

**ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY REVIEW TEAM 2 (ATRT 2)
CONFERENCE CALL – THURSDAY, 9 MAY 2013
TRANSCRIPT**

Brian Cute: Okay, we are at 8:03. We have 14 folks online so I'm going to get going. Welcome, everyone.

Larry Strickling: This is Larry. I'm on the call, I'm not on Adobe Room.

Brian Cute: Hi, Larry. Are you logging on to Adobe? Okay, I see 14. Let's kick it off. Welcome, all, to ATRT2 conference call. May 9th in most places. We have the agenda tonight -- can you put up the agenda? This is the preliminary report on the screen, so Larissa, would you mind? Or Charla? Larissa or Charla, did you hear me?

Larissa: Yes, Charla, go ahead. Can you put up the agenda?

Charla: Yeah, I just did it in the chat pod, so if you want me to pull it up in the document, give me a second.

Brian Cute: If you would, thanks. Oh, I see it now. I see it in the discussion notes, tool. I'll just tee off of that. So today's call we have a number of items that we need to make forward progress on. Just to confirm, as you can see starting at item number 3, we're going to spend a half an hour developing follow-up questions for ICANN staff and further direction in terms of inputs or reports to the ATRT2. That will be a half hour, and then for about 35 minutes we're going to have some planning discussions and moving the work forward in concrete terms. We're going to look at the overall time flow and speak in some detail about the workflow over the course of the months between now and December 31st.

We need to talk about specifically the different work streams kicking off their work separately from the full review team and how to go about starting that effort. Also, we need to talk about whether we want to engage or feel we need to engage an independent expert to assist us in our work. So 3 important items there. We have some time to finish up some discussion of the terms of reference and then any other business. Any objections or modifications to the agenda as stated? Looking for hand. I'm seeing none. Unless I hear objection, the agenda will be adopted for purposes of the call. Okay, let's move to item number 2.

Does anyone on the call have an update to their declaration of interest? The screen just went blank. Hold on. I was looking for hands. Any new items? I don't see any hands being raised. Okay, no updates on declarations of interest.

Jorgen Andersen: Brian? Jorgen Andersen speaking. I can't raise my hand on the Adobe Room unfortunately, but I just have a quick revise on ISOM-1 on the preliminary report of the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles.

Brian Cute: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. I jumped over that. You're quite right. Please, go ahead.

Jorgen Andersen: It's on page 2, the last paragraph in item 1 where I'm quoted for having asked to clarify. The very last sentence of this paragraph states the review team suggested that Jorgen Andersen circulate revised language. I don't recall that we agreed to that. What I recall is that you clarified that the intention is to move on with the international outreach. But before going on in that respect, you wanted to have a chat with Fahdi and to also mention the issue to Heather.

Brian Cute: That's correct. Charla, could you pull up the preliminary report so we can look at the language in question that Jorgen's referring to? You're correct in the recollection. I think precisely, the offer to clarify the preliminary report was made and you declined just as long as the preliminary report, or minutes from that meeting, reflected the clarification. Is that right?

Jorgen Andersen: Exactly.

Brian Cute: Yep. Charla, if you just scroll down a little bit, I want to see the exact wording and make sure that it's accurate given Jorgen's input here. It's in -- okay, paragraph 1, asked to clarify item 10 with respect to international outreach at the Beijing preliminary report which the team adopted. The review team suggested that Jorgen circulate revised language. I think for purposes of preliminary report, Jorgen, if you'd agree, because we will have full transcript of this discussion, the preliminary report could simply just be the first sentence where you asked for clarification.

Jorgen Andersen: Exactly.

Brian Cute: If that is satisfactory to you.

Jorgen Andersen: Yes, that is quite all right.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Charla, if you would just delete the last sentence there that starts with the review team suggested that Jorgen circulate revised language. That sentence is struck. Are there any other edits or changes to the preliminary report? Looking for hands. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian, it's Olivier for the transcript. Yes, I've noticed that Michael [Yekerchak] is mentioned in the apologies, but also as being present. I remember he was not present at that meeting.

Brian Cute: That is correct. Was Michael on for any part remotely?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I don't believe so. I think he was actually presenting in a conference elsewhere. He was busy running some place, so I don't believe that he was there even remotely.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you. Charla, if you'd also make that correction, too, to not have Michael reflected in as present in the preliminary report.

Demi Getschko: By the way, this is Demi. I'm not sure if you heard me. I was in the meeting and I'm not on the list.

Brian Cute: Yes. So Charla, Michael out, Demi in. If you'd make those changes.

Charla: Actually Larissa is making notes right now since this is just a pdf. So Larisa is taking those notes.

Brian Cute: Okay, great. So those are being made, and assuming those changes have been made and the sentence discussed with Jorgen has been struck, are there any other changes for the preliminary report? I'm looking for hands. I don't see any hands. If you're unable to raise your hand, please speak up. Okay. Other suggestions? Okay, hearing none with those changes to be made, Larissa, if you'd recirculate the edited version when you're done with that, then we will move to adopt the

preliminary report and have it published on the Wiki. Any objections to adopting the report and having it published on the Wiki?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. Just one thing I just noticed. I don't recall, but I may have missed it, that we definitively decided what city in Australia we would be meeting in. I do recall a discussion that Stephen said it was up to us, but I don't actually remember settling on one, but I may have missed something.

Stephen Conroy: Yeah, it's Stephen here. I think it's possible Chris was offering us the use of the .IU offices, so Melbourne would probably a logical place to be.

Brian Cute: Okay, is the city reflected in the preliminary report, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: It is on the very end of it, that's why I mention it now.

Brian Cute: And it's shown as Melbourne?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it is.

Brian Cute: Okay. Was there a discussion? Was there a decision or was it just simply an offer? What's the status, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: There was no discussion at the meeting. At the previous meeting I think it was left open, but it sounds like, because of the offer of facilities, unless someone objects, I'm assuming Melbourne will be acceptable to all.

Brian Cute: Are you making a suggested edit to the preliminary report?

Alan Greenberg: I am not. If Melbourne is indeed selected, de facto selected, then the report is fine as it stands.

Brian Cute: Any objections to adopting the preliminary report as it stands now after edits and discussion? Hearing none, the preliminary report will be adopted and posted to the Wiki. Thank you.

