

20130829_ATRT2_ID813028

- Brian Cute: This is Brian Cute. Welcome to ATRT2 conference call 10, Thursday, 29th August. We have the agenda up on the screen. Let's begin with adopting the agenda. Does anybody have any suggested edits? Changes to the agenda as proposed? Looking for hands. Anything that we should touch on that's not there? I'm seeing a check mark. Okay. Seeing no suggestions, we're going to adopt the agenda and move forward to item number two. The first item, number two. And adopt Los Angeles preliminary report. The preliminary report has been circulated. If you could put that up on the screen, thank you very much. Does anybody have any suggested corrections?
- Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan. I must admit I haven't looked at it so if you want to adopt now, I'll abstain.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Anybody else have any suggested corrections or edits to the report as drafted? I'm not seeing any hands. Then we will adopt the report as drafted and move back to the agenda, the second item number two. Thank you, Alice. Update of statements of interest. Does anybody have an update to their statement of interest that reflects back on our conflict of interest policy? Looking for hands. Okay. Seeing none. Carlos, is that a non-response? Okay.
- Alright, let's move to item number three on this agenda, update from template and issue owners. Do we have a—Alan, you have a question.
- Alan Greenberg: I don't have a—well, I guess it's a question. We never came up with an actual format in the body of the report of the—of how well the implementation went on the other reports. With ATRT, we know we're sort of merging them together with the new recommendations. I'm happy to invent something along with David since we're the only ones drafting something and present it by the end of next week, or something like that.
- Brian Cute: Can you say that again? The piece of the report that you're referencing, is that work stream four related? What work stream are we talking about?
- Alan Greenberg: Work stream two and three. That is the assessment of how well the implementation was done on the other two review teams.
- Brian Cute: Is the template that we're working off which is in two parts a backward-looking review and a new issues template? Is that template not sufficiently structured? Is it missing some elements?
- Alan Greenberg: No, we said the templates are going to go into the appendix, but we're going to have something briefer and more concise in the body of the report.

Brian Cute: The narrative that's built on the content of the templates.

Alan Greenberg: That's correct.

Brian Cute: Yes, you raised a good point and I think it's just one piece of the overall report so I hate to—I don't hate, I just worry about having one piece of it developed, kind of, in a vacuum. I think it would probably make more sense to pull together an outline of the entire report and maybe some guidance as to structure and circulate that.

Alan Greenberg: I think we already did that in Los Angeles but there was one section we didn't do any deeper diving on.

Brian Cute: And you're saying that that section needs more structure or outline.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think it's going to be a narrative, you know, grouping recommendations together and giving a simple assessment in not too many words identifying the parts that are, you know, have either been done well which is easy or the less well, and pointing to the templates for more detail. I don't think it's an onerous thing that needs the whole group to discuss for an hour.

Brian Cute: No, understood. But just to be clear. Work stream one also has some backward-looking assessments to do as well, so whatever was developed, we would want consistency and structure in the narrative, right?

Alan Greenberg: Except that one you decided that they were going to be sort of interspersed with the new recommendations that come out of it. So that one is different in a substantive way.

Brian Cute: Okay. I have no problem with you taking the [ten] with David and developing that piece of the report out for work stream two and three. I think we do want to keep an eye on consistency, though, of approach. And so, as you're doing that, coming back to the team so that we can see where you're going, and if we need to make adjustments along the way, we can do that.

Alan Greenberg: And we've got plenty of time between now and October or even the Washington meeting in October to restructure if it significantly disagrees with the other formats.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I just want to start drafting something.

Brian Cute: Fair enough. No, I agree with that impulse. Thank you. Please do that. Do we have the list somewhere of issue owners or template owners? I think we had constructed that. Larisa, or Alice, does that exist and can we put that on the screen? I see Alice is typing. Oh, there's the link.

Alice Jansen: Yes, we have the inventory, and we're about to put that on the screen.

Brian Cute: Great. Thank you. Alright. Just waiting for that to come up on the screen. Olivier, do you have a question? Olivier, please? Yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, if I can find my mute button I would be able to ask my question. Thanks very much, Brian. It's Olivier, for the transcript. Looking at this list, the wiki page which has got all the—has that been updated with all of the names that we put on when we went through the list on Saturday morning? Because I wasn't quite sure, looking at it, whether this was included or not.

Brian Cute: Is that the link that's being put up on the screen now that you're referring to? Or something else in the wiki?

- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Templates for Assessment of Implementation and New Recommendations. I wasn't quite sure because, if you remember, we went through the whole list of work stream one recommendations. Sorry, work stream one previous recommendations and then flagged out the ones which might give rise to new recommendations. And then put a name next to—with the person who was going to work on this. I couldn't find that updated document anywhere.
- Brian Cute: Are you looking at the—just so we're on the same page—are you looking at the link that Alice provided that is titled Templates for Assessment of Implementation for New Recommendations on the wiki?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Correct.
- Brian Cute: We're in the same place. Okay. So there's a—issue assignments with issue and review team member, and then draft template submitted. Two different—
- Larisa Gurnick: If I might clarify. This is Larisa.
- Brian Cute: Sure, please.
- Larisa Gurnick: On the wiki page, if you go down to the section called Inventory of Observations and Potential Recommendations.
- Brian Cute: Yes.
- Larisa Gurnick: There are two bullet points under that, the top one ATRT2 Inventory of Observations and Potential Recommendations for accountability and transparency update, August 22.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's where they are.
- Larisa Gurnick: That's where it is.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Terrific. And this is updated from our discussions in Los Angeles.
- Larisa Gurnick: Yes, it is. And it's updated based on feedback that I received from Jorgen.
- Brian Cute: Fabulous. Okay. Thank you very much, Larisa. So now we are all on the same page, as it were. And we have a total. I'm just scrolling to the bottom. We have a total of 37 potential recommendations, and we have the assigned to the work stream it's a part of, and then the ATRT members who are assigned to complete the drafting of those templates that underpin the potential recommendations.
- Okay, so starting with work stream one, I guess what we want right now is just an assessment of where people are in their work.
- Jorgen Abild Andersen: Brian, please.
- Brian Cute: Yes. Oh, I'm sorry.
- Jorgen Abild Andersen: Jorgen speaking.
- Brian Cute: Absolutely.
- Jorgen Abild Andersen: Just before we get too far away from the Larisa's remark, I just wanted to ask a question of clarification. Larisa mentioned that she made an update based on a (inaudible) from my side. Larisa, could you clarify what you did?

