20130620_ATRT2_ID795926

Brian Cute:	Welcome. This is Brian Cute welcoming you to the Accountability and Transparency Review Team Two conference call of Thursday June 20. Welcome, all. What we have up on the screen is the agenda with seven items. Importantly in terms of the substance today, we want to focus on after the administrative items, the independent expert, results of the poll, and next steps, update from the work streams, report on activities, and public comments, and preparing for Durbin. Is there any proposed addition or change to the agenda before we adopt it? Looking for hands. I see a hand. Avri?
Avri Doria:	I'm wondering if we should just include a quick update based on the question David asked about the confidential list, et cetera?
Brian Cute:	Sure. We can make an amendation of that. So, we include a new item number seven -- update on confidential inquiries or inputs. Any other suggested edits? Looking for hands. Okay. With that amendation, hearing no objection, we'll adopt the agenda as proposed and edited and move to item number two. Do we have any updates to individual declarations of interest to be announced on this call? Looking for hands.
	Seeing none, going to move to item number three, adopting the preliminary report which was circulated by Alice and was a report for -- let me pull it. Alice, can you give me the date for that report while I'm hunting around for it again?
Alice Jansen:	Yes. May 23. Call 06. It's up on the screen.
Brian Cute:	You put it up on the screen? Thank you. Are there any proposed edits or corrections to the preliminary report from our call of May 23? Looking for hands. Okay. Seeing none, then the preliminary report will be accepted as written. Alice, if you would kindly post that to the ATRT2 website?
Alice Jansen:	Certainly.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very much. Let's move to agenda item number four which is the independent expert. So, let's walk through the things we need to accomplish. Number one, the results of the doodle poll and recommendations from the chair and vice chairs were sent out to the team. We need to discuss those recommendations and make sure the team is comfortable with them. Number two, we need to -- if we're moving forward fairly rapidly put together an RSP. We need to talk about scope of work and I think it's important that we come to a consensus on what the scope of work should be. Alan has put together a document for us to look at and discuss. Thirdly we need to look at timing of the engagement and what the rational calendar looks like and how that would feed into our work streams. So, let's make sure we cover all those items during the time we have.
	First, let's start with, before we get to the document on the screen, for those on the phone who've seen the email from the chair and vice chairs with the recommendation of how we

proceed. It encapsulated the results of the doodle poll and our suggestions. Are there any objections or support or suggested changes to the recommendations of the chair and vice chairs with respect to the independent expert? Looking for hands. If I see no hands we're going to proceed along the lines of this recommendation.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: I was dropped out of the Adobe. So, I'm not able to raise my hand. If you'll allow me just a few words. I have no objections as to proceeding as sanctioned -- it's straight forward. What I just wanted to ask is additional administration to the this, what's the process regarding establishing a budget for ATRT2? Certainly we found out there was a budget which in practical terms would leave with a certain amount of money, around $90,000 for work to be carried out by independent experts. I looked into the budget for the first ATRT and it seemed the expenses for consultants in ATRT1 amounted to almost three times as much as the budget. I was a little bit confused about what the background for ICANN posing such a small amount of money was. But having read the recommendations where he informed us all about the budget it became clear to me that if ATRT so wishes it would be possible to extend the amount of money for external experts. That led me to another thought. I think -- I cannot recall why we decided that we would only have external experts on the one particular topic, the topic which received the most votes in the doodle poll. Can you clarify this for me? As I said, I was certainly confused about what was the background for this whole process.

Brian Cute: Let me start with the last question first which is something I can respond to and we should come to some understanding on the team. On the budget questions, I'm with you. I have little certainty as to what the actual dollars are for this exercise, the independent expert exercise. We'll put those to Denise. But your last question in terms of how much work we were going to ask an independent expert to do which does tie to budget dollars I think the analysis -- Alan, feel free to jump in after me. From the chair and vice chair's perspective what really focused on the results of the poll and the support of the team and in particular the fact that it was more than half the members of the review team that supported the one issue, that that was the lens through which we analyzed, what do we think should be the work that will be scoped out by an independent expert. We have the same questions you do about budget. But in my recollection, really the focus and the analysis is which question does the review team think is most important and ergo which should we recommend to the team for work by an independent expert. Alan, Avri, obviously feel free to jump in on that. Your hands are up. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. Pretty much what was just said, I think it wasn't that one of them was close, it was that only three of them met a minimum threshold of half the people commenting, let alone half of the entire group. So when looking at these things and saying -- did more than half the people in this group think this was something that would be worth getting an outside research and outside consult for and only on the three topics that are mentioned was there even close to enough. The one that was picked had a good amount more than half. Metrics had a slight bit more than half and I think the wider use of the case studies was just about half of those who voted which was still less than half of those on the team thinking it was important. So, it wasn't so much they were compared against each other, what is most important is they were compared against a threshold of at least more than half the people thought it was important enough to get a consultant for. I think that's certainly the way I was looking at it during the analysis with the rest of the folks. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: I don't disagree with anything that was said. I think another issue certainly in my mind was this is a big study. It's going to involve fair amount of work not only on the part of the consultant but on the part of the review team in terms of establishing and setting up the terms of reference and then working with the external consultant during both the process of the study and analyzing and taking the results and analyzing it. Trying to do two seems to be overwhelming to me in any case. If this had been a small study then we could certainly imagine doing several. Given it's not going to be small, at least certainly in my mind, it seemed like just overachieving to try to do more than one and do all of this

in parallel in the very short timeframe we have to get a contract out and then have them do it.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. I would add one more thought to that that does tie into the budget. The issue of metrics which you know I put forward and as Avri noted received the second highest level of support, I think I put some of those thoughts into the email to the team. It merited the support of the team. Perhaps it could've been charted to an independent expert. But having heard from Denise that staff was in the process of engaging a consultant or expert it is to my mind one of those areas -- why would you spend twice the amount of money for the same inputs? So, from a dollars perspective, that consideration was in my mind in seeding to -- let's not get an independent expert.

