20130708_ATRT2_ID799851

Brian Cute:	Welcome everyone to the ATRT2 conference call July 8, 2013 in preparation of interaction with the community in Durbin. We have the agenda up on the screen. I hope everyone can see that. It has six items. Any proposed changes to the agenda? Looking for hands. Seeing none, we'll continue the call. The second item is statements of interest in the conflict of interest policy of ATRT2. Any -- statement of interest update? Seeing no hands, we'll move forward in the agenda to number three. Let me step back for a minute. On this call we -- face to face with the members of the community --
Larisa Gurnick:	Brian? Sorry, but you're fading. We're losing you. Can you speak closer to the mic, please?
Brian Cute:	Sure. On the calendar of meetings ATRT2 is going to have, we want to look at the proposed face to face meeting agenda and make sure it's full and complete. We also want to on this call agree to questions we have for ACs and SOs in Durbin and our engagement with them. Also any questions we may have for ICANN staff as we have interactions with ICANN staff on the agenda. We're going to have an update from staff and also a discussion of the status of the letters to high ranking government officials. Hold on. My apologies for that. This is what we need to accomplished here on item number three, the Durbin calendar and proposed face to face meeting agenda. Alice, can you put the Durbin calendar on the screen, please? Thank you very much.
	We've got the schedule from Friday July 12 through Thursday July 18 up on the board. And I'd like the members of the review team just to review this calendar and the question is -- have we missed anything? Any scheduled meetings with groups or individuals that we've discussed? David?
David Conrad:	This is David Conrad for the transcript. I'd like to set up a meeting with Patrick or other representatives of the security group to talk about SSR related stuff sometime during the week. I don't have a particularly good time right now. Just need to negotiate that with whoever that will be, presumably Patrick, whoever ICANN deems is the appropriate person.
Brian Cute:	Thanks, David. I think we have that covered, an hour into -- agenda on the list, if you can confirm that?
Larisa Gurnick:	This is Larisa. On the proposed agenda for the two days on day one we've got a time slot with Patrick at 16.30 right after the afternoon coffee break.
Brian Cute:	Dave, will the help you get what you want out of Patrick?
David Conrad:	It's actually in the context of work stream one we provided Patrick a set of questions and I was hoping to be able to sit down and talk with him and get a better understanding of that prior to the more general meeting. But I guess that will work.

Brian Cute:	Okay. If that works, terrific. But if you have focused questions we need to address within your work stream with Patrick and that session doesn't cover it I would encourage you to make arrangements for additional time with him and instead of doing work with ICANN staff, Larisa and Alice, so the interaction can be documented appropriately?
David Conrad:	Will do.
Larry Strickling:	Brian, this is Larry. I have a question about the schedule. On Tuesday July 16 it shows us with only a 15 minute session with the ccNSO. Is that right?
Larisa Gurnick:	Yes. That's right.
Larry Strickling:	Then there are a couple we're only meeting for half an hour. I just was wondering -- is that our choice or their choice? They only thought they had 15 minutes worth of stuff to talk about?
Larisa Gurnick:	Yes. That's the only available day unfortunately. Their agenda was already full. And they only had that slot available. Sorry about that.
Brian Cute:	It's a matter that we focus on -- keep that in mind when you get to the questions we're going to send to the ACs and SOs because we have to discuss how that works in the interaction with the time we have. Any other questions on the schedule of meetings?
Alan Greenberg:	Brian, it's Alan. I can barely make out what you're saying. I'm on a regular phone. It normally works.
Brian Cute:	Is this better?
Alan Greenberg:	Slightly.
Brian Cute:	Any other -- schedule? Looking for hands. Okay. Other than the discussion point with David Conrad on the work stream scheduling and meetings which we certainly have the latitude to do. So, we have the schedule for Durbin. Alice, can you take this to the face to face document? So, this is the breakdown of day two, ATRT2 face to face meetings on Friday July -- Saturday June 13. Pardon me. July. That should be July. So -- look at up on the screen, just a look at day -- scroll through to day two to see the entirety of the proposed agenda. Scroll up a little bit, please. Olivier? I see you have a question.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thanks very much, Brian. It's Olivier here. I just wanted to ask with regards to the confidential information we've received if there's any -- I can't see anywhere this being dealt with or discussed. Brian, if you're talking we can't hear you. Anyone still here?
Larisa Gurnick:	I'm still here.
Brian Cute:	Can you hear me now?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	We could hear those words.
Brian Cute:	What is the status of the confidential inputs and next steps coming out of the call we've had, chairs and vice chairs, before I went off on vacation?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Brian, are you asking that to something?
Brian Cute:	I was asking you.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	As far as I know nothing's been done here. Thank you whoever cut that out. The last I'm aware of is you were supposed to reply to the second person who sent in input

acknowledging receipt and I don't believe there's been any follow ons. I think it's probably appropriate we spend at least a little bit of time in the confidential session sometime in Durbin talking about it. I don't know when that's going to fit in. If we don't talk about it now either to decide we're not going to do anything or to decide we are going to do anything, I'm not sure how it's going to move forward.

