

20131213_ATRT2_ID840318

Unidentified Participant: Charla?

Charla Shambley: Yes. The operator just started the call.

Brian Cute: Okay. Terrific. This is the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2, Conference Call of December 13th. This is Brian Cute, opening the call.

We have in front of us two hours of discussion, on any potential final modifications to the recommendations on our report. We have the agenda, proposed agenda, on the screen. Are there any proposed edits or changes to this agenda?

I'm not seeing any hands up on the Adobe. Okay. The agenda is being approved.

Let's move forward to item number 1 on the agenda. Overview of the call; yeah, effectively we have 11 items here, but the general thrust is to continue the discussion that we started earlier this week. And the real focus here is interaction with ICANN staff on proposed recommendations to determine whether any modifications should be made to the recommendations as drafted. So that's why we are here.

Before we launch into the substance, I just want to do a quick stocktaking. I am trying to follow the proposed edits to recommendations that have come in from ATRT2 members, and I just want a quick stocktaking. I've seen something from Carlos, and something from Olivier. Has anyone else on the call send in by e-mail suggested changes to the draft recommendations; if you'd just indicate that right now?

Alan Greenberg: This is Alan. I did last night. Not a final, but much closer.

Brian Cute: Okay. So, Carlos, Alan and Olivier. Anybody else?

Fiona Alexander: Hi, Brian. This is Fiona, we'll be sending the GAC-related ones later today.

Brian Cute: Terrific. Thank you, Fiona.

Fiona Alexander: But I do have one question while we are on this. Are you going to -- is someone going to circulate a revised -- a complete set of revised recommendations to take a look at, because my understanding at the call on Tuesday has just, sort of, finally closed everything out. So can we expect like a complete, you know, summary document or something? What do you think?

Brian Cute: Yes. We can. The reason that both -- Larisa, staff, and Paul Diaz, who was helping on the editing process again, were holding off, was they felt it more efficient to wait till we had

all proposed edits and recommendations, and to do it in one fell swoop. So, yeah, I think after today, with the GAC-related recommendations in, and after this call, they'll be in a position to put that together, and circulate it. And, yeah, the purpose of the call next Tuesday will be, effectively, we've got the final proposed recommendations drafted in front of us, and we'll be walking through to make sure that we have consensus on them, as they are, and they are locked down, and we go into final editing of the report mode.

- Fiona Alexander: Okay. So I think what we'll send is a redline version, that's easier to see the edits, and then we'll include the paragraph that summarizes the public comments that have been received, the 11 or 12, or whatever has come in. They are related to this as well.
- Brian Cute: Terrific. And, Lisa, before I come to you, I just want to check Charla -- I mean, Larisa. Is my summary consistent with how you see the process going? If I was wrong there, please let me know.
- Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa, Brian. Yes. It's consistent. I would just add to Fiona's point, that staff is prepared to turn around a complete first draft of the final report, which would include recommendations, as well as any additions summarizing public comment, or further analysis. But in order for us to be able to do that, we need to get that from a majority, too, by Monday, based on the calendar due date that I had circulated earlier.
- Brian Cute: Okay. I thank you for that addition, and that's understood. Larisa?
- Lise Fuhr: Well, (Inaudible) sent in some changes to the financial part, but we haven't sent any other reports from that.
- Brian Cute: Yes. And I did see those. So I've noted those, and I confirm that, as stated before, no proposed edits or recommendations have been integrated into the draft report, yet. So Urin's (ph) were seen, and will be incorporated once we have all the final proposed edits in.
- Lise Fuhr: Okay.
- Brian Cute: Okay. With that being said, just to, again, before we jump into number 2. So, on our last call we did a very nice job of walking through the document, which was the initial assessment in response to ATRT2's draft report. And we covered a lot of ground. We had a discussion around a number of those inputs, and ATRT2's reaction to them.
- The purpose of today's call, was that there were certain draft recommendations in the staff's assessment document that we didn't get to, and so we are going to walk through those today, and ICANN staff is here to be with us in that conversation. But I also think it would be wise for us, before the call is done to, perhaps, just revisit a few points from our conversation on Tuesday. I sent an e-mail last night that outlines the points I think we want to touch on, and make sure that there's consensus at this moment.
- And I believe you all saw, in a referenced that ICANN staff had sent another document that had proposed revisions to text, of recommendations coming out of Tuesday's call. I think we should walk through that as well.
- So, a lot to cover in two hours, but I'm confident that we can do it. So without any further ado, I guess item number 2 is reviewing the schedule and due dates.
- And Charla, if you have that text -- that outline from the last call. Can you put that document up? It came out of my e-mail, where I have the deadlines for the various inputs out to the team.
- No. But I like it, the One World Trust report.

- Charla Shambley: Yeah. I didn't know what that was in there. Hold on.
- Brian Cute: No worries.
- Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. While Charla is looking for that, perhaps I could just speak to the deliverable dates that I had outlined for the ATRT2 through coordination in an e-mail, yesterday, I believe.
- Brian Cute: Yeah.
- Larisa Gurnick: Okay. My understanding was that on Monday, December 16th, the ATRT2 would deliver to staff revised content, which would include recommendation, language, any discussions or rationale for changes made to the draft to be included in the body of the report. A summary of public comments and feedback received from Buenos Aires consultations.
- And I just wanted to highlight, if there will be any changes to the executive summary, other than updating the language of the recommendations, then that would be the third piece. And once that content is delivered to staff, on Monday, within 24 hours, we'll be able to turn around a final report draft number one; that would be circulated to the review team for a review prior to Tuesday's call. So that at that point everybody could take a look at all the content in the report, and the wording, and make sure that that meets with everybody's expectations.
- Then any changes to that would come after the call on Tuesday. Ideally, by Wednesday, within 24 hours of the call, we would have the final content changes, and then staff would turn around another version by Thursday, December 19th.
- Brian Cute: Yeah. That's good. And then we are in synch with you and, yes, there will be changes to the executive summary, to make it even more succinct and streamlined. Maybe just a reordering some of the (inaudible/audio skip) -- that will come to you as well, by Monday.
- Larisa Gurnick: Okay. Thank you.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So what we've got up on the screen, is we are looking for, so first, today, any of the editors who are drafting the recommendations themselves, please, if you have edits to make to the recommendations, have them in today. The GAC-related recommendations, as redlined, are coming today as well, too, so, if everyone can meet that deadline, that's important.
- And then, the number 2 is, inputs from ICANN staff, regarding the implementability of draft recommendation that was due on Wednesday, and we are having the follow-up call today to finish that discussion, to see if that discussion results in any changes to recommendations.
- Public comments, item 3, as noted from Carlos, there's 11 comments that were received, that I saw as well as of last night. The reply comment period closes today, there may be more. So when it closes we'll check that, and everybody on the team, please read those comments. For the editors of recommendations, please pay particular attention to the comments that relate to the subject matter of your recommendations, and by Monday, if you believe those comments support a modification to the recommendation, send that in to the list, the edited language of the recommendation. And, importantly, the citation or quotes, or text from the comments, that supports that change. That's a very important piece. So that's number 3.
- Four, the One World report, we are waiting on that from staff. Larisa, did you have an update on when that might be available to us?

Unidentified Participant: Larisa, you're on (inaudible).

Larisa Gurnick: Question -- can you repeat your question, please?

Brian Cute: Do you have any update on the draft One World report, and when the ATRT2 will receive that?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. We did receive the draft. We are in the process of reviewing it right now. We anticipate being able to share it with the review team on Tuesday.

Brian Cute: Okay. The last item is citations, and so I just ask that if you have modifications, edits to the recommendations coming out of the comments, get them in by Monday, and provide the quotes, text, citations from the comments, along with that edit.

The Tuesday deadline is also a deadline for citations, generally. If any team member, in going through the record of face-to-face meetings, public comments, from either of our public comments cycles, input from the staff, basically the record itself over the course of our work. If you think there are citations that are useful in the text of the report, and we need to be thoughtful about that, this isn't just willy-nilly.

We send those in by Tuesday, at 17:00 UTC, and then we can go about the business of working those into the report.

Tuesday, you should (inaudible/audio gap) --

Is everyone else still there? And that come Friday, it's really in final form. So any question --?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. I lost you for about a minute or so, and just had static. I don't know if anyone else did.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Brian Cute: I'm sorry about that. So item 5 citations. That's citations that are important to include in the report from any part of our record over the course of our work. Get those in by Tuesday. Be very thoughtful too. Just not citations for citations sake, but if they support a conclusion, the analysis, and they are meaningful, then provide those by Tuesday.

By the end of Tuesday, we are going to view the inputs as closed, and Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, are the days where staff and Paul, and myself, can be making sure the document is clean, and in good shape, and come Friday, we want it to be locked down. So Tuesday really is the cutoff date for any inputs.

Any questions on the schedule? Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. Let's go back to the agenda.

The next item is cross community deliberations. And those are -- that's recommendation. I'm sorry, what does the 10 refer to, in parenthesis, in agenda item number 3?

Unidentified Participant: Those are the recommendation numbers.

Brian Cute: Okay. So with respect to recommendation 10, we have 15 minutes for discussion with David Olive, and Marika Konings. From the ATRT2 side, just, can you remind me who owns the drafting of recommendation 10?

