

20130418_ATRT2_ID780889

Brian Cute: Why don't we get started. I'll start slowly. This is Brian Cute. This is ATRT2 conference call with ICANN staff to prepare for a face to face meeting in Los Angeles that will be held on May 2nd and 3rd between ATRT2 and ICANN staff. Welcome, everyone, wherever you are. I also want to give thanks to the ICANN staff for pulling this call together on relatively short notice. We're following up on a constructive suggestion by Denise Michel that in preparing for a face to face in May, it would be useful to the ATRT2 to discuss with ICANN staff and managers or folks who had to manage implementation of recommendations to have an interaction to provide any guidance and back and forth on how the staff can begin to provide inputs to the ATRT2 for the purposes of assessment and review. So that's the purpose of the call.

The objective as stated in the agenda, and I'm starting with agenda Item number 1, 1B, the objective is to determine how best to address ATRT2 questions and the methods of providing responses and updates to the review team. I think we should have a fulsome conversation on that front and also want to note again that this is an iterative process. That we will have an initial face to face in LA and have some inputs and likely discussion with the staff, but that there will be other touch points as we go forward, an opportunity for the review team to think further on requests for information and questions to be answered by ICANN staff. So this is just the beginning and is not intended by any means to be the first and only interaction with staff.

In terms of Item 1C, what are the ATRT2 goals and expectations? And I would like to open this up to the review team as well. I thought a bit about this, and for myself, the expectations at this point are fairly simple. And as it relates to the responsibility of ATRT2, the simple expectations are that the ICANN staff provide fulsome and timely, timely inputs to ATRT2 so that this review team can undertake a comprehensive review and make full and timely recommendations by December 31st of this year as required by paragraph 9.1. That, to me, is kind of a simple and overarching expectation of the review team.

At this point in time, before we open up for discussion, I'd like to ask Denise, on your end, if you could introduce the ICANN staff members who are present for our benefit.

Denise Michel: Actually, Alice has the roll, so I'll ask Alice to do that.

Brian Cute: Okay. Alice? Do you mind?

Denise Michel: Did we lose Alice?

Alice Jansen: Hello? Sorry, I'm having issues. So I'd just like to remind people because this call is being recorded and streamed, if you are not participating actively, please mute your phone and computers as well as we're streaming through the Adobe Room. So in terms of staff present, on the call we have Amy Stathos, Samantha Eisner, Olof Nordling, Chris Gift, Jamie Hedlund,

Denise Michel, Larisa Gurnick, Steve Antonoff, and I believe we're expecting more staff to join, Diane Schroeder, and we will update you throughout the call when people join of course.

- Brian Cute: Thanks, Alice. And could you also -- sorry -- I should have asked you at the outset, could you identify the role or title of the ICANN staff attendees so we have an understanding of what role they play in the organization?
- Alice Jansen: Okay, we'll type those in the notes.
- Brian Cute: I'm sorry, I missed what you said.
- Alice Jansen: I was just saying that I'm going to type those in the discussion notes for you.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Very good.
- Denise Michel: And we can also have staff introduce themselves and their titles as we speak.
- Brian Cute: That would be great. So in terms of Item 1 on the agenda, again, finishing up on the goals and expectations, I've given a simple expectation from my perspective, open for the ATRT members if you'd like to weigh in or make any observations at this point. The floor is open and I'm looking for hands. I'm not seeing any hands. Okay then. Jorgen?
- Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, Jorgen Abild Andersen speaking. Thank you, Brian. Just a question for clarification. We got this excellent list of questions on implementation and just to be sure what the meeting on the 2nd and 3rd of May will be about, do we anticipate that we will go through the summary reports on ATRT implementation and get responses from the staff on each of the questions which we elaborated during our meeting in Beijing? If that is the case, I wonder whether we could ask the staff to do some answers in writing before we start our meeting in LA. We have quite a large number of recommendations to discuss and it would be very helpful if we had some written basis for our discussions. But I don't know whether I've put it in the right way or the right basis. Thank you.
- Brian Cute: Certainly. So the questions on implementation which are up on the screen in Adobe are questions that originated in an email from Larry Stricklane just prior to or contemporaneous with the first face to face meeting in Los Angeles. And where was a request, albeit for the first number of presenters from staff on short notice, to provide responses to these questions along with inputs they provided with respect to how implementation occurred.
- This is a standing request, so to your point, Jorgen, I think it is a standing request for the staff that when they make presentations to us in Los Angeles with respect to how implementation occurred, that a response to each of these questions is requested. And certainly a request to have that in writing as well would also be useful to the team. Allen?
- Allen Greenburg: Thank you. I'll note on the way back from Beijing I got a bad cold which has become a cough in the last couple of hours so I'll try to speak without annoying everyone. I guess one of my problems is the questions we're asking. We're doing this blind certainly from my perspective and I don't know if we're asking the right questions. But what I want from staff certainly, and I think what we want from staff, is an understanding of what went on in trying to implement the recommendations, what the problems were, where they felt there was insufficient information in the recommendations. What the internal processes were to end up with the final outcomes. I'm not 100% sure that the questions embody those issues, but that I think is what we're trying to get out of the overall process. Thank you.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Allen. Jorgen, please?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, thank you Brian, and thank you, Allen, for asking the question. I think that Allen is completely right in his point that we cannot be sure that getting the answers to these questions which we drafted previously will give us the right answers so to speak. On the other hand, I think it is essential that we get the answers to these questions in order to carry out a dialogue with staff members. And that was the reason for me asking whether a written contribution with respect to the questions could be available to team members before we meet in Los Angeles. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Sure. So I don't think that this list of questions is intended to be exhaustive, nor is it. And if I can offer an observation, and I'd certainly like to hear from the review team as well, one view of this is that ICANN staff in its role has been responsible for implementation of recommendations. And that at this juncture, the review team would be looking for ICANN staff to provide it with any and all information about how the staff went about the business of implementing recommendations. I don't think it's best for ATRT2 to try to shape or dictate the methodologies in which the staff reports into us or how they report into us. There is a -- if you look at it this way, there is a cold historical record, looking backwards, of what was implemented and how it was implemented. And one view would be just staff please provide us with inputs to documentation and any other information that tells a story of how it happened. I think the questions get to some perspectives that staffers would have with respect to that process that can be helpful in a number of different ways. So that's how I view the questions. They are not intended to be the scoping, they are not intended to put boundaries. They are just there and if answered would illuminate the overall task of providing to the review team a full report on how implementation occurred. That's one way to view this. Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you. I want to add two points for the benefit of staff listening, two points that were made during our first meeting in Los Angeles. Steve Crocker put emphasis that recommendations should be practical. They should be reasonable, they should be understandable, they should be efficient. We don't want to work out things that staff will look around or will say what do they mean by that. So I think this is very important in our conversation with staff that we want some kind of feedback if the recommendations were practical or how can we express our recommendations so that it's useful for you in the future?

