

20131210_ATRT2_ID839025

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you and welcome. This is Accountability and Transparency Review Team Two conference call of December 10, 2013. Welcome, everybody. Thank you for joining. This is Brian Cute.

The first item of business for us is to agree to the proposed agenda, which is on the screen. I hope everyone's had a chance to see that. And the question is any proposed modifications? Heather Dryden. Heather?

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Brian. So, I need to step off the call for a bit at what would be 15:30 UTC. That's the same time as the item related to the GAC. It is scheduled. I'm wondering whether it's possible to push that back so that I could be on the call for when we discuss that.

Brian Cute: When would you be available, Heather, to come back to the call?

Heather Dryden: I'll be off for at least 30 minutes, possibly 45.

Brian Cute: So, if we went to 16:45 or later, that would be comfortable for you?

Heather Dryden: Oh, yes, definitely. Yeah.

Brian Cute: Charla, Larisa, is that possible to make that move? I'm imagining there's ICANN staff that's supporting that section of the call.

Heather Dryden: Oh, I see.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. We've got four people confirmed to dial in at 15:30 and I'm not sure that their schedule will be able to accommodate a change. I can certainly try, but we've got Tarek, Sally, Mandy and Patrick dialing in at 15:30 based on the agenda.

Heather Dryden: I have a call with Tarek and he's one of the people on the call that (inaudible).

Larisa Gurnick: Okay.

(Laughter)

Brian Cute: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: Alright. Let me see what we can do, Heather.

Brian Cate: Larisa, I think that if you could just check with the principals and do your best, if you can, and let us know what's feasible.

Larisa Gurnick: Okay. Alright.

Brian Cate: Okay. Thank you, Heather.

Any other questions or suggested changes to the agenda? Okay. I just see Heather and Larisa's hands up. I assume that's from our last conversation. With no objection, we'll approve the agenda and move forward.

The first item -- Charla, if you would put back up -- put up the proposed work calendar or work schedule that I sent out last night if you have that document.

Okay. For ATRT2 members and staff, this is a proposed work schedule that I put forward last night identifying what I believe to be the inputs that are coming in to our process between now and next Friday. And to be clear, our deadline is December 31st to give the report to the board. We have internally targeted December 20th, recognizing the holiday break and how things slow down, as the deadline for us to have this report effectively done.

In the opening of this document, I've got six items that I'd call inputs to our process. They are edits from the editors to recommendations. So there's assigned editors right now to specific recommendations. We've asked each of them, based on all the input to date and the Buenos Aires input, to propose modifications to their recommendations edits. Those are coming into the process.

And the second input is from ICANN staff regarding implementability of draft recommendations. We've received that input and we'll discuss it today.

The third input is public comments. There have been a few. We know others are coming in. Friday is the close date for the reply comments. We may get a bit of a dump at the end and we recognize that, but that's input number three.

The One World Trust Report or a draft report, which One World Trust said they would get to the review team for us to review before we finalize our report, that's input number four.

Input number five is the ICC report. Now, we already have the ICC report. It was an appendix to our draft report and recommendations. But, the reason I point that out is just to note if there's anything that the review team wants to pull from the ICC report into its final draft and recommendations, that would be input number five. If not, it can remain an appendix and we're done with that.

And then the last input I've identified is citations. We really -- we've done a good job so far with the draft report, but it's important to reflect back to the community that we've heard their inputs, that we're using their inputs as the basis for our analysis and showing that through citations of public comment, input received from the community at any of the face-to-face meetings, input from staff, from the board. That is the last input on my list.

Have I missed anything? I'm looking for hands. I don't see any hands. Okay.

So, in terms of managing the work, those are the inputs that I'm going to be keeping my eye on to make sure that they are well managed.

Scrolling down, I also identified the editors who are assigned to specific recommendation numbers. That list is there for you. If I got that wrong in any way, please let me know. Where you see two names, like recommendation 9, Alan Greenberg/Avri Doria, that means Alan has got the point and Avri is supporting him in that drafting exercise. If that's incorrect, please let me know.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. On 10.4 the order should be reversed. Because I think the way Larry left it is it was passed to me to integrate the two sections.

Brian Cute: Okay. We'll make that modification. Any other changes to the assignments besides 9? Excuse me, besides 10.4?

Okay. Not seeing any hands, let's scroll down. What I've got in--.

Alan Greenberg: Hold on a second.

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: What is 9 base without a number which has me as the lead? I don't think that's correct.

Brian Cute: I'll have to look back at that. Hold on. Nine is -- actually, that's the grouping of formal advice -- okay. Mandate forwards response to advisory committee. Formal advice to ICANN bylaws. I think this is where the board is responding to advice from ACs.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I think Avri had the lead on that.

Brian Cute: Avri has that?

Alan Greenberg: I think Avri had the lead on all of 9.

Brian Cute: Okay. Alright, 9 and 3.

Alan Greenberg: Avri has her hand up, though, so maybe she disagrees.

Brian Cute: Avri? Avri, go ahead.

Avri, we can't hear you if you're there.

Okay. Until I hear from Avri, then, Alan, I'll make that change. Nine is Avri. 10.4 is you with the lead and Larry in support.

Any other changes to the assignment list?

Okay. Let's move on. And folks, we're going to have to be very disciplined about our time on this call. We have quite a lot to accomplish and I'm going to try to push us forward expeditiously.

So, this is a proposed work schedule that I put together for the next effectively week and a half. It addresses each of the inputs. It puts a deadline on input from ATRT2 members with respect to each of these inputs. So, if you have anything to say, anything to add, anything that you think edits a recommendation or adds or subtracts from the report, these are your deadlines. We are at the point of the work, folks, where, for better or for

worse, if you don't meet the deadline we cannot take your input. So, this is really critical and I want to be clear. We're just there. We're at the end. We're at the finish line. We have some time here to get our final thoughts in.

What I would ask everyone to focus on for these inputs is, if you're offering something into the process, it should be something that is going to materially impact the report and the recommendations. If it's an additional thought that adds support to a conclusion we've reached and a recommendation, that is not critical. What's really critical at this phase is, is there something we have to modify? Is there input from the staff? Is there input from the community that changes a recommendation in any way, or even maybe eliminates a recommendation? That's the most important type of input. And when you offer that input, please, please provide citations, provide quotes, provide the material that would go into the report along with your point.

So, if everyone could please follow those guidelines. Understand that these are real deadlines. If you don't get something in on a given input by the deadline here, it will not be factored into the final report. We have to get this thing wrapped up next week.

Any questions on the proposed schedule? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. The only potential problem is if people don't get their input -- their revised work done much before the 13th, there's no opportunity for anyone else on the review team to critique it or say they got it wrong.

Brian Cute: You mean the revised recommendations, if those aren't in by the 13th?

Alan Greenberg: Right. If I don't get my revised one in until late on the 13th, it's signed, sealed and delivered at that point and there's no opportunity for other people to say, hey, that isn't what I meant or whatever the issue is.

Brian Cute: Well, we have -- the last deadline is next Tuesday, December 17th, for specific citations or quotes or footnotes that go in the report. We also have a deadline of next Monday. So, anything that comes in on the comments on Friday when the reply comment period closes, so from the member fields, if there's something in the comments that's relevant, that changes the recommendation or the report, they have until Monday to provide that input. And they can use that window. If your revised recommendations come in -- I know we're waiting on the GAC revised recommendations, at least until the end of the day on Monday folks have a shot.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Brian Cute: And that's the best we can do, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: That's what I wanted for clarification. Thank you. I'm not planning to put anything nefarious in mine, but mistakes happen.

Brian Cute: But after Monday, that's it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Brian Cute: We're only looking at (inaudible) and we're done.

Alan Greenberg: That's a fine window. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay. Any other questions on the proposed work schedule?

Okay. That being said, let's move to the agenda. And I think we're now moving into the discussion of the staff input.

The initial staff assessment of and response to ATRT2 draft report and recommendations, which provided a lot of very useful feedback with respect to implementability and other aspects of the draft recommendations and report.

Folks, we're going to have to be very disciplined on time today. I really am asking only for very crisp, short, impactful statements. My goal is to move through each of the recommendations in this document and get a sense of the review team of what our reaction is to the staff input on a recommendation by recommendation basis.

Secondly, Amy Stathos has made herself available, and I think other ICANN staffers, for a call on Friday. And the game plan here would be to walk through this entire document, get a reaction from the ATRT2 members as to the staff input and take that reaction into a final call on Friday with staff to talk through the implementability issues so that, by the end of that call on Friday we have a clear roadmap of how we may modify the recommendations and report in reaction to the staff input. That's the game plan so time management is going to be critical here. We're not going--.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, is that call scheduled?

Brian Cute: Not yet, but it's going to be.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Brian Cute: So, that's how we're going to manage the time we have. We also have some time with the Ombudsman and the Global Stockholder Engagement Team. So, those are two items in addition to this. So without further ado, folks, let's start working through this.

We have as the first item under 1.a., reaction to preliminary staff assessment and response. I'm going to ask folks for a 30-second, 30-second high-level reaction to the staff inputs, if you have one, and then we'll move to -- on an item by item basis.

I've got Larisa's hand up. Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Amy is on the call right now in the hopes that some of the discussion can take place today. And the call will be scheduled at the -- once this call is completed to see exactly how much time we'll need and who ought to participate.

Also, just to clarify and confirm, Heather was able to stick to the original schedule so we do not need to move the GAC item around. Just FYI.

Brian Cute: Terrific. Okay. So, we've got 12 minutes. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I did have a long call with Denise yesterday. And I was the one who kicked off the discussion on the public list on the staff reactions. Just a very quick point. From my perspective, I do not believe changing a lot of these things to comments instead of recommendations has the same power and puts the same onus on ICANN to implement. And although I appreciate that there may be a heavier reporting load from reporting on a recommendation instead of a status of something that's happening, I think that's a reflection on ICANN's effectively disorganization and ability to report to the community and the board on a regular basis using a unified method. So, I think ICANN needs to do some work to clean up their reporting so that ATRT is not something special

and different than other types of work that are going on. But, I do not believe, and I'm trying to address a whole bunch of issues in one, that in most cases replacing the recommendation with an observation is something that I would consider satisfactory. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Avri?

Avri Doria:: Thank you. I have a very similar issue, but just wanted to make one extra point on it. The fact that something is being done now or is in a working group now is sort of ephemeral if it's a situation that could change, if there's -- something else was considered more efficient or if it was a change in variety -- a change -- I mean in priority, a change in staffing, what have you.

Also, we've seen working groups don't necessarily terminate in a process, in a decision. So therefore, having the recommendation is the necessary placeholder to make sure that something gets done and that in three years' time, in addition to the yearly reviews, but that in three years' time it is possible for ATRT3 to have the basis to review and say, yes, this was done; no, this wasn't done. And if something isn't already -- is already in practice because staff has been paying attention to our processes and has wonderfully already gotten some stuff in motion, that that just means that the first yearly report can have a much higher level of success indicated because some of the work is indeed underway.

I do think that it's probably a good idea to, in addition to the recommendation, also include the observation that the work is in progress and we praise that fact. Thanks. I apologize for using more than 30 seconds.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Avri, for keeping it to a minute and a half. Thank you, Alan, for just over a minute, and let's keep that going and strive for better.

Okay. Let's move to recommendation number 1. We have some time before the GAC global outreach session and discussion begins. Let's jump to the recommendations. I've lost my Adobe Connect for the minute, but I'm going to plow forward.

Alan Greenberg: We have Denise and Larisa's hand up, thought.

Brian Cute: Okay. Denise?

Denise Michel: Thanks. Just quickly to respond. We really appreciate the team's consideration of all the various staff input on this and, although to be consistent with previous discussions, staff felt it important to note the option of moving some of these to an observation and relying on all the existing project management tracking and reporting work that is going on. The position actually today by Avri and Alan is certainly understandable in the desire to have the extra weight of the ATRT recommendation rather than an observation and reliance on ongoing tracking and reporting. We do remain concerned about the breadth of the total (inaudible) recommendations and sub-recommendations and the work involved in ATRT, sort of special tracking and, if nothing else, the workflow that the next ATRT3.

As Alan has suggested, we'll look for ways of streamlining the ATRT work if the team chooses to go forward with all the recommendations. And we really appreciate the opportunity to work through the implementability on all of these. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Denise. Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Denise addressed my issue already. Thank you.