Alan Greenberg: Alan.

Brian Cute: Alan. Okay, Alan, if you would take point on this, and we are making reference to the initial staff assessment of -- in response to ATRT2 draft report and recommendations documents. So go into that document, number 10, which has quite a few. For us we need deliberations. I think without reciting all of these suggested changes, I guess, why don't we start with the staff, and have David and Marika, if you would, could you hit the specific high points of what changes do you think should be made to recommendations under 10, and please be specific from a numbering standpoint when you're speaking. Like 10.1.3, we think X, et cetera.

So, with that, I turn it over to David and Marika, and Alan, if you'd take point, and then open it up to anybody else in the review team.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Brian. I presume they have all seen the new, revised version, because I think an awful lot of the issues have already been addressed.

Brian Cute: David, and Marika, have you seen Alan's proposed revisions?

Marika Konings: Yes --

David Olive: These are all -- first let me start -- please, Marika, go ahead. Yes, we have.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Just so you know that I actually had a conversation with Alan yesterday, and I've already conveyed some of the issues or concerns I had about some of (inaudible) questions. And I think -- I've seen the revised draft, and from my perspective, I see most of these have been addressed, have had some additional clarifications in those. So I think I can save you on this item, I believe, and most of my items have been covered by those updates that Alan has made to the draft.

Brian Cute: Okay. Are there any open issues, can (inaudible/audio gap)--? I guess that's a question for both David and Marika, from your standpoint, and for Alan.

David Olive: David Olive, here. Our initial concern, when we were reviewing this, was that some of our staff comments, we weren't sure that it gotten through to Alan and to others. And that was the reason for further consultation with Alan and Marika, and myself. So, I think with that; that should be closed. I don't see any other open items to raise at this stage.

Brian Cute: Okay. Alan, anything from your side?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Two things. And let me just try to focus on where it is in the recommendation. In the new 10.3, which is called 13.3 in my version, because I was the text from the body where the numbering was different. The 13.3 now reads, 10.3, says the Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative. Both Marika and I felt we have too many strategic initiatives in ICANN, and they get confusing.

So we are looking for different wording there and just saying something with priority, but to be honest, I couldn't come up with a better set of words, so I'm highlighting that for the group as you read it. If you come up with some wording that implies this is important and must be a priority, but not reusing what is becoming a rather mundane word, "strategic" in ICANN, that's a thought.

And lastly, the last bullet on 13.4, 10.4, was originally targeted at PDP comment processes. In the discussion I had with Marika, we realized that if it's going to be done on PDP comment processes, it probably should be done in general comment processes. And that is, give commentaries an opportunity for pointing out the staff summary has a mistake in it, or misrepresent something.

And so I would suggest that one actually be moved into the public comment recommendation, because it's no longer specific to the PDP. Other than that, I have no

other comments. I still need to go over more carefully, the public comment input and my notes from Buenos Aires, but I think I'm already -- I've already most of the substantive issues that have been raised there.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Alan. Just so I'm following the peak that -- bouncing ball, the last recommendation, and I'm now referring to the staff response document. You are referring to 10.4.2 on the comment process?

Alan Greenberg: That's correct.

Brian Cute: So, your recommendation is that that recommendation be moved to the recommendations with respect to the comment process, generally.

Alan Greenberg: The reworded version of it, yes, that's correct.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. Noted. Okay, any questions from the Review Team on these points? And again, we are all going to have one last opportunity on Tuesday to look at these revised recommendations and say, yeah, we agree, or I think there should be a modification before we close.

So, I'm not seeing any hands up. David and Marika, thank you. That was very, very efficient time management. Really appreciate it, and your inputs are appreciated as well.

Okay, let's go to number 4. Board performance and word practices; these are recommendations one through three, and I've got Amy as the point for staff on this, and these were drafts of mine. So, Amy, the floor is yours.

Amy Stathos: Thanks, Brian. I don't know if -- Larisa, did you share with Brian some of the suggested edits that we made following Tuesday's meeting?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, I did.

Amy Stathos: Okay.

Brian Cute: Yeah, those are -- I referenced those in my e-mail of last night. So, do you want to refer to that -- that proposed language now?

Amy Stathos: Yeah. I mean, I think so because basically I think we went over these, all of these on Tuesday, then we tried to, based on that conversation and understanding, edit some of the language of the recommendation.

Brian, I don't have your e-mail, so Larissa could you forward that to me, please.

Larisa Gurnick: I can do that.

Brian Cute: And, Charla, can you pull up the document that we just referenced; the proposed changes to language from staff that came across yesterday or the day before. That's a separate document from this staff assessment document.

Charla Shambley: I'm sorry, who sent that document out?

Brian Cute: Larisa did. I'll pull it up myself, but if you can hunt that down, and put it up on the screen so we can all makes reference to it, as we go through the discussion with Amy here, that will be helpful. I'm hunting myself, so just give me a minute, as well, to get to it. Okay, it was sent yesterday at 8:02 p.m. Eastern, U.S.

Unidentified Participant: So Brian, while you're hunting for that, I think if we are looking at number one--

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: The latest I had gotten from Larisa, was that your idea was that you were going to remove this particular recommendation.

Brian Cute: Actually there was a piece of it, that I thought we might do away with, which was the regularly assessed director's compensation levels, and that was my perspective. I honestly need to make sure that the review team is comfortable with that. My thinking behind that was -- the point was made that the Board is in the middle of a compensation review right now. That the Board did the original compensation review after ATRT1, that the Board is committed to doing regular compensation reviews as an organization would.

And for that reason, I offered that, perhaps, we might drop that part of this recommendation. To be clear, that's what I was suggesting. The end of (inaudible) --

Unidentified Participant: But, that's number 3?

Brian Cute: Yeah. The last part of three as I had it drafted. I've now got the -- oh, we've got the document up on the screen? Is that up yet?

Unidentified Participant: No. It's still the old one.

Denise Michel: So while we are waiting, Brian, this is Denise. Just to clarify, I believe our take away from the last call was that we were -- that the team wanted to drop number 1 which was focused on qualitative analysis, as specific Board members, but go forward with compensation and assessment test included in recommendation three. Is that what you're saying?

Brian Cute: Yeah. Let's see, right here. I'm looking at this document that was sent by Larisa yesterday, which starts with number 3. So, for purposes of clarity, number 1, which was focused on assessing the performance individual directors, yes, my recommendation was that that be dropped.

Number 2, which focuses on the performance of the Board, is preserved. Number 3, the last part of number 3 which calls to regularly assess director's compensation levels, I was suggesting that, given all those points I just made, ATRT2 could drop that from recommendations.

Amy Stathos: Okay. Got it. Thanks, Brian. In terms of that part, it's dropping, it's fine. We are committed to doing it. If you leave it in, it's fine, because we are committing to doing it -- committed to doing it. We had a couple of suggested changes to the first half of number 3.

Brian Cute: Okay. Let's do this, Amy. Let me (inaudible) --

Amy Stathos: Oh. I think it's up on the screen now.

Brian Cute: It is. But before we go there--

Amy Stathos: Sure.

Brian Cute: I don't want to get ahead of the review teams.

Amy Stathos: Oh sure. I apologize.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Let me just do -- let me do two things. Let me check on, number one, the review team members comfort level with dropping number 1 which was focused on individual

director's performance. I had put that quarterly. If anybody on the Review Team has a strong objection to that, please raise your hand now --

Avri Doria: I do. This is Avri.

Brian Cute: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Please.

Avri Doria: I do. Right. Okay. I understand that the regions were taking that out, because it might be difficult, it might be difficult to do it and itemize (ph). What I had mentioned was, I believe that this should be done, and I believe that we need to find the longitudinal ways of doing it. And we do need to be able to do an appraisal. The Board itself is already doing this 360 review of its members and (inaudible/audio skip) to find some way to record that information and to have it, and to follow it longitudinally over time.

So, I'm actually not comfortable with dropping the requirements. I'm comfortable with, sort of, adding words that acknowledge the difficult of doing this in a non-prejudicial manner; however, still suggesting that a method be found. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Okay. So let's discuss that, I'm making sure that I have all the facts. The reason I was suggesting it, to be clear was, what I heard in Buenos Aires was that in fact, assessments 360 -- not really 360 -- peer review of directors was already being done. What I heard was that the review that was being done was very comprehensive. That it had been used in nomination cycles, and so it was on that basis that I was suggesting we could drop the recommendation, only for director-level performance assessment.

So if I get the facts wrong, that in fact it's not being done, then we need to clarify that, first and foremost.

Amy Stathos: Brian, it's Amy. I can speak to the facts, if you'd like.

Brian Cute: Please.

Amy Stathos: Yes. At present the BGC now facilitates and oversees -- whether you call it a 360 review, or a peer review, but they do a review of the five Board member, voting Board members, that are going to be leaving at the end of the AGM, so after the AGM -- so after -- let's say, just right now, a review of the five Board members, whose terms are up at the end of 2014, are being evaluated, so you do five every year, because five Board members turn over every year.