Brian Cute: Thank you. I agree. I think we need to get this on the calendar. Do we have -- is there any disagreement that we add this to the calendar?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I would say perhaps we can extend day one a little bit and do it there?

Brian Cute: Let's just get the agreement of the group of this as an agenda item then we can take the scheduling of it offline. Anybody disagree? Looking for hands. Okay. We'll find some time to add that to the agenda. Thank you very much, Olivier. Any other questions about the face to face agenda? Anything we should change? Not seeing any hands. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. Olivier here. A question regarding the working lunch discussion with Amy regarding the ICANN whistleblower program and reconsideration process. Is this going to be public and recorded, et cetera, or will this be in Chatham House, will it be confidential?

Brian Cute: My perception is it will be open which is our default. I haven't heard from ICANN staff a request for Chatham House treatment.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Larisa? Can you confirm?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, Brian. I will.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Any other questions or suggested changes? I'm seeing no hands. We will add an agenda item, talk about the topics for ATRT2 and move forward with this as the agenda for Durbin. And going back to -- so I can see the next item, please. I apologize for the audio issues I'm having here.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm sorry to come on late on this, it's Olivier again. The session with Terry Camel, I have heard he may not be in Durbin. Not sure whether he's confirmed or not. Will that take place by remote conference call?

Brian Cute: That's a question for Larisa. Do you happen to know?

Alice Jansen: This is Alice. I can confirm that Terry will be attending remotely.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks.

Brian Cute: Any other questions before I move to item four? Seeing no hands, let's move on to number four. This is to prepare and review questions for sessions with ICANN community and staff. We had discussed the utility of putting focus questions in front of ACs and SOs, et cetera, in advance of Durbin to help frame our interactions and help signal to these groups some of the specific inputs we're looking for. That being said, it's helpful but we have to be mindful of time. There are many session as we've seen that will be short in duration. The value of the interaction is getting information and inputs from the audience. So, up on the board are a number of questions that we have sent out and what I'd like to do is take the time to come to an agreement amongst ourselves which questions we should send out to the ACs and SOs. And the last point, that needs to happen today or tomorrow with folks getting on a plane in the next day or two. We need to have this conversation now to just talk through these questions, agree which ones should be sent. If there are some we disagree on we can put them aside. If some should be

sent to a particular AT or SO, let's identify that. Those that can go to all of the groups we're going to interact with, let's identify those. Alan? Your hand is up?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. A couple of things. Obviously number one question I believe should go out to everyone except the ccNSO -- it's just not applicable to them. Number two I think is an important question. I would propose however rewarding it somewhat. Alice earlier today tried to look up what I said in the meeting with the CSG and sent it to us and I came up with another version which is somewhat revised. I'll read it and see if this is applicable. Specifically, the multi stakeholder model presumes we can get substantive involvement from all stake holders including those who do not have financial interests at stake. Are we doing that effectively? If not, what does ICANN need to change to be able to do it effectively? Actually it's on the screen at the bottom there. I think that covers it a little bit better. It makes reference to the fact that it's just not that we'd like volunteers. The credibility of the multi stakeholder model depends on getting involvement and the question is what do we need to do to get it? If we're not already doing it, what do we need to do it properly?

Brian Cute: I guess first we need to agree on the focus of the question to go forward. Then we can figure out which ones go to all the audiences and which ones go to targeted audiences. With that in mind, Alan, you're suggesting what you would substitute for question number two on the board. Any discussion on that point? I see an agreement from Olivier. Any discussion? Looking for hands. Not seeing any let's leave question number two and Larisa and Alice, what Alan -- will become the new number two, if you will? Alan, did you have any other comments?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think number one, other than the fact that it doesn't go to the ccNSO, probably needs to be reworded slightly in light of the fact that we have issued an RFP and just to tell people we've done that so it's not just us that are soliciting information. But if they have any interest in talking to the external consultant, we need to pave the way for that because it's not clear how the external reviewer is going to be able to make contact with the right people and vice versa. I think we just need to set the stage that it will be happening.

Brian Cute: Do you have a suggestion? I'd like to get questions agreed on.

Alan Greenberg: I don't at the moment. I'm sure I could come up with something right after this meeting. It's that we're asking for input now and will be in other process going forward. Hopefully by the time we have this meeting we will know if there are any bidders or not and whether the process will be going forward or not.

Brian Cute: So, it looks like we're adding a preface to question number one to the fact that ATRT2 has determined that in order to engage they have a set expert to view the effectiveness of the BDP process -- comma or second sentence -- in your view is the GNSO is working well and if not needs to be done. Is that what you're trying to hit?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think so. Perhaps a third sentence saying input during Durbin meeting is welcome and expressions of interest in interacting with the consultant? Something like that?

