20130904_ATRT2_ASO_ID813945

Brian Cute: Okay. Greetings. Thank you, Alice. This is Brian Cute, ATRT2 conference call with the Address Supporting Organization. Greetings to all who have joined. Thank you very much for your time. What I'm going to do at the outset, for the ASO members who are on the call, is outline where we are, that is the review team, in terms of our work, the areas of focus, and primarily this interaction is about hearing from you. As we went to Durban and the ICANN meeting and met with the supporting organizations, ACs and SOs, this is part of the extension of that interaction and outreach. And primarily we're interested in hearing from the community and the stakeholders, their views as we develop our report and recommendations.

So let me take a few minutes to outline for you where we are. The review team is moving into the drafting stage of its work. We have a report and recommendations that we are going to deliver to the ICANN board by December 31st of this year. We've had a number of interactions with the community. We put out a questionnaire for public comment and received inputs in response to that. And right now our timetable has us issuing a draft report and draft proposed recommendations mid-October for public comment to be followed by attendance at the Buenos Aires ICANN meeting. And again, a series of interactions with the ACs and SOs to get feedback on the proposed recommendations and draft report. So we're having this call at an opportune time where we're really beginning to formalize our first pass on what we think our recommendations should be.

That being said, so you understand what our work is, the scope of our work, we are tasked under the Affirmation of Commitments to review ICANN's implementation of recommendations from the prior three review teams that preceded us. That is the Accountability and Transparency Review Team number one, if you will, the Securities, Stability and Resiliency Review Team's recommendations and the WHOIS Review Team's recommendations.

So one of our tasks is to assess ICANN's implementation of the recommendations of those review teams. Another discrete task we have is to make recommendations with respect to the review process itself. Make observations and recommendations as to this review process and whether there can be improvements to it. And thirdly, to look for new issues. That if there are areas where the review team believes, based on input from the community, that there can be improvements in accountability and transparency, to make specific recommendations to that effect.

So that's the scope of our work. What's important from our perspective is that this review team, to the greatest extent possible, act in an independent and objective way. We recognize that we all come from different parts of the community and reflect in some ways on the stakeholder interest from the group that we originate from. In your case, Fiona Asonga has been a terrific leader, driving the work of Workstream 4. But we need to be independent and objective and one of the ways we can reflect that in our work is that we operate on the basis of facts and with facts, analysis and conclusions and recommendations.

So sorry for the longwinded introduction, but I wanted to have you have a fair understanding of what our scope of work is. What you see up on the screen, hopefully you have access to the Adobe, is a list of questions that we have developed over the course of our work. We think these are salient questions to help inform our work and the questions are up there for a guide. If you would like to speak to any or all of these questions over the course of our conference call, your thoughts and inputs are welcome. But don't feel bound by them. If you have specific issues you want to address or raise for us, please do so and direct us to facts that we can use to integrate into our report.

So with that, I'm going to open the floor for questions or clarification or for anyone who wants to pick up the questions and speak. Before I open it to the ASO members, I have Alan Greenberg's hand up. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Brian. Just one more note. These are questions that were raised either because someone on the group raised them or they were raised by someone in the community. They're not necessarily things that we've already decided that we will have recommendations on. They are just issues that were raised from one of a variety of sources. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks for that clarification, Alan. So with that, this really is your meeting. We're interested to hear from you and I'm watching the Adobe to look for hands up. If you're not on Adobe but you'd like to make an intervention, just please speak up and we'll get everybody in the queue. So with that, the floor is yours. Are there any hands or any comments? Let me check, is Fiona Asonga -- are you on the call? I see you on the Adobe.

Fiona Asonga: Yes, I'm on the call.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Fiona. Are there any thoughts you'd like to offer in terms of the conversation to interact with the ASO?

Fiona Asonga: One of the things that came up as I remember from our last ASO conference call as to planning the session with ATRT2, was that members from the ASO felt that probably in reviewing the policy development process of the gNSO (inaudible) recommendations on how to improve (inaudible) we would take time and look at and share the highlights of the ASO policy development process that is very much community driven, that is very dependent on input from various stakeholders across the different geographical regions that have been developed within ICANN. So using the structure of the regional internet registries and the (inaudible) in the registries have, we have policies developed for specific regions, then we have policies that move onto the global policy that are now ratified by the ICANN board and that are discussed at the ICANN level. And so we -- because for me, getting in and having the involvement of the gNSO (inaudible) policy development processes are named after the policy. Whereas, (inaudible) yes, there's a name for the policy, but the policy purpose, the purpose for which the policy was to get stakeholder participation and approval (inaudible) by the ICANN board is one specific development process.

