**20131202_ATRT2_ID836733**

Brian Cute: If everyone on the phone is comfortable, and I know we need to make a record of this call, but I think we should at least touch base on the proposed edits that have been sent around so far. Just get reactions to them and I'll go about memorializing the call and sharing it with the rest of the list. Is everyone agreeable to that?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Brian Cute: Thank you. The other question I have is, since I'm not sure that -- we don't have control of the Adobe, the next question then is, we've seen -- what I've seen is Lise and Jorgen sent an update to the finance recommendations. Alan sent an update to some of his recommendations. I sent an update to my recommendations. Did anybody else see edits beyond those? I know Avri had some I think, Larry had some. Did we see any others come across the email?

Alan Greenberg: I saw nothing.

Brian Cute: Okay, then what I suggest is, for those who are on the call and who are online and can access their email, please, we'll go around in order. Jorgen, are you there and able to talk through the edits to the financial recommendations?

Jorgen Andersen: I'm here, Brian, and I will be happy to start if you want.

Brian Cute: That would be great. What I'd ask is, Jorgen, if you would go first and really just focus on the recommendation itself. In terms of background research or other inputs, let's put those to the side for now. That's the body of the report that we will build, but let's just focus on how we modify the recommendation, check with folks on the call to see if there's any reaction directionally. Alan, if you would then go second and then I'll go third. And let's at least capture that at this moment in time and then we'll, I'll send a summary to the list. Okay? Who's joined the call?

Theresa Swinehart: Hey, Brian, it's Theresa. I'm just going to join for part if that's okay to listen in.

Brian Cute: Hey, Theresa. Thank you. Swinehart, right?

Theresa Swinehart: Yes.

Brian Cute: Hi. Okay, we are on the call. I just tried Larisa, Charla and Alice and none of them are on the call and none of them answered. I think there's been a snafu. No big deal except that these meetings should be transparent and open. My sense is that in order to progress the work as we need to, I'm going to ask for a brief report from each of the editors about how they modified their recommendations, get a sense of this group who's on the call, are they directionally heading in the right direction or should we provide guidance on the editing. And just do no more than that, capture that in a summary, send it by email to the open ATRT2 list. And then we can circle back for the logistics of the next call.

