EN

[0:16:28]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For those on the line we're going to reconvene momentarily.

[0:18:50 – 0:18:53 Miscellaneous talking and laughter]

[0:18:56]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay folks, we're going to get going with the next session. For those of you on the line, it's ATRT 2 reconvening. We're going to move on the agenda to a review and discussion of past AOC reviews. We're going to hear from Denise Michel and other ICANN staff who will walk us through implementation of the respective review teams recommendations.

What we have on the board first, and hopefully on your screen, before we get started are some questions that we'd like, Denise and the ICANN staff, as you go through your presentation, to provide some feedback on the questions up on the screen. Could you get those back up? Sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah I just told them to replace the slide. So all of the staff have those questions as potential questions that we need to…

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay…

DENISE MICHEL: …want to answer here, and do follow up information on.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But also for the people on the line, to have the, just walk them through those questions as well, people listening in. So what the ATRT 2 is asking for context in the presentation is: From the ICANN staff for perspective, ICANN staff for perspective, that person who or she, who had a hand in implementation of any of the recommendations, in that task what did he or she understand the recommendation to be? And what did he or she understand the underlying issue to be that led to the recommendation?

So we're asking for some context for the ICANN staff person's understanding of the recommendation. Also how did he or she implement the recommendation? What options were considered and how was the actual option chosen for implementation?

Does he or she believe ICANN fully implemented the recommendation? If not, why not? Did he or she run into any new or unforeseen problems or issues while implementing the recommendation? What have been the feedback, both inside ICANN and external to ICANN as a result of the implementation of the recommendation? And finally, how does he or she feel that ICANN has improved as a result of the implementation of the recommendation?

So Denise and for the other staffers, if you can provide some feedback on those questions along the way that would be much appreciated. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: So we have over 70 recommendations and three implementation reports to run through in less than two hours. Staff was asked, although

they have all of these questions, they were asked to get the discussion started to address how was this implemented and why and where have things been left.

So you have that basic information. Of course, along with the implementation reports and updates that you've received. As I have mentioned before, staff will be happy to provide additional follow up information in writing, because I'm sure we won't have time to really get into all of the issues you'd like to this morning.

So here's the agenda that we've been asked to follow and here's how the reports will be broken down for your overview. Next time. So just to give you an overview on the ATRT 1 report and the reporting requirements. So, as I think Bobby reminded you the 27 recommendations that were offered by the first ATRT team covering the board, the gap, public input process and review board decisions was after a public comment period and was formally adopted by the board in June 2011 – was submitted to the board New Year's Eve 2010.

The staff developed detailed, and published very detailed, work plans, frequent updates and reporting was, they were posted publically. And out of ultimately the projects that were created around each recommendation, all the paths that were outlined were openly completed a little over half after the first fiscal year, and all of them after the second fiscal year.

And sort of annual report is posted online and that's fine. But it's important to note that although the key tasks that were outlined for each project were completed, it doesn't mean that work in these areas has ceased. In fact, the ATRT 1 has inspired a number of long term

efforts. The initial recommendations were used as stepping off points, and have engendered much more additional and long term activity.

Which is great, but it does raise the point of where is there? Should there be, and where is the completion point when you're looking at continuous improvement in all of these areas? So I'm working with you, I think, in ATRT to be really clear about the completion points and the success criteria, I think will be very useful for all concerned.

And so with that quick intro, I'll turn it over to Amy to review the board operations composition and review of board decisions.

AMY [No last name provided]: Thanks Denise. I think most of the people know my name is Amy [Staff-us 0:24:47], I'm Deputy General Counsel here. There are some folks that I have not met yet, so welcome. I'm not here as a representative of the Legal Department, I'm here mainly as a key support staff member for the Board Governance Committee.

In terms of taking the recommendations that had been received from the ATRT 1 group, what the Board did was they identified different arms within the Board and staff who would be responsible for particular recommendations.

The Board Governance Committee was delegated 14 of the 27 recommendations. And so what this work shows is what that was done with staff and the Board Governance Committee, and then obviously from there gone back to the Board for review and approval.

So Denise told me I had only one to three slides, but I had nine so sorry about that [laughs], with 14 of them. The first two were bunched together, and there is a couple of other slides that are going to have numerous ones just for purposes of reporting because they seem to go together a bit.

With the recommendations number one and two relating to Board skillsets and training, there was recommendations asking for – that the Board do some benchmarking with respect to the skillsets that might be appropriate for organizations similar to ICANN. That there be an annual review of those skillsets, and that the skillsets should be provided to the nominating committee.

So that when the nominating committee, in fact, seeks expressions of interest from members who want to be on the Board, that they have the understanding of what those skillsets are that the Board, at least, believes would be appropriate and helpful for the Board itself.

Then there is also an idea of regular reinforcement and review of Board training process and mechanisms. In terms of the implementation, there was a benchmarking report conducted and it has published, and you'll note on these slides, I don't have the links but in the annual report there are links to all of the publically posted information that relates to the implementations of all of these recommendations.

There is standard operating procedure now with the BGC, it's in their work plan, is to annual identify and provide skillsets to the noncom. The BGC Chair works through the committee and provides that information and seeks also Board member input. And then that information is provided, in fact posted by the noncom.

The noncom in fact publishes with the skillsets with both the statements of interest and just generally on their website, so it's there for all time. And as I said, that's now part of standard operating procedures.

In terms of Board training, there has been an initial Board training plan identified. Over the last year, there has been training during each of the Board workshops provided by various Board members. The organization is in the process of establishing online training modules that will be helpful for everybody, not just Board members but community members also.

We are developing both training modules that will be Board related, that will help Board members understand exactly what their role is. But also ICANN related, to help people understand the various aspects, the various business sectors, the various opportunities that there are in ICANN, what the policy development process means and how it operates.

So a lot of specific topic areas, but also manners and how to become a Board member that the Board member training will involve. We're also developing and formalizing right now a curriculum that will be for Board members directly both the outset of their service on the Board, as well as continuing training and ongoing as a standard operating procedure.

And I think a lot of these… We do have two current Board members sitting in the room, so if anybody wants to jump in and add anything, please feel free.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you Amy. Since I have to, or get to, stay in the room beyond this briefing, I'll just put a place marker here. I'm happy to tell you what

EN

efforts we've taken within the Board. We've taken a number of attempts to move forward, tried to balance the amount of time available and various differences.

I'll be happy to expand that and share with you quite candidly sort of what's worked, what hasn't quite worked, what's in progress and so forth and just expand on what Amy said. If you want to spend the time now, but I suspect that's not the best use of the time to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No thank you for that. Just, and to set expectations to I think clearly any question is welcomed from the review team, and we appreciate Denise and your staff putting together the presentation. I recognize we'll probably be a little time constraint today because we have other work to do.

There is a good chance we'll have you present the balance of whatever we don't get through at another time. We're also going to establish as a review team a specific work strain that looks at these matters and have more opportunities for engagement.

So I'd ask, of course, any questions on the review team at this time, but let us be conscious of the time that staff has to give the initial presentation. Yes Larry has a question.

LARRY [no last name provided]: So I appreciate the kind of the list of activities that you've engaged in. But step back a bit and the question that I think the team was trying to get at was that there was a skill deficit at the Board.

You've now benchmarked it, you've come up, you spent a lot of time thinking about it. What are the key skills that you've identified that you think Board members need to have? What was the gap of what you have? How much improvement have you actually generated as a result of implementing these different activities?

AMY: Well in terms of the material that the board presented to the noncom, for example, clearly there was significant people with policy experience, with industry experience, with technical experience. One of the things that was identified was not a lot of direct audit related function.