- Brian Cute: Okay. Let's -- with the minutes that we have before the start of the next session, recommendation 1. I sent around also last night a document where I just provided my own individual, non-chair reactions for creating some discussion points here.
- On recommendation 1, my point was that -- and I owned the editing of the recommendation. The most recent version I put forward effectively eliminated the measuring board/director performance element of the recommendation. So, I believe that, that being the proposed edit, that the staff response in that one has been addressed.
- Any very crisp points on that one? Denise, is your hand up anew?
- Denise Michel: No. I'm sorry.
- Brian Cute: Okay. And no discussion on that? Let's move to number 2. So, develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement. Two notes here. Number one, I thought the discussion with the board in Buenos Aires was very, very constructive and productive on this point. I heard a clear signal from the board that the board felt comfortable with the notion of measuring the board performance. Of course, the devil is in the details.
- And also clear, as pointed out in my notes, that publishing training materials that are the intellectual property of third parties might be a non-starter. But, the question I raised in my notes, among others was, to the extent that these types of materials that ICANN created can be published to the community, what would be the downside to doing so as it would be -- it would allow the community to see what's being done and to gauge the improvement efforts underway. And that's just an open question for me.
- So, looking for reaction from ATRT2 members or staff on this point.
- I don't see any hands up. Avri. Oh, no. Okay, no discussion?
- Denise Michel: I'm sorry, Brian, this is Denise.
- Brian Cute: Denise, please.
- Denise Michel: It would be -- couldn't it be -- and Amy may have an opportunity to discuss this today on this call or on the call that's being scheduled later in the week. It might be useful for the team to consider the recommendation asking for ICANN to come back with the actual metrics rather than suggesting some specific metric sets if staff is having trouble in implementing.
- And regarding the training material, would it be acceptable to just, I don't know, suggest a (inaudible) and how to jump to this (inaudible) sort of summarizing or hot-lining the types of training the board is getting and that would get you around the issue of proprietary material and give the community, I think, an overview of what the board is being trained on. I don't know that that's specific. Do you think -- and it'd probably just raise the question of whether the community would actually read through all the detailed material that the board uses if it can be published. And wondering whether a summary of what the board is being trained on might be more useful. And those are just my personal opinion to contribute to the conversation.
- Brian Cute: Let me offer the reaction to both points, Denise. And again, this is just my personal view and you're familiar with it, but I also think it's the posture the review team has taken, that on metrics, I think the review team indicates that the importance of metrics, that the staff

is working with One World Trust is a good sign, but that the review team doesn't feel it is an expert in what the right metrics are. But, there is an expectation and a recommendation that the organization develop them, adopt them and implement them. So, we really do leave that to the organization to manage forward.

In terms of any suggestion of how and what you communicate to the community, a baseline reaction is it's important to communicate to the community so they know what's going on. What form that takes and what is truly informative and useful so that there's an ability to gauge improvement of the board performance, again, leave that to the organization, but the communication is the key part.

Anything else to add from team members? Got a little bit of background nose. If someone could mute? Any other inputs? Okay. And again, we have a call on Friday as well that's being scheduled. We can take up any and all of these points if there's anything left hanging.

It is about half past the hour. So, why don't -- are the -- is the team ready to present, Larisa? The Global Stockholder Engagement Team?

Larisa Gurnick: Alright. It looks like we have Olof on the call, Mandy, Amy. And I think that might be it.

Denise Michel: Mandy, do you want to kick it off?

Brian Cute: Are we waiting for Tarek and others as well?

Sally Costerton: I'm on the call. It's Sally Costerton.

Brian Cute: Hello, Sally. It's Brian Cute.

Sally Costerton: Hi, Brian. How are you? I'm in a public place so I'm going to mute my phone. Mandy is aware of that. So I'm here for questions so I can pick out one or two of the items as needed.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much.

Sally Costerton: I think the person we're waiting for is -- that's perfectly fine. I think we're waiting for Tarek, aren't we, Mandy?

Mandy Carver: I have sent him -- I'm not certain. He was supposed to join, so--.

Sally Costerton: What -- do you want to kick off or how do you want to do this?

Mandy Carver: I can go forward. I'm expecting -- and texting him for some time.

Brian Cute: Why don't we kick it off. We're trying to manage time pretty carefully on this call. And with your indulgence and with my apologies to Tarek, why don't we kick off the session and I'm assuming he'll join shortly.

Mandy Carver: Okay. That would be helpful as many of us are in an all-day session on Friday that would make it a little harder to join, although we'll -- okay.

So, what I'd like to do is walk through some of the specific subsections of recommendation 6 pertaining to the GAC that go to just some comments and concerns that GSE staff. The first I'd like to talk about is 6.7, which is about the board should

regularize senior official meetings by asking the GAC to convene a high-level meeting on a regular basis, preferably at least once every two years.

The primary concern here is perhaps on certain anticipated possible negative impacts on the ICANN meetings. While staff absolutely is ready to support and recognizes the value of high-level meetings, the decision to host them comes down to the local host and the role of the national government in those meetings. The national government is not always the host in an ICANN meeting. And what we would hope is that this be changed to an observation of the importance and utility of these meetings, but not made a requirement or a recommendation of a schedule for implementation.

In part, if there are strategic reasons for doing them more frequently than every two years, one would hope that was a possibility, but we would also be concerned because of the increase both in cost and logistic burden that this puts on the local host that this not be in any way considered a prerequisite to the decision to host an ICANN meeting. And that's the primary reason for our making a recommendation or comment that this be turned into an observation rather than a recommendation.

Sally Costerton:

Mandy, do you want me to just add something to that. I think that's absolutely (inaudible) what you just said.

And just for the group to be aware, as an example of what Mandy's just described, we have in fact, I believe, got quite a high level of interest from the UK governments to hold their high-level meeting at the ICANN (inaudible) meeting in London in June, 2014, which would in fact be slightly less than two years since the last one. And that has to do with the nature of the sort of -- ambitions as a host, which is not the government in this case. There is no host as such. But the UK government seems quite closely involved in the planning of the meeting with us and is expressing a reasonably strong interest in doing that.

So, I would -- as Mandy says, I would be hopeful that where we have governments that really want to engage in that, we -- they will step forward. But, we don't want to be in a position where we force the governments of perhaps a much smaller country because they happen to be the ones that fall on the two-year anniversary that they have to host us. But overall, I would say there's good (inaudible) in our experience.

Brian Cote:

Thanks, Sally. I've got Heather's hand up.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you, Brian.

In terms of some of the sensitivities that staff have identified around this concept, I mean, this has come up as part of our work on ATRT2 before. Frankly, I felt we had addressed it, but I hear some of the same concerns again.

And I think it's important to remember that a recommendation is simply a recommendation. And this goes to the larger point that did come up in ATRT2 discussions with the GAC when we met in Buenos Aires to say, look, anything that relates to the GAC, the GAC would want to be part of implementing or discussing the implementation of a particular recommendation with the board. And so, we have to get the -- we have to find the right wording and so on for that. But, the idea is that this is a joint effort. And of course, input from staff are useful to us, especially when there are remaining concerns about something like this.

Really, I see no difficulty in having a recommendation. And it's really meant to be a target. It's not meant to be overly prescriptive as far as the willingness of the host to

come together with the GAC. And I'm not hearing mentions of the GAC, but clearly this has to be attached to the government committee at the organization to hold a high-level meeting. But, that's only going to happen if all the pieces do fall into place. And it's not meant to be imposing on local hosts, but rather providing some further motivation and target for holding these regularly because we think they're beneficial.

And we have an example. It worked well in Toronto. There we had a government host willing to do it. And the meeting was actually hosted by the country code operator, Sera (ph). So, I don't think there's difficulty there.

I would be cautious about appearing to push back on this, because I think it's quite likely that you'll get a negative reaction from representatives in the GAC who will see this as a hesitation to invite this kind of high-level arrangement to involve governments and raise awareness about ICANN and the GAC and so on. I hear staff using careful language about saying we do think it's important, but here are our concerns. But still, I think there's quite an opportunity for a negative response.

So, what I suggest is that we keep it as a recommendation. I do not see a reason to change this to an observation; particularly, as I say, when I'm confident that there will be quite a negative reaction to what will seem -- appear to be the downgrading of the importance or the (inaudible) of a high-level meeting for governments and that we focus discussion on implementing and some of those considerations as an effort between the GAC and the board in implementing that recommendation. Thank you.

Brian Cute:

Thank you, Heather. Larry?

Larry Strickling:

So, I agree with everything Heather says, but I'm going to be more direct, which is most of our recommendations are outgoing to the GAC to ask them to make improvements. This is one of the few places where we're asking ICANN to do something. And in this particular -- and in this case we've watered down the recommendation so that all you're asked to do is to request the GAC to organize these meetings every two years.

Frankly, I don't understand why you all can't do more of this. I think it's absolutely critical to your global engagement strategy. We have the example of the Canada meeting that Heather mentioned, where in that meeting we basically turned Turkey from a skeptic about ICANN into a big supporter of ICANN simply by having the opportunity to expose the ICANN process to a very senior Turkish official, who is now one of our strongest supporters.

We have to be finding those opportunities constantly to continue to expand the credibility of ICANN among other countries, particularly those in the developing world. And I, frankly, am worried that this recommendation isn't strong enough. There ought to be more of an expectation created that this is happening because, my God, it's the key to your long-term success in terms of dealing with the international community of governments. And I don't understand why you all don't see that and aren't jumping on this and -- for suggesting it needs to be even stronger than it is as opposed to turning it into an observation.

Brian Cute:

Thank you, Larry.

Any other reactions? ATRT2 or staff?

Mandy Carver:

May I just (inaudible). So, could it be with the target of two -- once every two years, but that would not be a prescription if you have enthusiasm to do it more frequently, such as

in London. Nor would it be a bar if we had feedback in particular meetings, either from the GAC or the local host if that was not a setting for a high-level meeting.

Brian Cute: I'm looking for hands. Larry?

Larry Strickling: Well, read the language. It says at least once every two years, which means you can do it more frequently. And if you run into problems, obviously it'll slip. But, my question is why aren't you all taking this on as a mandate for you all to be doing more in this regard? This is critical to your success. I don't understand why you aren't all over this in terms of trying to get governments together to talk about ICANN and see ICANN as opposed to saying, well, we have to push this off to the host country. We have to push this off to the GAC. I mean, I'm very concerned about the absolute reluctance I'm hearing from ICANN staff to take this on as a critical issue.

Again, the recommendation is mild. All it -- all the recommendation says is that you're going to ask the GAC to do something. But, behind it I'm worried that I'm not sensing any enthusiasm from ICANN to make this happen and I think it's critical to your success.

Brian Cute: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I have no problem saying with a target of no less than every two years. It's a target. I don't think anyone doesn't understand that there are restrictions and situations which will cause it not to happen. And ICANN cannot change the environment to make it happen if the local government has no interest. But, I'm agreeing completely with Larry. I just don't see why there's pushback. And if the language is too prescriptive, which I don't think it is, then we can make a minor modification. But, I think we're spending far too much time on this one. Thank you.

Brian Cute: I just want to offer this. This is Brian. If the concern coming from staff is primarily centered on will we be able to satisfy this recommendation and are we going to fail in our efforts if we don't do it a particular way, if that's part of the concern, I would suggest that that's not -- that's a misplaced concern.

From our prior experience with ATRT1, there were recommendations that we made, such as implement a comment and reply comment cycle. And the intention was clear and the top potential gain for the community and the board was clear and the staff went about the good work of doing that. And it turned out that that wasn't accepted or used by the community in a particular way and, at the end of the day, that effort didn't have the effect that was intended. But, that shouldn't be the concern of the staff here. If you think any aspect of the recommendation is in fact too prescriptive about the how, I think that's a conversation we can have. But, I think you're hearing a clear signal from the review team that the what, or the objective, should be pretty important and should be one worth striving for.

Sally Costerton: Brian, it's Sally. I hear you loud and clear. I mean, I think what -- this feels to me like -- with (inaudible) ICANN are not to want to engage governments (inaudible) for all the reasons Larry raised. And I wouldn't want this (inaudible) to be (inaudible) having a very strong recommendation that says it must be (inaudible) and therefore government that happens to pick up the lottery on that time has to do this. But, you've made that very clear in your comments, that that is not what you're saying. Have to make that very clear. And I think that clarifies it, certainly in my mind, that we're talking about an aspiration here that it's something we want to do more of. We're not going to force it on an unwilling government, but we'd like to keep it top of mind and we should be reviewing it regularly, every time we look at an ICANN meeting or on a regular basis. And I

certainly hear that recommendation in the spirit that I think it's been intended, which is very helpful.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Sally.