The second comment I want to make is that from Fadi's comments on the second day of the first meeting, I think we are aware that you are going through a major refocusing of your activities, etc. So this is a moving target. So I would make emphasis that we don't want to lose time on things that you think -- or you should make us aware of things that you are addressing well and beyond the first set of recommendations. I would expect to get a feeling of where you are going when we engage in these discussions because it doesn't make any sense to start with specific dates. We know, or I get a feeling that you are under a revolution with a great leadership and we should that should help us shape also our recommendations. Particularly in setting some kind of measuring improvement or measuring change. Thank you very much.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Carlos. Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes, thank you. This is a very useful discussion. Thank you for hosting ATRT2 and the staff. One thing to note, and then a question. So the responses to these questions for a majority of the ATRT recommendations and their implementation necessarily involve many members of the board, the GAC, and the NONCOM in particular. So while -- so in order to give a fulsome response to several of these questions for a majority of the implementations, they would also need to reflect the input of GAC and NONCOM members as wells. So that of course affects the timing as our volunteers have a variety of circumstance and some are able to respond in a timely fashion and others are not. So just to make you aware of another aspect of this, that staff is grappling with. So that's my statement.

My question is, it would be extremely useful for staff and I think for ATRT2 as well, to ensure that all the ATRT2 members are on the same page in terms of their expectations and their requests or needs of information from staff. We had these specific questions from Larry and we've heard

additional suggestions of questions from Allen and Carlos. And Brian, you've offered sort of your cuts on some of these questions as well. So it would be useful to us, to the extent possible, to have closure on whether these questions will be revised or added to, and for any other guidance that ultimately reflects the whole ATRT2 rather than individual members. If it's possible for the whole team to come to consensus on what the objective of the May 2nd meeting is and the specific deliverables requests from staff. If it's changed, that would be really useful.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Denise. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier for the transcript record. And I believe, Avri, then you will be in the queue although I'll let Brian confirm that. I'll also let Brian answer Denise's questions. I wanted to actually go along the same path also and ask staff when looking at this list of questions that we have on the screen, if there is any question that they believe we might have missed. This is something that we are actually doing with a lot of our questionnaires, keeping it quite open in order to obtain not only information that we thought about that we'd like to hear about, but perhaps also extending to things that we've not thought about it. So I think that would be worthwhile hearing from staff. And I guess hearing from staff during the call now since if we do agree on the questions now, the additional questions now, staff will have time to answer them by the time we meet face to face. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Olivier. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. I guess I understand wanting to have the complete clutch of questions beforehand, but I think that there has to be an acknowledgement and an opening that as one starts to get information and one starts to understand the way in which the information is coming, new questions will occur to the members of this. And I think that those have to be okay. So I think that yeah, we are starting out with a consolidated list of questions, but I think we do have to be open for the fact that as we discover --and partly this is what Olivier was saying, is we're asking you. And in addition to the questions we've asked, which other ones we should be asking. And hopefully those will open up still others to sort of understand the whole situation, a situation that we don't have a clear view of yet. It's a progressive issue. So I'd ask you to sort of be tolerant of the progression of questions as we start to learn more. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Avri. Allen?