Larisa Gurnick: Sure. This is Larisa. Jorgen, you wanted to make sure that all the details that were discussed during the LA meeting were included in the body of Proposed Observations and Recommendations for Discussions. And that is, in fact, what I did.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: On which recommendation?

Larisa Gurnick: Hang on a second. I will make sure that I can reference—

Jorgen Abild Andersen: I had two points.

Larisa Gurnick: They were the budget and the finance related items.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, finance accountability and transparency. I made the point that the Board chair in our meeting made a proposal for content of a recommendation on finances. And I repeated that. I couldn't find it exactly in the list on Finance Accountability and Transparency. But the feedback you gave me indicated that it would be included in further work to be done by Fiona Asonga. And you also mentioned that you proposed to have ATRT2 meet with Susanna Bennett and Xavier Calvez which is under one of the next agenda items. So was that what you meant by the remarks?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. That's correct.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: I had another observation on outreach to the entire Internet community but maybe we come to this further along the line.

Brian Cute: Actually, Jorgen, if you don't mind, while we're here, what were your suggestions or points on that one? Can we identify which recommendation number?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, recommendation 29 on outreach.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Where we had a text for discussion which everybody supported. ICANN should enhance it (inaudible) aiming at making ICANN's work relevant to stakeholders in those parts of the world where stakeholders are less active systems in the work of ICANN (inaudible) stakeholders. In other parts, in order to ensure that ICANN's decisions are pro to embrace, supported and accepted by the public and the Internet community in all parts of the world. And the answer from Larisa was that it was covered by the decision to await the proposals from the independent expert, and I'm a little bit puzzled by that because I don't really see the connection. But maybe we can come back to that when we see the recommendation from the proposal from the independent expert.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Jorgen. The independent expert was one that ICANN is engaging with respect to metrics. Is that the one referenced, Larisa?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: (Inaudible) the PDP report.

Brian Cute: Okay. I just want clarity on the point. Okay. Thank you.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: In my mind, it has nothing to do with outreach to the entire Internet community. So I missed that recommendation, actually. And I missed it also due to the fact that there seemed to be general support for that when we met in LA.

Brian Cute: So just to be clear on this point, on potential recommendation number 27, in the action items column, H where there are notes, one of the notes D says discuss benchmarks/metrics project with external consultant and provide feedback. Is that where you're focused?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Just a second. Just a second. It should be recommendation 29 on outreach.

Brian Cute: 29, pardon me, I was in the wrong place. Okay.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay. And is this—are the statements in column H for 29 accurate reflecting our discussions in LA?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: I haven't got the exact—I have got the spreadsheet on my screen. Just a second.

Alan Greenberg: We're talking about spreadsheet line 31, number 29?

Brian Cute: Correct. Line 31, recommendation 29, column H.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Sorry to keep you waiting.

Brian Cute: No, no. I want to make sure that we have clarity on this before we move on.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: I'm really sorry. I simply cannot find it right now.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: If you want to move on with the discussion—

Brian Cute: Yes. Please. And let me know when you've come back to is.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, certainly. Certainly.

Brian Cute: Good. Okay. So that being said, we need a status update on the drafters of owners of these potential recommendations, and a touch point to see if the drafting is on schedule or at risk of not being delivered in a timely fashion. I guess we could take this by group, and that would be work stream one is the first group. Olivier, if you want to walk through or if you just want me to walk through and call out and check with the drafters as to the status, I'm neutral as to how we manage this.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. I don't mind you just combing through. I guess you're just going through the list and looking at the names that we have as far as the drafters are concerned.

Brian Cute: Essentially, yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I must admit, I haven't had any feedback yet from any of the drafters with regards to whether text is moving forward or not. So it would certainly be interesting to hear from them if you're on the call here.

Alan Greenberg: We have Avri's hand up.

Brian Cute: Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri speaking. Since my name is attached to so many of them, I think there's only like five or six of us that have writing tasks, so I don't know that we need to go through all of them. I can say that, for all of mine, I think for the most part I've got an idea of which ones I'm working on. With some of my co-authors, we figure out which ones I went first, and which ones the other person went first. And some we haven't done that yet.

With two weeks left, I say that yes there is a risk that, you know, they'll all be finished just in the nick of time. And when that's the case, there's always the risk that there will be some intervening event that makes the nick of time be missed. But as the (inaudible), I'm on a last minute finishing schedule.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Avri. And as I was co-author, I'd share that assessment too of the ones that we're co-assigned to. I don't see risk of missing a deadline but certainly needing all of the remaining two weeks to get these things as fully written as they need to be so that there's an adequate basis for analysis. And not raising the alarm just yet but noting that there is a tight timeframe. Jorgen, I see your hand up. Is that from before or have you found the piece that you wanted to look at?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, thank you, Brian. Sorry to keep you waiting. It was a bit confusing with all these (inaudible) and items. The item 29 which I mentioned was from the summary document which Fiona Asonga made for our discussions Friday in Los Angeles. It was item 29. And in item 29, there was a recommendation which goes like this. ICANN choose (inaudible) I quoted just a few minutes ago. This recommendation in Fiona's document was approved or endorsed by the ATRT members present in LA. But I couldn't find it in the inventory which was submitted by Larisa. That was the reason for me writing to Larisa. Larisa mentioned in her reply to me that this particular recommendation from Fiona's paper is incorporated in item 28 of the inventory. Item 28 of the inventory is the item which deals with effectiveness of the GNSO PDP. And according to my view, this is maybe too broad to cover this particular aspect. So what I would propose for discussion is whether we might need a particular recommendation which reflects the text which I quoted just a few seconds ago, also taking into account that everybody was in line with that particular recommendation.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Jorgen. I think it is appropriate that that be reflected on the spreadsheet. It was a specific item that was discussed and supported. I would note for any and all of these recommendations, until the full drafting of the templates, and analysis, and some discussion among the team members takes place, none of these are necessarily recommendations for sure. So we have to go through that process. But I think it's appropriate that that one be broken up separately for our Los Angeles conversations.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Good.

