

ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY REVIEW TEAM 2 (ATRT)
TRANSCRIPT – CONFERENCE CALL 02
THURSDAY, 28 MARCH 2013

Brian Cute: Greetings to all, whether it's morning, evening or early morning. This is the ATRT 2 call of March 28. First order of business for us, we have the proposed agenda up on the screen. At this point I'd like to ask are there any suggested modifications to the agenda? Hearing none, we'll adopt the agenda as proposed.

We have five items. The first is a review and approval of questions for public comment. At our meeting in Los Angeles, we discussed our desire to put questions out for public comment at this point in time to get feedback from the community for the primary purpose of issue identification and work streams that the ATRT2 will undertake.

With that in mind, we have a draft of proposed questions that would form the request for public comments that were put forward by Larry, and we have a document of follow-on questions from Carlos. Viewing those two as effectively companion pieces at this point in time. One way I'd like to open up the dialogue is to ask, does anybody have any concerns or problems or any specific questions that either Larry or Carlos have put forward? Open table.

Xinsheng Zhang: Hello, Mr. Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes, Mr. Zhang?

Xinsheng Zhang: At first I would to thank Larry for drafting the paper. (Inaudible) my suggestion is that questions are for public comment and should be translated into the official language (inaudible).

Brian Cute: Thank you for the question, Mr. Zhang. And, yes, thanks, actually, both to Larry and Carlos at the outset for doing the work and putting the suggested questions together. Alice, we did have a practice of translating documents. Can you tell me what the present practice is and what are the languages we would use for translation?

Alice Jansen: The present practice is draft the documents in (inaudible), so we would have it translated into Arabic, Spanish, French, Russian and Chinese.

Xinsheng Zhang: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Does that answer your question satisfactorily, Mr. Zhang?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes, thank you very much.

Brian Cute: Okay. That's an important point. We need to keep that top of mind for all the work that we do in terms of being multilingual in our outreach and in our output. I haven't heard any questions about any of the specific questions.

Alice Jansen: Three people have their hands up.

Brian Cute: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. There we are, thank you. Alan? Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. I don't have any concerns about the questions, per se, but I'm wondering how many people are actually going to answer such an extensive and detailed set of questions? And I'm a little worried that the size of them will dissuade some people who might have been inclined to say things to us from not following suit.

Brian Cute: I don't think anybody is required to answer all of them. They can pick and choose what they want to address, and we can make that clear, I think in the request.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think that may be worthwhile. Obviously, anyone can choose to do what they want, but it may be a bit intimidating to see that long list of questions. And they're not one-liner questions, they're things that require thought. So, I think we may need to frame it properly. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you. David?

David Conrad: Hi. So, in reading the questions, I note that sort of a start off of being sort of a binary, and I have some suspicion that no one will be able to answer those questions in a binary yes or no. I think it might be more effective to say something like on a scale of 1 to 10, 1 being not implemented at all, 10 being fully implemented, how would you rate implementation of whichever aspects of the questions are applicable.

I also was wondering if it would make sense to sort of restructure the questions to include the cross-cutting issues for each of the questions. So, for example, in the first question asks have recommendations from ATRT 1 been fully implemented? If so, what metrics would you use to judge that implementation? What mechanisms do you believe there should be for continual improvement of the implementation of those recommendations? That sort of thing.

Brian Cute: David, can you just elaborate on the cross-cutting? You made a reference to cross-cutting. Can I be clear about what you meant by that?

David Conrad: Right. I guess after you had left the meeting in Los Angeles, we had discussed how some of the issues are -- cut across all of the various aspects of the reviews that were being done.

So, for example, metrics are, for each of the various aspects that are being reviewed, you probably need metrics to enable you to measure whether or not something has been implemented.

So, it's not just what are the metrics that you use to measure, but for this particular aspect of the review, what metrics would you propose? And the same for continual improvement. There were a number of others, I don't recall offhand the full list.

Brian Cute: Thank you for that.

Alan Greenberg: We did ask a general question about metrics, No. 14, that would let people -- otherwise, you're asking people to give you metrics on every one of these. I think that's maybe more burden that people can stand.

And on the [continually] improvement, I think that's mentioned where it's specifically included in one of the subparagraphs. So, if you look at question 10, it picks up with continually assessing improvement, because that's part of subparagraph C. But that language actually isn't in all of the subparagraph, but we did try to capture where it was in the paragraph.

Brian Cute: David, does that question get to the heart of the metrics suggestion that you had or is your suggestion beyond that or different from it?

David Conrad: Well, I appreciate the concern of providing an overwhelming set of questions for public comment. I sort of agree with Alan's initial comment, that looking at this -- I would actually be a bit dissuaded from actually participating in the public comment just as it exists now, providing specific examples for each of the questions. I think there is sort of an overriding issue of just the amount of information that we're requesting on the public comments.

My interest in sort of dividing the metrics is sort of fundamentally, I believe, that in order to measure improvement you need to actually have something that you can measure against. And I guess my thought was just to try to incorporate those metrics throughout all of the various things that we're looking at.

Brian Cute: Just an observation, and it's a discussion point that we had in Los Angeles, which is the fact that ATRT 1 did not to a large degree propose specific metrics other than, in some cases, specific deadlines for certain recommendations.

So, with that being the background, asking the community how they would measure could certainly be informative in terms of providing us what across the community respondents think are appropriate metrics. But getting to that place you just mentioned, which is the delta between how they performed and how they should have performed, I'm not sure how we could capture that effectively given what the ATRT 1's recommendations were. Any thoughts there, David, on how we could shape a question to address that?

David Conrad: I might have some ideas. I'll propose it in an e-mail to not hold up the subsequent discussion.

Brian Cute: Great. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri. I have two comments. One of them on the format of all this. I think, if you look at most of the questions, the first one, as somebody already indicated, does lend itself very much to a -- on a scale of 1 to 10, with follow-up questions that can indeed be optional.

I know that last time, when I was part of a constituency filling out what was also a very long questionnaire, we put a lot of time into it and we did answer most all of the questions, assigning them out.

Now in the intervening years, ICANN has got a lot of experience in terms of putting these things on the Web, doing it in such a way that you have, first of all, a 1 through 10 choice, and you have the option of filling in spaces that you can stop and start doing the questionnaire, as opposed to you get it all done at once or not.