So for every policy development process, it's a particular procedure or set of procedures that have to be followed regardless of which policy is going to be used. And at every stage you find that there is interaction with the community. When it is a global policy, it means it is something that between the different regions has been identified as an issue that should be addressed across all the regions. And therefore there's a process of getting people within the different regions who form a team of foresight that drive the policy. Then defined within the SO policy team that's appointed every year (inaudible) who look at the different policies being discussed (inaudible) and recommend on we would like for this policy to be considered for global policy or when something (inaudible) to insure that that gets to (inaudible) to move to the next level which presents it to the larger ICANN community for input. And input is reviewed and there also (inaudible) to see if it's possible. When possible, (inaudible) all of these processes.

So by the time it's going to the ICANN board to be recognized as a global policy, because actually we need consensus literally across all geographic regions. And we have (inaudible) probably can be used to see where changes can be made in the gNSO process, the procedures of the local (inaudible) SO websites. So the details of how many days and the timeframe are all on the SO websites and that can be looked up on there. So looking at that in comparison to the local internet gNSO policy development process, we should be able to give some guidance on what could be borrowed from that to give the gNSO process a more community involvement approach in the sense that all of us within ICANN would know, yes, it is this policy that is (inaudible). So sometimes I think some of us end up (inaudible) so many different policy development processes with different names.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Fiona.

Fiona Asonga: (Inaudible).

Brian Cute: Thank you very much for that. And I did omit in my outline a particular piece of our work which is the engagement of an independent expert who is providing an assessment and analysis of the gNSO PDP process. That's an input that will be coming in to the ATRT2 and will be integrated into our report. So thank you, Fiona, for giving the background and pointing a finger toward that important piece of our work. Inputs from ASO on those questions obviously would be welcome. And just another piece of background, there has been discussion on ATRT2, and if you look at question number 10, does the community embrace decisions made in regards to IP addresses and AS numbers, a recognition by this review team that this area is one that doesn't get a lot of, or hasn't gotten the focus of prior review teams, and noting the importance of it, I think Fiona's background was very helpful in terms of how the policy making process works in the ASO context. But please, if anyone has thoughts to elaborate on that or suggestions on prospective gNSO PDP process, that's a wonderful area to focus on. So I'm looking for hands, suggestions, points on those areas or other offerings. And I see Wilfried. Please.

Wilfried Wober: Yes. I'd like to start just with a comment with regard to the question number 1. For my situation, I would not be able to provide any input about gNSO policy development as I haven't participated in any of that. So that's sort of just to set the background. With regard to question 10, as a nonnative speaker, could you explain a little bit what the meaning of embrace decisions is? Is this asking whether sort of everyone is involved in making the policy decisions? Or is this pointing fingers at the effect of decisions on the community afterwards? Thanks. Back to you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Thank you very much. Let me first note that the word embraced comes from the Affirmation of Commitments. So there is specific reference there and that's why it's imbedded in this question that was developed. There isn't an appendix to the Affirmation of Commitments that gives clear interpretation of the term. For myself, I certainly can see the connotation of is it embraced or are the decisions embraced after the fact. And speaking to it through that context, clearly not an easy thing to measure necessarily, but that's one connotation. I think another connotation that's equally acceptable is in looking at how the decision is made. Does it go through an open process where there's opportunity for input and active input of community members can be a reflection of how a decision is embraced. So I think either lens is a fair lens. And I hate to do that to you, but to put the question back to you, Wilfried, is are there some things that you see either in the ASO process or other processes that reflect the embrace of the community of a policy decision that are worth our focus?

Wilfried Wober: Yes, I think so. Because in the numbers area, the policy development is, as Fiona has already pointed out, is first of all regionalized and it really starts in the regions. And if some activity or some issue comes up and the policy discussion starts in one area, then the ASO is sort of providing the glue in assessing whether the policy proposal would have any impact on interactions with IANA. And so if this is the required definition to make a policy proposal into potentially global policy proposal, to be then treated within the framework of ICANN. And sort of these grass roots things are in all the five regions open to everyone. And there is no membership requirement of

any type or any sort. And most of the discussions are pulled out and developed on the mailing list. And there is even the notion of you don't have to do business or be physically living or having any particular interest in one of those 5 regions to be allowed to participate in the discussion.