Allen Greenberg: Thank you. I think Avri said in a different way what I was trying to get at. That is, we don't really know the full set of questions at this point. My concern, however, if we treat this as an iterative process, we're not going to meet our deadlines. So there's got to be a fast path through the iterative process and I was hoping that to the extent possible staff could identify the gaps in what we're asking and make sure that we get a completed picture of the processes, the thought processes and the administrative processes, that they had to go through to implement the recommendations. Otherwise we have a real time problem on our hands. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Allen. And yeah, Denise, I've been reflecting on the requests, too. I agree strongly with Avri and Allen that this is an iterative process, that questions will evolve as our interactions evolve over the course of our work. There are some questions that we haven't thought of that will be triggered by input that's provided by the staff. So that's going to be a natural part of the process. I also don't think that -- I personally don't view these questions as Larry's questions. These were questions that were circulated by Larry to the team before Los Angeles and were presented to the staff and we asked for answers to these questions as part of the initial presentation. They're standing questions. No one from the review team objected to them. I didn't call for consensus on them. I certainly could call anyone to see if they object to them, but I don't view these as Larry's questions and Carlos' questions and Brian's questions. These are questions that are coming from the review team as part of our process. We're at the organizational, initial phase. This is a useful list of questions. I can poll on the question from Carlos to see if there's consensus, but I'm not sure that's where we need to go. Jorgen?

- Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, thank you, Brian. Jorgen speaking again. I appreciate that this is an iterative process, but I think that also in the interest of time and in the interest of having a comprehensive basis for our discussions when we meet in LA, I would ask you whether you could come to the conclusion what we would urge ICANN staff to provide answers to the list of questions on the page, questions on the implementation for each of the 27 recommendations so that we, before we go to LA, have some written documentation which can form the basis for the discussions. If that's not the case, I'm worried that we will get into trouble with completing our discussions on all the recommendations when we meet. Thank you.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Jorgen. Denise? Is your hand still up from before or are you in queue?
- Denise Michel: No, I'm the queue. Thanks. So staff is expecting that as a dialogue occurs with ATRT2 on the implementation of the first ATRT report, that these additional questions will come and potentially additional requests for information, which I think is a natural process to follow. My request from the ATRT2 is, and perhaps it would be useful to state it a different way, the questions on implementation that we have on the screen are the questions that staff will endeavor to answer and hopefully in coordination with the board, GAC and NONCOM members that are also part of this implementation for the May 2nd meeting. And that will be our tasking. If the ATRT wants to add to these questions, questions that were raised on this call or elsewhere, then we'll endeavor to answer those if we get them in writing from sort of as official ATRT questions. Is that a useful way to approach that?
- Brian Cute: I think you certainly can start with the questions that are posed on the board and questions that were posed in this call. And if you can take those questions onboard and provide responses and, as Jorgen said, if possible in writing, recommendations from ATRT1 and provide us what you can in LA and let's have a good, interactive face to face there. And I will also footnote, as I've told you privately, this is a first phase where there's a lot of work here both for staff and for the review team. There's a lot of recommendations from 3 different review teams. Nobody is expecting miracles over the course of 2 to 3 weeks. We understand the constraints of time. We will come back to this and have further opportunity. So as I said to you privately, it really is, given the constraints of time, best efforts to get the process going. It's really important, understanding the amount of work that this review team has to do, to get the information and inputs flowing at the early phase and your efforts to help us with that are appreciated. So I would say take the questions that are up on the screen and the questions that are coming out of this call, and with respect to the recommendations from ATRT1, providing written answers prior to the face to face and then let's pick it up there. Again, this process will evolve and iterate as we move forward. Is that agreeable?
- Denise Michel: Yes. Staff will endeavor to provide additional answers to these questions. And I'd like to ask those on the call from ATRT2 that have suggested additional questions if you could just type them into the chat screen here and we can -- that will be an easy way to confirm exactly what question you've asked to be answered.
- Brian Cute: Yes. Review team members, please do that. Thank you. That's -- we jumped to Item 3 on the agenda which is a discussion of questions on implementation. If everyone is comfortable, let me just check to see if there's anything -- Olivier? Before we jump back to number 2. Olivier?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Brian. It's Olivier for the transcript record. I want to ask a question first of Denise. And then a question of all staff members. I'll first ask all staff members, if you yourself have questions that you'd like to be asked, then please type them in the chat as well and we'll be able to -- so we can ask those as well and have responses to those. That was one. The other one was a question to Denise. Why does the board and the NONCOM have to be involved with staff replies? Since these are questions on implementation, I would have thought that this is purely staff.