So, ICANN has already gotten really quite good at doing these, and I believe doing them in multiple languages. So, I think if we look to leverage on top of that, we can actually do something that is very hard. And let people know upfront, listen, you don't have to

answer them all, you don't have to fill in every space, but say what you've got to say and here's the opportunity to say as much or as little. If you just want to do the 1 through 10 without explaining, and some people might, that's okay, because that gives us a measure. Giving reason is better, but leaving it up to people how much they do but give them the opportunity to do a lot.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that I also submitted an extra question, which -- on the list, which I have cut and paste into the chat -- I've reworded it slightly, that I'd also like to have considered as one of the list questions that we ask. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Okay. And on that note, Avri, we have your question, and we also have Carlos's questions, too, which are not currently on the screen. And we're considering all of those in this discussion. Alan, you're back up?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. If we do go the way Avri is suggesting and do it online, please, can we also present on a Web page or something, the whole list of questions? It's really difficult when you go into this and it starts going on forever and maybe you'll get -- what percentage of the way are you through? People should be able to scan the whole thing before they start the process. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Anybody else in the queue? So, what I'm hearing is that we should qualify the document, to make it clear that people don't have to answer every question, that if they only wanted to answer select questions, that is encouraged. That any feedback is welcome. That we need to structure the document as best we can so that it is easily digestible, if you will, from the readers' perspective.

And I have heard no -- the only -- I had one thought, and I want to flip over to Carlos's questions. It's a minor edit, but I think it's things we should think about in terms of how - - the types of responses we want to elicit. And in Carlos's document it was toward the end -- pardon me, just give me a moment to get there. One of your questions, Carlos, on the second page, the bottom third: Do you embrace the decisions of the board after the initial internal review of it in your community and/or working group?

Just one thought struck me that maybe the question: How do you embrace the decisions of the board would also be a useful construction of a sentence in order to get feedback from the community that would be very informative.

So, I think at this point we just need, unless there is any objection, to combine these documents --

Jorgen Andersen: (Inaudible)

Brian Cute: Yes, please.

Jorgen Andersen: Brian, this is Jorgen Andersen speaking from Denmark, from the remote island in the middle of the great (inaudible). I came in late but I've been listening very carefully to the discussion so far, and I can support everything that has been said. I just have one question, and that is do we consider government as part of the ICANN community, or do we foresee that we will deal in a special way with governments and their use about how things have been moving since ATRT 1?

Brian Cute: Well, the baseline answer is when we put out questions for public comment, they are open to the public-at-large, all stakeholders of the community. Is Heather on the phone, or Larry, if either of you two have a specific view on this question?

- Jorgen Andersen: I have a specific view myself. I'm not sure that this is sufficient for government. I'm not sure whether we can be completely sure that those government representatives which we want to get in touch with will be reading this consultation document.
- We heard [Favi] at our meeting in Los Angeles stress that there was a gap between those participating in GAC work and administrators. So, I think we should consider that that might be under another agenda item if we can do something special to get hold of [views] of government. That would be my view. I don't whether there are other government representatives in our group who have views on this call. Larry?
- Larry Strickling: Well, I think it's important to understand that this is by no means not the only consultation that we should do as a committee. So, for example, ATRT 1 spent a lot of time talking directly to the GAC and its members, as well as to the board and its members on these issues. And I would think that given the fact that the GAC/board relationship makes up one of the four paragraphs, subparagraphs in paragraph 9 of the affirmation, it would behoove this group to consider doing the same this time.
- So, I don't think anybody expects that these questions are intended to be the primary or only source of information to us, but at the same time it's just as important that we do this kind of reach out to the entire community to gather and to invite their input.
- So, I think if we think of it in terms of one piece of a larger set of consultations we have to perform, we ought to be able to proceed with something along these lines. And then make sure we are doing the more face-to-face consultation with key groups like the GAC through the process.
- Jorgen Andersen: I agree. I agree.
- Fiona Alexander: This is [Fiona] (inaudible), because I don't think Heather is on the phone. For the GAC agenda for Beijing, she has actually scheduled some time for the GAC members of the review team, or the government members of the review team to meet with the GAC.
- Brian Cute: Very good. Carlos, I saw your hand up.
- Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Hello?
- Brian Cute: Yes?
- Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay. It's very awkward to have two different devices for the same action here. Okay, but maybe one day we can just have it one -- let me lower the -- okay. My comments is just some comments to Larry's questionnaire, which is fine, and I want to summarize two, three things.
- I see three big groups in Larry's paper, and I think if we organize it around these three groups, it doesn't look as long or as impressive, because people can choose right away to go to one of the three chapters. I think that first set of questions is related to the interaction between the different review teams.
- And then when we go to 9.1, I have a preference for separating it also in two groups. A and B are related to formal bodies and the questions are straightforward, and a lot of people, particularly governments, can jump immediately to that section.
- And then we have the third group of questions, which are related to 9.1 C, D and E, and my comments are based on -- in the list out of Los Angeles -- and, again, in the questions by Larry, I think that the questions of these last three points are rather weak. If I go to the Excel chart that we produced or that was produced in this brainstorm, I see only two

questions related to D and E, those are 15 and 17, and we even said those are not very important.

And when I get to Larry's questionnaire, I think he deals pretty well with D, with the acceptance by the community, but I think that the questions related to C and E are, again, very weak. And I get a feeling that we haven't dealt enough with how to analyze these three questions that are pretty much related with a multicycle (inaudible) policy development process.

And related to David Conrad's [early commands], I think this is pretty hard to measure, also. Because if somebody puts up something and thinks he doesn't get hurt, and he sees no reaction, and he sees no commands, either positive or negative to his proposal, no evaluation by staff, if that's positive or negative, then in the end he won't embrace any decision. I mean, they are pretty much related in these process. And although I agree this is the first questionnaire and we can easily put it together, I mean, add some of my commands to Larry's excellent questionnaire, I want to signal that I see a particular weakness in the last three segments of 9.1. I see it again and again, and these should be -- I think we should spend more time or get more input before letting this thing out to the big community. Because if we have no clear message that we are here to try to listen to everybody, we'll become a self-fulfilling prophecy that nobody will answer. Thank you very much.

Alan Greenberg: Hello? It's Alan, I'm still here.

Brian Cute: Oh, I'm sorry, I was on mute. Sorry, folks. Carlos, it's a very important question you raise. I think Larry's response to Jorgen's point is a partial answer to your last point. That is, this is going to part of a series of touch points with the community by this review team. We'll do it in a very structured way. We will do it in Durbin, and we will do it beyond. And different from ATRT 1, this team is already talking about potentially going to the IGF as part of reaching out further to the community.

I do think it's important at this point in the process, as we organize our work and organize and select the issues that we want to turn into structured work streams, that we get some feedback from the community, whether it's robust or just partial. It helps us, we need our work to be informed not just by the team's view and interpretation of the AoC, but also from community feedback. So, I think that's the goal here. Any other points of discussion on this?