| | |
|---|---|
| Alan Greenberg: | Brian, it's Alan. I'm a little bit confused how this call started, because normally the call originator has to be on the call for Adigo to let anyone else in. Does anyone know how to contact Adigo to make sure they're recording for us? |
| Unidentified Participant: | You can leave standing bridges up. |
| Alan Greenberg: | On Adigo? |
| Unidentified Participant: | Yes. |
| Operator: | This is the Operator, the recording has been started. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Ok, thank you very much. |
| Brian Cute: | Theresa? |
| Theresa Swinehart: | Brian, I'll go and check on the staff. So I will put myself on mute and listen in the meantime and then follow up. |
| Brian Cute: | Okay, thanks very much. And you know this is being recorded which is great. So let's have -- we'll have an abbreviated call as discussed. Jorgen, I'm going to turn it over to you. I'm going to pull up the email that you and Lise sent and refer to the text myself there. Anybody else who can, please do so. And again, if you'd just focus on the recommendation edits that you made and why and then we'll get reactions. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | Great. Thank you, Brian. Well Lise and I have the drafting responsibility for recommendation of 12 and the general observations made during the meeting of the stakeholders was there was no remarks or, to some extent from some stakeholders, positive support for the proposal made. I think that the most outspoken comments on the recommendation came from the board. And I think Brian that you did an excellent summary on the particular board input on that particular recommendation in your email of 19th November where there's a note attached that takes up some very good points. And we tried to reflect them in the changes we made. |
| | The first change -- or no, let's start by saying something else. When Lise and I looked at our notes and recalled what happens during the meetings, we came to the conclusion that only recommendation 12.4 was affected with the reactions from the community. The first change we made is really maybe not coming from the meetings with the community, but rather from the meeting Lise and I had with Larisa and Zavier about the form which is, the form of strategic planning which is considered by ICANN staff right now. And the underlying idea is that when you look at the yearly budgets you must consider that if it's the right English, deviates from a strategic plan with a corresponding financial framework which covers not 2 or 3 years, but 5 years, a 5-year period. |
| | So the first sentence with changes is drafted as you see it in order to correspond with what is actually going on in ICANN which I think is completely in line with the work we have discussed in ATRT, changing to the 5-year period and also making it a rolling plan framework. So that is the first change. The blue text is just moving that particular sentence up in the complete text. |
| | At the same time, we decided when we looked at 12.4 that we would delete the words, "and to facilitate the work of the review teams", because when Lise and I looked at that, we couldn't remember why we had inserted that particular phrase. If somebody can remember that, please remind me. But to me and to Lise it appeared somewhat awkward to have that phrasing in the recommendation at that point. So we decided to delete it unless you want us to reinsert it, of course, we'll do that. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Brian Cute: | Jorgen, this is Brian. Let me react to that. I think that not only is that appropriate but it's fine because in the observations of the review process, documents that will become part of the report, I believe we make an explicit call that the review team, actually it might be in the recommendations, that the review team be provided with a budget at the outset of its work. So if that was what you were targeting, it appears in another part of our recommendation, so we've lost nothing by deleting that. |
| Alan Greenberg: | It's Alan. Yeah, I agree that's probably why it was there. But the focus of these should be on ICANN in general, not making the review team work better. So I think it's quite appropriate to delete it anyway. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | So I understand that you all agree that we delete that wording, "and to facilitate the work of the review teams". |
| Brian Cute: | Yes. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | Good. So when you look further down to the last 3 lines, the next change was sort of trying to reflect the remarks made by board. I think it was Sherine, actually. Brian, you may remember that. She was very tough on that there was a need for being very active on follow-up reports. And that is why we inserted the sentence, "the board may want to have internal follow-up reports on a quarterly basis". And that was -- I don't think that ATRT should recommend that there are follow up reports on a quarterly basis to the outside world, but for board, it might be important on an internal basis to have follow up reports. I think that was what she was aiming at. So that's why it is phrased as it is. And finally, there's a sentence that the report should be submitted for consultation. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Jorgen, on the -- since in general anything going to the board, unless it's confidential, goes out to the public as well, perhaps we want to word it, the board may choose to request follow-up reports on a quarterly basis, not necessarily internal. If the summary is to keep them internal, that's a decision that can be made under the normal rules of confidentiality. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | Okay, so what you're saying, Alan, is that anything board requests from staff will not be internal, it will be out in the open? |
| Alan Greenberg: | Unless there's some particular reason, but we don't need to justify that. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | So, and your proposal is that we change the wording to board may request follow-up reports on a quarterly basis -- |
| Alan Greenberg: | May choose to request. In other words, give them the option, but it's their choice. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | Good, I agree. |
| Brian Cute: | Any other reactions to the edits on 12.4? |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | It's Olivier, I've got my hand up. |
| Brian Cute: | Yes, Olivier? |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier for the transcript, Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Just a question with regards to this. It seems to totally forget the existence of a board finance committee. And the way the board finance committee works with ICANN staff and with ICANN Finance is a lot closer than just official documents being passed on from ICANN Finance to the ICANN Board. In fact, the board's finance committee has a lot of closed meetings with ICANN Finance where the documents don't go any further than the BFC and ICANN Finance. So I'm not quite sure how |

much that 12.4 is going to move forward. I welcome it, but it certainly negates the fact that the BFC exists.

Jorgen Andersen: Brian, can I answer to this? I think it's a good point made by Olivier, but sometimes I think when you use more, you may -- how many committees are there underneath the board or with the board as an umbrella? I suppose if there's a finance committee, there might be other committees, right?

Brian Cute: There's a good number. I don't know how many off the top of my head.

Jorgen Andersen: When you're doing legislation or executivism or whatever, sometimes you use the name of the umbrella to cover the whole family, if you understand what I mean. So in that sense, you could say the board also comprises the financial committee or the finance committee of the board. And I don't know whether we have mentioned explicitly the committees elsewhere in our report.

Brian Cute: I don't know that we have. I know that we mentioned them in the first ATRT1 report, the fact that they existed and the work that they did. I'm not as troubled by the use of the word board here. We are, as a review team, to make recommendations to the board as a whole. And I would add the finance perspective, every director and the board as a whole has a right and a responsibility to financial information under their fiduciary duty. And the fact that a finance committee is set up to do focused work on finance issues doesn't negate the fact that any director and the board as a whole has that right and responsibility. So I'm not as troubled by it unless in the implementation of this recommendation, Olivier, you see some disconnects because the finance committee might implement this in a particular way.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, I'd like to have Olivier explain a little bit more exactly which part of this recommendation he's troubled with. I certainly wouldn't put the name of the committee. They may choose next week to call it the money committee and we wouldn't want our recommendation to hinge on the title of a committee. But I'm not sure which part of the recommendation Olivier thinks there may be a conflict with.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, thank you, Brian, it's Olivier speaking. So I don't have a trouble with the recommendation itself, but I just think that it needs to be a bit more focused on the actual publication of the strategic plan and of the report. The key word being publication. There is a lot more information and discussion in internal reports and spreadsheets that goes on. And I know about that due to the fact that I have worked with the ALAC Finance & Budget Subcommittees and we have shared a lot more information with ICANN Finance than working documents, etc., than what gets published at the end. So this recommendation here speaks about a report to be drafted describing the actual implementation of the framework including activities and related expenses, etc. It doesn't describe the depth to which this should go, whether you are speaking about collecting all of the working documents, or whether a report should be drafted and published. So specifically publication describing the actual implementation of the work.