There is a lot of need for people who are very experienced in auditing, and very experienced with financial, understanding financial statements and how to understand revenue reports, etcetera. So those are the things that, in the report to the noncom, that the Board asked the noncom to look at.

Now they're not asking the noncom to find particular people for a particular purpose. But Identifying that these are the things that the Board were looking for in terms of specific skills that they think that there may not be as much experience as they would otherwise like or appreciate.

In terms of satisfying that, in terms of what the noncom has identified, I know that the most recent add to the Board of Olga [Madrew-ga-forte 0:32:29], is in fact experience in audit committees, she has been involved in that on other boards, and she was a great addition to that.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Very helpful comment, Larry. For my perspective, the way I parse what you're saying and play against experiences, that there are sort of two kinds of things and they're not directly substitutable for each other.

One is for Board members that we have, to what extent would training be helpful, cross-training or filling in gaps? We have non-technical people who show up with enormous experience in having – no real firm understanding of how the domain name system works. It's helpful to bathe them in DNS 101 kind of thing.

We have technical people who show up, and who don't have any idea about the secondary market in domain names and that's an opening experience, for example. So that kind of cross-training is helpful.

The other aspect though, is that there are skillsets that are really hard to pick up on the fly to the depth necessary. And the audit – the experience to be effective in, sitting on the audit committee, and complimentary on the finance committee, and a few other kinds of things that have to do with experience in seniority, and management, and corporate governance and those sorts of things.

Really, and this is my opinion, speak for myself, really we are best served if we bring people in that have those kinds of talents. Trying to develop it on the fly, it just doesn't work in my, again strongly view. We don't have enough time and there isn't a rich enough process to make that happen.

So that then goes to the recruiting into the noncom process. So there is really, in my mind, two separate levers if you will to work on, both of which are very important in getting attention.

LARRY: And my questions was trying to get at how much you've moved the needle on that, in terms of how things were three years ago and how they are now. I mean, I respect and appreciate the list of activities, but again it goes back to the question of…

You did a benchmarking study, what did you learn? I can't tell any of that from the material in front of me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I agree with you.

LARRY: You've identified skills that you want added to the Board, what success have you had actually adding that? We just heard a good anecdote, and kudos to you for having done that, but… That's what I'm just trying to get at, is to move past… So for the activity, you can get more to the substance of what the outcomes have been.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe to the dismay of my colleagues on the staff, I agree with you. I think we've identified the problems, we've done some, we know we have to do more, and we have not gotten our arms around it to the extent that we have a calibrated measure and we know that we're here and we need to go here in terms of specifics.

That's still… It's been one of the things that I wish we were slightly more in control. We've done some, we've definitely done some and we

EN

can document what we've done. But your larger point of, do we have a road map? And do we know where we are exactly on that map? I think the answer is not quite.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Yes Jørgen.

JØRGEN ANDERSEN: Well I could really not add anything new to what Larry said, but I think it's important to voice your support his views, because I think it's really essential what Larry has said and it comes back to our discussion yesterday about metrics and methods for continued improvement. I think this is really the core of, part of the core of our activities, to demonstrate that we move forward.

Not by take the box approach, but by really measuring, positively, what is improved. And I want to let this be part of the conclusion of our first discussions here at this meeting. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And if I may, I'd welcome hearing from staff. We've had a discussion about metrics, and other than deadlines, I don't believe the ATRT 1 gave a lot of specific focused recommendations in terms of the types of metrics that the organization should apply in measuring how they've implemented a recommendation.

So an important thing to here is when you have developed metrics, what are they? What are they showing you? Were you haven't… And

EN

going forward in this review, this is an issue that we should think about and contemplate for our next series of recommendations. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Bryan, it's Olivier. Just I have a silly question and a serious comment to make. The first one, the silly question is, are these board skillsets going to be shared with the community? So with SOs and ACs?

AMY: I believe that they are. And I know that they are published right now with the noncom, but I believe last year they were distributed to all of the SOs and ACs as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that's one. That's why it's a silly question because I might have seen it and then it's just one. The serious comment is, I've been on the other side of the wall. I've actually served on the noncom, and the one concern that I've had when I read through the recommendations specifically to do with the transparency of noncom's deliberations.

I think transparency in the process is great. Deliberations themselves were new actually. And I have said so in noncom meetings, "I'm sorry that applicant is an absolute idiot." I wouldn't want that to be shared, and I wouldn't… Well, the applicant I'm sure wouldn't want to have that shared. Thank you.

AMY: Actually to Olivier's point, the BGC has spent a lot more time with the noncom in terms of talking through these issues and making sure that the transparency guidelines that in fact the board has now imposed on all noncoms, which is the aspect of recommendation number three.

I think the committee knows that the noncom has the right and ability each year to identify its own operating procedures. So each noncom is a new noncom. So just recently, in response to recommendation number three from the ATRT, the Board did impose some limited guidelines for transparency.

And the noncom has taken some significant steps about the process. Definitely not about the deliberations, because I think everybody agrees that those specific deliberations, when you're talking about a particular person or a particular candidate, you do need to be able to at least understand that you can have an open and complete frank conversation.

But the process, there is no reason that the process needs to be secret or behind closed doors, and the noncom has done, has taken a lot of steps in developing more procedures that will provide the process to the whole community, as well as reporting after the fact.

This year was the first year that they in fact did that and tried to report. I think that there is a lot of room to improve upon that reporting. But when you start with baby steps when you're reporting about things that you've done, so I think it's a very good step in the right direction in response to recommendation number three.

In terms of recommendations number four and five from ATRT, which we'll now call ATRT 1, I guess, so this is two. There was a… To continue and enhance Board performance and work practices, which is a very broad scope of a recommendation, of course.

And then the second one, which is recommendation five, is implement compensation scheme for voting Board directors. I'll take number five first, that is in place. It is now standard operating procedure. We think that we have satisfactorily put that in place, and every voting Board member that comes on the board has an opportunity to elect to except the compensation.

They're not required to, it is their choice. In terms of continuing to enhance Board performance and work practices, I do expect Steve might have some commentary on this in a bit, whether it's now or later during your later meeting. There have been standard operating procedurals, procedures in place even actually before the ATRT recommendations were finalized for Board self-appraisal.

There has been two or three, I believe, that have been posted. And there is annually the idea of doing self-appraisals for the Board itself as well as for the Chair of the Board. There has been a couple of different effectiveness training sessions held during Board member workshops.

We're now… It is now a standard requirement that each Board committee have a work plan, so that annually they know from the day they begin operations to the following year when the new construct of each committee is established. They know what their plan is.

Of course, things come into play throughout the year, but at least the standard work that each committee does is laid out in a calendar and a schedule. There have been some updated tools and workflow processes to help the Board access materials better and be able to communicate amongst themselves so they become more effective.

At Steve's home, there has been a creation of what is a Board procedural, procedure manual which basically lays out each of the processes in the procedures that the Board does. And it is a work in flux and continual improvement. Board procedure manual aspects are added as we go, as new processes and procedures are put in place for the Board's operating procedures.

The initial one is posted and, again as I've said, they are continuing to be updated and approved. There is also a standard operating procedure to be put in place to evaluate annually each committee and its effectiveness. And whether or not the committee needs to remain as a stand standing committee, or if possibly some of the work can be maybe put in more of a work team, as opposed to a standing committee.

Also there's been an addition to some new mechanisms for Board interaction. We've added a significant number of what we call informational calls that will help each Board member understand in greater detail what the details of a particular item or issue that is coming to the Board is all about. And those have been proven very effective to allow the Board members understand, in detail, some of the areas that they are interested in, and that they think need to have a

little bit more time than what you might otherwise have on a regular Board call.