So my assessment is that in the numbers world, the policy development is really open to everyone. Of course with the footnote everyone being interested in that. And thus, I would answer the question sort of are the decisions embraced as yes. Because all the parties interested had a very fair chance to chime in before a decision or before a consensus is reached. Of course like in any environment, those people or those organization or those groups who or which do not participate in the discussion, might later on not be totally happy with the results. But I think that is just a real life environment and we have to live with that. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much. Can I ask, any other feedback on this aspect of the process of policy making, the ASO, is useful, so it's an open invitation. Let me ask a question. Have you observed in the past any controversy over a policy decision that's come out of this process? Any unhappiness? How was it reflected? How did you interpret that with respect to the embrace of the decision made? And I have David Conrad with his hand up from ATRT2. So David, please.

David Conrad: Hi, Brian, thank you. So I just note Adobe is giving me some interesting problems, so my apologies if any of this is confused by cross talk. On the question of embrace, this question came up in our meetings in Durban, particularly with board members that were voted in by the ASO. The question of what it means to embrace in the context of addressing. And I just wanted to clarify that if you actually use Google and look up the word embrace, the second definition I believe is the one that is intended for use. And for those who don't like Google or don't have access, that definition is accept or support (a belief, theory or change) willingly and enthusiastically.

And that, whether or not the ASO policy decisions or the address allocation of policies that are provided to ICANN for global policy ratification are willingly and enthusiastically supported are I believe the thrust of the question. With regard to whether or not the policies are willingly and enthusiastically accepted, I'm wondering whether address communities have looked at the -- even the knowledge of the efforts of the various bodies outside of the normal context of the ISP communities in which they operate. One of the things that ICANN I believe is attempting to do is actually bring all of the various communities that ICANN has some impact on, together in one place in order to sort of allow for a cross fertilization. And I'm wondering what efforts the address communities have undertaken to engage in other communities of interest within the ICANN context. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, David. I see John Curran's hand up. John?

John Curran: Yes, this is John. I want to respond to several points raised so far. With regards to acceptance of the output of the policy coming out of the ASO, I guess it's important to realize that this policy is, when there's a consensus policy that's going to the ICANN board for ratification, it's already been discussed in every region and it already is a consensus output. So I think the -- as probably the ICANN board can see, the outputs of the policy development process, at least for the ASO, don't have the same level I guess of contention or possible angst that may happen from decisions out of the gNSO policy development process.

I think it's important to realize that the regional nature of the policy development process of the RIRs within ICANN provides two things. And it's not just regional for convenience of the service providers and end users and web hosters who participate. It's regional because it provides the ability to have many more meetings much closer to the community. Rather than a handful of meeting spread throughout the globe, collectively we can have 10 or 12 meetings a year that are often aligned with other meetings taking place in the region and far more likely to engage relevant stakeholders than a handful of platform meetings popping around the globe.

I think in addition to a higher level of engagement, when it comes to policies, they are discussed materially five times over and in different contexts, different cultural alignments. Some of these tradeoffs may come down differently and it results in iteration. It may not be a quick process to achieve consensus, but if the goal is a very good consensus for a fast process, I'll take a very good consensus every time.

I think there's some real strengths in the global policy process that is used within the ASO and to pick up on the last point that David raised, I guess with respect to engagement, because of the diverse meetings held throughout the globe, because the RIRs have for example done outreach efforts for specific communities, government --Aaron has done outreach to a hosting community for example. We have I think a tighter level of engagement with affected stakeholders or of primary affected stakeholders. As noted earlier, it's very difficult to engage all affected parties because potentially that's every end user on the internet. But by providing meetings throughout the globe, more frequently on a regional basis, I think we provide certainly a better opportunity for engagement than, and an engagement that's meaningful where someone's remarks, whether remote or on the floor, are actively considered in the discussion, than the typical remote participation and community engagement mechanisms that we see for the gNSO.