- Denise Michel: Yeah, so it's actually the board members, GAC members and NONCOM members because yeah, it wasn't just staff. The staff proposed initial implementation activities as a starting point for discussions, but the board was responsible for the board related ATRT recommendations and various board committees have responsibility to make decisions about how the recommendations would be implemented and to guide, direct staff and guide staff's actions on implementations. Similarly with the NONCOM, they made their own decisions about some elements of recommendations and how they decided to implement them and they asked staff to do. And then of course the GAC very much was a driver for how they wanted to interpret and implement the ATRT recommendations that related to GAC operations and processes. So a number of members besides GAC were intricately involved in implementation. Does that answer your question?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, thank you very much. It's Olivier for the transcript. Thank you very much, Denise. That does answer my question. I'd just note that we will, the ATRT2 will be speaking to the GAC and in fact has already started speaking to the GAC and will be speaking to the board as well. So if there is no ability for you to consult in advance with the board, the GAC, etc., prior to your replies, I'd imagine that you'd be able to supply us with whatever answers you have there. And the group would be consulting the GAC and the board separately. In fact, it might actually be advisable to consult them separately so as to have more than one point of view. But of course, I'm just one of the members of the team and I'll let Brian drive this. So thank you for your reply.
- Denise Michel: Yes, this is Denise, if I may interject. So in Beijing I think the ATRT had agreed that we would include the staff and the key members of the board, GAC, and NONCOM who were directly involved in implementation efforts in the LA meeting. Some obviously on the phone. Have you guys changed your mind on that? Because that's what we were planning.
- Brian Cute: No. Not at all, Denise, your recollection is correct and Olivier, your gut instinct is correct. We will meet separately with the board, separately with the GAC. We will have a structured interaction with them in Durbin. We will ask focused questions about implementation and as Denise rightly said, the way the recommendations mapped out, there were some that were really the responsibility of the board or primarily the responsibility of the board. The GAC as well. The NONCOM had its own role in implementation of some of the recommendations and then staff had primary responsibility. So that is how it acts. Certainly staff providing us at this stage and in Los Angeles with a report on its implementation efforts is appropriate. Identifying those key individuals from board, NONCOM, GAC is a standing request and quite appropriate, Denise, you're right. And in thinking this through, there's certainly at least one other aspect, too. Which is, while those different units, if you will, across ICANN, each have a primary role on some piece of this, there is also the holistic question of accountability and transparency for the organization. So even in staff reporting on the implementation of the recommendations for which it has the primary responsibility, it would be clearly useful to illuminate for the review team in doing its implementation, was there a touch point with the board and how was that meaningful? Was there a touch point with any other part of the organization? So just food for thought there. I think for ICANN staff certainly to extent you can add those aspects to your inputs at the end of this process, that would be useful information to have.
- Any other questions from the review team? Okay. So I was about to jump back to number 2 on the agenda but I think we did that already. Okay. Shared responsibility for implementation. Denise, do you have any other add-on thoughts to that? The board, the NONCOM, the GAC?
- Denise Michel: No. I would like to ask if any other staff on this call have any other questions or contributions on the shared responsibility issue? Okay, I think we're good.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So we're onto number 4 on the agenda. I'm sorry, I'm seeing a hand. David?
- David Conrad: I just wanted to note that I added a question in the chat room case. If people don't have access to the chat. I just didn't want it to be lost.

Brian Cute: Thanks, David. Is that captured? Denise, do you see that question from David?

Denise Michel: Yes.

Brian Cute: Great. Okay, so jumping to number 4 on the agenda, discussion of optimal method of response in order to achieve uniformity, timing, method, format, etc. I think to some degree we may have responded to this in our prior discussion but wanted to make sure that we have. For myself, and I'll open it up for discussion, in terms of the response from staff, again, I think one way you can view this is, implementation has taken place or efforts on implementation have taken place. There is a cold historical record looking backwards, staff is in the best position to present to the review team how this all took place, and they should have the documentation and individuals who can speak to this and their role in the dynamics of it. So I would be hesitant to try to shape the methodologies or dictate how staff went about the business of doing that.

At the high level, clearly there's documentation. Denise has been issuing a tracking document for implementation of recommendations which is on the public site it's been spoken to a number of times. The tracking element is certainly an important one. I think coming out of the conversations from Los Angeles, the first face to face, that measurement for efforts is going to be a key element as well. And in addition to anything that staff might report along those lines, I think some of the dynamic aspects might be of interest, too. Which is, at what stage did staff implement changes to workflow as a result? Or were there workflow changes that resulted from implementation that are worked out? Were there changes to the org chart? And in fact, actually I meant to make a request, too, to staff, if there is an org chart that the review team could have so it could consider that as it approaches the interaction and discussion with staff.

But I think in addition to any kind of standard documentary based inputs that are provided, any inputs on the dynamics of implementation, whether it's changes to workflow, changes to staff, changes to communications, changes to the culture, I think those would be very useful inputs as well. But again, I don't want to dictate the shape or the methodologies of how you go about the business reporting this back to the review team.