That information is then fed to the groups that are responsible for selecting those five, and they are held confidential until it is determined which of those five Board members are seeking re -- another term.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Amy Stathos: And then the group uses them as they deem appropriate for that selection process. That's what's happening right now.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you for that. So, Avri, is you hand up again?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Alan, I see your hands. Okay, Avri, why don't you pick that point up, and then Alan we'll come to you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. Two points here. One is just the fact, because new has been started is not a reason that we've used throughout this second process of review for removing things. The recommendation that has been done, stands in its own place, no matter what processes may be in the process of being done no. So that's one reason for not removing it. I actually have one question, and a question on that, some of these elections happen mid-year, for example, those that are NomCom, are elected by the various SOs, mid-year. Are those reviews done and made available to the voters in plenty of time for that?

And that's part of this whole process, that not only the NomCom, but also the voters would have information in a timely manner, and just to make sure that that's sort of codified, and not just something that and experiment now, but that could go away. Thanks.

Amy Stathos: Avri, to answer the question, if I might, Brian?

Brian Cute: Yeah, please.

Amy Stathos: Yes, Avri. That's actually one of the reasons why we start that review immediately after this AGM, so that those will be completed in sufficient to give to the SOs, and/or the At-Large, in anticipation of their selection process as well.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. First of all, a clarification; although Amy didn't use the term, and specifically didn't, the term 360 Review is still being used. Currently that is not what is being done, so I think for clarity, we'd better make sure we are using correct terminology. What we were told at our last -- at the meeting in Buenos Aires, is that each director -- other directors work closely with that director. Be it on committees, or whatever, are identified and then a random selection of those do the evaluations.

My understanding is the evaluation is actually done only by a small number of two or three people. So that's point number one. So terminology counts in this kind of case. Second of all, and I'll defer to Olivier in a moment; the last we heard, it was not at all clear that this evaluation was going to be made available to the electors, and that makes a big difference, because doing evaluations is one thing. Doing evaluations and never letting any of them see the light of the day outside of the Board, or not letting them see the light of day of people who have to make the decision. is a rather different thing

So, I think we need some clarity on that. I hope Amy is correct, but I haven't heard a confirmation in the specific case of At-Large, whether that is, indeed, correct or not.

Brian Cute: Amy?

Amy Stathos: Yes, so -- Alan, I know last year, which is the first yr we did this, and we are in the process of doing it again right now. So I know that the plan is -- this is going to be standard operating procedure going forward. Last year, Bruce, as the Chair of the BGC, sent the evaluations to each of the leaders of the groups, to whom the selection -- who are making a selection.

Last year, the ALAC was not -- or the At-Large Group was not making a selection, so they did not receive anything. I believe this year, Sebastian's term is up, so he -- my understanding is that the ALAC leadership, or ALAC will receive it, and it will be up to them how widely they distribute it, in terms of the process of electing or selecting their Board Member.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Amy. I guess I'd like to hear from Olivier because there were strong discussions in Buenos Aires, about whether that would, in fact, be made available to the electorate, or just the selective leaders, or the earlier selection committee. That creates the slate, but not the election.

Amy Stathos: Yeah, I believe that's up to the ALAC leadership, so I'll step out of that one.

Brian Cute: The last we heard it wasn't so, that's why I was asking if Olivier has any info on this now. Olivier is here, but Steve's had is up. Steve, first? Steve Crocker, are you there? You may be on mute.

Steve Crocker: And, indeed, I was on mute. Sorry. So I can add a little bit. Much of what I was going to say has already been said. So the points that Alan and Avri have raised about whether or not this is shared in time; that's been very high on our list of things, to make sure we get it right. And what Amy has said is correct. That we are pushing hard on that now, in order to make that input available in a timely fashion.

When we aligned the Board terms, what we didn't do was change the selection timing of the SOs and ALAC. That information is needed so that NomCom can do the geographic balance. So we are very cognizant of the timing requirements there, and we have been focused on getting the evaluations done. I've been working with (inaudible) to try to get a process in which the year-long calendar, that shows all these dependencies, is laid out well in advance, so that everybody is well aware of the coordination that's required.

As Andy said, we make the evaluations available to the leadership, and then what happens there, is under the control of the leadership, so if I -- (inaudible) talk to Olivier. To Avri's point about (inaudible/audio skip) --

Brian Cute: Steve, this broke up a little bit.

Steve Crocker: Can you hear me?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Steve Crocker: To Avri's point about making a recommendation irrespective of what we say is happening, that's fine with me. We've generally been fine-tuning -- tightening and improving this, but it's been in place for a while. We'll be happy to document exactly what happens. I think it's a little broader than what Alan said of just a couple of people, but I also agree that it's not necessarily a complete 360 Review.

So what -- we have to be precise about what happens there. And the larger question is, so do the evaluations actually provide the information that you want to have about the performance of Board Members? How to approach that beyond what we do do? I'd be happy to provide the questions, the questionnaire, the methodology and all of that, and we'll -- it will be what it is.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Steve. Olivier, did you have -- yeah -- your hand up. Olivier, please?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Brian. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just, first two things, a question to Steve with regards to the institutionalization of those 360 Reviews, if tomorrow -- not tomorrow -- if in a few years' time we had a new Board who suddenly would think, well, you know what, these 360 Reviews are a real pain because they make us look like we are a bunch of people who do absolutely nothing, let's just put these 360 Reviews out of the way. Would they be able to do so?

Steve Crocker: Would they be able to do so? Well, yes, they can do -- the Board can do an awful lot of things. You can phrase a lot of questions in the form of, would the Board be able to do X, Y and Z. The cost of doing so is invisible, and in the invisible there are consequences.

How quickly those consequences would come into play, depends upon what the situation is, but -- so that --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So the gist of my question, Steve -- it's Olivier speaking -- and it's breaking up so -- but the gist of my question effectively is: is it worth institutionalizing, you know, putting those 360 Reviews within the Board in ICANN's DNA; so as to make it harder for any future Board Members to take those out of the way if they don't like them?

Steve Crocker: Yeah. But I would say so already in the DNA. If you want to --institutionalizing it, but putting in these little bylaws, my reaction would be, that's probably the wrong approach to take, in that you don't really want to worry the bylaws with too many unnecessary things.

Now, if it turns out that there is some sort of persistent or deep issue, then maybe you'll want to do that, but until you see that there's actual resistance, in fact, there isn't any resistance, but I think once it becomes -- well, it's already standard practice, I think it will be hard to cut that off, I don't think there's much fear there. So I think it's a non-problem that you'd be addressing.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Steve. That was my first question. It's Olivier speaking again. Now just my feedback with regards to how the ALAC will be using the 360 from the current ALAC-selected Board Member. The information will be shared to a Board Candidate Evaluation Committee that is effectively the first hurdle to all of the different candidates that will be applying for the position.

That Candidate Evaluation Committee has signed a confidentiality agreement, so they will keep all of that information confidential. There is currently discussion within the ALAC as to whether all of the ALAC, the 15-member committee, should have access to those records, plus the leadership of each one of the regions -- At-Large organization. That's another, potentially, 5 to 10 people in addition to the ALAC.

So we are looking at 25 people, at that point, confidentiality becomes a lot more difficult, and therefore there is discussion as to whether there should be -- that confidentiality agreement signed by all of the ALAC members and the regional leaders, but we are not there yet. That's all. Thank you.

Brian Cute: This is Brian. Avri, before I come to you too, I want to be careful that we are not -- be thoughtful about not being too prescriptive, the recommendation not using the term of our 360, or something like that. Currently it says, develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members, dot-dot-dot, that seems to me to be appropriate, and also, I want to watch our time on this issue too. We seem to have consensus on the results.

And with that being said, Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Two questions; and I'm not quite sure we are at consensus, but perhaps we are. I think at this point, given what we've heard, actually just requesting an explicit explanation of what it is they are doing, and the full details. (Inaudible) suggestion and leave it up to ATRT3 to specifically look at it, and see whether what they've done is enough.

And two; one of the things now -- Olivier was talking all the way through about this evaluation, and that you need to remain confidential, whereas others say, it was given to the Chair, and the Chair was able to determine what to do with it. Within the GNSO, for example, where absolutely everything is done transparently, I would wonder if it explicitly allowed for it to be dealt with transparently in the GNSO, if that's what they wish to do. Those are my two questions towards for (inaudible).

- Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks. If those are questions that belong in a draft of the recommendations, that's something we can consider, but I think we are getting into details that probably can be worked out through implementation --
- Avri Doria: I take the -- the transparency issue, I think, is fundamental, and is not just an implementation detail.
- Brian Cute: Yeah, and I'm not suggesting it isn't fundamental. And we need to manage our time here, too, and get onto the other points as well. Alan, very briefly, please?
- Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Thank you. The statement that was made to us here today is that there is no confidentiality imposed from above, and I think that's something that needs to come out in the process. I don't think we can specify it. I also think at this point, a recommendation is still warranted. I would not see that to implement that recommendation requires it be put in the bylaws.
- I think that's a level of specificity that may not be necessary, but simply a statement by the current Board that goes on record, saying, it is being done and will continue to be done, is at least something that can be brought up in some future time, if a Board decides to change that. So I would say, stick with recommendation, and let's try to find wording that is not too prescriptive. Thank you.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. So I heard Steve say earlier that he's comfortable with the recommendations staying in place, and I believe that's the consensus that we have. Steve?
- Steve Crocker: Yeah. Let me just add quickly. The reviews are certainly (inaudible/audio skip) the Board level, and we've come along with the understanding that they will be handled in a reasonably confidential -- in a confidential fashion that is appropriate to the process.
- So, we don't prescribe to the NomCom, or to the SOs, or to ALAC procedures, but we certainly do expect that it will be handled in a sensible, confidential way.
- Brian Cute: Thank you. Okay. Let's move on. So that was recommendation number one. We are keeping it. We'll review the language, and we'll come to a final decision on Tuesday as to what it should be.
- Amy, there wasn't -- was here anything on number 2 from staff in the most recent document?
- Amy Stathos: No.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So jumping to number three; where I left off was the suggestion to ATRT2 that we could consider dropping the regularly assessed directors' compensation levels for the reasons I had stated earlier. So, like, why don't you just take the temperature of the ATRT2, is that something people are comfortable with, or not?
- I think I see a green check from Olivier on that point. Alan -- oh, no. I see green checks, okay. So we are going to drop the last bit that says; regularly assessed directors' compensation levels. That being consensus point, Amy suggested language from the staff with respect to the balance of recommendation three. Can you just hit the high points on what you think?
- Amy Stathos: Sure. The language we just went ahead and suggested language, the key point here, Brian, is that the information that needs to be had, if it's maintained at all, it's maintained by the NomCom, so the Board does not have access to any of the information. So the idea is that this -- to having an evaluation of the Board candidate pool, the Board itself doesn't

have the ability to do that, which is why it was -- we kind of changed it to: ask the NomCom to do it, or direct it at the NomCom as opposed to the Board.

Brian Cute: Okay. I think that's a clear enough suggestion, and I certainly understand that. And we have a fact question outstanding, as to whether or not the Nominating Committee had sufficient candidate data, still, say, from prior cycles that would provide the databases for doing the study. I don't think we have any answer to that question, unless somebody has gotten that in the meantime. This may require reaching out to the NomCom Chair to ask two questions. (A) Do you have the data? And (B) if we made this recommendation asking the Nominating Committee to undertake this study, is that something you could accommodate?

I do think those are important inputs. I'm asking for additional thoughts. I've got Denise, Avri and Alan.

Denise Michel: Yes. I believe as Larisa, emailed the list. The Nominating Committee does not have access to candidate information from before the directors were compensated; and so the challenge here, if you leave the language in about judging -- determining if all occasions of Board candidate goals change. Once compensation was available, we don't have that benchmark of pre-compensation to look at. But Luther (ph) did e-mail the list about the archiving from year-to-year as the NomCom does.

It's only -- it only keeps prior years, and (inaudible) information, if the candidate expressly gives them permission to do so, and to consider them further for any openings. If the candidate does not provide that permission, then the candidate information is deleted and so as the NomCom used to do, an analysis, it would have to be -- an analysis each year, when the new candidate pool is created.

And then, of course, just as it's a completely separate note, for those who aren't familiar with avenues to the Board, there are of course Board members who are seated through selection, from the SOs, AOCs, and they have their own process in candidate pools, and that's something to consider as well. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, I'm sorry I missed that e-mail. Larisa, so the fact from the NomCom is that they have no data on candidates prior to 2011, to put a fine point on it.

Larisa Gurnick: That's the information we received from them.

Brian Cute: Okay. So that being said, there is a question of whether there's a benchmark available to measure against. And if there isn't data prior to that I think that makes it a problematic study. In that light, I mean that opens some questions about the utility of this recommendation. I'm going to open it up for about five to eight minutes of discussion from ATRT2 members as to what to do with this.

Please be concise. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I mean, what we've been told here, is basically is basically what candidates are told. That is, if you do not exclusively, say, carry it over to the next year, and it's only to the next year, that everything will be deleted, and we are told NomCom participants are told the same thing.

I think we have a real problem. If indeed there are secret copies kept somewhere for legal reasons, to make sure people didn't lie when they applied, or whatever, I think we'd have a real problem if the ATRT2 said, go review those documents that don't exist, and come up with an analysis of them. So, I don't think we have much choice particularly with this.

- Brian Cute: Thank you. Any other thoughts on this? Yeah. Okay, I see Avri's post. I think in light of that information, that this recommendation then needs to be dropped. Okay. Amy, anything else in number 4 on the agenda?
- Amy Stathos: No, I don't -- I'm not sure what number 4 on the agenda is, because I don't see it, what is --?
- Brian Cute: Board performance and work practices, recommendations 1, 2, 3; we just covered them.
- Amy Stathos: Oh, no. I think we are good.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Moving on to number 5, policy/implementation/executive function, it should say (slash) administrator too. So this is the recommendation picking up on the continued work on recommendation six, from ATRT1.
- And I am taking on board -- I'm not sure, I don't think I've sent out a draft, but I am taking on board staff suggestion to use only the policy versus implementation vernacular in this recommendation. And in making that statement, I want to make sure that the review team members are comfortable with making that adjustment. Whereas, ATRT1 used the word "executive function" and administrative, that for purposes of clarity, policy versus implementation be the vernacular used in this recommendation to frame the work going forward at the community level.
- Is there any objection from the ATRT2 members on that point? Steve, that's an old hand, right? Or is that a new hand? Avri?
- Avri Doria: Yeah. I don't have an objection because that is the language that everybody is using these days. I do think it will need a footnote somewhere explaining why you move from one set of language to another, and perhaps indicating a slight mapping between them, but that makes sense.
- Brian Cute: Good point on the footnote. Thank you. Any other points on this? Okay.
- Alan Greenberg: Yeah. It's Alan. My only comment is, I'd like to see the final language before I say, yes, I'm comfortable with it. I have no problem dropping the term "executive function" I do have some worry that because of the confusion in the community about different meanings to words that we are using, I do want to see the final wording before I bless the change. But, yes, dropping executive function, I have no probably with it.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. And you will, for Tuesday, at the latest. Okay. Amy, coming back to the proposed edits from staff, on recommendation four, I see the changes in text, the proposed changes in text, continue supporting across community engagement, whereas the draft, the latest draft they have says, continue cross-community engagement. It's like the difference, supporting versus continue.
- I think the draft I've got in place suggests an active role, almost as participant, and the reason that's there, is because the ATRT1 recommendation was directed to the Board to take action this point. So, hence the reason for that construction, and I think the proposed change here to continue supporting cross-community engagement, could introduce a non-active, or passive posture for the Board and the staff.
- I'm not saying it's an end-of-the-world type change, but I think there is a difference there, and I'd like to understand what do you think the impact of the proposed changes and text from staff would be.
- Amy Stathos: Sure. I agree that it's not an end-of-the-world change, whether it's there or not. The thought that we had was, we just wanted to make it very, very clear, that the way this has progressed, is that this is a community-led process, and that the Board or the staff is not

directing how it should be. Is not mandating what should happen, but they're doing what they -- everything we need and the community wants from us, to help support the process.

That was the only intent of the word supporting. Is to just make it clear that it's not coming from the Board or the staff directing how it should happen.

Brian Cute: Yeah. And that sensitivity is one that we all fully appreciate.

Amy Stathos: Yeah.

Brian Cute: That we wouldn't want the perception out there that this was top-down from the Board.

Amy Stathos: Exactly.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Fully appreciated. Let me take that thought on board, and if there's a way to tweak the language here. I do think though, there has to be recognition that this was a recommendation to the Board, to do something --

Amy Stathos: Sure.

Brian Cute: -- from having one hand in this AOC review process. It will always come back to, how well did you implement that, and that's a lens we have to have over this as well. So let me think that through and see if there's a way we can come to a middle point there.

Amy Stathos: Understood.

Brian Cute: Hmm. The second piece of that; is development complementary mechanisms whereby the supporting organizations and advisory committees can consult with the Board on administrative matters on which the Board makes decisions.

And I think, Avri, did you own that own that piece of the draft, four? It's indicated that you did.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I guess I did. And I'm not sure. On this one, on line one I don't see a recommended change from staff. I see a significant one on line two, that I was going to comment when we got there. But on that second piece of line-1 (ph) is there a problem? Is there a change required to it? I thought that was something that was already, sort of, being done, and it was a recommendation to cover the codification of something, as it were. And line-2, I see that there's a suggested different language.

Brian Cute: Do you see the screen, Avri, on the Adobe?

Avri Doria: Oh. I was actually looking at the file. The screen, all I see is -- it's the same thing, yeah. It's the same thing I've got for that.

Brian Cute: But they are effectively side-by-side. It has --

Avri Doria: We are talking about number 4, I think, right?

Brian Cute: Yes. Number 4 on the screen--

Avri Doria: Oh. I thought we had already made it to 5. We are still at four. Sorry.

Brian Cute: No.

Avri Doria: So, I'm sorry, I was at --

Brian Cute: Can you see number four Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I've got number four in front of me.

Brian Cute: Okay. If you can read under your draft, develop mechanisms whereby to supporting you organization, et cetera. And then look over to the right, and it's the second, under that draft, develop complementary mechanisms. That's the suggested change in text from the staff. If you could read that and just give us a reaction.

Avri Doria: Sure. Why not?

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I was up (inaudible) for line 2, which was the first one we are having issue with their language. Sorry, I thought we had gotten there.

Brian Cute: No worries. If you can -- and you can think after the call, but can you give a reaction to the suggested change in text from staff?

Avri Doria: I thought it was okay.