Brian Cute: Any -- what -- suggest verbal edit and create a new question number one and have that sent out by ICANN staff? Okay. Seems to be the -- is that it? Take it offline? Alan? Did you have anything else?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Three through six were all specific to the business constituency who we've already met with. I don't think those are applicable. I did have one other suggestion.

Brian Cute: The BC? Since I was not on that call, were those questions already discussed with the BC? Or did the emerge after that call?

Alan Greenberg:	Those were questions posed to the BC because of the statement they submitted to the public comment. We were asking for more elaboration.
Brian Cute:	Are you saying remove them from the list of questions?
Alan Greenberg:	Yes. They are specific to what the BC said. Since we're not meeting with the BC again, I don't think they're applicable to Durbin.
Brian Cute:	Okay. Any objection? Okay. Seeing none, three and five and six?
Alan Greenberg:	Three, four, five, and six. All of them. The last four numbered ones. My last comment is I tried to word a question related to the whole public comment process and I tried to do it in a way that was not leading and you can see on the screen what I came up with and I'll read it or we can have people read it. It says there's been a lot of discussion and some ATRT1 recommendations related to the public comment process. Do you think the process to receive comments is working well? And if not, what needs to be done to fix it or change it? For comments that are received do you feel that those requested by GNSO PDPs or PDP in general staff or the board are effectively taken into account in ultimate decisions?
Brian Cute:	Any discussion? Looking for hands. I don't see any. We'll move forward with that question. Alan, if you would look at the last two questions -- ? I see -- hands -- one question for -- Olivier?
Alan Greenberg:	Olivier? Are you still there?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	I am indeed. But I'm not following your question, Brian. I'm sorry. You keep dropping out. I heard my name. I'm not sure what you're asking.
Alan Greenberg:	At the top of the second page of what Alice has displayed there are two questions that came out of work stream one. Do you want to discuss them?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Okay. I could I guess. The two questions -- let me see those. Yes. These are effectively questions that were suggested so as to keep the question as open as possible and not restrict the answers that anyone on the -- during the session would wish to have. We just thought this was going to be quite helpful. I guess Fiona is the one who suggested the first question and everyone was in agreement with it being a good, strong question. The second one came out of -- from you, Alan. I don't know if Fiona, if she's on, or you would like to expand on those? But I certainly understood from those questions that they're open to enough interpretation so as to basically be the doorway to more dialogue afterwards rather than have a Q&A session with very tight questions and very tight answers or no answer if the person -- if the people we're speaking to have no opinion on it.
Alan Greenberg:	Certainly in regard to the second I regard that not as an explicit question but perhaps part of the preamble of what Brian or whoever is chairing the meeting will give to explain why we're here. Essentially we're talking to people because we want to know to what extent do they believe ICANN satisfies the need of being accountable and transparent and if there are holes in those areas, we want to know about them. I view it not so much as a question but as the rationale for why we're there at all.
Fiona Alexander:	This is Fiona. Just to answer Olivier's question, this was a follow on from the questions from the meeting with the constituents, the stakeholders last week. I think it was just a general conversation starter. So, obviously it can be edited or changed. But the point was people kept bringing up these divisions and how it was causing challenges for them.
Alan Greenberg:	Just to give context to the people who were not on the meeting, one of the questions that was raised was -- Do you feel -- I think it was -- Do you feel the constituencies within the commercial stakeholder group work well together? I don't remember the exact wording

but it was something to that effect. And Steve from the intellectual property constituency said -- This is a structure forced on us by the board. We were a constituency in the old GNSO. We still think of ourselves as a constituency. They lumped us together. But that doesn't make us work together as a unit. We're still three separate constituencies. You can see how Fiona's question comes out of that. Fiona, the way I read your question really is -- Is ICANN organized to be effective or not? And if not how should it change?

Fiona Alexander: I think that's a fair read of the question.

Brian Cute: The only editorial question I have is looking at the word subdivisions and wondering if it will be clear to the recipients, the audience, what we mean by that. Does that need some clarification or sharpening?

Alan Greenberg: I guess you could replace it with advisory committee, support organizations, constituencies, et cetera.

Brian Cute: Fiona? Others? Would that be acceptable?

Fiona Alexander: Yes.

Brian Cute: I don't see any hands. Olivier? Okay. We'll make that edit offline. Any other discussion of these proposed questions? I don't see any hands.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, I hadn't thought of it but I guess in light of our responsibility of reviewing the other two review teams we could have an open ended question in our list although I don't expect most to necessarily address it but they might. Do you have any comments as to what we should think about in critiquing ICANN's implementation of the WHOIS review team and DSSA review teams? So, essentially asking them for input and things we should consider.

Brian Cute: In ATRT1, right, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: We're already asking them that in terms of the accountability and transparency but, yes, we can certainly explicitly include that also. There's no problem. Of course we can.

Brian Cute: So, one catch-all question about the review of the prior review teams?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Brian Cute: Any discussion? Seeing none -- Alice, can you scroll up to the first page of this document? So, we're removing questions three through six and going with the questions that remain as edited. Is there any group we should not send this to in advance? We're striking -- kind of global questions if you will. Any opinions on that?

