a few lines – not necessarily pages, but a few lines – explaining why you think it has not been implemented.

The second area where we have to comment is an assessment of the effectiveness of the recommendation once it has been implemented, meaning does it meet the overall requirements? Here, in this case, that's a little bit I think more open to interpretation and I think that people, again, I think we're probably looking at keeping a lighter touch versus writing pages on these things. But definitely we have to come up with some of the criteria we're thinking of using to say if it's effective or some of the examples or if it's not effective. Again, sort of a combination of walking through these things, trying to understand if they met the original goal of the recommendation even if they were implemented, and if so, how? And if we don't think it's effective, then again, a few lines and major point? I think sort of a bullet point approach might work well if the members think this is useful. Back to you, Pat. I hope that was useful.

PAT KANE:

Yes. That's exactly what interview as trying to get after, so thank you very much for that, Bernie. Any questions from the review team on either the assignees, on the formats? Yes, Vanda, your hand is raised.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

The question is, as we know, we have discussed this inside some meetings. Some of those implemented are not implemented, so we just ignore that, that is implemented. But I don't know who had stated this implemented issues because during our meetings with [inaudible], for instance – of course, I will talk about the issues assigned to me. The idea was there but nothing was really done. And [one] is implemented [is

stated on that]. I don't know. It's just a question and we'll just ignore the name is implemented and we continue our assessment and our suggestion for recommendation because, as I said, we identified two or three that's not really implemented. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Vanda. Bernie, do you want to address that?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yes, I do. I took the status from the ICANN official implementation report of ATRT-2. I'm not making a judgment on it. I'm saying this is what is in that report. Now, our job here is to see if we agree with that statement and that implementation report should probably be the starting point for everyone who's got an assignment here because they list everything that ICANN has done that leads them to believe that they have implemented the recommendation. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Bernie. Wolfgang? Wolfgang, are you on mute?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Can you hear me?

PAT KANE: Now we can. Yes.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay. My question is if we try to investigate the effectiveness of the implementation, is there any procedure whom to contact or what would be the procedure? Should we have interviews with board members or with staff members? What is the proposed procedure to get the right answers if we try to collect material?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Wolfgang. I'm open to suggestions from others in the group on this, but I would think that, Wolfgang, given the experience that the members of this group have, I think we should take an additional cut at what we believe the effectiveness is and if we have to have follow-on conversations, we should certainly get those set up with specific people that would have implemented them to understand better as to maybe what or why they did what they did and how they felt that it met the recommendation itself. But the one thing that I would caution, back to what Bernie said about this being a lighter touch since this is pre-transition review on the Affirmation of Commitments and that timeframe, that we might not want to get too deep in that area should it not be as pertinent to where we are today under a different governance, if you will. Does that help?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay. Yeah, thank you. Thanks.

PAT KANE: Alright. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

[inaudible] the Affirmation of Commitment reviews [inaudible] on the implementation of the CCWG Accountability [inaudible] to the process which was also associated with the [inaudible] reviews. So, what [inaudible] is the removal of the requirement that the ATRT would evaluate the effectiveness of all other specific reviews, recommendations [inaudible] now being tasked with assessing the implementation of recommendations. So, does that mean that we are not evaluating the effectiveness of the other specific reviews? Partially, the answer [inaudible] top whereby we are looking at the effectiveness – we are looking at the assessment of the effectiveness of the reviews.

Also, probably a bit more clarity is am I correct to say that [inaudible] limited to the review of the assessment of the implementation of the recommendation of the ATRT-2 [inaudible]? So because right now we are going to be looking at [inaudible] of the respective implementations. So, what happens to the previous discussions that have been going on in the respective mailing lists? So, are we [inaudible] summarize them and put them there or there will be [inaudible]. Thank you. Back to you, Pat.

PAT KANE:

Daniel, I apologize, I missed. I got maybe every other word of what your specific question was. I think the way you were going was in line with some of the emails that you had sent to the list either late last week or over the weekend. I can't recall exactly when they came in. Could you go ahead and give me a thumbs up if that's the direction that you're going?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Absolutely right. Thank you, Pat.