Also, and then the final thing that I would just like to mention is that, again, at Steve's home, he has identified for every particular topic that goes to the board for review or consideration and approval, there is a Board lead, or a senior staff member lead, that is meant to shepherd that topic throughout the Board members to basically answer any questions that people might have offline, to really be able to get in a discussion, and help everybody understand exactly what the issues at hand are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah just a quick question. To what extent are all of these evaluations, and self-appraisals, and procedures, and all of that open and available for everyone else?   I haven't seen them, maybe I wasn't paying attention.

AMY: The self-appraisals are all posted on the Board page.   The Board procedural manual, the first initial draft is posted. I can't tell you as I sit here right now where they're posted, but they're definitely posted.

STEVE CROCKER: I presume Avri, you're asking about what's available publically versus what's availably internally to other Board members. Yeah. So I don't

think the evaluations that we do for ourselves, I actually don't know the answer about how much of that is made available.

Certainly the detailed answer to each and every one of the evaluation questions is not made publically available. That would be an interesting exercise, probably….

AVRI DORIA: Committee reports too, the effectiveness of a committee, for example, which isn't personal stuff. Is that available to us? I mean the rest of us…

STEVE CROCKER: No, no, I hear you. I truly don't know the answer. The Board procedure manual is intended to be open, and I'll just say a word about that. My intent on that is not to have it be a controlling document, not to have it be law, but to have it be reflective of what we have done so that we don't lose track.

And when you want to say, so how did we do that before? I've been through that exercise a few times, and it none the less has a tendency of becoming law. I've tried to hold that down. The word policy does not exist in there. Policies get made elsewhere, this is just capturing a procedure so that we can…

But delicate process, even though it's intended to be super dry and super straightforward, none the less tends to take an over, see how it goes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you Steve. I've got Jørgen and then Larry.

JØRGEN ANDERSEN: Well maybe I'm asking the question which Larry will repeat after me [laughs]. It comes back to the hold conflict of… Well you're doing a lot of things which I think are very appropriate and very adequate, but when the recommendation is talking about enhancing performance and work practices, I think it's important that you know where you were before and what has been the outcome of your efforts.

I think this is vital. I really appreciate that you have invented a lot of good ideas for moving forward.   I'm confident that something will happen. But I think we have a problem if we are not able to assess what has been the impact of what we have been doing. Maybe we have been doing something which has had no impact what so ever, and I think this is a key issue.

My second question would be around recommendation number five. You say compensation available to all voting directors, you say it's voluntary whether you want to apply for compensation. I suppose the compensation scheme is open and you can see it on your website, or wherever.

AMY: As well as who has and has not elected compensation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And also to clarify the evaluations, the appraisals are actually on the web. They're available as well. And yes, yes, and yes. We need

scorecards, we need benchmarks, we can't just having words. We have to, around all of these things, start thinking scorecard, benchmark.

So we also see the progress from time to time, from year to year. We have no mechanisms doing that. if we show you that list again in five years, it's activity. But it's not tractable activity, so that's part of implementation.

As we implement things, we should put scorecards and benchmarks around it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you [Fadhi 0:48:55] and you're going to wait for Steve to come back… Oh you want to… Okay. Go ahead then.

LARRY: Because I just want to follow up on [Fadhi's] last comment, have you experimented with… In your own mind, having now seen these tools, do you have a sense of what dimensions you could do a metric on any of this? We know this is hard, it's not easy stuff at all.

But I think, Jørgen's point, we do want to know what the progress makes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: In the absolute minimum Larry, would be for example when you say something like, "effectiveness training sessions held." It's a minimum, okay, how many people attended these sessions? Do we know that

every Board member attended? How many different training sessions do we have? What are the training programs we have?

Has every board member gone through it? Some of them are simple, they're just numerical frames to be able to ensure that everyone went through these things. Some of the things also are potentially done through surveys.

A Board member's feeling that the Board meeting are more effective. Or are they feeling that they are wasting too much time to come to a decision? So we need to sit down and look at each of these things, develop the benchmark, share it with you, get feedback, improve it, and track it.

Otherwise, again, it's a lot of words.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Any other questions? Carry on.

AMY: So recommendation number six, I think most people will recognize this is one of the most difficult recommendations that the ATRT made. There was a paper posted to attempt to clarify, at least what should be a part of a PDP. And, of course, a PDP is a formal Policy Development Process.

It also attempted to identify what was an executive function, or management function, or an administrative function, either a staff level or a board level function, that was not necessarily policy itself. Denise

EN

said earlier that the recommendations led to… They were actually jumping off points.

This led us to realize that there was a big gray area in the middle. The Board had previously asked various advisory committees or supporting organizations for policy guidance, or policy advice, that wouldn't necessarily reach the level of a formal Policy Development Process.

But we also realize that there was not a process in place for that policy guidance or advice to be sought or provided. So again another paper was developed that would launch that discussion within the community.

There was a session in Toronto, unfortunately it was very poorly attended. I think it has led to a current discussion now, on at least the GNSO group discussion, to expand upon that understanding and try to figure out a mechanism for formal provision of advice that doesn't necessarily reach the level of policy development itself.

So that is an ongoing discussion in the GNSO, and I believe other SOs as well as the ACs. So that was one that, while we did publish the paper, there was an attempt to clarify, it's definitely an ongoing discussion and I think it will be going on for quite some time. And hopefully the community is really the area that, the group that needs to help us identify how that process should be put in place.

BRIAN CUTE   Thank you. This is Brian. I'd like to ask a couple of follow up questions. This is an important recommendation and yes it is a difficult issue. But it's also one that's been known for some time. Director de la Chapelle,

for a long time now, has been talking about implementation policy, we need to figure that out.

With respect to the status of the work today, other than poor attendance at the meeting in Toronto, what's holding up getting this to completion?   Whether it's community participation or some other aspect of the process, in your view?

AMY: Well I can't really speak to what the community is doing. I know that Brian might have, Brian Peck who is here, who supports the GNSO in many regards, might have a better understanding of that, and he'll be up in just a moment. But with respect to one thing that is holding it up is I think agreement on what in fact says, require a Policy Development Process formal.

What is simply, could be policy guidance. I think that there is still just a disconnect between members of the community as to what falls into what category.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think part of the difficulty of the problem is that even the nomenclature, the definition of the words in the statement, are not something that people would generally agree on across the board. There is a belief among many people in the GNSO for instance, that you can have policy development without a PDP.

Certain aspects of policy development require a PDP, but there are other ways of addressing things that don't happen to meet that particular mold. So when you have differences of an interpretation of the meetings in that one sentence in the recommendation, I think it illustrates some of the difficulties that come into closure on it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Carlos?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Yes. I think it is a very, very important point and similar to the find differentiation that Olivier did on the difference between the transparency of the process, the privacy of the deliberations in the noncom. I think this is a crucial point because some policies might result in actions for the Board, other policies might result in actions for the staff, and some other policies might imply reaction by other agents down the food chain.

And the accountability for these different levels is absolutely and totally different, and has to be differentiated. So I think we have… Also yesterday, said if we want to become very international, we have to be very careful with this semantics. It's not enough just to translate, we have to be particularly careful with the semantics and the [Berkman 0:56:00] report did a very good work in the semantics of accountability and transparency and governance.