Jorgen Andersen: Brian, Jorgen speaking again. Could I just add one view on top of what I said before? I think the answer to Larry's is very good. I think the questionnaire is excellent. I appreciate Carlos's views as well. Could I propose that we leave it like this and maybe put a very short agenda item up for our meeting in Beijing on how to move forward? I agree with what you said about IGF, but maybe there are other things which we should address. Could we add an item on the agenda for Beijing?

Brian Cute: And the item would be outreach, or something of that nature?

Jorgen Andersen: Yes. Yes, outreach. Supplementary activities on top of this questionnaire.

Brian Cute: Okay. Point taken. Thank you, Jorgen.

Xinsheng Zhang: (Inaudible)

Brian Cute: Yes, please.

Xinsheng Zhang: I would like to see something about thanks for Carlos and [Fiona] for working on the next item of the Los Angeles meeting. But I ask you, I recall some of you team members also mentioned about nom-com [transparency] or nom-com evaluation model. I suggested nom-com issue should be included as one action item. We would like to make a proposal. Thanks.

Brian Cute: So, noncom issues explicitly worked into the questionnaire, was that the suggestion, Mr. Zhang?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Xinsheng Zhang: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Brian. It's Olivier, for the transcript record. I agree totally with the questionnaire. I think it's really well put together, perhaps bringing the other questions and integrating the other questions in would be good.

I know that Larry has mentioned that one does not need to answer all of the questions because, yes, it indeed seems to be a bit heavy, and it is seven pages in length. Perhaps having subheadings, so the review team subheading for all the, you know, who is RT, etc., then a subheading for board, a subheading for GAC. Just give a better formatting to the document to make it less scary, to start with, and make it very obvious right at the beginning to say you don't need to answer all the questions. If you just want to concentrate on one section or on some questions, you're free to do so. That will probably get a higher return rate. If we don't distribute the document like that, the questionnaire like that, I really don't think we'll get that many answers. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Sounds like an excellent suggestion, Olivier. Any other suggestions on the questionnaire for public comments? I'd like to draw this to a close. Okay. All we need is a volunteer or two -- yes, please.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan.

Brian Cute: Alan, uh-huh.

Alan Greenberg: I just wanted to reiterate what was said a little earlier that the last questions in the AoC, and particularly the policy development process, I understand we could ask it in a later questionnaire, and I'm negligent, I didn't propose any questions on that one. I think we need to hit it at least a little bit in this questionnaire, and I'm willing to put together something quickly, if that helps the situation. But I really don't think we could ignore it. ATRT 1 didn't really focus on that issue at all, and I think we have to touch on it at the beginning to show that we are interested in that issue.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Effectively, what I'm seeing shape up is Larry's questions are formatted in some way as umbrella questions, asking about specific questions of the affirmation and the reviews that were undertaken. Carlos's list adds some specificity. Alan's suggestion, Mr. Zhang's suggestion adds some specificity about particular items within a given paragraph or provision in 9.1. We need to strike a good balance here so that we're asking for the broadest possible input, and where we add specificity, that we are not inadvertently getting the community to focus on particular items and not get the broadest possible feedback. That's my assessment.

What I think we need now, unless there are any other substantive suggestions, is someone to hold the pen, to take the combined documents along with Avri's question -- so, Larry's, Carlos's and Avri's. I think Olivier's very good suggestion about organizing with headings and subheadings, perhaps, to make it less scary, and someone who can take this document to the finish line. Do we have a volunteer or a victim? Do we have a vice-chair volunteer or victim who I could assist?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I would normally volunteer, but I'm right now trying to clean up a whole bunch of other responsibilities I have so I can devote more time to ATRT 2. So, in the next [four] weeks are really not good.

Brian Cute: Okay. Well, okay, then, the chair will take on that --

Alan Greenberg: I'll certainly work with you on it, though.

Brian Cute: Okay. The chair will take on that task and recirculate that shortly to the team. To close out this item, the discussion in Los Angeles was that we recognized the suboptimal nature of putting out a request for public comments shortly before an ICANN meeting. And that's not a held practice, but felt it was important, again, to get feedback from the community at the earliest possible moment. Is that still the sentiment of the team? Is there any question there? Should we just move forward with this?

Denise Michel: This is Denise.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Denise Michel: Hi. Another option the team may want to consider is putting the questions on the section page for the ATRT public session, articulating how you'd like to use the public session time, the key questions you'd like the community to engage with you on, and list them. And then also send e-mails directly to all the constituency, stakeholder groups, advisory committees and councils, as well as the board, and detail the questions that you'd like to engage with the community on. I think that would afford you an opportunity to give people advance notice about the issues and questions you'd like to address without violating the forum standards.

And then, of course, you could still post these on the public comment forum right after the Beijing meeting and encourage people to engage on these questions. Just another potential option.

Brian Cute: Yes, thank you for that, Denise. That's a good suggestion. Question, again, just remind me, on the public comment for a comment period followed on by a reply comment period, that's 20 days and 20 days is the norm right now, for a total of 40?

Alan Greenberg: 21 and 21 is the minimum.

Brian Cute: So, 21 and 21, so minimum of 42 days. Okay. Any reaction to Denise's -- yeah, go ahead.

Denise Michel: And then just sort of sub-rule, I don't know if we call it a rule, Alan, it may be a practice. Avri would know this. The GNSO had a longstanding request that forums are not open during ICANN meetings, where the community is really busy then (inaudible).

Brian Cute: I certainly think it makes sense to publish the questions in final form as you suggested on our website to the ACs and SOs for the purpose of drawing people to the public session that we'll have, and giving them advance notice of the types of input we're looking for at the public session. Makes complete sense to me.

With respect to putting it out for public comment prior to Beijing, that was the consensus coming out of LA. Any discussion on that point?

Alice Jansen: You've got two hands up.

Brian Cute: I don't see them.

Alice Jansen: You've got Olivier and Alan.

Brian Cute: Okay. Olivier, please?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier, for the transcript. The suggestion was to open it before Beijing and then let it run throughout Beijing. And effectively have a blackout period so that would not -- so, the Beijing time would not count as part of the 21-day initial comment period.

The issue of commenting is always very touchy due to the fact that some part of the community do need to reach consensus before sending in consolidated documents and comments. And, as you know, as you well know, as in fact we all well know, an ICANN meeting is not conducive to commenting on top of all the other activities that take place. So, that's it.

I certainly support the view, though, opening it as soon as possible and then closing it after Beijing, I think maybe 21 days after Beijing would be good. And that's for the initial comment period. And then, of course, we'll need a second comment -- the reply comment period for another 21 days. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Olivier. And, Denise any reason why we wouldn't be able to extend the first comment period in the manner stated by Olivier?