Larry, is your hand up anew?

Larry Strickling: Oh, I guess maybe I didn't take it down from the last one. I'm getting warmed up here.

Brian Cute: Okay. Mandy, I think we can move forward.

Mandy Carver: Yes, absolutely. Thank you.

6.8, we wanted -- there are two items. One is that when we had prepared these comments, there was an anticipation that we would be providing a presentation in the Buenos Aires meeting. And I just want to flag that, understandably, given the heavy agenda, it was not possible for us to -- it was not possible for the GAC to make space in their agenda for a presentation, although we did submit materials in advance. But, I just wanted to acknowledge that our materials -- our comments say that we were making a presentation in Buenos Aires and that, in the end, did not take place.

We wanted in our replies to highlight the ways in which we are currently working with the GAC in the coordination of the engagement of governments. And also, to keep GAC members current on what activities GSE is engaged in. And those, as it says in the notes, include things like monthly reporting and the activities of the regional VPs in reaching out to the specific GAC representatives when they're active in countries that are members. And then -- and certainly in outreach and explanations about the ICANN multi-stakeholder model and the role of governments when they are interacting with ministers, etc., that are not members. There's an explanation of the role of the GAC and how to contact the GAC secretariat if the government wants to become members.

I think that mostly this was both a sensitivity to the volume of the work that the GAC is already engaged in and a concern that the board not be tasking advisory committees to take on additional work that would, in fact, be creating guidelines on an operational level for staff activities rather than in the traditional role of advisory committees and the development of policy and the addressing of concerns raised by those specific constituents.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Mandy. Any comments?

I'm not seeing anything. So, is the suggestion -- the suggestion here is that this recommendation be withdrawn or revised?

Mandy Carver: Well, we would probably say withdraw the recommendation that the board be tasking the GAC or any advisory committee to develop guidelines for staff activity. But, we do want to highlight that we embrace and support coordination and cooperation and are receptive to other ways that we can work together and keep the GAC engaged and in the loop on activities.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

Heather?

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Brian. It sounds to me that we need to make sure that we have the right language. Again, the suggestion that this be withdrawn or that there not be guidelines,

I'm not sure I see, really, what the difficulty is. Anytime you're needing to coordinate between two or more parties, you're going to benefit from having guidelines or clarity on that. So, anyway, let's look at the language of the recommendation and focus our efforts there. And remember, there are staff support to ICANN. And so, if those staff are working with staff at ICANN on guidelines, perhaps that's a good thing. So, I'll leave it there. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Heather. Any other comments? Larry?

Larry Strickling: So, I would just affirm Heather's comments. I agree with them. I think there needs to be a recommendation. I think there need to be guidelines. If the problem is having GAC draft guidelines, let's fix that. But, it seems like we're picking at the -- some technicality to try to abandon an entire recommendation and I can't agree to that.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Larry.

Okay. I think we're going to take that onboard as a drafting exercise.

Thank you, Mandy. Could you move to your next point?

Mandy Carver: Yes, 6.9. This is about instructing GSE to develop with the community input based on a set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement. And this is just a flag that we are already actively engaged with the community for feedback through both conference calls and webinars that engage both the SOAC leadership and members of their community.

I do want to flag that the global engagement plan was discussed in Buenos Aires in the -- and presented to the community. There was not a separate presentation to the GAC in Buenos Aires, again, due to the heavy workload for the GAC and the gTLDs, etc., that were on the agenda.

Sally Costerton: It's Sally here. If I understand this, this recommendation, it goes wider than just a GAC. Is that correct, Brian?

Brian Cute: Well, I'm looking--.

Sally Costerton: Or if it's only about the GAC and the GAC (inaudible) to the board?

Brian Cute: It's broader than the GAC. It's seeking community input.

Sally Costerton: That's what I thought.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Sally Costerton: Yes, that's what I thought. So, just -- I think there's quite a lot here and we haven't got that much time on the call. But just so the review team knows, as Mandy says, we developed a global stockholder engagement plan and a separate government engagement plan. The global stockholder engagement plan was shared with the community after a lot of input from a very good group; a very, really engaged group of committee members. We had about 70 or 80 people in the room in Buenos Aires, so this has been a very consistent group we've worked with. So, the plan has been put together partly with their feedback.

The second thing I would say is that there are some draft KPIs in that plan, which is what you refer to in Mandy's slide. In addition, Susanna Bennett, the ICANN COO, as you may know, in a separate part of the forest, as it were, is working very actively now on an

overall dashboard for ICANN, which Fadi mentioned in his presentation at Buenos Aires. And that contains a whole section of KPIs around stakeholder engagement, which also leads onto the next topic when you're talking about this how do we bring people in from areas of the world, but perhaps there hasn't been as much -- it hasn't been easy for them to access programs and activities.

The primary -- two things that I'd finish on. So one is that process, assessing those KPIs is an ongoing and it will (inaudible).

Brian Cute: Sally, we're losing you a bit.

Mandy Carver: Brian, I think she was stressing that there are a number of KPIs that are in development and there's also an organization-wide revisiting of the dashboards and developments of KPIs. So, this work is underway and ongoing.

I think that we had some specific questions under some specific subsets. And they go to 6.91--.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Mandy Carver: Which is the question of the database. And there is work ongoing for the creation of a CRM with the expectation that that would, of course, integrate all of the existing information on the current GAC members. And I guess the question is on the relevant ministers. One of the issues with these kinds of databases is they are both resource intensive to develop, but they also are resource intensive to maintain, particularly when you're talking--.

Sally Costerton: I'm so sorry. Sorry, Mandy. I got cut off--.

Mandy Carver: Go ahead.

Sally Costerton: For some bizarre reason.

Brian Cute: We hear you now, Sally.

Sally Costerton: Sorry. Love the Adigo line.

So, all -- I was just going to finish on what I was saying. This is -- I'm incredibly happy about the level of input from the community. We'll continue to encourage that. As we start to finalize the section of KPIs and the overall dashboard that relates to engagement, we will share those on an ongoing basis with those people in the community, increasing - a growing number of groups in the community who are interested in them. I felt that the group might like to be aware of that and the availability of the plan.

Sorry for the disrupted conversation.

Brian Cute: No, thanks very much, Sally. And KPIs are wonderful and it sounds like you have a very robust plan.

Two points here. First, on the observation versus recommendation. This is a point I raised at other -- in reaction to other inputs here. If good work is ongoing and you have KPIs and you have deliverables and communications plans, unless a recommendation adds a specific burden that we need to understand from an implementability standpoint, we wouldn't move away from making a recommendation.

Mandy just started to speak to something that is important, which is building a database, maintaining a database, what's the cost involved, what's the operational complexity of that. Those generically are important questions that we need to understand from an implementability standpoint.

At the same time, the motivation for this recommendation, to my understanding, was the ATRT2 endeavored to send letters out to high-level government officials to alert them to this process and, in so doing, learned very painfully that the necessary database of contacts for these very critical individuals just doesn't exist. And so that we view as a problem that needs to be addressed.

Mandy, any other points on the database operation?

Mandy Carver: I guess the only is a question of who are the relevant ministers. And one of the issues is at different times you will want to interact with different portions of a government, whether that may mean -- if they're in the GAC, obviously, the first point of contact would be the GAC member. That might mean administrative communications in some interactions with the governments around various issues. And in part of our engagement work, we might be working with the trade minister or the foreign affairs people, etc.

So, the real issue is that we have, in fact, created these databases at different times for different initiatives. It becomes a full-time position to simply maintain and update if you imagine what happens each time there's an election or a change in portfolio at a ministerial level.

The other is the utility of doing broadcast letters to governments. There are cultural differences in how people respond, whether they'll respond to electronic transmission, etc. Just so that they're -- we want to make sure that we do this in the way that is most resource sensitive and that we are addressing the concern. So, if there's some clarity on who relevant ministers might be, specifically, because that can be a much broader realm, then -- but, in any case, that was our concern in that instance. And it has been our experience that you don't always get a response when you're writing to a blind, if you will, even if it's a targeted letter to a specific minister, they don't understand the background and haven't had a prior contact from the entity, it may not generate a response.

And then we have a question on 6.92, if there can be some additional input on -- is there a deficit seen in the use of the GAC advice register? And is there something about the way it's being used or is it something in addition to the GAC register that is being requested?

Brian Cute: Okay. I've got Fiona Alexander, I've got Heather, I've got Alan are in the queue. I'm going to ask folks to be brief on their points. And coming back to you, Mandy, we're running out of time on our session here, so let's (inaudible).

Mandy Carver: Right.

Brian Cute: Fiona Alexander?

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. So, just to be brief, and I'll defer to Heather and Larry on the substance, but I think the public comments that we've received so far very strongly support these recommendations. I think it's important to take into account when considering the reaction and the feedback. And also, the write-ups that justify or explain the recommendations have a lot of background material that might be useful for ICANN staff to read that explain what the recommendations are trying to get at. And that's unclear to

me from the comments we've received (inaudible) or a thorough reading of that. So, I would just offer that.

And in writing that -- those write-ups, we actually took the input from the ICANN staff on the first draft, which was very helpful. And I think we tried to capture all the going work that was already there, but I think if the write-ups miss all the work you guys are doing it would good to point that out so we can include it.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Fiona.

Larry? Or sorry, I've got Heather then Larry.

Heather Dryden: Thanks again, Brian.

So, I'm just wondering whether staff has looked into the GAC liaison at all. He could have helped point you towards some of the discussion, including the exchange with the ATRT2 in Buenos Aires where we talked about some of these issues, as well as the ones raised earlier by staff.

And as far as the databases of governments are concerned, this is something that we have had back and forth about throughout. And again, it's a bit frustrating to see it coming up again on this call. But, the fact of the matter is that the GAC is continually dealing with the part of government that is responsible for ICANN and probably more broadly internet governance at the same time for now over 130 governments. So, this isn't all of the governments in the world, but what you do have is an up to date database of more than 130 governments and government GAC members, meaning those governments are continually updating their representatives that are coming in and out of the GAC and each time we update our records in the GAC and check them.

And so there, a minister or director general and so on and so forth are the person responsible for matters related to GAC and ICANN. It may be the case that it is useful to talk to other -- to governments, but I would hope that in most, if not all instances, you would be going through the GAC representatives, or using them at least, to keep them looped in on your outreach to other parts. I mean, there's no lack of clarity on this point, to my mind.

So, I would hope that you would acknowledge that and that you would understand that the GAC, out of necessity, needs to keep dedicating a significant amount of effort to maintain those records and dealing with those issues. So, make good use of it.

Regarding the GAC advice register, this did come up in the discussion in Buenos Aires with the ATRT2. And I myself pointed out that I think it's the rules and procedures around the register where we could usefully focus our attention. And again, this is something that could have been clarified by either working with the GAC liaison or having some sort of discussion, rather than allocating it to the level of identifying what are I think smaller issues while we're on a conference call of the ATRT2 and close to finalizing this report.

So, there we are. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. And I've got Alan and then Larry. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, just very quickly. I completely support some of the things that were said, that letters may not be the right way to get people. And maintaining a database, an exhaustive database of all ministers that may be relevant and creating it and maintaining it may be

inappropriate. The intent of the recommendation is that ICANN has the ability to contact relevant governments when it needs to. And if that doesn't come clear from the recommendation, then maybe the wording needs to be changed slightly. The recommendation as I read it seems to be not particularly prescriptive. Maybe the word database is incorrect. But, the intent is what we're trying to get through and that I don't think there's any interest in withdrawing. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Larry?

Larry Strickling: Well, I just need to channel Jurgen because he's not on the call. I mean, the reason for this recommendation is that -- largely driven by Jurgen and some of the other government members of the ATRT2, we wanted to send a letter out to ministers. That letter was delayed for months because ICANN didn't have an up to date address list.

And then your comment that you don't always get a response, the fact is that that letter got no response from anybody. And in fact, I don't think any of the government members of the ATRT who might have been the intended addressee of the letter ever got the letter. So, it just pointed out a real important failure at ICANN in terms of its ability to reach governments when you need to. I kind of -- I tend to agree with Alan. I mean, if creating a database isn't how you solve the problem, maybe there's a better way, but I -- nobody's suggesting you have to go out and spend a lot of dollars on this. Heck, even having an Excel spreadsheet that somebody kept up to date would have been an improvement over what we had, which was a disaster. So, I will now stop channeling Jurgen and drop my hand.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Mandy, we are out of time on this session, but happy to, as quickly as we can, get through whatever points you have. We do have a call on Friday, but you all are here, as is Sally, so let's take advantage; if we can, very succinctly.