And I think this differentiation between policy and implementation requires a careful semantic analysis of policy and implementation. And requires a tremendous amount of work and discussion because it

impacts on the way that we're going to measure, or hold different agents, accountable. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Fahdi].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. More candor. This is an area where we're not doing well. It's an area, in my opinion, that we can dance around the words, we can publish papers, we can do… It's not working. We do have a real break down in terms of what is policy, what is implementation, and what is in between.

Because we keep going to the GNSO for policy advice, and Jonathon Robertson has all but made me swear that I won't do that anymore. He says, "We don't understand. What is policy advice? What is coming to us with the policy advice? We're not set up for that. We make policy. We don't give advice."

So he's very confused, and frankly his counsel was not happy with us continuing to go back to them with the advice request. So the continuum between the PDP and implementation is not clear. I'll be frank. [Marika 0:57:32] of the GNSO team made the best effort in her paper to start creating lost understanding of that, but we're not there and of course people use it.

I'll give you a simple example. The only policy that is written about protecting IP rights, with the new [detailed D 0:57:49] program, simply directs me to do my upmost to protect people's IP rights. That's where

it stops. It doesn't go more than that. There is nothing in the policy that describes the Trademark Clearing House. Nothing.

It's not even mentioned in the policy. Now when I go to implement the Trademark Clearing House, people think that details on how I implement it are now policy. Who is right? Who is wrong? I don't know. This is a debate, it's open, it's discussion, people are I think making very good arguments either way.

But there is… I have no precedent to lean on. I find myself a little bit, kind of, I don't know where to be. The TMCH is not part of any policy. The TMCH was an implementation that the staff came up with, to implement a policy that says, "We must do our best to protect the IP rights of people."

Now the details of how to do it, suddenly, have to be policy. This, I think this continuum is not clear, and so long as it remains gray, it will create a lot of angst in our community, not just semantic vagueness, but also practical vagueness that causes people to not feel good.

And of course, if somebody doesn't like something, then it must be policy because they know it will take a year and a half to get done. And if they love it, then it's implementation. I mean, all I need to do is again point to some elements of the Trademark Clearing House now were you have one community saying that all implementation, and another side of the community saying that it's all policy, and nothing in between.

So anyway.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for that. I'm hearing… Larry go ahead. Okay. So I'm hearing a couple of common themes through all of the remarks. One which is, it's a definition challenge, what do these respective words mean? And we need agreement. So focusing on agreement, can you articulate for me exactly where and with whom that agreement has to take place? Because that's the first step of getting this done.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Frankly this is not mine. I cannot agree with staff. This is not the Board's business, it's a whole community effort. The community has to come to some understanding of when policy is set, when is it set, what is something in between, is there a fast track policy process we need to create. Because the reason we go for advice is because we can't wait a year and a half.

So we need something to happen quickly so we call it policy advice, and then the Board makes a decision, then they get upset. So we really need to get the whole community around a process to define this continuum between a proper PDP and an implementation decision. And that, in my opinion, all of what this paper did is just start the dialogue.

But there isn't a plan that is in place today to get us from where we are to clarity. It's not there yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Larry?

UNIDENTIFED FEMALE: Can I just quickly note, I'm sorry. There is a public comment forum that is open right now on policy versus implementation. There is also going to be a session in Beijing on this matter as well. So it is an active and ongoing conversation with the community.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right. I'll just, okay [laughter]. Anybody else? Okay. Amy? Thanks.

AMY: So the next three ATRT recommendations relate to number seven, eight, and 19, which really talks about the posting and publishing of Board materials and rationales. A lot of these were, in fact, put in place even before the ATRT recommendations were finalized.

These suggestions have, I think, been extremely beneficial and adding not only posting of the materials that the Board receives from the staff, which are now posted with every – once minutes are approved from each meeting, the materials are posted as well. There is a rationale now posted with every Board decision and their posted at the time of the resolutions being posted, which is basically two days after each Board meeting.

The adopted resolutions are posted with rationale. The rationales, I will say, take different lengths and in depth natures depending on the topic area. Some rationales area very simple short paragraph, some are very lengthy. I think with respect to many of the new GTLD topics, there was over 150 pages of rationale posted that identify all of the material that went into the decision making process, and the reasons why the Board took the decision that it did take.

In terms of recommendation number 19, the translated board resolutions and minutes are now posted within 21 days of them actually being posted in English. So this is a standard operating procedure now, and it is being done as the ATRT had recommended that it be done. Heather?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Heather.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. I'm wondering about where there is a timing established as a standard operating procedure for the Board to receive the materials before a meeting. It's related to this, but not exactly covered here.

AMY: Right now our standard practice is that the Board receive the materials one week before the Board meeting. Is that responsive to your question?

HEATHER DRYDEN: That answers my question. And so then, I guess to be consistent with some of the other comments you've heard, it would be useful, I think, to see whether that rule or guideline is actually followed. Just is that actually what happens, in fact. Just like the implementation of other items that we've discussed today.

AMY: Sure, as a metric in terms of reporting, absolutely. We can do that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [INAUDIBLE 1:04:39]   Having the Board members receive the items a week in advance is a piece of the larger puzzle which is all aimed at, are the Board members well prepared?   And are they making informed decisions? And so forth.

So you're looking at it from the slightly broader picture. You have to look at what the workload is on the Board members, whether they attend to the issues, whether they – we get the issues settled before things actually come to a vote. Are there other processes that ought to be in place such as informational calls and so forth, to work through that process.

So that's, from my point of view, an important but just a piece of the overall puzzle as to whether or not the system actually works properly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes [Fadhi].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So just to put this to bed as we go, I'm going to ask staff to develop for each of the recommendations, including these ones, the past one, an actual set of metrics. So we're going to do that. So as we go, just like Heather did, if something pops in your mind as a good metric, please tell us, and I'm asking Denise to record these.

And I'm hoping to get back to you as soon as we can with a scorecard for each of the recommendations from the first review, and hopefully

with the new ones, we'll do the same thing. So this way we can put this to bed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Very good. Very welcome. Thank you [Fadhi], we'll take you up on that offer. Carlos. Oh, sorry. Larry – Carlos then Larry.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Just from the rationales, are they being drafted by one person or revised by one person? So they are all in the same style independently of the length.

AMY: No. There were some templates provided in terms of what should or should not be in a rationale, depending on whether it's a short, medium, or long rationale statement, depending on the topic. And the… They are presented with the Board materials to the Board for review, and revision, and evaluation as they are, as draft resolutions are presented and other materials.

So the Board reviews all of them before they are posted and approved. They are approved with the rationale – with the resolutions themselves.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Larry.

EN

LARRY: On the question of metrics, and I know that I don't even need to say this to you [Fadhi] because I think you would do it anyway, but obviously with the ones that we're talking about, there is some very clear, quantitative metrics can do. But I hope you challenge your team, and I'm sure you will, to be thinking about the qualitative aspects of this as well.

For example, I think everyone around the table agrees that ICANN is a better organization by the discipline of publishing the rationales of its decisions. But I would still be interested in knowing, has it made any difference to anybody? I mean, are you getting feedback from people? What has… What changes and behavior has it led to, now that you're explaining and releasing this information?

I think for transparency purposes, it's an imperative. It has to be done anyway. But still, it would be interesting to know how people have reacted to this, and what other positive changes it might have elicited in the organization?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. Lise then Jørgen.

LISE FUHR: I just want to ask if the rationales are linked to the public comments? And if they are, do they link to all of the comments? Or are some picked out? And if they're picked out, who does it?

AMY: So in terms of the actually physical linking, they aren't necessarily. But to the extent that there is a topic that the Board is discussing and does make a resolution on, that had public comment, they are addressed in the rationales.