That being said I feel very strongly that if staff is to engage a consultant or an expert to look at experts that this team should be engaged with that expert, with staff, should provide our perspective along the way, and inputs, and if the engagement of that expert we need some more information from ICANN staff, is not going to happen in a timely fashion that's something we need to think about. Any -- Jorgen, your hand is up?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes. Thank you very much for this explanation and sharing your considerations with me. I think this is straight forward and I completely endorse your thinking around this. I have only one small concern. That is linked to my question. And that is the proposal to looking at the finances. I had hoped it would be possible to let an external expert look at this and I saw from the comment on the spreadsheet that many of us, our colleagues on the team, shared my emphasis on dealing with this. But at the end of the day it didn't reach a result with as many votes supporting we move forward on this. I would hope we would at least in the work streams can deal with the finance issue because I still have in my mind it was a clear proposal from GAC at the meeting last autumn that the ATRT should deal with finances. I completely appreciate the arguments put forward by particularly Avri and Alan that a lot of things on this issue currently that means we would end up in the snapshots result which would not be a clear reflection of what's really happening when we get the report from the external expert. So, I can accept that. I think it's straight forward. Thank you very much for clarifying and I think I have a clear picture now of what has been the considerations. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. For your suggestion that in terms of the work streams in the ATRT2 looking at finances, that's something that should be very strongly and carefully considered. As with every issue we're looking at that will come down to a question of emphasis and focus. If it's there I strongly encourage the work stream take that issue on. That being said, you asked about budget. One of the things we can do on this call is come to some consensus around the scoping of the work that the independent expert will do on the BDP process, the scoping of the work will obviously have an impact on the amount of hours and the cost of this exercise. That's an important take away from today that I would like us to get to. That being said, the emphasis on budget that was posted earlier, Denise or anyone from ICANN staff, can you please speak to the available dollars, the budget beyond the June dollars and what flexibility you might have?

Denise Michel: There's an email that was sent to the team May 30 which outlines the proposed budget for ATRT2, $90,000 was correct for consulting for ATRT2 in fiscal year '14 which starts July 1. What else would you like to know?

Brian Cute: It's $90,000 in the fiscal year 2014 budget, that becomes available July 1?

Denise Michel: Right. Assuming that the budget is -- the FY14 budget is in the process of being finalized. Assuming it is finalized and there are no significant changes, that's what we anticipate being available for July 1.

Brian Cute: So, it's not fully approved yet but that's what's in the proposed budget? That will be available July 1 if approved? With respect to the $60,998 which was in fiscal year 2013,

that's authorized up until June 30 and then expires with that budget? Is there any possibility of a carryover or is that from an accounting perspective not possible?

Denise Michel: There's no carry over in ICANN.

Brian Cute: I think we have $90,000 in total assuming this budget passes.

Denise Michel: Correct. For consulting. Right. And then as long as we're on this budget issue I think we should flag this and discuss it separately but the budget also anticipated ATRT attendance of meetings at Durbin as well as Argentina. Is that correct, Alice? And a US meeting in addition to that. So, there's another budget issue that's a challenge emerging. Rather than meeting in the US which costs around $20,000, the team has indicated it will meet in Australia which is now looking at over $100,000 in cost. That's a significant change in travel funding. We should flag that and have a separate discussion about that.

Brian Cute: With respect to independent expert, just to stick on this issue for now, looking at the process from the first time around just in terms of the timing and calendar, ATRT2 took four to six weeks from issuing an RFP, interviewing candidates, selecting a candidate, getting the contract signed. That's a rough estimate. Let's put it this way. This review team moving forward, an independent expert won't know what the actual cost is going to be based on bids likely for three to four weeks time which takes us into the July timeframe. I can't predict where we're going to land. I think the scoping discussing today may give us some sense but in terms of actual dollars this is an unknown. I think if the review team decides to proceed and we scope out work and put it out to bid we may find ourselves in a situation where we're coming back to the cost for this exercise that may be under $90,000, may be over $90,000. I can't predict. I need to know the flexibility from ICANN's side in this process if we were to come back with a cost that exceeded the $90,000, assuming that's approved.

Denise Michel: The process that was established by the board with the creation of the first ATRT team was a process in which the ATRT could discuss with the board if there were budget issues. I think it's work revisiting that and looking more specifically at what the appropriate process is now. So, why don't I take an action item to look into that and come back to you with some more information?

Brian Cute: That would be very welcome. Okay, that being said, I think we need to get to the substance of our discussion on the operating process.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: I don't want to prolong this discussion but I found the email from Denise from May 30. And I have noted in that email which I think was very encouraging, there's a sentence saying ICANN staff and board fully appreciates the importance of the work the ATRT2 is engaged in and will ensure the most appropriate resources are available to conduct this work in the most productive manner possible. I have read this sentence in the way that if there is a need to exceeding the $90,00 for consulting ICANN staff will look at that in a positive manner and I completely hear the remarks made by you, Brian, we should hope ICANN staff can come back with a positive response to exceed the $90,000 if we -- I think it would not be very helpful if we limit ourselves with respect to the scope of this effectiveness study. I think the paper, the draft by Alan is a very good one and that would be a great basis for moving forward. I would really think it would be a pity if we had to limit the work which is sketched out in that document. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Your points are noted. From my perspective I think the review team should be and will be where possible with respect to engaging an expert and working to have an understanding of the undertaking and do it in the most responsible way with respect to dollars spent. That is my point of view. And we should strive for that. That being said, I think we will jump into the discussion of scope of work, the basis of Alan's paper. We also need to think about the timeline and as I mentioned, looking back at ATRT1's experience it what six weeks give or take before we went from RFP to contract and

realistically that time puts us to the end of July at this point in time. And so if we move forward in this and that seems to be the will of the group we have to realize that the expert will be engaged in the work at the beginning of August and the timeline as it stands has us issuing draft recommendations some time in mid-October. Therefore this experts would have a window of time -- we want to factor in that their work would come to the review team and inform our recommendations really two months maximum. And probably with some intermittent reports along the way so the review team would digest the analysis and conclusions of the expert. So, we need to think in terms of the timeline and how that relates to the scope of work and make sure that we get the benefit of an independent expert's work and that it be quality work that feeds into our work. So, with those statements being made, I would suggest we take a look at -- if you're agreeable, Alan, going right to the end of your document and focus our discussion on the scope of the work on this issue and have a discussion about what the actual scope of the work should be. We're looking at the heading assignment on page three if you all don't mind going there. Alan, I'll turn it to you and let you walk the team through what your view is the appropriate scoping of this work is and we'll open it for discussion.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Brian. As I said, I didn't put it in the note to the working group, to the entire review team last night but I did note when the vice chairs were looking at the draft, that the last section was the one I thought was weakest from my point of view. As this document was pulled together very, very quickly and that's probably the section that needs the most work to make sure that we're being rather explicit and clear as to what we want done and what we're trying to get out of this. The other section that we need to look at very carefully is the one defining what effectiveness means from the point of this review team. In other words how do we recognize the PDP process that is effect? We need to give guidance to the external expert as to what we're really expecting. So, setting the bar is also an important issue.

