20131217_ATRT2_ID841118

Charla Shambley: Yes. The recording's started, Brian.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you, Charla. This is Brian Cute. This is the accountability and transparency review team two (ph) conference call of December 17, 2013. Welcome, everybody, wherever you are. And welcome to what may very well be the last call of this review team.

We have an agenda of three items on the Adobe under the discussion notes and proposings from the staff that item one be an inclusion of draft recommendations along with final recommendations in the body of the report. Number two, boilerplate text. There's nothing to report for public comments section. Three, posting a final report with or without translations. Okay. Those are three proposed agenda items from the staff.

And, really, the first purpose is-- in item number one, I think, would be a final discussion on the revised proposed final recommendations that have been submitted and now appear in the draft report. So this really is the last call for any ATRT2 member. We now can review each of the recommendations as they've been edited through our process. This is the proposed final form. This is your speak now or forever hold your peace moment that, if you think a recommendation as drafted here needs to be edited or modified, speak now.

So, with the review of the proposed recommendations being agenda item number one and the three proposed by the staff on the screen, being the four agenda items. Is everyone comfortable adopting that agenda for this call? If there's any other item or a change to the agenda, please, make that recommendation now.

Okay. I think there probably will be a couple of other housekeeping items to bring up at the end before we close.

But let's get started.

The first question for Larisa.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Brian, it's Olivier. I had my hand up.

Brian Cute: I'm sorry. I did not see your hand. Okay. Please, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Brian. It's Olivier, for the transcript record. Just a concern that I have. I understand. We keep on speaking about draft recommendations and so on. And I'm really getting increasingly concerned that our report-- ATRT2 report does not only contain recommendations but also observations. I'm quite worried that anyone reading it will pretty much focus on just recommendations. And the observations, which this

working group has made and on which it has spent, I would say, an enormous amount of time because most people (technical difficulties).

Unidentified Participant: Olivier, you've become very garbled.

Unidentified Participant: You're getting chopped up, Olivier. Sorry.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Can you hear me?

Unidentified Participant: Still a bit rough, but try, please.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. I'm increasingly concerned that we are spending-- we have spent a significant amount of time on observations. And the report as it reads at the moment is very recommendation influenced. And I'm very concerned that the observations in the readers' minds will go straight into the bin. I don't know how to strengthen the observations, by the way. We're spending, of course, a significant amount of time now on (technical difficulties) in my mind, equally important. And I'm not quite sure how we can promote those.

Brian Cute: So my question back to you, Olivier, would be: When you say observations, do you mean the analysis in the body of the report under each recommendation? Do you mean observations as we title them in the appendices, observations on the ATRT2 process? Or do you mean all of that or something else?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. I mean observations when we look at, for example, an ATRT1 recommendation and provide an observation that it's running slowly, it's not currently being totally implemented, but we don't have a further recommendation to make based on that.

Brian Cute: And, if that's our observation-- I'm trying to understand your question with precision. You're not suggesting that we change the observation or analysis. You're just underscoring that you're worried that people may not read it, or it may not come to their attention. I'm trying to understand your concern.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. Indeed, I would like to suggest that we have some text that puts an emphasis that this report is not solely a set of recommendations but has observations which need to be looked at by the board. I'm concerned that the board would just be reading the recommendations and would be not taking any other-- of the other stuff into account and, therefore, just acting on the recommendations but not on the observations.

Brian Cute: So, if I were to offer to add a couple of clear sentences to that effect in the introduction language, would that satisfactorily address the concern you're raising? Or would you recommend something else?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. Having no solution myself, I think that what you're proposing is a good step forward. I don't know if anyone else has any suggestions. But that certainly is a good way forward. Yes. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay. At a minimum, I could offer to do that. Any other discussions on this point? I'm looking for hands.

Alan Greenberg: Alan. I have my hand up.

Brian Cute: Alan? I'm not seeing hands up. Alan, is your hand up?

Alan Greenberg: My hand is up.

Brian Cute: It's not showing up on my screen. So, folks, please, call out as Alan did. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'll make an observation. What you're proposing covers our backside in that we're making the statement that there are observations, and everyone should read them. It still will not-- without being a recommendation, it's not going to get tracked. The board doesn't need to report on what they're doing about it or what they're thinking about it. I'm just raising that issue that it may heighten their visibility slightly, but that's all it's doing. And, if that wasn't the intent of Olivier's request, then it doesn't solve it.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Let me offer a thought here. There's only so much we can do. If people-- the desired outcome is that people read the report from front to back and take all these points on board, we certainly expect that the board will, and we certainly expect the staff will and has. In terms of the rest of the community, other than explicitly saying there are some important elements in this report and we really think you should read them, I'm at a loss as to what else we can do. I am open to suggestions. Certainly, I'd be happy to add some explicit sentences to that effect in the introductory paragraphs. I think that's worthwhile. But, if there are other suggestions as to how to address the concern--

Alan Greenberg: Brian, with sufficient time, we could gather those observations together into a separate section to make them easy to find instead of being embedded. I'm not sure we have the stamina to do that right now. I think we made our choice by not making them recommendations, perhaps sadly so.

Brian Cute: Okay. I've lost my connectivity. So, if there's any hands up, please, call out. Otherwise, we'll move on. I don't see any hands. If you have a suggestion on this point, I'm all ears.

                       Otherwise, we'll move to review the recommendations.

                       So a question for Larisa. Larisa, the draft of the report that you have on the screen-- does this contain all of the updated recommendations from the ATRT2, or are there any that we're still waiting on, just before we start?

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. This is to confirm that the draft that you are looking at contains all the edits that have been submitted to date. If there are other components that people are still working on that they haven't submitted, obviously, that wouldn't be reflected here. But we ought to be up to date on everything that has been circulated.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. And today was the deadline to submit these, so we really are going to have a hard cutoff after this discussion.

                       So, again, I don't have visibility. But can we go to--? What I'd like to do is just go through each of the recommendations one at a time. The floor will be open. And, folks, this is not an invitation for discussion. This is only an invitation for - I believe this recommendation needs to be edited. Here's why. Make it compelling. And offer the edits. I really want to manage our time intelligently here for everyone's benefit.

                       So can we move to--?

Fiona Alexander: Hey, Brian, this is Fiona. I have a question before we start.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Sure.

Fiona Alexander: So the format and the wording of the recommendations are different. So will that--? I don't want to offer edits that do that just yet. But are we going to at some point do a scrub? Like the GAC recommendations, because you're recommending the GAC but not the board. But the board and the GAC working together through the DJR-- it has more of a preface. But some of the other recommendations just say - develop an objective measure. Like, it doesn't say who the recommendation's going to. Will that be addressed later? What do you have in mind?

Brian Cute: Feel free to call those points out as we go. Those edits, if they're needed, can be added in the next two to three days. And that's a very good point. If that's needed, just call it out on a recommendation. We'll make notes (inaudible).

Fiona Alexander: It's needed on all of the recommendations except the GAC ones.

Brian Cute: Okay. Then the recommendations-- Let's take a look at each of them. I assume most of them will be to the board and maybe to some other group within ICANN. Let's make that a point for each one.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, before we start, a question for Larisa. Currently, the formatting, numbering is sort of a grab bag of different formats. I'm assuming we're not talking about that today, and that will be fixed afterwards. Is that correct?

Larisa Gurnick: Alan, this is Larisa. In the version that you're looking at, we've cleaned up the numbering in terms of (technical difficulties) been deleted. Obviously, it no longer shows up. And the sequencing of numbers has been fixed for that to a certain extent following the GAC recommendations format-- that suggestion to eliminate bullet points and replace them with numbers. We tried to do that. But that's-- the majority of the formatting cleanup effort will necessarily take place after the content is all finalized.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'm talking about things like-- some are in italics; some are not. Some are indented differently. That kind of-- You'll do all that? We're not going to talk about that today, I assume.

Larisa Gurnick: We haven't had a chance to really do (inaudible) on the formatting. Yeah. I suggest that we perhaps do that in the later draft.

Alan Greenberg: Just confirming. Thank you.

Brian Cute: We are very lucky to have the resource-- the professional writer that staff has made available for that sort of work so that the chair and the vice-chairs and Paul Diaz wouldn't have to be doing that sort of thing on December 30. So that detail will be taken care of.

                     Let's move to recommendation 1. Do we have control on the screen, folks? Sorry. We do. Okay. I'm now scrolling along with you. For purposes of clarity, we're on page 3 on the screen.

Alan Greenberg: You're doing page by page numbers not on the PDF.

Brian Cute: I'm trying to go to recommendation 1 and identify what numeric page it's on.

Alan Greenberg: I'm just saying you're using the page numbers on the page, not the page number that shows up on Adobe Connect, which are different.

Brian Cute:	Correct. Recommendation 1, page 3 in the report. Develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN board members and the success of board improvement efforts, and analyze those findings over time.
	Again, the call is for-- This needs to be edited. Here's the compelling rationale. Here's the edit.
	Going once, going twice. Sold.
	Number 2. Develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.
	I guess-- Carlos, I'll come right to you. Back to Fiona's question, both of these should be edited to say - The board should develop. The board should develop for 1 and 2. Correct, Fiona?
Fiona Alexander:	Yes. That would be my recommendation.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Larisa, can you, please, capture that? So number 1 should be edited to say - The board should develop objective measures… And number 2 should say - The board should develop metrics.
Larisa Gurnick:	Brian, this is Larisa. I got that.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very much. Carlos?
Carlos Gutierrez:	Yes. I'm sorry, Brian, but I still have a (unintelligible) in number 1. We had this discussion in Buenos Aires that we should refer to the board as a group and not members individually. Now it says - board members and success of the board. But I just wanted to make that comment. I think we had agreed we were not going to talk individual board members or individual GAC members or anything that might make us think about them individually. Sorry.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Thank you for that, Carlos. On our last call, this issue was discussed. I had suggested dropping this in its entirety based on the conversation in Buenos Aires. There was significant pushback on the call that we needed to preserve a recommendation. I will say again that the board made it clear that they're doing very detailed peer reviews of directors and doing that in a systematic way. But the reason this is back is because of output of the last call.
	I got Denise and Larisa in the queue. Denise?
Denise Michel:	Yes. Can you guys hear me? I'm hearing a lot of static on the line. (technical difficulties). Can you guys hear me?
Alan Greenberg:	I can. This is Alan.
Denise Michel:	Okay. Great. So, staff had suggested that 1 and 2 can be combined as one recommendation, noting Larisa's comment. They're very closely related and likely would be addressed together. So we are suggesting, while maintaining the language there in both, just combine those as one. So it would read: develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN board members. I can't quite read the--

Larisa, can you read the comments that we added to this? My screen is a little blurry.

They were suggesting these are very closely related and would be addressed as one. So we were suggesting that you combine 1 and 2. And the comment-- you guys can read it. My screen is cut off-- speaks to that.

Larisa Gurnick: Denise, this is Larisa. So, the suggested combinations of - Develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN board members and metrics and analysis to measure the effectiveness of the board's functioning and improvement effort over time. Publish information on board training materials. That should have the end quote at that point.

Denise Michel: And then, further, I've received a note from Steve, who wasn't-- it didn't seem clear to him on the feasibility and intent of the recommendations. I don't know if Steve is on to speak to this. If not, I'm sure that can be covered as the board considers this recommendation.

