Brian Cute: We'll get it kicked off. So welcome to ATRT2 conference call number 9 on Thursday, August 1. Welcome to all on the call and online and apologies for the difficult hour for those of you who are on the early AM. To kick it off, we have the proposed agenda up on the screen. Let me ask if there are any suggested edits to the agenda, as proposed. If not, move to adopt the agenda. (Inaudible). I don't see any hands so we'll adopt the agenda as proposed and move to item number 2. Are there any updates on ATRT2 members' statements of interest? Just looking for hands. If so, please show them. Not hearing any, we'll move to item number three review and approval of the preliminary report from Durban. Larisa, correct me if I'm wrong but I think that went out with the email within the last 24 hours, correct?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct. It just went out.

Brian Cute: I'm hearing some discussion in the background. If you wouldn't mind muting your speakers. Thank you.

                   I had a chance to go through the preliminary report. It seemed to be in good order to me but my operating assumption is that not every member has had a chance to go through this. If that's the case, I wanted to suggest that everyone take a look at the document offline, and if there are edits, they could send any corrections or edits to the preliminary report via email to the list. Would that be acceptable to everyone? Can I see either a green check mark or red cross from folks? I'm seeing lots of green check marks. Okay, so folks, if you take the time to go through the report, if you have any corrections to it, this is the preliminary report from our face-to-face meetings in Durban during the ICANN meeting. Please send those edits in and please do so. Let's give it three days. It's not a very long document so let's give it three days, and Larisa and staff, please make and corrections or edits that you see coming online from the team and shut down the document or lock it down after three days and post it to the list. Thank you for your agreement on that.

                   Then we go back to the agenda. The next one is engagement of the independent expert. An update on that from staff. Larisa, could you give us an update on the status of the engagement of the independent expert. Noting, this is an open call. So let me just note before we begin that we have held closed sessions for the reasons of fairness and competition. We have not announced the selection. Larisa, if you could give us an update, being careful not to identify the name of the vendor and being careful to surmise the updates that are necessary that we can share in the open.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, Brian. Good morning. This is Larisa Gurnick.

Brian Cute: Larisa, actually, hold that thought.

Larisa Gurnick: Okay.

Brian Cute: I'm thinking we might want to invoke chat on house rule for this. You're going to be giving us an update on the selection process. Even coded language could potentially provide some information. I've got a concern here. Does anybody share it? Should we go offline for this until we formalize the results?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. Maybe we can just wait to the end and do it when the recording has stopped.

Brian Cute: Yes. Why don't we do that? Great suggestion. We're going to push this item to the end.

Alan Greenberg: We may well have people listening on this call. It is an open call. So there's no real practical way to stop it right now.

Brian Cute: Thank you. So with that we'll move item number 4 to the end and go offline and invoke chat and house rule to have that discussion.

                       The next item is item 5. We're going to review the revised templates. For those of you who were not in the last session in Durban on the morning of Thursday, among the things we did during that hour and a half was take another look at these templates that people were filling out. And there was some discussion and some edits although I would characterize the edits as not substantive and sweeping. We've got the template as revised in that Thursday meeting up on the screen. My view is that the template, while revised, is still substantially similar to what you've been working with. Again, it's just a tool to organize our thoughts and to begin to formulize the basis for a potential recommendation. Requests have been-- assignments have been made and requests to have templates filled out by August 9th is standing so we can have these going to the LA meeting. Is there any, Al and Mike, since you're on the session, that's my view of this document. I'm not sure we need to open the document up for discussion, but I certainly would like to give the members of the review team who weren't in Durban an opportunity to see the document, and if they have any questions, raise them. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just to highlight that one of the things we did do is put in that square parenthetical statement pointing out that section A and B have two different focuses. A is to review existing recommendations in prior reports. And B is to try to document the substance of any new recommendations we may be making, which could be related to an old one or could be completely new.

Brian Cute: That's true. I'm seeing agreement from Fiona Alexander in terms of the approach. Just allow the ATRT2 members who were in Durban to have a look at the document. Again, it's a template, to organize our thoughts.

Alan Greenberg: Staff may want to give us scrolling privileges so we can actually look at the whole thing.