Denise Michel: No. You have full flexibility in keeping your comment period open.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you. Alan, I saw your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. No, Olivier said most of it. It's not only the GNSO, but the ALAC and other groups who have made that comment, and the real issue is having the days of the meeting and just before and after the meeting, which are travel days, count against the count. If we can get the questions ready in time to post them before Beijing, so much the better, I think.

Brian Cute: Okay. So, to sum up, we finalize the questions, circulate them to the team. When in final form they get posted to the website, they get sent by e-mail to the ACs and SOs, all interested communities, stakeholders, in advance of Beijing. And they also get posted for public comment prior to and through the Beijing meeting, and with 21 days after the end of the Beijing meeting being the close of the comment period, to be followed by a reply comment period. Everyone comfortable with that approach? I can't see nodding heads, but I hear silence so I take that as assent.

Okay, let's close up that item. I'll take the pen and get back to you shortly with that revision of the questions for public comment. Thank you all. And, also, please do give me a prompt. The hands up seem to be popping up in a delayed fashion on my machine. It might be my connectivity, but don't hesitate to prompt me going forward.

Alice Jansen: You had three green checks on that one, so it wasn't just silence. You had people checking green.

Brian Cute: Good. And they just showed up.

Alice Jansen: Okay, they're gone now.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Okay. All right, let's move to the next agenda item, please. Can you throw the agenda up? I think it was the issues. So, correct me if I'm wrong, Alice, it was the issues document coming out of LA with the color-coding?

Alice Jansen: Yes, it's up on the screen now. It says review and vote on initial list of issues for review.

Brian Cute: Okay. Okay, so two points before we open the discussion. We do have the document of issues, it's now on the screen, that was color-coded coming out of the LA discussion. And the purpose of this document was to identify issues that the ATRT 2 felt it may want to select to create unique work streams that may result in recommendations.

Just prior to the call I sent out a work stream document. Could you put that up on the screen for a moment, please, Alice, and then we'll get back to the list?

So, I offered this document, which ATRT work stream organized strictly for that purpose, to help organize our thinking around work streams and workload. This is not a suggestion in any way in stone as to what we should do. But what's clear from the AoC is that this review team will address uniquely the implementation by ICANN of ATRT 1's recommendations, same with respect to security, stability and resiliency review team, and same with respect to the WHOIS review team.

Under work stream 4, this language is pulled directly from the AoC, 9.1 at the end, that calls on the follow-on review teams -- that's us -- to consider the extent to which assessments and actions undertaken by ICANN have been successful in ensuring that ICANN is acting transparently, is accountable for its decision-making, and acts in the public interest.

I want to go back to the list so we can have a full and open discussion. But I want to note here that having an appreciation for the workload on ATRT 1 in putting together the recommendations that it did under 9.1A through E, that the work up on the screen, work stream 1, 2 and 3, is itself a considerable amount of work. Work stream 4, which is unique to this review team as opposed to ATRT 1, is a separate set of work stream.

And then as we walk through the issues list, that we think not only about prioritizing which issues really require focused work and recommendations from this group, but also think about the workload itself. How issues may tie into these four work streams, which are baseline work streams for us, and see if we can come to consensus tonight on what additional specific work streams we may create and take on. And then make assignments or initial assignments of volunteers.

Is everyone comfortable with the organizer, if you will? Shall we move to the list? Okay, I see a green check. Let's move back to the list, then.

Alice Jansen: You have Carlos's hand up. He had it up before, he took it down, and it's back now.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Carlos? You may be on mute, Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay, I think I'm on now, is that right?

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay. Going through the list, I don't agree on the three colors. I think I sent an e-mail on that and I discussed it with Fiona Alexander a few days ago. The items repeat themselves in yellow and in white, and I think they are not organized well. I think we should organize them along 9.1, and I come to a totally different grouping.

It's the same grouping that we have in Larry's questions, as a matter of fact. We have three groups, things related to the other review teams, questions related to board and GAC, and then questions related about the policy development process.

So, I don't know if it's still -- we are working on the three colors or not, but I don't feel comfortable with the three colors. Thank you.

Avri Doria: I put my hand up, this is Avri.

Brian Cute: Sorry, I'm on mute. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think that's good. I think the colors were done just to give us a quick, what were we doing when we were trying to do something quickly at the end? I think that the spread that Carlos put out was really quite good and organized it quite nicely. I'm wondering if we have that, because I think that was -- I agree with him. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you. So, what I'm hearing is that a number of the items on the list actually do map back to Larry's questions, and would map back to the review for the ATRT 1, SSR and WHOIS in some form or fashion.

I guess a question now would be are there any issues on this list that people -- that do not somehow map back to those discrete reviews that people feel are of such importance or priority that this team should create a unique work stream to focus on that issue? Demi?

Demi Getschko: Just as a short comment. I remember David Conrad and myself have suggested something about the dealing with IP numbers as one of the issues. I don't see this in the list. I suppose it was in the first version.

Brian Cute: You're quite right, Demi. That was a point of discussion and it's --

Unidentified Participant: It's actually down at the bottom.

Brian Cute: Line 20. IP address policy --

Demi Getschko: Okay. Thank you, thank you.

Brian Cute: -- (inaudible) implementation.

Demi Getschko: That's down at the bottom, yeah.

Brian Cute: Yeah, so the question is on the table. Is there any particular issue or issues that anybody feels is of such importance or priority that a discrete work stream should be created to address it?

Jorgen Andersen: I have a question. Jorgen Andersen from Denmark speaking.

Brian Cute: Yes, sir?

Jorgen Andersen: I sent out a couple of days ago an e-mail with two items which are of particular interest, from my perspective, legitimacy and accountability of GAC operations. My question to

you is, this grouping proposed by Carlos and supported by Avri, would that cover my proposals for explicitly doing work on these two particular items?

Brian Cute: Let me offer a suggested response and others please jump in. Let me give you an example, Jorgen, that the team has already -- some members of the team have already identified the fact that in ATRT 1's recommendations there was not specific focus put on the PDP process, for example. The team from this review that will review implementation of ATRT 1's recommendations, in addition that, as they're reviewing the recommendations of ATRT 1 and examining A through E, could themselves focus on the PDP process and offer new recommendations with respect to that.