Alan Greenberg: Have we lost Brian?

Unidentified Participant: I don't know. I wonder if we did. I don't hear him responding. Do we have anybody who's just on the phone?

Alan Greenberg: I really like the other conference system where you can see who's on and who isn't.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Brian says they can hear me. So we just can't hear Brian. Maybe he's muted.

Brian Cute: I'm muted. Sorry about that, folks. My apologies. I was calling you, Avri. Please.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'm not uncomfortable with merging those two. And I just wanted to put in a note at the moment that I think there's confusion over the elimination of all three. So, when it gets time to talk about that, I want to, but I didn't want to just to jump over all three.

Brian Cute: Let's focus on number 1. Again, folks, we're at the finish line. Okay? I'm not opening this up again. Is the language here broken, not working, unclear? Carlos raised an issue. I addressed the issue. I didn't hear anybody coming in en masse behind that comment saying - No, no, no. Drop number 1. So we're at the finish line. If this language doesn't work, I want to hear specific edits to it. If the thing should be dropped, I better hear a large majority of people saying to drop it. Otherwise, we're moving on. Hands, please.

Alan Greenberg: All I heard was Denise's suggestion, which says eliminate the number and merge them into a single paragraph or a single recommendation, which I have no problem with. I don't consider that a substantive change. I consider that editing.

Unidentified Participant: And I don't particularly care one way or another about it.

Alan Greenberg: Nor do I.

Brian Cute: One is targeted at individual board directors; one is targeted at the board.

Unidentified Participant: Yep. I think it's fine to leave them separate. I don't think you have overwhelming support to separate-- combine them. So leave them separate.

Unidentified Participant: Fine.

Brian Cute:	Okay. Moving on. Number 3. Okay, old 3-- If I'm correct old 3 was-- What was old 3? Let me ask Larisa.
Avri Doria:	Okay. Old 3 had two parts in it-- if I can speak.
Brian Cute:	Sure.
Avri Doria:	Old 3 had the - Do the history of candidates to see if things had improved because of confrontation and then moving on. Now, we agreed at the last time that we couldn't do the historical part and basically collect information from old (ph) on the candidate tool. But that didn't mean that we drop an ongoing collection of that data so that it could be used later to evaluate how the (inaudible) section is being reached, et cetera, et cetera. So we got rid of the historical comparative part last time. I didn't think we were getting rid of the whole recommendation to collect data on the candidate pool.
Brian Cute:	So, does that collecting data tie to the compensation issue or just generally collecting data to gauge the--
Avri Doria:	Yeah. And, in fact, I had rewritten it to cut out the second one and say the first. And it seems to have completely disappeared from the merge.
Brian Cute:	Had we discussed that as a standalone recommendation that--?
Avri Doria:	We had gotten to the point of agreeing to remove the historical part. We didn't discuss anything other than - Oh, we can't do the history. Okay. We won't do the history.
Brian Cute:	I would really need to see that version of the language in whole to refresh my recollection, unfortunately.
Avri Doria:	I still have it.
Alan Greenberg:	It's Alan. I don't think we discussed it. But my intuitive feeling was that, because of confidentiality issues, unless someone developed a high-level ability to summarize and then discard the original data, that was not likely to be possible. But I don't think-- we didn't discuss that consciously.
Brian Cute:	All right. Just so you all know-- Thank you, Alan. I'm going to hunt for the last version and read the language slowly to the group because I've really got to revisit it myself because I'm honestly, Avri, not remembering as well.
Avri Doria:	It was just my edits in one version. No reason that anyone should remember it. I can read it now.
Brian Cute:	Can you read--? Do you have it in front of you? This would be the last--
Avri Doria:	Yep. This was 3. This was the old 3 as I recommended changing it. Conduct qualitative, quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of board candidates pooled change over time and regularly assess directors compensation levels against prevailing standards. And so, basically, I took out-- I left the old part, and I-- I mean I left the old, except for the historical, which they said was unavailable, which is what I thought we were trying to do.
Alan Greenberg:	It's Alan. I recall that we deliberately left out the assess compensation because we were told, basically, that's business as usual. And we didn't think that was really necessary.

Avri Doria:	But that's that same observation thing. And, yeah, they're doing it. So there's no harm in saying it. So that's where I thought we were. I just tied it into--
Alan Greenberg:	I actually think the bylaws require periodic--
Avri Doria:	No. It took too much. It also took the deleted part when I did the copy. So that didn't come out right. Sorry. The part that I just put in there is everything except - improve (inaudible) was available. That phrase was deleted in what's in front of me. But, of course, when I cut and pasted, it wasn't deleted.
Brian Cute:	I'm still shuffling around trying to get the last version, so I can see it and see what was dropped, what Avri is saying should be preserved, and so we can have a focused decision here. Did you guys--? Sorry. Still hunting.

Larisa, do you by any chance have the last version? Could you throw it up on screen? Sorry to ask on the fly like this, but I'm having a hard time getting my hands on it. |
Avri Doria:	I just sent it to (inaudible).
Larisa Gurnick:	I'm sorry. I'm trying to hunt down the version that Avri is referencing, and I don't have it in front of me.
Avri Doria:	I just sent the language to the list.
Larisa Gurnick:	Okay. Let me take a quick look.
Brian Cute:	All right. I'm looking at a version from December 12.
Avri Doria:	And I just cut it into the thing corrected this time.
Brian Cute:	Okay. What I'm looking is from December 12. Avri and Brian proposed edits to ATRT2 recommendations. This was a document from staff. And the revision--
Avri Doria:	This was a document I sent on the 16th. I was sent away to do homework, and I sent in my homework on the 15th and the 16th. And this was--
Brian Cute:	15th and 16th?
Avri Doria:	This was in the 16th. I think it was even in the 12/15 version. But yeah. I sent it to the list with all my edits.
Brian Cute:	When was our last call? It was last week. Okay. So this is an edited (inaudible)
(Multiple Speakers)	
Brian Cute:	-- on the 15th that wasn't discussed on the last call. Correct?
Avri Doria:	Exactly. This is the result of the last call when we decided to take out the historical part because that couldn't be done.
Brian Cute:	Okay. All right. I'm looking at an e-mail from you at 8:27 a.m. on December 15, Sunday. Is that correct? Is that the right one, Avri?

Charla Shambley:	This is Charla. I have another one from Avri that's time-stamped at 11:23 my time; so, about 2:23 your time. Is that the one you want?
Brian Cute:	Would you be able to put that up on the screen, Charla?
Charla Shambley:	Yes. Give me one second.
Brian Cute:	Take your time.
Avri Doria:	So, did any of my other edits get in, or did all my edits get lost? I guess I'd better check. I did my edits to 9. I did everything I was supposed to. (Unintelligible).
Larisa Gurnick:	Avri and Brian, this is Larisa.
Avri Doria:	All of my changes were ignored.
Larisa Gurnick:	You don't see your changes incorporated in--
Avri Doria:	Let me go back and look at other stuff.
Larisa Gurnick:	I don't know if perhaps Paul can speak to this. Paul, you were incorporating everybody's changes up until Sunday night, at which point, you handed the document to me.
Paul Diaz:	Yeah. Hi, guys. Avri, I was pinging you offline. I can assure you because I spent the better part of my Sunday plugging in everybody's edits and overriding things as you guys would come back with updated edits-- To tell you the truth, because--
Avri Doria:	So how did 3 get changed?
Paul Diaz:	That's what I'm getting to. To tell you the truth, this is the first time I'm looking at this draft because we've had our board meeting the last two days. So I'm happy to post back to the list what I did. But I'm as frustrated as everybody because I feel like what I'm seeing-- all the work that I did, I'm not seeing it reflected. Very, very screwy.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Then we have to pause. We've got to pause. Number one, we need to know what version document we're looking at - if it's Paul's version, if it's Paul's version modified by staff. We clearly are seeing that some proposed edits that came in aren't reflected in the document we're looking at. And there's a number of different things we could do here.
	But the first question is-- Larisa, what are we looking at? Is this Paul's last version or Paul's last version with additional edits brought in from staff, just for clarity?
Larisa Gurnick:	Brian, this is Larisa. We are looking at Paul's last version with some further edits from staff, most of them in note form.
Paul Diaz:	But there's a lot of other changes incorporated. I've noticed, like, where I had AOC, it was changed to affirmation of commitments. I'm not complaining, but someone got a lot of detailed work on this report.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Here's my suggestion. For the time that we have remaining, we go through recommendation by recommendation. Now there's an onus on every drafter or editor of a recommendation to take a careful look as it goes by, identify whether or not your-- this is your most up to date edit of the recommendation. If it is, please, confirm that. And then the group can come to consensus on the recommendation or make a final edit. If you

identify that something is missing, please, do that. We will take stock of that point, and we will keep moving through the document. We need to get through the exercise of coming to consensus on these recommendations. So I want to get as much done on this call as we can.

Is that an acceptable way to proceed?

Unidentified Participant: Yep.

Brian Cute: Okay. Larisa, your hand is up.

Charla Shambley: Sorry. This is Charla.

Brian Cute: I'm sorry, Charla.

Charla Shambley: Do you want me to (inaudible) document posted, or do you want me to put the old version back up? I have Avri's in the room right now.

Avri Doria: I would not put my version up. I would put the final version. I'm going through. I'm finding most (technical difficulties) that old 3 was missing. I think that's the only thing of mine that seems to be deviating as I do a comparison.

Brian Cute: Okay. Actually, for the moment, Avri, if--

Lise Fuhr: Brian, Larisa sent out an edit just before this meeting. And that has a lot of other changes in. The one we're seeing at the screen now is not the same as the one Larisa sent out.

Alan Greenberg: Right now, nothing's on the screen. So let's wait 'til the next one.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. But, before, Larisa sent one out some hours ago--

Larisa Gurnick: Lise, I believe this is the one that you're seeing on the screen right now. Is it not?

Lise Fuhr: No, because the one-- it might be now. I don't know now. But, before, I didn't see any of my changes, and those are included in the one you sent out before. Let me check this one. Yep. This one is the same now. Okay.

Larisa Gurnick: Lise, this is Larisa. I think that you may have caught what was on the screen, which represented Avri's version, which only included her edits.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Yep.