Now we can move on to item 3 of the agenda. If you'd put the agenda -- or actually if you'd put up the -- we've asked for updates on declarations of interest and heard none, we're moving onto agenda item 3, follow up questions and implementation. If Larissa or Charla, you would put up the document that I just sent to you. So for the next 30 minutes we are going to develop follow-up questions to the extent that we have them for ICANN Staff. They have provided us reports in Los Angeles. We had provided them with a list of questions that Larry had offered and as part of their feedback to the team.

So at this juncture, I've just put this document together really to provoke discussion and it's not necessarily a suggestion from me. But in the interest of gaining deeper insight if you will into how implementation went for the recommendations with ICANN staff or board, one thing we could do is ask staff for example to, of their own choosing, identify 3 specific implementation efforts and provide significant detail, have them judge one that they judge to be fully successful, one that they judge to be difficult or impossible to implement because of the nature of the recommendation or some other factor, and one that they judge to have been unsuccessful, that staff or board or a combination or some of the other entities that took part, whether it's GAC or other entities, simply weren't successful. And to provide detail as to why, an assessment of their own as to why they were not successful in fully implementing a recommendation.

It's just a notion and a concept of follow-on questions we could ask. It would put the ball in the staff's court, if you will, to make their own judgment, provide some more detail along these lines. I just throw this out to provoke discussion. Let's take the next 25 minutes and see if there's

something we want to develop at this juncture to give to the staff for further inputs. And I'll open up the floor for discussion. Looking for hands. Okay, Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you, this is Carlos for the record. I really enjoyed the presentation by David Olive the morning of last Friday. And when I look at your questions, I would like to go a bit deeper. He presented some general data of public comments if I recall, and then he mentioned the work they have been doing in terms of separating policy from implementation issues. And I don't know if it is the right juncture as you said or if this should be the work of one of the work streams. But I would be very interested. If I recall, David mentioned that last year they had about 51 consultation processes. And I would like to see if we could get a sample of the processes and try to start sorting out if the processes were just general requests for public comment or some of them were policy development. In the case of the public comments, it would be interesting to see who comments and in the case of policy development processes, how the cycle developed.

I should write a note of that and just because you said it, I think this is one thing I really want to follow up with staff and I think it's an issue where staff can provide some data for analysis. I don't know if it's the right juncture and we would move it to one of the work streams. But I was waiting for the recordings of the LA meeting to go through it again and I will come back with this question again. Thank you very much.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Carlos. And, Alan, before I come to you, just an observation. We are going to talk about kicking off the work streams today and it's important that that happens. It's time for that to happen. Your suggestion that this additional data collection could happen within the context of a given working group, completely agree. I guess at this point, if there are going to be additional documents or information requests let's at least have a full review team discussion before we segment off just for purposes of coordination and some uniformity across the full review team. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. First of all, for clarity, Brian, are you suggesting that they do this for each of the 3 reviews? Or one example of each type regardless of where it came from?

Brian Cute: I think that depends. It could be for each of the reviews, it could be just across the three. Pick three. One that was fully successful -- we could go in either direction in that one. Again, this is just to provoke discussion.

Alan Greenberg: No, I understand. I have something that isn't fully thought out and it comes in two flavors. But the general question is, can you identify any recommendation where the implementation was significantly larger than originally estimated or originally envisioned? And the 2 flavors are either estimated or envisioned. Estimated by staff on first review or, to the best of their knowledge, as envisioned by the review team.

In other words, something that either the review team or staff on first review thought was not going to be really difficult, but it proved to be significantly more complex than originally understood. And again, I think that might help us understand the process of making recommendations and having them addressed. So I'm not sure if I'm asking 2 questions or pick one or the other, but something on the order of how did the actual work compare to what it was dreamt up at the earlier stages.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you. Anyone else? Follow-up questions? Suggestions about how to structure this? Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, I fully agree with Alan's comment. I should have said at the beginning that I get the feeling that recommendation 6, which is the separation of policy development and implementation, is very well in progress. It's very interesting, it's fascinating but has not been fully implemented. And that was the reasoning behind my suggestions that we should go a lot deeper based on the nice interesting presentation of David Olive.

- Brian Cute: Well one of the other things we need to discuss is, and I don't want to jump the agenda here because we need to talk about whether we need an independent expert, but having a case study done on a specific recommendation and its implementation is also a tool that we could use to do that very deep dive if you will. The original ATRT1, that's why Berkman was engaged and Berkman was chartered to take on I believe 3 specific case studies and do a deep dive on that. That's a technique and a tool we can use in addition to follow-up questions. So that's just a thought for you. Any other suggestions?
- Larry, I know you weren't in LA and I assume that you saw the spreadsheet that was structured to provide responses to the questions that you had originally put on the table. Do you see utility in developing the follow on questions in this way? Do you have any additional questions beyond those that you think might provide some greater depth and context for the review team?
- Larry Strickling: Yes and no. Yes to your first question, no to your second.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So at this stage of the game, staff, there's two staffers who need to complete their reports to us. Larissa, can you remind me who that was? I think it was Patrick Jones on SSR and who was the second?
- Larissa: Christina Rodriguez. Her answers were included in the spreadsheet, but she was not able to join in person to present in LA. So both of those individuals are scheduled to participate in the next call. It's a week from today. And I expect a written response from Patrick to be able to share with you early next week.
- Brian Cute: Okay, so we'll need to have both of them complete their reports to the review team, at a full review team call, coming up. They've got the questions that we provided to them and I'm not hearing a great human cry from the review team to develop additional follow-on questions at this juncture. So unless I see some hands raised -- hold on. Alan?
- Alan Greenberg: Maybe I didn't say so, but I'm supporting the questions that you proposed. I think those are good exercises -- I'm at a loss for the words. I get the impression sometimes that the position that staff believes we're looking for is that if they haven't done everything fully, they have failed. And I think these questions bring to the front that things can be not done or not completed or difficult to do for a whole variety of reasons, not just people didn't do their job. And so I think focusing on questions like this, I think is important.
- Brian Cute: Thank you. And I'm with you. I don't put as much stock in the title of AB&C as much as the follow on questions that try to get underneath to an understanding of how the process went and why.
- Alan Greenberg: Exactly. And I will take the question that I was trying to phrase on the fly and put it in email in the next day or so because I think something like that will be a good compliment to the 3 you already have. I certainly am supporting. I didn't get a feeling from the other team members whether they are ambivalent on it, they don't care, they're supporting it, or what. So maybe we need a straw poll of ticks or something like that.
- Brian Cute: Well I haven't heard any objections. I've heard some thoughts and discussions and suggestions and some little ambivalence about developing something at this point in time beyond what we're waiting to hear from the staff. So let's keep this on the table as a potential request to staff. I think at this juncture, unless anybody else has another point on this, why don't we move to item number 4 and talk in concrete terms about foregoing work, how we attack it, how we kick off the work streams, etc., If everyone is agreeable.
- Larissa, if you'd put the timeline, workflow and timeline document up, which is 4A, I think that's the one with the Chevrons that you helped put together.