Alan Greenberg: I would put in the word published before all the actual.

Brian Cute: Let me suggest something. Olivier, your point is well taken. It also triggers a much deeper analysis of what we are recommending. Look, we've been involved, a number of us have been involved in developing budgets and financial review and audit and it's a very expansive process. And there are working sessions where budgets are being developed, where the documents in that session really at the end of the process are effectively worthless because they are working documents that evolve. I think I hear you and transparency is important here, but I think we have to think very carefully if we're going to be prescriptive about what documents must be made public. That we really need to think this through because it is an expansive process that involves a lot of different moving parts and not all of which necessarily add to accountability and transparency if we were to force them out into public light through recommendations. Is that a fair assessment?

| | |
|---|---|
| Jorgen Andersen: | Brian, Jorgen speaking. Could I just step in here? |
| Alan Greenberg: | And Alan when Jorgen is finished. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | I think I agree, I have the same view about that we should be careful not to be too prescriptive. I think the important thing here is to signal the basis and I want to just approach one of the sentences from your note, Brian, from the meeting with board on financial. Mike said the board has already picked up this issue beforehand. And then he said, strategic planning runs the budget which runs operations. ICANN has been good in reporting against that. And I think what we do with this particular recommendation is exactly to mirror what his remarks are all about, that there is this connection between strategic plan with corresponding financial framework and the yearly budgets and the follow up on the yearly budgets. This is what is said here and this can be done in many ways. There are many people involved, staff was involved, finance committee was involved. We should not cover this, we should not be prescriptive on this. The important thing is to make a recommendation which reflects the basic strategic considerations how to move forward in the right way in this respect. |
| Brian Cute: | Thanks, Jorgen. Alan? |
| Alan Greenberg: | Thank you. The relationship between financial planning and strategic planning is a relevant one. But if I remember correctly, the origin of this whole recommendation was the lack of clarity in the community regarding ICANN budgets. It's not only the multiyear part, it's any given year our review team didn't know what our budget is. ACs and SOs don't know where their budget comes from. The ccNSO is continually on a campaign to say we need clarity to understand where the money is being spent and where the money comes from. So we don't want to forget that part of the origin of this recommendation which does require publication of understandable reports and understandable documents from the linkage between strategic planning and finance which is of course relevant. But not the only issue we're trying to address. Thank you. |
| Brian Cute: | If I may, the recommendation does focus on the implementation of the yearly budget in question and adds also specific budgets for the ACs and SOs. |
| Alan Greenberg: | I'm not disagreeing. I'm just saying as we rework it, let's not forget that part of the origin in addition to the linkage between the two. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | If I may, Jorgen speaking again, I think please note where we say in the last sentence, the report shall be submitted for consultation, that's exactly -- it has been invisible what it's all about. We have to involve the stakeholders in what is going on and ask for their remarks. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Yes. At this point they submit things for consultation but they don't tell us very much. So it's one of the problems we're trying to fix. |
| Denise Michel: | Hi, this is Denise. |
| Brian Cute: | Yeah, Denise, hi. |
| Denise Michel: | Hi, Brian. Sorry there was a staff mix-up on our end. |
| Brian Cute: | No problem. This is being recorded, we're moving forward and having a discussion. I just assumed there was some sort of snafu. Not a big deal. We're managing. But thank you. So what we're doing, Denise, is for the folks who are on the phone call, just asking the editors who have provided some draft edited recommendations to walk those of us who are on the call through those edits, get reactions from this group to see if they are directionally headed down they right path or should consider modifications based on reactions. And just capturing this at this point and then looking for the rest of the edits from the balance of the team and getting ready for the next call. |