Mandy Carver: The only other item we would raise is we just want to underline that regional engagement strategies are bottom-up exercises that are driven by the community themselves. And so the priorities that have been identified vary depending on the region. And so the development and the importance of the DNS and access to the next round of new gTLDs, etc., the DNS market is not -- has not been identified as of the same priority in every region. And so that's the only -- the item we wanted to flag. And also, it wasn't -- the rest of it is just placement, whether this is particularly GAC related. But we do understand the intent; that they want -- that there should be equality of access to ICANN programs, regardless of region or economy.

Sally Costerton: It's Sally. I would build on that. Specifically, there will be a matrix in the final engagement plan I referred to earlier on, which will be entrenched on our website and will list by, if you will, kind of circle the group (inaudible) access. So it might be registries and (inaudible) or it might be governments or it might be civil society and by region. So, if you were for example an entrepreneur in Ghana who wanted to get involved in the DNS and becoming a DNS entrepreneur or apply perhaps for the next strand of gTLDs, you would be able to click on a link that would take you to the person to plan the activities and the commentary and the content that would allow you to actively sign up for that. That's quite a big piece of work and it's bringing several of the engagement teams activities which Mandy's been referring to which are very community based with the communications team's activities at ICANN.

And the final thing I would as is that, as some of you will be aware, we've been engaged for about six or seven months now on a major bottom-up review of our digital engagement strategy with a very specific goal that, in many cases, people who want to be involved in our programs won't necessarily come to an ICANN meeting. May not even

be aware that those programs are there. So, there was an awareness raising exercise, especially in the DNS space, not exclusively. So, the activities of the digital team, the communications team, the PR team if you like, and the regional team are very closely linked in the delivery against this goal.

And just to finish, from my personal perspective, I would consider this to be one of the primary objectives of the engagement and communications function of ICANN. And setting KPIs that show we're moving the needle on this kind of access is really important. And it's not always easy because we don't have very good base data of who's engaged in it at kind of the moment, sort of less than one might imagine. But, our new additional engagement, our new website structure were, as some of you may know, you may have been involved in the (inaudible) of developing it, will allow us to have much more infrastructure about what people need and who they are and how we can help them.

So, I do anticipate that -- over time that they will become much better at tracking (inaudible) numbers. But, I want to reassure the committee of the priority of this goal for the teams at ICANN.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much, Sally. The sentiment is well shared. This is Brian.

If I can add my own two cents here, I think in terms of interpreting the recommendation, an this is my own two cents, that really the emphasis is on the last part of it, that they can make use of ICANN's services, including new gTLDs. I don't think the recommendation should be construed that ICANN is getting into the business of developing or somehow playing a role in the business models underneath on a region by region basis at all. It's really from an ICANN has a set of services that need to be available to all. And so, if that helps in the interpretation of the recommendation, I think that's an important element.

Sally Costerton: Brian, it does. And I would add specifically, of course, the set up of the hub offices, which will be (inaudible) matrix across those service sets. For example, the setting up of the phone line in Beijing and the Beijing engagement center which is handling around 200 calls a month, mostly in Chinese, in the Chinese language, often about things like how do I register my domain name and this kind of thing, is a very good example of exact -- more precisely, in fact, with your clarification, of service provisions is perhaps a better way of putting it, rather than awareness driven.

Brian Cute: Thanks. Good. Okay, that's good input. And again, we have another call on Friday. So, if there's any additional thoughts that you all have coming off of this conversation for us to consider, please feed those into the call on Friday.

Mandy, any other points for us to consider?

Mandy Carver: I am mindful of your time schedule so, at this point, no. I don't have anything else to add. Sally?

Sally Costerton: No. Thank you all for participating in this very helpful clarification discussion.

Mandy Carver: Thank you very much for giving us your time.

Brian Cute: Thank you all. Thanks very, very much and we'll be communicating soon. Thank you.

Okay. Charla, if we could go back to the agenda document.

So, that was good. We made some progress. And I think we left off on -- was it recommendation 3? I think that was the one we left off on.

Just to make a note here, we have Chris coming in in about 45 minutes. Is that correct?
Chris LaHatte, Ombudsman?

Charla Shambley: Yes, that's correct.

Brian Cute: Okay. So, we've got 45 minutes to make some more progress here on the staff's assessment of, and response to, the draft report. So, let's pick up where we left off, which was recommendation 3, conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine the qualification of the board candidate pools, improved once compensation was available.

On my notes -- and again, these are my notes only and I'm open to hear from the rest of the review team, not to mention the staff. My sense is if compensation review is something that is regularly conducted, documented, can be communicated in some form, we could consider eliminating that aspect of the recommendation, but there's some ifs in that statement. And I think we did have an open question.

Fiona Alexander: Hey, Brian, this is Fiona. I'm sorry to interrupt, but were we going to finish the GAC stuff? I think there was three in the recommendations that the staff had questions on. And I think Amy's on the phone as well, or are we going to do that another time?

Brian Cute: If Amy's here for that purpose, then we can plow forward on the GAC stuff.

Amy Stathos: So, this is Amy. I'm not necessarily here for the GAC stuff, Fiona, so I'm not sure what the process is. I think Olof was scheduled to talk about those. I can certainly try to answer any questions that you might have.

Brian Cute: We can finish running through recommendation 6, that's the GAC, right?

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. I'm just taking it off the chart that Larisa sent, where she had indicated Amy Stathos for 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6. So I mean if now's not the time, we just wanted to know when. And I think Heather's hand was up as well.

Brian Cute: Okay. Heather?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Just to clarify, Amy's name was listed on there, that is true, but it was really Olof that was prepared to speak on the remaining GAC recommendations. So, this may be something that we can take up on Friday since Olof dropped off the call already.

Brian Cute: Heather? Heather, are you there?

Heather Dryden: Sorry, I was on mute. So, I have 15 minutes before I need to go on to the other call. But as to Olof being on the call or -- I don't know. I have no previous information about that, so I'm at a bit of a loss on this call.

Brian Cute: Okay. So, we've got part way through the GAC recommendations and staff's input. If Olof is the point person from staff to speak to the balance of these recommendations in terms of staff input?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct.

Brian Cute: Okay. And he is not here. So, I don't know about, Heather, your availability on Friday? Do we have a schedule for the call on Friday? Do we have a time?

Larisa Gurnick: Not yet, Brian. You have suggested some timeframes, but we don't have a call out yet to find out what time would be best for everybody. We were waiting to see who would need to be involved in this call.

Brian Cute: Heather, I think it would be important for you to be involved in that. I'm sure Larry, Carlos, any of the other government representatives would be interested in that. It really doesn't make sense to do this without Olof if he has specific talking point or can react to our reaction. I would suggest then that we put out a poll, do a poll for the call. I would suggest that whoever can make that call on Friday, please do. If for whatever reason you can't, I guess what I'd recommend is then seeing the staff input on the balance of the GAC recommendations here. I would ask you to put into e-mail form your reaction, your questions, your clarifications so that we can factor that into the Friday call and we'll take that onboard. I think that's the best we can do unless somebody has a better suggestion.

Heather, is your hand up?

Heather Dryden: (Inaudible), that sounds fine, though, since I am on the line. And I will join the call on Friday. And in the meantime, I can catch up with Olof as well and find out what's happening.

Brian Cute: Okay, that'd be great. If everyone's comfortable proceeding that way, that's what we'll do and we'll finish the balance of the GAC staff input on Friday.

Okay. Then let's do move back to recommendation 3. And again, where we left off on that, there were two points, two reactions I had to the staff input. One, if there is a regular assessment of director compensation by the board that's taking place, that's documented, that can be seen or communicated in some way, then that may be an aspect that we could consider dropping.

And on the determining whether there's been improvement in board candidate pools, there was a fact question that we had open in Buenos Aires. It was has the NomCom retained the candidate information that would provide the basis for making that type of an assessment. And I don't think we knew the answer to that. Do we have an answer, staff? Has anyone checked with the NomCom on that? I know we haven't; I don't think so.

Amy Stathos: Brian, this is Amy.

Brian Cute: Yes, Amy.

Larisa Gurnick: Oh, go ahead, Amy. I'm sorry.

Amy Stathos: No. Larisa, if you have an answer, go ahead.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, we did check with NomCom and the response was sent to the ATRT2. There is certain information that gets retained. For how long it's retained is dependent on whether the candidate opts in to be kept as part of the pool for a certain amount of time. And all that information is confidential to the NomCom staff, essentially.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: But a more fulsome response is available and has been sent to ATRT2.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'll go check that. Amy?

Amy Stathos: No, I think that's what I was just going to say, Brian, is that there's different levels of data that's maintained, depending on what the individual candidate has accepted or agreed to do. So, if you -- I think reviewing that response is probably going to answer your question.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Amy Stathos: And then secondly, on respect to the director's compensation, yes, I think we can figure out a way to post that. Currently, the board is talking about figuring out whether it's a once every year or once every two years or once every three years, but they're definitely regularizing the review of that. The last review was in 2011. They're currently doing it now, two years later. So, definitely there's a place we can figure out where to post that, that it's absolute and it's made public and transparent as the review of the compensation is conducted.

Brian Cute: Yeah. And I think that would be -- that would obviously be helpful. Okay, thank you for that input. I will check the NomCom e-mail to determine what kind of data may be available for purposes of doing a qualitative and quantitative study.

Any other points from ATRT2 members or staff? Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. This is Avri. On this, I first of all want to state once again against taking something out of a recommendation status and moving it to a lesser status. I believe this should remain a recommendation.

And also, in terms of the parts that are being brought up as difficult, there is a lot of experience, especially as one starts to collect data longitudinally for anonymizing the data, or basically taking things like skills and skill sets measured, for taking things like understanding and abstracting information from the 180-degree reviews that the boards do of themselves. And certainly not in an individual year by year basis, but having that data anonymized and basically subjected to being used as metrics. So, I really don't -- I think perhaps giving better advice on ways to do this, although, as we said before, they should really go to experts. There are experts that know how to do this longitudinal, difficult, statistical work and I think we should maintain our recommendation that it be done. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Avri. Any other points on this? Okay. We've got our to-dos on that one. Thank you.

Moving to number 4. On this one, in my reaction I noted that I had to redraft that recommendation, a, to put it into plain English, hopefully. Hopefully in language. But that -- the modification or edit to that recommendation does reflect ongoing work and recommend that the ongoing work continue. So, the baseline question I had on that and reaction to staff's input is -- also, the point of changing vernacular to policy versus implementation, I think that's an improvement as well for clarification purposes.

And other than that, what would be the additional burden that a recommendation puts on the organization that we're unaware of?

Heather? Can't hear you if you're on mute. Heather? I'm going to move to Amy, Heather, and then come back to you. Amy?

Amy Stathos: Thanks, Brian. Yeah, so I think with the revisions, I have not seen the revisions that you're talking about, but it sounds like you addressed the concerns that were raised here in terms of vernacular, etc.

In terms of the additional burden, I don't necessarily think that there is an additional burden. I think one of the concerns that we just want to make clear is that the recommendations from the ATRT are not intended to override or get in front of the ongoing community work. And so that the ongoing community work can in fact be the basis for the implementation of the recommendation. I think that's the only real concern in terms of suggesting that this be looked at as a recognition of the ongoing work. So, I think with that it's probably fine as long as that understanding is held by everybody.

Brian Cute: Amy, let me take up those points. In my revision I don't think I've made the policy versus implementation vernacular adjustment yet, but I will. So to be clear on what revision I sent to the list, I don't think I hit that yet, but I think that's the right way to go.

To your point, too, about recognition of ongoing work and the community work, again, most times we try not to be prescriptive. And certainly in my review of the record, the engagement on this issue has become more robust and more meaningful and I don't think the recommendation is designed to override or be prescriptive of how the community and staff go about the work, but I'll check that point on the draft.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri again. On this one, I think it's important to remember that a working group is indeed something -- they indeed come to an end and have a proposed solution; then again, it may not.

Also, it's important to remember that the way the whole work that is being done now, yes, it's being done in a relatively bottom-up manner at the moment, but the way in terms of the work being structured and defined was a staff-driven process. So basically, putting this recommendation should indeed take account of ongoing work, but it shouldn't go so far as to say and therefore that's the only thing that needs to be done. It again needs the recommendation, perhaps with some clarifications or a change of words as you've done, to hold it firm and to basically make sure that that recommendation is paid attention to. So, thanks.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks, Avri, and thanks, Amy.