With those thoughts, I'd like to open it to the review team members for questions and observations. Allen, I see you typing. Did you want to --

Allen Greenberg: I already typed it. It may not have shown up on your screen yet. I was just saying that PowerPoints can be useful as talking points, but don't put a lot of effort into fancy, glitzy PowerPoints. I think we want, I want in any case, the information in usable format and I'm not particularly worried about how pretty it is.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Allen. I guess, Denise, let me ask this, because you've gotten a number of staff pulled together for this call and will interact with a number of staff. In terms of how you're envisioning structuring the input to the review team, how do you envision that from your side?

Denise Michel: We talked a little bit about this and we're actually quite eager to hear from the ATRT2 what would be most useful to them. There's a couple of different ways we can do this. Have there been any other requests from ATRT2 about how you'd like to get them? Obviously not a PowerPoint. But I mean we could just ask you inline answers, we could create a table that provides staff answers and then the related order that numbers, answers and attached supporting documents. There are other approaches.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I guess one thing would be, if you've already got reports or things that you've been using internally to sort of track as these things are being done along the way, those things would be useful. The idea of creating new things, new tables and such, is good, but I would sort of think that there had been a bunch of tables and spreadsheets and lists and check off lists that you all have using during this process. So being able to see into the process and the way it was being tracked as it was being done, that would be very helpful. And then perhaps some sort of chateau

over it to sort of explain how these pieces fit together. But not really the whole notion of creating new -- obviously if there isn't anything, well then digging through the history becomes sort of an exercise. But that's kind of what I was hoping for, is to actually see how the process has unfolded, how it's been tracked, and to make that particular thing the transparency we get to see how it's all been working. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Avri. Allen?

Allen Greenberg: Yes, I guess I'll ask a question that's the opposite of what Olivier was asking. Are there any questions on this list which just don't make any sense to the people who are going to be expected to answer them who are on this call? Or they don't understand exactly what we mean by them? Are we too far out in left field in any of these cases or do these seem to map well into the kinds of things you have to tell us?

Brian Cute: Thank you, Allen. Denise, staff? Any reaction to Allen's question on the questions on implementation?

Denise Michel: I think the written questions don't reflect the aspect of feasibility, implement ability, reasonableness as to timeline, clarity of information, those types of questions about the recommendations that you would find useful.

Brian Cute: Well let me -- the 1, 2, 3, 4 -- 5th bullet point from the bottom reads, did she or he run into any new or unforeseen problems or issues while implementing a recommendation? That is to say scope increase, costs, legal, resources, timing. It's a little bit shorthand, but I certainly could see that question being a good basis for the inputs that you had in mind. Does that work for you?

Denise Michel: Sure, but you want that bullet to also address the actual initial recommendations themselves.

Brian Cute: Well you were just citing implement ability issues. I'm just suggesting that his bullet point might provide the basis for you to provide those inputs.

Denise Michel: Sure, we can include it in that bullet.

Allen Greenberg: It's Allen. An extreme and unforeseen problem, it's not implementable and things like that, so --

Denise Michel: Obviously all of them were in some fashion implementable. I think there was a little bit of a discussion about this, but I think also part of what ATRT2 would like to take away from their review of ATRT1 is using, learning from the recommendations and how they were implemented. Not only on the implementation part, but also on the recommendation part as well. So I just also would be looking for some lessons learned from how recommendations were put together, what the recommendations say and that type of thing. You've already mentioned things like timelines and benchmarks and things like that which is why we're following up on that.

Brian Cute: Sure. So let me try to tie together an answer to your question of a few minutes back. In terms of format or what should you present, Jorgen kind of said provide us in writing your view on the implementation of the 27 recommendations from ATRT1. And in so doing, respond to these questions on implementation at the same time. I would think -- I'm with Allen. I don't necessarily need pretty, I just need solid data that can be understood and assessed. Text based responses to whatever degree provides the satisfactory input should work for the team. I would also underscore, too, that we're going to be interacting and having Q&A and discussion and that's part of the record as well, too. So to the extent that providing written responses seem voluminous or cumbersome, need not be a bar. You can provide text based responses to varying lengths, answer the question, and we can also have discussion. Verbal responses to these questions on implementation as part of this record are just as valid as any writing. So again, I don't want to -- I want to be cautious not to dictate to staff, who's in the best position to know how to present this information, because you've been working with it, creating it, and you have it and own it. I want

to steer clear of that, but I think those are a couple of thoughts that might provide some suggestions as to what would be useful on our end. Denise?

Denise Michel: Yes, I think staff would like a little more clarity on how the written information will be used. Am I correct in assuming that it will be publicly available and will it be used to tailor the questions and interaction at the May meeting and essentially request additional information? Is there other things that we should be aware of in terms of how the written responses will be used?