But there isn't a specific link, which is something that we could certainly do that you can get to the public comment from the rationale that is discussing.

UNIDENTIFED MALE: Or vice versa.

AMY: Or vice versa.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. Jørgen.

JØRGEN ANDERSEN: Yes. Well it was more or less the same as Lise has asked because she had asked the question yesterday, and I found it, it was a very good question. I think that talking out of national experience about how you carry out these consultations and make the final decisions, it is extremely important that you reflect all of the comments received and you, in the response, in the decision, you explicitly address each of the comments received before you give the rationales toward the final decision.

So you understand what I mean?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

JØRGEN ANDERSEN: So what I wanted to hear is your confirmation is that this is the way you're doing things. If the answer is no, I would urge you to maybe adjust your practice in that direction. Thank you.

AMY: Definitely the rationales do express a view of the public comment. The process that is in place right now is, there is a public comment, once the public comment closes, there is a summary and analysis of that public comment that is posted separate and apart from any decision that the Board might make.

So that is separately posted. And then when the Board makes its decision on a particular topic, it is provided with the full public, with the public comment as well as the summary and analysis. And if there are decisions that are made as a result of the public comment, it is reflected not item by item specifically, because sometimes the comments might be just too numerous in order to do that.

But it is reflected in concept as to whether or not public comment affected the Board's decision in a particular area.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The analysis that Amy mentioned, actually if you look for example on the recent analysis, I don't know if you published it yet, but the one for

the TMCH. I don't know if it is out yet, but it will be out any minute now.

I reviewed it yesterday, go comment by comment. So and so said this. So and so said that. This is what our analysis of this or that. So the analysis actually addresses every comment we get. But then when we get to the point where the Board is making decision, sometimes there are hundreds of these.

So to re-do that and the rationale, would make the rationale immense. But then we bring up the key things that came up in the analysis. I don't know if this is adequate or if you have ideas on how to improve…

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Let me provide a little context, [Fadhi] particularly for you as you start thinking about the qualitative metrics here. The discussion ATRT 1 on this particular issue, to my recollection, focused on the following: there were two issues, whether they were real problems or perceptions that we were focused on.

There was one that we called the black box. That input goes into the Board, but it's a black box, and out comes a decision and often community members are complaining that they don't know what happened inside the black box.

The other one was the simple notion of, has my voice been heard? And this one was directly to the construction of a Board decision should reflect specific sentiments that were expressed by the community in the process. And what we put on the wall, in Boston, was – by way of example.

We walked through it with Peter who should us some of the other decisions that had been made by the Board, was a Federal Communications Commission decision. By way of example, where that agency would present an issue that it was deciding, one way or the other, and then in the rationale of its decision, quote AT&T's position on this was quote, we agree.

Here's why we agree. Verizon's position of this was Y. We disagree. Here's why we disagree. That was the example that we used. And that's some of the context underneath this recommendation because if it's done that way, the community members who have put input into the box, even those who have lost, know that their voice has been heard.

So just to give you some context and background, this was what the review team was trying to get at, in that way.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We don't do that today. We don't do that today.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Please. Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just to follow on what Larry has questioned. I suppose it would be very good to have some kind of closed group to see what is the reaction of the community to the changes that ICANN is doing all of this time. And there are some methods, actually, the big data so we can in some way

measure the impact on the whole environment of what are you are doing right now in the social networking.

And so it will be good to have this kind of [read on 1:14:01], because it is of course a lot of changes we are going through. But it is not easy to measure what the consequence of this in the community, of the image of this institution in the community.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank you. Amy.

AMY: Recommendation 20 from ATRT 1, does actually provide a bit of, in terms of is my voice being heard aspect, in that this actually asks to ensure and certify that the input into the policy making process, were considered by the Board. In fact, the ATRT 1 suggested a checklist. And a checklist has been developed, and is now in use.

So the first PDP that came through where the checklist was put into place with respect to the IRTP recommendation. And that checklist follows that policy from beginning to end, all the way through to Board decision. So it's now in place and it has been vetted, and there is some slight modifications depending on the sponsoring organizations from which a policy may come.

But… And sense there is a template that is now being utilized in the policy making process, and it was vetted and approved through the GNSO as well as the other assets.

Recommendations 23, 25, and 26 relate to the accountability mechanism in terms of taking a look at and putting together an expert panel to make some recommendations on how those accountability mechanisms could be reviewed and improved, to clarify some the standards and the scope of particularly the reconsideration process.

As well as to standardized some of the timelines and the formats for the reconsideration requests and the rationales that are issued with those decisions.   In terms of the expert panel, you see ASEP, which is the Accountability Structures Expert Panel, so that's our – one of the newer acronyms of our world, anachronism too.

So the ASEP was formed.   It was…   The members were identified through various different mechanisms to reach out and receive recommendations for the individuals.   We had three members.   One, [Gram McDonalds 1:16:52] from, former justice of the Supreme Court in Australia.

We have Mervin King who was a, a widely, globally, respected and former judge and governance expert.   And then also Rich [Maranne 1:17:06] who is a governance expert here from the United States. Mervin King is from South Africa.

They made some recommendations, held a public comment process, provided an opportunity for public discussion both at a session in – I believe it was Toronto.   And they also had meetings with various community members, individual one on one meetings, and meetings with the BGC also at that time.

The recommendations were put to the Board after the public comment were made, and the Board approved them in December. The Board did not make them effective, because there was one major issue with respect to the independent review process that we needed to ensure that we could implement as it was recommended.

Which was to actually have for the independent review a standing panel, which is not something that is in place today. And to make sure that we can obtain the right levels of expertise throughout a six or nine member panel that would be in place. So whenever an independent review process is initiated, that there would be an opportunity to select form those folks.

So that there would be some consistency of experience and expertise on the panel, rather than each time and independent review process is initiated, going out and just getting individual one off panel members. As I think most people know, we've only had two independent review processes initiated, both on the same topic, which was triple X.

But there have not been any others, but with the new GTLZ program coming up, we just don't know how many we might see. So we think it's important to make sure that the implementation is put in place. And expect that those changes would be made effective very soon.

In terms of the reconsideration scope, the recommendation was that we span the scope to a certain degree, and the standards have been clarified and the bylaws, in fact, were put up for public comment and revised to reflect some of the recommendations.

There have… Since this recommendation was in place, a timeline was posted, the format, a form reconsideration request form was put in place, and so those are already in effect. The rationale for decisions have been in place for a long, long period of time, we've just made them a little bit more uniform in terms of what the BGC does, because the reconsiderations are in fact heard by the BGC first.

And then they… The BGC issues a quite lengthy recommendation to the Board, and then it goes to Board for the Board approval. And those are all posted. We have both an independent review process page, as well as a reconsideration page. [Coughs] Excuse me.

If you go to the next slide, and I believe this is the final one, which is ATRT recommendation number 24, relating to the ombudsman and the asking that the ombudsman assess the operations and the relationship that it has with the Board. And to, if needed, bring it to compliance, its operation with internationally recognized standards.

At the time the recommendation went into place, we were having a transition period with our ombudsman, so the ombudsman had only really been in place for a short period of time. There was this analysis done however, and at that time there was some more formal reporting structures put in place between the ombudsman and the Board.

Because, as I think everyone knows, the ombudsman reports to the Board, and to the full Board. Not just to a particular member of the Board, or a particular committee of the Board. But in order to ensure that there was regular communications and regular inputs from Board members to the ombudsman, there is now two different committees that meets with the ombudsman regularly, which is the Compensation

Committee, of course to evaluate and ensure that the ombudsman is satisfying its goals.