Why don't we move on to number 5. Okay. And number 5, determine how the proper scope of redaction could be reasonably confirmed. I do take the points raised by staff on this one. And there was a question from the staff about are there specific examples that could be provided of redactions where a particular look behind process could be exercised or should be exercised. I do want to put that back to the team. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you again. And sorry about the pause it takes to turn the microphone on and off.

On this one, one of the things that I thought the process for determining when things can become unredacted, I guess, was just discussed, is also good. But in this one, there's also an issue of what are the reasons for redaction? Remember -- and perhaps we haven't been clear enough in explaining this, but that we're suggesting, that we're recommending that there be an assumption of transparency except where exceptions are made. So, what are the categories of exceptions that can be made?

And then, also, I think there's also the notion that when something is redacted, the reasons for its redaction - it was a category two redaction because of personal data or what have you - is indeed known; that just the random appearing, drawing of black lines through text saying that, don't you worry, it was redacted for a good reason is not

sufficient to meet the base of default transparency. Redaction where required and explained. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Avri. Amy and then Alan.

Amy Stathos: Sure. Thanks, Brian. And Avri, look, I completely appreciate your comments and so let me just remind everybody, because I'm not sure everybody's aware. Every -- with every posting of board meeting materials where there are redactions, the guideline for the categories of items that could be redacted and why are also posted together in the same box. In addition, when there is a redaction placed upon a document, in the upper left-hand corner there is an explanation for the grounds for why that redaction took place; whether it be confidential private information, privileged and confidential. I mean, there's a reason on each box for -- where something is blacked out. Just to remind the team that that does occur.

Brian Cute: Let me just -- oh, okay, Alan. Please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I wanted to remind that one of the other issues which was raised before was, when things are redacted, there's never any check to see whether it's no longer necessary to redact it. There are often things that say they need to be kept confidential at the moment. When we asked whether anyone reviews them to say are -- to unredact them when there's no longer need for confidence, the answer was no, no one does that. So, it's not only the redaction, it's the revealing of information when it's no longer a cause for redaction if it was a temporary cause. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan.

And just my own point here. I think, Amy, that your points are very well taken and understood. And I think what Alan just said, in addition to Avri, is really what the focus of ATRT2 was how do we check all this. And I know that's difficult and I know it's -- if you run it through your policy and you followed your policy and only the proper things have been redacted and the policy's clear, that's understood. The question was how do we confirm it.

Amy Stathos: Yeah. Absolutely, Brian. And again, this is Amy for the record. And you'll see in the staff response we absolutely agree that that is a process that we can implement and put in place. So, to put in a process where we regularly go back and review items that have been redacted to determine whether they can be released at some point in time, we agree that that is an implementable process and think that's a good recommendation.

Brian Cute: So, if the recommendation were drafted so that's clear that was the aim, that's implementable. You would see that as being a useful--.

Amy Stathos: Yes.

Brian Cute: If it's in the process. And then the question that would come back to the ATRT2 members, is that hitting the mark from your perspective. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. In terms of what has recently started to happen with the board decisions and such, that is a great start and, yes, there should be an observation that that is a good start. I would think that these redaction rules, though, apply not only to the particular board meetings and the particular documents and the board materials, but basically would apply to any and all ICANN documentation. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you.

Alan, are you up from before?

Oh, no, I'm sorry. Amy?

Amy Stathos: Oh, sorry. No, I already -- I should lower my hand.

Brian Cute: Okay. Okay, I think that was a helpful exchange. We'll take that onboard in terms of the drafting.

Okay, let's move to number 7. Number 7, explore mechanisms to improve public comment through adjusted time allotments, forward planning regarding the number of consultations, giving anticipated growth and participation and new tools that facilitate participation.

So, the staff input is heard. The suggestion of changing a recommendation into an observation. And we've discussed our view on that more broadly.

Just my reaction -- focused reaction here is that the -- as I noted, the number of consultations and the challenge of managing for participation is a very consistent and loud pain point that we're hearing from the community. That alone is an issue that if it could be better managed would, I think, greatly improve the work of the ACs, SOs, the members, the volunteers. I think there's important weight there. And their recommendation calls for what staff is setting out to do, which is develop new tools.

So, any input from the board -- I mean, from the staff or from the review team on this one? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, just one thing to highlight. You said that it's a pain point. That's true. But, the real concern is that because of the volume and because of the process of how it's done, that means ICANN is not getting considered comments because of the issues. And that threatens our credibility. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

And I think that these are some of the reasons why the review team would feel strongly that a recommendation is appropriate. The question I would have back to Amy and anybody on the staff is from an implementability perspective is there anything about the way the recommendations currently drafted that creates serious obstacles to implementation or aspects of implementation we really need to consider before finalizing that.

So, if there are other points to bring forward, we are all ears.

Okay, not seeing any hands up on that. Let's move forward to 9. And 9 and the 9.1, 9.2 have to do with board -- well, let's start with 9.1. Mandate board response to advisory committee, formal advice and the ICANN bylaws should be amended to include language to accommodate that. The staff recommendation has changed from -- staff's input has changed from recommendation to observation to extent to work already underway.

Any points here from the review team or staff? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I don't understand staff -- the staff comment. It says the work is underway. What, in fact, is happening is there's process in place to make the bylaw requirement less relevant, but that's only operational issues which can change on a dime

and certainly almost surely will change as boards turn over. So, I don't understand how this can be classed as underway. Perhaps not as urgent, but not underway.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan.

Any feedback from staff or ATRT2 members?

I'm not seeing any hands.

Okay. Okay, not seeing any hands. Let's move forward.

9.2, explore options for restructuring current review mechanisms. ICANN board should convene a special committee to discuss options for improving board accountability with regard to restructuring independent review and the reconstruction process. This group will use a report of the experts' group report (inaudible) on restructuring as one basis for its discussion.

I just want to add, one thing that I found important from the interaction with the board, and I'm not sure if it was Mike or not, but there was a sentiment expressed by a director that while there is the view of the board that there was a process that went through, that it was clear, that it was, from their perspective, well managed and that the implementation of ATRT1 recommendation was executed that there appears to be a clear and sharp disagreement from the community about how that was done and the affect of it. And that -- on that -- because of the existence of that sharp disagreement, that pursuing this recommendation or this exercise had some value. I'm not saying that was the entire board, but it was a clear sentiment expressed by a director.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you.

I think there was an expression by a number of directors that the current reconsideration process does not address what the community believes there should be a process for. Clearly, it wasn't unanimous. Clearly there were some concerns that a new process might open the door to anyone who's not happy asking for something to be reviewed. But, that there was a strong dissatisfaction in the community and among part of the board that we do not have a process in place which can address a perceived need. So, I don't see how we could avoid putting this recommendation in in some close form to what's there.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan.

Any other comments on this one?

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands raised. Let's move to 9.3, reviewing the (inaudible) role. This is a good time for a time check since we're here -- well, he's 20 minutes away.

Amy Stathos: Brian, this is Amy.

Brian Cute: Yes, Amy?

Amy Stathos: I just have a couple clarification questions on 9.2.

Brian Cute: Sure.

Amy Stathos: In the recommendation as it's written it talks about a group. We use the report of the experts' group report as a basis for -- as one of the bases for its discussion.

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Amy Stathos: To clarify, in the staff response, is that meaning the accountability structure's expert panel that was empanelled pursuant to the ATRT1 and just a different way of reporting how that -- what they were called?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Amy Stathos: Or -- okay.

Brian Cute: I believe that was the target, Amy, on that point, yes.

Amy Stathos: Okay, I just wanted to make sure there wasn't some other expert group that you were anticipating.

Brian Cute: No, I don't think so. If I'm wrong on that, ATRT members, speak up. But, I think that was what we meant by that, we can correct that.

Unidentified Participant: We have so -- I have so many expert groups these days it's hard to keep--.

Amy Stathos: I know.

Brian Cute: Okay, we'll make that correction.

Amy Stathos: Okay, good. I just wanted to clarify that.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Amy Stathos: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Yep, we got it. Thanks.

(Inaudible) role. The role is defined and the bylaw shall be reviewed to determine whether it is still appropriate as defined or whether it needs to be expanded or otherwise revised to help deal with such issues as -- and then there's the series of issues that goes through 9.3.3, I believe. Avri, I'm going to ask you. Those are the relevant ones for the (inaudible)? I think I have that right.

Okay, staff's input. But, this is feasible and bylaw changes may be required. And this is a -- Amy, just to be clear, you're saying consideration of the role, not the (inaudible), the person. It's the function that we need to focus on in terms of the drafting, correct?

Amy Stathos: Right. Yeah, this is Amy, for the record. Yes, Brian, that's right, is that based on what the scope of the position is helps inform who the person to fill the role would be. So, you need to definitely evaluate the position of the (inaudible) -- the office of the (inaudible) as opposed to the current person.

Brian Cute: Right.

Amy Stathos: One other comment that we made in understanding the scope for our review so that when whoever's doing the review understands what's being looked at would be a question -- the clarification requested for 9.3.2--.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Amy Stathos: Which is -- yeah. What is meant by related to the public policy functions of ICANN specifically so we can understand what the review would be evaluating?

Brian Cute: Yeah, fine question for clarification. ATRT2 members, assist me with this.

Avri, I think you had this. Yeah, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Hi. Sorry, on the tablet it just takes me so long to switch from one window to another that I can't comment quickly when I was asked a question.

In this one -- and I think it was an awkward phrasing, but it was trying to differentiate between the issues where if an employees interaction with the policymaking community, with the work that we do, it's not -- basically what it's trying to exclude is the issues that have to do with the employee relationship with ICANN as employees, avoiding using the world (inaudible) employee. But, basically, there's those issues that this wasn't being directed at. But, any of their activity, whether it was in the policy making teams, in the operational teams, in the compliance teams where the issues came up that there were employee issues related to -- now, these are some of the things that pertain to the outline, but not necessarily -- that the employees issues have to do with the work of ICANN not the management structure of ICANN. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Let me ask -- and Avri, I understand the distinction you're making. An employee, whether they're working on the policy aspects or back in the office doing other tasks are an employee of the organization. That doesn't change. Is that a meaningful distinction from your perspective, Amy, to make or can we make this as more of a blanket recommendation that would cover both categories of activity?

Amy Stathos: Well, I mean, I think Avri's point of trying to make the distinction is important because I think it's -- we've got to be very careful not to infringe upon or have somebody from the outside or who's independent infringe upon actual employee relations between employees and their managers, etcetera. I still think a little bit more explanation, possibly in the final report to explore a little bit more of what Avri's trying to distinguish would be helpful to understand a little bit better as to what the idea of what an (inaudible) might help work -- help with would be still advantageous because I think it's still a little fuzzy.

I get better now what the distinction was that Avri was trying to make. But, maybe a little bit more explanation would be helpful as well.

Brian Cute: Okay. And I just heard you say effectively an outside party interfering between -- in the relationship between an employee and a manager. And you're talking about the (inaudible) there. And that maybe we could use a little more clarity on what the live issues are there and what boundaries or desired boundaries should be.

Amy Stathos: Okay. So, we can try to think about how to put some words around that, certainly, in terms of employee relations.

Brian Cute: Yeah, I think if we're going to get a good clarity on the distinction that Avri's trying to make, and there's -- that's an important aspect. If you can provide us with some guidance there, and then we can work toward the end of creating something that's clear all the way around.

Thank you. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I -- we always worry about trying to be -- not trying to be too prescriptive and giving specific instructions. And I think here's an area that we have to be careful about that. Most of the thing -- kind of things that we've discussed in our meetings, there will be no trouble exposing them once the discussion starts with the (inaudible). In a number of cases the things that we're looking for that might be left in the bylaws or elsewhere are things the (inaudible) is and has already been doing forever. But, they're not listed there and therefore no one's allowed to talk about them because they're unofficial. Staff -- interactions with staff and (inaudible) on behalf of staff may be one of those. But, certainly, it's not restricted to that.

So, I worry about being too prescriptive, especially when there are plenty of resources around which can -- when the discussion starts can identify what the issues are. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Alan. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. I endorse what Alan said. I think a lot of this will come out in the discussion with the (inaudible). And also, though, I was thinking that perhaps since I'm the one that's having a garbled time getting the concept completely across, but it seems like Amy's kind of understanding where I'm going. Perhaps she and I can communicate offline and we can sort of find the right set of words that is not prescriptive, but that also gives the guideline. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Or communicate online and transparently on the email list. Thank you.