Larissa: Sure, it's the other document that's the one page or the timeline. Please bear with us, we'll get on the screen in just a moment.

Brian Cute: Certainly. Okay, thank you. I just popped that to full screen for better viewing. So this is roughly -- and the first Chevron starts in Durbin and obviously we have some work to do before we get to Durbin. But just to walk through, as we're about to split off into work stream efforts in addition to the full team work, just so everyone is clear on what the agree of the work is going to be, we are in the process of getting information from ICANN staff and in my view, it would be very good if we could have as full a dump form ICANN staff before we get into Durbin. I think mid-June at the latest would be ideal in my view so that we can have that information as we formulate questions that we put to the respective community and to SOs and the ACs before Durbin.

In Durbin we will, if we repeat what happened the first time, literally meet with each of the SOs and ACs with the board and have interactions with them, hear from them as to their views on implementation of recommendations, take that data from Durbin and continue to collect data up until we go to Australia. And really that's the point in time where the data collection should be pretty much wrapped up. And the Australia meeting which is scheduled to be 3 days, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, with the Saturday the authors, those holding the pen, will begin in earnest to start drafting recommendations out of the respective work streams. That's really where the analysis portion kicks in. The beginning formulation of recommendations and a report happens and we have targeted October to issue draft recommendations for public comment.

I think what we need to consider is that in the September timeframe, as you'll see bulleted, consulting with board and staff, validating preliminary findings, and address metrics. If we are going to have an interaction with ICANN staff and ICANN board with a view toward understanding how to shape recommendations so that they do not run into resource constraints, time constraints, legal constraints, things that the first review team didn't anticipate, that's the timeframe where we really need to have those interactive discussion with ICANN staff and board for us to understand how we can shape meaningful recommendations that are implementable, the implement ability issue that Steve raised. So there's a placeholder for those interactions in the September timeframe.

And then if you work the calendar forward, if we have a comment period and a reply comment period, if we do that, 42 days takes us to roughly I think 3 weeks before December 20th. Put December 20th as a target for issuing the final report. And since we're going to have public comment coming in, we're going to need at least a two to three-week window there so we can read through the comments, we can pull salient quotes that get incorporated into the report. It's very important that we identify the comments and the quotes so that the community knows that we've heard them as well and have acted on their inputs.

And then if everything runs on schedule, on December 20th, God willing, the send button can be hit and the final report with recommendations can be sent up to the ICANN board. Any -- I skipped over, there will be community consultations obviously in Buenos Aires of the last ICANN meeting of the year as well. Any questions about the timeline, the milestones, the specific work? Let me get back to -- hold on, I gotta get back to -- Alan.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I think presuming the 21 plus 21 day consultation or public comment on the draft report is problematic. We've already pretty well determined that the first 21 days is not sufficient for many groups to come back with thoughtful responses. And we do want thoughtful responses. We can fix that I suppose by consciously choosing to bend the 21/21 to allow comments to come in in the latter half of the reply period as often happens anyway. If we're tactically agreeing that that may happen, we don't have as much of a problem.

Brian Cute: Well I think I looked at, Larissa, I think we looked at October 18th. If that were the target date, or the week of that, that week, if that were the target date we could do a 30 day comment and a 21

day reply and that would give us 2 weeks after the close of the reply to read the comments and bring in points from the community into our final report. To your point, Alan, I think we can play with the calendar a little bit to have a longer comment period. We have the flexibility to do that and we should talk about that. It is also very important to provide sufficient time to read all the comments and integrate the necessary pieces into the final report. And we really can't compromise too much on the backend either.

- Alan Greenberg: I wasn't looking at the calendar, I was reacting to your saying 21 plus 21, that's all.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Any other questions on the timeline and milestones? So that's the workflow.
- Alan Greenberg: We've got Fiona and my hand is back up.
- Brian Cute: I'm sorry. Fiona, please?
- Fiona Asonga: Fiona Asonga for the record. I'm just wondering, as we approve this timeline, every public comment and every information that goes out to the community and to the public will need to be translated. If there is a way we can have the translation and the actual English version, everything go out so that then tells the manager our time (inaudible). Not be able to follow the same language.
- Brian Cute: Thank you. Larissa, it would be optimal if we could have the translated versions and English version go out together. We sequences the initial comments, requests for comments. In part, we were rushing them out a bit to get them out and the translations came after. Is there any reason why we wouldn't be able to synch those up going forward so they all get posted together? And what is the typical time it takes to do the translations in the five languages that ICANN uses? UN languages?
- Larissa: Brian, I will take that as an action item and I will coordinate with our translation team and get an SLA and then estimate a time and any other details to see if we can make that commitment. So I'll take that as an action item.
- Brian Cute: Thanks very much. And also, as a matter of process, if there are things that the review team needs to do to help that process along, identify those as well and we'll work toward that end. Okay, Alan?
- Alan Greenberg: Actually, first of all, in response to that, what at large has done at times with the support of the translation people is give them interim documents. That is, give them a draft. They can translate that and then they can work from redlines to make the corrections as we make the corrections. And we've -- assuming we give them heads up ahead of time as to what the dates are, so they can make sure there is translator time available, we've been on occasion able to have them almost simultaneously available to a sort of day or so lag. Because the last changes tend to be small ones and they only have to fix those things. So that is a process that we've used before and I suspect Christina and her group are willing to do it again. It does require close coordination.
- Brian Cute: That's great. Anything you can bring to the process, let's bring that to Larissa and the staff. And if it helps us, let's take that onboard.
- Alan Greenberg: My original comment, the reason I raised my hand, is you started off by saying you're hoping that we can make sure we get all of the feedback to new questions from staff by middle of June. I think that's probably a bit optimistic. If the work streams are not going to kick off until at the earliest a week from now, we're not going to be able to schedule meetings immediately, especially meetings with the original review teams. I suspect we're going to be pushing into the end of June before we give them the questions and expect answers back. So that doesn't alter the timeline as shown on the display, it does push the response period from staff up a little bit further than you had originally projected.