Having said that, I can go over what's here or open it up to questions. Brian, do you want me to -- not read it out but go over the logic in it?

Brian Cute: Yes. That sounds fine. Then open it up to hear what folks think. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. The first difficulty and part of any assignment like this is finding people. We're not likely to find people who are already very familiar with the process. The process is very complex and a lot of both detail and subtly in it. So, the first step is going to be to understand what the process is and how it's actually carried out. We believe over the last few years there are enough PDPs that have been done with enough varied outcomes that there will be an opportunity to find a good cross section of them and there's still many people around who participated in these and can be available for interviews and discussions. We think the material is there and hopefully we can find someone who is willing to dive in and understand it all.

What I believe we're looking for is an identification of how well it is working and an external opinion of what success means because there is a wide variety of opinions as noted earlier in the document on success and we're looking for people with experience in this area to try to make an assessment of what it is we should be looking for. And a large part of that is not only are the outcomes good but are the outcomes being based on the needs of the various stakeholders and representing the public interest which is a core part of our assignment. Are we involving all the groups that need to be involved in the policy process? At the extreme, if we're only involving those who are contracted parties and have a financial stake in the game we're not likely to meet all of the needs and ICANN's overriding need of satisfying the public interest.

The question is, are we getting the right people involved? Are we coming up with reasonable answers? Are the mechanisms we have within the process sufficient to address the range of problems we put into PDPs and of course are we doing it in a transparent manner? That's essentially the sum total of what I put here and I'm not at all convinced

it's expressed well. But that's the general gist of what I was trying to imply and what I think we need to satisfy section E of 9.1 or at least to go a good way to addressing it.

I'm open for questions, comments, or people who want to rewrite it. Maybe my screen is frozen. I don't see any hands. Fiona?

Fiona Alexander: Yes. Hi. I think this is a good start. We definitely agree with what you put on paper. I think there are several people that could actually do this. I don't think there's going to be a lack of people to provide good quality products. I think we would just propose one modification on your input that starts at line 82. Perhaps we could add another sub bullet that compares the existing ICANN PDP process to the policy process of other multi stakeholder bodies like the IEF or whatever else might be out there, not even in the internet space so there's a comparison point between the others as well.

Alan Greenberg: I guess my reaction to that is I would be delighted if we could get that. Is that increasing the amount of work load? If we can't find someone who understands ours, are there people who already understand the others? Or are we implicitly requesting an in-depth study of the others by asking that question?

Fiona Alexander: I think in terms of actually getting a best practices you've got to look at what works in other venues and institutions. It will help. I think it's something that's put out there and see what people come back proposing how they would do it. It's something you could evaluate in terms of scoring once you get responses to the RFP.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Brian?

Brian Cute: One question I'd like some clarity on is understanding the PDP process itself is one clear piece of the work. Looking at specific PDPs and various outcomes, clearly the number of PDPs that are reviewed as part of the understand can determine the scope of work and the number of hours and the lists of independent experts. Do you have any specific thoughts about how many PDPs, how they might be selected, and how that might impact the scope of work?

Alan Greenberg: I certainly have some thoughts. If you go back to my original concept paper, I identified three classes of PDPs and in fact identified three specific ones or general ones. In one of them I said any one of several would satisfy it which I think demonstrates the kind of problems the current PDP process has right now. And therefore I think are a good range. I'm not 100% we want to be very prescriptive in identifying them but I think it would be reasonable to give them a selection of -- and Marika will have to help us a little bit on which ones are perhaps well documented and that we can go to. But perhaps a half dozen and suggest they look at three or something like that. It depends on how prescriptive we want to be or to what extent we want them to do the picking in collaboration with some review team members. I don't think we can let it be completely arbitrary or done on our side because we need to be convinced we're getting good value for it and are really addressing what parts of the community have seen as the possible trouble areas or the different kinds of results that come out of PDPs. So, I think we need to be more prescriptive than what is in this document today. I'm not sure we want to be as prescriptive as what was in my original concept document. Fiona?

Fiona Alexander: One more recommendation and one question. I think it's important that whatever an expert looks at needs to be a PDP or process that's been completed, not something in process so that process can get a full evaluation. The other question I have -- I'm not sure what the right answer is. Maybe we should put it to the group. Are we looking at just the last three years of PDP or since ATRT1 never really focused on this issue, would you open it to everything in ICANN history?

Alan Greenberg: Certainly I'll give you my answers. I took it as a given that we were going to look at PDPs that were completed and implemented if there was an implementation because

typically a PDP results in a consensus policy or in a decision which then is implemented. I don't think we'll have the luxury necessarily of picking one where we have a long history afterwards of seeing how well it works although that would clearly be even better. In terms of how far back it goes, my recollection is the first PDPs we did really under the current process which involves working groups, it may have been the domain testing one in 2007. I don't think there was anything earlier and even that one was not quite according to our current process. I don't think we can go back farther than five to six years because the process was radically different before then but I see no reason not to go that far back. We did do a major revamp of the PDP process but it's really altering to some extent the details of it and not the overall flow and how people are involved. Does that answer what you were asking?

Fiona Alexander: Yes. It does, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: We have Fiona either again or maybe it's an old hand? And Jorgen? Jorgen? Why don't you try?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Fiona is -- oh. Thank you. As I said already, it's a very good draft you provided and not very many comments on it. I have one observation which is linked to the last lines of the first page where I think it is very well put. The mentioning of the specific role of GAC in all this context. I think the context is very balance I can fully support this. But having mentioned GAC and also taking into account one particular point of criticism which has been brought to the table on various occasions recently, GAC is not appropriately taken on board by ICANN. I think that it should be considered adding an extra bullet from the very last page. I have a concrete proposal for such a bullet, it's between line 86 and 87 and the bullet would go something like this -- maybe I should reiterate or repeat what is said in line 85 and 86, incorporate the activity of ICANN and ICANN deliberation and then a bullet noting whether particular views and advice provided by GAC has been taken into account regarding the specific events of government with respect to public policy. This is also reflecting the lines at the bottom of the page. I would be happy to send you a short email if you agree this bullet be included.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I was trying to copy it down and stopped after about five words because you got past my ability to write. Maybe if you could put that sentence in the draft, in the chat? But certainly have no problem with the concept, I just want to see it.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: I just sent an email but I can put it in the chat as well.