Okay, have we got anybody else here? Amy?

Amy Stathos: Sorry, just forgot to lower my hand.

Brian Cute: Okay. I think we have a path forward here and, Avri and Amy, you've got the ball, if you will.

Let's move to 9.4. We've got 10 minutes before we're on the line with Chris.

9.4, develop transparency metrics and reporting as part of its yearly report ICANN should include. So, this would be a -- the concept of doing an annual transparency report. The staff's input is agreeing with the objective, but proposing the recommendation be deleted and replaced with an observation. And reducing an annual report addressing not just transparency, but also accountability, which sounds like a constructive addition.

What are the other ATRT2 reactions to the staff input on this one?

Alan Greenberg: Well, Brian, it's Alan.

Brian Cute: (Inaudible.)

Alan Greenberg: I'm not at my desk. Again, this is one where I don't think we really wanted to lead the recommendation. The board always has the discretion board with staff conversation to say, no, we're not going to implement it exactly what you asked for, but we have different methodology, which will achieve the same end. And I think it's the end we're looking at. So, I can't see a rationale for deleting. Thank you.

Brian Cute: And let me add a thought here, too. A, I think that staff's suggestion that the report be expanded to be a transparency and accountability report is meaningful and constructive.

Also, at the end of this, I think when you look down to 9.4.5 you also have recommendations for new metrics. And to the extent that staff goes about putting new metrics in place, as we're going to recommend they do, and that that becomes part of an annual report. We've also talked about how to make the AOC review process more efficient. And it occurred to me that if this report is issued on an annual basis and includes these elements, including metrics, that in and of itself could become a very helpful tool for future review teams and maybe, in some way, lessen the burden that staff may have of producing a very wholesome report that drops on the desk of the next ATRT on day one.

So, anyway, I think all of this is very positive. Those are some loose thoughts and reactions for you.

I'd guess I'd ask staff at this point, with the sense that the review team is going to maintain this as a recommendation and these are reactions to your points, do you have any other things for us to consider? Larisa? Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Your interpretation was exactly how staff had intended it. So, no, no further concerns.

Brian Cute: Great. Okay, perfect.

So, we still have seven minutes before Chris, so let's keep going forward. 9--.

Amy Stathos: Brian, this is Amy.

Brian Cute: Yeah, Amy?

Amy Stathos: On the -- I'm trying to -- the -- I guess the 9.4 grouping, there was some staff reaction on 9.4.3, a request for clarification relating to the use of the term other information in terms of documentation of release. So, just asking not -- you don't have to do it now, but asking to understand a little bit more about what that means. And also, indicating that there is a reference in the recommendation to -- the use of Chatham House Rules. And that's not something that the board actually utilizes or invokes.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Actually, two good points. And I understand -- and Chris is on the line, so let's -- the ATRT2 author, can we get some of Fiona Alexander, please?

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. I'm sorry if I missed this, Brian. But, if you say from the staff input, maybe it makes sense to refrain this whole section as transparency and accountability metrics. Obviously, if you're not doing transparency just for transparency sake, but it's to help with accountability.

Brian Cute: Yeah, I agree with that. That's one edit we'll make. Thank you, Fiona.

On Amy's questions, Avri or Alan, were you the authors here? And can you speak to Amy's two questions? Chatham House Rule on the one hand, and what was the first one, Amy?

Amy Stathos: Understanding of what was meant by other information--.

Brian Cute: Right.

Amy Stathos: Because the recommendation as it stands with respect to board books I think is easily implementable in a sense of we can certainly do that and identify a number and percentages, etcetera. But, I'm not sure what other information is intended to reach.

Brian Cute: Okay. Does anybody have any clarification in the moment for Amy? If not, we just need to assign those two questions and the ball is in our court.

Okay, the ball is in our court. We've got those and we'll come back with some clarification, Amy.

Amy Stathos: Great.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Okay, we've got Chris LaHatte on the line and -- Chris, are you there? Chris, can you hear us? You may be on mute. Or maybe you've fallen asleep at some God-forsaken hour in New Zealand. Chris? We are having trouble hearing you.

Oh, Chris is dialing in right now. 11:56. Yeah, it looks like he's just dialing in, so let's give him a minute.

Avri, are you on the line, too? Avri? Let's see, it looks like Avri's dropped off as well.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'm here.

Brian Cute: Yeah, could you stand in on Avri on leading the discussion with Chris?

Alan Greenberg: I can try.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Alright, let's just give him another minute.

Chris, are you there?

Okay. While he's attempting to join why don't we move on to the next one so we can keep making progress. We're on 9.5 right now, establish a viable whistleblower program. The recommendation is adopt the One World Trust and/or Bergen (ph) Center recommendations to establish a viable whistleblower program.

And then, there's 9.5.1, the processes where ICANN employee transparency whistle blowing should be made public. 5.2, ICANN should -- also should arrange for an annual professional audit of this whistle blower policy to ensure the program meets global best practices.

Let me ask staff, are you anticipating that One World Trust is going to be making a recommendation on the establishment of a whistleblower program or not.

Chris LaHatte: Hi. Chris LaHatte here.

Brian Cute: Hello, Chris. It's Brian Cute. How are you?

Chris LaHatte: Good, thanks.

Brian Cute: Okay, folks, let's hold on 9.5. We'll come back to that since we've only got Chris for 15 minutes and I imagine it's probably two in the morning or something ugly like that for him. We appreciate you being here and we'll make good use of your time, I hope.

Alan, would you start the conversation with Chris?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'll try. I'll prefix it for Chris that was an issue that Avri had raised, and she seems to have dropped off the call at this point. So, I'm trying to channel for Avri. And I'm not 100% sure I remember why we arranged this discussion. But, I think primarily we have a recommendation on enhancing, enlarging, changing the scope of what the ombudsman may do or can do under the bylaws. And we understood that you had some feelings about that. And I believe we're, in fact, going to be making a formal written comment to us. I'm not sure if you have done that or not. And I guess from my perspective I'd like to hear your feelings of what kind of things do you believe you should be doing or how should we be framing our recommendation to facilitate the ombudsman position growing and it's ability to address ICANN's needs?

Chris LaHatte: Right.

Brian Cute: And Alan and Chris -- if I can add one thought to that, Chris. We just came out of a conversation, and ICANN staff is on the call with us as well, and in terms of the recommendations for the ombudsman role, a central part of that is making a distinction between when employees are dealing with issues that are related to the public policy functions of ICANN as opposed to when the employees are acting as an employee within the -- internal to the organization. And our understanding is that's an important distinction. And also, that the parameters of how an ombudsman may engage on those issues is also important to understand any impacts and boundaries. So, let me add that to Alan's question, then, if you would give us your thoughts.

Chris LaHatte: Sure. One of the things that has always been important for the ombudsman to draw the distinction between dealing with internal staff makers and dealing with issues when staff interact with the ICANN community. The bylaw is very explicit and has always been interpreted as such that I have no ability to get into internal staff matters. And that's -- I mean, there's a number of reasons for that, but that's (inaudible). And I don't think there's any proposal to change that at the moment. I mean, that's quite a -- perhaps a different question.

I think the principle issue that Avri was concerned with was a combination of issues of protection of privacy and issues of access to information. Essentially, I've got wide powers already to have access to anything. I think, in fact, it would be correct to say that under my bylaw I can see anything that I want to see and that staff are required to provide it to me should I ask. It's not something I'm -- a power that I've particularly needed to exercise. But, that's the first part of it.

But the second one is to do with access to information in a wider sense. I think Avri was concerned that I would have appropriate power going forward, to continue to have that -- effectively as a sort of privacy officer, dealing with issues where I had access to information, people wanted access, and whether I could have the ability to make decisions about that sort of thing. And again, we need to draw the distinction again between internal staff matters and staff and community relationships, and relationships within the community as well.

Brian Cute: So, Chris, I'm hearing you to say that if your jurisdiction, if you would, is expanded in any way, that that distinction between acting internally as employee versus dealing with the community is one that has to run through each area that you have authority. Is that right?

Chris LaHatte: Yes. I've discussed that issue a number of times with Amy and I think we're both pretty well on the same page on where we can go with it. Because the whole concept of acting

internally is a very substantial (inaudible) in a different sort of direction. And frankly, I haven't got time for that, in any event. But leaving that aside, it's quite a different concept.

Brian Cute: Is the definition of the two spheres very clear to you, that what is within the definition of acting with the community? I imagine there's gray areas between the two in some places, right?

Chris LaHatte: Well, I think probably the most difficult area -- it's not so much defining staff. I mean that's of course pretty clear. It's more what is the ICANN community. And that creates some interesting questions from time to time because of the way we operate with the At Large organizations. Virtually anybody who puts their hand up and says I'm interested in ICANN can become a member of the community. So, it's not so much a gray area as the fluid around the edges.

Brian Cute: Fair enough. Other questions from ATRT2 or Amy while we're here?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. I have my hand up.

Brian Cute: Yes. Thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I guess I also look at other aspects of changing the mandate; not only going into the staff issue, but -- and I'll give you a concrete example. You and I believe your predecessor has engaged in what I would generically call mediation on occasion, trying to get parties together before an objection is lodged, before a complaint is lodged, to see if agreement can be reached on things. When I proposed that that be mentioned in a formal document not very long ago, I was told since it is not in the bylaws it's not something that we can list as the Ombudsman doing.

So, there's a whole range of things that my understanding is you already do, but are not officially sanctioned. And that, certainly from my perspective, was one of the directions that any new mandate could go in.

Chris LaHatte: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: (Inaudible.)

Chris LaHatte: That certainly is the case. And I've always operated on the basis that, if people ask me to do something, then I can proceed to do that. And I certainly do frequently try and reach out to parties and conduct mediation. Perhaps from the context of when those bylaws were drafted in 2003 and 2004, mediation didn't have perhaps quite the same impetus or force or acceptance as a tool used by people like ombudsmen. Certainly it's my background. I've done a fair amount of work in this field and I would be keen to have formal mention of mediation in my bylaw as one of the tools by which I operate. It doesn't actually say that within the bylaw. It talks about a (inaudible) diplomacy and other things like that. But effectively, Frank and I both interpreted what was there as the ability to mediate at first instance.

In international practice, ombudsmen frequently will engage in mediation as one of the first methods of trying to resolve a dispute, so it's regarded within the vocation as one of our more important tools. So, if we were to have a change, some appropriate tweaking to the bylaw to drop the word mediation in the appropriate places would certainly be useful because it would make explicit what we already do.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Chris. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I guess from my perspective what you're talking about certainly matches what I understood. The problem right now is, although you engage in it at this point, officially we're not allowed to advertise it. So, there are customers, so to speak, who might avail themselves of the services if they knew you did that.

I guess from my perspective -- and all we're suggesting is that the discussion be started to look at this. We're not trying to be prescriptive to say what the things are. I guess the ultimate outcome that I would like to see is the bylaws are a little bit more flexible and allow you or your successor the discretion of identifying what an ombudsman can do within the scope of -- it's not staff that we're talking about; it's the community. So, I guess that's what I'd like to see the discussion to go, but I'm not sure we need to be specific at this point.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Yeah.

Chris LaHatte: No, I agree. It's not that we need to rewrite the bylaw, it just needs a little tweaking, I think, for recognition, to recognize the fact that it's evolved a bit in the 10 years since the bylaw was drafted.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Anybody else? ICANN staff as well? Any points? Okay.

Chris, sorry to get you out of bed so early and sorry that it was only 10 minutes, but it was really a very useful 10 minutes for us. We're at the finish line of crafting these recommendations and we want to make sure we get them right. So, your time is very much appreciated. Thank you.

Chris LaHatte: Yeah. It's not so early, by the way. It's only 6 in the morning, so it's not too bad.

Brian Cute: Alright. Well, enjoy your coffee or tea. Thanks so much.

Chris LaHatte: Thank you. Bye.

Alan Greenberg: Bye-bye.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Let's move back to 9.5, which was the whistleblower program, establishing a whistleblower program, which includes 9.5.1 and 9.5.2. And the question I had, I guess for Larisa, was do you anticipate -- the way this is worded, are you anticipating a recommendation from One World Trust regarding establishing a whistleblower program. Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. Thank you. I think the nature of this recommendation originally pertained to the One World Trust Report from 2007, or whatever that year was that they issued that first report. So, just to be clear, I think there's that.

Brian Cute: Right.