Alan Greenberg: Aside from omitting the first one from the ccNSO, I think the rest are all applicable.

Brian Cute: Any other opinion on that?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, for clarity, the very last one which I found more as an introduction are you suggesting that we omit that one or leave it in as an explicit question?

Brian Cute: No. Alan and I, after this call, we will -- Alice and Larisa and ICANN staff will get these questions out the door. With the exception of number one, not going to the ccNSO that will be sent to all the ACs and SOs or organizations -- Okay. Can we go back to the agenda? Thank you. We're on number four. There are two more things we need to complete here before we are done. We have to look at the interactions with ICANN staff during day one and day two. So, Alice, if you'd put the agenda for day one and day two back up on the board. The interactions with ICANN staff, are there any specific questions

we want to put forward to those staffers before we meet with them in Durbin, noting that time is tight. Just look through the agenda and see who we're meeting with. Okay. The first item is number seven, discuss metrics and benchmarks with Michelle and Larisa Gurnick. Having discussed this earlier on the call with Larisa, our understanding of this interaction is largely Larisa bringing to the ATRT ICANN staff efforts to engage a consultant to assist ICANN with the development of metrics. There's a clear interest by the ATRT2 on this issue but it didn't strike me as an interaction that required questions in advance from us. Larisa? Alan? Anything to add there?

Alan Greenberg: Nothing on my side.

Larisa Gurnick: Nothing here.

Brian Cute: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I was actually waiting to speak about the earlier questions. So, I'm okay with letting go.

Brian Cute: Happy to hear your thoughts on that question.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I was just going to ask some committees might have questions for the ATRT2 in addition to the questions we're asking. So, the question was what is the protocol? Are they going to be asked first to bring their questions forward? Or will the ATRT2 start the discussion? And with regards to responses, how do we do this? Will it be for you or whoever? Or is it just whoever has the first answer? Or the other thing is will you be looking at enabling a very healthy, open dialogue stimulating more discussion and information to be generated from the discussion?

Brian Cute: I don't think we need to solicit questions in advance from any of the groups we're meeting with. I think the purpose of the face to face interaction is to hear from them any inputs including questions from them will be solicited then. How we respond during the interaction just fro a logistical, tactical, managing the interaction is something we're going to be discussing during our interactions during day one and day two. Is that sufficient?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's great, thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Moving back to the agenda, interactions with staff, number seven, metrics and benchmarks. Any other points on that? Okay. The next is item eight on day one. We're going to discuss ICANN's governmental engagement and my understanding is this is going to be not just about the letter to high level government officials that is working its way through the process but Terry is presenting to the ATRT2 at a high level the engagement with governments, the process and dynamics of that effort at the ICANN senior staff level. And as such the first presentation to the ATRT2 on this issue, with that understanding, I'm not sure questions in advance are necessary here. Larisa? Alan? Anyone else? Discussion on this?

Alan Greenberg: I don't think we need questions in advance on that one. I think on this call, on this one like a number of others, what we're really trying to get out of this is a belief that everything is going well an we don't need to make a recommendation of it or to get an understanding of what we're going to be recommending. So, I think we should make sure that he gives us a good overall briefing but also that we allow time for questions and interaction because there's bound to be some of that. We need to have some level of closure before we complete these sessions, that we understand what's going on. We may need to debate amongst ourselves what's going to be happening next but this is probably our last chance to talk to these people other than targeted teleconferences which could be done but we haven't done many of them. I think we need to impress on people that there needs to be opportunity for interaction and they need to give us a good high level review and let us probe as necessary.