Alan Greenberg: I think also it needs to include the flavor not only of whether the views are taken into account but whether they are presenting in a timely manner. Certainly if you look at some of the issues that GAC is raising right now, if they'd been raised four years ago the world may have unfolded in different ways and so I think we have to incorporate both parts of that. Certainly the GAC I was implying in line 85, 86, given the importance of the GAC as mentioned in the ICANN bylaws, that is it talks about the board having to take the input but not necessarily other groups or how they have to respond to it. I think it's valid to call it out separately. Marika? Maybe I can call on you? Because you've been involved in depth in a whole bunch of PDPs but not of course the original gTLD one, it was before your time. Do you have any thoughts on this overall issue of the involvement of the GAC and addressing the needs being presented?

Marika Konings: Yes. I've already typed some comments in the chat, first of all in regards to the old versus the revised process. Maybe it's worth pointing out that we haven't actually had a PDP that has completed under the new rules from start to finish. I think that's something that needs to be pointed out either in the brief or the report so people understand there were some important improvements made in the PDP especially with regard to including external views and reaching out to other stakeholders to ensure their input. Alan, I think you're spot on when you say it's not whether input is refused but whether input is received. Looking at the recent PDPs we've brought where there are requirements for working

groups to reach out to ICANN reporting organizations as well as advisory committees for input and feedback, we haven't received a whole lot of that. I think as well the subject of one of the conversations GNSO is having with GAC is how to improve that. From our side we've identified all those different points in the PDP where this is being done and how the feedback can be provided and recognizing from the GAC side, are we asking in the right way? Are all the mechanisms we need to explore in order to make sure that an input is received in a timely fashion and early in the process. I think as you said, looking at the recent PDPs, assuming the domain one was the first one run and there were a couple others in that timeframe, following again a little bit of the categories were identified which we think from our perspective were successful, coming to consensus, outcomes that resulted in changes to existing policy or new policies but also a couple that didn't manage to come to consensus or were concluded without policy recommendations or even didn't conclude or were concluded because no progress could be achieved. I think some of the recent ones will provide good data and I provided a link in the chat. We do keep track of all the PDPs, at which stages they are. Myself, I have a number of time sheets I keep track of how much time it takes to get from one step to another. So, this is an idea too of how much time it takes to run through the overall PDP. But having looked at Alan's draft, I think one of the key questions will be for you to identify what you think is efficient and timely taking into account this is a multi stakeholder process and as Alan noted as well that may differ from person to person. I think it will be important to make clear in the RFP that the third-party looking into that will be clear on what they're comparing and looking for. I hope that's helpful.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Marika. Brian?

Brian Cute: Just with an eye on the clock I think I'd like to draw this to a close and have next steps agreed to so we can get to the rest of the agenda. That being said, are there any -- Jorgen has made a suggested recommendation or amendment to the assignment portion. Is everyone comfortable with that? Are there any suggested changes to Jorgen's language offering?

Alan Greenberg: As I suggested I think it needs to factor in the question of whether the views and advice are being presented in a timely manner and then whether they're being taken into account. I think it's a two part question.

Brian Cute: I'd like to get this down to an agreement on language. Are you making a suggested amendment to his statement?

Alan Greenberg: I haven't responded to the extent of doing that. Jorgen and I can work offline if you're happy with that. I think I heard general agreement from Jorgen on the concept if someone else can disclose the actual working I'm happy to consider it. Let's look at the actual hands we have. We have Avri --

Brian Cute: Alan, if I may, the next steps we need to get to is we need to draft an RFP, we need to get it out the door. The RFP is going to be drafted on the basis of this language here in lines 74 through 89 as amended. Two things I want to capture from the group is are we in agreement on the language in that section and is the group comfortable on delegating to the chair and vice chair the task of drafting an RFP that aligns with this language and getting this process flowing? That's the key next step. I have a tick from Fiona and we have two hands up. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'd like to hear what Avri and Olivier have to say.

Avri Doria: I guess when the question was asked about this change I had the opinion and many responded neutrally. The way Jorgen stated it, it sounded like it's more on the option that some of the community might believe it. It just needs to be done neutrally as opposed to assuming there hasn't been enough GAC mentioning. If it's written neutrally I'm fine.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Just a couple of points. The first one, the paper is entitled PDP effectiveness study. Should we put GNSO PDP effectiveness study? I understand PDP is maybe a reserved term but some refer to it was GNSO PDP.

Alan Greenberg: It is not a reserved term and the text refers to the GNSO. I think the title should to. The title was just an arbitrary thing. I expect that will change. It should be.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That was one thing. The other thing is I've noticed in the chat Marika mentioned that no PDP has been completed under the revised PDP rules which were adopted in December 2012. Does this introduce complications for a review of that process?

Alan Greenberg: I'll give my opinion. We made a large number of changes but they were to do with exactly how we addressed public comments and both addressed comments and made sure there were comments. We added comment periods on the issue report. We formalized a number of things which were informal before such as using the working group model which hadn't actually been there. There were other options. We made a lot of changes. In my mind if we -- let's go to the extreme. If we'd done the vertical integration PDP which is one that stopped halfway through because they couldn't come to any closure and couldn't even make a noncommittal recommendation, if we'd done that under the new rules the timing would've been different, the details of the process would've been different. I don't think the changes we made would've effected the outcome and I think that's probably true on most of the PDPs. So, it's true we haven't finished anything under these rules but I would've thought PDP hierarchy was in fact mostly done under them. But I believe Marika if she says they weren't. I don't think it's a revamping of the overall process compared to for instance if you look at the process that was followed for the new PDP process itself where I don't believe there was an issue. The overall flow was completely different. So, it wasn't a working group it was a modified task force. I'm comfortable in not worrying about the fact that the details of the rules changed halfway through. I think the overall concept is very close to the same. Brian?