|  | While you are here, so if you -- are you going to be able to join us for the rest of the call? |
|---|---|
| Denise Michel: | Yes. |
| Brian Cute: | Okay, so what I would ask, Jorgen's got to finish his financial recommendation, Alan will walk us through his, I'll walk through mine. When we finish with that, what would be useful is just an update to the extent you have one on implement ability inputs from the staff and a draft of the One World Trust report on metrics. If you can hit us on those two points for the call. |
| Denise Michel: | Sure. |
| Brian Cute: | Okay, thank you. Anything else on -- yes? |
| Jorgen Andersen: | Brian, could I summarize what I've noted so far on recommendation 12? I have taken note that everybody agrees that the only part of recommendation 12 which requires changes is 12.4 and that you have agreed in all the changes made, apart from the change in the parenthesis at the bottom of 12.4 which instead should read, "board may choose to request follow-up reports on a quarterly basis". Do we agree in this? |
| Brian Cute: | It's not just for me, everybody else on the phone as well. Directionally, are folks comfortable with the edits here? Or if there is discomfort on the direction, please note that now. I think I'm hearing silence which I'm reading as assent. I would drop a footnote, Jorgen, this is Brian. Olivier, to your point, and Alan to your point, we're going to move forward with this edit. But I would ask, if there are specific documents or specific parts of these processes, the strategic process, the operational plan, the budget, that you think are worth noting, by all means, bring them to Jorgen and Lise's attention, submit these points to the email list. I think we have a consensus that we don't want to be overly prescriptive here, that directionally this is the right direction. But if you think there are points that Lise and Jorgen need to think carefully about for possible modifications, please submit those to the list so they can take them into account. Fair enough? |
| Jorgen Andersen: | Good. Thank you very much. |
| Brian Cute: | Thank you. Alan, if you would do the same, just walk the group through specifically the edits to the recommendation, not necessarily the body of the report, just the recommendation you sent across. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Okay, thank you. With regard to the public comments, I'll just note that I have not gone through the formal public comments. All I've noted there are the comments we received verbally that drove the changes. There may well be other comments that need to be addressed and of course footnotes being more detailed as to where they came from.<br><br>Okay, in the changes, the first bullet of 13.1, and that was in reaction to the word facilitators which caused visceral negative reactions from a number of people. And I have changed it as discussed in our wrap up meeting to say we want funding for professional services. And then I give some examples which may include training to enhance work group leaders and participants' ability to address difficult problems and situation. Professional facilitation, mediation, negotiation, and there should be an etc., or some follow-on there which I apparently omitted. Any questions or comments on that? |
| Brian Cute: | Open floor. Looking for hands. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Nope. |
| Brian Cute: | Okay. And to be clear, I'm looking at your document now, so edits to 13.1 -- |
| Alan Greenberg: | We're on the first -- well 13.1, correct. |

Brian Cute:            Is it just 13.1 or 13.2 and 13.3?

Alan Greenberg:        No, there's more to come.  13.2 was the recommendation on the GAC and the assignment there was to take was to merge inapplicable parts of recommendation 10 from the GAC recommendations.  And I hope I did that properly.  I first of all noted that the one on the GAC, number 10, was talking about the policy development process in general, not the PDP and that is correct.  This one should have been more general than the PDP because we're looking for GAC advice into any policy process.  And I -- so I took some of the wording out of that recommendation.  I also added at the end such -- sorry, there was a reference to face to face meetings and intercessionally which I think was a good reference in that one.  And I added, "and should institutionalize the cross community deliberations" which is an expression right out of the AOC foreseen by the AOC.  And I think deliberations is a key one here because it means not just tossing documents over a wall.

Brian Cute:            Okay.  We've got Heather and Fiona Alexander.  I know Fiona that Larry had taken some of the GAC recommendations to edit.  Any specific reactions to 13.2, Alan's proposed edits about GAC and on PD?

Alan Greenberg:        I'll note when I originally crafted the original one and tried to preserve it, I tried to be very non-prescriptive in how this be done.  But focus on the end product.  That is making sure information is exchanged.

Fiona Alexander:       This is Fiona.  I don't know if Heather has a comment to make, but I do have one question which is the recommendation is about improving effectiveness of cross community deliberations.  But then all the recommendations focus on the gNSO.  I'm just wondering why it's so narrow.

Alan Greenberg:        That was left over from when it was a PDP.  That probably needs some widening.  It probably needs the GAC in coordination with other parts of the ICANN community or something like that.

Fiona Alexander:       And I would have the same question on 13.1 as well.

Alan Greenberg:        One second, let me just look at that.

Brian Cute:            Thanks, Fiona.  Any other inputs on this?

Fiona Alexander:       On the specific 13.2, I would just defer to Heather about what the GAC isn't working on with the GNSO, but the GAC has done some good exercises with the ccNSO that have worked that I thought always provided good models.  But I just thought the whole, all the recommendations in this section were very narrow.

Alan Greenberg:        I guess our origin was the GNSO PDP.  I suspect they can be widened without hurting anything however.  Let me take that home as an assignment.

Brian Cute:            Okay, any other inputs at this point for Alan?  I'm not seeing any hands.