Larisa Gurnick: And then the second part of your question, so since -- I think you know that we already have an employee hotline policy and we'll continue to ensure that it meets all the good practices, including any good practices that One World Trust may identify in their current work, as part of the work that they are doing to benchmark the work of ICANN to other similar organizations, as well as to create a framework for accountability and transparency to help us measure.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you. Thank you for the clarification. We can take that onboard. Alright. Any -- I've got Alan and Avri.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. A quick comment. My recollection, and I don't have a transcript in front of me, is that at least once, and possibly more than once, we were told that the current hotline program is not a whistleblower program or it was not intended to be. So, I'm a bit confused by this staff comment here saying we already have one and therefore we should just refine it.

My recollection is that we were explicitly told that the program that is there now is to identify certain kinds of problems and not necessarily the staff relations type thing that a whistleblower may be used for, or the reporting that senior people in my organization are committing fraud or whatever it is. The very fact that the complaint initially goes to the senior managers in the organization makes it questionable whether it is the classic type of whistleblower program. And my recollection is from ICANN legal is that we were told it was not one. So, I just want some clarity from the staff response. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks.

Amy Stathos: Brian, this is Amy, if I might.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Amy Stathos: Yeah. Alan, that actually is not correct in terms of your understanding. It is a whistleblower policy in the sense of the word of -- except for the fact that we don't call it whistleblower. As part of best practices, when we evaluated both the One World Trust recommendation from back in 2007, we went and actually did undertake an analysis to try to put the best programs in place. And the idea was to call it anonymous hotline to make it actually more welcoming, if you will, because whistleblower sometimes does have a negative connotation. But, it is a mechanism that was developed in response to the One World Trust recommendation, as well as in response to some of the more stringent requirements that were placed on the for-profit organizations, at least here in the United States, as a result of the Sarbanes-Oxley requirements.

So, the process is in place and it is a formal whistleblower program and people can -- the idea is that you can call this anonymous hotline. It goes to a third party provider. And when the complaints come in, they have to come in to management in a sense so that management can evaluate and understand and stop any activity that needs to be stopped immediately and investigate activity that needs to be investigated. But when they come to management, if the party making the call to the hotline is -- wants to remain anonymous, they will remain anonymous. They don't even have to tell their name to the third party. So, I just want to clarify that's the way the process is established.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Amy. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. Hopefully I can be heard better now. I transferred to a phone because I kept losing sound.

I think part of what's being looked for here, and as the original writer of this, I'll have to take blame and be more clear. It's yes, the program -- and thank you for clarifying. The program that you've got now was indeed created in response -- or at least post -- I guess it can be called response, certainly post the One World Trust. That was over five years ago now.

So, I think what we're calling for, and I guess what wasn't clear, is that using that as a basis, perhaps even going back to One World Trust but, again, not over-specifying, not over-mandating, basically go back and say is what we've got now what we need? Is this indeed something that matches those requirements? Is it reviewed? Is there significance in the fact that it's been used once, perhaps, in years significant? Does it have the trust of the employees? Are there concerns? Are there gaps in the protection of anonymity in that the smallness of the company makes people immediately known? Any sorts of issues that might come up without at the moment being prescriptive about any of them.

So, perhaps it's going back to One World Trust or to some other significant whistleblowing employee rights kind of work is being done. And have an evaluation and then have that be something that is part of the periodic evaluations that are done. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks. And this is Brian. If I can interject. And again, I want to be crisp on time here, folks. So, don't want to belabor it.

But, it sounds to me like staff's position is there is a whistleblower program in place, we just don't use that term, so that if we had a recommendation that said establish a whistleblower program, that would be not -- staff wouldn't agree with that or that would be viewed as inaccurate. Can we just focus on the right approach here on the recommendation briefly? Amy, do you have a recommendation with respect to technology?

Amy Stathos: Sure. Brian, thanks so much. And yes, Avri, I think the recommendation for getting an external validation of the current program is a good one. And as it relates to 9.5.2, that's exactly what our comment was, is that if we can take a look at using that language of evaluate what we have in place, make sure that it is state of the art, that it does do what it's intended to do and that there is a continual review cycle of that, we think that's a great recommendation. And whether it comes out that way or not, we're going to do it. So, we think that is a very good recommendation.

Brian Cute: That sentiment is well appreciate, Amy, too.

Avri, is that enough to work with on the drafting side?

Avri Doria: Yeah. It certainly works for me.

Brian Cute: Terrific. Okay. Thank you very much.

Alright. Than that takes us -- well, I just want to note also, Amy and Avri, in 9.5.1 there's a question for clarification on what we mean by ICANN employee transparency. Any -- if there's any specific suggestions there, Amy or Avri, let's make sure we resolve that in the final recommendation.

Amy Stathos: Yeah. Thanks, Brian. Just the one question we had is because we recognize that this was all surrounding the whistleblower anonymous hotline process. But, if there was some other aspect that was meant to also be incorporated, it's unclear. So, if there's more clarification on that, great. If it was really meant to be limited to the whistleblowing process, then we understand that as well.

Brian Cute: Okay, great. Alright, thanks.

Alright, moving on. We're back to the GAC recommendations. We got through some of them. We've identified the balance that we have to pick up on the Friday call with Olof.

And that there's a doodle going out to folks to participate directly in that call. If not, please send your e-mail points in to the list so they can be taken up on that call.

Moving on to 8, multi-lingualism. Okay. To support public participation, ICANN should review capacity of the language services department versus the community need for the service. Make relevant adjustments such as improving transition quality and timeliness, and implementing, continuous improve, benchmarking, etc. Recognize that there's been significant improvements. We still need to be able to evolve this and shift from a craft-based ad hoc to projecting, professional demand that's coming down the line, and having multilingual resources available.

So, the staff's reaction. Proposed change recommendation to observation and implementation to the extent of work already underway. We have alignment on the work and the recommendation. (Inaudible) represent examples of some broad-range activities that ICANN may consider as it continuously improves. And ICANN's committing to providing ongoing reporting and progress updates, including milestone and deliverables to inform the community.

Any points on this in particular? I've got Amy and then Olivier. Amy?

Amy Stathos: Brian, actually not for me. This one is not really my area.

Brian Cute: Oh, okay.

Amy Stathos: I hadn't really--.

Brian Cute: Then I've got--.

Amy Stathos: Focused on this.

Brian Cute: Okay. And that was your hand from before. I've got Olivier then Lise. Olivier?

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

Brian Cute: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay, fantastic. Thank you. I just wanted to mention a couple of things on this recommendation. I understand that there is work going underway but, really, the recommendation here focused specifically on the performance and on actually changing the performance from being something that's just saying, well, we're improving all the time, to actually having something like key performance indicators. And really, getting the translation and the interpretation to reach a level that is on par with international organizations. I don't see this from the current work that is being performed. There's no benchmarking taking place.

So, I would suggest that we keep the benchmarking side. And I was going to actually propose a friendly amendment to this, which I might just send by e-mail, where I was going to actually just add the capacity of the language services department versus the community need for the service using key performance indicators. I was going to add KPIs in there. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Olivier. And you hold the pen, so please edit and propose away.

Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, hi. I can only support what all of you have said. And I think it's very important that we keep this recommendation because we tried to set -- well, what we've seen is that the translation has been quite slow and it comes as a surprise every time there has to be any translation. And we also made an agreement about putting in the distinction between interpretation and translation. And I know this was Fiona and I who should have done this to this recommendation and we didn't do it. So, this will make it even more specific regarding that there needs to be work done on this. So, thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Lise. Denise.

Denise Michel: Yes. Thank you, Brian. These are very useful discussion points and Larisa will flag this for follow-up work and discussion. And if needed, we can incorporate this into the call that's being scheduled for later this week and get Nora involved in this issue as well.

Brian Cute: Okay. So, Nora may join us on the call on Friday?

Denise Michel: I think that Larisa is going to look into that, yes. And we'd like Nora to address these additional points that were raised on the call.

Brian Cute: Okay, great. Great. Good.

Okay. Any other points on 8? Okay. Not seeing any hands.

Olivier, please edit and send those edits and we'll look forward to hearing from Nora on Friday.

Okay, folks, we've got 34 minutes left. We're making great progress. Thanks, everybody, for staying focused. Let's plow forward and see if we can't get through to the end here. We've got a bit to go, but let's stay succinct.

Cross-community deliberations, recommendation number 10. (Inaudible.) We've got a number here that -- some of which are differently focused. 10.1 through 10.1.3 are GNSO focused. 10.2 brings in the GAC and the GNSO.

The staff inputs on these recommendations under number 10 essentially are saying changes from a recommendation to an observation, the work is underway. And we go through 10 -- just give me -- bear with me one second. 10.4.2. I guess I'd ask staff, Larisa, please, any focused points you'd like us to consider? Then I'll ask ATRT2. Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, thank you. We just wanted to clarify that Amy is actually not the lead person on this and it would be Marika (ph) and David and we will make sure that they will participate in the call on Friday. So, it would be more productive to have that conversation then.

Brian Cute: Okay. Alright, so Marika and David really are the ones to talk to about this. Okay.

ATRT2, any points from ATRT2 members on these? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Just a quick one and it's a generalized one. We understand that a lot of these discussions have already been initiated, that discussions have been going on since somewhere around Beijing. And there is a general belief within the organization that we have some problems that need to be fixed. Discussion does not necessarily lead to results and what we're looking for is board commitment that some of these things be done. As an example, saying face to face meetings may be useful is not the same as getting board

commitment that they will be funded. Without board involvement, we simply have a budget where it may or may not show up next year and no real recourse. So, that's certainly part of the aspect.

The second part is, large parts of recommendation are very generalized. They're recognizing that we have some very severe problems. The problems bring into question the credibility of ICANN's ability to use the bottom-up stockholder -- multi-stockholder model to develop policy. And we need to formally start looking at addressing some of these problems. No one envisions that we're going to fix them immediately, or even within the three-year lifetime of this report's recommendations, but we need to seriously discuss them and understand that without addressing them we have a very severe problem. And from my perspective, that is going to require board involvement, to put the stamp of -- that, yes, this is an important thing which must be looked at. It doesn't guarantee results, but it says we can't ignore it anymore. And that's basically the gist of many of these recommendations.

So, the discussion we have on Friday I think should be from that perspective. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Specifically, I don't think it's going to be useful to have staff repeat the discussions that are ongoing in other parts of ICANN as evidence that we don't need to address this. We're well aware that all of that is happening. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan.

Okay. Then with that being said and these issues coming up from staff input on Friday, let's move to recommendation 11, which is AOC review process effectiveness. And we have a number of recommendations. 11.1 through 11.7. Differing staff input for these. So, let's take them one at a time.

11.1, institutionalization of the review process. ICANN should ensure that the ongoing work of the AOC reviews, including implementation, is fed into the work of other ICANN strategic activities wherever appropriate. And staff's input is changing recommendation to observation. It's implementable to the extent of work already underway. Implementation of AOC reviews as directed by the board is incorporated in ICANN's SOP. Publicly tracked and reported. (Inaudible) in the strategic activities as appropriate.

Noting, as reflected on page 58 of the draft report, you have provided the following information, that the AOC commitments are incorporated in strategic (inaudible) plans. (Inaudible) the board and staff and other organizations of what these recommendations (Inaudible). ICANN follows (inaudible) while integrating the spirit of recommendations to ICANN's operations and strategic initiatives as appropriate.

Larisa. Larisa, your hand is up? Larisa, are you there?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. I'm sorry, Brian. I was on mute. It took me a while to unmute.

So, the whole series of 11, perhaps it might be useful to look at them as a whole. Because while staff provided various clarifications, I think one of the topics that we'd like to discuss with ATRT2 is how to practically piece together all the components that are covered within the set of recommendations and still fit it within the three-year cycle.

So, if you read through the depth of the comments, essentially that's something that staff has tried to highlight, which is to say that between ensuring that one year is -- a full year is allocated to the work of a given review team, giving the six-month period to the board to respond to -- to analyze the recommendations, come up with an implementation plan and then have enough time for the organization, for staff and community and the board to actually implement the recommendations. And then have -- on the back end, for the next review cycle to have fully articulated, updated, ready-to-go information on the first day of their review as to the progress. But, by the time we factor all these pieces together into a timeline, it's somewhat challenging because not enough time, in many cases, will be provided to the actual operationalizing of the recommendations. So, I would say that is probably the overarching element that we wanted to flag here.

And then, as it relates to the budget for the review team, there were some clarifications in terms of just correcting or proposing a correction as to when the information was shared and such. But in concept, there is no disagreement that the work of the review team is important and the budget should be shared at the earliest possible point in time. So, there's no issues with that.