Brian Cute: Thanks, John. David, then Hans Peter, and if I can beg your indulgence, I'd just like to ask John to expand on two points if you don't mind, before we come to you. John, two things. The scope of participants -- and it's clear that the concept is that it's open to all who are touched, if you will, by language, by decisions, policy decisions with respect to numbers. So that's a broad open opportunity. One, has there been any analysis of actual participants and from which interest group they come from over the course of these meetings? Any stock taking data on who the participants have been and how that relates to the broad community to whom the process is open, question number one.

Question number two, when you said that inputs are I think it was actively considered or something to that effect, can you expand a bit on that as to -- the suggestion to my ears is that those inputs have a greater possibility of affecting the policy outcome. And if that's what you intended, can you expand a bit on that please?

John Curran: Sure. Let me take the two questions and I will reverse the order for clarity. First, with regards to how input is taken, a given policy is discussed in a session. A session is the address working group of a particular RIR or a public policy session. It has various names. But that discussion is an open discussion with a presentation by whoever is coordinating that policy proposal. And inputs are coming from the floor and remotely and generally equally balanced. What I mean by that is, it really isn't a question of someone filing written comments, it's a question of someone raising an issue and the issue itself is what we're discussing. Not whether it came remotely or whether it was raised in person. Not whether the person has five stars after their badge or is just a disembodied voice. We're raising the issue and discussing about the issue on the merits of the issue.

And so the input that a major corporation provides on a policy proposal is taken equally to the remote participants' remarks that come five minutes later during the review of that policy. And it's not a question of informatra or wait or representation. It's a question of what technical matter are you raising that needs to be considered. This, again, happens in 5 different regions when we're discussing a global policy. So I guess I want to make sure it's clear that the nature of the policy processes in the RIRs allow for open participation whether that's people who are primary stakeholders who are directly affected like ISPs and service providers, or incidentally affected like their customers, or incidentally affected like law enforcement and governments, whether it's in person or whether it's on the mailing list. So I think that's important. I'm not sure it's quite as clear when a given policy in the gNSO process is going to be discussed when the comments raised on the list will be put on the floor, and how those will be addressed.

Certainly that might change, be a significant change if the gNSO were to do development. But I point out it is how we know that all participants have an opportunity using the processes in the ASO.

Now to come to the second point, you asked about how do we know, picking stock, how do we know the level of participants. And how do we know the representation or the communities that have been involved? We don't. While we have lots of engagement activities, we've also reached out to folks such as the at-large community. We work with operator farms, we work with meetings that have been held in conjunction in many cases with other associations. The fact is, we're not actually trying to measure what groups are represented because it doesn't matter. What we're trying to do is create good policy and it's the issues raised by those who come to the floor that have to be addressed, not whether or not everyone had a chance to say they were counted. It's, again, not a question. Everyone does have a chance to raise an issue, but we're working focused on the output, not on the representation per se.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much for that. I have David and Hans Peter in that order. It looks like it flipped on the board. David, if you don't mind, we'll have Hans Peter go and then I'll come to you and to Alan. Hans Peter?

Hans Peter Holen: I agree with most of what John said. And this actually makes me think about item two on your list where I see a difference between the processes on the numbering side and on the naming side. The naming side moderation is that all the different stakeholders does not meet as a community to discuss stuff, but they meet in constituencies, make sort of points and discussion papers and so on. While at the RIR meetings in direct regions, my experience is that I see naming actors, I see government bodies same as on the GAC, I see law enforcement people and I see operators discuss in an open manner and in an open forum how to find solutions to different things. So when we talk about the community, I think ICANN needs to have a look at how do we actually form a community rather than a lot of small communities and how do we make an address? Therefore, I think that's also a question of how has the numbering community reached out to go to the naming community? I think it's actually working the other way around. The naming community comes to the numbering community when they have numbering issues to discuss. And they are already doing that at various levels in different regions. That's just my observation.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much, Hans Peter. David, and then Alan.

David Conrad: Actually I was just wanting to get clarification with regards to what John was saying earlier. But the impression that might have been gotten was that in order to participate in the RIR policy forums, one actually needed to be present either in person or remotely at the policy meetings. Could you clarify that? And also, one of the things that ICANN has received comment on is that during public comment periods for example, ICANN receives a number of comments and there has been some concern that there's no indication that ICANN has accepted and acted on those comments for each and every individual comment. There has been for example some request that ICANN address each and every comment directly that it receives in for example the public comment periods. How does the RIR community address the input it receives? Does it address each individual item or does it group them? And if so, how does it actually do that? How does it do that grouping? And apologies, it's 5:00 A.M. here.