Alan Greenberg:        13.3 is I added a bullet at the beginning which says all communities, all ICANN communities with an interest in gTLD policy and in particular those represented within the gNSO, and this is in relation to trying to find ways to increase participation, and I also add the word robust participation because as Mikey has pointed out a number of times, there is participation from various groups, but it is limited to a very small number of people.  So that bullet may be a bit too cryptic, but essentially we're saying we're not going looking for outreach, we're looking for in reach or in selling, I think someone used the expression.  That is, we need more participation in policy development than we have right now.  So I welcome additional wording, but that was the intent of trying to capture that in a bullet.

| | |
|---|---|
| Brian Cute: | This is Brian. I'm not trying to nitpick on words, but robust may be vague to some degree. I'm wondering if broad-based participation -- you're really talking -- if it's Mikey's point, it's that a very small number of people are doing this work at the working group level. It would be better if we had more people and more participation from each of the stakeholder groups. Just a suggestion, there may be other phrases that get to that a little bit more clearly. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Okay, I'll try to work on robust to enlarge it and make it more clear. |
| Brian Cute: | Any other points for Alan on 13.3? Olivier? |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. I actually did note some points which were made in the public comments part. And I was actually going to ask, I didn't get an answer on this one, just before this call I sent an email out asking whether we were going to take into account the input we've had from the public comments cycle already. I gather we are to some extent? |
| Alan Greenberg: | I certainly haven't on this recommendation yet. If it wasn't said, then I have not captured it. |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | Right, it's Olivier speaking. So there was 10.3 and I guess that the whole recommendation beginning with PDP, there are several locations which mention having participation across all of ICANN, under represented regions, non-English speaking linguistic groups, those with non-Western cultural traditions, etc., etc. And the note from I think it was Chuck on this, and a few of his colleagues, was that the critical term in these recommendations, and I think that you are speaking here about robust participation, the critical term according to them is equitable participation as well which effectively perhaps is not something -- I think we have put equitable participation elsewhere and it was something that they believed was not achievable regardless of how many resources were devoted to it. And they suggested a more relative term to be equitable opportunity to participate. Give everyone the same opportunity for robust participation if one meets with your recommendations. |
| Alan Greenberg: | I'll look at that and see if I can work that in. |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | The concern they have is that there will no doubt be some people that will be more concerned about some points being discussed and they are likely to take much more their participation to heart than other parts of the world. And so asking for equitable participation is something that somehow a bit unreal. I try to understand that. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Olivier, however, this recommendation is not saying get equitable participation. It's saying this is recommending a strategic group to look at the issues and focus, and I quote, "focus on the viability and methodology of having equitable participation". I think equitable participation is a target. It's probably not achievable. |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | It's a target, okay. If it's a target then that's fine. |
| Alan Greenberg: | This is a very mild mannered recommendation. |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | I just wonder whether we should then expand it to say, because you already know that there is a recommendation to finance that equitable participation is not possible, perhaps it could be expanded to not only equitable participation but also providing equitable opportunity to participate. That could be a study. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Noted. I was just saying though, this is a recommendation to study, not necessarily to implement with bad marks if they don't implement. |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | I just want to make sure the study is worthwhile and not just a study for a tick box. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Noted. |

Brian Cute:     Okay, other inputs for Alan?  Heather?

Heather Dryden:     Thanks, Brian.  I was just going to add, I'm sorry, I stepped away for a bit so I hope I haven't missed too much of the call, but on this point about participation, sometimes I find it useful to refer to notions about having representation or having some participation that's representative and working towards that goal.  So if that's helpful at all in trying to find the right wording, I offer that as a suggestion.

Alan Greenberg:     Okay, thank you.

Brian Cute:     Thank you.  Okay, any other points for Alan to consider on 13.3?  I don't see any hands.  Okay, Alan, 13.5?

Alan Greenberg:     On 13.4 I had some notes on my piece of paper which said the words were presumptive and need clarity.  Unfortunately, there was no discussion that said that on the section when we were talking about this recommendation and it may have been made elsewhere in the wrap up meeting, but the transcript hasn't been posted yet and I just didn't have the time to listen to the full hour or two hours or whatever it was to try to find them.  So there may well be some need for a change in 10.4 and once, or 13.4 rather, and once the transcript is posted, I will review it and try to find it.  If anyone remembers what that is, I'd appreciate their input.

Brian Cute:     I may be reaching here, but I recall -- this is the point of whether the board can or should change the outcome of the PDP when it comes to the board.  And I recall Larry making the point, and I'll paraphrase that, that's the point that needs clarity.  That for some there's presumption that the board should do nothing more than just accept what comes up in the PDP process and for others that may not be the assumption, that the board actually can change the outcome.  And then we talked about the non-output of the PDP like vertical integration.  I'm not sure if that's the notes you're looking at, but I think you've got this  -- the first bullet of 13.4, second sentence, this resolution also should note under what conditions the board believes it may alter PDP recommendations after formal board acceptance, certainly appears to get to that issue.