Brian Cute: So Larisa, if you could see to it that that gets entered as a potential recommendation with the language around it that we used in Los Angeles summary, and add it to the spreadsheet, that would be appreciated.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Brian, while I have the floor, could I just ask a question for clarification with respect to the other items? I mean, certainly my email to Larisa, that was the finance accountability and transparency point where Steve Crocker made an intervention at our meeting Thursday. And on the basis of that, I drafted the text which was more or less completely mirroring what he said. And it goes like this. In order to improve accountability and transparency and facilitate the work of the review teams, ICANN's (inaudible) each year on a rolling basis is (inaudible) PWB reflecting the planned activities and the corresponding expenses, the PWB may cover a two-year period.

The following year, a report should be processed describing the actual implementation of the PWB, including activities as well as related expenses.

Peter mentioned this was—that taking into account that the Board chairman himself mentioned that, as a possible recommendation, I would find it a little bit awkward if we do not pick up on this. Also taking into account that many of us have mentioned the finance issue as an issue where some recommendations might be needed because it's also been asked for by the GAC.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Jorgen. If Larisa, you can take that language and include it into the spreadsheet in a new line or a new role, if you will, that would be appreciated so that's memorialized.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Thank you very much, Brian.

Brian Cute: Certainly. And I do see.

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. I just wanted to clarify that after this call, I will make sure that the right version of the spreadsheet is uploaded. Perhaps that's what's causing confusion. But on both of the items that Jorgen highlighted for me, I am pretty positive that I've incorporated all that language. But I will go over it in detail and make sure that I didn't misread his note in any shape or form. And I will make sure that the updated inventory property reflects that. That was my intention.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much, Larisa. That's well appreciated. Thank you. I see Alan's hand up. I thought I saw Fiona Asonga's, but it's down. Alan, if you'd go.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. First of all, a review of where I am on the ones I'm responsible for. The situation is basically the same. I don't have nearly as many recommendations, but I also have some non-ATRT work that I'm in the middle of. But I'm optimistic that I'll have it done well before the two-week deadline from now and hopefully before that. That includes the final review of the work stream three of the previous "Who Is" report.

I do have one question on something that I can't find. There was a—and it wasn't the full template, I recognize, but we did discuss the need for a recommendation that essentially says the Board should—and this addresses the how the Board handles the Who Is. But that the Board needs to, with clarity, address results of the Who Is of the review teams. And I think it probably fits well with two that are number 30 and 31 that are also talking about improvements of managing the review team process. But I don't see that one listed here so I don't know if it's another one that got lost in the wrong version of the spreadsheet or what.

Brian Cute: Just so I'm clear, you're suggesting a recommendation that is specific to how the Board handled the Who Is review team recommendations?

Alan Greenberg: How they should handle review teams in the future.

Brian Cute: So we're talking work stream four broadly reviews going forward, a recommendation on that piece. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Seems to go in with number 30 and 31. And I think when we started talking about the possibility of not having the Washington meeting, we suggested budget clarity for review teams should also be wrapped into that.

Brian Cute: Yes. Well, just a quick reaction, draft recommendation. So that a draft recommendation around 31 is specific to implementation report prior to review team kick-off. Okay, I'm going to—it's a good point, Alan. I'm going to leave or put that in the hands of Fiona Asonga.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine. I'll deal with her directly.

Brian Cute: As perhaps another recommendation, or an expansion of an existing one here on the spreadsheet, if you're okay with that.

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you. Okay, Lise, your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: I think we had Carlos before that.

Brian Cute: Oh, I'm sorry, Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: No, I was just calling your attention that there were a few hands up. Sorry. I didn't mean to think—

Brian Cute: Thank you, Carlos. Lise, then Fiona.

Lise Fuhr: I was just asking a question, so you want to implement—what one just said it in our suggestion for the financial, the recommendations.

Brian Cute: Implement. What was the question, Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Do you want Fiona Asonga and me to try and incorporate what Alan just said about the subject for review teams in the finance recommendations? Is that what you were saying before?

Brian Cute: Not necessarily. And I haven't really thought through whether budgets for review teams is something that more appropriately sits within a recommendation as to how you conduct reviews going forward which there's a lot of logic there. Versus as a one piece of a potential recommendation of financials, I hadn't thought about that at all, honestly.

Lise Fuhr: We'll find it. And I want to—I have a few recommendations that I need to write for us and looking into finances so—but I don't see any problems of meeting your time on writing them. And that was it.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. I think I have Fiona Asonga, please.

Alan Greenberg: She said she's going to type because her line is so bad.

Brian Cute: Okay, Fiona, type away and while we're waiting for you, is there anybody else whose hand is up?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I was just going to respond very similar to what you said to Lise. The issue about review teams being given clear budget could well be one of the many items in the overall financial review, but I think it needs to be highlighted in the one about making sure for improving future reviews.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Other drafters, I'm not looking at the spreadsheet of templates right now, but I think, Carlos, and whoever else has got ownership of a template, status of your drafts and any risks of your drafts not being done on time.

Alan Greenberg: I think Fiona's the only other one who hasn't spoken, looking through it quickly.

Brian Cute: Yes, let me cruise through there on the spreadsheet. Is it just Fiona Asonga as a drafter?

Alan Greenberg: Carlos has a couple.

Brian Cute: Yes, I thought so. Carlos, are you there?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, I'm here. You know what, I haven't had a lot of time but I will have it either within the next few days, and then since I'm not traveling to Washington, you will find it by the time you arrive there.