Brian Cute: Okay, folks, can you hear me? This is Brian. Can you all hear me?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. We can hear you.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'm going to make as they call a management decision here. Given the state of things and the fact that there seems to be a number of proposed edits to recommendations that are in e-mail form and not reflected in this document, I just don't see the point of this exercise at this moment in time. I'm sorry. It's just there's too much loose. And we can make our best efforts, but it's too loose. And the only thing that makes sense for us is to as a group go through this document with all of the edits-- final edits to all of the recommendations reflected in the document so we can have a clear discussion. I just don't see the value of working--

Alan Greenberg:	Brian, Avri came back. You may not have been on-- there a second. Avri came back and said most of what she did is there. Just the old 3 was missing.
Brian Cute:	Old 3 missing. I heard Lise say that there were some edits to recommendations that were just sent in.
Alan Greenberg:	No. She was looking at an Avri document on the screen at that moment.
Brian Cute:	All right. Here's the deal.
Avri Doria:	(Inaudible).
Brian Cute:	It's okay. Here's the deal. We're going to go through this one by one. Everybody who's edited a recommendation is charged to look carefully at the screen. And, if you final edit version is there, please, indicate that. If you indicate that affirmatively, we will have a discussion about it and finalize it.
	If as we move through this we start finding that more than one occasion we don't have a final edited recommendation in this document, I am pulling the plug, and we're going to do this call tomorrow or Thursday or Friday. That's going to be the approach.
	Larisa?
Larisa Gurnick:	I can clarify in response to Paul's comments. Paul sent me a document that questioned whether the old 3 should have been included or not. And then you had responded to that with your own version, directing us to delete old 3.
Unidentified Participant:	Yes.
Larisa Gurnick:	That is why old 3 has been deleted. All the other changes that were made that Paul feels confident were incorporated should in fact be there. But this should explain to you, Avri and everybody else, why-- what the logic was for dropping the old 3. It was because it was in response to Paul's question regarding what was to be with old 3 that, Brian, you responded number 3 should be deleted because the nom comm does not have pre-2011 benchmark data. And, based on that, it was deleted.
Brian Cute:	Okay. That's clear. Thank you. And Avri's point is she felt that a portion of old 3 should have been preserved. And that was the discussion we were having.
Larisa Gurnick:	In terms of the integrity of the document, I think that this hopefully will help understand why that was missing. But that shouldn't necessarily mean that everything else was missed as well.
Brian Cute:	Look, that's fine. This is what it is. And, although I have a tone in my voice, it's because of two days of a board meeting. It's not that I'm angry at anybody here.
	But, really, for our sanity, if we find as we go through this that final proposed edits are not in this document, it's not worth our time. So my suggestion is let's pick up the discussion. Let's start walking through them. If we bump into the instance of - Hey, I sent in a final edit here-- it's not in this document, I say we get this document finaled and walk through it carefully as a group.
	So, Avri's point on old 3 was that she didn't think the entire thing should be removed. And I guess, then, the point is, Avri, can we isolate the language that you believe should

have been preserved, because we did delete a portion of it on the basis that the nom comm does not have candidate data pre 2011. And, since that data would be the benchmark for the analysis of what was the impact of compensation, then it just doesn't make sense. So I think we agreed on that point on the last call.

I'd like to isolate the remaining language that you think--

Fiona Alexander: Hey, Brian, this is Fiona. So, Avri actually posted something to the list. It's just one sentence. Maybe we could just look at that one sentence. I think she's done that for you (inaudible).

Brian Cute: And it's in the chat box?

Fiona Alexander: No. It's on the e-mail list.

Avri Doria: It's in both the e-mail list and the chat box.

Brian Cute: Okay. So I'm looking in the chat box. And, just to make sure I'm reading the right stuff, Avri says: Conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of board candidate pools change over time and regularly assess directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards. Is that the right language?

Avri Doria: That's the right language. Yep.

Brian Cute: Okay. Terrific.

Avri Doria: And it's basically so that we don't get ourselves in the situation - Whoops, no history next time somebody wants to make a change. We can measure it starting (inaudible) totally now and are in good shape to compare what (inaudible).

Brian Cute: And can I ask--? This is an important question. Was this language in a prior iteration of the draft report that this group discussed? Or this wholly new language?

Avri Doria: It's the same language with just a phrase cut out.

Brian Cute: Okay. So this comes from earlier iterations of the report, and it's been reviewed by the team.

Avri Doria: I cut out the language about historical review.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Avri Doria: And so it's an edit on that language that cuts out the historical stuff.

Brian Cute: Okay. So I want to have very focused, crisp, and short discussion here. Assuming that that goes back in as number 3, an open question coming out of our earlier conversations was whether a recommendation to regularly assess directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards is necessary, given that we've heard from the board that that is something they're doing as a matter of course. And they have started their round two of compensation review, and that's in process today. So that's a question to the review team.

I saw Denise's hand up and Avri's hand up.

Denise Michel:	Yes. I'm not answering your question, Brian. But, just as a point of clarification for the team members, so we all are generally clear on how this would go forward. The board would ask the nom comm since the nom comm is the only entity that has access to the current candidate pool that goes through the nom comm. The board would be asking the nom comm to collect data and do-- anonymise (ph) it and provide it to the board. And then, separate from the nom comm, as you mentioned, the board does a-- and the staff supports the board-- assessment of compensation on a regular basis already. So we're meeting-- Those are two separate-- That's how those two things would be on that, just to clarify.
Brian Cute:	Helpful point, Denise. Thank you. Avri?
Avri Doria:	Yeah. I think it's good that there is an implementation path for it. I think, especially since we'll be measuring compensation again and we'll want to do the same backwards-- did the change of compensation change anything kind of studies. And, also, finally, we've never used-- just because somebody's doing something already in an informal sense-- that that was a reason not to make a recommendation. And, in fact, we started out this meeting lamenting observations that weren't recommendations. So I think it should remain.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Thank you. And I personally, not speaking as chair, agree with your last point. But, when you bring compensation into this recommendation, I want to make another point. We don't have pre-2011 data, so that benchmark just isn't available to us. If you're suggesting that there should be a compensation element of this recommendation, I ask - What are we getting at, because the directors are compensated today. There could be a worthwhile scenario I'm missing. But, unless you're anticipating changes in compensation level and measuring the effect of that on the candidate pool at some future time, what would be the benefit?
Avri Doria:	That is indeed the case. I am assuming that, at some point, compensation will change, or there'll be a discussion of it changing. And we'll be looking at the pools that we had. We won't be in a situation that says - Ahah. But there's no history, so we can't do it. So, at that point, there will be history, and we will be able to.

And it will be useful for more than just compensation. The other part of it is, when you're doing compensation studies against prevailing standards, you're looking at - Hey, these other boards have people that were presidents and they were Ph.D.s and they were thises and that, and they got half of what you people are getting. And so that kind of data becomes reasonable even without the historical data. |
Brian Cute:	Okay. I'm looking for a show of hands that supports this language as it is. That would be the green checkmark, please. I'd like to see whether we have broad support for this. I'm not seeing a lot of checkmarks. I'm seeing Avri. Is everybody able to make a checkmark? There's Lise. That's two folks. I'm not getting a sense of broad support for this language. If anyone opposes this language, could you, please, indicate that with a red X? I'm trying to get a sense of the group here.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, it's Alan. Since we're not getting a lot of response here, I'll tell you what my position is. I don't strongly oppose it, but I think it's a make-work exercise that's not likely to yield a lot. So I'm not actively supporting it. I'm not going to try to veto it. I don't think it's a particularly powerful recommendation.
Brian Cute:	Demi-- I see Demi typing. I'll just wait for that.

Alan Greenberg:	When there was a possibility-- It's Alan speaking again. When there was a possibility that we could say - Was this whole compensation thing a boondoggle, I thought it had merit. At this point, I don't really think it's--
Brian Cute:	Okay. It was in the report up until I cut it. I'm not hearing strong opposition. I'm not hearing strong support. There's agreement on the piece that was cut. I say we leave it in because I'm not hearing overwhelming support in either direction. It was in the draft. It was supported. Keep it in.
Alan Greenberg:	Move on.
Brian Cute:	Okay. That becomes number 3. One last point, to Denise's point, which was a very good one, this is the board directing or asking the nom comm to conduct these studies. Is that correct, Avri?
Avri Doria:	To collect that data.
Brian Cute:	It says - Conduct qualitative and quantitative studies. That's the action.
Avri Doria:	Right. I don't know that we're talking implementation. I'm not certain that I agree with Denise's implementation design already that basically-- that the board will say - Oh, nom comm, you have to do the whole study, not that - Okay, nom comm, we have to figure out how to collect the data and how to anonymise it. And we need to work with you to make sure that this is what's done and that you're able to collect this data in a way that is commensurate with your confidentiality policy. So I'd be really surprised at a board that just would sort of say - Oh, studies, nom comm, do it.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, what's the purpose of the question you're asking?
Fiona Alexander:	Hey, Brian, this is Fiona. I would just suggest you leave it broad that the board should. And then, as Avri was saying, the board can decide how and what and who does it. I mean, because the last piece necessarily involves the nom comm. So leaving it broad gives them the flexibility to decide.
Brian Cute:	Folks, sorry. I got interrupted. First of all, we weren't talking about implementation, per se, Avri. I was trying to get to Fiona Alexander's question of to whom should this recommendation be directed. There was a tie-in, I thought, to Denise's remark. That's what I was focusing on.
Avri Doria:	It's directed to the board. They're all directed to the board unless specifically saying otherwise.
Brian Cute:	And, in some cases, we tell the board to, please, ask the GAC to do XYZ. Nom comm is clearly the entity that has this task, this role, has the data. Should we not say the board should--
Avri Doria:	I don't think so.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, the nom comm is going to have to oversee the extraction of the data, which will likely be done by staff. The correlation and tracking of it year to year would not be a nom comm responsibility. So it's an ICANN responsibility overall, some part of which has to be delegated to the nom comm and nom comm staff.

Brian Cute:	Okay. Then it's going in. The board should conduct qualitative/quantitative studies, et cetera. Thank you.
	Moving on to number 3 on the screen. It will be new number 4. But let's just go with the numbers as they are.
	Continue supporting cross-community engagement aimed at developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation, develop complementary mechanisms whereby the supporting organizations and advisory committees can consult with the board on matters, including but not limited to, policy implementation and administrative matters on which the board makes decisions.
	This needs a serious edit. Here's the compelling reason why. Here's the proposed edit. The floor is open. Not seeing any hands.
Alan Greenberg:	I will ask the same question I asked on a different recommendation. What does complementary mean there?
Brian Cute:	Who is the editor?
Avri Doria:	I was. I took that language there. Complementary means pieces that fit together in a complementary manner.
Brian Cute:	Does it still work if we drop complementary and it says - Develop mechanisms whereby the SOs and ACs can consult with the board?
Avri Doria:	The thing that complementary adds is that, obviously, you don't want the board stuck with a bunch of irreducibly different processes that don't fit together. But, if you want to drop the word, I won't fight it.
Brian Cute:	Anybody feel violently about this one or any other?
Alan Greenberg:	It's a word which has elicited questions before of - I don't know what it's saying. I don't know what it meant. So that's why I raised it.
Avri Doria:	That's because most people don't speak English that well.
Brian Cute:	Moving on. Number 4. Review redaction standards for board documents. Document information disclosure policy and any other ICANN documents to create a single, published redaction policy. Institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted material to determine if redactions are still required and, if not, ensure that redactions are removed.
	Larisa, your hand is up.
Larisa Gurnick:	Back on the previous recommendation, can we--? Can you, please, clarify for me if the word complementary is staying?
Brian Cute:	It's staying.
Larisa Gurnick:	Thank you.
Brian Cute:	Number 4? Absolutely needs an edit. Here's the compelling reason. Here's the proposed language. Open floor. Looking for hands. Okay. Don't see any hands.

On to number 5. Okay. Increase transparency of GAC-related activities is the umbrella for the following. 5.1 (ph) ATRT2 recommends that the board work jointly with the GAC through the BGRI to consider a number of actions to make its deliberations more transparent and better understood to the ICANN community. Where appropriate, ICANN should provide the necessary resources to facilitate the implementation of specific activities in this regard. Examples of the activities the GAC could consider to improving transparency and understanding include-- and there's A for all to read.