Brian Cute: Okay. You've read it, and you think it's okay?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Avri Doria: That's what I said.

Brian Cute: The only question I have, is since we are changing the vernacular to policy versus implementation, and getting away from executive function and administrative, is that last bit of administrative matters out of synch?

Avri Doria: No. Because of policy, it's implementation, and perhaps administrative matters are a third sort of thing that we identify before long. Or, perhaps, will end up and empty bucket. I think when we get to the policy and implementation in other places, we may also find that we've got a category of administrative matters, that are separate from implementation. So the fact that we have three buckets in this one doesn't bother me in the least.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Avri Doria: I mean, I'll still say that we have to be multi-stakeholder at the administrative level, but that's a different issue. But that they be in three different buckets of objects, is that, you know, from a factual, analytical perspective that some things are not really implementation for policy, that they're more administrative, that may be the indication of the case of the analysis.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Amy Stathos: And Brian, just to add in. That's exactly, Avri, what we were thinking, is that there might be some of those that don't fit quite in the development or implementation process. It's a level that we are thinking. Yes, that what --

Brian Cute: Okay. So I guess we have agreement. Okay. Let's move on; making progress, thank you. Amy, I think we are done with five, unless there's something else on your end.

Amy Stathos: Done with five? I thought there was something (inaudible) --

Brian Cute: No, no. No. I'm sorry. Number 5 on the agenda, which is recommendation number four.

Amy Stathos: Oh. Okay, sorry. That's what was confusing me. I keep jumping to five when you say five.

Brian Cute: Ugh. I know, sorry.

Amy Stathos: (Inaudible), what can I say?

Brian Cute: We are done with number 5 on the agenda, unless you have anything else, Amy?

Amy Stathos: No. I think that's right. Thanks, Brian.

Brian Cute: All right. Terrific. Thank you. Let's move to recommend -- oh, God -- agenda item number 6, GAC operations and interactions, and conveniently, also recommendation of the six. Fiona Alexander indicated that the redline versions of those, are coming in later today. Were there any points that either staff or -- I don't see Larry -- Fiona has o this point?

Fiona: I'm just going through the comments now that have come in, and the one thing I wanted to put out to the group. There have been a couple other suggestions of recommendations. I think Carlos has been tending to some of those on the list. So I'm trying to incorporate this as much as I can, but the one thing, just wording-wise, there's a sensitivity to the Board requesting the GAC folks (ph) for the right wording, so that people are less sensitive to that.

But overall, just the comments of their responses, but I think there is still some -- from the staff feedback, the question about some of the recommendations. I think the first group we did go over on the call on Tuesday, so I'm not sure if there's going to be any staff, further follow up on that or not.

Brian Cute: Staff, anything?

Fiona Anderson: I'm sorry. Which recommendation number are we on? Specifically, or you've been talking generally about all this in the sub- topic, in this too?

Larisa Gurnick: I think it's the one under number 6 in the sub-topic, because we went over the other ones on Tuesday. So it's the first grouping.

Unidentified Participant: Right.

Larisa Gurnick: Denise, this is Larisa. I think that's the grouping that we didn't discuss on Tuesday, because Olaf (ph) was not available at that time. He had already signed off, but since then we know that staff and Heather had an opportunity to connect and discuss --

Heather Dryden: Right.

Larisa Gurnick: So, I don't think there are any further open items from the staff perspective.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, correct. Oh, (inaudible) spoke with Heather, and I think everything is fine there. I think, more broadly, I think the only additional comments that Jack wanted to explore with you was -- or perhaps, clarify, was the -- certainly the intention of staff supporting and going forward with all the recommendations. And on meeting and engagement with the GAC to, perhaps, broad wording in the introductions that -- that this is -- that we are not -- something online to clarifying if this be -- the intention here isn't to ask the GAC to get involved in sort GAC operational matters, but rather to engage broadly on them.

Larisa Gurnick: So that's specific to the 68, 69, these are the ones with the global stakeholder engagement group.

Unidentified Participant: Right, right.

Larisa Gurnick: I remember on one Tuesday there was a suggestion that this might be a little bit too, sort of the (inaudible) methods. But did you guys have specific language or -- I think Heather might be on the phone. Is there a language that you guys have worked that is more comfortable to describe the spirit of what we are talking about?

Unidentified Participant: We could certainly suggest some language, again, I think there's certainly a line that's between the goal and intention here, with the global stakeholder engagement staff and the GAC, and so we can propose specific language if it clarifies that relationship with (inaudible). We could give the time -- it would be really better to- training those offline, or we can discuss them -- wording here, what would be better for our agenda and timing?

Larisa Gurnick: I mean, I'm saying to Brian, but I think it's really a recommendation 68, so the recommendation is the Board should request the GAC, work with ICANN's GSE group -- team to develop guidelines for engaging governments. So I guess the question is, what's the wording that, I think -- and I don't know that --? Heather, I think is on the call, or at least she has views. I don't know.

Heather Dryden: Hi. This is Heather. Brian, if you will permit me?

Brian Cute: Certainly.

Heather Dryden: Probably I can help a bit here. So, I really thought that, on the call on Tuesday, we were getting a bit too much into the mechanics of things, and to the point of, perhaps, beginning to constrain, the review team, which is an independent review team, and meant to function as such. To actually make recommendations to the Board, and to the GAC by the Board, to look at issues like the stakeholder engagement. If there are clarifications to be made to the GAC, you know, I have no difficulty with discussing those.

But, provided we are not getting into such details, that we are not making appropriate use of the time of the review team, and also not respecting that there is that line between refining the language usefully, which is really meant to be high-level. And allowing for further discussion and for implementation questions to be addressed later on, and actually getting into maybe some of the finer points, perhaps a bit too early.

And so, with this particular example that Fiona is raising, talking about there being guidelines for engagement of governments, I fully support the recommendations, and whether we can, in fact, refine that further, or need to, it's maybe less clear to me. But I haven't had any further concerns likely this point offline, by talking to staff, by talking to Olaf, who you might know is the GAC relations staff member at ICANN to help the GAC liaise with other parts of the organization at staff level. So, I don't know how clarifying that is, but that's kind of how I see things.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Heather. Denise, is your hand up anew?

Denise Michel: Ah, yes. It is. So, the global engagement staff, the GAC to the last ATRT2 call wanted to reiterate that it fully supports all of the broad objectives that are articulated in the recommendations. And I think the only -- and I certainly take your point about not needing to get into too much recommendation detail at this point. I think the one suggestion that they wanted to offer for consideration by the team, was just a clarification that the intention here is not to put the GAC or other ACs or SOs, in the role of creating the operational guidelines or directives for staff, or get into that day-to-day work, but rather to agree on with methodologies and processes for engagements.

- Brian Cute: Okay, any other points on this? Okay. I don't see any hands. Thank you. And we look forward to seeing the recommendations shortly on that. I think we can move on to number 7.
- So number 7, on the agenda, is decision-making, transparency and appeals process, which are recommendations five, seven and nine, respectively, so let's go to that. Okay, and Avri and Brian, number five. This is to determine how the proper stroke or redaction (ph) could be reasonably confirmed, and the staff has some proposed language, Institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted materials, and determine if redactions are still required, and if not, ensure that redactions are removed.
- Avri, I think you were primary on this. I'd like to get your reaction.
- Avri Doria: Yeah. I think what's missing here is perhaps the other half of this, which is proper scope of redaction had two parts. One is the review of whether something was redacted, to remain redacted, but the other was, what things could be redacted and why, and what this suggested text doesn't do, is include any of that part in terms of, you know, finding categories, and it was already sort of said that the categories were actually known, what sort of things got redacted, when. But basically getting that explicitly defined, and then being able to have redactions indicate under what basis they were redacted.
- So the writing from staff gives us the first part of it, but doesn't give the second part. Making redactions clear and (inaudible) --
- Brian Cute: Just a quick point, and I'm going to ask Amy to -- I remember in the process, this goes back a while, that in looking at the record, there was policy developed or refined, on this point as a reaction to, I think, ATRT1. Amy, does that policy speak with significant specificity to the categories and the timing?
- Amy Stathos: Yes.
- Brian Cute: The point Avri is hitting on?
- Amy Stathos: Sure. It does. And as I mentioned on Tuesday, we have created, as a result of the ATRT1, a document that's called guidelines for positing a briefing -- Board briefing materials, which also has defined areas of where redactions are appropriate, and that document is posted with every set of Board briefing materials that are posted. So that's what we are saying--
- Avri Doria: Well that is --
- Brian Cute: Avri?
- Amy Stathos: What the other part was -- sorry -- the other part was that -- and we discussed this Tuesday, is that it's good, and it -- but it only applies to court documents. It does not apply to other documents that are redacted by ICANN. And so this was a requirement, not only on Board minutes and notes, or stuff -- but it was on ICANN documentation. Thanks.
- Avri Doria: So, that's part of it, but not, again, it's only four documents at that point.
- Amy Stathos: Okay. I guess I'm just not sure. If you could give me some examples, because I don't know what other documents are redacted. I'm not sure that we posted any other documents that have any redactions in them, but if there are, it certainly recognizes that we could expand this to apply to those as well.
- Avri Doria: Okay. That was really what was missing in that particular page, so if the policy is to any other documents -- and this can include -- and indeed, I'm not sure of the full scope of

documents that fall into the documents given to the Board, and whether every document given to the Board is under this policy.