Brian Cute: That may be the case. It was an aspirational statement. I think it's important if we're going to formulate questions for the community in Durbin for interactions, that those questions be informed by as much input from staff as possible. We have a view of how staff feels implementation went. Some of their perspective and context. That will allow us to form better questions for interaction in Durbin with the community and get better data. So I would keep that aspiration in place and let's work toward it, but you're probably closer to reality than I am.

Okay, any other questions on this milestone and timeline document? Okay, let's move to the 4B item, kicking off work streams.

Xinsheng Zhang: Excuse me, Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes, Mr. Zhang?

Xinsheng Zhang: I'd just like to mention about a matter. I would like to volunteer during the working group one of the working streams, too. Working group, the working stream one.

Brian Cute: So WS1A?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes.

Brian Cute: Wonderful. Thank you. Larissa, if you could add Mr. Zhang to WS1A which only had three members. Thank you very much for that. We're very much welcome to have more than three folks there. Thank you. Okay, we have the works team document up. As you will see under work stream 1, I am very happy to inform you and thank Olivier Crepin-Leblond for volunteering to be the chair of work stream 1. Very happy about that. As I mentioned or one of us mentioned, I am going to be facilitator if you will for work stream 1. The 3 vice chairs, likewise, are going to be acting as facilitators. What that means is we are going to support the chairs in terms of the organization of the work and the coordination of the work going forward. And I've assured Olivier that he can lean on me in that regard.

At the same time, it's still going to be important to have leaders of each of the work streams within work stream 1, that is WS1A, B, C, D, and E so that those specific work streams can be driven by someone. And also it's going to be important to have drafters, volunteers to hold the pen and draft the reports. So not all of those positions are filled yet, but Work Stream 1 will be chaired by Olivier. If you could scroll down to work stream 2.

So work stream 2 is going to be chaired by David Conrad, and thank you, David, for taking that onboard. We have 4 members which is good. Anybody can at any time volunteer for a work stream as well before we kick things off.

Work stream 3, we still don't have a chair appointed to that yet. Can we scroll down -- how many members do you have on that one, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Not enough.

Brian Cute: We have 3.

Alan Greenberg: Yep. Michael, I believe has agreed to be chair with me as vice chair. But my communication with him is spotty and I need to verify that I did not misunderstand him.

Brian Cute: Okay, so we have a potential chair there. I would encourage anybody on the full review team, if you're interested in volunteering for the Who Is work stream, please do so. I think a minimum of 4 would be very good. If we could scroll down to work stream 4. Thank you. And thank you very much to Fiona Asonga for volunteering to chair work stream 4 which has quite a number of

interested folks participating in that. So Fiona, thank you again. And once we have a chair for work stream 3 identified, we will have all our chairs and leaders in place. At this point in time, could you put up the conference call calendar, Charla? Because I want to walk through a suggestion for the team with respect to structuring the forward going work, both for the full review team and the working groups.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. Could I suggest that as the work streams meet, they try to identify a vice chair or a deputy chair just to make sure there's continuity if the chair has to bow out for one reason or another for a week or two or whatever.

Brian Cute: Certainly. And I think each work stream can and should organize as they see, as they deem fit to move their work forward.

Avri Doria: This is Avri speaking. Isn't that one of the things that the facilitators are supposed to help with? That sort of continuity and being assistance to the chairs in these groups? I mean having a vice chair is great, too, but I thought we already had that as a task.

Alan Greenberg: You may well be right, Avri.

Brian Cute: We certainly can do that. Are you hunting for the conference call document?

Charla: I am, Larissa is trying to help me with it.

Brian Cute: Okay, thanks. Here's the notion, and we'll get it up on the screen in a second. We've already got a healthy schedule of conference calls for the full review team. Since we're going to be breaking up into four separate working groups, I think it makes sense to clear some of that calendar so that we're not just adding additional calls for the work streams on top of the full review team calls. We need to keep a rational approach to how many hours and cycles people have to manage this work. So I had a couple of suggestions in terms of tweaking the conference call calendar that I wanted to walk by everybody and see if they felt it would work.

Effectively, I think there's two calls between now and Durbin that are scheduled as full review team calls that I would suggest we could not have the full review team calls, but allow those dates for working group calls in lieu of full review team calls. And again, the working groups can organize their work and the frequency of calls as they deem fit.

Charla: Brian, I'm sorry we're having trouble getting that information on the screen, but I am on the Wiki page right now and I had actually, based on our earlier conversation, indicated those potential breakout calls to be June 6th and July 4th.

Brian Cute: Right. So the suggestion was --

Alan Greenberg: I put the URL on the chat.

Brian Cute: So the next call for the full team is May 23rd, correct? So let's -- I was going to suggest that there's 2 calls that would otherwise be full review team calls that we could dedicate to working group calls and not have a review team call. That I think is rational in terms of using our time. But that being said, we need to be clear as to what are the decisions that the full review team needs to make in the short term for actions that we need to take in the short term and be sure that we're able to do that between now and the 23rd of May before we make any change to our call calendar.

With that in mind, we have the question for the full review team of whether or not we want to engage an independent expert. And I think we need to have a full discussion on that and we need to do it soon because if we're going to engage an independent expert, we're going to have an RFP process that takes some time, selection process, engagement, and then chartering their work. So I want to jump to the next item on the agenda before we reach conclusions on the schedule. So in

terms of potentially engaging an independent expert, there have been a couple of discussion points. One, a survey. The review team has discussed that perhaps there'd be some utility in engaging an independent expert to develop a survey mechanism that could serve the review process, not just at this time, but also forward for future reviews. There's been some discussion about an independent expert just generally assisting the review team in the assessment and analysis of data as it develops recommendations. There's been some discussion of an independent expert undertaking case studies as was the case the first time around. Those are three potential uses of an independent expert. I'd like to open up for discussion and have some careful discussion now about whether or not the team things we need an independent expert. And if so, for what purpose and if so, let's begin the process of getting that in place. Sorry, I'm trying to get back to see what hands are up. Avri?

Avri Doria: This is Avri speaking. I feel like we're putting carts and horses in the wrong order. I think that what we need to have is have a task. In other words, if we already had case studies that we plan to do, then -- and we had even gotten to the point of saying, yes, we were going to do case studies, then I think it becomes reasonable to say how do we do this? Okay, an independent expert.