So open floor on 5.1.A.

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. I just wanted to flag that, within the GAC recommendations, beyond 5.1, there is an italicized headline, if you will, that speaks to the topic of the block of recommendations. But I don't believe there was such for 5.1 through 5.5. So I just wanted to flag that to see if you wanted to add that in.

Brian Cute: What's your suggestion? A header?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes.

Brian Cute: Is - Increased transparency of GAC-related activities - intended to be the header, Fiona?

Fiona Alexander: Yes. So, for 5.1 through 5.5, those are all about increasing transparency. And then 5.6 and 5.7 were about resource commitments-- 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9. So that was the sort of three groupings. And then the third grouping was increase GAC in earlier involvement in the policy process, and we're deleting that recommendation because it got folded into the one Alan was writing.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Fiona. Larisa, did you capture those other headings?

Larisa Gurnick: They're already there.

Brian Cute: Oh, they're there. I'm sorry. I haven't gone all the way through the document. Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. I did. 5 by itself will be just GAC-related recommendations or something like that.

Unidentified Participant: So 5-- all of 5 are GAC-related recommendations. And then, within that, you have two groupings. 5.1 through 5.6 (ph) are about transparency, and 5.6 through 5.9 are about engaging government in ICANN or increase support and resource commitments, I guess, is the way that's written.

Brian Cute: Thank you. I see Olivier's hand up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. Are we looking at grammatical errors as well?

Brian Cute: Sure.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Just looking at GAC and the GAC. It's correctly used initially, but then, in - Examples of activities that GAC could consider to improve transparency and understanding. I believe this should be that - The GAC could consider to improve transparency and understanding. And there might be other occurrences where, instead of GAC, it needs to be the GAC. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. So, Larisa, could you have the editor note that and, where it makes sense, to put the in front of the GAC? Do that consistently throughout. Thank you.

	Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	Two editing things. Number one, the BGRI is-- we have to make sure that in the executive summary acronyms are defined on the first usage, which they are not right now. And, number two, I believe the correct term is BGRI working group, not BGRI.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Larisa, could you have BGRI spelled out and then, in parentheses, put the acronym BGRI, just as we did with documented information disclosure policy in number 4. Same construct.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, I wasn't trying to identify all the cases. I'm saying there's a lot of acronyms in the executive summary that currently are not defined on their first usage. Someone's going to have to look through that carefully to identify them.
Brian Cute:	Your point's well taken, Alan. I'm asking staff to do just that.
Alan Greenberg:	Okay.
Unidentified Participant:	Alan, by the way, the BGRI is Board/GAC recommendation implementation working group. So I think it is actually BGRI-working group. Staff can help clarify that.
Alan Greenberg:	Where it's defined, it uses the word working group after it. But in all of the uses within the bulk of the document, it just says BGRI.
Brian Cute:	Okay. We've got the edit captured. It needs to be spelled out the first time with a parentheses right after it that provides the acronym. And then the acronym can be used liberally in the rest of the document.

Okay. I'm asking for 5.1.A through H as a group. Do we have any suggested edits for the language here? And the grammar catches are good catches. Please, bring those up. This is our last chance. We do have an editor at staff. But, if there's something important to us, let's make sure we flag it. |
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, I hope it's not our last chance. I hope as we get close to a final version, it will be distributed for people to look at. Editors don't always catch things of substance.
Brian Cute:	It will be, but Friday is our deadline.
Alan Greenberg:	I understand.
Brian Cute:	Anything on 5.1? Moving to 5.2. No hands. Moving on to 5.3.
Fiona Alexander:	Sorry, Brian. This is Fiona. I dropped off the call. Just to point out on 5.1-- I think Jurgen had posted a question on G and H. Those were new examples of activities that could be undertaken. And they were specifically posed (ph) by USCIB (ph) and one of the commenters. So I know that Carlos had commented that he was supportive. But I just wanted to flag that Jurgen had raised that on the e-mail list.
Brian Cute:	Thank you. So G and H are new examples.
Fiona Alexander:	Yeah, in 5.1.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Thank you for that note. The folks on the call have had an opportunity to read it, and there was no edits suggested.

Fiona Alexander: I'll try and just not hang up on the call again by mistake.

Brian Cute: No worries. Okay. Heather Dryden?

Heather Dryden: Hello. Can you hear me?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Heather Dryden: Okay. All right. I was on mute.

On point H, looking at that as drafted currently, I wonder whether we just need to soften the language a little bit so that-- giving an opportunity is something that is considered rather than saying, for example, that, when the GAC is deliberating, relevant entities-- that it's automatic that they would have the opportunity to present to the GAC. What I have in mind is the experience of a new gTLD program where the GAC was inundated with requests to come and present from applicants for those affected by applications. It just wouldn't have been practical and, I don't think, would have enhanced the deliberations readily because it was going to be difficult to do that in a fair or balanced way. So I would just want to maybe adjust the language so that you're encouraging this to happen but without being too prescriptive where you may have various parties coming and saying - You needed to give us this opportunity, even though there may have been particular circumstances that are applicable.

(Multiple Speakers)

Brian Cute: I'd like to get to editing. Sorry, Alan. I don't mean to cut you off. But do you have suggested editing to this that would incorporate your thoughts?

Heather Dryden: Perhaps give due consideration to giving those entities the opportunity.

Brian Cute: Give due-- so - When deliberating on matters relating to particular entities, give due consideration to providing the opportunity to present to the GAC as a whole-- providing those entities with the opportunity.

Heather Dryden: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: For the record, Brian, I was suggesting edits.

Brian Cute: Heather is providing the motivation for the change. With all due respect, I'd rather hear from her first to make sure we're capturing what she's presenting.

So - When deliberating on matters relating to particular entities, -- please, Heather.

Heather Dryden: So - giving due consideration to the relevant entities to provide them with the opportunity to present to the GAC.

Sorry to do this on the fly.

Brian Cute: No. That's why we're here. Fiona Alexander, Larry was the author of this. Just want to get a reaction to the suggestion.

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. We took the recommended suggestion that came from the comments directly. So I think anything that Heather wants to provide to make it a little bit crisper is probably better to do. So whatever Heather wants to do is fine.

Brian Cute:	Okay. Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	I was just suggesting wording like - consider the possibility and practicality of, which gives more discretion to the GAC based on the situation.
Brian Cute:	Here's what I recommend. Since the thought behind the edit has received no objection, Heather, and we don't want to just edit on the fly, would you take that thought as you just expressed it and send to the list? Just take a few minutes to thoughtfully edit this thing, and send it back to the list.
Heather Dryden:	Sure. Yeah.
Brian Cute:	If everyone's okay with that. All right. Let's move on. We were on 5.3. 5.4.
Alan Greenberg:	Alan. I note working group has reappeared now.
Brian Cute:	Larisa, you've got that edit for BGRI? It's implementation-- Is it working group? What is the correct form?
Alan Greenberg:	It is working group. I was just noting that suddenly the wording working group has appeared again. So it's in and out.
Brian Cute:	Okay. So that's correct. Okay. Any edits to 5.4? 5.5? Okay. 5.6? Okay. That's a bit of a long one. Any edits on 5.6? I would just ask one thing on clarity. Toward the end - Routine consultation with the local DNS stakeholder and interest groups. Fiona, interest groups, just for clarity?
Fiona Alexander:	Which part are we talking about?
Brian Cute:	5.6 very near the end. After a semicolon, it says - routine consultation with local DNS stakeholder and interest groups. I'm trying to understand for clarity the difference between those two groups.
Fiona Alexander:	So, my recollection is that that particular edit came from Olivier when we were having a meeting out in California. We were looking at how this worked. So, in some cases-- The point was that we need-- As GAC members get ready for the ICANN meetings, they should consult with their local stakeholders. And I believe the interest groups came from Olivier to broaden out a little bit.
Brian Cute:	So interest groups may be interest groups that don't have anything to do with the DNS, but, still, they're groups that governments might listen to in advance.
Fiona Alexander:	Right. And I think the point was to make sure that people come to the GAC as prepared as they could be having run a domestic consultation process.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Thank you for the green check. Olivier's confirming that interpretation. Thank you. Okay. 5.7. No changes. 5.8? Oh, I see the comment-- yeah-- from Larisa. Did we address--? There was one issue that the wording not effectively dictates staff operations or have that effect. I remember that

	part of the conversation. Fiona, was that addressed satisfactorily, or do you think the language is good as it is?
Fiona Alexander:	So, it seems when we were (inaudible)-- Can you still hear me?
Brian Cute:	Yes.
Fiona Alexander:	-- that we thought that, since this was specifically the ATRT2 recommending that the board work, having the board involved in it would prevent one particular constituency group from dictating inappropriately to ICANN staff. So we thought with the ATRT2 recommending to the board working with the GAC should take care of it.
Brian Cute:	Okay.
Fiona Alexander:	I would look to Heather to confirm. I think it was her preferred approach.
Brian Cute:	Okay. We got a green check from Heather.
	5.9?
	Thank you, Heather.
Alan Greenberg:	Just an editing thing. I think the before GSE (ph) is probably not needed.
Brian Cute:	If the board should instruct the GSE? Drop the the?
Alan Greenberg:	If you write-- If you say global stakeholder engagement, you wouldn't put the, unless you have group at the end.
Brian Cute:	Yeah. Could we add group instead? And then it's consistent and makes sense.
Alan Greenberg:	Well, actually--
Brian Cute:	-- should instruct the global stakeholder group to develop.
Alan Greenberg:	In the previous paragraph, we define GSE as including the word group. So, I guess, technically, it's correct.
Brian Cute:	Yeah. And, actually, we've got the word team there. That's unnecessary in 5.8. I'm not religious about whether it's group or team. But global stakeholder engagement group, GSE for the acronym. Drop team in 5.8. And then the board should instruct the GSE group in 5.9.
Alan Greenberg:	Or team if we're using team. Whichever.
Brian Cute:	Let's just go with group. I don't think it makes a hill of beans of difference.
	Okay. 5.9. Any suggested edits to this?
	Okay. Let's move on to 6. Is this category - GAC operations and interactions - see report section 8. Is that going to be deleted? What purpose does it serve? And the language in the red. I assume that's just going to get deleted, and we'll keep the header - Increase GAC early involvement.