Unidentified Participant: Actually I have a question (inaudible). Can you just refresh what the assignment was?

Brian Cute: What the assignment was?

Unidentified Participant: Who is responsible for which set of (inaudible) so that we can --

Brian Cute: Oh sure. Actually, I was just looking at that list in some document this morning. Larisa or Charla, could you-- we actually have a list of the issues and the person who was assigned to draft a template was in one spot. I just can't recall

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible). Let me take a look at it and see if I can bring it up. Give me a few minutes, please.

Brian Cute:	Okay, sure. We'll pull that up for you so that everyone can be reminded what they're responsible for.
Alan Greenberg:	Since we're approaching the deadline and not everyone is on this call, we probably should send that out as soon as possible to remind people.
Unidentified Participant:	(Inaudible) new recommendation but I just (inaudible) things on the list to make sure that (inaudible) I don't recall 100% what (inaudible).
Brian Cute:	Yes, fully appreciated. That's right. It's in the report from Durban down at the bottom. Bingo. Here we go. So you can see that? Fiona? Everyone? We also, in that Thursday morning session, looked at the templates that had been circulated. Avery had circulated one. I had circulated one. David Connor, I think, had circulated one. And really, those three are available to folks on the list to use as you start your own template. This is not scientific. It's just a guide as to how we began to populate the templates with information. Please use it as a point of reference. And again, those folks who've gotten issues here, we're expecting you to provide us a filled out template by August 9th. It's going to be very useful to us as we go into Los Angeles to have some concrete thinking underneath the issues that we've identified to really push debate and discussion on whether we actually need recommendations. So Alan, to your point, Larisa, when you get a chance, could you send out this list and a reminder to those who have assignments to please get the templates in by the 9th? If they have questions, they should send them to the list and we can probably handle them. The chairs and vice chairs can probably handle them that way.
Larisa Gurnick:	Will do, Brian.
Brian Cute:	Carlos. Thank you, very much. I've got Carlos, Fiona Asonga, and Fiona Alexander. Carlos?
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:	Yes, good morning. Thank you, Brian. This is Carlos. Could you repeat-- you mentioned two examples available already that have been worked out on the template. Can you repeat where are they? I don't see them in the documents that were distributed today. Thank you.
Brian Cute:	Certainly. Larisa, those-- and I think it was David Conroy, Tom [Brady], and myself. If I'm missing someone, let me know.
Unidentified Participant:	Pat Conrad.
Brian Cute:	I think we sent those to the--
Unidentified Participant:	Conrad. Pardon me.
Brian Cute:	We sent to those to the ART2 list and are those posted in the wiki?
Larisa Gurnick:	We will circulate it with the list of assignments as well as make sure that the links are all available so that it's perfectly clear. We'll take care of that.
Brian Cute:	That would be great. Thank you. So Carlos, you'll be getting those documents along with the reminder email for your efforts. Fiona Asonga.
Fiona Asonga:	Sorry. I have a question regarding the template. I'm preparing this for all of our recommendations that we make. Also identify within the work stream or is it just for (inaudible) recommendations we have identified as giving the (inaudible).

Brian Cute: The templates-- I think the answer to your question is this and, Alan, please of course correct me if I'm not hitting the mark. We identified these issues on the screen in our discussions as areas of specific interest, potential recommendations. So the assignments were made to draft the templates to provide the foundation of discussion in Los Angeles. This is not an exhaustive list. I believe, Fiona, that any of the work streams could develop recommendations certainly with respect to prior ATRT1 recommendations. So I don't view this as an exhaustive list but a list that came to the surface through our discussions. Am I getting that right, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think very much so. I would suggest that if this is the only-- if this is the super set of all recommendations that we then do triage on, we'll probably have a problem. So I'm expecting significantly more to come out, some of which may well be cut along the way but I would think we're going to have more ideas than this.

Brian Cute: Right.

Alan Greenberg: I would certainly expect us to.

Brian Cute: Okay, and I'm seeing a green check mark from Fiona so I think that answer was satisfactory. I've got Fiona Alexander in queue and then Alan.

Fiona Alexander: So just to confirm, we agreed also to do the assessments of the existing recommendations. Are those also due by August 9th (inaudible) draft template?