So, to your point on the workings of the GAC, there was a very robust set of recommendations on the relationship between the GAC and the board, and the effectiveness of the GAC, which would have to stand [review] as to ICANN's implementation of those recommendations, but which could also be focused on through a slightly different lens and produce new recommendations. I believe that's a way we could proceed. Could I hear from the rest of the team? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I wasn't trying to answer your question; I was going back to the original one of what's missing. And Demi mentioned an address policy development implementation. I thought we had in that list the corresponding one of name policy development and implementation. I don't see it there now. Either I'm blind or I imagined it was there, but I'm sure it was one of the issues we talked about in Los Angeles, because it's the missing item that wasn't referred to much during the ATRT 1. I think the policy development, be it address or names, is one of the streams we must be looking at.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. So, PDP with respect to names or policy development with respect to names. Yeah, okay, thank you. Denise?

Denise Michel: Yeah, so we mentioned it in LA and I think it's part of probably action item No. 2, on [methods of] success criteria. But stepping back and looking broadly at what it means for an organization such as ICANN to be transparent and accountable, and what the international best practices are and what the benchmarks are for accountability and transparency. I think that's a companion to what you mentioned on metrics, but it really goes a few steps further and could be very useful for the organization.

Brian Cute: Thank you for that. So, can we add both Alan's and Denise's suggested items to the list, if not in real time certainly after the call? Can I get back to the question on the table? The suggested way forward in terms of working some of these issues on the list into the structured work streams of review in the organizing document, is everyone comfortable with that approach? Does that make sense? Should we take a different approach? Carlos? Can't hear you, Carlos. Carlos, still can't hear you, if you're talking. Okay, are you there? Okay, Carlos, I'm going to continue until you join us.

One other suggestion to the group is in ATRT 1, in addition to the specific recommendations mapped to 9.1 and A through E paragraphs, we did engage the Berkman Center and charge them to take on three specific case studies. I think we need to have a separate conversation in Beijing about whether or not we need to do that, whether or not we need to engage an independent expert to take on some form of work for this review team.

But that being said, I think -- and it's just my opinion -- some of the issues on this list could be treated as case studies under the umbrella of work stream 1, 2, 3 or 4 as well. And instead of creating a specific work stream 5, 6, 7 or 8, any of those issues could be taken up and treated as a case study, that then becomes an appendix or an integral part of the recommendation itself.

So, I'd like to get some specific feedback as to whether there are new work streams that need to be created, because I would like to get some form of structure here and then get some volunteer hands raised to start organizing specific work streams. Carlos, was that you breaking in?

Alice Jansen: He's got his hand up again.

Brian Cute: Apologies, Carlos. We still can't hear you on this end. Avri, do you want to --

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Hello, hello, hello?

Brian Cute: There you are.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay. Just one comment to your work streams. I fully agree with the four work streams as long as we don't spend more than 50% of the resources in 1, 2 and 3, and not less than 50% of the resources in work stream 4. Because I think work stream 4 is the new review. That was the comment I wanted to make. Thank you very much.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Carlos. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, hi. I think your approach is good, the work teams can actually decide at that point, as you said, what is as a case study, and I think it would be great to have case studies. And then they can also decide and make recommendations on what needs to be done externally or what, as opposed to us needing to take that up with a prior decision. Let's wait on that decision until we've gotten the work stream, looking at them, and starting to figure out how it is they want to tackle it. Yeah, thanks.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Avri. Alan, I saw your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: No, that was just supporting Carlos's comment. All of the work should not -- the vast majority of the work should not be in review in the other review teams, but also looking at substantive issues separately. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay, so --

Larry Strickling: Hey, Brian, could I just ask a question?

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Larry Strickling: I'm sorry, because I'm not on Adobe, so I don't have any ability to raise my hand.

Brian Cute: Please, just jump in.

Larry Strickling: On your work screen, on your page, on work screen 2 you have for ATRT 1, reviewing implementation of ATRT 1 recommendations plus any new recommendations. That's clearly within our charter.

Work screen 2, on security, stability and resiliency, review the implementation of that team, and then you have plus any new recommendations. Is that a typo, or what do you mean by that? Because we're not supposed to become another security, stability and resiliency review team here. There will be another one of those teams created to come up with new recommendations.

So, while we have the mandate under ATRT to look at the subparagraphs of paragraph 9 and come up with new recommendations, I don't see our mandate extending that far to

the other two review teams at all, because those teams are going to be reconstituted at the appropriate time and do that work for their second iteration.

- Brian Cute: You are correct, that was a typo in haste. Strike that last phrase.
- Larry Strickling: I think there's a fundamental difference in the group that looked at ATRT recommendations clearly has a mandate to go beyond that and come up with a new set of recommendations under paragraph 9, but the other two reviews of the security team and the WHOIS team, it's a much more limited look, in my view. And I think that's borne out by the language of the AoC.
- Brian Cute: Yeah, that's correct. Thanks for that catch, Larry. Alan?
- Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think in work stream 1, any new recommendations, there's really two aspects to it. One is, are there any recommendations as follow-ons to the work that ATRT 1 did? In other words, ATRT 1 did work on the GAC/board relationship. If it was insufficient or [something] needs to be done, it's clear that that work stream should be coming up with those recommendations. It's not as clear to me that it's that work stream's responsibility to look at the areas that ATRT 1 really didn't touch, or didn't touch in substance. So, we may want to divide those and segregate the ones that are not follow-on recommendations to ATRT 1, but new issues.
- Larry Strickling: Right, but I think it's all organized under paragraph 9. You've got, I think, five specifications in subparagraphs A through E, and it seems like you would have a group that would look at the GAC both in terms of recommendations that were made, recommendations that could have been made but weren't, and then totally new issues that weren't on the table.
- And I think I would apply that right down the road to all five of those paragraphs as opposed to dividing them up and say, well, one group should look at all five subparagraphs in terms of what was recommended, and a different group should look at them in terms of what wasn't covered. It makes more sense to me to do this horizontally, not vertically.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay, I can live with it. I'm just worried that, again, all the focus ends up being on refining what was done the first time and not parts that were missing. As long as we ultimately catch them and the work gets balanced among the people, I have no real problems.
- Larry Strickling: Yeah, and not just things that we're missing three years ago, but new stuff that wasn't even on the table three years ago.
- Alan Greenberg: Sure. Yeah.
- Jorgen Andersen: Brian, one quick question from Jorgen in Denmark.
- Brian Cute: Yes, Jorgen?
- Jorgen Andersen: On top of what Larry has just said, I take it that my parts on GAC operations and legitimacy issues will be covered by work stream 1.
- Brian Cute: It would be, yes. Yes, it would. Both the prior recommendations and new aspects, as Larry said.
- Jorgen Andersen: Good. Good.