His or her goals, I should say. And the Executive Committee, which is the – made up of – in terms of the Chairman of the Board, the CEO, and the Vice Chairman of the Board. And then, at present, there is one At-Large member that was selected also by, I believe, the committee themselves or the Chairman of the Board, selected that At-Large.

But these are not people that are on that, the Executive Committee. They are positions. So whoever is in that position is a member of the Executive Committee.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Question, does the new ombudsman have any particular reaction to the recommendation?

AMY: Actually the new ombudsman was very pleased to have a formal reporting structure, and recognizes that he feels that [AUDIO BLANK SPACE 1:22:30 – 1:22:40] … at every public meeting, when the ombudsman is in face to face meetings with them.

The ombudsman typically also comes to the Board workshops, at least the ones that are held in Los Angeles. And they have face to face meetings during those as well. And then throughout the year, any online communication with whoever the ombudsman believes is appropriate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. And again, this is a ripe area again for scorecards and follow up, and we get this from him. But you have no visibility to them. We should make that visibility to you so that it's clear what he's doing, how many cases he is resolving. Things… Just to give you some metrics about his work.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. And that wraps up the presentation?

AMY: It does.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are there any other questions? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Brian. I'm sorry, I might have dozed off for a second. I missed out one word in your mentioning of an At-Large member in the Executive team. Could you…

AMY: No, not the At-Large, At-Large. At-Large in the broader sense of that it's not a specified member of the Board or the CEO that would be on the Executive Committee, it's just another member of the Board who would be the At-Large in the other sense of the word. So I won't use that term….

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well I'm reassured that I did not doze off, thank you.

AMY: So it's just another member of the Board that's not specifically
                                        designated.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Until compelled to [INAUDIBLE 1:24:14]. So the Executive Committee is
                                        just a small subset of the Board. Consists of myself as Chair, a Vice
                                        Chair, [body 1:24:23], a CEO, and one other member. It has the power
                                        to act in lieu of the Board when necessary. We use that to the absolute
                                        minimum possible.

                                        The biggest thing that we've done regularly is approve internal travel
                                        expenses for people, which is a dumb thing and we need to regulate
                                        that in some other way. And then it has now taken on this small task of
                                        listening to the ombudsman in addition to the Compensation
                                        Committee listening to the ombudsman.

                                        But other than that, it's primarily a stand-by operation. In years past,
                                        different chairs used the Executive Committee to a large extent. We've
                                        tailed that off to have it be dormant, and just a stand-by when
                                        necessary, and there really have not been any emergencies where
                                        we've had to act so fast that we couldn't follow normal processes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Any other questions from the review team? Yes Jørgen,
                                        sorry.

EN

JØRGEN ANDERSEN: Thank you Brian.   Just a quick question, or two questions actually. You're talking about a formal reporting structure, is that just between Board and ombudsman?   How about…   Is there any annual reports which is published?   Which is accessible to everybody?   That was my first question.

AMY: Yes there is.

JØRGEN ANDERSEN: And you have already answered, yes.   The second question, compliant with its nationally recognized standards, what are these standards?

AMY: So there are recognized standards for ombudsmen.   And in fact, there are a variety of different standards.   Steve…

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah.   Fair question.   Don't have the answer on the spot.   So it's obviously a small to-do item.   We'll provide a copy of the most recent report to the community.   And hopefully, I hope, in there is a citation of what the standards are that we've used, and if there isn't we'll deal with that as well.   So a fair point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a specific reason for asking the question about ombudsman, we know that the term ombudsman comes from Denmark.   Denmark was

the first place in the world where you had an ombudsman. [CROSSTALK 1:25:39]

No, no, no, no. [LAUGHTER AND TALKING] They are far behind, as always. [CROSSTALK 1:26:46] No problem. [LAUGHTER] [AUDIO BLANK SPACE 1:26:51 – 1:26:54]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Any other questions for Amy or staff? Amy, thank you very, very much. Appreciate your time. So Denise, let's just keep rolling. If Patrick wants to go now, that's fine by us.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, actually next is the rest of the ATRT recommendations. We have the GAC, operations engagements interaction with the Board, that set of ATRT recommendations, followed by public interest, followed by….

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I got to know if Patrick wanted to start at noon.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's your show, I'm just trying to accommodate you.

DENISE MICHEL:	Well actually, it's your show. So we can either reschedule Patrick, or you can stop going through the ATRT and jump to the security review. What would be most useful?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	I think the continuity of sticking with ATRT 1 would make sense, unless anyone…
DENISE MICHEL:	And so we'll send you a copy of Patrick's slide, and we'll follow up on information of implementation of that. We can schedule another call if you like.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Absolutely, sure. Okay. Olivier?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you for your interest, sorry for being a nuisance but in order to fix the problem with the word ombudsmen, just checking, it is a Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian term. So it is actually all of those [laughter]. However, however, however, in order to settle the score in fact, the ombudsman was actually already used in the Qin Dynasty in China in 221 BC. So [laughter and applause].
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	That's just the prototype. It says in the third paragraph down there [laughter], modern term began in Sweden [laughter]. [AUDIO BLANK SPACE 1:28:31 – 1:28:32]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's enough of that. [Background talking 1:28:34] That's enough of that. Denise, it's your mic.

DENISE MICHEL: So Charlotte is having a little issue with the slide deck, but I think we can start with the GAC presentation with Heather and then Jamie.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. So I'm just going to give just a very brief introduction to explain the approach that we undertook to looking at the role of the GAC, and in particular its relations with the Board. So it wouldn't entirely suit the GAC to have others reviewing it, and that being the limit of the approach to looking at the role of the GAC.

So it was always viewed as something where GAC members and the GAC would be very much a part of reviewing itself, and working with others, like I mentioned, the Board in order to look at the role and what kinds of improvements or issues were really key from the perspective of governance.

So this explains why that… In terms of implementation, a particular role was giving to a joint working group of the Board and the GAC to really oversee the implementation of the recommendations. So it's a formulation that's perhaps a bit different than what we have seen with other recommendations put forward by the Accountability and Transparency Review team.

So we have a few slides that Jamie has kindly put together, and will take us through. We have consulted with the co-chairs of the joint working group that I described, [ma-nal as-file 1:30:47] from Egypt in the GAC, and Bill Gram from the Board are co-chairing that effort, in order to continue the implementation process.

So not everything was something that we could quickly determine was fully implemented and move on from. But they are perhaps substantially implemented. So that work is very much ongoing. So they have a role still to play in what you're going to see today, particularly in relation to a couple of the recommendations.

But at this point, I'll turn over to Jamie if you could take us through and then we can discuss.

JAMIE [no last name given]:   Thank you Heather. If you can go to the next slide please. I will just walk through each of the six recommendations and the implementation of them, some of them, as Heather mentioned, remain works that are ongoing. The first recommendation addresses, what is – asking for clarification of what is GAC advice that triggers bylaw requirements for Board consideration and, in some instances, Board and GAC consultation.

This is a foundational recommendation for the subsequent work on the following recommendations. And as such, it was one of the first recommendations to be implemented. The Board and GAC working group, the BGRI working group agreed to a clarification of what is GAC advice. It was posted publically at that link.

EN

It was also incorporated into the GAC's operating principles. And it is embedded into standard operating process because it's – GAC advice is a precedent for, clarification especially for the other GAC related recommendations. Next slide please.

Okay. So recommendation 10, the ATRT report recognized some gaps in the tracking of the provision of GAC advice and methods for the Board to request GAC advice. It calls for a timely provision and consideration of GAC advice.