Brian Cute: That wasn't the request. That wasn't the assignment. To the extent-- and I was going to ask on this call the next item is updates from the work stream chairs. I know I'm missing at least one or two but I wanted to get a sense from the chairs of where their work was and whether we could have other drafts available for Los Angeles. So that's an open question.

Fiona Alexander: We (inaudible) on the GAC-related one, so we'll do that for the August 9th.

Brian Cute: Fantastic. Thank you. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I was just going to point out for those that weren't at the closing session that, of the ones that were distributed by Avery, what she had done was actually looking at old recommendations from other entities and considering them as new recommendations. But she was filling in parts as if they were (inaudible). She didn't necessary follow our current guide rules for how to use A and B. So anyone looking at them, should they take that into account.

Brian Cute: This is Brian, let me add a point. Thank you for raising that, Alan. So when you look at Avery's and David's and mine, again, it's just a guide as to how to fill this out. You'll see that we each did it slightly differently. To Alan's point, as I recall, and I have to beg forgiveness for my tone during the meeting. It was very early and I was very sleep-challenged and wasn't as professional as I like to be. We had a misunderstanding. Avery was, in fact, in her template referring back to, if I'm not mistaken, a One World Trust document form 2007 or 2008 that made some recommendations to ICANN on accountability and transparency. And in bringing it into the template, it looked as though that was being treated as a recommendation. We had a long discussion about recommendations from ATRT1 as being recommendations that are within our charter explicitly, that we have to address looking at the back of the former reviews and how well ICANN implemented those recommendations.

    What we clarified during the discussion was that, in my view, while a recommendation from a prior consultant may not be the same as a recommendation from a former review team, that recommendation is still relevant. In ATRT1 we also looked at backward history and looked at that report and the Boston Consulting report as well. So certainly

seeing relevance by just noting the distinction between recommendations and prior review teams, and our assessment of those versus a recommendation for a former consultant and how that may be treated by us. And I'm open to how we end up treating those, and certainly as part of background history, important things to note. I hope that was a fair capture, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think so. I think she also did one from the Berkman Study. But yes, that's correct.

Brian Cute: Right. From the Berkman Study. Thank you. Fiona Alexander. Your hand is up. Is that from before? Yes. Okay. So just noting that when you see Avery's template. That's some context for that template. And those will be coming at you soon. If you have questions about them, please send them to the list. Any of the three (inaudible) can clarify and the Chairs and Vice Chairs to provide guidance as well. Any other discussion on this item? Okay. Seeing none, let's now move to item six and ask the work chairs, work stream chairs for a brief update on the status of their work, and the work going into Los Angeles. Please take a note down, Fiona Alexander's question of are you also preparing or in a position to prepare some templates which we expect to implementation of prior recommendations from your particular area? Who do we have on the line? We've got Fiona Asonga. We've got Olivier. I know David's out.

Alan Greenberg: Michael is here but he can't speak.

Michael Yakushev: No, no. I can speak.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. Sticking with numeric order, let's just go with Olivier first as work stream one, Olivier. Could you weigh in on the status of your work in preparation for Los Angeles?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Brian. It's Olivier here. Can you hear me?

Brian Cute: Yes, very well.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. So basically, I haven't unfortunately got very much to follow up with since Durban. We've not had any call yet since the time that we met face-to-face. As I said in Durban, I as a little concerned about the amount of material that we've had to read and whether all of the team members have read the material and have been able to somehow digest it in a manner to know and start to focusing on what strings still need to be tighter. What is still loose in the overall set of recommendations that we've got there?

I was hoping that the sub-teams would be able to come up with, basically, giving us a little bit of feedback on what they've been working on, specifically. As you know, the whole group is not looking at each one of the sub recommendations. We've got smaller teams there. And, of course, following the discussion that we've just had now where we had specific people looking at basically potential issues for recommendations, and how they fell under the different parts, I thought that for a work stream, for example, for sub-part B, Larry would be able to give us much of an idea of how he believes the progress is. And on sub-team A, it could have been Carlos, or David. We just have a small set of people for some of the sub-streams. And I don't know whether any of them are able to actually give us a bit of feedback on this.