Brian Cute: Thanks, David. John, do you want to respond to David's questions and then we can come back to Alan?

John Curran: I'd be happy to respond briefly. And I apologize, my fellow ASO participants on the call, because I don't necessarily have all the regions down, but first and foremost is that while each RIR does tend to use a face to face meeting with remote participation as a place where the policies are reviewed and the input is reviewed and sort of a determinant sense of how to proceed, it is true that the discussion takes place between the meetings on each policy proposal taking place in a policy working group or policy mailing list in each of the RIRs.

So there are some mailing lists in each region, some of which can be blessed with several hundred emails a day, but usually much quieter. And these are where the people working on those policy proposals receive feedback from the community continuously. And I mean the greater community, any party, can participate and respond. And then when these face to face meetings happen, a given proposal is put on the table and the input received and the major issues raised, based on the input collected over since the last meeting, are brought on the floor and discussed.

It's possible that some of these issues have been dismissed or have been by the community it's fairly clean that the community doesn't consider a raised issue to be material, but that's confirmed by having the face to face meetings which discuss what happened on the mailing list, what issues have been raised. In this manner, I would say that the RIR process has a strong resemblance to IETF working groups and efforts on internet class. And that's a process that I think we know has been shown to be open and yet consensus building. I hope that addresses both your questions, David.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much, John. Alan. Alan first. Hans Peter, is your hand up from the last time or is up anew? Okay, let's go with Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Brian. This is an interesting conversation but I just noticed we only have 20 minutes left and if there are any other issues that anyone in this group would like to raise with the ATRT regarding transparency and accountability throughout the rest of the organization, this is a good time to raise it. Because what we've heard is the policy development process within the ASO and their constituent bodies seems to be working relatively well. Certainly, however, if there are other things which need our attention, this is a good opportunity to raise them. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Alan. I was about to make the same prompt as well. There are questions up on the board in Adobe that give you a sense of some of the areas that we're focused on. It is, again, an open floor invitation for any and all inputs. The ASO policy making processes are of distinct interest since we are looking at the gNSO PDP process and likely to make some recommendations on that front. But please don't confine your comments to just the ASO policy process. Are there other issues or any other questions for the review team in terms of our work? Looking for hands. Wilfried?

Wilfried Wober: Yes, not sure whether this is the right place and the right time to have another brief look at the RT4 thing, the newest thing. You are probably aware that some of us having been on this RT4 did have second thoughts about the activities after submitting the report. So my question to the currently active ATRT is, does this group intend to also look at the, I don't want to say processes, but at the activities which other groups within ICANN started after submission of the formal report of RT4 and the activities from the board? The reason why I'm asking this is because I fully appreciate the fact that the board has the ultimate responsibility and thus the board is free to "do whatever they want". But I'm having some hard time at the moment after attending couple of sessions in Durban to see or to really believe in the fact that the focus is put primarily onto following up on RT4's recommendation, set of recommendations. And not being sort of staffed by the parallel activities to come up with ideas and proposals for a bright new world. But the primary question is, is this even an issue for the ATRT at the moment? Thank you.

Brian Cute: Yes, Steve, did you want to pick up the question or did you have a different point?

Steve Crocker: Well I had a different point, but I'll be happy to respond to this. But I want to be certain that I understand precisely what's being asked here. Is this with respect to the WHOIS review team's recommendations?

Wilfried Wober: Yes, it is.

Steve Crocker: And if I might ask, one additional clarification, what is the essence of your concern? Does it appear, and I don't want to be putting words in your mouth, but does it appear to you that the recommendations from the WHOIS review team were either not accepted or aren't getting enough attention with respect to implementation?

Wilfried Wober: No, my concern is more on the procedural plane. Because I was for one of those team members have expected the security group to work with us during the preparation of the report instead of submitting sort of at least parallel if not conflicting reports to the board. This is the background for my question.