Brian Cute: Very good. Waiting for Fiona. I know that on the GAC Larry Strickling, and a number of the other government reps are working on that, on those recommendations. I don't see Larry on the call and this really is a touch point just if there's anything at risk, if there's any resources you need.

Fiona Alexander: This is Fiona, Brian.

Brian Cute: Fiona, please.

Fiona Alexander: Alexander. Yes, so we're on track. There's actually a document in Larry's inbox to review the last couple of days, so hopefully we'll get that out. Sorry.

Brian Cute: No, that works. Thank you very much. Okay. Anybody else who is an author who hasn't weighed in yet? Okay. Not hearing that, I would encourage everybody as I'm an author myself and, as I said, I don't see risk but it's a short timeframe. If you get to a point where a deliverable is genuinely at risk, my request is that you raise the red flag before we get to the deadline so that we can perhaps bring other resources to bear to stay on our calendar. It's very important that we do that. That being said, if there's any other resources that you need, please flag that as well.

Staff, as we had asked in Los Angeles, ICANN staff is tasked with looking at these potential recommendations and bringing back to us any additional information, even if there's something we've gotten wrong and there's a record to suggest otherwise that anything that bears on whether we should make a recommendation here is requested from ICANN staff. And in that light, unless there's any other points on three, we'll get to item four which is part of ICANN staff's—

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan.

Brian Cute: Oh Alan, I'm sorry. Please.

Alan Greenberg: On status information, we explicitly asked for anything else related to the Who Is implementation because that's going to be frozen real soon now. And so far I don't believe I've gotten anything unless I missed something in my inbox. So Larisa has her hand up maybe. Maybe I missed something or maybe she'll tell us when it's coming.

Brian Cute: Okay. Larisa, please.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. Alan, you have not missed anything. There is a draft being finalized as we speak and I anticipate to deliver it to you in the next day or so.

Alan Greenberg: Excellent. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Larisa. Any other topic of discussion on this item before we move to number four? Okay, seeing no hands. Number four, exchanges with ICANN staff. Larisa, are we ahead of schedule, are you able to bring these folks in now? How are we doing on that? This is Susanna Bennett, the COO, and Xavier Calvez as CFO.

Larisa Gurnick: Xavier is on the line. Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: Yes. Hi.

Brian Cute: Hi Xavier. Brian Cute here from ATRT2. Thanks very much for joining us. Are we—is Susanna going to join you or follow you? How is it structured on your end?

Xavier Calvez: I don't believe that Susanna was planning particularly to intervene. And I was intending to be able to address comments or questions that this team would have relative to its financially related recommendations. So I'm yours over the next few minutes and for

how much time you need to be able to address the subjects that you have on financially related subjects. And of course, I will connect with the help of the support team here to ensure that we convey to Susanna anything that's relative and useful for you to have her taking charge.

Brian Cute: Xavier, thank you very, very much. I will ask some of the review team members to pose some questions to you. But generally speaking, where we are in our work is we are at a stage where we are developing what may be recommendations. There has been a recommendation on financial accountability and transparency that is in early draft form. We need to do fact gathering and analysis to determine whether or not there's a recommendation or recommendations to be made. So that's exactly where we are in our process. With that, I appreciate your participation here. I would open it up to review team members now that we have Xavier to ask any specific questions that help in your fact finding on recommendation for ICANN's financials at this time. So looking for hands and questions to Xavier. Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Hi Xavier. It's Lise.

Xavier Calvez: Hi Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Hi. I saw in some of the comments for the (inaudible) budget plan that there were questions regarding metrics of how to fulfill the goals set out in the strategy according to the budget too. And there were some questions related to how to trade the money used on different projects. And I've seen those in this very thorough spreadsheet. I don't know where it tells how many are used on different projects, but this is a very broad explanation. Do you have any plans on the metrics, and do you have any plans on the traceability to the project?

Xavier Calvez: Understood. First, thank you very much to everyone for the opportunity to participate and to respond to your questions and comments, and to communicate with you all because this is very helpful to help the process of making your recommendations always more relevant and I think it this is very helpful. So thank you for that.

So Lise, to your question, so that everyone understands, I think we're talking about the new information that we have provided as part of this recently closed budget process for the fiscal year '14 where we have provided a breakdown of the overall budget by project as per the AtTask system that's been implemented to help track the activity of the organization, and the system which every staff member uses where all activities are documented whether they're projects or ongoing activities. We have used the system to produce and to break down the budget information so the dollars across all those activities.

So as part of the budget process, we have provided the budget for each of the 160 programs that make up all the activities of the organization, and a breakdown of each of that 160 set of numbers by the four categories of costs that the organization tracks, being personnel, travel, professional services, and then (inaudible) type of costs. So 160 numbers times four. That's about 600 different numbers provided to the public, obviously to the most interested parties who look at the budget to help have a more granular understanding of what are the dollars associated with which activity of the organization.

This is the first time we have provided this information. This is quite granular information so it's been interesting to see that, I think, providing this information for the first time was both welcome by a large amount of the community who had asked for more information in the past. So we made progress there, I think.

At the same time, we've also noted that the information appears sometimes either too granular or not sufficiently granular. So I think what this is telling us that we're going to refine over time the level of granularity that's provided, and maybe the processes to

provide more granularity sometimes to adapt to the needs, the information that's provided. But I have the impression that, globally speaking, more information and more granular information has been positively received.

As to come back to your point a little, as we have been ramping up and using the system, one of the benefits of the system is to enable the formulation for each project and program of the number of attributes, what I'm going to call attributes which are which objectives, what deliverable, who is the owner, what are the metrics, what's the timeframe for either the project or the program to be carried out and completed.

So you mentioned the metrics, I think, and measurements, so we have embarked into the process which, honestly, is an ongoing evolving process of documenting for each project and each program those attributes that help qualifying what the scope and the objective of the project or programs are, and what the timeframe is, and mentally basically help the understanding, or facilitate the understanding of each of those components of the activity of the organization to which the budget is associated.