Two main things have, sorry. It requires two main things. One is developing a process for the Board, notifying the GAC and requesting GAC advice in writing. And secondly, developing an online tool for tracking advice from the GAC for Board consideration and response.

A number of implementation steps have been taken for starters, and Heather please chime in if I misstate anything. But the GAC developing new communique format, which sets out much more clearly the GAC's advice, or requests, or notifications to the Board. So if you look at the most recent GAC communiques there is a format that they followed, I think it starts initially with a report on the meeting, and GAC's work at the meeting, and then followed by GAC advice to the board.

The biggest implementation step was the development of an online registry, and there is a link for that, a GAC advice register. And if you go to that link, you will see various representations of advice provided from the GAC to the Board, whether and when the Board responded, how it responded, and it follows that process through to either implementation of GAC advice or disagreement with GAC advice and the subsequent required consultations.

It also allows for the GAC to request information from the Board. So not actually just giving advice but requesting information, background documents. And it also tracks board requests for advice or guidance form the GAC, and that's also been used recently.

So this… I think it's fair to say that this recommendation is fully implemented. The GAC advice register is, it's an iterative document, it's something that, it is live and being used but will be continuously improved. There is also a manual that sets out both the timelines and where things are supposed to go.

And it's also, this recommendation has been fully implemented by the new format for the GAC communique. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So the first thing though, the formal documented process by which the Board notifies the GAC matters, where is that?

JAMIE: So that's another thing where… That is another thing that goes into the GAC advice register. A lot of that goes more to 12 and 13, which is GAC early engagement. But the… If the Board notifies… If and when the Board notifies the GAC of something that's coming up, it would be tracked in the online register.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. But my understanding, the first thing is the Board needed a process by which it would determine when, if and when it would seek

advice.   So is there a statement of that that is now out there somewhere?

JAMIE: I don't know that there is a statement. I mean, the SOP is that the Board would formally communicate to the GAC that there, there notification there is an ongoing matter of policy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. But when do they… How do they know when to do that? What's the process by which they decide to do that? Which, I think, is what the first part of their recommendation was aiming at. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: We know when to do that [laughter]. So I understand your point. I'm not aware that we have a checkpoint, sort of a standard criteria that we would say, whenever we discuss this or whenever we fall into the following area we have to go and get advice from the GAC.

So that probably doesn't fit… I mean we're probably aren't at the state that you're suggesting. In practice, whenever we are talking about things that effect governance or so forth, we typically will have that discussion.

I don't know enough work examples, so that's probably worth looking at to see for the flow of things to come, which things did go, could of gone, should have gone. Heather, do you have perspective on this? I mean in principle, and Heather has caught me off her position of having to be in two places at once frequently with being both on the Board and chairing

the GAC. But in principle, her presence is supposed to be helpful in identifying and bridging that gap. Over to you Heather.

HEATHER DRYDEN: [Laughter] Well, I would agree that the liaison role can assist in flagging a perspective and identifying where there is a need or likely an interest from governments to be providing inputs. But really, that's not the equivalent of having a procedure in place and understanding around that procedure that would really facilitate that happening. And I don't think it's good practice to place the onerous, if in fact that is what's happening on the liaison position.

And I think there has been a tendency to be overly focused on that. So, in other words, is Heather on the phone call? Oh fine then we don't need to worry about a GAC perspective. You know, I don't think that's particularly good practice.

So from my perspective, having procedures would really reinforce that function that's served by the liaison.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe this was not as fully implemented as we thought. But let me ask this, because obviously this was in response to an issue that was identified three years ago, which was largely wrapped in recommendation nine as well which was this lack of clarity as to what was advice was. Do you think this is still a continuing issue that this team ought to be concerned about?

Or has by resolving the issue of what advice is, is this issue of when the Board actually asks you for advice a continuing issue? Or is it basically gone into the background because the Board and the GAC fixed the primary issue which was defining what advice was?

HEATHER DRYDEN: I don't have a definitive answer on that because we're still implementing the register. And I think by that process we're drawing out the issues that you're referring to, about whether there is really a need, as outlined in the bylaws, for the Board to be saying to the GAC, "Please advise on this."

I don't have specific examples of them doing that.   Did someone mention that they had in mind one… Of where the Board has explicitly gone to the GAC to say, "It would be likely of interest to you or beneficial for you to advise us on this." [INAUDIBLE 1:42:20]

STEVE CROCKER: I think that there is certain examples and GAC coordination on ongoing policy issues. So within the new GGTLZ program protections for certain names, Red Cross, IOC, as well as [IG-o-n-ing 1:42:40] and that's…

It seems to me…   And that's an example of the Board and the GAC working together, the Board advising the GAC of what the Board is hearing, what letter's it's getting.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. So my understanding is that that is a different issue from how the GAC initiates advising on a particular issue, how it identifies those issues. And that's a particular function.

To come back to the point about either the Chair of the GAC or that liaison function to the Board, it's not enough, in my view, to leave it to them to be tracking and identifying those issues.

So I think it's worth looking at. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MAN: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Brian, it's Oliver here. I've been looking at the GAC just advice, and I just wondered how mature was this so far? Is that ready? Is it still under testing? Because I must say, I just had looked at it and I'm a bit confused because there is very little response from any of your requests from the Board, or maybe that is the actual situation.

But looking at the tracking of each one of what is on there, there is a lot of blank spaces and very… I mean, it just brought more questions to my mind here.

HEATHER DRYDEN: So in terms of implementation, what we're doing is we're populating the register with the advice that we provide to the Board, and what we can identify as a response to that advice. So that's all being put in.

And the GAC has the responsibility of inputting that data. In terms of the process, the administration of it, then you have various points where information is sent to the GAC and the GAC is asked to confirm, is this your understanding of what our advice is?

Does it represent [AUDIO BLANK SPOT 1:45:01 – 1:47:08]

[Computer voice: Joined]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: …pause and get this straight back up. Heather please.

HEATHER DRYDEN: I think that's an interesting idea to increase the automation of it. So yeah, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I've got Al and then Avri in the queue.

ALAN GREENSBERG: This may just indicate my state of mind right now, but I know that recommendation talks about the Board asking for advice. It doesn't say that the GAC has to respond. [Laughs]

HEATHER DRYDEN: I don't have the bylaws language off hand, but that might help us work out what was the related information to that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I've got Avri and then Fiona.

AVRI DORIA: I just had one quick question, and it was a phrase you used it was what you could identify as a response. And I was wondering, does that mean that you get responses, or you get things back and you're not really sure when you've been responded to and when you haven't?

Because it was just things that I can identify as a response, so it struck me as sort of ambiguous.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Yes. If you imagine, for example, that the response comes in the form of a letter, if someone is going through that to say, "Okay that's a response to this issue. That's a response to that issue." And putting that into the register.

And so then, the next step would be the GAC saying, or perhaps the board saying it at the appropriate moment, "Yes we agree that those are the right contents, or the right places that you've put them in the register." And so it's to get around… There is a step in there, and need to get confirmed at each stage, that there is agreement that yes, that was the advice that was the response and so on. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Fiona.

FIONA ASONGA: Mine is an observation. I just visited the link provided, and I realize you can't get any information, and I'm just wondering the interest of transparency, is it possible for us to know what like there is there a link we are [INAUDIBLE 1:49:35] I can board regarding early warning and GAC advice?

As a member of the community, I'd be curious to know what the GAC feels about some of the issues that the community is handling. Can that be made public? Because I realize the login and therefore you can't get anything.

HEATHER DRYDEN: The register is public, it has been public. If there is a problem with the link, then we need to correct that. But that the register is certainly intended to be public.