PAT KANE: Great. So, Cheryl, can you address that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When I get back to the [inaudible] that allows me to stop looking at chat in the screen and actually unmute myself, yes, I can have a go.

We need to remember that there were significant discussions, and indeed some changes, about the role of ATRT in the post-IANA world as opposed to the historical, if I might suggest almost in some cases hysterical, attitude of the Affirmation of Commitments world.

So, the answer is yes and no, I'm afraid, Daniel, because of course we can also do other things as we so desire. But because we are in a different governance world where we can use a light touch on some of these things, it makes sense to do so.

One of the matters that was raised with previous ATRT was the inordinate amount of time that was required to do the deeper dive and more serious and significant audit of the other specific reviews, when of course the specific reviews cycling was still going on in many cases as opposed to getting onto new work, etc.

So, right now is a kneejerk reaction to your verbal follow-up in this meeting of what indeed you did write to us in email and we have yet to respond to. That's what you're going to get out of me. Bernie, you may

have something else to say from a workstream 1 and 2 perspective, however, or even a transition from IANA point of view.

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

No. I think you've set it up fairly well. It's not a simple answer. But I think, also, in some of the conversations back and forth [inaudible] I've noted in the various groups and what's going on with the reviews is there is a need and it's well within our mandate, at least for the specific reviews, to look at the review cycle because obviously we've got the RDS review that's not yet published, although it is finished. We've got SSR-2 which is still ongoing and will not be done before we're done probably. There are issues around that, I think, participation in these things, it has been difficult and maybe one of the best things that this group can do instead of diving too deeply in the recommendations is looking at the context of those reviews. I hope that's helpful. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Bernie. Daniel, you good? There we go. Thanks. Alright.

So, the next piece that's part of the same topic is taking a look at the work plan and how we want to record these action and these tasks that we now designated and how we want to put these and where we want these to fit in in terms of the work plan and dates that we need to have these back by. So, if we could go ahead, Brenda, and pull up the work plan, please. Thank you.

Jennifer, if you could take a look, if you could walk us through this and just kind of share some of your past experiences in managing this with

the group, what would your recommendation be in developing the work plan?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks. With the work plan, obviously you want to keep it as high level as you can while still providing sufficient detail on your timeline. So, in terms of ... I will quickly highlight a recent edit that we made and if you go down into the section on line 1.2.2, it's items addressed at plenary. So, this was previously the other section and we changed it on the leadership call on Monday to say items addressed at plenary, given that we have incorporated the independent review process and work stream 2 accountability items in there as well. So, those are two other items that we need to build into the work plan and [inaudible] perhaps as line items. And so, as well, I would suggest the ATRT-2 Implementation Review gets moved or gets placed in this, items addressed at plenary level as well.

The admin [inaudible] are all complete, but under work plan execution and the prepared draft report section – so, line 130 and line 135 – under each of those, you might want to put a line item for the IRP for workstream 2 and for the ATRT-2 review of implementation. So, one item for each of those under the two sections, work plan execution and then prepare draft report section.

That's really as much detail as I would go into it here in the work plan, but open to other suggestions. Thanks.

PAT KANE: So, you're recommending that we do not put 38 line items?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes.

PAT KANE: Does anyone have concerns or suggestions in us going ahead and doing what Jennifer has recommended? Go ahead and you can give me a no if you've got concerns or raise your hand if you have a question. I see a yes from Cheryl. I see a no from Jaap. Jaap, what's your concerns, please? Jaap changed it to yes. I like how you think, Jaap. Alright. So, not seeing any objections or any raised hands to the process. Jennifer, let's go ahead and do that. We don't need to do it on the fly but let's go ahead and make those changes and then send a note when the work plan [inaudible]. Well, I guess we get updates anyway, so if you would do that post call, that would be great.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. I will do, thank you.

PAT KANE: Alright. Thank you, Jennifer. So, that concludes item number 3 and if we want to go to item number 4 which is the work plan specifically and taking a look at any other updates to the work party work plans the team may have. Cheryl, I'm going to let you take the second bullet on this in terms of the methodology for approaching workstream 2 topics

or maybe Bernie can, and how do we want to roll those into the work plan as well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pat, Cheryl here. Can you hear me? I've actually removed a headset [inaudible] improved or not.