Brian Cute:	Thank you. Any other discussion? To Alan's point, looking down on the agenda at item nine which is analysis of data collected and next steps, the purpose of that session is for the review team to discuss presentations they've received from the staffers in number seven and number eight and draw some conclusions, discuss next steps. Do we need further interactions? Et cetera. That's the purpose of that session. So, no questions in advance. The next interaction with staff is the working lunch with Amy. She's going to be presenting on the ICANN whistleblower program and board reconsideration process. Coming out of the coordination call this afternoon my understanding is that whistleblower aspect will be bringing to ATRT2 some specifics about that program in response to questions we've already raised and second on the board reconsideration process there have been some developments on that front that Amy will be reporting in to us. With that understanding it doesn't appear to be a session where we need to put some questions forward in advance. Alan, your hand is up?
Alan Greenberg:	I would suggest a question in advance to Amy and that is to explain to us why this program is treated as an internal confidential program with not public information. Whistleblower programs, often the details are publically known, they're not open to everyone but they're not secret. I'm curious as to what the rational is for ICANN treating this as a confidential manner where they cannot release even the existence of the process in most public forums and certainly not the details. I'd like to understand that more. I think it's reasonable to give her a heads up that we're going to ask that question.
Brian Cute:	Any discussion or other points in terms of questions to raise?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	I think that somehow ties in with the question I had earlier with regards to this session, whether it was going to be public or not public. I'm concerned that if this is -- I'm entirely for transparency but if Amy is going to speak about a program which appears to have been absolutely confidential and of which very little was heard of prior to the ATRT2 asking the questions about it, I'm concerned about the amount of answers Amy might be able to supply to us in an open environment where the information is immediately broadcast in real-time. My suggestion was going to be that this would be a closed session with the recordings being made and if upon the closing of that hour which has been spent with Amy there doesn't appear to have been any kind of information that Amy would not want to release or legal would not wish to release, if there is no such information then at this point the recordings could be made public without any problem whatsoever. This is just a suggestion by the way. You might want to go for or against it. And by the way, just to stimulate absolute openness and being able to get real discussion rather than Amy being on guard and saying -- I'm not sure I can tell you this. Then we're stuck. Thank you.
Brian Cute:	Understood. I see agreement from David Conrad. And Alan's hand is up?
Alan Greenberg:	Yes. Just one clarification. I made a glib comment saying the existence of the program is secret. That's not quite true. There was a response to Karen McCarthy. The existence of the program has been -- it's not well publicized but it wasn't kept secret as such but the details certainly have been. I just wanted to make sure I'm not taken to task for saying something that's not quite accurate.
Brian Cute:	Would the ATRT members on this call be comfortable if this suggestion was made to Amy to consider having this be a closed session for the purposes stated by Olivier?
Alan Greenberg:	I would put the question to her as to whether she thinks she can be more open by having it closed then we make it closed.
Brian Cute:	Everyone else comfortable with that? Okay. We'll have that passed on to Amy and let her indicate which way she'd like to go. Moving on, next interaction with ICANN staff, item ten, discussion with Chris Mahat, ICANN ombudsman. Alan? Your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Question. Maybe I'm missing something but I don't see why we're taking an hour with him. By the way, as a preamble to that, I would suggest, there are a fair number of people on this ATRT2 review team who are not intimately involved with ICANN on a day to day basis. We probably should send something out to the review team members ahead of time to just give them a quick summary of what the ombudsman's responsibilities are and things like that if that's not already clear. Maybe it is. But we might want to save some time from him spending 20 minutes talking about exactly what it is he does at a high level. But I'm not sure why we need an hour with Chris. Maybe I'm missing some crucial issue.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. I think we had some recommendations out of ATRT1 -- we did in fact. We had a number of interactions with the former ombudsman. I think in fact a closed session, if memory serves, I guess this would be more of a work stream question. Because the value of spending time with Chris could be in his view of the implementation of the recommendation has been handled. I could see value in his time there. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'm not unhappy to leave it with the understand that if we do not indeed have an hour's worth of talking that we say thank you and go on to other work.

Brian Cute: I think that applies to any session we have. Anybody have any points on the ombudsman? I don't see any hands. We'll keep the agenda as is. If we don't use the time we'll break early. The next interactions with ICANN staff, number 11 on day one, discussion of implementation of WHOIS recommendations with Margie and Chris who we've heard from before. And number 12, a discussion of implementation of SSR recommendations with Patrick Jones who we've heard from before. On the call this afternoon my understand is that these are additional inputs to the ATRT2 based on some outstanding questions that were left with these individuals and my assumption is that we don't need to provide additional questions up front but I did note David's points earlier and asking everybody now, should we put questions in front of these folks before we get to Durbin? David?

David Conrad: Part of the issue here is for the SSR review we in the work stream had prepared a set of additional clarifying questions. But those questions are more oriented towards facilitating a conversation other than explicit you must respond to these as part of the ATRT effort. The idea, the intent was to provide additional information that could be used to come up with more concrete questions or actually more generalized questions than the ones that were provided which tends to be more specific. I'm not entirely sure at this stage that we'll need the full 45 minutes of Patrick's time to discuss additional -- those questions in particular. Because I think that might be done better out of the context of the work stream. But I'm hoping to having that discussion within the context of this meeting or actually freeing up the time for other topics. So, I'll leave it up to you all.

Alan Greenberg: The time we spent with staff in Los Angeles was not nearly as effective as it could've been because most of us anyway and certainly I did not have time to thoughtfully mull over the huge spreadsheets we received prior to talking to staff. We were listening and if anything obviously popped out of the discussion we could ask a question but one of the results was what ended up being a rather large number of questions on the WHOIS work stream because of things which really in our minds were not adequately addressed in the spreadsheet. I'm a little bit worried that this time again we're going to get the written results so close to when we're going to have the meeting that we're going to again be in a mode where we haven't really processed what we've been told and the 45 minutes for WHOIS anyway is not going to be enough to go over everything in depth. I'm a little bit worried we're repeating a cycle here.

Brian Cute: Thank you for those observations. Any other discussion? Just to follow-up one of your earlier comments, Alan, I personally don't view this as the last opportunity to interact with these folks. We will have ample opportunity to come back to all of them with follow

on questions before we get to drafting at the end of August. But your point is well taken that the quality of this interaction is critical and that's something, Larisa, if you can help to stress to the staff, that would be much appreciated.