So, you know, that's where I have not, perhaps, necessarily understood, but also I thought I had seen, but I don't have the example in front of me, I'd have to go find it if I can. Is, when sometimes documents come out of -- oh, yes, there's the example.

When we got the copy of the Hotline documentation, when it was finally released to us, it was released in a redacted manner. Now, the reason for that redaction was also made clear to us in the cover documentation we got --

Amy Stathos: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Saying, it's redacted because it has the telephone numbers and we don't want to, et cetera.

Amy Stathos: Right.

Avri Doria: But that's an example of another document, where you hit, but it doesn't fall under that policy.

Amy Stathos: Understood. But I think that's the one reason why we made it really clear and why, but we can certainly take a look at expanding this policy. Understood, I get your point Avri.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Brian Cute: Okay. I don't think that covers the discussion. I see Alan's hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I originally put my hand up to say I thought that Amy had said what she didn't think she said. However, the discussion of what other redactions are there, I would think the other prime one is under whatever ICANN's, Free to Move Information Act, it's called. You know, where you can request the documentation, and there are certainly redactions, and that kind of thing.

So, I think it would be helpful if -- I'm not sure where we are at this point, if we are -- where, certainly, I can widen the clarification so that it applies wherever redactions are done for whatever reason. Thank you.

Amy Stathos: Brian, just a quick response?

Brian Cute: Go ahead. Yeah.

Amy Stathos: Yes. So, Alan, thank you for that. Yes. And in fact, I don't -- I can't say that the reasons match up one-for-one, from this policy, but the documentary information disclosure policy, under which you're talking about, that people reference it, itself has the basis for those redactions and withholding of information. So they are laid out already in that policy.

Brian Cute: Okay. So, Amy, just so we are clear; does the DIDP cover all other documents or is perhaps the category that's not covered by that, and therefore, to Avri's point we should have an (inaudible) recommendation that broadens this?

Amy Stathos: So it covers anything that people ask us about that isn't already posted, and in response to whatever it is, if we are intending to post additional information, it gets posted as opposed to just, say, it's on- off. So it covers all of those. Frankly, the thing that Avri mentioned about us sending to you, at your request, of that particular policy, is the only other document that I can see, that we didn't just go ahead and flat out post.

But I think we could go ahead and expand, if you think it's appropriate, suggesting that the guidelines for posting Board briefing materials, is expanded to posting of materials, in general. And then we can take a look to actually incorporating some of the grounds that are in the DIDP into the guidelines, so it covers everything.

Brian Cute: Yeah. I think that's what I'm hearing is the direction of the team and its recommendation.

Amy Stathos: Yeah. I think that makes sense.

Brian Cute: Okay. And we'll have a last shot at it on Tuesday, if any other points arise between now and then. Okay, let's move on to number 7; recommendation number 7, mechanisms to improve public comment, Board planning regarding number of consultations, et cetera, given anticipated growth.

So staff is -- can we go back to the document that Larisa sent yesterday, with the proposed new language, on the screen.

Fiona Alexander: Hi, Brian. It's Fiona. Just to point out, the intellectual property constituency had some very detailed comments on this recommendation.

Brian Cute: Oh, yes. Thank you. Yeah.

Fiona Alexander: I'm shooting a mail, (inaudible), it helps.

Brian Cute: Yeah. And they had some very active comments during our face-to-face in Buenos Aires. Just to be sure we capture that. Okay, I'm not seeing any -- so for recommendation number 7, I'm not seeing any suggested change of language from staff, in this document.

Amy, were there any points to cover from a staff perspective, before we move to number 9?

Amy Stathos: I'm going to let Larisa or Denise take that one.

Brian Cute: Okay. Larisa, Denise, any points on number 7, recommendation number seven?

Larisa Gurnick: No, Brian. This is Larisa. I don't believe so.

Brian Cute: Okay. All right, let's move to number 9. And for 9.2, we have some -- proposed new language from staff. Avri, you've got the pointer on this one, so if you could look at the proposed new language from staff, and give us some reaction.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I have.

Brian Cute: I know one of the changes was to change to ESEP to ASEP to make it correct, but Avri, if you would?

Avri Doria: Yeah. Sure. Thanks. I appreciate most of the language. I'm fine with pretty much all of it, I think it all makes sense, except for maybe one little thing at the bottom, which is, I think, still somewhat a slightly contented, but I don't want to get into contending it. But basically included with the ICANN Board, and cannot legally see it. And I would just ask her to send it, including the degree to which the ICANN Board cannot legally see, keeping this out of the arguments, where people have made, and these are lawyer types, professor types that know more than I do.

Sort of saying it's not as absolute as everybody always says it is, and there may be ways to do something so that those discussions do not preclude that, but by having the words in, and the degree to which, we are sort of admitting that, you know, it's absolute, or there, indeed, legal pathways within California. As I say, that as professors, and I can

pick up the names, but I'm sure you guys know them anyway -- have argued that there is leeway. So, if that change to it would be the only that I'd be looking for.

Brian Cute: You almost sounded like a lawyer there for a second Avri.

Avri Doria: For the lack the student child of two lawyers. What can I say?

Brian Cute: All right. So take into account, any limitations, the degree to which there are limitations, is the direction you're suggesting this goes?

Avri Doria: Exactly. Just so that it's not completely closed from the start, should we want to, as this discussion goes on, review those possibilities that have been put forward by legal professors.

Brian Cute: Okay. All right, so directionally, that may be an edit. Amy?

Amy Stathos: Yes. Thanks, Brian. I think that's fine. I mean, I have no problem with that. Obviously, as Avri pointed out, there are some people who disagree, and I think we will always agree to disagree. So I'm completely sympathetic to Avri's -- for the revisions to that.

Brian Cute: Okay. Any other -- Avri, any other reaction to the suggested language, from staff?

Avri Doria: No. I thought it was, you know, fine -- good language, and I thought it improved the clarity of the original language.

Brian Cute: Okay. So you hold the pen on this one, so if you would, you know, edit the recommendation and then edit this as we just discussed, and send it back, and then we should have this batch of 9.2.

Okay, staying in the nines. We've got proposed language appointments of the staff on 9.4, which was the -- expanding the transparency report to be a transparency accountability -- for accountability and transparency report. And, Avri again, I think you were the primary on this one.

Avri Doria: Yeah. And I have not done my work on it yet. So I haven't written change yet. So, for example, where I'm being asked to provide more examples to clarify, I still need to do that.

Brian Cute: So I want to ask question on this, because you discussed this a bit, and we've discussed this in different contexts. I think, Avri, when you first proposed it, you had examples of other transparency reports, that you were pointing to, and you were putting this forward as a transparency report. Expanding it to be accountability and transparency report, I believe was introduced in a different context, or at least was discussed in the context of improving the AOC reviews going forward.

Some discussion on: hey, if there were an accountability and transparency report that were issued on an annual basis, that could be helpful in facilitating more efficient and effective reviews going forward. It could be one piece of the inputs. It could help staff in terms of getting into the routine of doing annual reports, and tracking all of the implementation efforts. That was another context that we discussed this in.

I want us to be thoughtful about this. Do we really -- do we intend it to be that type of tool, if we do, do we want to suggest annual accountability and transparency reports. Or, if not, do we want to leave it more open. And does this become -- do we need to be concerned that this becomes something different from an AOC-related tool in terms of content, broader, different.

These are questions on my mind, so I'd like to hear people's thoughts. Avri?

Avri Doria: Was Denise before me?

Brian Cute: Oh, I'm sorry. Denise?

Denise Michel: No. I'm sorry, but I had to take my hand down.

Avri Doria: Okay. So then, this is one case where, when people started, I felt overloading it with accountability, I was kind of, going along to get along, type of thing, which is okay. But the more you talk about it, the more I hear it loses what was needed in terms of an in-depth look at the transparency efforts, and they could indeed go beyond anything that the AOC had said, mandated, or according to the prevailing transparency methods and standards at the time.

So it felt to me like it was losing a little bit of the focus that I had originally hoped on, but as I said, team not just (inaudible), you know, extending it to that, while it does overload it and make it more work, being unreasonable. So, as I said, I was going along with it but wasn't completely comfortable.

Brian Cute: So, your points are all taken. You know, I do see the utility of this as an annual report and I do see utility in tracking the accountability. So I think we need to clear that up in our minds and what we intended to be. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Well, I'm going to say I haven't really through carefully, but as we are having this discussion I'm reminded of comments we got very, very early in the process from a number of people. In reference to ATRT21 saying, they created an awful lot of make (ph) work, and ongoing make work, but not necessarily fixing problems. And mandating an annual transparency, or rather, annual accountability review, where we don't know how it interacts with other things.

We are not -- you know, it wasn't something that we've developed for the bottom up. In my mind, has the tone of something which may generate a huge amount of work, may replicate other things, but in a slightly different form, and may not yield results, just because we haven't actually thought through the process. So I have a little bit -- some level of unease about it. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay. So, Avri, again, unless we hear from a significant number, review team members who are pushing in the making and accountability and transparency reports, I'm hearing it tilted back towards -- as originally offered, and that's what I'm hearing. So, unless there are any other hands on this?