Brian Cute: Well I can at least say, and I'll open it up to the rest of the team, our default operating MO is open, so this call, inputs, documents would be open unless there were a good reason. And there's the Chatham House rules for us and there's also legal issues as well which is understood. So that's one response. And then in terms of how they would be used, they're going to be used primarily by the review team to begin to understand how implementation took place, to begin an assessment, and also certainly to develop follow-on questions that we would bring back to staff to get more information for a fuller understanding of the implementation of a given recommendation. Allen, anyone else on the review team, feel free to answer that. Allen?

Allen Greenberg: Yeah, I was going to answer Denise's question similar to you that yes, if there's some overriding reason why some particular answers should not be made public, we'd prefer to get the real information and treat it appropriately than not getting the information. In terms of the format of information, I have a little bit of trepidation that we're talking about 27 recommendations and 12 questions and that we're going to get 500 pages out of this. Certainly I think that's what we're aiming at. Thank you.

Denise Michel: Yeah, if I may respond to that, thanks, Allen, I think that staff will certainly be as concise as possible. I wasn't suggesting that any of the answers not be made public, although staff will of course -- we'll notify you in advance if something needs to be kept offline. Primarily the staff involved just wanted to understand and make sure they hadn't missed anything in terms of how the questions will be used and that all of them make sense.

Allen Greenberg: I'll add one more comment then be quiet that often tables are a good way of presenting information in a moderately concise way.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Allen. Jorgen?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, thank you, Brian, Jorgen speaking. Well I think that it is very important from my perspective that ICANN staff appreciates that getting the answers to these questions on the screen essentially is crucial for the team to carry out what it is foreseen in Workstream I, I think. And I would really urge you to answer all the questions. I don't completely share Allen's concern about that we would have several hundred pages. I don't think that it is necessary to make very long answers to the questions in writing, because it also comes down to will we have the opportunity in Los Angeles and even in the next month or two to get the staff to further clarify what's in the answers. But short, precise answers to each of the questions on the screen for each individual recommendation would be very much preferred by me. I think that, as I said, it is essential for doing appropriate work in Workstream I that we have these questions available. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Jorgen. Jamie?

Jamie Hedlund: Thanks, Brian, And thanks to everyone who's spoken up on the review team. This is really helpful. And to -- I just want to reiterate something which is that staff is -- I think I can speak for at least most staff, we are eager to provide whatever information in whatever format that will be most useful to the review team. And I think everybody expects that this would be an iterative process and would not seek to cut it off or impose deadlines or ultimatums or anything like that. What's been really helpful for me on this call is getting clarity around what the review team would like to see in LA. So for example on the questions, it wasn't clear to me at least before this call what kind of -- what kind of the format of the response, what kind of response would be most

helpful. So the information you provided here has been at least really helpful to me. And going forward, if you could continue to provide that kind of clarity, hopefully in advance of calls like this, which you may have, I don't know, that will also help us meet your expectations and not set up a dynamic that some complained of previously where staff was seen as not being cooperative. So that's it. Thanks again.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much, Jamie. Appreciate that. Amy?

Amy Stathos: Yes, thanks, Brian. One question I have about the very first question for each of the 27 recommendations regarding the baseline. I think for some of the specific recommendations, it's easy to determine. Say for example if there was a post translation within a certain period of time, the baseline might be that either we weren't posting, or if we were posting, there was a different timeline. But on some of the more less specific recommendations, I'm trying to understand where we identify the baseline. So just as an example, I'm looking at recommendation number 4 from ATRT1 which says continue to enhance board performance and work practices. I'm challenged to figure out how I would identify or respond to the question what was the baseline?

Brian Cute: Yeah, that's a good question, Amy. Speaking only for myself, there are certain activities as you described that are more difficult to measure. Both from a quantitative and a qualitative point of view. I don't know that I have any more refined guidance to give to you on how to answer that question in those types of contexts. My view is that this is kind of like in one way, this exercise is like a survey where no response is a bad response. All the data is good data. And if some of the data that comes back is, that one was really difficult to measure, I don't know how to create a baseline for that, that's potentially very good data in terms of an assessment. So that's the perspective I personally take on this. And again, I don't know that I have any refined guidance to give you unfortunately.

Amy Stathos: Well I think your response though, Brian, that was helpful. Because if we just simply say, it's very hard for us to gauge what the baseline is, that will be information for the ATRT2 team.

Brian Cute: That's the way I would receive it.

Amy Stathos: Okay, great. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Sure. David?

David Olive: Thank you, Brian and members of the mission and my fellow staff members. I'd just say this series of questions lends itself more to a one on one discussion and therefore it was very helpful to learn that you don't really want 500 pages of documentation to be referenced to a lot of the materials that were prepared during the course of the discussion of how to implement, when to implement and then finally decisions. Two of them can be listed, but I think the discussions here are best face to face to understand what you need to know and how we can better answer that. So somewhat of a fight at the beginning of the call might have been related to what we really need and how we can address those needs. And I think you've done that very well, so thank you.