Larisa Gurnick: Of course.

Brian Cute: Any other points on this interaction, including again that we don't need to put specific questions in front of these staffers in items 11 and 12.

Alan Greenberg: I'm only hearing silence. I don't know if anyone's talking. Anyone else still here?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I think we lost Brian. He was using Adobe Connect and I see his name has disappeared from the list. Is anyone having a back channel discussion with him? Or should we wait for a second and hope he gets back?

Brian Cute: Hello? Sorry, I dropped off and I can't reconnect on the computer so I can't see hands raised. Let's keep moving. I have the document in front of me. We're on to day two, correct? Item number two, we're going to have a presentation from staff on ATRT1 implementation, the public comment process, and multilingual access. Sallie Costerton, David Olive, Nora, and Chris, some of whom we've heard from, some of whom we haven't. Again, coming out of the coordination call this afternoon, the sense here is this is a presentation from staff with some new information, perhaps some elaboration on earlier conversations we've had with David Olive, a sense coming from the coordination call with Alan, Liza, Larisa, and Alice, that this may not require specific questions. Alan, if you'd be my eyes, I can't see hands raised. Do we have any discussion?

Alan Greenberg: We have no hands at the moment.

Brian Cute: Okay. Then let's move on. I think the last one is our working lunch, number seven on day two, discussion with Marika who is going to discuss to us on the GNSO GDPs. Alan, if you want to capture the discussion out of the coordination call on this one in particular with the independent expert in the background?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think the only thing that came out of it is I'm not sure Marika has a good handle on what she wants to get from us or tell us and vice versa. But it's a working lunch and if we end up just being social then so be it. I think the one message I would like to give Marika is she's in a very unique position in that she's been involved in so many of the PDPs that have been undertaken over the last number of years and if she hasn't been the lead policy person on it then she tends to be involved at least peripherally. I think her interactions with the external consultant are going to be key. She's in a position if she chooses to be candid -- and I think we need to make sure she is -- to explain whatever problem she's seen and not necessarily to propose answers but just to identify what things have worked and what things haven't. I think she's unique as the only person who can give some insight to this, probably the only one that has the breadth of coverage she does. So, I think her buy in on the process is really important.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Any other comments? Do you see any hands up, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No. If I do I'll let you know.

Brian Cute: The consensus is to move forward with no questions for Marika in advance. To recap, I think the only thing we're doing is communicating to Amy that if she'd like to have a closed session to provide more breadth of discussion to make that offer to her. Alan you had the question about the visibility of the program and why that is or lack there of, minimal visibility. I think that's the only take away here. Did I capture that correctly?

Alan Greenberg: I think so. We have a hand from Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I was going to suggest one question actually which was a very broad one but one I didn't wish to put her on the spot with at the time itself. That was for her to think of an example of the PDP that she felt went very well and an example of a PDP she thought was absolutely terrible and state whether she noticed any ingredient that was missing in the one that went terrible and that was present in the one that went well. Without needing to let us know which was the terrible one and which was the good one but the ingredient, what makes a good PDP?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, if I may, I think it needs to be wider than that. There are the absolute failures in some minds which others say were not failures but were successes and vertical integration is one where the PDP stalemated but some people feel since we talked over the issues really well and passed on our notes that the PDP was a success. So, one of the questions is how do we judge success? I think we're going to find there are different opinions on that and that's one of the questions I think the external reviewer is going to have to look at. But even ignoring that, which is not at all subtle, there are lots of different outcomes that can come out. You can have very successful, absolute failure, but there's flavors in between and is there any way we can -- what we're ultimately looking for is the PDP that we have a high degree of confidence works with different kinds of questions. We ask PDP groups to answer a wide variety of types of questions and some of those types they do better at than others. I think it's a tapestry, it's not just white and black. I think that's what we're getting at. I guess that message has to be conveyed to Marika and whoever we hire to do the actual work.

Brian Cute: I welcome both comments. I see the utility of the technique, Olivier, you're suggesting to provide some thoughts, some compare and contrast comparison by the staffer. Alan raises good points as well. Might I suggest that we can ask her to provide that to us during the session? We can hit the framing at the outset of what we're looking for in the broadest terms and during the interaction ask her the question of compare and contrast in her mind, what went well and what didn't and what were the key differences? Would that be sufficient?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think so. To be honest I think a private discussion ahead of time would be worthwhile, not just a written question. I've worked with Marika probably more than anyone else on the review team. I'm glad to talk to her for a few minutes in the hallway before we actually have the meeting with us to prep her and get the terms of reference.

Brian Cute: The point here was to develop any questions in advance and that could include framing questions and have this open and transparent which is our default as opposed to a private conversation. If we think it's worthwhile putting this together as advanced questions for Marika then lets agree to that. Is that's what's on the table?