Failing that, I do have a B plan which is what I mentioned last time to use colorings for these huge Excel documents which staff has provided us with and those would immediately be able to show us what we're still left-- where there was still plenty of work to be done in one of the sub-streams. I think that, at the moment, we're suffering from having an overload of information, being able to weed out stuff that's already been done now, and that seems to be on course to a satisfactory resolve is probably the first thing to

do. And then we can reduce our set of subjects to look at quite dramatically from the several dozens of subjects that we've got on the desk at the moment. That's something which can just take a couple of days to do, actually. And so I would expect that by the time we meet in LA, we'll have a focus exactly on the specific threads that still need to be closed or where additional recommendations need to be brought forward.

Now with regard to the actual format of the analysis, I firmly think that the template which was developed-- the analogies of previous review teams' recommendations will fall directly in line and will work very well with the format of what we have to do. I hope that (inaudible).

Brian Cute: Yes. No-- good to understand the status of the work. A couple of thoughts here. Number one, again, it's to the work stream chairs to manage the workload. I don't necessarily-- the utility of a conference call can be questioned at this point. Maybe it's useful, maybe it's not. We're certainly in a phase of work where we need to be really thinking hard about the information that's been put in front of us, that we've read the documents, and really advancing the writing. The suggestion that Fiona Alexander put forward that the work streams could use this template to flush out not just the identified issues on the bullet list, on the stream, but also implementation of recommendations in your-- from the review team that you're looking at full stop. It's a good suggestion. To the extent that we can have organized thinking in writing that we use as a basis for discussion in LA, and if a work stream chair, again, managing the work stream as they see best fit, just wants to assign writing or drafting of templates, that would be a perfectly acceptable approach too. Any additional thoughts there, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I have a question, I guess, largely if I guess it's philosophy. If in assessing the old recommendations, we find something has really not been done, and particularly perhaps not done and marked as complete or something of that ilk; do we need a new recommendation to drive that point home that ICANN still needs to do more work on that one? Or is that going to be taken as a given? I guess I'm asking Steve or someone of what format do we have to address those what we believe are holes in to ensure that they be picked up? Do we need new recommendations to say that?

Unidentified Participant: You mentioned my name, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Well, you're going to be leading the group that couldn't decide what to do with the recommendations that come out of this group.

Unidentified Participant: So I apologize. I didn't quite catch the question that you're asking.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'll start again. If we find recommendations to old reviews where either they are incomplete or, moreover, incomplete and marked as complete or something of that ilk--

Unidentified Participant: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: Then simply noting that position to say wake up, you still have something to do, or do we actually have to phrase new recommendations so there are things that can be ticked off and can be tracked?

Unidentified Participant: So let me try to make this a common sense thing. I give you a belt-suspenders kind of answer. It's surely on our side speaking with my Board Chair hat on. We will read the full report. We will pick up comments in any form, and anything that speaks to what was done or differences of opinion about what was done, we will take note of. It will be part of the broader process of reading and absorbing the report and the recommendations, and doing an assessment. I spoke about this kind of thing in general in the past that, that just as a matter of standard process, whenever any group-- this group or any other group-- makes recommendations, one of the things that we are subjected to is an assessment of feasibility and resources and the like.

So half of my answer is it doesn't matter if you say it, we will read it, pay attention to it and take it seriously. That said, switching to being a member of this group, surely the strongest and most straight forward thing to do would be to add a specific recommendation or multiple recommendations that are focused on addressing whatever the group thinks wasn't done or wasn't done fully. And I don't see any reason why this group should be shy about that. Let me recommend, again as a member of this group, that in terms of packaging that, it might be good to have a specific section or grouping, or some way of flagging that so that it's a consistent thread.

Alan Greenberg: So we could certainly have a recommendation for a previous review identifying the places that we believe are things that should have been done factoring in all of the assessment-type things you just mentioned but were not done. And it would be a way of capturing them and making sure the tick marks are put in when necessary without being overly verbose and repetitive.

Unidentified Participant: And let me add just one more thing. Again, as part of my standard perspective on all reviews by any group, whether it's this kind or an expert group of some other sort. As earnest and as serious as this group is and every other group, it's appropriate in my experience to go through a period in which the draft of the report is made available, and there's a period of time to receive comments and questions and be able to go back and revise what's written. So I'm talking about something a little different from the public comments after a report is fully submitted. I'm talking about something closer to the kind of peer review process that takes place for publications.