Larisa Gurnick:	Brian, this is Larisa. Let me clarify that. I thought that, at the end of each recommendation, it might be helpful to create a link, actually, to the appropriate report section to make it easier for readers to navigate.
Brian Cute:	Oh. Okay.
Larisa Gurnick:	That's why that's there. But that's completely up to the review team whether-- if you would like to keep that or not.
Brian Cute:	No. That's sensible.
	Number 6. Any suggested change to number 6? Okay.
	Number 7.1? Is the thing seriously broken? Needs to change? Here's the reason why. And here's the edit. Okay.
	8.1?
Larisa Gurnick:	Brian, this is Larisa. I would appreciate if you would clarify your response to my comment. There were assorted bullet points previously that were used as examples for this recommendation. And it would be helpful to get clarity whether that is to be included in the body of the report only or whether it should be included in the executive summary as well or whether it should be cut out altogether.
Brian Cute:	Avri?
Avri Doria:	My comment is a question on 7.1, not on this one.
Brian Cute:	Oh, back to 7.1? Okay.
Avri Doria:	We're still at 7.1.
Brian Cute:	Okay.
Avri Doria:	7.1. Shouldn't there be a 7? Or is that just 7?
Brian Cute:	Good question. That's a numbering question. Right?
Avri Doria:	It's either a numbering question, or there's a missing 7. But I think it's a numbering question. Just making a point.
Brian Cute:	Could you follow up on that, Larisa, and let us know? If there is a missing 7, let's identify that. Otherwise, it's just the numbering convention.
Larisa Gurnick:	Brian, that is the nature of my question actually. Perhaps Olivier or Lise or Fiona Asonga can address this, because this is (inaudible)?
Brian Cute:	Asonga?
Fiona Asonga:	Thank you, Brian. Fiona here. I think there is not a 7. It's just supposed to be 7. It's not 7.1 or another section. It was the former 8.
	The only thing is that it's missing on the past (ph) sentence-- we talk about quality of-- translation quality to support public participation. We had proposed that - To support

public participation, ICANN should review capacity of language (unintelligible) what the community needs for the studies. (Unintelligible) and make relevant adjustments such as improving translational quality and timeliness as well as interpretation quality. The (unintelligible) part of this is missing.

Brian Cute: Language that was in there before is missing? Or we need to add language to cover up that point?

Fiona Asonga: We need to add language to cover up that point. And we'd sent that to an e-mail, but it seems to have been missed.

Brian Cute: Okay. So do you see the language on the screen?

Fiona Asonga: Yes. I am.

Brian Cute: Could you read the language and where this additional language would be inserted, so we can all understand the edit?

Fiona Asonga: Okay. I would like to propose that it reads this way.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Fiona Asonga: To support public participation, ICANN should review capacity of the language services department (unintelligible) does the community need for this service using key performance indicators [KPIs] and make relevant adjustments such as improving translation and interpretation quality as well as timeliness. Full stop.

Brian Cute: Okay. So it's really adding and interpretation. -- such as improving translation and interpretation quality and timeliness.

Fiona Asonga: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Brian and Fiona, I think the wording you used when you first read it was better. When you first said it, you ended the sentence with - such as improving translation quality and timeliness and interpretation quality. The way you said it lastly was translation and interpretation quality and timeliness, and timeliness doesn't apply.

Fiona Asonga: Okay. Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: So just, after the word timeliness, add and interpretation quality.

Fiona Asonga: Interpretation quality.

Brian Cute: Okay. So that's the proposed edit. Larisa, did you capture that?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. So it reads - and make relevant adjustments such as improving translation quality and timeliness and interpretation quality. Period.

Alan Greenberg: Correct.

Brian Cute: That's the suggested edit. Is that it, Fiona?

Fiona Asonga: Yes. That's it.

Brian Cute:	Thank you.
Fiona Asonga:	And then the numbering is just number 7.
Larisa Gurnick:	Thank you.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very much.
	Okay. Back to 8.1. Any suggestions here or edits? I'm not seeing any.
	8.2? And, Larisa, you were asking a question about the last statement that's highlighted.
	And I had made one minor edit there, which was - all recommendations of the special community group would be subject to whole (ph) community participation, consultation, and review and must take into account any limitations-- any was the word I added-- that may be imposed by ICANN's structure, including the degree to which--
	I think the sentiment of the review team was that we didn't want to take that statement as a hard and fast given-- that there could be disagreement on the limitations. And I offered that any toward that end.
	Any suggested edits? I read a green check. Thank you. And, Olivier, I saw your green check on the interpretation edit as well. Thank you for that.
	8.3. Ombudsman's role. 8.3.A through C. I just want to ask because I know this has come up in another context-- executive functions in B. We've had the discussion around policy versus implementation. We agreed to adopt that structure. In a prior recommendation, we have policy making and policy implementation and administrative matters. Here we have executive functions. We had a discussion about eliminating that because it caused confusion in the policy versus implementation discussion. Should we drop executive functions here? Should we change that to administrative functions? Who's the author? Avri?
Avri Doria:	I was. Yeah. I think changing it-- Yeah. That was oversight. I think changing it to administrative would be sensible since that's the (inaudible) we picked up elsewhere.
Alan Greenberg:	Where is those words-- that wording?
Brian Cute:	8.3.B.
Alan Greenberg:	Oh. Sorry. I will still looking at 8.2.
Brian Cute:	So we're editing-- we're changing executive functions to administrative functions for clarity and consistency. Anything else on 8.3? And, Avri, this captured the anonymous hotline versus a whistle blower? Open question. C?
Avri Doria:	Sorry. I tried to. Basically, I included the anonymous hotline, but I did not remove whistle blower. So it's halfway to what staff was requesting.
Brian Cute:	Okay. All right. 8.something. Develop transparency metrics in reporting. Any necessary edits, your rationale, and the language.
Fiona Alexander:	Brian, this is Fiona. I thought at one point on A4A (ph) we talked about transparency and accountability issues so that reporting dealt with both and not just transparency.

Brian Cute:	We did. And, on our last call, if recollection serves, I think there was a sentiment of making sure this doesn't become a substitute for ATRT2 or AOC review team or avoiding confusion about the boundaries between this new accountability part of this report and the AOC reviews. That's my rough recollection of the concern, which is why we landed with just going back to the original-- do transparency reports.
Fiona Alexander:	So then maybe there's a way to sort of say-- a report on the broad range of transparency issues with supporting metrics to facilitate accountability, because it's not just transparency for transparency sake. There's a purpose to it.
Brian Cute:	Okay. So that's a suggested edit. Support for that edit-- adding to facilitate accountability after metrics in A? Avri, I saw your green check. Is that a new green check?
Avri Doria:	Yeah. It's a new green check. I think that's a good rephrasing. The effort was to avoid overloading the report with everything about accountability. But, certainly, it is not transparency for transparency sake. It is transparency for accountability sake. So, yeah, I think it's a good edit. Thanks.
Brian Cute:	Thank you. So, Larisa, after metrics-- to facilitate accountability. Period. Thank you. Anything else on 8, on develop transparency metrics and reporting? It's a long one. We'll take just a few minutes to make sure everyone's had a chance to go through it.
Alan Greenberg:	CI (ph) has some grammar. I'm not sure what it's trying to say. But disposition of board book these requests does make sense.
Brian Cute:	Correct. Author?
Avri Doria:	Yeah. There should be an and there. Disposition of board-- let me see. Requests for the physical (ph) reporting should include at least the following elements - requests for DID disclosure policy be processed and the disposition of board book requests. I guess that's it.
Brian Cute:	Drop the?
Avri Doria:	Yeah.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Thank you.
Larisa Gurnick:	Avri, can you also clarify the item in the paragraph in 8.4.B?
Avri Doria:	Yeah. That was ICANN. It was both staff and community. And it was just an inclusive phrase. So it was ICANN staff and community. The word both was implied. But I could see someone asking a question if there's three entities. And, if it was, I probably would have put a comma after staff to indicate that. But it is both staff and community.
Alan Greenberg:	There's also a problem in the purple there. Discussions with redactions and other practices. I rarely have discussions with redactions.
Brian Cute:	I wish I could do that from time to time. But you're right.
Alan Greenberg:	Touché.
Brian Cute:	Yes. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I still think the language needs fixing.

Avri Doria: Okay. You can fix it any time you want. The question would be discussion (inaudible).

Brian Cute: So it would read: The discussion of (inaudible) which ICANN staff and community on adhering to a standard transparency by default in all policy, implementation, and administrative actions, and in discussions--

Alan Greenberg: -- regarding redactions maybe?

Avri Doria: No. And - in discussions, redactions. And, in discussion--

(Multiple Speakers)

Brian Cute: One at a time. Avri, friendly suggestion. Should we put a period after administrative actions and create a second sentence or not? I just thought it might be clearer, and it might help to reformulate the second sentence in some way. Avri, are you there?

Avri Doria: I actually think-- Yes. I think, if you put a comma after discussion and delete the word with, it parses fine. It is a long, run-on sentence.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Okay. As part of its yearly report, ICANN should include-- I see you, Larisa, so hold on. As part of its yearly report, ICANN should include but not be limited to a discussion of the degree to which ICANN staff and community are adhering to the standard transparency by default on all policy implementation and administrative actions. And, in discussions, the actions or other practices used to keep information hidden from the ICANN community to document in a transparent manner-- I think it can be-- It's not entirely clear to me. I don't think it's major surgery, but I think it needs some--

                       Larisa and Olivier?

Larisa Gurnick: I wanted to call attention to - keep information hidden. Perhaps there is a different way to say that that you might consider.

Brian Cute: Fair enough.

Avri Doria: I thought hidden was fairly neutral, but, if you can think of a word that's even more neutral than hidden, sure. I mean, it's not a pejorative. It's information is hidden. But, you know, whatever.

Alan Greenberg: Probably a different verb instead of keep hidden.

Brian Cute: Not disclose, for example? Olivier?

Avri Doria: Or not disclosing information. Sure.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier speaking.

Brian Cute: Yes, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Olivier speaking. I question the use of the word discussion because a discussion is usually between two people. Well, my English might not be correctly assuming this, but I would have thought perhaps another word would be better than this, such as-- well, I was going to say an analysis or a--

(Multiple Speakers)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: -- degree. I'm sorry?

Larisa Gurnick: Narrative?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That would be a lot better. Yes. Definitely. Good call. Narrative.

Brian Cute: So, okay. I know we're doing this in real time. I don't want this to get messy and unwieldy. But we've got some edits on the table. Can I hear a reading of B-- as with proposed edits? Or not? Avri? Are you open to Olivier and Larisa's friendly edits?

Avri Doria: I believe so, I think, whether it's discussions or narrative. And I'm fine with finding a word to replace-- something more euphemistic than hidden. Yeah.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I think we had a suggestion, although I don't remember what it is now.

(Multiple Speakers)

Brian Cute: Not disclose. I think that's my suggestion.

Avri Doria: For not disclosing-- okay. Then it would have to be for not disclosing information to the community.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay.

Brian Cute: If you can, take those and rework it. I have one more suggestion too. It's just a small thing. But, at the beginning-- As part of its yearly report, ICANN should include, among other things…

Avri Doria: Okay. At first, I had put the inter alia, and then I knew everybody would be objecting to that.

Brian Cute: I love inter alia. I just put it in English. That's all.

Avri Doria: Among other things. Okay. Sure.

Brian Cute: Yeah. How about inter alia in English. I think it works just a bit better, if you're open to that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Brian Cute: All right. So you're taking the two suggestions in B and reworking those.

Avri Doria: It makes sense (inaudible) I understand them.

Brian Cute: And, as we said, Alan, this will go out when folks will have a last opportunity to come back on Avri's fix.