Not seeing any, let's plow forward. 9.4, 9.4.1; now, so the question was to Avri from staff; 9.4.1 through 9.4.5, are these intended to be set of examples? If so, consider identifying them as such and included in the body of the report; section 11, but not in the executive summary. Avri?

Avri Doria: I was muted.

Brian Cute: Any reaction to the question from staff?

Avri Doria: Okay. I think, in part, some of it was, and illustrative, and some of it was -- excuse me -- choking on an almond. So, yeah, I should probably go through, indeed, and clarify that. As I said, I haven't done the work yet. I had to get in some -- and some of it was examples of things that could be included, in its transparency report. In fact, it was a recommendation of things to consider for the transparency report.

Again, don't want to get overly specific, but it was things like, the usage on the DIDP. You know, the degree to which information has been rejected this year; numbers and natures of issues.

Now, the other thing that was included in there, which was sort of going too broad, and probably should either be cut out on those to a foot note, as you know, we have two tiers of redacted -- of further transparency in ICANN. Either people can see it, or they can't. And we don't have an intermediate level, which was being referred to as at in-house (ph) level, where there was intermediate amount of confidentiality. But I also don't see a consensus here in the group, of people saying, yeah, we should really recommend to the ICANN staff and Board, that they should a three-tier with that.

So, that probably ended up an illustrative example of how they could go from a two-tier, either you hit or you don't, to something intermediate. But I don't know that we are making that recommendation and so it was in there more as explanatory material.

- Brian Cute: Okay. And there is the suggestion to change from Whistle Blower to Hotline, so if you would take the staff's questions, onboard?
- Avri Doria: Okay. On which --
- Brian Cute: And come back with proposed language -- final language for the recommendation, that would be great.
- Avri Doria: Yeah. As I said, I was going to work on that tomorrow. I know wanted it by the end of today, but I'll work on it tomorrow. But the other thing on the Whistle Blower, may just go for -- hyphenate (ph) and such, and different words are used in different places, and standards, but I'll put up some of that data and put it in.
- Brian Cute: Thank you. Okay. So I think we've worked through staff's suggested edits, and discussed those, and now the editors have heard the discussion, and can propose final recommendation language.
- Larisa, that covers everything in this document, right?
- Larisa Gurnick: I believe so, Brian.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So now, looking at agenda item 8, 9 and 10, we are going (inaudible/audio gap) -- initially accountability and transparency. These are the last three items for us. We've got 24 minutes, 23 minutes, so let's try to be efficient.
- Multilingualism, I guess the question is for staff. What were the specific points, you felt we needed to consider on the multilingualism recommendation? Anyone from staff?
- Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. I think there was general agreement on all the points on multilingualism. I noticed that Olivier made some suggested revisions most recently.
- Brian Cute: Right.
- Larisa Gurnick: And staff hasn't had a chance to -- or haven't had a chance to connect with Nora yet, to see if there's any, you know, questions regarding the latest edits.
- Brian Cute: Okay. All right. So you've got edits from Olivier, please review them, if you have any reaction to them, make sure you bring them to us for the Tuesday discussion which will be the -- or before, please send that over on the e-mail list so Olivier and the team can consider them. Okay.
- Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Brian Cute: So that means we can move on to -- Oh, Fiona Asonga. Fiona?

Fiona Asonga: Hello, Brian. Thanks. I did make an adjustment to what Olivier had sent through, because I realize that the staff has an issue with the summary, with the recommendations for the multilingualism. However, once (inaudible) read through the explanatory notes, it's very clear on what the overall recommendation is all about. But I've made an adjustment to -- as Olivier said, and I hope that gives a good summary of the entire recommendations, (inaudible).

Brian Cute: Thank you. Thank you, for that. Okay, anything else on recommendation 8 before we move to 9, item 9 on the agenda. Okay. I'm not seeing any hands so let's go ahead on the agenda, which is AOC review process, effectiveness, that's recommendation 11 to 11.7. Okay, Denise, and this is actually from Charla -- actually from Larisa, okay.

So, implementation timeframes, and I believe this came out of a conversation I was -- Larisa and I were having after the call, in terms of getting organized, and I was observing the fact that ATRT1 had put some deadlines in for some of the recommendations, and there were lessons learned about implementation, in that I didn't envision deadlines coming out of ATRT2 recommendations, but of course, that needs to be accepted by the team.

So, not to get ahead of the team, let me ask on that point. I don't believe any of our recommendations actually have deadlines, start dates, et cetera, built into them. So the question for the review team is, is that how we intend to proceed? This is 11.7, could be revised, with suggestion from staff. Any points? Fiona Asonga?

Fiona Asonga: Thanks, Brian. I did also have discussion with Larisa on these, over e-mail. And my feeling is, in (inaudible) on a review team, we are not going to have hyphen, for the different recommendations. I'm happy to make the change. If it is (inaudible) accommodation, and I think it would be positive (ph), but from the way things are moving, I don't think that (inaudible), so I'm happy to adapt to the change.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you, Fiona. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I am a little bit concerned that we make a change because of what our practice is, whereas we have no control over future review teams. So I'm not happy with the revision as it stands, I think we should either keep the old one, or say, the Board is expected to provide expected timeframe, and a rationale for that timeframe.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I guess the thing that I freeze on, in the draft as it stands, is the wording, "If that timeframe is different from one given by the review team, and there aren't any--" I believe there aren't any given by the review team. But this is a recommendation for how the Board handles review teams' input, not just our review team.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'm now reading it through that lens. Okay. In responding to review team recommendations, meaning any review team recommendations?

Alan Greenberg: I think so. We are the AOC, we are giving rules about how ICANN should work in the future.

Brian Cute: No. No. Thank you. That's a different lens, and I do see your point there. Okay. Thank you. Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Oh. I'm just agreeing with Alan. I'm not happy with the changes, and I think if you provide this change, we might, kind of, say that the review team shouldn't give any

expected timeframes, because sometimes you might want to take the time for expecting -- for the expectant implementation, and sometimes you don't need to. So I don't want to tie a future (inaudible).

Brian Cute: Thanks, Lise. Steve Crocker?

Steve Crocker: I was just for the (inaudible), I should have taken taking myself off queue earlier. Just something that I've said several times before, and said again here, from my perspective being, not only, the review team's report on general, or (inaudible) reports. Any recommendation that has specifics about timing, implementation and so forth, from my point of view, is necessarily have to be subjected to a review by staff. And the first part of what we do, is subject every set of recommendations to a feasibility and cost analysis.

So, no matter what you say about when you want something done, I'm going to ask for the staff's recommendations and estimate. And before we adopt the recommendations, we'll have some internal estimate of whether it's feasible to do it. What resources it's going to take, who is going to do it, and what the schedule is likely to be.

So it doesn't matter, in practice, whether you say something or not, about when it should be done, we are going to run it through the same process. The net effect of actually set down a time, is going to convey your sense of what you want, and that's perfectly fine. But I want to help set expectations that that's the way it will be interpreted. It won't be interpreted as a command, because it has to be subjected, as I said, to a kind of reality check.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Denise?

Denise Michel: Steve -- I don't have a valid, so I'll take my hand down. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I'll start off by saying, if a Board or ICANN reacted anyway other than what Steve just described, they will be negligent. So review teams can say what they want. I can see situations where review teams may choose to put a target timeframe in to convey a sense of urgency, if nothing else. And, of course, that has to be passed through a rational test -- a rationality test to make sure it's viable and reasonable and can be done.

All this recommendation was trying to say is, number one, the Board, in approving something, should give some timeframes, so that future review teams or the community has expectations set, and can judge them against whatever they thought was reasonable.

And number two, if indeed they are changing something from what our recommendation said, then provide some background for why that was being done. And the answer may be, the time has already passed; of course, we can't meet it, and therefore this is what we are doing.

So, you know, I don't think that anything that's been said here is at all unreasonable, or putting unreasonable demands on anyone, it just says, let's set expectations properly, and make sure the community and future review teams who are judging them, understand what they're supposed to be doing, that's all.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Fiona?

Fiona Asonga: Thanks, Brian. I think in view of what Alan has said, we could incorporate the issue of rationale, so that the Board has to give a rationale for the timeframe for implementation, and that then captures any potentials for our review teams, providing a timeframe that the Board doesn't think is appropriate, then the Board will -- because the Board has to give a rationale for the (inaudible). And they'll a rationale explaining why they would go in one

way as opposed to what the review team proposes. So I would probably add in, the Board should provide an expected timeframe for implementation and rationale. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: I'm happy with that.

Brian Cute: I'm hearing, and I take Steve's point at face value, and agree with Alan's assessment, a Board being responsible in that way. I'm hearing support for the draft as it is, and in reading it through, I'm going to give it some more thought. I think in the best light, it leaves open the possibility that a review team might feel the need to recommend a timeframe. I think it leaves open the possibility for the Board to be responsible in a way that Steve is describing.

And I think that one of the learnings of this review team is that, implementable (ph) discussions as part of the process are important, and I think that in observing that, and suggesting strongly that that becomes part of the regular process, there's a lower likelihood, and review teams are going to make a suggestion for a timeframe, that is not implementable. And even if they do, you know, the Board was well within its right to say, yeah, we've thought about that, but here's what it takes to implement that, and that just doesn't work, and here's our rationale as to why that doesn't work, and we are going to do our best to implement, and over this time period instead of that.