So it's not perfect. This is—we only started the journey of becoming much more proficient at the usage of this system. We're walking in the right direction. It's just going to be a longer road and the ideal situation will be reached as the staff becomes more and more proficient with the system. So metrics, we definitely intend to continue documenting metrics, doing a better job at it, and obviously being able to measure them, and be able to integrate into AtTask the measurement of those metrics over time.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. Lise, any follow-ups or do we have other questions for Xavier?

Lise Fuhr: Well, Lise here. I don't have follow-up on that one. I have other questions. But I want other people to be able to ask questions too. So anyone else?

Brian Cute: There's two opportunities here. Maybe one is not so immediate but A, hearing from ICANN staff and Xavier, how processes are operated in the first question. The answer was very helpful but gathering some facts. Secondly, and Xavier, we may come back to you down the road but, if you don't mind that if we are developing a recommendation for sure, that we want to discuss with staff the question of implementability. What we're asking in terms of improvements, what does that mean when you actually try to implement it in terms of resources and processes and other issues that we need to be thoughtful of in drafting a recommendation.

Xavier Calvez: I very much welcome that opportunity whenever it makes sense for you.

Brian Cute: Absolutely. That will happen. Olivier, I see your hand is up, please.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Brian. It's Olivier for the transcript. Xavier, I remember one recent thing, occurrence, where this committee here tried to find out what it's overall budget was. And somehow it was quite a challenge to reconcile the number with the AtTask system, and the way that things are currently being changed, I guess, from one accounting system to another system it did require some manipulation of some sort of the data source to be able to get the answer. Are you able to give us an idea of when absolutely everything will be on the AtTask system, and things will then be clearly consultable by the community, I guess, so that the reconciliation of the sort of front end with the back end will effectively be easier for people to understand?

Xavier Calvez: So we are in the process of finalizing the approved budget numbers with the corresponding AtTask structure of projects and programs. And this is imminent as we are getting the final adjustments from the departments to map, basically, to synchronize the final budget with the structure of projects in AtTask. We are constantly updating that information and we will have that information very soon, and then be able to provide it in a finalized fashion.

I want to nonetheless emphasize the fact that AtTask, and that's part of its value, is structured not in terms of departments, but in terms of activities. The point that I'm trying to make here is that while the budget numbers and data is being produced through the organization by department, we are asking to formulate—we are asking the departments to formulate that budget information across the number of projects and programs in AtTask. So it's a little bit of a matrix if you see what I'm saying where the input comes from a certain source, and distributes that information across the programs. And then when you consolidate it in the programming direction or dimension, we need to re-aggregate differently the information so that we can say ATRT2, if it's a project, who are the various departments who have formulated resources contributing to that project so that we have both the department view and the project view.

So this is, I think, the relatively logical and natural complexities of implementing a new system that we've met whereas the synchronization of the activities and the components relative to a given project, ATRT2 for example, have not always been formulated in the same fashion by various departments. And I'm taking that example because you're mentioning it to Olivier. I could take others where it would still be applicable as well. So that created complexities from a purely circumstantial standpoint, complexities in reconciling the numbers produced in one direction with the perspective of the project.

We will continue having sometimes strange conversations when we talk about subjects that are transversal to departments, and that can be sometimes understood differently by different people.

Let me take another example. Compliance. Compliance is both an activity and contractual compliance is also a department in the organization. I am sure that we will continue having discussions when we look at AtTask data as to, well, is this what I'm looking at the contractual department budget, or is this the cost of a project within the contractual compliance activity? And so on, and so on. And I think this is a healthy problem to deal with. It's a good thing that we do track the activities by activity rather than by department because that enables us to stop being siloed when and where we had been siloed in the past. And it helps looking at our activity in our budgets from a topical standpoint rather than from an organizational standpoint. So the more general answer than the specific question that you were asking for, Olivier, but I think it's important to understand because we're actually providing, I think, as a result of this structure, much more useful data, but at the same time that it complexifies the level of communication that we need to have so that we can reconcile on the permanent basis the numbers produced from different perspectives.

So the only thing that it says is that it puts a little bit more burden on us to ensure that this consistency exists at all times irrespective of the perspective that you take looking at the numbers. And while we are finalizing our processes to produce that information for the FY (inaudible) budget, we'll get much better at it, I'm sure, and we're gearing ourselves up to be able to be much better at it.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. Olivier, do you have a follow-up?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, please. Just to ask, I mean, first, thanks very much for this, Xavier. It's very helpful. Do you have a timeline for when you believe that migration will be complete?

Xavier Calvez: When you say migration, may I ask to clarify, Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Xavier. From the previous system, what was not structured in such a way. So the way that you're currently structuring it and using the AtTask system, I just wanted to find out when all of the projects will have been moved over to AtTask, and this would have been fully integrated with the front end. So we could have that matrix which you mentioned to us about.

Xavier Calvez: Right. So there was no previous system. So there's no migration per se. We've implemented AtTask and populated AtTask I would say, from scratch which is what happened between October and February—October 2012 and February or March of 2013. And then that is ongoing on a daily basis because the staff were using AtTask every day and changes what the projects are, and work with the project on a daily basis. So the exercise that we are trying to conclude in the next few days is to synchronize a picture of the projects and activities in AtTask that reconciles to the budget, the finalized budget, which is the same information than what we have produced in the budget materials that were provided for public comments in May 10th, but now the updated and final version of it. And that's what we are intending to provide over the next—to finalize over the next few days. I will need to check with my colleague, Carol Cornell, on the timing of that publication of that information in MyICANN. So I will have to come back to you on that one.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. Alan. I'm sorry, Lise, then Alan.

Lise Fuhr: Xavier, does this mean that you, in the future, will have an overview of what is used on the different ACs and SOs and what the budgets are for these groups?

Xavier Calvez: When you say used, you're thinking about the support provided to each organization, correct?