	With the rest of this one, C, D, and E, any other suggested edits? Looking for hands. Going once. Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	I just realized we skipped over something else that had a problem in it, if you want to go back now. Or we can go back afterwards.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Hold that thought.
(Multiple Speakers)	
Alan Greenberg:	Whenever you finish 8.
Brian Cute:	Let's get through this one.
Alan Greenberg:	Yeah.
Brian Cute:	Just in the parentheses, I might offer, in Ei, i.e. and, in quotes, teaching to the test-- putting teaching to the test in quotes. It's a--
Avri Doria:	As opposed to AKA?
Brian Cute:	Yeah.
Avri Doria:	Okay.
Brian Cute:	That's the inter alia coming on at me. i.e. and, in quotes, teaching to the test. It's a phrase.
Avri Doria:	Got you.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Anything else? All right. We're done with this one. Avri's got the edits.

Alan, where are we going back to? |
Alan Greenberg:	Did we finish 8.4?
Brian Cute:	Yes.
Alan Greenberg:	Okay. It's fine in the executive summary 6. But, in the body, the first paragraph is missing. That was the one on public comments.
Brian Cute:	Okay. We're going to-- When we have these recommendations in final form, and we're doing that now, they will be copied as they are into the body of the report in each place where they belong.
Alan Greenberg:	Understand. But the edit was done differently there. I'm just asking staff to notice.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Moving on to 8.5. Any edits? |
| Avri Doria: | Okay. Yeah. This is Avri again. Larisa had one edit where she talked about there being a confusion between a One World Trust (ph) report of 2007 and the project currently underway. Now, her recommendation was that we switch just to best practice. There's a lot of content that-- in the One World Trust recommendations of 2007. So I think we |

should just be specific and say - The professional external audit should be based on the One World Trust recommendations of 2007 and give a URL.

Brian Cute: Yes. For clarity, agreed. And, just for consistency, where you have parentheses in this that say annual or biannual, for example, and then, later on, can we put e.g. at the beginning of the parentheses and then the words and drop for example?

And I have a question. Would biannual audits really be advisable in terms of resource, timing?

Avri Doria: What does biannual mean? I've never known what-- Does that mean twice a year or once every two years?

Alan Greenberg: Semiannual is half a year. I think biannual is every two years.

Brian Cute: So annual or biannual? So you're suggesting every year or every other year?

Avri Doria: Exactly. Would you prefer it to say or every other year? Makes no difference to me.

Brian Cute: I don't know. It's the question of being prescriptive. And I'm not reacting violently to this.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. The free online dictionary says biannual is either twice a year or every second year. Let's be specific.

Brian Cute: We certainly wouldn't intend twice a year. Would we?

Alan Greenberg: Apparently, the word is used both ways.

Avri Doria: I think it avoids being prescriptive by saying - determined upon recommendation by the professional audit.

Brian Cute: Did One World Trust have a recommended frequency in their report?

Avri Doria: (Inaudible) professional audit, and among the things we're going to ask them for-- not one. No. I don't remember one.

Alan Greenberg: Just drop the parenthetical.

Brian Cute: Okay. Are you comfortable with the recommendation of professional audit and dropping the parenthetical, Avri? If you're not, that's fine.

Avri Doria: Sure. Why not? It's (technical difficulties).

Alan Greenberg: I didn't understand that.

Avri Doria: If it turns-- I don't know who that was or what it was. (Inaudible) in three years they haven't done it again or something, then it will become an issue. I don't think we need to see annual or biannual.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. So we're dropping those parentheticals. Any other points on this one?

Okay. Moving on. And we've got 20 minutes left. So we've got to make hay here.

Number 9-- 9.1, specifically. Carlos?

Carlos Gutierrez: I hope it (inaudible) can be turned into the positive (inaudible) recommendations arising from ATRT2 or something like that. But it's just a style comment. Thank you. The title about number 9.

Brian Cute: Oh. Your recommendation is (inaudible) the ATRT2?

Carlos Gutierrez: Why not? Make it positive, not--

Alan Greenberg: Or new recommendations unrelated to ATRT1 recommendations.

Carlos Gutierrez: Well, I think we are in ATRT2, so we can take our shot.

Alan Greenberg: (Inaudible) what the title was above 1.

Brian Cute: Carlos, we've captured the thought. We'll work that.

    Fiona?

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. I had a question.

(technical difficulties)

Carlos Gutierrez: (Inaudible). Now it can be turned around into something.

Brian Cute: Okay. Understood. Fiona?

Fiona Alexander: Yeah. I had a question. I posted this to the list earlier, before the call. And I think we've discussed it on the last call. But the section is about improving effectiveness of cross-community deliberations. But then all the recommendations are very specific to the GNSO and the GSOPDP (ph). And I'm not sure that it's actually our interest to limit it so much. I mean, obviously, some of the recommendations are specific to the GNSO. But I think it could go beyond that. And I'm not sure why it's so limited.

Brian Cute: Alan? Thank you, Fiona.

Alan Greenberg: I did answer your question on the list. But I also addressed it when I posted the revised recommendations. The AOC is talking about cross-community deliberations in relation to policy development. And the other two supporting organizations, the ASO and ccNSO, we have been told repeatedly do not have a problem. They are working well. They work with the-- the ccNSO works with the GAC. The ASO has completely different processes, and they're working superbly. And we should all use them as the model. So we have not gotten any evidence that we need to fix the policy development process anywhere else other than for the gTLD realm. And that's why, after due consideration, I couldn't figure out a way to really widen it without implying that the other areas needed fixing, where the people involved have told us many times they don't.

Fiona Alexander: So the affirmation of commitment uses the word policy development process or processes but doesn't use the acronym PDP. So I think we're limiting ourselves beyond what the affirmation does. I understand that folks feel like some of the other processes work better. But the goal of this section, the affirmation, was to do cross-community development; so development of policies across all the different silos. I don't think this group is actually helping address that need.

Alan Greenberg:	It would appear that these edits reversed all of my changes, where I took out the word-- the capitalized PDP and replaced it with lower case policy development processes. And it looks like someone went through and inserted the acronym back in here in a whole bunch of places throughout this whole recommendation. I don't know. That was done after my last edit.
Larisa Gurnick:	Alan, this is Larisa. Let me take that one and make sure that this appears exactly as you intended it.
Alan Greenberg:	Thank you. In at least one case, there's a hyphen between policy and development in 9.1.C. That's extraneous also.
Fiona Alexander:	So I would recommend we revisit this one one last time once we see that. Again, I don't think we want to limit it just to the PDP process of the GNSO but other things that the GNSO may do.
Alan Greenberg:	I'm not limiting to the PDP. I removed all those references to the PDP. Someone put them back.
Fiona Alexander:	Right.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Staff is checking it. Let's get the language that Alan intended into the document. When it circulates, this is something that-- This may be our last call, folks. So, if you catch something after the fact here, we've got to do it on the e-mail list.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, let me note that I'm a little bit uneasy. I haven't held these documents up to the light to see what other minor changes may have been made as they were editing. This one may-- Someone may have thought this was simply putting an acronym in when it applied, but it made a substantive change. I'm a little bit uneasy at this point.
Brian Cute:	And I ask you to go through it with a fine-tooth comb.
Alan Greenberg:	I will. But you know the difficulty of going through something that you've already read 400 times.
Brian Cute:	Thank you. Yes, I do. 9.2?
Alan Greenberg:	By the way, 9.1 in the body of the report has completely different numbering. It starts with I, J, K or something like that. I presume that will be fixed.
Brian Cute:	That's going to be fixed. 9.2? Nothing? Okay.
Alan Greenberg:	Nothing that I'm aware of.
Brian Cute:	9.3? 9.3? I'm not seeing any hands. I see Fiona and Alan. I think those are old.
Alan Greenberg:	Again, the references to PDP are all throughout this whole body of the entire 9.
Brian Cute:	That's important. Please, check that Larisa. And, Alan, please cross-check it yourself. Let's make sure the intended language is in the next version.

Alan Greenberg:	I can only cross-check once I get the next version.
Brian Cute:	Okay. 9.4 done.
	Moving to 10.
Alan Greenberg:	No, not yet. 9.5 is missing. It got lost along the way.
Brian Cute:	9.5 is missing?
Alan Greenberg:	It was 10.5. It should be 9.5. Not there, not in the body of the report or in the summary.
Brian Cute:	Okay. That's important. Larisa, please, find that and put it in the next version that circulates, and Alan will cross-check it.
Larisa Gurnick:	Will do, Brian and Alan.
Brian Cute:	Thank you. All right.
	Number 10 - effectiveness of the review process. We'll take these as a whole. 10.2? 10.3? We have a comment from Larisa to delete the word staff. I'm comfortable with that deletion.
Alan Greenberg:	What does appreciate the cycle of AOC results reviews mean?
Brian Cute:	Understand. Well, really-- Okay. I think it means more than that. It means that we've been through a few of them now. There's a clear understanding of the dynamic. On one issue, the teams got their work started late on ATRTs both times. It's appreciation in that sense. It's been done a few times. They understand the dynamic of it. They should appreciate it and work toward all these ends.
Alan Greenberg:	I would suggest factor in instead of appreciate.
Brian Cute:	I see where you're going.
Alan Greenberg:	I don't like the word factor in, but--
Brian Cute:	Factor in--
Alan Greenberg:	It has a better connotation than appreciate.
Brian Cute:	Action oriented. Let's go with that-- to factor in the cycle of AOC reviews. Thank you.
	10.4?
Alan Greenberg:	And delete staff, by the way.
Brian Cute:	Yes. Delete staff, and add factor in.
	10.4? 10.5?
Larisa Gurnick:	Brian, this is Larisa. Just wanted to highlight that it seems that the construction of some of these sentences would need to change in order to make each recommendation consistent with the board should--

Brian Cute:	Oh, yeah. Thank you. Yes.
Larisa Gurnick:	And you'll see that on the next draft. And then you can comment on that.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very, very much for that catch.
	All right. 10.6? 10.7? Okay.
	Number 11 - financial accountability.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Brian, it's Olivier. Thank you. Just in-- was it 10.6 and 10.7? I notice here - The board should clearly state the process. I believe you need to specify in all of those the ICANN board. So, in 10.4, it's - The ICANN board should clearly state the process for studying gTLD policies. And 10.3 - The ICANN board… Or define board as being the ICANN board.
Brian Cute:	Yeah. We can do ICANN board. The first time we do it in the document, put the board in parentheses and use board throughout the rest of the document.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Correct. Yep. That would be fine.
Brian Cute:	Thank you. Let's do that.
	All right. 11 - financial accountability and transparency. Okay. 11.1? 11.2?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Brian, it's Olivier again.
Brian Cute:	Yes.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you. I do note a question from staff regarding 11. You might include engaging stakeholders. And it says here - Unclear what this means. So I don't think that's something that's going for everyone if it's unclear.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Lise, if you're still awake.
Lise Fuhr:	Yes. I'm still awake. I've been looking at this one, but it actually means that ICANN in its financial governance structure has to include engaging stakeholders. This really refers to that-- a lot of the comments we've had from people also in round two refer to that the comments are made-- the commentary is too late in order to be able to actually have any effect on the financial-- on the report. And this is what it means-- that they have to include engaging stakeholders in their principles and methods and decision-making process.
Brian Cute:	So is it just a way of clarifying this language? Olivier, do you have a suggestion? You have to have a suggested fix if you're pointing out a flaw. Sorry.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you, Brian. I'm not pointing out a flaw. I'm pointing at a staff comment on the document, which says that it's unclear what this means. So, if it's totally clear to everyone what it means, then I guess that's fine. I guess it would be up to staff to come back to you and say whether they've found Lise's interpretation or Lise's explanation helpful.
Brian Cute:	Fair enough. Thank you.
	Denise? Your hand is up.