I'm not seeing this causing major problems, but I'm just giving you my interpretation of everything I'm hearing. And I am hearing support for the draft as -- I guess, Steve, what I would ask you, is just to consider, between now and Tuesday, if you see this recommendation operating in a way that really constrains the Board in a helpful, or complicates implementation, I am all ears on how to tweak this. And, just giving you a reflection back of what my thoughts are now.

Steve Crocker: Well, I don't see a problem at all. Actually I don't see a problem with either of the drafts, either the draft or the proposal, because the obligation -- from my perspective, the obligation after seeing the reports, is to do this and to respond, and part of that response is, if we are going to present it, what our expected timeframe is. If the recommendation includes a suggested timeframe, and our response is a different one, then just as with every other aspect of the recommendation, where, what we choose to do is different from what's recommended, we will speak to that issue.

So, I don't have any problem with any of the words that are here. The obligation on our side is to be responsive enough that it would meet either or both of those wordings.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. One thought as we are speaking, is that we wouldn't want words which would force the Board to say, the review team were a bunch of loony dodos for suggesting that, and we are just putting in a rationale timeframe instead. But I think we have enough good wordsmiths that we don't have to worry about that. Sorry, just a bit of levity.

Brian Cute: Love, loony dodos, not enough of them. Okay. We are -- I think we were at the end. Well I guess financial accountability and transparency, item 10 on the agenda. So I think we've covered this off, and if we can move to number 10, financial accountability and transparency. Were there any inputs from the staff on this draft recommendation?

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. No further inputs from staff.

Brian Cute: Okay. I would suggest that one obligation (audio gap) -- for financial planning, strategic planning and budgeting. It is more of a common practice to three-year planning cycles

and projections, and I think when you get out to five years, it's just, you know, it begins to strain credibility in reality in terms of financial projections and forecasting and planning. So that would be the only suggestions that I would make. Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Sorry. I just had to un-mute. I'm fine with going to three years, changing, five to three. I agree it's more of the norm, so no problems with that.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. Any other inputs on this one from ATRT2? Okay. We are at item 11 on the agenda. So any other point? Alan, I saw something about, you had a question on the GAC recommendation?

Fiona Alexander: No, it's Fiona. I had a question.

Brian Cute: Oh, I'm sorry. Fiona.

Fiona Alexander: My question was to Alan, but anyone can answer.

Brian Cute: Okay, so the question is?

Fiona Alexander: So the last GAC recommendation was sort of a placeholder wavelength for the consultant report. But I kind of think this issue is covered in Alan's recommendation as well, on getting the GAC more involved in the GSO process. I wasn't quite sure how he wanted to handle this, in terms of merging it, or if I'd missed this in the conversation, which could have easily happened.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Alan, what do you think?

Alan Greenberg: At our meeting in Buenos Aires, Larry asked me to make sure that they were rationalized, and I took a lot of the wording out of the 10-point whatever -- not 10-point -- the something-point-10, the last of the GAC ones, and merged into the one under the community to consultation, it's under the PDP one. So they have been merged, there's no need for the GAC one. I mean, I'd appreciate if Fiona looks at it, and make sure what I wrote is good. But I took a lot of the words out of that one, and merged it in so that's -- the merger has been done.

Fiona Alexander: Okay, if you can go ahead and send the list now, I can take a look. But in terms of the template I'll just delete this one and not that it's been merged. And the (inaudible) --

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, it's in the doc -- the version I sent out yesterday and the earlier versions in it, they have been merged already.

Brian Cute: Okay. One last point and it's not putting time tables on recommendations, but we have talked about prioritization, and so we are almost out of time on the call here, but I think I would ask all of the ATRT2 members, let's try to do it this way. If you believe that we should prioritize some of these recommendations, please send an e-mail to the list, and do so by Monday, and identify the recommendations you think we should prioritize and why.

And you don't have to be long-winded, just give us a succinct rationale as to why. I do think we want to address that question, and see if we come to consensus, on whether to prioritize or not, and if we prioritize, get some consensus on which ones we think are priorities. Again I don't think that translates into, necessarily, giving timelines or deadlines since we are at the end of the process, but I'd ask everybody to do that by Monday, so we can talk about that issue on Tuesday.

With that we are the end. Is there any other business? Sorry. I logged off, so if someone's hand is up, please point that out to me.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier's hand is up, and so is mine.

Brian Cute: Okay. Olivier, then Alan.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. I was just going to ask, are we going to have at any point, a discussion on the actual format of the report, just as editorial format basically?

Brian Cute: Wasn't planning on it. What do you have in mind?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well, I -- it's Olivier speaking again. I did note from some of the feedback that we received in the public comment area, is that some were confused by the way the report, was set out. I'm not quite sure whether it's -- what others think on this call, but I certainly was surprised to see that, although, I can't say that I'm overly happy with the way it's currently structured, and perhaps having sub-section numbers might help.

Brian Cute: So, staff just within the last week, I believe, circulated a completely re-numbered version. Have you seen that? If you haven't, take a look at that version. Staff has made a suggestion as to how to number it, and I very much would love to get your feedback on whether you think that is clear and addresses any of the feedback we've gotten.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: If I can ask staff to e-mail it to me because I've got so many versions now flying in, it's crazy.

Brian Cute: Yeah, yeah.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So many different -- it would have been helpful to version numbers, maybe, but never mind.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Please get some feedback on that, Olivier, and I hear you loud and clear. I intend to create an executive summary that really starts with the recommendations, and perhaps shift down some of that contextual narrative, but it's more of a re-sequencing. Other than that, look at staff's draft, and give us whatever feedback you have on that, and that will be helpful.

Fiona Alexander: Hi, Brian --

Brian Cute: Yeah. Sure, Larisa?

Fiona Alexander: It was actually, Fiona.

Brian Cute: Oh, Fiona.

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. Just in terms of the GAC, the recommendations, one of the comments was that we shouldn't use bullets, but we should actually enumerate the bullets with user numbers, just for ease of tracking, so I've included that in what I've said. But I'm assuming the staff probably already caught that in the reformatted version.

Brian Cute: Okay. All right -- Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Thank you. Just to Olivier's point. I think it is part of the confusion was that we used two completely different set of numbering in the body of the report, and in the executive (audio skip) -- and that alone was enough to confuse people who were otherwise astute enough to try to compare the two. And I'm assuming all of that is being covered.

Brian Cute: Well, don't assume. Please take a look at it --

Alan Greenberg: No. No. I'm going to look at it, but I'm assuming on the first cut that we will not use different numbering in the two parts of the report and have them conflict with each other. I hope that that's the target. I just want to note that in an earlier meeting, several meetings ago, we had on the agenda, but I don't think we did approval of a whole bunch of reports, and clean up the terms of reference, which we never did at the beginning of this process.

Brian Cute: We never did finish the terms of reference, you're correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Just some housekeeping that we probably need to do, at least approving the reports, so that they can be published and are in fact reports of this group before we disband completely. So just a to-do that we need to catch up with sometime.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Okay. Thank you, for that. I don't see any other hands up.

Unidentified Participant: Larisa has her hand up.

Brian Cute: Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Brian. I just wanted to respond to Olivier and Alan. So in the staff proposed re-sequencing, that I will make sure that everybody on the ATRT2 Review Team, has access to, and is posted in the Wiki, had the (inaudible). Our approach was not to -- our proposed approach was not to renumber sections of the report, because we thought that that would be confusing for people that had spent considerable time digesting the draft reports.

So the sections of the report, will stay numbered as they were, but it will be much more clear as to the fact that sections -- I'm making it up -- but let's say section three of the report, actually, pertains to recommendation that will -- Alan's example was a good one, section 13 of the report, actually pertains to recommendation 10, on draft (ph) constituency considerations. And that maybe a follow-up recommendation to -- recommendation from -- numbered something else from ATRT1.

So it's still going to be a little cumbersome, just based on the fact that a report -- how the report was constructed, but something that I wanted for the review team to consider, which is keeping the section numbers as they were in the draft report. Not to create additional confusion. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: In that case we just need to be really careful. For better or worse, we use the section number as the thing by which we numbered the recommendations. Or these people did, so we -- if the recommendations are not akin to the section numbers, we just need to make the -- you know, have clarity in how it's presented.

Brian Cute: Okay. Folks, please take a look at the draft from staff, and if you think that needs to be modified, let us know.

Alan Greenberg: The larger single problem, I think, is the size of the report, but we made the decision to include the analysis of ATRT1 in the body, and not in the appendix. That's what end up causing the size of the report to be as large as it is, and I just can't see redoing that right now, as much as I personally would think we -- it would help clarity, but I just don't think there's time to do that properly.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Any other hands up, I can't see?

Alan Greenberg: No. Larisa, still has a hand up, but I assume it's an old one.

Brian Cute: Okay, folks, we are out of time. Thank you very much. Very good work; please get edited recommendations, and please get any edits based on public comments received. Please

read them, and citations by Monday, and we will see a draft of all the proposed final recommendations as edited to reviewer to, say, get consensus, and move forward.

Thanks, everybody for a lot of good work this week. Well, appreciated.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you, Brian.