I think in terms of developing surveys, we've seen this can be done. I think we've got lots of help. Now I don't know whether the staff is telling us they need to go out, that we need yet more help on things, that we need to get an outside expert. So I really think that we have to know what we want one to do before we decide that we need one. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'll largely support Avri in that most of the tasks I don't think we know what we want. I don't think I would support the concept of developing a permanent survey as it were. I don't think we're anywhere near the stage where we have any idea what kind of questions we would be asking or what the motivation would be. So I think that one we are really unprepared for.

I did, however, recall from some email or some discussion that there was a mention of an independent expert to help us develop metric or identify metrics or something regarding metrics, and that struck a resonant bell with me. I don't remember exactly where I saw it though.

Brian Cute: No, you're right, Alan. I did mention metrics. That was the other notion that there be some independent expert who could help in the development of metrics or recommendations on metrics. Those were the 4 items I think. And I fully understand carts and horses, but I want to underscore is from the experience the first time around, Berkman wasn't engaged until -- we didn't have interviews with candidates until the Brussels meeting in June. We made selection, we had contracting time to execute a contract, and by the time Berkman was engaged, they had a very short window of time to do the case studies that we chartered them to do. So I hear you on carts and horses, but I'm also going to underscore that in terms of our timetable, we don't have a lot of time to get an independent expert up and running and chartered. So it's a little bit of a conundrum there. Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Hi, it's Lise Fuhr. I would think it would be very nice to know from public comment what are the suggestions from outside to what to review. And maybe it would be nice to have -- I really think we should have a case study because I would like to have some more solid -- at the moment we're discussing a lot of history a lot as to how to make a recommendation. And some of this that I would really like to see. To have an outsider (inaudible). And maybe we would get some ideas from the public comments.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Lise. Larry?

Larry Strickling: I wanted to propose an additional option on a consultant, in addition to the ones you've listed, Brian. And part of this is reflective of the fact that our focus up until now has really been very heavily on looking at the recommendations of the last teams and evaluating how well they

implemented. But just as the first review team had to 3 years ago, we also are charged with looking overall at the accountability and transparency of this organization above and beyond anything that might have been the subject of the recommendations from 3 years ago. And to that end, from our discussions there's been a lot of interest in looking at the policy development process as an area that ought to be looked at. And Indeed I think there's a lot of interest among a number of review team members to do that.

I think if we are going to tackle that type of an issue, we may need to have some expert help with this particularly as we perhaps benchmark how ICANN does it now against how other multi stakeholder organizations might conduct their policy development. But I think we're going to need some kind of an authoritative comparison there before we can make recommendations that would have the credibility with the community about anything as fundamental as making suggestions in that particular space. So I think both to understand what the possibilities are as well as to have credibility in our efforts to take on this issue would argue strongly for bringing in some consulting help if we're going to tackle that as one of the new issues that we want to take on as part of the ATRT review.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Larry. So I'm adding PDP to the list after metrics from Alan and there has been a fair amount of discussion and interest from the review team on tackling the PDP process. So thank you for that. Jorgen?

Jorgen Andersen: No, I didn't ask for the phone.

Brian Cute: Oh, sorry. Avri and Alan, your hands are up. Are those new or from prior?

Alan Greenberg: Mine's a new one, don't know about Avri's. Avri's is down.

Brian Cute: Okay, and then Carlos.

Alan Greenberg: I'll suggest a variation on what Larry was talking about. And not so much on the policy development process, but a case study of how ICANN over the last number of years has chosen to interpret things as policy or implementation. I've made the comment a number of times, that is only semi humorous, is that if you like something its implementation, if you don't like it, it's policy. And I'm not sure ICANN is being very consistent. I'm sure they haven't been consistent, we haven't been consistent on how we use the labels of policy and implementation. And I think case study looking at that may in fact be rather interesting.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Anyone else? Something that's occurring to me, too, when you think about these suggested uses, if you will, whether it's a survey, case study, assisting with analysis and assessment, or metrics or PDP process in particular, some of these are more backwards focused if you will. Looking back at how implementation took place and in some way assessing it. And at least the one on metrics and PDP strike me as having a clear forward looking focus or more of a forward looking focus.

I think that that might be meaningful in terms of choosing whether to engage an independent expert for help. I think on the backward looking analysis, there's a historical record. We're getting input from staff and the community. We're in a fairly decent position to take that on. I do have, I'll be honest, a little bit of concern now at the amount of work that we've got staked out for ourselves. But just as an observation, I think the forward looking aspect of metrics, which have not yet been put in place in a meaningful way, and PDP could be meaningful in terms of distinction. Any other discussion on this point? And again, I urge us to try to come to a conclusion fairly quickly on this because time is ticking. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. Between those two, I think going to an external body on metrics makes a lot more sense. The policy process that we are trying to use and trying to enhance with ICANN is a new beast in that we're trying to do it with multiple inputs including from those with vested interest,

including those who are independent. And I don't think there's a lot of models out there. And to be quite candid, if you look at the independent reviews that we've done over the years, when you take an outside body and try to quickly have them understand ICANN and develop something to serve ICANN well, they haven't done really well. So I don't have a high confidence level that bringing someone in to help us develop a new or an enhanced policy development process is something which is really within our mandate or likely to succeed. The metrics, on the other hand, I think have a lot of merit.

Brian Cate: Thank you, Alan. Jorgen?

Jorgen Andersen: Well just an idea with respect to process and independent experts. I think that one of you mentioned that you cannot enter into a contract with an independent expert unless you have a task to give to the expert. And you yourself, Brian, mentioned that proper with respect to timing, we don't have a lot of time to do all the work related to a contract. And then the idea, could you imagine that you enter into a contract with an independent expert, sort of a framework contract, which where you have the shell of the contract and then you could put something in afterwards. I think it has been experienced in other contexts. Just an idea for consideration.

Brian Cate: Thank you, Jorgen. Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you. This is Carlos for the record. I don't want to discuss if an external company or an external consultant will help us or not. But I'm pretty sure that if we sit down and do some deeper analyses of these public comments that David Olive made, we can start addressing the questions that Alan just mentioned. Where these processes really are subject to multiple comments or these comments come only from one side and if I had 3 days with David Olive, 3 days, I could sit down and start doing these analyses immediately. I don't think it's very difficult. We cannot set future metrics if we don't measure a little bit in the past. We cannot develop something for the future without having touched bases. We should sit down -- a very simple questions. We had 51 processes last year. Give me your feeling how much were really related to policy and how much were related to implementation. This is a fair question. We can address this question immediately. It will help to develop the policy versus implementation paper which in my view got very weak comments. We have only 4 comments on that, they're very general, nothing too transient, and I think we have to go deeper. As I said, I don't know if we should do it or who could help us, but this is the main, this is the beast. And we have to start putting our fingers there as soon as possible.