- Brian Cute: Thank you.
- Larry Strickling: I mean, Brian, I almost wonder whether, if you're going to break this up more, it's almost as if there are five work streams that consist -- you're work stream 1, and then a separate work stream on looking at WHOIS, and another work stream looking at security and stability. And that's pretty much how we had it broken out three years ago in terms of having a group that looked at each of those subparagraphs of paragraph 9 -- 9.1.
- Brian Cute: We did. We had sub-working teams, if you will, across A through E. And, again, this was just a straw man organizing thought. What I had in mind was a notion that, boy, if we create work stream 5, 6 and 7, given the limited, finite resources we have in terms of people, we might get stretched. But if we're coming to a consensus where we agree work stream 1, 2, 3, as we've discussed, and work stream 4, I think breaking down, if you're suggesting separate work teams on A through E, is something we could do, given our resources.
- Larry Strickling: Yeah, because as this is sketched out here now, work stream 1 is, as compared to work stream 2 and 3, is probably more than triple the work of 2 and 3 combined in terms of what we have to do.
- Brian Cute: It's dense, and I also take Carlos's point, too, in terms of resources wanting a healthy balance on the new part of our recommendations. Fiona, too, I saw your hand up. Would you like to jump in, please?
- Fiona Alexander: I think (inaudible) because didn't they propose that we have (inaudible) our best on A, B, C, D and E of 9.1 as Jorgen said, so I think I'm okay with that.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So, I'm not hearing any suggestions for additional new work streams beyond 1, 2, 3 and 4 that are on the screen. At this point, I would like to ask for volunteers. And I'm not going to ask for volunteers for 9.1A and 9.1B, and 9.1C separately, but just for ATRT 1. Actually, could we get that section of the AoC up on the screen, just so volunteers can see where the issues that they are interested in lie, and be certain they're volunteering for what they want to volunteer for? There we go. And if you could scroll up a little bit so we can capture -- A is assessing and improving --
- Alice Jansen: It's not synched. We can all scroll for ourselves.
- Brian Cute: Oh, there we go, okay. So, A is assessing and improving the ICANN board of directors' governance; B is assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC and its interaction with the board; C is continually assessing and improving processes by which ICANN receives public input; D is continually assessing the extent to which ICANN decisions are embraced, supported and accepted by the public and the Internet community; and E is assessing the policy development process to facilitate, enhance cross- community deliberations and effective and timely policy development.
- So, at this time I'd like to get some volunteers for 9.1 ATRT 1 review. Carlos? Thank you, Carlos.
- Larry Strickling: This is Larry. I'll go on there. In fact, I would actually propose every one of us ought to take at least some piece of work stream No. 1.
- Jorgen Andersen: Jorgen speaking. I can support Larry. I'll be on that as well.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Jorgen.

- Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. Larry just sort of referred in a sideways way to the question I was going to ask of, are we presuming that everyone will be in one work stream or are we double-dutying? And I would support what Larry says, that everyone should take some part of work stream 1. Maybe only work stream 1 if it's a heavy part, or maybe work stream 1 plus one of the others?
- Brian Cute: I agree with that. I think, for example, Alan, you've shown an interest in the policy development process, which is D. If that's the specific work stream you were to volunteer for, that would be welcomed. And I would ask everybody, since we have three other work streams, to think carefully about volunteering for the other work streams as well. We're going to need all hands on deck across all these work streams.
- So, let's take Larry's suggestion, unless we hear an objection, that everyone on the review team will be taking a piece of 9.1. Let's ask for volunteers for work stream 2, which is the review of ICANN's implementation of the security and stability and resiliency review teams and recommendations. Do I have volunteers for that?
- Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. One more question. Can we presume that each of these work streams, as they work, will not be working completely in silos, but the other people on the overall ATRT will have an opportunity to see what they are doing and commenting, if they have some input?
- Brian Cute: We can certainly create that dynamic, and that's a healthy dynamic. We don't want to have any, you know, discord in terms of ultimate recommendations. I can tell you, though, Alan, from the first time around, the work within each of those paragraphs does get very focused, and there is a kind of natural separation of the issues. But we will strive to make sure of those dynamics so that the developing work is seen by all with the opportunity to be --
- Larry Strickling: This is less need to feel you have to be part of the team if you know you'll get a chance to comment as you go along.
- Brian Cute: Yeah, we definitely will have sessions where the work-in-progress is surfaced to the group with the opportunity for input.
- Larry Strickling: Thank you.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Any volunteers for security, stability -- excuse me, the SSR review team recommendations? You can raise your hand or type your name in. Not seeing any volunteers.
- David Conrad: David Conrad's hand is up.
- Brian Cute: Oh, thank you, David. There it is, okay. I thought you might go for that. Do we have another person or two to assist with David? This is certainly not a one-person job.
- Avri Doria: Demi put his name down for 2 in the chat.
- Brian Cute: Who did, Avri?
- Avri Doria: Demi did in the chat.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So, David and Demi. I'll take a third now or I'll take a third after someone has a chance to reflect, but based on experience, I think three hands is something of a minimum number.

Alice Jansen: Olivier has his hand up in the thingy, I don't know if he wants to talk or volunteer.

Brian Cute: Is that a volunteer, Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Brian, it's Olivier, for the transcript. I hesitate to volunteer for that due to the fact that I don't know much about the SSR's work apart from just reading some of their reports. But seeing that there is very little other interest, I do have some technical knowledge, so if I can be of help, I would lend my hand.

Brian Cute: So, I'll take that as a qualified volunteer, but I'm going to take that, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: A maybe yes. I need to read it, but, yeah, I'm zipping my coat.

Brian Cute: Okay, very good. Thank you for that. Work stream 3, the WHOIS review team's recommendations. Volunteers?

Alice Jansen: Brian, this is Alice.

Brian Cute: Yes?

Alice Jansen: I believe Michael wanted to volunteer for that work stream.

Brian Cute: You're right, he did. He indicated that in his e-mail, right. So, I've got Michael. Anybody else?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'm not sure how much thin I can divide my time, but I certainly have an interest in it.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'm taking names down even of people qualify their participation. Thank you, Alan.

Steve Conroy: Steve Conroy.

Brian Cute: Stephen.

Steve Conroy: (Inaudible).

Brian Cute: Great. Raising your hand for WHOIS?

Steve Conroy: Yes.

Brian Cute: Brave soul. Thank you very much. Well, we've gotten three, and obviously after the call, anybody who, upon reflection, wants to volunteer, please put your names forward. But I want to at least walk away with three in each work stream.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, given that WHOIS is very much a work in progress, I don't think the workload is going to be really heavy for that. We just don't have the tools to judge a lot of what was done.

Brian Cute: I'm tempted to say famous last words, but I won't. Thank you, Alan. Work stream 4. Do I have any volunteers for work stream 4?

Avri Doria: I put my name in it, this is Avri.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Avri.