Brian Cute: Okay. We need to bring this item to a close. What I'm hearing is -- I need to hear now if there's any objection. Last call. Agreement with the language in page three under the heading with the recommendation offered by Jorgen to be agreed to offline with a little more editing, that will form the basis of the scope of work that the chair and vice chair now have the task of putting together in relatively short order a draft RFP to be put out and have all of the elements necessary in terms of a timeline for a response and what the requirements are and expectations of the ATRT2. We will need to work with ICANN staff in terms of that RFP process and we will do it as expeditiously as we can. I think as a matter of timeline just projecting out based on past experience, again I don't think it's likely we're going to have responses in hand to have a discussion with candidates by Durbin. My guess at this point and it's just a guess is that sometime shortly thereafter we should be in a position to have a full team call with the candidates so they can make their presentations and make a selection. Part of making a selection means we have to have agreed upon evaluation criteria. The chair and vice chairs will take that on as a task to put together some draft evaluation criteria we will use to make a selection of the independent expert and circulate that to the team for review and agreement. Those are the specific tasks. Any discussion on that, anything I missed before we head off? And by any means if you have objections to what I just said, please state them now.

Alan Greenberg: I just have one caveat. This whole thing was put together very, very quickly and in particular you haven't really had a chance to go over it because of your commitments with your board meetings. So, I would suggest that if indeed the currently titled section assignment, if we find as we're working on the next levels of documents that we did omit something we will call it out clearly and break line to the review team that if we do have to make changes. But I wouldn't be surprised if indeed we find something that halfway through we slap our heads and say -- We forgot something obvious. With that caveat, I'm happy with what you said.

Brian Cute:	Fair point. As a team we'll have a chance to interview candidates and have opportunities down the road to slap our heads and say -- we forgot that item or this item and bring that into our work in our discussion with the experts. We'll make room for that in case it comes up. Any last objections? That's the task we're going to undertake as a chair and vice chairs. Otherwise we'll move on to the next item on the agenda. Okay. I'm seeing no hands. Next item on the agenda is reports from the respective work streams. We've got 26 minutes allocated for that, maybe a bit less given the time the expert issue took. What I'd like to invite now in turn is Olivier, David, Michael, and Fiona to give the group an update on the work within your work streams. I'd like you too focus on at a minimum three things, what specific deliverables do you have in view, how is the work progressing, and are there any resource needs or gaps in terms of what you have to work with that are hindering your work? In turn, please at least hit those three points and any others you think are relevant. Olivier, if you would take it away?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Brian. The only technical problem I have at the moment is I have one more minute until the call of death. So, rather than starting now and having to call again and so on, maybe you can start with someone else and I'll dial in again?
Brian Cute:	Right. Very good. David?
David Conrad:	Hi. So, deliverables. Sort of a status update. Work stream has gone through a set of SSR related documents and working on a set of questions for additional information related to SSR efforts within ICANN. Deliverables, we're planning on providing a set of questions to Patrick and the security team that basically expands on information they've provided to date. Progress, making some progress. I don't see any sort of time criticalities in the immediate future but that's sort of related to workload which is not entirely clear to me right now. One of the things I'm trying to do is cut down on the number of questions. I came up with quite a few when I was going through the SSR related documents and my expectation is given the current number of questions it might take awhile for staff to be able to respond. So, I wanted to summarize and pop up a level. The existing questions are pretty detailed. Resources, needs, gaps, at this stage the biggest resource need is time. I am becoming increasingly concerned about the timeframes we're looking at to get all sorts of things sort of lined up and moving forward. Resource gaps, my guess having more eyes on the questions and more input in that area would be helpful in the work stream but outside of the work stream there will be some requirements of staff time that amount of time is currently not entirely clear to me. At some point in the near future that might be an issue for me. I will keep people informed as it becomes more clear to me. With that I'll hand it back to Brian.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very much. Michael? If you would?
Michael Yakushev:	Okay. Good morning to all. Our work stream was and is lacking in terms of headcount. There are only three participants while the task is not less important. As for the deliverables, I think David, most of the things would work for our work stream as well. We've had a number of discussions on phone calls on different aspects of the WHOIS issue and their perception and the implementation of the team and finally we located that we need educations and update on the report that we received approximately a month ago from the ICANN staff because some of the points that were mentioned in the report are either ambiguous or out of date. We need more information, preferably right before Durbin about what happens now with this implementation and I think we will be able also to arrange some meetings including the members of the WHOIS review team in Durbin just to get the full picture and be able to give full and clear understanding on the WHOIS review. Thank you.
Brian Cute:	On the additional information you need from ICANN staff with respect to implementation, have you made a specific request to staff? Are you getting an opportunity for input or interaction put on the calendar?

Michael Yakushev:	We do work with people from ICANN staff. We will get the feedback as soon as possible.
Brian Cute:	Great. One other follow-up question. This applies to all the work streams but in particular the WHOIS work stream. It is one of the more thinly populated work streams. We've got effectively three people who are on work stream three. And I wanted to call that to the attention of everybody on the review team that work streams one and four seem to be very well populated. Work stream three in my view certainly could use another volunteer or two. We don't want all the work to fall on the shoulders of one or two persons. It's not an efficient use of their time. I'm going to make a call to everyone on the review team. To the extent that you're on a work stream that's well populated, that there's a number of people there to do the work and you're willing to reallocate yourself to work stream three in particular, I'm making that specific ask right now. Please notify the list if you're willing to do that. That's one observation. Anything else, Michael, on your end?
Michael Yakushev:	No. Thank you very much, Brian. Thank you.
Brian Cute:	Thank you. Fiona, please?
Fiona Alexander:	The specific deliverables we've been able to complete in work stream four are we were able to identify the main issues we'll cover and narrow them down to four. We've also been able to come up with a set of questions with ten guiding questions that should look at the question, raise specific questions for Durbin and the progress is confirmed. We did one call. So, that's putting more time into the reading assignment and we have managed to update the weekly information for the work stream with the help of ICANN staff. We have had a discussion on whether the first definitions based on this call, we want to know that independent expert will be covering. Then we'll be able during our work to cover the main issues for our work stream and we're still waiting for input from ICANN staff on some issues that our work stream is addressing. If ICANN can be more specific, we need materials on processes used to review, implement, and recommendations of the other review team. We have not been able to identify material in that area and ICANN staff has agreed to help with that. I think that's what we have for now.
Brian Cute:	Thank you, Fiona. Just so I'm clear, the outstanding request to ICANN staff, is that reading material or input from staff? Just so I understand the nature of the request.
Fiona Alexander:	It's reading materials we're looking for.
Brian Cute:	Thank you for that clarification. Olivier, I see you're back with us? Olivier, if you would give us your report?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Brian. In work stream one we've had an enormous amount of information to read, review, and digest. I'm not actually talking about digest as reducing its size. Unfortunately at the moment we're still in a position to just take in all the material that's there. In order to be as clear as possible as to what information relates to what, a wiki page was created to try and organize that information and make it all as easily found as possible. I'll send a link over of the wiki page in the chat. That pretty much is the nerve center of the working group. You'll see what the work stream is doing with AOSC 9.1A all the way down to E and we've got sub teams in the team. Effectively each of the subparts has had some bits of information specific to the work they were doing. So, for example, the staff answers which were provided were very kindly chopped up by staff so as to relate them directly to the sub streams. The relevant issues also are linked to that page for each one of the sub streams. There's a link to the sources repository. We put together a large page with all the sources so we have access to all the document s that are required and also staff has very kindly chopped up the transcripts from the two meetings which the ATRT held on March 14 and 15 and May 2 and 3 meetings. There's additional information on that page. And then I'd invited everyone to look through it and make themselves aware of them. That was pretty much the line we've