Brian Cate: Thank you, Carlos. If I could offer to augment your comments, I have full confidence that the member of the review team can do a full assessment and deep dive of these issues and the useful analysis. No doubt in my mind. I so see whether it's a question of metrics looking forward or a redesign of the PDP process, I do see while the team itself can provide some concrete inputs, the utility of an independent view, an independent organization, whether it's one that is in the business of accountability and transparency for international organizations or whether it's in the business of policy processes, the independent aspect, particularly while the review team is operating as independently and objectively as we can, still, we are all from inside the ICANN tent. There is certainly value there that an independent can bring to either one of those subject matters as we try to address them going forward. Any other discussion on this point?

My sense is that we would really need to make a decision on this no later than the next conference call which is May 23rd. Even that would have us, if we go through the RFP process and do a thoughtful selection, having us running into July. And in making the decision by the 23rd, we have to give some thought to what would the tasks be. And if the expert were selected and started its work in July, what would its timeline and milestones look like and would there be ample time for them to give useful input to our process? Olivier, your hand is up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Brian, it's Olivier for the transcript. Just a couple of points. I think that experts can come in as two different types. There certainly is one type of work that needs to be

done and that is the analysis of public comments for example. And this requires a lot of legwork and I'm not quite sure whether the team first has the ability to spend so much time on legwork, but at the same time, whether the team should not spend its time on other matters that requires less legwork but more thinking.

Now you also have the ability to use experts for the thinking part and there I agree with Alan's point of view that if you are going to get experts to do some thinking of the policy development process, I fear as well that we might be disappointed with the results that we get at the end. It's a very steep learning curve to understand ICANN and asking for an external party to provide us with some input for changing things and first requiring a full understanding of the process as is to date, we could end up with a half-baked cake at the end unfortunately. So thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'll just add to what Olivier said. If we can come up with a strong recommendation that the policy development process is broken and needs to be changes, fixed, redesigned, I think we are serving the organization well to pretend that we can do that design or even propose something I think is taking on far more than we're like to succeed in. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Other points? Larissa, I see your hand is up.

Larissa: Yes, I just wanted to mention that in terms of the process to be used for selecting an independent expert, it would depend -- whether an RFP is necessary, might depend on the nature of work and abilities more technical and less substantive, then it could follow a different process also in terms of ICANN procurement guidelines. The size of the contract, whether it's roughly under \$50,000 or more, these are all important considerations in terms of what options are available and whether we would need to use a RFP process.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Larissa. We would need to be familiar with those elements of the process before we made a decision as well, so those are going to be inputs we need to consider when we talk about this on the 23rd. So let's connect if we can after this call and get those guidelines to the team so we can add that to our thinking.

Larissa: Yes, absolutely.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, Carlos for the record. Alan, I didn't mean to be negative. I think that we are making progress on recommendation 6. I think that policy development separation from implementation is very important. I don't think it's broken, I think it's evolving and it's a great field to think about transparency. Maybe it's not so transparent. Maybe there is something else participation. Maybe it's not as multiple as we think, and I think it's worthwhile working. I don't dare to start with assumptions like the policy development process is broken. I wouldn't be sitting here if I would think that. I would expect we approach it on a more positive way.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Carlos. Alan, Avri, and then I'm going to draw this to a conclusion.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, just very quickly, I sense we're using terms differently as we're speaking at each other. And I think there's a very different discussion to be held about the policy development process from the issue of policy versus implementation. And I suspect from what Carlos just said that we may not be -- we may be using the terms interchangeably and they are, in my mind anyway, very different issues.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I speak only to the paper that was published recently. That's my only guide is the paper and maybe I don't have enough background.

- Alan Greenberg: I think the paper you're referring to is Policy Versus Implementation, is that correct?
- Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, it is correct.
- Brian Cute: Avri, your hand was up. Are you coming in? No, okay. Let's address it this way. I think we really need to have a definitive discussion and conclusion on this not later than next call, the 23rd, two weeks from now. What does the team need to make a decision one way or another on this prior to the 23rd? I think this is where the chair and the vice chairs can, over the course of the next two weeks, gather some data or points of reference to inform our discussions and conclusions on this point. What does the team feel it would need to make a conclusion about engaging an independent expert, whether it's for metrics or for the PDP or for some other task? Sorry, my screen just went blank. Can I hear from the team? Carlos?
- Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Sorry, I forgot to lower my hand. I'm sorry.
- Brian Cute: Oh, no problem. Okay, any suggestions? Olivier?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. I have a question. Sorry to answer a question with a question, but my questions is as follows. When looking for an expert, what will the process be for looking for an expert? Does one put together a requirements document and then send it out there in the ether and hope that an organization will respond to it? Or does ICANN have a list of current experts it has worked with or companies that are listed by their type of knowledge or forte? Is there a presence around this? Thanks.
- Brian Cute: Well, sure, the last time the ATRT2 developed the terms of reference for an RFP, the task there was for a third party to undertake 3 different case studies to do the research on some decisions that ICANN had taken in the past to interview parties who were party to that decision or process or affected by that decision and then draft a report. There were some entities that were known to the review team as potential candidates, viable candidates. The RFP was published, it was sent to those candidates, and published openly. And I think we had at least 3, 4, or 5, if someone can help me remember, entities respond. We interviewed them in our Brussels meeting and then made a selection. So that was the process the last time around and there may be some entities that ICANN works with who would also be potential candidates depending on what the scope of work was.
- And I'm sorry, my screen keeps going down. Let me see if there are any hands up. Olivier is your hand up anew?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, it's new. Thank you, Brian, it's Olivier here. And I noticed that some people also say, Avri says for example, we have a hammer in search of a nail or we're looking for a hammer in search of a nail. I don't know. At the moment, without really knowing what we would need an expert for, since we haven't gotten deeper into what we're working on at the moment, it's going to be extremely difficult to make a choice. And maybe we should take those two next weeks to really focus on what we're going to be focusing on and looking at to be able to actually get a mission for an expert before we get an expert and the mission is undefined.
- Brian Cute: Okay. So we have on that list, for example, metrics. There's been some discussion about whether this review team would engage to some degree in developing metrics or suggesting metrics to ICANN that it could implement, that it could take onboard for measuring progress on accountability and transparency. There are organizations out there. Transparency International, One World Trust, others who as subject matter experts focus on accountability and transparency processes and metrics. If we were to engage a party on that question, what do the review team folks need to think about or understand before we came to conclusion if that were the issue? Olivier?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian, it's Olivier here. Well I think the first thing we would have to look at if we were going to look at metrics let's say, is to find out if we actually have that competency in-house,

so if any of us have experience on the type of metrics that are to be developed. If that's not the case, then it's a clear answer. Yes, we would need an expert on it.