Lise Fuhr: Yes, if—

Xavier Calvez: Yes, so the structure of projects and activities in AtTask is not necessarily divided by SO and AC. So let me take, hopefully, a fairly simple example. In David Olive's team, there was the Secretariat Support. The list of projects that David has for Secretariat Support are more topical or by type of activity, than by SO an AC organizations. Now, so my point there is that I'm not fully sure that AtTask would be the medium for that purpose.

I have a separate plan which I need to be able to assign more detailed steps in timing as well as resources to be clear which is something that you, Lise, is very well aware of which is the model that we have developed for the purpose of supporting the cc contributions working group, the finance working group, working on the cc contribution. And my intent is to try to use the same model to provide on a recurring basis, probably annual basis, an understanding or valuation basically of the direct and shared resources by organization. As you remember, Lise, we've done this specifically for the cc—for the cc, so for the ccNSO, but if we would replicate that same model across all the organizations, I think it would provide a good answer, at least the beginning of an answer to the question that I think has been asked for a long time to be able to provide exactly the view that—the answer to the question that you just asked me which is what is the support provided by organization? So my intent is to use that model, (inaudible) AtTask, obviously to be consistent together but to use that model to provide a comprehensive view, a breakdown basically, of the costs associated with the support of each organization.

I recognize that my answer may make more sense, hopefully, to you than it does to others who have not seen the model that I am talking about. But is that answering your question?

Lise Fuhr: Well, it's answering that you're planning that you might do it, but is it a more solid plan or is it only an idea?

Xavier Calvez: Well, it will be a plan when I will have put together the various steps to get there, and I will have associated a timeline to it, and a deliverable. And so then it will be a full project. I'm not yet at that stage and I'm not going to—I was not going to tell you more

than there is at this stage. But this is what I would like to be able to do that I would intend to do.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. Alan, were you in queue?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I was. I have two—well, one statement, I guess, and a statement/question. Budgets organized by your operating structure is less than transparent to us given that we still don't have an org chart of how ICANN is organized. I know Fadi is telling us it's going to come someday soon but I'm just pointing out, it's less than clear when we don't know what the structure is. So I don't think you can answer that other than to note it and, if we still don't have an organizational structure at this time, maybe you have to provide a Finder's Aide with the budget so we can understand it better.

Xavier Calvez: Do you want me to comment on this for now?

Alan Greenberg: If you have a comment, otherwise no.

Xavier Calvez: I just want to make sure we are clear, or I am clear, at least, on your comment from the perspective that are you referring to the budget information that we've provided as per the AtTask structure that is difficult to understand without an org chart? Is that what you are referring to?

Alan Greenberg: Well, you were talking about the budget being allocated, basically, to an operational part of the organization. Not necessarily based on who they're supporting.

Xavier Calvez: Right.

Alan Greenberg: And therefore, it's hard for us to fully have the whole picture when we don't know how these various parts of the organization fit together.

Xavier Calvez: Right. So the org chart that you referred to which Fadi has said, so I'm not going to comment further on that, but the org chart would show the organization's structure of the corporation. The budget and the granular information that we've provided is as per activities, not as per organizational breakdown.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Xavier Calvez: So when we provide the view of the project that, I don't know, finance operations, obviously, there is a lot of what the finance department does that fits under there, but not only. Because legal contributes to it, as well as IT, as well as a number of other departments who contribute to developing a budget, who contribute to a number of those activities that are in finance. So it's by activity, rather than by organization that we provide the information in AtTask. I'm not saying that having a view of the org chart is not going to be helpful for that and other purposes. I just wanted to make sure I correct, if needed, the description that we are making of how we provide the budget data.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So you're adding a third dimension to it, or possibly a fourth.

Xavier Calvez: Third, I think, yes.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure that helps, but thank you. Let me give a specific example because I want to try to understand, and you were talking about we may end up with some interesting discussions when we start breaking it down by not only the activity, but essentially who they're supporting or what they're doing. For instance, the volunteer travel part of the organization, I presume, gets funded based on an estimate of how much each of the groups will be needing in travel funds. But in the past we've also been told that, for

instance, if I can get a really cheap flight by being part of the ALAC in this discussion, you can get cheap flight, the money saved may well help the travel budget pay for business class for a GAC member whose leg is in a cast and has to travel in business class. And so the money is fungible and may move back and forth across the boundaries, hopefully, the whole thing averaging out. But that leads to problems when you do start breaking it out based on who it's funding and how much the ATRT gets versus the ALAC, versus whatever, in that the details of the particular year, of the particular circumstances, may in fact influence how much money is spent on you and how much is not. I'm not sure if I'm making myself clear.

In the case I was giving, if five GAC people break their legs, their travel costs are going to soar. But in a reasonable world, that shouldn't be held against them and, say, the GAC is now too expensive, we have to fund fewer GAC travelers because of that circumstance in this year. So I think I'm just reinforcing what you said that when you start trying to divide it in the two dimensions, you end up with some interesting problems.

Xavier Calvez: So I think there's two different things in the example that you're taking. One, avoiding the issue that you just pointed out, is the reason why we look at the travel funding by seat rather than by the amount of money estimated at one point of time to fund the travel for that traveler. Which means that if the budget had assumed that there would be five seats for this organization to travel, and that we estimated that the time of the budget development of the budget design that each seat would cost \$1,000 per flight, but that when we find ourselves nine months later in the year the flights cost \$1,500 for each of the seats, we are going to fund seat by seat at \$1,500, not five seats—sorry, not \$5,000 worth of travelers, if you see what I'm saying. So that we don't penalize organizations that plan to have five people at a meeting, for example, and that can only have three because the costs have soared.