taken during our calls. We've held three calls so far covering the overarching issues and the sub stream work and the work stream asked for additional documents. There doesn't appear to be that much request from any of the work stream members to ask for more information. There is the concern that time is running out to ask for more information. So, I've asked the participants of different sub streams to look at what's still missing from all of the information we have there. With regards to the sort of action items we've had, the last action items from our last call, Alan Greenberg had volunteered to obtain transcripts regarding board reconfigurations and these would be added to the work stream repository that deals specifically with the board and board reconsideration requests. There are not many people in that sub stream, only three, so again it would be helpful if another person came and gave them a hand on that. With regards to other action items, developing targeted questions for SOs and APs regarding 9.1E, that's really in preparation of the Durbin meeting and I'm not quite sure, perhaps you will be able to offer guidance on this, whether it's something that should be done separately by the people working on 9.1E or by the ATRT as a group. Finally, we are scheduling and unfortunately this week I have been unavailable. But we're scheduling a call next week with Christina from language services to follow-up on her responses she provided in written form. She will attend the call for 30 minutes to review her responses. Of course I encouraged all work stream one colleagues to read Christina's responses prior to the call and prepare questions. Finally, with regards to the LA May 2 and 3, staff was going to follow-up on any of the items that might have been requested at this time and add them to the relevant subpage on our wiki so we can also start reviewing this. That's all for the time being. With regard to resource needs, nothing to ask for specifically at the moment. We're very happy with the amount of support we've had. It's been very good on that front. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. I'm glad to hear about the organizational work underneath and the support from staff. I'd encourage everyone to visit the wiki Olivier built to help organized and direct the work of work stream one. Even if you don't replicate what he's done I think it's very useful to look at for organizational purposes.

Let me make a suggestion or two with respect to the developing questions for Durbin. I think that ties in clearly to the work of the work stream and the entire group. To be clear from my perspective, developing questions for Durbin need not be a long list of questions. We've already put out a request for public comments and a questionnaire that was exhaustive to say the least. What I think would be useful to have more interaction in Durbin is if the review team and the relevant work streams are able to, even if it's articulating two or three very focused questions that can be provided to the relevant AC or SO or GAC or organization we're going to meet with in Durbin just to focus the conversation and get fulsome exchange. Those questions in my mind should be borne from the reading that's been done to date and the analysis that's been done to date within the work streams and the focused questions to drive good discussion.

Another important piece of where we are are the public comments we've received. Alice has provided us with summaries of the public comments. So, I would encourage each of the work stream chairs on the task of developing questions for Durbin -- A, don't think of it as an exhaustive list, think of it as a focused task. B, try to make sure the questions are based on the assessment done to date, based on reading of background documentations and taking into account the public comments. To that end if we develop a short list of questions to help drive useful discussion we've done ourselves and the community a favor.

That being said we need to look at the calendar in terms of when we want to get these questions out in advance of Durbin and as I'm copying my screen again and I'm happy to take thoughts on this from the review team, the Durbin meeting is the week of July 13, 14, 15. We are at June 20. To my mind, let's have a bit of discussion. If the review team were able to generate some focused questions by July 5 which would be three weeks from tomorrow that would give the review team three weeks to put those questions

together and give the ACs and SOs and groups we're meeting with a little more than a week to receive the questions and ponder them before our exchange. Does that make sense or does anybody have other suggestions? I'm looking for hands.

No hands? Can we agree to make that a target? By July 5 we'll have any focused questions to be provided to the community to pull together then we can give them to ICANN staff and Alice to communication accordingly? If you have questions that should be delivered to a particular AC or SO please indicate that and we'll take that approach.

Alan Greenberg: I'm agreeing. And Larisa has her hand up.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Michael, I just wanted to clarify something from your report. My understanding is that you and your work stream will finalize the questions and send them to staff? We've had a variety of drafts and previews. We've seen those. Can you clarify whether you're working on a finalized version?

Michael Yakushev: I will talk to Alan and we will finalize it tomorrow at the latest.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Hopefully today. I'm going away tomorrow.

Brian Cute: Thank you. We'll close and agree July 5 is our date for questions to be delivered by us to ICANN staff in advance of Durbin and I've given you my view of what we should be doing in the meantime in terms of the questions. Anything else on work streams before we move to item six? I see no hands. Turning to item six which is public comments in Durbin, I hope everyone has seen that Alice has provided us with public comments. They're here to factor into the work streams. I would ask the chairs looking at the comments to please take those as part of your reading assignments and homework for the work stream members in a focused way. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Brian. I didn't want to cut you off. I just wanted to comment on a first browse of the whole document I performed earlier. I'm somewhat concerned about the comments we've received. Many of the questions which were asked the range of answers goes from one to ten. And with sometimes an amazing distribution between the one, three, four, seven, eight, and ten. I just wonder if people answered the same question or not. It's clear that some find things excellent, some find things unacceptable and they're talking about the same thing. I'm not quite sure how we're going to deal with that.

Brian Cute: It's a good point. We have to go through the task of assessing the responses and making sense of them in a political way. I don't have a suggestion for you at the moment as to the way forward on that or the approach we should take but you've flagged an issue. Perhaps this is something we should put on the agenda for the ATRT2 face to face meeting in Durbin? Larisa? Alice? I think that would be a good use of our time, how we assess and interpret public comments and factor that into our work. Alan? Your hand is up?