Alan Greenberg:     I guess the origin of this recommendation was we're not trying to set the rule, but -- and the board is the only entity and perhaps through altering the By-Laws, and maybe we need a reference to that, that can definitively say what the rules are, but the community needs clarity as to what the board believes.  And we know the board right now is divided on some of these questions.  We know some people feel that under no condition should the board be setting policy.  Other ones are more pragmatic and say sometimes it has to.  So I --

Brian Cute:     I would add, Alan, that looking at this again, I think the phrase after formal board acceptance, may actually cloud the question we're trying to pose.  This may be clearer in terms of posing the question to the board if you put a period after recommendations and dropped after formal board acceptance. Just food for thought.

Alan Greenberg:     That's an interesting thought.

Brian Cute:     Food for thought.

Alan Greenberg:     No, no, there may be two different thoughts here.  One with and one without.  So let me think about that.

Brian Cute:     Okay.  Any other feedback for Alan on 13.4?

Alan Greenberg:     We don't have staff on the call so we don't know when the transcripts will -- unless Denise knows when the transcripts will be available for Buenos Aires.  It would be really useful if we had the

transcripts from not only the wrap up meeting, but all of our meetings with the various ACs and SOs in trying to craft our final document where the deadline is creeping up real quick.

Denise Michel:     Yeah, I understand it would be useful. It's unlikely that those secondary meetings will be posted in time to be useful for your December 13th deadline, but Charla will check and send you an email.

Alan Greenberg:     Okay, if the priority of the transcriptions can be juggled to try to get some higher priority for ours, that would certainly be useful to some of us anyway.

Denise Michel:     Sure. She will look into it certainly.

Charla Shambley:     The recordings are up on the Wiki right now. I posted those on Friday.

Alan Greenberg:     Yes, I know, but there are many, many hours of them. If you're trying to find a particular sentence where in many cases I have notes, but it would be useful to go back and see exactly what the full sentence was. That would make life easier. In any case, the last one I have is we had a note in the report saying we might widen the bullet that says those without essentially corporate financial support are disadvantaged. And there was strong support from At-Large, from NCSG and from SSAC which we hadn't thought of before. And there's some rationale giving that in the comment section and I've put a bullet saying the board must facilitate. And again, it's not a strong one because we really don't -- we can't solve all the world's problems, we don't have the budget for that to facilitate in reference to what Olivier said, equitable there should probably be opportunity for equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities. And those, of those ICANN stakeholders who lack financial support of interested players. So it's not a strong one saying fund everyone who wants money, but it says we've got to work towards that direction.

Brian Cute:     Any feedback? I'm not seeing any hands, Alan.

Alan Greenberg:     I'll note something else that I put in the -- I think I put -- yeah, in the reference, the commenting on the comments, that there are times when this applies to players who are part of the ICANN ecosystem but simply have employers that don't see any value in supporting ICANN. And I don't know if we want to widen it for that, but I'll value any input now or through email. The example that's being given, we've got intellectual property attorneys who believe ICANN is something that should be worked for, but their employers don't. Is this a category we want to reference also as applicable as At-Large and noncommercial in that they may be commercial, but they don't have a corporate source of funding. So I don't know if we want to reference that or not. If anyone has any thoughts, perhaps get back. I see Jorgen's hand up.

Brian Cute:     Jorgen, please?

Jorgen Andersen:     Yes, thank you, Brian. I'm looking at 13.5 and I wonder whether the sentence would be better if we delete the last three words, of industry players. I don't think the support of industry players in particular is the essential thing. What we are aiming at is to propose the board to facilitate the equitable participation by those stakeholders who don't have the sufficient funding for participating. Isn't that right? I mean financial support could come from other sources than from industry players, at least theoretically.

Alan Greenberg:     I think you're right, but I worry that taking that out draws the focus away from the fact that the vast majority of those who are very active in ICANN are doing it, if not as part of their jobs, with the active support of their employers. So you're right, if I find a sugar daddy to pay my way, even though they're not related to internet, that would be fine as well. But it may take too much focus away from what is the real problem today.