Denise Michel:	Yeah. I'm not sure where that comment came from. Speaking for staff, I understand what include engaging stakeholders means, and I have no problem with it.
Brian Cute:	Yea! Let's move on. Okay.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	One more. This is Olivier speaking.
Brian Cute:	Yes?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Sorry, Brian. Number 11 still. The ATRT2 rather than ATRT2 recommends that…
Brian Cute:	Yes. The ATRT2. Thank you.
Alan Greenberg:	It's Alan. Why are we suddenly add recommendation 11, saying these are ATRT recommendations in the body, where all of them are?
Brian Cute:	Yeah. We could drop it. You're right. It could start - In light of the significant growth in the organization, ICANN should undertake special scrutiny.
Alan Greenberg:	There's a should missing.
Brian Cute:	Lise, are you okay if we go in that direction?
Lise Fuhr:	Yeah. I'm fine with that. No problem.
Brian Cute:	Larisa, was that captured?
Unidentified Participant:	Yeah. And should is missing. I agree with you, Alan.
Larisa Gurnick:	Yes, Brian.
Brian Cute:	So we drop ATRT2 recommends that. Drop all that. We start with - In light of the significant growth in the organization, ICANN should undertake a special scrutiny. The rest of it remains the same.
Lise Fuhr:	Do you not want to conform this to - The board should?
Brian Cute:	Yeah. We could say - The board should.
Unidentified Participant:	Or the ICANN board?
Brian Cute:	Yes. Thank you.
	Okay. 11.1?
Avri Doria:	I have to go back to if it's the board or ICANN because-- Does that mean that the ICANN board will instruct ICANN to make sure that the comments to the financial reports or to the budget are sent out in due (ph) time, because, for me, it's also in the process of making the budget that ICANN needs to involve and engage the stakeholders. And that was what we (inaudible).
Brian Cute:	The board is responsible for the budget.
Avri Doria:	Okay. That's fine.

Brian Cute:	The board should be instructing the staff with respect to the budget process and the budget itself.
Avri Doria:	I'm fine with that.
Brian Cute:	Okay. All right. 11.1? Going once, going twice. Alan, is your hand up a new or old?
Alan Greenberg:	Sorry. That's very old.
Brian Cute:	Okay. 11.2? Okay. 11.3?
Lise Fuhr:	It's Lise speaking. That's a new one, and that's made because some of the comments wanted to have more specification regarding this one. So we tried to put in what should be done, but we didn't fulfill all the suggestions in the comments that was made from the (inaudible) group and then (inaudible).
Brian Cute:	Okay. The registered stakeholders-- okay. Thank you.
	Olivier?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. Different font required here.
Brian Cute:	Okay. 11.3? Any substantive edits? 11.4? Why do we have hyphens on either side of rolling? It's -rolling-plan. Does that look--? Is that necessary? I don't think so.
Unidentified Participant:	No. I'm fine.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Let me ask-- Lise, we're saying - The yearly budget should be based on multi-annual, strategic plan and financial framework, a three-year period. Rolling plan and framework should reflect the planned activity and the corresponding expenses. (Unintelligible). And then it says - The following year, a report should be drafted describing the actual implementation of the framework, including activities and related expenses with a particular focus on implementation of the yearly budget in question.
	I'm sorry. An open-ended question here. I was looking for precision. But do we want them to develop a new report?
Lise Fuhr:	No. It's in the financial report. We just want them to be more specific in the financial report.
Brian Cute:	So could we do it this way? And I think you're zeroing in with me. Instead of - The following year, a report should be drafted describing, how about starting the sentence at - In its financial reporting, the board should-- or - The financial reporting should reflect or describe the actual implementation of the framework.
	Look, they're going to give quarterly reports, variance reports, reforecasts. Don't we want to say, within the context of the reporting you're going to do, make sure you reflect this stuff? Is that accurate?
Lise Fuhr:	Yes, it is. It's just to let your (unintelligible) track what the budget was, what has been implemented, and how it's been done. So it's just-- If they do it already in the financial report or another report, it's fine. It's not to make a report just-- It's just to have the traceability throughout.

Brian Cute:	Yes. And I don't want to-- Would you mind if we take this offline, because I don't want to do something quick here that somehow doesn't capture what we want. And financial reporting comes through a number of different documents. It might be worth taking a few minutes to think with precision what we want to say here.
Lise Fuhr:	I'm fine with it. But I don't know about the rest of the group.
Alan Greenberg:	It's Alan. I support that. The way it reads right now is very prescriptive and probably make work.
Brian Cute:	Well, it's calling for a standalone, new report.
(Multiple Speakers)	
Brian Cute:	-- I think we want to change. And, you know, there's a number of different financial reports. We want to make sure that we're able to track this. So we need to be precise. You okay, Lise, we can take it offline?
Lise Fuhr:	Yes.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Thank you.
	All right. 11.5.
	Thank you, Olivier, for the green check.
	Anything on 11.5?
Alan Greenberg:	Replace enough with sufficient.
Brian Cute:	Sure. 11.5, change enough to sufficient time. Anything else? Okay.
	I think we've gotten through the recommendations.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, just one small note. I put it in the chat. But just a note to staff on recommendation 6. There's two different thoughts. They need numbering. They're not numbered right now.
Brian Cute:	Okay. All right, folks. Here's the rules of the road. Staff, on some of this, you have to-dos in terms of putting language into this draft that used to be there in some instances. Editors - for example, Lise and I - have to go offline and come up with a proposed edit to that financial one. Editors, you have some to-dos. I would like all of the inputs into staff within 24 hours. And then, staff, if you can circulate the updated version of the recommendations-- it doesn't even have to be the entire report necessarily-- at a minimum, the recommendations by Thursday, that will give everybody a chance to look through, particularly, the recommendations one time and indicate before close of business Friday that they're okay with the recommendations.
	Larisa, your hand is up.
Larisa Gurnick:	Yes, Brian. I just wanted to remind you about several points that staff had raised that were included in the agenda before you end the call.
Brian Cute:	Yes. We'll get to those.

Fiona Alexander: It's Fiona. I have a question on the timing that you're proposing.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Fiona Alexander: I'm all for finishing by Friday. I fully support that. But I just want to make sure we have enough time to actually thoughtfully reflect on the text. The conversation today was a little bit scattered, and that's what happens when you get sort of towards the crunch time and (unintelligible) various, different documents. But, if we're going to have a document on Thursday, can you tell us Thursday by what time exactly so that we have a full 24 hours to take a look at it? I don't want to get something Thursday night at 10:00 p.m. and be told I need to sign off on it or have Larry sign off Friday at 5:00.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Fiona Alexander: I have a multiple review process to manage.

Brian Cute: Fair enough.

Alan Greenberg: But, Brian, when you're considering that, I believe the deadline was also Thursday for giving the final version of the-- of summarizing the input we got and footnotes and references--

(Multiple Speakers)

Brian Cute: Yes. Hold that thought, please. If we give everyone 24 hours to get these edits in, which think is fair, (technical difficulties) this time tomorrow. And then we have to be fair to ICANN staff being able to integrate these changes and circulate a document. And, being on the U.S. west coast time, I'd have to ask Larisa. What do you think is realistically the earliest you could get the next version of the document out?

Unidentified Participant: Brian, of course, we're going to start working on the items that were already flagged and the cleanup immediately. But, from the time that we get all edits, depending on how much has changed and to what extent it impacts formatting, I would like to have 24 hours to implement the changes and have the opportunity to check the document to make sure that everything was right before we forward it to you.

Brian Cute: So you're talking Thursday night. So that's your answer, Fiona. That's the earliest we could get this around, which leaves only one full day before we lock down the document or lock down the recommendations, I should say. That's not a lot of time.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, let's not mistake. There's relatively few where the editors still have to submit something. There's a few where we'd decided to do word-smithing offline. The vast majority of them we went through and finalized.

Brian Cute: If everyone's comfortable with this approach, what I would suggest to frame this is we have just walked through the recommendations, and we have agreed on the recommendations. There is some editing to be done, which was described to us, which we agreed on so that, in terms of this document being circulated this time on Thursday, any changes thereafter are really corrections, not edits, if that makes sense-- not substantive edits. I believe we've gone through that exercise.

                      In that regard, I really don't want to push past next Friday, as you can all tell. But, if there is a correction that needs to be made, it can be made to the document until the 31st. And I

want to reiterate we do not want to go past next Friday, folks, please. That's the best I can frame it for everyone, unless someone has another suggestion.

Fiona Alexander: Brian, this is Fiona. Is it fair to say that there's agreement in principle to the recommendations and then the addition of old number 3 from Avri? And then I need to at least see the revision-- Alan's original wording on 9. That's the only thing that's outstanding in my mind.

Brian Cute: I believe that's a fair statement as of this moment in time. If anybody seriously disagrees with that, please, speak now.

Avri Doria: By the way, I've sent in my revised 8. Hopefully, I caught it all-- once (ph) in future 9.

Alan Greenberg: The revised 9, as far as I know, is exactly what I sent out to the group the last time. I can resend it. I can resend the clean version. I don't believe we made any changes in this discussion.

Brian Cute: So, Fiona, that's the state. Are you comfortable with that? All right. Let me-- That's how we'll proceed in terms of 24 hours for final edits, another 24 hours for staff to get the next version out, and Friday, the 20th, for folks to make corrections.

                     Let me offer the following thoughts. And we will get to the three points from staff.

                     Number one. Yes, we are going to include the recommendations in the executive summary as they've been constructed (ph) and copy each recommendation into the body of the report. Full stop.

                     Number two. Boilerplate text. If there's nothing to report for public comment section-- okay. So the suggestion is in the body of the report where we have a header - Public Comments. If there's nothing there, then we're going to put this statement in. There were no specific public comments on this issue and/or comments received (inaudible) agreement with the report's findings.

                     We can do that. And here's the risk. If any comment has come into the system that actually was on point and not supportive, we've just asked for fright and signal that perhaps we didn't read your comment. That's a worry to me. I'm not sure about that holding statement is my view.

                     Alan?

Alan Greenberg: In general, we are citing comments which caused us to act. We are not-- In our comments section, we are not citing every comment that was made about something. Certainly, we're not necessarily citing ones that supported what we said. So I would strongly advise not to put that kind of blanket statement in.

Brian Cute: I would rather spend the time finding a comment that supported this or putting this statement in if I knew to an absolute certainty that there were no comments that otherwise applied. That's my disposition on that one.

Alan Greenberg: No one's likely to do the work required for that last sentence.

Brian Cute: Oh, you'd be surprised.

For three, posting of the final report, with or without translations. Ideally, this is-- you know, we know the routine. If we can be done by the 20th, I don't know if that provides sufficient time. I don't know what the translation team's schedule is. I don't know what's feasible. We do what we can. The goal is to have the translated versions published at the same time the English version is published. Staff, you'll have to let us know what is feasible.

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. I'd like to respond to three, but I'd also like to go back to one. So let me respond to three first.

Brian Cute: Sure.