Brian Cute: Glad to hear. Thanks, David. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. I think in going back to the baseline, I think a lot of the baseline can be found in the ATRT1 report and perhaps some of the materials leading into it, but mostly in the report itself where the issue is discussed and the reason given for the recommendation is there. So I think just abstracting the recommendation is one thing. But going back to the ATRT report and looking at what was described there that motivated the recommendation can give some basis for a baseline. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Good point, Avri. Thank you. Carlos Raul?

- Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Hello. I think Amy put a very good question. In part Avri responded. But I would just like to comment, in case of doubt, I would like to know if there was any change, if there was any change because of the first report. So the baseline is before the report and after the report. And when we sit together we then might go a little bit deeper and see if the change was for the good or not, but I should take it as a minimum thought from your side if there was change. Thank you very much.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Carlos. Any other questions from the review team or staff? So at this point, at the risk of being redundant, but just for the sake of clarity, the ask from the review team is that staff provide written responses in advance of the Los Angeles meeting that speak to implementation of the 27 recommendations in ATRT1. That staff also endeavor to provide written responses to the questions on implementation and additional questions from review team members as captured in the chat room. That would be the takeaway from the call. My mind is now going to the face to face interaction itself and it might be good to talk about how we structure that. We're going to have two full days, correct? Alice? Is it two 8:30, 9:00 to 5:00 days to work with? Denise?
- Denise Michel: Yes, I think Alice is on mute.
- Alice Jansen: I sent an email. Yes, that's correct. Two full days.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So clearly part of this is going to be staff reporting in if you will or providing input, overview, insights. And then part of it will be a dialogue and back and forth. And I think we just want to think carefully about how to structure that so it's as effective a meeting as it can be over the course of two days. I note the review team members focus on the questions on implementation and the utility of having that be also a conversation with staffers. So I think we need to think about how we integrate that across the agenda so that's useful. At this point, I think we've worked our way through the agenda. What I think might be useful just at a high level in an introductory sense is to have each of the ICANN staffers just give their own personal introduction and what they do for the organization and any just immediate observations they have with respect to the review team process and the implementation of recommendations process. If you're okay with that, why don't we give the staff an opportunity to introduce themselves to us and their roles. Are you okay with that, Alice, Denise?
- Denise Michel: Yes. Alice is having some audio issues and had to drop off and dial back in and I have just a quick comment or question first. So the ATRT2 originally asked that this May meeting be devoted to answering, having them answer these questions and reviewing all 3 of the previous reviews. And our discussion is really only focused on ATRT, on the ATRT review. So I just want to confirm that you are still requesting that the questions that staff attempt to collaborate and answer the implementation questions on, WHOIS and SSR as well.
- Brian Cute: Thank you. You're absolutely right. We focused in on ATRT1 over the course of this call, but it was for all 3. I don't think -- I think we should proceed. Because we do have to review all 3, I'm just going to say again, it's from my perspective a best efforts and this is a first touch. And I fully understand the scope of that work in terms of 3 different review teams, recommendations, implementation, reports to us. So you're quite right, it should address all 3, staff using best efforts and we'll all view this as a first interaction. Certainly there's going to be another follow on interaction or two before we've completed this back and forth if you will. Does that make sense?
- Denise Michel: Yes, it does. So for staff introductions and statements, may I suggest we just follow the alphabetical attendee list and have Amy start?
- Amy Stathos: Hi, this is Amy Stathos. I'm deputy general counsel. I've been with ICANN for 7 years and my role, certainly as it relates to the ATRT matters, is that I am key support for the board governance committee. And the board governance committee was assigned 14 of the 27 recommendations provided by ATRT1. Other than that, I am in terms of general litigation, management for the organization, I work with other board committees and I support all of the business units at ICANN in any legal advice or issues that they have.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Amy.

Denise Michel: David Olive, you're next.

David Olive: Thank you. My name is David Olive. I'm vice president of policy development support at ICANN. I've been with ICANN about a little over 3 years. When I first joined, it was going through the ATRT1 recommendations. We were actively involved in that from the policy side. A little more importantly, I was working with the senior director for participation and engagement who had the main role of implementing the public comment issues as well as working closely with Jamie Hedlund and others on the recommendations for early policy engagement for the GAC. So to that extend, we have been actively involved in supporting and reviewing the recommendations and supporting the implementation of them. Thank you.

Brian Cute: David, just for clarification, when you say early policy development, could you just elaborate a little bit on some of the elements of that?

David Olive: This relates to the ATRT recommendations of engaging the GAC earlier in policy development. And we have been working with the board GAC committee to develop information flows for them, creating communications list at the ccNSO and the gNSO as they start their policy development to push a policy to development process and we provide for them one page summaries that are on their website from our various public sources for initiating, when it's initiated by the various councils in the policy development process. This is an ongoing effort and we met with GAC on this and the board GAC committee talked about this in Beijing as well.