Jorgen Andersen:     I agree with you, Alan. I think maybe it's only theoretical, but you could imagine some countries where for example government will support stakeholders in that particular country to participate.

| | |
|---|---|
| Alan Greenberg: | Your point is well made. Let me see what I can do to fix it without taking support away from what is today's focus. |
| Jorgen Andersen: | Perhaps it could say e.g., industry players, for example, industry players. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Okay, let me take it home. |
| Brian Cute: | Thank you. Any other points for Alan? I see agreement from Olivier on that last point. Any other points? Okay, Alan, thanks. Let's take those inputs and iterate the next version of this if you will and send it back to us. |
| Alan Greenberg: | If we can get the MP3 for this posted as soon as possible, because I will have to go over this to hear what people said again. |
| Brian Cute: | Sure. Okay. I'm going to shift to the edits that I sent to the list on recommendations 1, 2 and 3. And again, these are taken from the notes of the discussions in Buenos Aires, I'm doing my best to capture those discussions. So for number 1, develop metrics and measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning -- |
| Alan Greenberg: | Brian, do you know when you sent them so I can find them? Sorry to ask embarrassing questions. |
| Brian Cute: | No worries. It was within the last -- hold on, Alan. I sent them on the 27th at 11:52 AM. The title is Finance Recommendation and I was replying to Lise and Jorgen's. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Got it, okay, I was confused by the title. |
| Brian Cute: | No worries. Okay, so number 1, actually you'll see in the deletion that there were two recommendations on the board's functioning. I've consolidated it to one and you can see the deleted language in the sidebar. It now reads, develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement efforts and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement. What this is intended to reflect is the conversation that we had with the board where there was a strong sense from the board that the type of peer review that's being undertaken right now with the board is very deep and robust and that this recommendation would be better served to focus on the board as a whole. So that's one reflection in this. And still leaving room for the community to have a sense of board training, materials that are used to improve the performance of the board overall. So that's what's in the edit. I'm looking for reactions to this direction, if it's directionally on target or not. Looking for hands. |
| Alan Greenberg: | It's Alan. I almost think that publishing materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement -- I'm not quite sure that there's a real linkage between the two and published materials, the training materials, may perhaps should be an example as opposed to one of the prime outputs. |
| Brian Cute: | So perhaps in parens, for example, publish materials used for board training or other measurements of board improvement, something along those lines? |
| Alan Greenberg: | Well the overall recommendation is develop metrics for measuring the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement efforts. And perhaps publication of board training materials, which we've already been told in some cases is not allowed due to intellectual property right issues, might be useful in fulfilling this need or something like that. |
| Fiona Alexander: | Hey, Brian, this is Fiona. Which one are we going over? I don't seem to have this one. |
| Brian Cute: | I sent on the 27th, it's ATRT Recommendation 1, 2 and 3. It used to be there were two and now I've consolidated 1 and 2 down into a single number 1. |
| Alan Greenberg: | The message is from Brian on the 27th with the title Finance, the subject finance rather. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Brian Cute: | The name of the document is ATRT2 Recommendations BC edits. Okay, any other feedback on that? Alan, I've got your points. Thank you. Okay, no -- I'm not seeing any reaction to the focus on the board as a whole as opposed to individuals, so I'm taking that as assent. |
| | Number 2, and this is taken from notes from the conversation. In fact, I think I had pushback on number 2, doing number 2, there was sentiment that we needed to preserve this recommendation. So it now reads, conduct qualitative/quantitative studies that include diversity based on gender, nationality/geography, etc., to determine if the qualifications of board candidate pools improved once compensation was available and regularly assess directors' compensation levels. Feedback please. |
| Alan Greenberg: | It's Alan. We asked the question, and I'm not sure we got the answer, of whether this is in fact viable. We don't know to what extent the details of the pools available to noncoms are accessible after the fact and whether it's viable to analyze those for looking at these pools. And of course we don't know to what extent the outreach of the noncoms themselves have affected the pool they have. |
| Brian Cute: | There was a remark made at the end, Alan, I'm recalling this, but I think somebody made the remark that the candidate applications and profiles, that that documentation may be deleted, destroyed or done away with after a short period of time, a year or so. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Yeah, or may be kept for legal reasons if there is some need to review them. We didn't get an answer on what the answer was. We had hypothesis. |
| Brian Cute: | This would be a question for the noncom? |
| Alan Greenberg: | Or staff. |
| Denise Michel: | This is Denise. The CSF can get the answer on the noncom documents and the retention. But to follow up on Alan's point, I think the initial response you got from the board and staff was we don't know if we're able to implement this, what qualitative measures we would take and how we would get access to and track the noncom documents. So I think there was certainly a question on this one in staff notes. And others as well by the way. I'm not interjecting on all of these and staff will be sending you the initial input on all of the recommendations by Wednesday night. |