PAT KANE: Yes, we can hear you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Just jumping to [inaudible] item and then I'll get back to wrangling my gremlins still with my laptop. I would suggest that we, as indicated in the ATRT-2 recommendations review, take a similar approach to the newly named part of the work plan with items dealt with at plenary that we perhaps take a couple of the higher-level topics in terms of SO/AC accountability, jurisdiction versus – the big topic descriptors – and we could in fact name those out but not go into details as such at this stage but make sure that the workstream 2 matters are picked up underneath the titling there. I think we also need to make sure that we also recognize that the implementation team, what was previously known as the implementation oversight team, workstream 2, has yet to meet but is being convened and we should probably note that we would need to keep a watching brief on whatever initial work they manage to get done during the life of our review work. And at this point, I think I'm going to mute back and see if Bernie wants to pick me up on any glaring oversights on that approach.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I would never do that ... Publicly. No, seriously, I think that's the right approach. I don't think you've forgotten anything there. Thank you.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Bernie. So, does anybody have any questions or concerns with that approach? Alright, not seeing any hands or any nos. I'll assume that that's how we move forward. So, Jennifer, if you will make that so, that will be fantastic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Pat, I'd make that an [inaudible] on Jennifer and Bernie, simply because he's got the titles at the end of his fingertips, so it'll make her job a lot easier.

PAT KANE: Excellent suggestion, Cheryl. Thank you. Alright. So, that brings us to the any other business part of our agenda today. Does anybody have any topics or items that they would like to bring up at this time? Go ahead and raise your hand. Yes, Michael?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Apologies if this was covered. I had to step out for a minute. But did we discuss the survey at all?

PAT KANE: We have not.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Can I ask if there are ... What is the timeline looking like for circulating the survey and looking for responses?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I jump in there, if I may? We haven't had that discussion at the leadership team yet, but we can certainly slate that to do on the upcoming one. I'm well aware that the [inaudible] working with you and Erika as co-leads on community will be looming. That said, well-constructed surveys don't just flip out instantaneously, so let's see what we can look at and perhaps have that as a topic being more fulsome discussion so that the plenary can agree on a way forward at our next meeting.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Yeah. Thank you. That sounds like a great idea and I fully agree with [inaudible] craft a strong survey which is all the more reason to get started. So, I look forward to chatting about that at the next leadership meeting.

PAT KANE: Thank you, Michael. Thank you, Cheryl. Jennifer, let's make certain that's on our agenda that we set out for the leadership meeting for Monday. Thank you. Do we have any other items? Seeing or hearing

none, let's move onto the next item for the agenda today, confirmation of the action items. So, Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you. The action items are for staff to update the work plan with the ATRT-2 line items and under the items addressed at plenary, and similarly [inaudible] the IRP on workstream 2 high-level items including work stream 2 implementation team and we'll work with Bernie on those items. Then, the action item there just captured for the Monday leadership meeting agenda to include the survey discussion. Let me know, as usual, if I missed any action items or decisions. I'd be happy to capture them. Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Jennifer. So, before we close, just would like to throw out to the members of the review team that as you meet within your work parties over the next several days or engage emails or discuss things via Skype, think about a couple of topics for next week's conversation to fit into the [inaudible] Topic B section so that we can take a look at those at the leadership meeting on Monday and get a couple of them on the agenda for next Wednesday. Cheryl, anything that you would like to close with?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No, I think that's fine. Although, the only thing I might just add other than my apologies for leaving [everything] in your very capable hands and me ... Well, I haven't been coasting, believe me. I've been wrangling

gremlins. It would be that when any of the work parties are gathering meeting or otherwise engage, do remember to add Bernie into your deliberations. It will make his job, as well as yours, a whole lot easier.

PAT KANE: Thank you for that, Cheryl. And with that, we will close today's meeting. Thanks, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, bye.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Bye, everybody.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]