Alan Greenberg: I would certainly support that. The more people that look at something before we put it out, the less we're going to be embarrassed by saying stupid things.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, and to speak a little more directly, I have seen numerous times where conclusions or recommendations went somewhat beyond what the facts or the available supporting material would suggest and that this process of challenging, "why did you say that," and "that doesn't seem to follow," et cetera, is a healthy process-- would be a healthy process if we did more of that.

Brian Cute: Thanks for that. Before I move to you Olivier, let me just note a couple of things. (Inaudible) Steve's quest for comments and also, as we discussed, we really need to have an engagement with ICANN staff and Board on the implementability of any recommendations that we develop so there has to be some exchange there towards that end.. I'm leaving open the concept of how many recommendations we issue that will distil out of or work as we move forward. And Fiona Alexander also rightly notes, in the notes, that when we put this report-- those recommendations out for public comment, we need to be very explicit about what direction we're taking with respect to recommendations or just commentary and assessment as part of our report. So let's note that as well. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. Just in response to Alan's question, I certainly think that new recommendations would have to be drafted in any case for any old recommendation that would need to be either updated or that brings to mind a new recommendation. Having a mix of old recommendations and saying well, just keep on doing the old recommendation and complete it, and the list of new recommendations is something which I don't find to be particularly positive because, effectively, they might then be treated in a different way as in, "oh, that's an old recommendation and that's a new recommendation." That was one thing.

Now looking at the work of work stream one, we're looking specifically at the implementation of recommendations. And there are five different sub-scenarios. The implementation is either complete, in which case nothing needs to be done by the ATRT2 on it, apart from maybe clapping their hands.

The second thing, it could be complete but a follow-up recommendation might have come to light and that's where we would need to draft a new recommendation on it. So that's one case of writing a recommendation.

And then there's three incomplete outcomes which could be incomplete but undergoing sustained work. So when we know that work is still going on and is going in that direction, we might wish to refrain from making a recommendation at that point because we're really looking at an incomplete ongoing work.

There's also incomplete and stopped for a good reason which is often the place of when recommendations were made and were not implementable or it was found that they were not implementable afterwards. In which case I don't believe that a recommendation would be needed from ATRT2 on this. Except, of course, if we do feel strongly enough and wish to provide different implementation mechanisms for that initial recommendation.

And then there is incomplete and then stopped for an unknown or unsatisfactory reason. And that's when a recommendation would be needed from this committee, from the ATRT2. So out of the five scenarios, there really are only two that would warrant a new recommendation. And I think that's how I'll try and structure the work of work stream one. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you for the observations, Oliver. I have Larisa and then Alan in the queue. Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Brian. On the topic of exchanging ideas with the Board when staff, and preliminary recommendations are being drafted or have been drafted, I just wanted to point out that the original timeline that we've been working with has set aside some time to do that mid-September. And since the meeting will be in LA, I also wanted to highlight that staff would be happy to participate in whatever capacity would be useful to clarify, answer questions, or provide early feedback. So that's something that we can certainly discuss and arrange.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Larisa, and I did want to know, particularly for the work stream chairs, Los Angeles-- the Los Angeles meeting but also into the month of September, as Larisa notes, to the extent that we have an issue that we think might be the focus of a recommendation, the quality of that recommendation is hinged on the assessment that we've done that it's fact-based, that we've been as independent and objective in our assessment as possible, and to the extent that there are open questions about the FAS, this is a really important opportunity to get to the right staffers, to get clarification of prior statements, to get additional information before we reach a conclusion. And so that is an important element of the work going into the next month and a half. And thank you for that open invitation, Larisa. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Primarily commenting on Olivier's observations, but I have a follow-on on Larisa also. I guess I would summarize where I think a new recommendation is warranted is where we believe that a recommendation from a prior review team is not being heeded and we believe it should be for whatever reason. Either it was dropped, staff assessed it, or the Board and staff assessed it an unimplementable and we believe they're crazy, or I'll (inaudible) follow up in a completely different direction is necessary that wasn't recommended last time but we feel is warranted because of whatever has happened.