Larry Strickling: This is Larry. I'm interested in this along the lines of the note I sent out after you sent this list out this evening, which is I do think there has to be some kind of general look at the process ICANN has followed with respect to processing all three of these reports. And I think it's separate from looking at how they handled any individual recommendation, but just how they approached the task. So, if that's within 4, I'm certainly interested in contributing to that.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Larry. Anybody else? I'd like to get the trifecta. Do I have a third volunteer? And just because I'm not raising -- yes, please

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible). I'd certainly like to see an Australian on that one.

Brian Cute: That was a suggestion, not pressure, Stephen. And just because I'm not raising my hand, I'll certainly participate in some of these work streams. But I'd like to see where the members come out on this. Do I hear a third on work stream 4?

Steve Conroy: Steve Conroy. I'm happy to be on 4, just depending on whether there's other people who want to be on it or not. I'm happy to have a look about it, if any other people are interested in it.

Brian Cute: All right. Well, Stephen, I'll lend my name to 4, to give you that security blanket that you're looking for.

Alice Jansen: Good morning. Two more hands up. David has his hand up, as does Fiona.

Brian Cute: Okay. David, first with David. Is that a question or is that a volunteer for work stream 4?

David Conrad: It's sort of both. I do volunteer to help out on 4, with, you know, [mindful of] the fact that I'm committed to 2 as well. But also I noticed that Carlos has made several comments within the chat. I don't know if you wanted to raise those verbally.

Brian Cute: Oh, yeah, sure. Sorry. I got off of the regular chat. Here we go. Carlos, Work stream 4 should be better specified or subdivided. Yeah, no, the point is well taken. All I can say, though, Carlos, is that that is verbatim the language out of the AoC. There are certainly three discrete questions at the end of it, whether it's acting transparently on the one hand, whether it's accountable for decision-making on the other, whether it's acting in the public interest, which all have unique characteristics that lend to unique treatment.

I think at this point in time I'd like to just get the volunteers for the work stream and then allow them to do some further analysis about how the work could be broken out, as you might suggest, if that's okay.

Alice Jansen: And since then Fiona has volunteered, so we have a big crew there.

Brian Cute: Yeah, Fiona, was that a volunteer for work stream 4, just to be clear?

Alice Jansen: Yes, she wrote it.

Brian Cute: Okay, great. And we've got Carlos, all right. Now it's a party. We have Avri, Larry, Stephen, Fiona, Carlos and myself. Very good.

Larry Strickling: You've got hands from Olivier and Fiona, too.

Brian Cute: Olivier, and I just called out Fiona. Okay, we are well stocked on work stream 4 and work stream 1. Very good. Anybody else after the call, please feel free, upon reflection,

upon review of the specifics of 9.1A through E, or any of the other work streams to put forward yourself as a volunteer, and we'll make a note on the send. Excellent. Excellent. Okay, thank you all.

We've got about 15 minutes left. Is there -- I'd like to close out this item and move to the Beijing agenda. Are there any last thoughts, comments or suggestions on this item, the work streams? Okay, hearing none, then we move to the Beijing agenda.

And you saw on the back of it, it will come up momentarily, I'm sure. I did not break this out to day one, day two. This was just at the time a best efforts stock-taking of the things that we should be doing when we're in Beijing. So, let me start with the first question. What did I miss?

Jorgen Andersen: Jorgen speaking, Brian.

Brian Cute: Yes, Jorgen?

Jorgen Andersen: As I asked previously, I think that it would be worthwhile adding an agenda item on whether there are specific needs for submitting a questionnaire to governments in parallel with the questionnaire submitted to the ICANN community.

Brian Cute: If you would agree to a slight modification, that we title it Outreach, and with a focus on governments, as you say. And if you're happy to provide a suggestion as to how we build that sentence, but I think Outreach more broadly is a part of that as well.

Jorgen Andersen: And that is for agenda item -- which item would that be? That would be a new item, right?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Jorgen Andersen: Yeah, good. We don't have an Outreach agenda item, I don't see.

Brian Cute: Yes. No, we don't. Alice, if you could add a new item, Outreach, and specific to governments as a follow-on piece, so we capture both?

Alice Jansen: Okay. I think general outreach is an agenda item 10, but I can always specify that.

Brian Cute: Yeah, I think --

Jorgen Andersen: If possible, I think it would be worthwhile considering having a specific outreach to governments item.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Brian Cute: Any other suggestions? Fiona? Fiona? Can't hear you on this end. Are you on mute, perhaps?

Operator: Please hold as we connect your call. Please hold as we connect your call.

Brian Cute: Okay. While we're waiting, I think, for Fiona to connect, anybody else? Items to add, something we missed?

Alice Jansen: Brian, this is Alice. Just to comment that in LA, someone asked that items important for GAC members be identified as well. So, I just want to remind you of this.

Brian Cute: What was the point again?

- Alice Jansen: That the team should identify items that are important for GAC members, because I think GAC members go into sessions on Friday and Saturday. So, just make sure that they are present whenever it's important for them.
- Brian Cute: Oh, effectively managing the GAC members' participation in the ATRT 2 deliberations.
- Alice Jansen: Yes, in Beijing.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Okay, so we will have to structure -- look at the agenda and think carefully about how we structure the items in sequence and make sure we have the fullest potential participation. And we also -- someone else earlier on the call noted that there was -- I think it was Fiona -- from the Department of Commerce, that Heather is arranging for an interaction between GAC members on the ATRT 2 and the GAC, is that correct?
- Heather Dryden: Yes. I'll look on the agenda, but it was on the agenda for sure, last time I looked at it.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So, that's another item, Alice. We'll know for sure they're out of the room then. Okay, any additional? Any adds to the agenda here?
- Larry Strickling: This is Larry. I had two questions, I guess. One is, I think it would be nice, although I don't think we can do it on the 5th or 6th, schedule some time, if possible, with members of the other two review teams. And I don't know when and how we might be able to do that. It's probably got to be done on the margins of other meetings. But it would be good to be able to meet with some critical mass of each of those groups just to kind of get a sense of their experience, that's number one.
- Number two, I see that there is a scheduled staff update, but only to talk about the security and stability team implementation. I come back to the set of questions that I had proposed before we went to California, which were proposed too close to that meeting in order to have staff be able to answer any of them. But I was just wondering if there was any opportunity to go back and hear answers to some of those questions in Beijing, or if we need to schedule further time on that when we get back from China?
- Brian Cute: Thanks, Larry. I think that's for Denise. Denise, if you recall, Larry had sent an e-mail prior to the meeting in LA, and I think we put his questions and e-mail up on the screen that were a request to the staff to answer as they made presentations on the implementation of the respective review team's recommendations. Do you think we have enough lead time, SSR, because we ran out of time, wasn't able to present in Los Angeles. Could we have SSR rep, Patrick Jones, respond to Larry's questions as part of his presentation during the Beijing meeting?
- Denise Michel: Sure. Yeah, Alice is trying to arrange Patrick's participation and could ask him about those questions as well. In terms of those questions as they relate to all the different review teams, implementation of some of the recommendations, particularly many of the recommendations on the ATRT 1, involve -- you know, many were board driven, many were GAC driven. Staff was wholly responsible for some and a supporting role on others. And so when the question is asked, did he or she do this or that, you're directing a question to a person when it's on some of the recommendations that the board, the GAC, sometimes the non-com, and sometimes staff, or particularly a staff person.
- So, keep in mind that many of these implementation efforts are a collaboration, and so getting a group response on specific recommendations will just require a little lead time. You can certainly get some initial staff insight on those questions for the various reviews (inaudible).