- Brian Cute: So competency within the review team? Or review team and ICANN or both?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Review team and ICANN. But searching through ICANN might delay us even more, so yeah, review team to start with, ICANN as a second guess. And if neither have, in ICANN nor in the review team, then we really need to move forward with an expert as soon as possible. That's the way I'd see it. Thank you. Larry?
- Larry Strickling: What I'd like to suggest is, maybe if there are volunteers, try to scope a couple of these topics. I'm happy to take the one on the PDP. I'm not as convinced as some of the other comments made on the call that they're aren't people out there who could help us. But I'm happy to take the time and see what's out there and scope that out with the idea of presenting something back in advance of the next call. Perhaps somebody would like to do the same thing for metrics where they could do a little prospecting, find out who's out there, get a sense of exactly what we might expect to get from retaining somebody. And then we could talk about that. And then you had a couple of other suggestions as well, maybe the people who are willing to take those on. But for our part, I'm willing to take on the idea of is there expert help out there that's knowledgeable enough about ICANN and other types of these processes who might be in a position to help us navigate through that particular issue. Because I do think it's an important issue and I think it's one that certainly a number of the members of the team have indicated an interest in taking on.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Larry. Okay, so there's a concrete offer. Do we have an offer -- and I see your notes, Avri, I'll get to them in a minute. Anybody willing to do some research on metrics organizations, independent experts that are out there, and bring a one pager to the next call for discussion? My screen saver is driving me crazy, I apologize, folks. Avri, are you on metrics?
- Avri Doria: No, not at all on metrics.
- Brian Cute: Okay, hold on a second if you would. Anybody at all on metrics? I'll take it on. Okay, and Avri, you're suggesting some specific case studies? Please proceed.
- Avri Doria: I am suggesting that if we're going to go out and get an expert to do something, then I think the most viable thing, or at least the thing I would like to suggest, is that we've talked about picking up a couple case studies. I think that we can find case studies of things that have occurred within the last 3 years since this last ATRT1 report came out and such, and take 3. I quickly put down 3, but by no means would they necessarily be the 3, they're the first 3 that came to my mind. But so I think since we have done case studies in the past, doing case studies in this case and actually looking at both anecdotal and perhaps even quantitatively if that can be found, I think things have changed in the last 3 years and the direction of change and so on. I think metrics are implementation but just like I don't see us fixing the PDP ourselves, even though we might want to point out issues with the PDP, I also don't see us necessarily creating the metrics ourselves. But I obviously may be wrong in that. Thanks.
- Brian Cute: Thanks, Avri. So would you mind putting together -- I'm calling it a one-pager, if it's a little longer than that, that's fine.
- Avri Doria: Yes, no problem. I've already started it in the chat there.
- Brian Cute: Terrific. Larry, one-pager on PDP, independent expert, Avri on case studies, I'll take on metrics. Anybody else? Alan?
- Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I was going to suggest on metrics, we have 3 review studies worth of recommendation with virtually no metrics on them. Just having an external expert look at those and suggest metrics that

might have been either suggested by the review teams or developed by staff might be an interesting exercise.

- Brian Cute: Thank you. Avri, maybe that's something you can incorporate into your one-pager?
- Avri Doria: It sounded different, but I can certainly add that any new case studies that were done should have a section describing metrics that would be used to do something with them. But I don't know.
- Alan Greenberg: Brian, that was aimed at you who said you'd take on metrics.
- Brian Cute: Oh, I see, have the metrics experts do case studies. Okay.
- Alan Greenberg: I was suggesting having that as the core of the one-pager. Not so much identifying outside experts who could do it, but the exercise would be to go over the 60, 70, whatever recommendations that have been made and come up with things that could have been metricified if that's a word. I like it, I don't know what it is, but I like it.
- Brian Cute: Thank you. Lise?
- Lise Fuhr: I was just wondering the process. Are you going to incorporate the public comment in the suggestion to this or how are we going to do it? Because you say we're going to have a decision by the 23rd of May and our public comment will finish 9th of June or something. Will we incorporate it or not?
- Brian Cute: I think we certainly can take a look at the public comments that have been filed and, to the extent that any public comment has a recommendation or suggestion with respect to the use of an independent expert in our work, that we should absolutely factor that in. I'm just a bit concerned of waiting until the close just based on past experience, Lise, that if we don't get through an RFP process and a contract and get an independent expert engaged, we really don't -- if we are trying to draft recommendations and have them out in October, there really isn't a long period of time for that expert to get its work done. And based on the experience with Berkman, I personally think they did an extraordinary piece of work in a very short, compressed period of time that they had to work with. And I'd want to work to avoid putting the next independent expert into the situation. So I think the public comment is critical and I think we can take that's there. I would be reticent to wait until it closed on the 9th at the hope if someone has a concrete suggestion on an independent expert.
- I'm trying to think on the calendar -- that's 8, that's 17 days, nearly 3 weeks after the 23rd. We can certainly continue to monitor the public comments after the call on the 23rd and if there's a useful contribution we can factor that in going forward. I just feel the pressure of time on this one. Jorgen?
- Jorgen Andersen: Thank you, Jorgen for the record. I just want to follow-up with what Lise said. I think that's a very relevant observation and I would like just to repeat what I said earlier in this call that you might have the possibility to enter into a contract with an expert leaving an option open to extend the task assigned to this particular expert. I think this is plausible. I don't know whether it's possible within the rules of procedure of ICANN, but I think it should be explored.
- Brian Cute: Thank you, Jorgen. You're right, having some flexibility in approach of contracting is something we should consider and if that can accommodate later public comment, then that would be a good thing to do. Agreed. Sorry, folks. So we have assignments for one-pagers. I would ask the 3 of us, let's have those for distribution to the team along with the agenda. And right now we are trying to circulate the agenda 5 days before the call. So the 3 of us, we need to have that in to Larissa I guess by no later than the 18th of May. Any other volunteers for one-pagers? We did discuss surveys. We talked about just general assistance with our assessment analysis and

recommendations. Is there anybody else who wants to volunteer for a suggested one-pager for an independent expert? Last call. Okay, seeing none --