Larisa Gurnick: Until we have the final document of the report, we will not be able to get a meaningful time estimate from the translation team. And I just wanted to call to your attention that availability of people after the 24th through January 1st is not certain as ICANN is technically closed for the holiday.

Brian Cute: Okay. We'll have to wait for your advice once you get the final report.

Larisa Gurnick: And, on number one, the clarification that I'm seeking is in reference to the draft recommendations. The way the template has been developed and included in the report-- it leads up to draft recommendations. Then there's a section for public comments and then final recommendation. So I just wanted a confirmation as to whether you still intend to include draft recommendations as they appeared in the report that was published in October in this report, in the final report.

Brian Cute: My strong sense is we don't include draft recommendations. I understand the purpose. It shows the evolution based on public comment. I get it. I think it's a possible source of confusion. I have a strong feeling that we don't need draft recommendations. We only need a final.

                Does anybody feel seriously in the other direction? I'm open to--

Alan Greenberg: No. But I'll reinforce what you said but make a suggestion. Because we are now separating public comments received before the draft and after the draft, we probably need somewhere near the top of the report the statement that these comments are separated. And anyone who wants to see the draft report, give a pointer to where it is.

Brian Cute: Are we separating comments that way? Do we need to separate comments that way? Can't we just have citations to public comments as footnotes or in the report and they support the point? If they don't, they need--

Alan Greenberg: In the template, we had two different sections. And I don't have the stomach to try to merge them together right now, to be honest. I don't know about everyone else, because, remember, the original comments we got when we solicited input were then fed into the analysis. These are now add-on comments.

Brian Cute: I personally don't think they need to be differentiated. I'll take a look at the report, Alan, and see what the structural challenge is so I better understand it. I don't understand it right now. I really don't see the need to differentiate.

Alan Greenberg: In my mind, the original comments were identified before the analysis, and the new comments are post-analysis. That's the structural difference. If we simply merge all the comments into the comment period, the analysis doesn't factor in the new ones.

Brian Cute:	I'm not sure I entirely follow. But let me take a look at the report and come back on that point. Okay.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, let me try and put this one other way. The changes that we've made since the draft report were based on the new comments. And they were not considered in the analysis which resulted in the original recommendations.
Brian Cute:	I understand the distinction. Let me look at it structurally and see what-- (inaudible) the suggestion.
	Okay. (Inaudible) points. The One World Trust draft report-- Larisa, I understand that it's not ready for public consumption. But could it be sent to the ATRT2 members to their individual e-mails and not posting it to the list? I think that the review team should have the opportunity to see the report and factor in any final change if we can do so. Is that possible?
Larisa Gurnick:	Yes, it is.
Brian Cute:	Thank you very much.
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, can I go back to the--
(Multiple Speakers)	
Brian Cute:	Some background noise. Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	I'd like to go back to the question of whether we release the English version before the other languages are available. I would suggest for public relations reasons we not release the report until everything is available. However, the English version could be made available to staff and the board, so they can consider deliberations and consider implementation planning on the 1st of January. But I would think, for optics, we want to release the whole thing at the same time. That has a minor benefit that, if we find any egregious errors where sentences don't parse or something, we can correct those during the translation period. We can correct the English during the translation period, although we shouldn't plan for that.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Couch your argument. We are going to send this report to the board by December 31. We are not going to do that in the dark. We're going to do that transparently. As soon as we send this to the board transparently, it is effectively released. A later release of multiple versions is window dressing at best.
Alan Greenberg:	Okay.
Brian Cute:	Okay. One World report to everybody. The other question was-- Okay. So, if you have any citations-- and the deadline wasn't Thursday, Alan. I think it was today, if I'm not mistaken.
Alan Greenberg:	I thought it was Thursday, but I may be wrong.
Unidentified Participant:	It's today. I'm pretty sure.
Alan Greenberg:	Well, I didn't get them done, so it will be tomorrow I'm afraid.

Brian Cute: And we talked about whether we should prioritize certain recommendations. I just want to spend a minute on this. It's an important question no matter what we decide, yes or no. It's also important because this review team for very good reason did not recommend any implementation dates to the board. We've gone over that. Very sound rationale to not do that. But, since we don't have any direction on when something should be done, I'm going to ask the team again if you think a particular recommendation should be moved on first because it is more important than some others for a group or more important than others. We really need to indicate that and have some form of consensus. And, at this point, since we're not having a call, we can only do that by e-mail. And that's messy. But I think we really owe it to ourselves to address this question. Any strong opinions on that? It would be simple enough for me to draft a paragraph as we did the first time around that ATRT2 has identified the following recommendations as priority, meaning the board should address them as soon as possible or some words to that effect and then provide the numbers of the recommendations. It's what we did the first time around. We don't have to do it. But I'm going to ask everybody to indicate if they think there should be priority recommendations to do that by e-mail to the list. I'm going to be looking for a majority of the membership if people point to one and it carries a majority of the membership. But I'm inclined to do that. So that's an ask. And, please, get that in. I can draft that up in no time at all. Get that in by Thursday. Priority recommendations closes on Thursday.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, for clarity, you're saying that, if a majority of this group send you e-mails saying recommendation 6 is a priority, you will identify it as such?

Brian Cute: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: I would think the chances of that happening are close to nil, given the tasks people have on the week before Christmas and the response that we tend to get to e-mail messages.

Brian Cute: If you can think of another way to do it, Alan, I'm all ears.

Alan Greenberg: You could do a doodle poll or something or some sort of thing saying - Identify the recommendations. And then at least we can track how many people answered.

Brian Cute: We could do a doodle poll.

                   Heather, please, and then Lise.

Heather Dryden: What I'm hearing is quite a strong focus on prioritizing. And I think this is going to be very difficult anyway. I think what Alan is saying is certainly true that we're asking for difficulty if we're relying on e-mails in this particular moment in time to sort something like that out. But, if we can identify by looking at the packages of recommendations that we are going to have in the final report-- if we can identify maybe scenes or-- rather than prioritizing that we can just describe as saying that there's a particular focus on these kinds of issues or that other one, maybe gets us a bit away from prioritizing. I think it also takes me back to comments that were made when we began, where a number of colleagues on the review team said they didn't want it to be too focused on the GAC. And I think that's fair enough if, from their perspective, we needed to look at other parts of the organization with sufficient focus for that reason as well. I would like us to try and duck a little bit. If it's helpful, I will scan and see if I can get an overall sense and maybe pull out some thoughts and can share those. And then others can comment, as well, maybe along the same lines.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you, Heather.

                   Lise?

Lise Fuhr:
I thought we were going to consider if we were going to prioritize or not. And it wasn't really decided that we wanted to prioritize the different recommendations. I didn't see any strong support or I didn't see any strong rejection against prioritizing in the comments from the last round of (inaudible). I'm really-- I'm not a fan of prioritizing the different recommendations.

Alan Greenberg:
There was strong support in the Chinese submission.

Lise Fuhr:
Yes. That's true.

Brian Cute:
Okay. I'm not hearing overwhelming support for this by any stretch.

Lise Fuhr:
For being against prioritizing or--?

Brian Cute:
For prioritizing. That being said, I think, at this point, we're going to have to pass on that issue.

Alan Greenberg:
Brian, unless you want to do a doodle with yes for each of the seven or twelve recommendations, whatever number there are-- yes, this should be focused on first or no it shouldn't-- and, if you can get any majority for any of them-- I think you're not going to, to be honest.

Brian Cute:
It's the only really feasible way to do it, Alan. Larisa, it's not like staff doesn't have enough to do, but could we put together a doodle poll to that effect. Basically, priority yes/no and the number of the recommendation. We don't need the text.

Larisa Gurnick:
Whether a doodle of that size is feasible-- I would think so, but I need to look into it.

Alan Greenberg:
I would say we do this on whole-numbered recommendations only, not the subparts.

Brian Cute:
Agreed.

Alan Greenberg:
We have eleven or whatever the number is.

Brian Cute:
Okay. Let us know what's feasible, Larisa. I think that's all of the loose items I had.

Larisa Gurnick:
Brian, this is Larisa. I just wanted to flag one other item for you, the executive summary, the way it reads currently. The part leading up to the listing of the recommendations is still in draft form. So I know that there were certain people that wanted to look into changing wording. At minimum, it needs to be reworded as a final report. So I just wanted to flag that for you. And we would need that as soon as possible, within the next 24 hours.

Brian Cute:
Yep. Understood. I need to edit it to make it for the final report. And I don't have the screen up in front of me. Anybody-- We'll put that in the next version that goes around. And, if anybody has any serious edits-- again, it's like something's broken; it's got to be edited and there's a strong rationale why. And offer the language for the edit. That's how we'll have to approach the executive summary as well.

Any other items that we haven't touched on?

Lise Fuhr:
Brian, I'm sorry to interrupt. This is Lise. I'm (inaudible) prioritizing because, for me, it's very important that-- how we put in the wording in the report because I find it very strange to make a whole set of recommendations that we want to prioritize because I

think they're all equally important. So I don't know if after this doodle poll you'll send the wording-- that you write to the group to comment on it.

Brian Cute: I would pull the wording from ATRT1 report. I would pretty much track that unless there was serious concern about that wording.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, just for clarity, are you going to consider something as priority if half of those who answered the doodle poll say yes or half of the group?

Brian Cute: Let's burn that bridge when we come to it, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Chair's discretion, eh?

Brian Cute: Thank you. Any other items? Just, please, speak up because I can't see the screen. Okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Brian, it's Olivier. Thank you very much, Brian. Olivier speaking, for the transcript. So we've reviewed-- tonight, we've reviewed a small segment of the full document that we're going to be submitting. Is there going to be any chance still for us to make any comments on any of the other parts of the report, like any of the appendices or like some of the observations rather than recommendations? I know it's the eleventh hour, but when is this due in?

Brian Cute: Well, we all have the report as it is now. There'll be some modifications that will be visible that go in the next version that come out on Thursday. And, yeah--

Alan Greenberg: Can we assume the appendices didn't change since we didn't get new versions?

Brian Cute: I don't--

Alan Greenberg: Hello?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Appendices have not changed.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And this is Olivier. I did note some errors in the appendices. This is why I'm asking.

Brian Cute: Feel free to send those in to the staff now if they're just errors and we're not changing the substance. We have this report now. There's no need to wait 'til Thursday for that sort of thing.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Olivier speaking. I did send them in. I'll send them again.

Brian Cute: Oh. Okay. Terrific. Those still stand. If you're catching errors, please, send those along. In terms of substance, we'll get the next version on Thursday, and best efforts to review and provide any corrections or edits by Friday. And let's see where we are. Okay? I know everyone likes getting together in this group, but it does have to end at some point in time.

Alan Greenberg: Ah, shucks.

Brian Cute: But, seriously, thank you, everybody, particularly for the focus in the last couple weeks. It's really important to get a quality product out. And I feel like it still feels a little unwieldy, but, in terms of our review and discussion, it's been very focused the last

couple times we've had calls. So thank you, everybody, for your participation and good work. And we won't sign off exactly yet. But we'll touch base by the end of the week. Okay?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Brian.

Brian Cute: Thank you, all.

Alan Greenberg: And, Larisa, I'll try getting my citations and references out today. I'm not sure I'll make it though.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Alan.