Steve Crocker: Aha, that's a much more interesting question actually. And I appreciate you asking it. I don't have a quick answer for you. The review teams -- but you may be putting your finger on an important subtlety. Each of the review teams is selected by a process which is documented well enough and then the review team goes off and chooses its own course. I don't know what happened inside the operation of the WHOIS review team. They certainly had the option if they had chosen to, to try to ask the SFAC, Security Facility Advisory Committee, for advice or to have sessions with them. I don't recall or don't know whether they chose to or not. It's typical I think of all of these review teams to reach out to a certain extent and then to focus inwardly and write its report. And then it's quite common for everybody, anybody to comment afterwards.

Let me add another comment which is more general. A concern I've had from watching various expert groups, and I'm including review teams that are part of the AOC, part of the Affirmation of Commitments, and I'm including advisory committees that exist on a long term basis and other expert groups that are assembled. There is oftentimes, more often than I originally expected and I've been watching this for more than a decade, a tendency for a group to decide on something and then to go marching pretty forward with it, sometimes exceeding either their expertise and sometimes exceeding their mandate. And even worse, I've observed that these groups sometimes take a sense of ownership. They've decided, they've issued their advice, and anybody who doesn't follow their advice isn't doing their job.

Sitting on the other side of this, on the receiving side from the board, and having watched, there's been quite a few of these in different areas, some security, some economic studies and various other things. My sense is that it's very important to have comments afterwards and to subject to the opinions, no matter how well through they are or how forcefully they're presented, to subject them to these subsequent review processes and then to proceed in a very careful fashion. So I recognize that it's a messy process, that it's sometimes unpleasant, but I think in the end it is absolutely necessary and healthy. I don't know if that helps you at all.

But to the first point that you made, it would be perhaps useful in guidance to future reviews to suggest that they reach out more acidulously, more rigorously to the various standing bodies like SFAC that are out there. Certainly I know in this review process, ATRT2, we have been doing that and in fact that's what brings us to this call in particular with you guys. But I -- there's always room for more and there's always a question of how much is enough.

Wilfried Wober: Okay. Thank you.

Steve Crocker: While I have the floor, Brian, I put into the chat a question that's on my mind. My sense of the history of the interactions with the ASO, between the ASO and the board, is that the board's job is primarily to ratify the decisions that are made, the policies that are put together through the very extensive, bottoms up process that ASO has through its regional and then cross regional deliberations. The only complaints that are on my mind that I can recall about what the board has done is whether the board has been sufficiently prompt in meeting the specific timeframes that are laid out in the process. And to the extent that we've missed those to date, it has been for very humble reasons. People busy or the calendar just not lining up properly or whatever. I don't recall any substantive pushback. So let me turn that into a question. Does anybody on this call have any recollection of where the ASO's policies have not been dealt with in a satisfactory

manner except for the minor details, what I'll call the minor detail of whether we were prompt enough in saying yes?

Brian Cute: Just so you know, Alan, if you're still there, I am now in route to my office and cannot see the Adobe, so if there are hands up, Alan, would you kindly call out the queue?

Alan Greenberg: There are significant hands up. I was going to address briefly the question on the WHOIS review team, but then we'll go onto the other hands in a moment. I think Steve addressed most of what you raised. An interesting question which I don't know the answer to is was there as SFAC member on the WHOIS review team. And if so, what kind of interaction was there there?

My recollection, however, is the SFAC submitted its report as a response to the WHOIS review team just like many of the other ACs and SOs did. And that certainly is completely within the process. What happened during the process I can't tell, and whether that was a problem in staffing at the WHOIS review team that didn't include SFAC or some other problem along the way, I can't really say. Certainly this team is reviewing all aspects of the response to the WHOIS review team and we will be going into some detail on that.

We have David Conrad, John Curran, Louie Lee, and Steve Crocker again in the queue, in that order.

Steve Crocker: Take me out.

Alan Greenberg: You have to take yourself out, I can't do that. Was that Steve saying take me out?

Steve Crocker: Yeah, and I did.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. David, you're first then.

David Conrad: In response to Steve, there was one situation that I recall generating, if not a reaction at the board level but definitely a reaction, is when the IPD6 global policy was put up to the board, the board had actually requested a review of that from ICANN staff. There was shall we say a bit of a negative reaction on the part of at least some members within the NRO to staff looking at the implications of allocating the [slash twelves] to the RIRs of the initial allocation. But that's the only case that I'm aware of.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks, we have Louis next. Louie Lee, are you on mute perhaps?