Alan Greenberg: I guess that's -- Olivier has a tick mark up. So, yes.

Brian Cute: So, Alan, you had a framing question and Olivier had a specific question in terms of talk to us about one that went well and one that didn't and what were the key differences or ingredients. Any discussion on the question Alan put forward and Olivier put forward? We can have them put it in writing and send it off to Marika in advance asking for discussion on those two questions. Any hands?

Alan Greenberg: Olivier? What's your schedule tomorrow? Will you be able to have a few minutes online to do this with me?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Sure. A few minutes.

Alan Greenberg: Alright. I'll get a hold of you as soon as I'm up and we'll put something together and send it out.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Sounds good.

Brian Cute: Any hands up or check marks?

Alan Greenberg: No.

Brian Cute: Okay. Let's leave that in your court and get that to Marika. Put it on the ATRT2 list if you would when you copy it to Marika. I think that's the extent of the interactions with ICANN staffers. So, Alan and I, offline after this call will put together the edits to the questions that we're going to send out in advance as discussed on this call, ask Larisa and Alice to get those out the door, Olivier and Alan have this last one for Marika in advance. That being done, just to walk through at a high level and draw some attention to other aspects of the agenda that are going to be critical for us. At a high level, number four, discuss and draw conclusions from public comments received. We do now have summaries of public comments received. We have the public comments themselves. I'm hoping the lion's share of the public comments have been read by the review team members. This is an important session. We've got 40 minutes but I think it's important that we have a good, substantive discussion of what we take away from the public comments to date. Also, five and six, progress updates from the work streams. A lot of work has been going on. I think this is a juncture where it's very important for the chairs of those respective work streams to report into the review team at a high level but very objectively and honestly, how are you doing? If the work is progressing well, if the homework reading is being done, if the analysis is taking place. It looks like the work stream is on track to be at the point of having a first draft at the end of August. The report on that, if that's not the case, please tell us what's not going well, why not, what resources are missing. This is really the juncture where we need to hear from the work stream chairs and get any corrections if need be. Very important session there. You'll see again, number nine on day one.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, before you go on, on item four, Lisa, to a large extent, and I think Avery also, have made statements that they believe it's essential that we provide specific, targeted answer to every comment that was made on the public comments process. I don't see how that's going to get done out of the kind of things we're doing right now unless we actually assign it to someone. You can't just have one person answering it. You can have one person answering it and the review team goes over it. But I don't see how we're going to actually engineer that at this point. So, I think we need to make a conscious decision as part of that discussion whether we in fact are going to try to address each question and feed that back to the public or just use the input and address it in a more general way in our report. I'm not looking to discuss that now but I think that has to be something coming out. We all have to come out of it with the same understanding of what we're doing.

Brian Cute: Let's make sure that issue is raised in that session. That's an important one. Working through again just the highlights but what's going to be important sessions. Again, number nine on day one and there's another companion session, same analysis of data collected and next steps. Those are sessions that allow us to do stock taking in real-time on the interactions we've just had with ICANN staffers, gather our thoughts and initial conclusions and reactions and talk about next steps. Those are baked into the agenda.

                    On day two, preparing for sessions with the ACs and SOs, again, to your earlier question, Olivier, how are we going to interact with the ACs, what are the dynamics of the session. Those we'll discuss and agree upon the approach and then we will have in number four on day two, preparing for sessions with the ICANN community, draft slides and determine methodology, again we can put slides up in front of these groups, it's probably useful now that we have a list of questions that we're sending to them, throwing them up on a screen to frame again the interaction but again my admonition is let's keep that part of it minimal and clear. The value of the time is coming from the community. Let's not get lost in producing slide after slide that we're going to throw up on the screen and have

us talking to them as opposed to the other way around. Stop me if there are any hands up along the way, Alan.

Then we will have item six on day two a brief update from ICANN staff on have any entities responded to the IFP indicated that they intend to provide a response? Just a brief update on the status of that. We felt it was appropriate given competitive effects between potential bidders that we do that in closed session. And last, but also very, very important, number nine, road map of work to Los Angeles. We're going to have a discussion of how we structure the work coming out of Durbin toward the Los Angeles meeting where we will be having again intensive discussion about initial conclusions culminating in a day of drafting where the first pass of a draft from each of the work streams is going to take place.

So, we have to talk about the mechanics of how we move the work forward between Durbin and Los Angeles. That's scheduled to take place at the end of day two. And not to overlook on Thursday morning there will be a wrap up meeting after our meetings that can also put better focus on the next steps between Durbin and Los Angeles in terms of structuring the work.

So, that's the overview of the agenda. Any questions? Any hands in the air, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Just mine. I have a question for staff. Have we received anything from any review team member saying they will not be in Durbin? At this point do we believe we're working with a full component?

Alice Jansen: Jurgen will not be in Durbin.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, he'd said that.

Brian Cute: Any other discussion at this point? I'm getting ready to close off number four and go to number five. No hands?