Alan Greenberg: I have a couple of things. There was an exchange earlier today I think on the general list that we need to make sure we answer every comment and exclusively say why we're doing with it or why we're not doing with it. I think as we go through the process of looking at the comments understand there are some that are going to be out of scope. There was one thing about spam and probably that's not something we can fix. Certainly in this review. And Olivier pointed out, the answers range all over the board. We're going to have to make, if we're going to address an issue and go into a deep dive on it, I think we're going to have to have -- ultimately come up with a decision of what is the problem we're trying to fix. We can't fix diametrically opposite things at the same time. So, there's

going to be a lot of value judgments involved in processing this input. We have to acknowledge that.

Brian Cute: Thank you. I see Olivier and Jorgen's hands. Before I go to Olivier, Alan, this was based on what was done in the ATRT1. We don't have to duplicate this. The review team -- in terms of the suggestion that the review team respond to each of the comments, I doubt we'd have the bandwidth to do that. What was done in the first review team was in the final report there were a number of comments from the community that were cited and included in the report. Not all of them. The comments were reviewed, assessed, analyzed, factored in, and those that the team felt were important in referencing or supporting their conclusions, those were included explicitly to demonstrate to the community we got your comments, we factored them in, they are part of our output. That's as far as we went last time. We can have a discussion about how we handle these comments. That's just one reaction. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Another question which I had with regard to this was whether this was just the summary of the responses to the online survey or whether this also included the input from freehand answers to the different points which were raised. So, that was one thing and if it was then does that also include any input which was sent in that was outside the scope of the actual questions that were asked?

Brian Cute: I think those are questions for Alice or Larisa or both. Can either of you respond to Olivier's question?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. Just to let you know this incorporates all the comments and responses, surveys and free form responses. Alice actually has a section towards the bottom that highlights other responses that didn't fit into the category of the original questions.

Brian Cute: Olivier? Does that answer your questions?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. That answers my question. That's great. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Jorgen?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Thank you, Brian. You were referring -- or Alan was referred to the email exchange this afternoon and he sent out email that was supported by Avri and myself. I still support the proposal. I don't think this is in contradiction with what you've proposed, Brian, or what you reported about what was the process last time. My proposal would be you put this on the agenda for the face to face meeting in Durbin. I think the spirit in the email sent out is very important to stick to. You can always discuss dealing with things but I think it's very, very important to find a means to be sure you have been going through all the responses. I think it's only 31 responses we have received. They are fairly well reflected in the paper sent out by Alice. Each of the work streams or the teams on the work streams might benefit from going through and seeing whether there are particular items in this summary which is dealt with by the particular work stream to take into account what should be taken into account. I think the emphasis should demonstrate that we have been responsive in taking certain views on board and where we haven't done so we must be able to explain why we didn't do that. I would postpone that for the face to face meeting in Durbin.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Very good suggestion. Let's have that on the agenda explicitly. I very much agree with the spirit of the email. We just need to come to our own comment agreement of how we approach this task but clearly we have to give back to the community that they've been heard and do it to the fullest extent. Let's pick that up as a team in Durbin and come to an agreement of consensus on our specific approach to that.

Let's see. Do I have any other hands up? I don't see any hands. Any -- Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick:	I just wanted to comment on the chat -- the questions for ACs and SOs, particularly in light of the first session prior to Durbin.
Brian Cute:	I'm sorry, Larisa. You were a little choppy on my end. You were a little choppy on my end. Can you say that again?
Larisa Gurnick:	I wanted your attention to the comment that Alice put in the chat and the need to address developing questions for your meetings with ACs and SOs, the first session actually being on July 1.
Brian Cute:	The first session is July 1?
Larisa Gurnick:	With the CSG. That's a call.
Brian Cute:	Oh. We're having a call with them on July 1, not meeting with them face to face in Durbin?
Larisa Gurnick:	That's correct.
Alice Jansen:	They couldn't fit it on their agenda for an in person meeting in Durbin so they're suggesting a conference call prior to Durbin and since the meeting are inclusive and note questions would be forwarded to structure discussions we'll need to circulate those in advance.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Understood. This is an outlier to our process. If we have any focused questions for CSG prior to our call July 1 we're going to need to get it to them at least a few days in advance so they have a chance to read them and prepare their thoughts. What's a reasonable goal? July 1 is Monday. To the extent that --
Michael Yakushev:	I hear nothing. Is anyone still there?
Alice Jansen:	I think Brian dropped from the call.
Michael Yakushev:	Maybe he has a 1.5 hours limit on his.
Brian Cute:	Hello? Sorry, folks. My line dropped. I just want to make this suggestion for next Wednesday if any of the work streams has specific questions for interaction on July 1, please get them to Larisa or Alice by next Wednesday and they will forward them on in advance. Any other outliers to our interactions in Durbin or is that the one? Larisa? Alice? Hello?
Alice Jansen:	Yes, Brian. Basically the meeting request noted that questions would be circulated throughout the discussion so I think the community is expecting questions now. I'm not sure -- how would you like to handle this?
Brian Cute:	I think we agreed that by July 5 the work team would put any questions they have for the ACs and SOs together to be send on July 5 by ICANN staff to the ACs and SOs. Does that work?
Alice Jansen:	Okay. Understood.
Larisa Gurnick:	Just to clarify the date of July 5 is questions from the team for SOs and ACs to be delivered to staff. What about questions from the team for the staff?
Brian Cute:	These are questions to the ACs and SOs to the extent that we have focused questions that we will send to Alice I suppose, Larisa, the two of you. To forward on to the groups we're meeting with. That's the suggestion. Is that going to work?