Now, of course, that puts a burden on us to ensure that everything put together does not bring us above the budget, and that there are puts and takes to this equation because sometimes the costs are higher and sometimes they are lower. But what we are trying to fund are seats. Now, I think this is part—the other part of your comment, I think, is about how do you or how complex is it to slice the information in a different direction? This is also part of why I was explaining to Lise's comment that—or question—that AtTask may not always be the right tool to use in order to be able to provide the answer to how much has been funded, for example, for constituent travel during a period of time, that we may have to produce more analysis or different analysis using different a different tool and more granular data in the accounting system, which AtTask is not.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. Thank you. Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Sorry, now (inaudible). Xavier, we have been talking a lot about the transparency, and I think the budget has improved very much in transparency. But do you do, within ICANN, any benchmark towards other non-profit organizations regarding the expenses?

Xavier Calvez: So there's been episodic and not consistently performed benchmarking analysis or comparing on-the spot basis on an ad hoc basis, certain specific information to other organizations. As you know, this is a relatively complex exercise because there's not a lot of organizations like ICANN but, at the same time, there's always, even if it's a sort of very close benchmark, there's always someone you can compare yourself to. So this is not an activity that's been structured and consistently performed, especially as the organization has grown. And this is something that we—I think would be a great permanent method or skill to ensure we develop and carry out further. So it's not been done very consistently in the organization. It's not easy but that's not an excuse for not doing it. And I think this is something that could make sense to try to develop further. It

is a fairly resource-intensive activity to do well, which doesn't mean again that we should not be doing it.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. This is Brian. I don't see other hands. I would just want to pick up on that last point. I think whatever this review team does in terms of recommendations or not, it is a good question that Lise asked, and good to be thinking in terms of benchmarks or measurements. One of the things we learned in the first review team process is that there weren't a lot of benchmarks developed by that review team or by the staff after the fact that some of our recommendations. And when you make improvements as you intend to in a process, and then come back for people to give you feedback without the original benchmark put in place, it's sometimes very difficult to measure, understand, and give credit to the improvement. So very much strongly encourage you in your thinking to think about benchmarks. And also, I think, coming out of this conversation, not just the issue that you hear a lot about which is transparency and I can't map program dollars across these documents, but also accountability in terms of how ICANN manages its money with respect to the stakeholders. Some reflections on that and how that could be reflected out in the improvements that you're making, I would strongly encourage you to continue thinking about.

Xavier Calvez: Understood and agreed. Thank you.

Brian Cute: And I see Larisa's hand is up. Larisa?

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, I wanted to highlight a couple of areas that I've heard discussed by the review team, and it might be, if there's time, it might be helpful to hear from Xavier in terms of things like the whole overarching process between the strategic plan budget and operating plan, and some of the improvements and work that's currently under way to ultimately have the budget dollars linked, not just to individual projects, but ultimately be traceable all the way back to strategy. So that's one item.

Also, in terms of oversight, wondering if it would be useful for the review team to hear from Xavier in terms of what the actual structure is within ICANN in terms of the audit committee and some of the rules and responsibilities that they have. Some of those topics that just wanted to bring those up in case it would be helpful at this point to cover.

Brian Cute: Sure. Xavier, please.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. That's a broad question. So one subject, I think, that is helpful to, let me give a bit of a status and perspective on it is what I would call the overall strategy planning process that has received in the past a certain amount of comments from the community, generally speaking, either as part of the budget process or the strategy planning development process or other matters as well, or outside of those processes as well. As you may remember, in October last year in Toronto, as our new CEO was arriving and ramping up his understanding of the organization and his involvement in direction of the organization, we had all, I think, through a fairly consensus-driven approach, determined that it was best to stay the course on the existing strategy planning process, rather than embarking on to a new one while the CEO was maturing his understanding, and was discussing with a number of parties the state and the direction in which the organization was going that would normally result in formulating a new strategic approach— not necessarily a new strategy—the mission of ICANN doesn't change. Nonetheless, how to achieve this mission being something that would be receiving a new or an updated approach. So this is important across, of course, the community and the organization because it drives, as it should in any organization, the definition of what is being done, what are the resources required, and translate into, on an annual basis, the budget.

If you look at a very high level, the planning process of any organization into three parts, I would formulate the first one to be what is the strategic—what is the strategy of the organization, what are the objectives that this strategy requires to be achieved, how—the

second piece is how do you intend to carry the activities of the organization in order to achieve those objectives? And the last part is really, once we've defined the how and the what, meaning the action plan, the third piece is this is how much it costs. And that's what the budget should be.

And we are making progress towards having a much more comprehensive and deep and thorough strategic planning formulation. So the first part, the high peer level part is, as you know, being invested a lot of time and energy on to formulate over the next five years. We will need then to use that information to then elaborate the second part which is how and what are we—how are we going to do it and, therefore, what are we going to do to make progress towards achieving these five-year objectives? And then the budget will be the result of doing that. So when you formulate the middle part, the second part, which is really the action plan—you can call it an operating plan, you can call it a strategic plan—but it's basically over five years, what are we going to try to do every year and how much money does that involve? And when you do that for five years, the first year of that five-year view is becoming very clearly the starting point of your annual budget process.

So we have had in this organization a fairly high-level strategic planning process. We have had a consistent annual budget process, and we have, I think it's fair to say, struggled consistently in the past to link the two together. And if I refer to my three-pronged analysis just before, I would say that we are probably missing a portion or have missed in the past, a portion of that middle section which is the how and the what over the period of the strategic plan, but with sufficient amount of formulation and details on an annual basis so that we can have an understanding of what is achieved on a year-by-year basis, and where we are going and how we are going and making progress towards those objectives over the duration of the plan.

So the strategic planning process has taken a new start and will allow ourselves to reformulate objectives in the organization and be the beginning of formulating the action plan over the five-year period. And that action plan, as formulated, will then allow us to also have a longer term perspective from a purely financial standpoint. It will have much more than that but to the action plan will be associated quantification in dollars that are then the premise for the annual budget process. I think this longer term perspective, financial perspective, has been missing in the past, and has been the subject of a number of comments and requests in the past to the organization in that the strategic planning process that we have embarked ourselves in will ultimately allow us to formulate that longer term financial perspective that supports a longer term action plan for the organization.