So I agree completely with Olivier, our point is not to have recommendations just for the sake of boosting our recommendation count. But it's for things if we believe if we don't make a recommendation or an explicit direction, then ICANN can do something-- it might not happen. I think, in my mind, that's the key issue. It's not just to reiterate

something which is already chugging along the tracks and going well. But something that we believe is not going to be done unless we explicitly call it out.

With regard to what Larisa just said, I'm a little bit confused on timeline. She said the meeting is in Los Angeles and I assume it's the meeting in a week and a half from now. But we're not going to have recommendations out of that until the very end of it on Saturday. So that's not going to be an opportunity for staff to interact with us unless I missed something else along the way.

Larisa Gurnick: Alan, this is Larisa. I did want to clarify. Yes, I was referring to the LA meeting. With the templates that are being completed between now and the LA meeting and the work that will be done in the three days, Brian and I had discussed that there would be opportunities where ideas are being formulated before they're perhaps written in actual draft language for staff to intervene in or participate in the process on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. So that's all I meant.

Alan Greenberg: If you notice things where you think staff can have input, we're going to welcome that of course. Yes.

Larisa Gurnick: Exactly. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay, let's have Michael and then Fiona Asonga, in turn, to give us an update on irrespective work streams and then we'll move to item 7, preparation for the LA meeting. So Michael, if you would.

Michael Yakushev: Good morning and good afternoon to everyone. So I will be fairly short. I think we do have enough information, enough material to prepare our part of the review. I would like to discuss the current status of what could be or was assigned to our work stream with Alan. Next week is the factor-- our group consists of only two persons. And I very appreciate very much the remarks that were given by Steve and the methodology which was described by Olivier. I think we should follow the same direction. As for templates, I'm not sure that it would be appropriate in our case to develop any new templates but, again, I think we will discuss with Alan at the beginning over the next week. Thank you. Hello?

Brian Cute: Sorry. Thank you. I was speaking on mute so apologies. Larisa, is your hand up new or is from the last exchange? Okay. Thank you. I've got Carlos in the queue. Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you, Brian. Carlos, for the record. Alan just mentioned something very important that there are many ongoing efforts. There is a new strategic plan and so on. And we haven't had time like (inaudible) of all these things that I'm talking about. I mean, I don't know how to address this, but maybe early in the meeting in Los Angeles, if we can have a 45-minute update on the strategic plan, so we can make notes on ongoing efforts so we don't have to worry too much about that, I think, would be very useful or something in that direction. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Carlos. I'm going to take that specific suggestion and roll it into item 7 on this agenda in preparation for the LA meeting. And we'll pick that up there. But very good suggestion, thank you. Any other questions for Michael or discussion out of Michael's status report? Looking for hands. Don't see any. Okay, thank you, Michael, for the update. Fiona Asonga, if you would. Work stream four.

Fiona Asonga: Thank you, Brian. Regarding work stream four, we have attempted to have a conference call last week. (Inaudible) 11 members of the work stream on this too have been available to have a conference call. So (inaudible) because I was of the understanding that we were to add additional issues to complete (inaudible) recommendations to the

(inaudible) we had in front of us and (inaudible) finalize that within the work stream. So that is (inaudible) work stream.

And the other thing that is still (inaudible) the questions (inaudible) is to share with the other (inaudible) and I'm happy that the media has touched on them and then (inaudible) are making a presentation on work stream one. Because from our assignment, we needed to (inaudible) around some of the issues-- some of the issues (inaudible). How they (inaudible) handled in front of (inaudible), (inaudible) front of the recommendations, which ones stood as being implementable or not implementable. And so I'm happy that we were able to have that type of discussion.

Then the other thing that we-- I was hoping we would finalize is (inaudible) template to members (inaudible) to work on the template that could add on to the template that (inaudible). But we have additional templates to look at given (inaudible). We are still hoping to have a meeting next week so that we can be able to have that discussion and (inaudible) assign individuals to prepare the template so that then we can get most of the areas covered. And that (inaudible) I'd like to mention that if maybe this call again, the (inaudible) method from Tim Alexander, (inaudible) and it does not mention if the group has adopted issues will also pay some attention to (inaudible) from work stream four on (inaudible), responsibility, transparency, (inaudible) very helpful because I'm sure that's (inaudible) in anyway. That (inaudible) area. And that is it for team four.