Louie Lee: Yes, hi, can you hear me? Great. Thank you. In response to Steve's question or comment, yes, the board typically is, as a global policy is coming through, working its way through, the board is kept up to date or at least is updated by myself or another member of the ASO AC or the ASO AC appointed members of the board of the progress of the global policy. And also, its major implications. So by the time a global policy reaches the board, there should not be any surprises. And the board, having seen that, at one point having seen a global policy as a good chance of reaching the board in between board meetings and might not have a chance to adopt or act on it, has tentatively adopted or given powers to the CEO to adopt it. And then let the board formally adopt it at a later point outside of the window. So I would thank the board very much on having seen that issue come up and taking steps to mitigate any problems as far as timing and seeing that that particular global policy was not contentious. There was another point and I've forgotten so I'll just go back in the queue for next time.

Alan Greenberg: And there is no queue right now -- oops, we now have a queue. John? John Curran.

John Curran: I'd like to take an opportunity to comment on one of the questions on the list which is, is transparency sacrificed for expedience when the board has a difficult decision to make? If yes, provide examples. I will not remark on anything in particular out of the gNSO process, but I will

instead summarize an experience in the ASO community which is that because of the requirement to have materially the same text in five regions in order to change policy, this is a remarkable forcing function for understanding the issues involved in a given policy change. And to really work on trying to understand other people's concerns and accommodate them.

I don't think there's any circumstance, short of the term emergency, which I'm sure the board knows when it wants to do such and why, I don't believe there's any normal circumstance that warrants sacrificing consensus or transparency in order to make a decision. There's very few time bombs built into the internet protocols to my knowledge. The only one I can recall offhand is IPD4 itself and its address size. So all the changes we're making actually are optional. They really truly are. And I don't think the board should ever compromise on transparency or compromise on consensus building. I think telling people it will remain the way it is until you can show you've considered all the material issues and address them is a great way of encouraging the type of work that needs to happen in a good policy.

We have that function built into the five RIRs in the ASO and we've seen policies take two years to get through it. I'd rather have a policy take two years in such a process than iterations of reviews and appeals and counter reviews and ad hoc inputs that might occur otherwise. And I would ask that the review team, when thinking of that question, think carefully about why a policy decision would ever have to be sacrificed for expedience.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, John. Any other comments on that or anything else? We have two minutes left, so we're getting close to the end. Is there anyone else who wants to get a last word in? Anyone from the review team, the ATRT?

Brian Cute: This is Brian, Alan. I've got a couple of housekeeping points for the ATRT2.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, we do have Louie Lee's hand up though. Louie, if you can be quick?

Louie Lee: Okay, I just want to jump in to address number 14, are the working list policies of your group fully accountable and transparent? If not, how could they be enhanced or improved? I think we've fully established that we are fully accountable and transparent on the ASO side with the different RIRs and the different regional communities. I do want to say that, even so, we are trying to enhance and improve it by pushing some of the topics and allowing the ICANN community to have a chance to come to our meetings or maybe even participate over mailing lists by letting them know what are the current activities within the ASO. Not just on policy, but on outreach, trying to increase outreach by going to the different -- not just at the ICANN level with trying to establish kind of a maybe even 10 minute session on a Monday where there's unconflicted time so that everybody can be notified what's going on at least at a high level and they can have a chance during the week to approach us individually or in a bilateral manner between the SOs and the ACs. The RIR staff, along with community members, are going to industry meetings, conferences, and put ourselves out there to be available for even non ICANN type folks to participate in one manner or another.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Louie. Brian, turn it back over to you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everybody, and everyone from the ASO for the exchange. Very, very much appreciated. This is an open process. Please be on the lookout for our draft report and proposed recommendations in mid-October timeframe. There will be a comment period and do take advantage of that. We have an email on the site, the ATRT2 site, if you have additional thoughts and inputs. And as I said at the outset, facts as well to help vet our thinking, that's welcome. But thank you all for your participation. One, two quick points of business for the review team -- please do, if you haven't, respond to the doodle poll for tomorrow's call. We're training to make arrangements with ICANN policy staff. And also provide your travel requirements for the Buenos Aires meeting to staff as soon as possible. And if you have any

questions on those two items, feel free to hit me on the email list afterwards. So again, thank you all very much for joining us, it's very much appreciated. Take care.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Brian. Thank you all.