| Brian Cute: | Great. And on the review team side, Denise, just to be clear, I tested this as well. The sense that I got back was on balance this is worth doing. The open question is, if the board were to do this, does the data exist on the profiles of candidate pools if you will? So the answer to that is yes, the data exists and it's accessible. The sense of the team is going to mean that this is worth doing. But please check on the availability of that data and let us know what the answer to that question is. |
| | Okay, number 3, if I can pull it up. Give me one second. So this is, the new number 3 is what was very poorly worded in targeting recommendation 6 from ATRT1 which is a distinction between policy and implementation. Trying to put it in plainer English, and I'm not sure I succeeded, it now reads, continue cross community engagement that develops an understanding of the distinction between policy implementation and executive function. Any reaction to that proposed edit? |
| Alan Greenberg: | I guess I would replace executive with executive and/or staff. |
| Brian Cute: | Okay. Any other suggestions here or reactions? Looking for hands. Not seeing any hands. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Yes, I think this is fine. I think it implies a follow on to the current GNSO activity which may be complete by the time the board acts on our recommendations. And puts some onus on the board to make sure it follows up in a cross community way. So that addresses part of what Olivier raised earlier. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Brian Cute: | Okay, that's what I had for now. I'm taking those points back for the next iteration of these three. With that, I think we've gone through the edited recommendations that we have. What I will do is looking for the other edits to come in. When we have all of them, we'll put them all into that short document of just recommendations, one single document, all these edits. Jorgen, Alan, myself, let's get our next versions into the list so that shortly enough we as a team can look at a single document all the proposed edits, and on our next call come to conclusion on the wording. That would be the goal. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Brian, it's Alan. Two points. Number one, staff was supposed to be working on a cleanup of the overall documents using consistent numbering and all of that stuff. Do we know what the status of that is? It would be useful if that's going to be done in the next several days to work on that as the base instead of on the old document. |
| Brian Cute: | Yes, I think -- yes, let's get the answer to that question. I think for purposes of just editing the recommendations only, we can still work off of that shorter 3-page document. And then once we've locked down the new language on recommendations, have that copied and pasted into the full report. |
| Alan Greenberg: | I'm just thinking if we had the new form, then working on that would be a better basis. But if not, of course we'll continue with this one. |
| Brian Cute: | Okay. Denise, that's one question for you. |
| Alan Greenberg: | I have another question. |
| Brian Cute: | Denise, that's one question for you, and if you could also give us just an update on the implement ability inputs on the one hand and the One World Trust draft report on the other, that would be appreciated. |
| Denise Michel: | Sure. And Charla may some more information on the cleanup of the current draft. I'll let her speak to that. One World Trust report should -- we're targeting still a draft to the team by the 12th of December. And we'll also have the initial staff input on the draft recommendations by Wednesday night. And Charla, did you have anything to add on the current draft? Or is that something we can look at? |
| Charla Shambley: | Yeah, we have not taken any further steps on cleaning the document up. I think we were looking at using some outside services. |
| Denise Michel: | I think this is something the team should consider that obviously a very large document, it may be better at this point to do substantive redlines on the current document and then we're bringing in a contract editor to just focus on cleaning up the final document, incorporating all of the changes and doing iterations necessary to get it to the publication point. So it may be simpler to just leave this draft as is, do substantive edits on this, and then use that as the basis for the editor to start working. |
| Alan Greenberg: | Okay. |
| Brian Cute: | Actually, now that we're on this topic, this is Brian, I would suggest that this is a topic for call of the chair, the vice chairs, and I'd like to have Paul Diaz in on this call since he was so instrumental in kind of the cleanup editing of the first version and will be again on this. So maybe, Charla, the best thing to do is to get a call pulled together somewhat soon of the chair, the vice chairs, Paul, and staff -- sorry for the background noise, and staff to really discuss this is detail and make sure we're all very coordinated on how this is managed. |
| Denise Michel: | Brian, when would you like that, this week? |

Brian Cute:          Yeah, I think this week, it would have to be this week.

Denise Michel:       Okay, I'll send out a doodle then to the coordination team and also to Paul.

Brian Cute:          Yeah, that would be great.  Why don't we do that?

Alan Greenberg:      Brian, my other point was, do we know who the other drafters are that have not put anything in yet that owed us something?  I guess Avri must be one of them, but I don't know who else.

Brian Cute:          I think Larry and Avri and I'm not sure who else.

Alan Greenberg:      Okay.  We need to touch base and at least find out what the ETA is for their changes.

Brian Cute:          Yes.  Will do.  Any other updates?  And I'm not online now, folks, I'm mobile.  Any -- I can't see hands.  Any other updates?  Any other updates, any other items before we close?

Alan Greenberg:      No hands.

Brian Cute:          No hands.  Okay.  Jorgen, Alan, myself, we've got the inputs to make the next iteration.  Thank you all very much.  Charla, we'll look for that doodle poll and I'll prompt the other editors to make sure we have their inputs very soon.  Thank you, all.