I wanted to give this perspective because Larisa, of course, shared with me the drafts of the recommendations that are considered by your group, and I felt that they were very relevant and very consistent with what I think is in the works. And I just wanted to make that point. Let me stop there and see if there's any questions or comments on what I just said.

Brian Cute: Thank you very, very much for that, Xavier. Jorgen, your hand is up.

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, thank you, Brian. Jorgen speaking. Xavier, thank you very much for your very interesting overview of the financial reporting of ICANN. When I listened to you, it struck me that, on top of what Lisa has already said about the need for benchmarking if it's at all possible, and you answered rightly that it must be maybe difficult to find organizations which you could benchmark yourself up against. It struck me that one might consider that ICANN has sort of a status as a monopoly institution. If you agree in this, could you tell me whether this recognition as yourself as a monopoly has led to particular considerations about the way you are doing your budgeting. I mean, you could say that there's no need to be cautious about too high salaries. There's no need to be cautious about costs of your activities and so on and so forth. It's very rudely said,

maybe, forgive me for that, but I hope you understand what I mean. Do you understand the consideration that I just reflected and what is your response, to that?

Xavier Calvez: I think I understand. I don't think there's—so, I'm speaking with—I'm going to respond with my personal exposure and experience within ICANN over the past two years or a little less than that since I arrived. I have never come across any behavior, any opinion formulated or not that suggests that people think we're the only ones doing what we do so we can do whatever we want-type of thing. I've never seen that. I would not even have had the thought of it before you mentioned it. So I don't believe there's any of that. I think there are, for example, you mentioned compensation as an example. There are fairly explicit benchmarks determined for compensation, for the compensation policy and strategy for the organization, defined and monitored by the Board Compensation Committee. So there are guidelines that don't even exist in most companies that I see on compensation, for example. So that there are—there is governance, there is rules, there is guidelines that can be used to operate the organization in a fashion that doesn't even make us or require to wonder whether we have a monopoly or not because it doesn't matter what our activity is. We have a guideline that says compensation should be between 50% and 75% of the market for a given position. So we are—there is no question of we have all the money we want and we can do whatever we want with it because there is no benchmark. I've never seen anybody behaving in that fashion in the organization. But that's me.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. Jorgen, did you have a follow-up to that?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes, thank you, Xavier, for your answer. Sorry for being maybe a little provocative but I think sometimes you have to be provocative to get in depth with things. I might like to follow up with an additional question regarding the charges paid by your customers. The charges paid by your customers, is there any competition on these charges or what considerations are behind the level of charges which are paid by your customers? I mean, you have now a situation where the whole gTLD process is likely to increase the income of ICANN substantially. This might lead to an extension of your activities. We met in LA. Fadi gave a flavor of what can be expected in that respect and it was very interesting to listen to him. But you may consider to do also at the same time, or to some extent, considerations about lowering the payments of your customers, maybe not fully corresponding to the increase of income, but how are your considerations on issues like the one I just mentioned?

Xavier Calvez: So first, I apologize but I'm not understanding the vocabulary of charters or—I don't know what you—

Jorgen Abild Andersen: (Inaudible), the prices, that customers pay for your services.

Xavier Calvez: Right. They do. So your question is about the prices associated with the fees that ICANN collects, correct?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Exactly.

Xavier Calvez: So should the 25 cents per transaction be 25 cents or should it be lower or higher? That's your point, correct?

Jorgen Abild Andersen: Yes. Exactly.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. Sorry. Thank you. So the way I'm looking at this is that this is part of where I think the formulation of the strategy and how the strategy translates into actions and how these actions translate into requirements of resources that—and having a perspective, an understanding of that on a longer term basis then allows you to be able to reassess the adequacy of the resources. And it also helps driving the need of resources on the basis of attaining the objectives rather than on the basis of how much money there is available.

And as a result, the process that would lead us to formulate a five-year plan to take the example that we discussed so far, and that would help identifying the actions and the resources associated to those actions, and the cost of those resources would then let us be able to formulate the fact that there is an excess or a shortage of resources that would be separately projected as well to support those activities. And this is how I think there can be a mechanism of adjustment of the price through the production of that information, sharing this communication, interaction with the community on it that would— can then allow to have a discussion and a communication, and resulting in the consensus on defining what the resources of the organization should be. In isolation with that, that long-term perspective, it's very difficult to make any kind of decision as to whether the fee is too high or too low or adequate. I think this is—I'm talking about a solution rather than talking the principle. To me, this is the solution to be able to have an adequately formulated opinion on the ability to adjust prices.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Xavier. Thank you, Jorgen. We're drawing up to the time of the call and I appreciate very much your time, Xavier. I think we'll certainly be following up with you, as I said, going forward. If you have additional information that helps to flush out responses, it's an open invitation to provide it, and working with Larisa and staff, your time is very much appreciated. Thank you so much.

Xavier Calvez: And again, thank you very much for the opportunity to interact with you. I'm hoping it was helpful and I'm hoping that any future opportunity to do the same the same thing or more will just contribute to helping your work. So it was a pleasure. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Absolutely. Thank you. With the minute or two that we have left, we had an item of discuss and review team activities and any other business. In terms of activities, the most immediate are getting the drafting done which we've discussed, and secondly, preparing for our face-to-face in DC which will be for the two days that have been communicated by Larisa and staff. Are there any other questions for team members on our activities in the short term? Looking for hands. Okay, I'm not seeing any. Moving on, Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick: Staff is doing everything within our power to schedule these interactions with various staff members during the weekly calls. However, Brian, we are coming up with some circumstances where some team members are just not available. One example is David Olive. So I just wanted to highlight that we will send out a couple of doodle polls and some communications about opportunities to schedule interactions outside of the weekly calls even though we've committed to try and fit those interactions within the weekly calls. But there's topics that would be worth discussing relative to cross-community deliberations, public notice and such. I just wanted to let you know that doodle polls will be launched to see availability.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much, Larisa. It's welcome. Any other business. Okay, seeing no hands, thank you all very much and we'll be talking to you on our next call. Thanks, everyone.