Brian Cute: Right. Thank you for that. And we did get some feedback from the GAC directly ourselves on that point. Thank you.

Denise Michel: This is Denise. I am vice president of strategic initiatives and advisor to the president and CEO. My portfolio includes strategic planning, a variety of strategic initiatives, as well as organizational reviews and structural reviews. I've been with ICANN since 2001 in various capacities including responsibility for at large, creating at large structure and also the policy and policy support staff. ATRT1, I was the primary staff liaison and subsequently liaison doing staff and ATRT1 and also supported the board's consideration and action on ATRT1 reports and coordinated the development, staff development of proposed implementation plans and also was responsible for the tracking and reporting on implementation of the ATRT1 reports.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Denise.

Diane Schroeder: Hi, this is Diane Schroeder and during the time that we were working on the ATRT1 implementation my title was director of board support. I've since become director of administration and ICANN archive and am not directly supporting the board, I'm supporting the organization more widely. My role as director of board support was to provide support to the board to see if they could officially handle the work that they did. In that role I worked supporting the board governance committee and along with Amy Stathos and Samantha Eisner in the recommendations specifically that that committee dealt with as well as the general board recommendations.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Diane.

Jamie Hedlund: Hi, this is Jamie Hedlund. I am VP, Stakeholder Engagement for North America. I've also acted as the staff liaison to the GAC and have generally supported the GAC and the board in some of their interactions. Specifically on the ATRT1, I supported the board GAC recommendation and implementation working group, the BGRIWG and its oversight of the implementation of the GAC related recommendations.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Jamie.

Larisa Gurnick: Hi, this is Larisa Gurnick. I am transitioning into, onto Denise's team in the capacity of being substantive liaison between the review team, staff and board. And I've been doing work with ICANN for the past year or so on strategic planning as well as some work on the new gTLD team.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Larisa. And I need to train myself to jump when I see your emails the way I jump when I see Alice's, so thank you.

Olof Nordling: Okay, well my name is Olof Nordling and I've been with ICANN since 2005 in various capacities. During ATRT1, I was director of organization reviews and during that time and still, I'm lead staff support for the NONCOM which is the matter of most interest to you right now. For the rest, currently I'm mostly doing implementation work for the new gTLD, various procedures and everything that we need to have ready. So that's right now, but perhaps of less interest to you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Olof.

Samantha Eisner: This is Samantha Eisner, I'm senior counsel. I work closely with Amy Stathos and Diane Schroeder in terms of the ATRT1 recommendations in supporting the board governance committee's work on those 14 recommendations that were assigned to them. I've also worked closely with Jamie on GAC related recommendations and assisting and moving forward to the implementation of that.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Samantha.

Steve Antonoff: This is Steve Antonoff, the director of human resources. During the period of ATRT1, in addition to human resources, I had responsibility for administration which I have recently transitioned to Diane Schroeder as she's already eluded to. My scope of responsibility is all HR related activities and as long as I've got the floor I would just like to clarify a point that Larisa put up in the chat earlier regarding organization charts. The charts that we will be providing will be an overarching chart that shows, if you will, the large functional areas at the senior level with all of the sub functional areas that they're responsible for underneath. It will not be a comprehensive organization chart showing all 190 plus staff member in boxes on pages in their roles. So if you're trying to understand where a function resides and how to get questions delegated down into that functional area, you'll know how to do that from the most senior leaders.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Steve. That will be helpful. Okay, at this point, just before we close, I want to make sure that both staff and review team, if there's any follow-on clarifying questions to make sure that we're on the same page in terms of what's expected in Los Angeles and the preparation between today and that meeting. Any other questions? Any other thoughts? Staff or review team. I'm not seeing any hands. Oh yes, David?

David Olive: Brian, can we confirm the dates and the time that you're planning for the face to face as we have to deal with a lot of scheduling issues?

Brian Cute: Sure, it's scheduled for May 2nd and May 3rd.

David Olive: Is there some (inaudible)?

Brian Cute: That was a little choppy, David, I didn't catch everything there.

David Olive: Hopefully we'll be able to know when you might expect the specific area that I'll be presenting. If it could be on the 3rd, that would be better for scheduling purposes as I'll be traveling in addition to LA.

Brian Cute: Okay. And I think, Denise, on your end, you can help in the coordination and structuring of the presentation across the agenda, right? And Alice?

Denise Michel: Sure. Yes we will, and Larisa.

Brian Cute: Right, and Larisa, thank you. Okay. Any other thoughts before we close? Okay, hearing none, seeing no hands, thanks to everybody. It was a very good, productive session. Well appreciated. We'll stay in touch. I'll stay in touch with Alice along the way and look forward to seeing you all in Los Angeles. Thanks very much.

Denise Michel: Thanks, Brian, and team members. This was very useful. Appreciate your time.

Brian Cute: Great.