Larisa Gurnick:	Yes.
Brian Cute:	Is it clear what we're doing?
Larisa Gurnick:	Yes. It's clear on the questions for ACs and SOs and I suppose the questions for staff will be addressed as they come up and we'll handle those separately?
Brian Cute:	Questions for staff are a completely different animal. That's an ongoing thing that the review team or the work streams may bring to staff at any time. These questions for the ACs and SOs we meet with in Durbin to be provided in advance to help inform the discussion the review team has with the ACs and SOs. That's the purpose of these questions.
Larisa Gurnick:	Thanks for the clarification.
Brian Cute:	Looking at the agenda, anything else on Durbin? Larisa and Alice has the proposed schedule for Durbin. Anything other than the calendar? Anything we need to consider in terms of preparing for the Durbin meeting?
Larisa Gurnick:	The calendar you see up on the screen is a draft. More sessions are to be added. You will need to discuss at some point the agenda you wish to have for the face to face meetings as well.
Brian Cute:	Yes. We have to put together an agenda for that. That's Friday July 12. We'll have a full face to face meeting of the review team as we will on Saturday. It's a full day. And a session with Dan Goodsman on Saturday. Everyone can see we have specific meetings from Sunday through Wednesday where we'll have a public session from 1.30 to 3. And we do have on Thursday July 18 scheduled a wrap up session for the entire ATRT2 coordination team. That would be the chair and the vice chairs to get together on Thursday and try to summarize at some high level what's taken place during the week. Does anybody have any questions about this? Anybody have a question with respect to the Durbin schedule?
Avri Doria:	I have a quick question. That last meeting, Thursday, the coordination meeting, I'm wondering if it would be reasonable to make coordination plus the chairs of the -- ? I'm suggesting having the work stream leads meet with the ATRT2 coordination.
Brian Cute:	I can certainly see the value in that. If the work stream chairs are going to be in Durbin and available I think that's a great suggestion. Alice? Can we have that meeting include the work stream chairs?
Alice Jansen:	Absolutely.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very much. I would say make it at their discretion. It may be the vice chair who's sitting on that work stream could also represent them if they have other commitments. Scheduling is scheduling. Let's structure those chairs, vice chairs, and chairs of the work streams. If people can't make it we'll find out in advance and use that time wisely. Any other questions from the review team or Larisa or Alice on the Durbin schedule before we move on and close?
	Okay. I'm not seeing any hands.
Alan Greenberg:	I have a suggestion for Durbin, not the schedule as such. I would appreciate if staff off the public list could collect arrival dates and flights and distribute them? That would if nothing else allow us to know when we can meet once we get there and perhaps even share cabs. It's a bloody long ride from the airport to Durbin and we're getting there before most ICANN people are showing up.

Brian Cute:	Is that possible, Larisa, Alice?
Alice Jansen:	I'll try to get the information.
Brian Cute:	Joseph may well have it all. But I'm not sure.
Alice Jansen:	I think he'll have the information.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very much. I'm going to close this item and move to the last, the seventh item. We're already over the 1.5 hours. Update on confidential inputs. Avri? If you don't mind I'm going to ask you to pick this up in terms of giving a report to the review team.
Avri Doria:	Turnabout is fair play. Okay. We've had a couple discussion among the chair with the vice chairs trying to figure out exactly how to handle things. I think there were a couple conversations with one person and the other person has not yet been contacted. We realize we need to be transparent and write reports about what we're not being transparent about. That's something we've talked about but haven't been able to do yet. So, it's really good that the question came up because we recognize the need to report them. One of the other things we've talked about but haven't reached a conclusion on is the confidential list containing the receivers list containing the two members on it and there was a question but certainly no resolution of whether that was appropriate. That was an issue that came back to the list on is it appropriate for board members who may or may not be dealing with issues to be on the confidential list and that's a question as they say we are exploring but we have not reached a conclusion on and it's something I've discussed with the whole group. I guess that's about it for now. I just wanted to say we're working through this. We're trying to understand the right way to do it, both maintaining confidentiality and being transparent about what we're doing, something we see reflected on a much larger scale in more important issues in our world. I wanted to make sure -- and I'm thankful the question was asked. Thank you.
Brian Cute:	To put a fine point on it, Steve, I think you're on the call. We received input from a former employee of ICANN to the confidential list. As part of that exchange it became clear that she wasn't comfortable know the chair of ICANN was on the mail list. For better or for worse but the obvious objective reasons. The question is do we create a confidential list that will include Steve and Heather who sits on the board as a liaison from the GAC and have a confidential list that does include Steve and Heather. It was one thought we had. We're working through it. We don't have a hard conclusion yet but clearly there's an issue we need to address. Is there any discussion or reaction or guidance? Olivier?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you very much. I was going to actually make the question even more complex. Once that information is received what are we supposed to do with it? I understand at the moment it goes through our confidential list. We all have the information in our mailbox. But is this information going to be stored anywhere? Is it going to be -- how are we going to address it? Are we going to have calls that will be in camera? I'm a little confused about this at the moment.
Brian Cute:	Questions we don't have answers to yet. I think it's incumbent on myself and the vice chairs to come back with more concrete suggestions. Anybody else on this issue?
David Conrad:	Just as a point of information the confidential list is currently archived on a machine that essentially no one other than myself has access to. I can delete those archives at any time should that be desired. Just the default set up was archives were created. It's not indexed. It's not accessible. But just so that information is out there.
Brian Cute:	Thank you, David. I also want to note that we're still being recorded. This conversation is about process, not about any individual inputs we've received. I think it's incumbent on the chair and vice chair to look to these issues, come back with some concrete

suggestions to the review team if we need to have the conversation in the house rules setting we'll do that. But I don't have any other solution at this point in time to offer. Alan? Anything to add?

Alan Greenberg: No.

Brian Cute: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. Perhaps we can all think about this and come back to you and your colleagues, maybe at one of the ICANN meetings in Durbin? The information is there. It's not like we're losing it. We obviously need to know how we're going to treat it and deal with it. That's just a suggestion to what we might wish to do. On the process of the archives being there, I do believe there needs to be an automatic record of what has been sent on that confidential list and it's important I'm personally happy with David having access to it. It needs to be there in case there is a question as to where that type of information was received and processed.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Inputs from the team would be welcome. I take the suggestion. Let's add this to the agenda in Durbin. Larisa and Alice, we definitely should talk about it there. We can talk about it in a shadowbox setting if we need to. I see Steve has typed into the chat because he's unable to speak with us but he's saying -- are you there Steve? No, I can't hear you. Steve says I have no problem in not being included in a confidential exchange with an employee. He's typing a bit more. That's very useful, Steve. Yes, I'm here. I just can't speak. Okay. I hope that improves after the call. Thank you for the input. We will take that onboard and come back with some concrete suggestions. Olivier and anybody else, please do the same and we will table this. Any other points on this issue? I'm looking for hands. Okay. Seeing none, let's move to the last item. Any other business? This is for the review team and Larisa, Alice, Charla? Any other business. Looking for hands. Seeing none, thank you, all, for you patience. We went a bit long. Very much appreciated. Please, everyone on the work streams, keep up the very good work. Staff, thank you for your support. Let's get questions in by July 5. Alan, I know you're off tomorrow but Avri will touch base with Larisa and get the next action items on the RFP to get that process going rapidly. Thank you, all, for your time, talk to you soon.