Brian Cute:	Thank you, Fiona. And noting too that both I and David Conrad owe a template on the review process. At-large will have that in by the 9th, if not sooner to help inform some of the discussion. And I see that there's two other work stream four templates that have been assigned. So hopefully those templates, once received, will help start putting the pieces of the assessment in place, or at least the discussion around the assessment. Any questions for Fiona? Or discussion around work stream four? Carlos, I see your hand up. Is that from the last time? Or is that new? It's from the last time. Okay. Thank you.
Brian Cute:	No worries. Okay, I don't see any questions. Thank you, Fiona. And to the work stream chairs, please continue to drive your work as best you can that when you have a good substantive base for the discussion, an assessment and testing of ideas in Los Angeles.

With that being said, we will move to item 7 which is preparing for the LA meeting. Carlos has raised one good question. Could we have a presentation on the strategic plan or strategic direction for ICANN that we can factor into our analysis and assessment? I think that's a very good suggestion. If there's any disagreement with that, could you indicate it now with red X or agreement? And if so, I'd ask staff and Steve Crocker in particular, to arrange that for us. I think that context would indeed be helpful. |
Unidentified Participant:	Coming off mute, Larisa and I are having a side conversation about scheduling issues.
Brian Cute:	Okay. But if you could take that on board and see if that could be-- a presentation to that effect could be made to the ATRT2 during the LA meeting on the first day, that would be very good.
Unidentified Participant:	It's really Chris (inaudible) work with Bonnie and others on the staff to get the briefing on the strategic plan and where that stands. I think probably Denise is probably the key person.
Brian Cute:	Okay. That's fine, and certainly understand calendaring issues and people's schedules factoring. Thank you for taking that request on board. We've got a proposed agenda up on the screen and this is something that Larisa and I had a conversation yesterday so I want to make sure that the team is comfortable with the approach here at a very high level. We've got three days of work face-to-face. And then a fourth day where the drafters, the folks holding the pens, will say and begin to draft in earnest a recommendation, pieces of the report and coordinate on the overall drafting of the report.

For the three days that we have, my sense is that we want to meet both as an entire review team for certain sessions but also have breakout sessions for the work streams. This is really the time where we have to start challenging our conclusions, having various debate, identifying open questions of fact, and I think a lot of the good work in Los Angeles will be done through the breakout sessions. We've identified we do have an issue with overlapping membership in different work streams. It's still an issue we're going to have to address. We're going to try to address that but I see the team meeting as a whole, and the team breaking off into work stream sessions to advance the work substantively. But over the course of the three day, it's natural, of course, for the team as a whole to meet at the beginning. And what Larisa has pieced together here as a suggestion to approach the agenda is how we could structure the breakouts so that we advance the work and then have the opportunity to comeback together as a whole and have full-team discussions around any particular hot issues or topics. Larisa, do you just want to walk through how you propose structuring the breakouts and how that might address the overlapping membership issue?

Larisa Gurnick: Sure. Thanks, Brian. First of all, I wanted to point out that this is just kind of a rough outline for what the days might look like and with certain questions still for other sessions, such as the strategic planning update, this is intended to provide some very general structure for us to work with. But on the first day, the idea is that starting at somewhere around 11 o'clock, it could certainly be after lunch, we would run work stream sessions but not concurrently. They would be run sequentially to address the fact that there is so much overlap in membership between the different groups. So that would allow for complete and full participation in the discussions of each of the work streams on the first day.

Then as we remove to the remaining days, my thought was, Charla, can you scroll please? I'm sorry, I don't have the scrolling ability-- as we move-- thank you so much-- as we move through the following days, you will notice that the breakout sessions that are planned in the afternoon of day 2 are actually running concurrently so there would be two parallel timeframes. Work stream one and two would run at the same time, and then work stream three and four. And then finally, on day three, we just left a block of time. In the morning to finish up work within the work stream breakout format. And then the vast majority of the day would be -- or the afternoon would be spent for the entire group together. Brian, did I address your--?