Brian Cute:

Thanks, Larisa. And I think the issue that -- the overarching issue you're raising is an important one to talk about and the inputs in 11.3 in particular are useful to think through the dynamics of the review cycle given the recommendations we're making. At the same time I think there's at least a couple points that are worthy of discussion in and of themselves and not just tied to that overarching issue. I think the first one that we're on, which is -- and I think also for purposes of the review being clear to staff and ICANN and the board, what it means, but how this is fit into the work of ICANN strategic activities is important to discuss in and of itself. And the budget, as used in example, is certainly, I think, an issue that can be discussed without being tied just to that overarching issue of the cycle, whether a budget should be communicated and clear at the outset of a process.

So, let's get to the overarching issue. It's a good one. Let's start with 11.1. And this issue came up at least in one context. Not -- and it's not the only context it's intended, but with relation to the strategic panels. And the discussion was, if there are strategic panels that are looking at the improvement of ICANN's functioning or ICANN's relationship with the external environment, if you will, that it's important for those strategic panels to have, at least on some level, an understanding of what this aspect of ICANN's undertakings are, the affirmation of commitments and the reviews and what they mean and why they're important. That was one aspect where it came in.

But certainly, just the overall strategic planning of the organization and staff's response here is speaking to that and suggesting that the review processes have become part of the organization's strategic planning. So, I think this is -- these are the important clarifications. But, let me turn it to Fiona Asonga and to Alan Greenspan -- I mean Greenberg. Sorry, Alan.

Fiona? Fiona, are you there? We can't hear you. Are you on mute by chance?

Let's go to Alan while Fiona's trying to get online.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. What I wanted to talk about was the review cycle. And Larisa talked about the problems if we don't allow enough time for implementation and board review and things like that. I'll simply point out that there's another way to fix the problem; that is launch the review team on time. And then the work is done within a year, giving them the full year to be done -- work to be done. And everything works perfectly. All this recommendation is saying is that if ICANN board, staff, whatever, cannot get their act together and launch the group in enough time, then the pain has to be shared. It's not

only the review team that should suffer, but the people who have to do the follow-on work. So the problem is solvable, but if it isn't solved properly then we're saying share the pain. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Fiona, are you there?

Fiona Asonga: Hello. Can you hear me?

Brian Cute: Yes, we can.

Fiona Asonga: Okay. The recommendation on the review processes, I think my proposal is that, in view of the staff, that the ATRT mandate requires ATRT2 to look at the other review processes. So, we're saying basically definition of commitment requires that before main review is done within ICANN over a three-year period, what does that mean? It means that basically, for there to be any (inaudible) from the review team, each review team needs about a year. And then, there needs to be time for the board to look at the recommendations and implementation and those are the (inaudible) that follow.

That means that moving forward for the review process that ATRT team does, in line with the affirmation of commitments and the other review processes, the work that is upon ICANN staff to begin the processes in due time might require there to be an expansion of the strategic initiative team, so that then we have in one year two review processes begin. One begins in January, for example, and then in August, October, another review process begins. And then in March we have another review process beginning. That way we didn't have three-year window. It's possible for the other reviews within the AOC to be carried out. And then for the ATRT, the next ATRT team to be formed to go through this review work.

As always, in the absence of that, we shall be reducing the mandates of the ATRT team in line with the affirmation of commitment. And that reduced mandate means a reduced scope, which is what staff is recommending. However, we are forgetting that the mandate of the ATRT is designed to be (inaudible) of commitment.

So then the issue here will be either the board sits down and reviews all these processes and makes a decision, we need to change the affirmation of commitment, but here we are going to use the affirmation of commitment as (inaudible), then that is the only way out. That is my view. And my recommendation is that the recommendations remain as are and we table them to the board explaining the future challenge. Because as the review -- as the ATRTs increase and the reviews are done for the different areas, (inaudible) affirmation of commitment, the work and the scope will keep increasing. So, what's happened.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much, Fiona. Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes, thank you.

So, I think we've learned a lot in going through the very first round of affirmation of commitment with you. And I think this group is -- it's really well situated to provide really useful (inaudible) on what's working with the overarching process and what needs to be improved and how we can improve it.

I think -- part of the challenge, I think, from the staff side is that given the independent nature of these community reviews, staff can advise on things like having a one-year work schedule. But ultimately, as it's currently structured, the team decides on their own work and their own timeline.

So, the ATRT is the only review team to date that has followed a one-year timeframe. (Inaudible) took significantly more than a year. So, it would be useful to get some more thought on an appropriate way to address that. Pushing that out beyond a year causes then the consideration of all the recommendations (inaudible) implementation to be pushed out as well. And as you've seen, puts the ATRT comprehensive review in a challenging situation.

And I think there are certainly things that, on the board and staff side that we can look at now and consider changes, particularly around how each community review team is populated and initiated, the very lengthy process that has been used in the past to solicit volunteers. And a lengthy process with the SOs and ACs to endorse particular volunteers and then the appointment process. I think there we can certainly look at that and other elements of the process to shorten the cycles to get -- and to get reviews underway. I mean, there's no question that really a full proposed budget should be available when each review team starts and we have changes in place to make that happen. But in addition, to just recap, I think it would be useful to get more thought and guidance from this team in particular about how to potentially streamline and improve the overall (inaudible).

Brian Cute:

Thanks, Denise.

And Fiona, I'm going to just add two cents before turning to you, if you'd indulge me. I think specifically the recommendation that the staff prepare a full report that's provided to the review team at the beginning, on day one of its work if you will, can create a real work efficiency, then the ATRT2 is not spending or wasting, however you look at it, three months or so trying to develop questionnaires and surveys. And frankly, with expertise we don't necessarily have in terms of doing survey questions, it can be a real time saver.

And trusting staff to provide a report and in some ways getting away from an unduly, sharp line of we have to be an independent objective review team, and a review team does, but rely on staff to provide good information to create these efficiencies as long as the review team has the opportunity to test that information. And it would. Those are the types of efficiencies, having a budget at the very outset of the work so proper planning can take place and getting an independent expert if needed sooner. All of these things can drive efficiencies.

And to your point that other review teams have taken longer, you rightly note that that has created challenges for follow-on review teams to have enough results to review and assess. So, I think that is the clear focus of these recommendations. And what we need to really hear is two things. Staff and Denise, you've been here and Alice has been here from the beginning and Larisa and Charla, if you see ways where these processes can be made more efficient, love to hear that input. And then, secondly, is anything we're suggesting creating an implementability impossibility or hurdle that we need to be aware of.

Fiona. Fiona, are you there? Oh, that's just a -- you don't have your hand up.

Okay. That being said, going back to 11.1, staff, is there any clarity on 11.1 that you would recommend to us in terms of getting this to a final drafted state?

Okay, not seeing any hands.

Coordination of reviews, 11.2, and 11.3, appointment of review teams. These are where we're really getting into in terms of staff input the focus on the dynamic of the review cycle. I think it is useful to look at staff's layout in 11.3 of the three-year cycle and how it translates into a total of 36 months. And the different time chunks, if you will, of how that plays forward; six months for the board to review and implement, accept or not and implement, and then the time period for implementation in the organization, staff, NomCom, GAC, board. And then the review team being assembled the next time around.

I think it's clear to me that if the staff is to produce a full report of implementation efforts for day one of a review team, that that exercise -- and Denise, correct me if I'm wrong, you're -- if you want to do a good job you're talking six to nine months in advance to really pull that together in a comprehensive way. Definitely seen the benefit of doing that, but noting that it has its own way of shortening the timeframe for implementation that can be assessed by the review team. I think these are important points for us to think about.

Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Brian. To add to what you're saying, I just wanted to reiterate, and we've had these discussions before, that different review teams tend to have their own interpretations of, and ideas for, the most useful way to collect information. And staff has already talked about some ideas of implementing annual accountability and transparency reporting and such that could be used to supplement or perhaps even take place of updated reporting. But at this point it would still be very helpful to the staff to get some suggestions and ideas from the review team as to how this sort of reporting can be accomplished ahead of time, while taking into consideration the different styles and requirements of each individual review team.

Brian Cute: So, perhaps some advice or recommendations from this review team to other review teams.

Larisa Gurnick: Right. Well, to other review teams and to staff as to the kind of consistency that staff can count on and work toward in producing ongoing reporting.

Brian Cute: Right. Okay, thank you.

Alan and then Fiona Alexander, and then we're going to go to recommendation 12 for the time being.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I'd like a quick clarification on that issue. I understand how groups work -- different review teams may have different methodologies in how they attack their problem of what they should address. But, I would have thought that the status review of how things have progressed on the implementation of the last review groups, of the last incarnation's recommendations, is pretty standard. Maybe I need an example of how methodology would differ that they would want different things.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa, Alan. Well, just for an example, using the experience of this review team, the initial set of questions to staff, multiple, very specific questions pertaining to different aspects of the implementation on the one hand, as compared to let's say the kind of update reporting that staff ended up providing towards the end on the implementation of Whois recommendations; just using those two as examples of the different styles and methods of how information can be provided in a way that would be most useful to the review team. And between those two examples lie all sorts of other ways that

information can be shared, such as PowerPoint presentations, verbal presentations during face-to-face meetings and such.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'll -- if I may have the luxury of a response, I think giving us the opportunity to (inaudible) what the questions were demonstrates why that's probably not a great thing to do. We've generated many, many questions with many, many answers, most of which did not help us and simply confused us. So, we've learned something from the process. We probably wouldn't do that again. Maybe we want to make sure that no one else does, either. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Fiona?

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. Thanks, Brian. And maybe this actually picks up on something Larisa had commended on previously. But, I think the staff response sort of lays on a timeline that assumes the expectation that implementation would be done. And I think it's important and maybe it was captured in the report and then the recommendation itself that the implementation of these activities is constantly ongoing. And just because you couldn't constitute a review team doesn't mean something needs to be fully complete or -- and it could -- but one recommendation could be implemented and across multiple ATRTs depending on the scope of it. And that might be something to sort of capture and make people start to understand a little bit better.

Brian Cute: Thank you. I just want to underscore I think what I'm sensing here is good conversation. And I think we really share the same goal here, that as a review team and staff, to make these reviews efficient and effective. And it's good to be operating off of that perspective. So, we'll take these thoughts in through the week and Friday and look at these recommendations again through that lens. Thank you for that input very much.

With the time we have left, want to get to the recommendation 12, financial accountability and transparency. I will just note for myself in the Buenos Aires meeting, not just in the broad meeting, but privately in sidebar conversations, hearing good support from the board of these recommendations. In fact, it's a suggestion of broadening them just beyond the budget, but into more clear, predictable financial planning perspectives, and it sounds like we're hitting the target with these recommendations to a large degree. Seeing implementation noted as feasible and other input from the staff, let's take the next few minutes we have. Lise, I hope you're here. I think you are. And staff, are there any specific points to hit on 12 and 12.1 through 12.5? Looking for hands.

Fiona, is your hand up anew or from the last time?

Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, obviously, Zavier (ph) is not a part of this call. And the reason we didn't include him was because of the very productive set of meetings that we had in Buenos Aires conversation with Zavier, Jurgen and Lise. And the staff response in this case really just documents the outcomes of that conversation just to make sure that everybody walks away with the same understanding. And beyond that, there is really nothing else to flag unless Lise or Jurgen have any comments on what's been written here. This really does reflect what we thought was a very good, productive understanding.

Brian Cute: Okay. Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Well, I can only support what Larisa said. I think the comment, I don't have any -- the comments I don't have any problems with. It's just explaining that they're working on what we're recommending, but that's fine with me. And I think we should stick to the

recommendation and I don't see any objections from staff regarding that. So, I'm all happy with it. Thank you.

Brian Cute:

Okay, great. Thank you.

Okay. We've gotten through the document as best we can. We still have some work to do on Friday, but thank you, everybody, for today's session. That was very important and I think we've got good input to take us to the finish line on these recommendations.

On the agenda, I think we're -- that's pretty much it. We've hit it. So, you should see a doodle pole from staff for the call on Friday. ATRT2 members, please make that call so we can finish up this discussion. You've seen -- if you can't make it and you have specific inputs on any of these remaining recommendations, please submit them by e-mail to the list so we can take them onboard in that discussion on Friday.

You've seen the work schedule. Please respect it. Please understand that if you can't get an input in by one of those deadlines, we're sorry. We just can't take it after that so we can get this thing done. And a very big thank you to staff for today. Good discussion.

Thanks, everybody. We'll speak to you on Friday.

Multiple Speakers:

Thank you.