Alan Greenberg: No hands.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. Number five. Staff update on the letters to government officials and the RFP. So, Larisa and Alice, we've got about ten minutes remaining.

Larisa Gurnick: I'll start with the RFP first because that's a really brief update. To date we've heard from one of the consulting firms that we reached to specifically. That's Deloitte. They have declined to provide an RFP. That's all we've gotten so far.

On the letter to government officials, on Friday 57 emails went out directly to officials in 57 countries. GAC representatives were copied. This was one of the multiple steps in the process of reaching out to the government. By end of day today or tomorrow expect a confirmation from the GAC support staff as soon as Heather approves the communication. They will be sending out emails directly to the GAC representatives on their list as well they will be sending out a request to share the letter with regional organizations such as EU and the African Union and various others that we represent, large groups of government. Finally, GAC support staff will also be posting the letter -- and when I refer to the letter, it's the English and five other languages. It's been fully translated into all the languages. It's the full set. We'll post it on the GAC website as well as it will be included in the advanced materials being prepared for Durbin.

Brian Cute: So, what we've got to date has been a combination of senior ICANN official resources and GAC resources. I've asked Larisa to provide a written summary in email to ATRT2 of what's gone out so far and also to highlight any of the specific challenges being encountered in identifying the list of high level government officials. And I also -- there was discussion around who that should be sent to and Larisa, did you want to touch on

the -- you talked about putting out in your communication the countries that letters were sent to and the title of the official?

Larisa Gurnick: What's the process to be shared with ATRT2 is a list by country and, Brian, since we talked about this earlier on the coordination call, I thought about this even further and I think this information would be useful presented by regions to see what kind of penetration is being accomplished by region. That's something that staff is working on pulling together. By region, by country, we will highlight all the different titles of individuals that were contacted -- not their names but their titles. So, with that infrastructure you have a pretty good idea of what kind of coverage is being accomplished by region.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Any hands up for discussion? No hands? Can you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I was on mute. No hands. But I'm moving away from my computer. Can someone else take over hand duty for a minute I'd appreciate it.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks for the update, Larisa. Looking forward to the email.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Question on the scope of the governments being currently asked. Do we have statistics as to the geographic diversity of those governments? In other words do we know how many from Africa, how many from Latin America, how many from Europe, et cetera?

Larisa Gurnick: I don't have that information that I can share with you at the moment because our process of assembling all this was done by country, not by region. But the next phase of us organizing our list is to organize it by region at which point hopefully I'll be bale to answer that question.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you. That's one good thing. The other question was in regards to organizations that are somehow in the realm of countries but not a country itself. The council of Europe is one that comes to mind. The European union was the other one but you've mentioned it. Have they been contacted in any way?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. Those organizations that are GAC members will be contacted and that's the process Heather is overseeing.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So, not only governments but also governmental organizations that are GAC members as well?

Larisa Gurnick: That's correct. Based on the discussions we've had with GAC support staff there is definitely a belief that reaching out to those kinds of organizations will be more productive than trying to for non-member GAC countries to do research sort of out in the cold. This is their recommended method of reaching to high ranking officials of countries where they are not GAC members per say.

Fiona Alexander: I think what happened in one of the first distributions is anybody from the GAC email list got this letter sent to them because it got sent to me and my other staff. Just FYI. So anyone on the GAC list and all the reps will have gotten the letter.

Brian Cute: Larisa, you're going to lay out in the communication some of the challenges in identifying the appropriate high level official. Please make that as clear as you can. There has to be some healthy conversation. I think there's significant interesting in this issue on the review team as to how we go about getting this in the right representatives' hands. And if we're running into obstacles, let's see if we can work through those. So, be as specific as you can as to what the obstacles are. We'll have an opportunity in speaking with Terry in Durbin as well to discuss how we might be able to get this to a more fulsome outreach. I'm not sure if Heather will be there but we need to touch base with her as well. Any other hands up for discussion on this item?

Larisa Gurnick: I just wanted Fiona to -- meeting over to --

Brian Cute: Did Larisa break up for others?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. She's breaking up.

Brian Cute: We can't hear you at all.

Larisa Gurnick: Is this better?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Larisa Gurnick: Let me try before the reception shifts again. It's my understanding that in Heather's communication she asked GAC representatives to supply names of appropriate government officials to the extent they have those available. So, they're set up to receive those names and get the letters out as soon as we get that information from the GAC representatives.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. Anything else on this before we move to close or the last item. Hearing nothing, moving to any other business, the last item before closing. Anybody? Open floor. I can't see hands right now. So, Alan or somebody? Or feel free to speak up. Okay. hearing nothing, thank you all very much for the last hour and a half, particularly those who are up late. Looking forward to seeing all of you in Durbin very soon and to a productive week there. Thank you, all.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Brian. You said you wanted to work with me. How do you want to do this?

Brian Cute: I'll call you in a minute.

Alan Greenberg: Give me five.

Brian Cute: Alright. Thanks, everyone.