- Brian Cute: That's an excellent observation, Denise. I think to the extent that Patrick can answer or integrate in his answer responses to Larry's questions would be very welcome. But you raise a great point about the fact that there are a number of people that work on any of these items internally, and really the review team would love to hear from them, their answers to those questions. And that obviously would take some more lead time, but it's a very good observation, it's an important one. And let's see that we can put together a thoughtful and reasonable and enough lead time, you know, outreach of questions. And if you want to help identify the folks who can provide those answers, let's start to work on that as a work stream. That's a great idea.
- Denise Michel: Yeah, it will be a little easier with SSR as the majority of those recommendations focused on activities that were pretty much wholly within the staff's purview, with a few exceptions. Alice will let you know after she's connected with Patrick.
- Brian Cute: Great. Great. Very good suggestion. Thank you.
- Larry Strickling: And I would just say, as the one who kind of put those questions together, nobody should get too hung up on the he/she type thing. It was much more just the construction of a question. I think what's really important is that this team gets feedback from ICANN in terms of what issues were created by the way in which the review teams presented the recommendations? I mean, we heard, I think both (inaudible) and Steve make mention of the implementability of the recommendations. I think getting that feedback will help this team make sure that they're putting things forward that take into consideration the issues ICANN board and staff had working their way through what had been proposed before.
- Denise Michel: Absolutely, yes.
- Brian Cute: And if I can add to that, not just the backward look, as Larry framed it, but also as this team does its work going forward in the process, that we want to have a regular dynamic where we're pulling from staff, whether it's those like yourself, Denise, who are staffing the work, or into the organization. This needs to be an important point that we think through as we build the recommendations, so let's make that a part of our work.
- Okay. Anything else to add? Alice, did you capture Larry's add, which was meeting with the members of the review teams?
- Alice Jansen: Yes, absolutely.
- Brian Cute: Okay. And I'm happy to see on the chat that Cheryl Langdon-Orr is noting that some of the ATRT 1 people will be able to meet with us at the end of our Saturday agenda. That's good news.
- One question there, Larry. I assume that you're envisioning members of the former review teams coming to meet with the entire ATRT 2, not ATRT 2 members who are focused on a specific review team meeting with them separately? Or is that something you're contemplating?
- Larry Strickling: I think it would be great for as many of us who are able, given all the other demands on the schedule, to meet with the members of the other two review teams. But I harbor no illusions that we'll get everybody. But I think certainly everybody should be given the opportunity to participate, yes, as opposed to subdividing it now. It may be that later on in the work stream with the group focusing on WHOIS may want to reach out to the review team again. But I think this is an initial conversation at a fairly general level, it would be great to have everybody involved if they can.

Brian Cute: Okay. Denise and Alice, if you would take up the task of setting up an outreach e-mail to the members of the review teams and making the invitation to them to come and speak with us. That would be great.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Any other additions to the proposed agenda in Beijing?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan.

Brian Cute: Yes, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Before we leave, with respect to item 4A, could we have an update on where that is? I know out of Los Angeles we had some illusions we were going to have that completed in the next week, at least the chairs and the vice-chairs. But as far as I know, I haven't been involved in any of that task, and I haven't seen any e-mails on it, so where do we stand and what are we going to be doing with it?

Brian Cute: It is to be completed, and we'll circle back with all three of you so we have that deliverable before we get to Beijing.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I just point out that some of us are leaving a week from now and it's a holiday weekend in the middle for some people.

Brian Cute: Understood. Okay. I think we have a fair amount of work that we need to do in Beijing. We'll go about the business with Alice of structuring this across the two days. We may or may not use up all the two days. We will be thoughtful about GAC representatives and making sure that they have the maximum amount of participation in the ATRT 2's agenda, given the demands on their time as well.

Is there any other consideration on the substantive agenda? I don't see any hands. Okay. I also will be making sure that we have some dinner arrangements for the entire team. Please hold your Friday and Saturday night, if you can, for right now. I think it would be a good idea for us to get together offline socially and begin the work in earnest.

Anything else before we close? Any other business?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. Perhaps we could do a quick survey and see when people are arriving. From my perspective, Thursday night and Friday night would be better for dinners and leave Saturday night open, because that's really the beginning of the week for many of us. I don't know how practical that is based on when people are arriving.

Brian Cute: Could I ask everybody on the team to please send an e-mail to the list indicating when you are going to get in town, so we can get a sense of having a dinner where the entire team is present, if possible?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Brian Cute: Avri, yes?

Avri Doria: Two things. One, I think a quick Doodle poll would be great. I have another thing. I sent an e-mail to the list, but the NCSG, the noncommercial stakeholder group, has already extended an invitation to as many of us as are in town on Tuesday afternoon during the constituency meeting to find a time and come in and talk to them. Not necessarily a formal thing, not necessarily all, but they've asked me to sort of extend the

invitation and see if we can find a time slot between 1:30 and 3:30 on Tuesday, when a bunch of us can show. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Great. And if you could just follow up with Alice on that, specifically, Avri, that would be great.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Brian Cute: Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes, I just wanted to virtually introduce all the ATRT 2 team members to Larisa Gurnick, who will be transitioning into working with all of the -- and guiding all of the review work at ICANN, and in particular being a liaison to the ATRT 2. She is on the call and fingers crossed she gets her visa and will be also joining you in Beijing so you get to meet her in person, and I'll send you some more information and her contact information online.

Brian Cute: Terrific, thank you, and welcome, Larisa. Looking forward to working with you.

Larisa Burnick: Thank you very much.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Any other items before we close? Okay. Hearing none, thank you all very much, especially those of you who are up at God-forsaken hours. Thank you very much. We'll see in you in Beijing.

Alice Jansen: Thanks, bye-bye. Travel well.