Brian Cute: Yes. I was on mute again. Thank you, Larisa. Okay, thank you for piecing that together and explaining it. For the team, I want to make sure there's an understanding of how we'd structure the work and a comfort level in the approach. Olivier, your hand is up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. Olivier speaking. With regards to the concurrent session, I'm a little concerned, I guess. With work stream one and work stream two, the majority of people in work stream two also have significant portions of work in work stream one. And I gather it might also be the case for work stream three and work stream four, working concurrently although I beg to be told otherwise. I was going to suggest that we look at breakout sessions, in these four B work streams but maybe having extended amounts of time in the region of work stream one having a certain amount of time but not running another work stream concurrently with work stream one. Or having a jagged set of work streams. In other words, half an hour into the end of work stream one, the work stream two thing starts. And then you would have people that would be able to take part in the first session and then move on to the next session. I'm not sure if I made this one very clear or not.

The reason being that I also think we should have some time in there to have ad hoc discussions, maybe even subsets of the work streams, being able to have just another meeting room that they can conduct a quick meeting and maybe drafting something and so on. So looking at the set up as it is at the moment, it looks like we have two rooms. I

	would suggest a third room as well-- third or even a fourth meeting room to be able to add small ad hoc sessions. I hope I haven't made a mess of this one by jumbling everything together.
Brian Cute:	No. Thank you, Olivier. I've got Alan, then Larisa. Alan.
Alan Greenberg:	Thank you. I agree it would be nice to have a couple of small meeting rooms. I'm just talking about the size of a roundtable and four or five chairs around it and I know there are a number of rooms like that. Typically, even if someone's office who isn't there for the day. So I don't think availability should be a problem. I would say this is for day two. By the end of day one we're going to understand much better what work still needs to be done. Work stream one, for instance, may well serve as better to break it up into some of its sub-streams, and those are the thinks that work in parallel. I don't think we need to micro manage the design of this day. We're going to have to be in a much better position near the end of day one to understand what needs to be done and how to organize it.
Brian Cute:	I think that's a fair point too, Alan. So Olivier, thank you for your suggestions and you're right, Alan. After day one we'll have a much better sense of what's needed in a given work stream and how to structure the work.
Alan Greenberg:	Again, as an example, work stream three may have an immense amount of work to be done. Or none. Or somewhere in between. But there's going to be examples like that and I'm pretty sure, for work stream one, the work is so complex and so subdivided that I think we're going to need some parallel work within work stream one itself. So I think we should not agonize over it now.
Brian Cute:	No, and we don't need to debate this agenda to death but I think, Larisa, taking Olivier's observations and suggestions, and Alan's as well, let's think through this agenda a bit more and develop it a bit in Los Angeles as best we can. And I think the team will need to take a flexible approach to how we actually hit the ground in Los Angeles after day one.
	Okay, any other discussion on the structure of the LA meetings? Not the specific agenda. Okay. Hearing none, Larisa will take this and continue to develop the agenda. Thank you for those thoughts. Do we have any other-- we're now done with item 7, I believe. Are there any other questions about the LA meeting-- the structural work or the logistics before we move to any other business? Not seeing any hands up. Okay.
	Let's move to item 8 on the agenda. Is there any other business? Looking for hands. Carlos.
Carlos Raul Gutierrez:	Yes. Thank you. Carlos, for the record. I just want to say that mainly changes after Durban in GAC have been exploding. There is a burst of activity and discussion there on two main (inaudible). One on working principles, and the other one on how to proceed with the detailed gTLD (inaudible). I've never seen GAC as active over the last two years and there's-- I will think hard about that because I don't think it's only work stream one. I think it's on work stream four's docket too to deal with that. This is a great opportunity. They were very motivated by the discussions with ATRT2. And there is a few things I will want to present on that and simulate. Thank you.
Brian Cute:	Very good. Thank you, Carlos. If you could make a note of that for the agenda, Larisa, and we'll develop that further. Any other comments on Los Angeles, or questions? Okay, any other business? I don't see any hands. Okay, we are now going to moving into closed session to get an update on ICANN staff on the independent expert. So thank you all. And for those who were on line listening, thank you for listening. Larisa, could you have the recording stopped and are we able to move into closed session on this conference bridge or not?