- Avri Doria: This is Avri. If I can suggest -- sorry I didn't get my hand up in time. If I can suggest that anyone who has one sort of milling at the back of their mind but it hasn't fully come to fruition, take that same 18 May deadline and produce one either for what they've seen in comments, what they've heard, or just that they think of so that we all -- some of us have assignments, but we all can come up with one by 18 May.
- Brian Cute: Let's take that approach. And submit them to Larissa and Alice and they'll distribute it along with the agenda for the next call. Okay, with the 7 minutes we have left, I'd like to go back to the kicking off the work streams items and just finish a couple of points there. So on the calendar, which is now on the screen, you can see we have the full team call on the 23rd and then my suggestion, if it's agreeable, is that in lieu of a full team call on the 6th, that day could be reserved for working group calls. Or if the working group wants to have a call in or around that date. But providing a break, if you will, so that we're not creating too many calls between the full team and the working groups. And then also, the call that was scheduled for the 4th of July could be not a full team call, but a call of the working groups. The only caveat there is that it's the last call before Durbin. And as I mentioned, we're going to want to have formulated some questions for the ACs and SOs for the basis of interaction in Durbin which means we'd need to get that work done on the June 20th call. I don't see a reason why we couldn't, but that's the only caveat I have there. Is this a sensible way to proceed? Does anybody have a better way to proceed in terms of accommodating both the full team work and the separate working group streams? Alan?
- Alan Greenberg: I'm not answering that question directly. But it dawned on me as we're talking that if, heaven help us, we get a lot of answers to the 100s of questions we've asked, how are we going to analyze them? Who is going to be doing that work?
- Brian Cute: You mean the request for public comments?
- Alan Greenberg: That's right. What if people actually answer them?
- Brian Cute: Then we have to read them. And analyze them and craft them into our work.
- Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think we may need some staff work to try to collate the answers for each question together to make that a doable process.
- Brian Cute: We certainly can segregate the answers in the public comments according to topic and map that to work streams. That would be one way to manage it. But at the end of the day, the review team is responsible for factoring in all the public inputs into its final report. So that's our task.
- Alan Greenberg: I wasn't questioning that.
- Brian Cute: Any other thoughts on structuring the work going forward? Fiona Asonga, please?
- Fiona Asonga: Fiona here, Asonga, for the transcript. I think we had a discussion around 4th of July and it's a public holiday in the US. Will we have the help from staff? Because like for example (inaudible) to the call. In the absence of support from staff, can we then move the 4th of July meeting to the 3rd of July or the 5th?
- Brian Cute: Larissa?
- Larissa: Since we have staff located in Brussels as well as the United States, I think we can probably arrange for some staff support, so I will take that as an action item.
- Brian Cute: Thank you. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier for the transcript. I was going to suggestion of the splitting of the 4th of July. In other words, having the breakout work streams on the 4th and let's say the full team for a shortened call on the 5th. So as to actually be able to synchronize after those work teams have met. Meeting on the 20th of June with a full team then and giving it one month until we meet in Durbin seems a little absurd to me. We do need to have the full team speak to each other before, between these dates. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Olivier, that makes sense. Larissa, if you could explore a shorter full team call for coordination purposes shortly after the 4th, that might make sense. Thank you. One last item I'd like to raise for the work streams. Oh, Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just point out that I don't think we can presume that the work stream calls will be held in the same time slot. There are people who are on multiple work streams and we're going to have to address those conflicts.

Brian Cute: We are going to have to address those conflicts. It's very much up to the working groups though to self-organize and determine what's the best time and place to have calls and meetings.

Alan Greenberg: No, I agree, but what Olivier said sort of implied the work stream groups would be on the 4th. So I was just pointing out that.

Brian Cute: Right. One last thought, and it's a very important one, at the outset of the call we talked about whether we want to have any follow-up questions to staff to provide input to us on the backward looking reviews. The working groups are also taking on, at least initially, new issues. We've identified and agreed on those new issues, they've been segregated according to the work streams, and they represent new work. In terms of the research and analysis that needs to be done, each work stream, it's incumbent on each work stream as it starts off its work on the new issues to provide any questions or clarification. So for example, international outreach is a new issue. Is there a specific aspect of international outreach? I think the first order of business for the work streams, or one of them, is to identify for ICANN staff specific aspects of the new issues that you want to explore and analyze because there is historical data and documents that need to be reviewed to preliminarily assess whether or not a recommendation needs to be developed on any one of these new issues. We're operating under the assumption that they are areas of interest that will lead to recommendations, but we need to do the research on what the state of affairs is. That requires going to ICANN staff, asking ICANN staff to point the working group members to the source documents on that particular topic, and then undertaking the reading and initial analysis to come to a determination of whether or not a recommendation should be developed on a particular issue.

I just wanted to underscore that in addition to getting inputs from staff based on the questions we've presented, work streams need to develop follow up requests to staff. I had discussions with Larissa about how to do this in an efficient and rational way. She stands at the ready to assist all of us. My own view is that this is a place where ICANN staff can certainly provide a pointer to the work streams of the relevant documents that need to be reviewed to make that initial assessment of whether a recommendation is in order. But I would encourage strongly each of the chairs, as you start organizing, to take that on as one of your first tasks and to bring that to Larissa so they can provide you with the background information that needs to be read initially. Any questions or thoughts about that process from review team members or Larissa? I see your hand is up.

Larissa: Yes, I just wanted to add that on behalf of staff we will make this process work well. And two, if some of these very broadly stated possible areas of interest could be narrowed to a more specific area of interest. And as much of the specificity and detail as the groups can provide us, that will help staff just be as specific in pointing in the direction of the appropriate documentation and information.

Brian Cute:

Thank you. Any questions for Larissa? Any discussions on kicking off the work streams? At this point the chairs are in place and empowered to organize the first call, to begin crafting the agenda, and the initial questions on new issues for ICANN staff. Are there any questions as to kicking off those work streams? I'm not seeing any hands. Then leaving it to you to take that on, we're at the hour. I don't want to belabor this any further. We can get back to other items in terms of reference on the next call. Any other business? Any other items to consider before we close?

I'm not seeing any hands. Nothing at all? Okay. All right, thank you all, folks particularly those who are up at difficult hours of the day. Thank you for your time. We'll look forward to speaking with you again on the 23rd and some of you before that on work stream calls. Thank you.