FIONA ASONGA: I'm on right now, and it's not… There is a login, there is a login that, you need to go public access. [Laughs]

HEATHER DRYDEN: Yes…

FIONA ASONGA: I don't have your…

HEATHER DRYDEN:	I repeat, it's a public register, it's meant to be a public register, and if there is a problem with the [AUDIO BLANK SPOT 1:50:27 – 1:50:31]

Well, the links keep breaking on the GAC website. That's the fact. And so we're having a real challenge keeping up with the links, links continuingly breaking. So yeah, thank you. [AUDIO BLANK SPOT 1:50:46 – 1:50:51] |
| UNIDENTIFIED MALE: | Okay. Any other questions? Okay. Jamie, was it you? |
| JAMIE: | Thanks. Okay. So moving to the next slide. Recommendation 11, this ties to recommendations nine and 10, and deals with two issues. One is the Board and GAC working together to have the GAC advice provided and considered on a more timely basis.

And establishment of a formal documented process by which the Board responds to GAC advice. On the first one, the GAC advice register is a key enabler.   The draft manual that Heather mentioned lays out timeline for every step along the way, so the – going from the issuance of the GAC communique to Board acknowledgement, Board response, through implementation and lots of iterate steps along the way in which Board and GAC communicate and provide opportunities for additional inputs.

The other… On the second issue, the formal documented process by which the Board responds to GAC advice, there is, the Board GAC |

EN

recommendation on the implementation working group has a draft paper before it, laying out this formal process in six steps.

And also laying out timelines for each step along the way, and dealing it directly with the issue of what happens when the Board may disagree with GAC advice. And how the consultation takes place, the timeframe for the consultation, and as well as….

Right now, the default is there would be a six month consultation period, it could be… Either party could ask to extend it. The other part that's in there is, that in the event that the Board decides it is not going to implement the GAC advice and do something with which the GAC disagrees, that it only do so after a two-thirds vote of the Board or whatever section of the Board is responsible for that matter.

And that would require a bylaw change. This paper is going to be discussed further and likely finalized in Beijing, which will trigger subsequent action.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Before we go to questions, just a housekeeping matter on the agenda. We need to get some other work done today, we've been talking about what we have to do for the rest of the day, and we obviously want to maximize the inputs from ICANN staff. It's critically important to do today.

In talking with Denise, I would suggest at this time that we… If everyone is willing to take a working lunch at the table? So that staff could continue to make presentations to us, we will continue the staff presentations until about 2:15, at which point we will have to turn our

attention to the balance of the work that we have to produce before we leave today.

So is everybody comfortable with taking that approach to the balance of our time today? [Laughter] Working lunch? [Laughter] If there is no objections, I'd say why don't we take a pause right now and grab something to eat, bring it back to the table. With the GAC stuff? Okay.

Are we close? Okay. Terrific. Great. Okay. Let's finish the GAC stuff and then we'll break, come back for a working lunch.

JAMIE: Next slide please, sorry. So recommendations 12 and 13 address GAC early engagement in the policy development process. And it really deals with improving GAC opportunities to engage earlier. And a prerequisite for this is, obviously, ensuring that the GAC is fully informed of policy activity within ICANN.

There is a lot of work that's continuing to go on and further consideration by the BGRI working group. As we mentioned earlier, this is deceivingly complex set of issues that they need to be dealt with to implement the recommendation.

The implementation tasks that have been implemented so far, include increased face to face for GAC meetings at ICANN meetings, and discussion of policy issues at each ICANN meeting. The GAC website has been redesigned, and is continuously being improved. And the advice registry has been launched.

And then there is also increased staff coordination and support for GAC processes and involvement within ICANN. Next slide please. As part of the continuous work, there was a pilot project that was launched back in November 2012 after consultations among the policy staff and working group at the Toronto meeting.

A lot of it is aimed at making sure the GAC is informed of policy activity within ICANN, and thereby enabling, ideally, the GAC to engage. It is… The policy support teams, the David Hollis team, produces a monthly report on all of the policy activity within ICANN that is posted to the GAC website.

There is a director from David's shop who is dedicated to managing this process. And then in Beijing, there will be an assessment by the Board, GAC group, BGRI working group of this pilot. We'll discuss possible improvements and other ideas for GAC early engagement.

The sense is that this is a time for experimentation to see… Because challenges there have been in the past where GAC, for the GAC engaging earlier in the process and how it works. It works with some of the other SOs. So.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Please do, yes. I apologize, he left me with the mic, so thank you. Please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, Jamie or Heather, help me understand.   With this earlier notification, is the idea that this invites individual GA members to

participate? Or is the idea that the GAC will do something more formal to have a GAC representative engage in these processes? Or is that still to be worked out?

HEATHER DRYDEN: It's still to be worked out. I think what's being reported on here is really a first step as a pilot. So the working group that's overseeing this, is very much alive, that's the Board GAC working group. And so I think this is one of the ways that have been identified as a potential solution to get us around the challenge of engaging particularly in the GNSO, where they have lots of working groups and so on.

And then to try to align the GAC's working methods with the GNSO's working methods. So it's ongoing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Any other questions or comments at this point? No? In which case, then perhaps… Oh. You have one more slide, okay I thought you had stopped. I'm sorry.

JAMIE: So the last recommendation is 14, and it looks at enhancing participation within the GAC, particularly from countries, governments from the developing world. And creating a process around engaging senior government officials on issues that intersect ICANN and public policy.

In terms of implementation, a lot was done on this recommendation early on. In the 2012 budget, the travel support for the GAC, which my

understanding it goes to exclusively to developing countries. Is that right?

Which tripled, and so there was a significantly increased funding for interpretation services at the GAC meetings, as well as translation of important documents into the six UN languages as well as Portuguese.

Increased support, staff support, was provided for the GAC Secretariat. And so that was done on the ICANN side. And GAC setup programs to educate new and newer GAC members about ICANN and the role of the GAC in DNS issues. Also there has been, form ICANN there has been increased…

As [Fadhi] has mentioned, much more increased engagement, internationally and particularly in the developing world in raising awareness of ICANN and the role of the GAC within it. And the last one, and Heather can add more on this one, was the pilot high level meeting at the Toronto meeting of senior government officials, that was co-hosted by the government of Canada.

From ICANN Board and from that perspective, it was a highly successful event. That shows up both in the GAC communique that followed as well as the Board resolution as adopted [in the latter meeting 2:02:16].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Any questions or comments? Nope? Thank you, thank you. In which case, I guess we can grab lunch and then I guess come back. And you're actually… You're leaving? So… [Laughter] Sorry to see you go, but thanks for having been here. I'm sure, and online. Okay. Thank you.

[AUDIO BLANK SPOT 2:02:56 – 2:04:10]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Audio test. Audio test.

[AUDIO BLANK SPOT 2:04:13 – 2:24:35]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. In the interest of staff's time, we're opening up the session again. We're going to have a working lunch and continue to hear from staff on implementation measures under ATRT 1. Thank you.

BRIAN PECK: Thank you Bryan. Good afternoon everyone. My name is Brian Peck. I'm Policy Director and work with David Alls in the Policy Shop. On behalf of David, he sends his apologies, he is somewhere over the Atlantic at this time, he wasn't able to be here. So we'll try to cover for him in this particular issue.

I'll be briefly going over the implementation of the recommendations related to public input and multilingual access, multi-language access. In the interest of time, and I think also judging for lack of agreeing form the discussions I've been able to fit in this morning.

First of all, it's pretty straightforward, the implementation of the recommendations related to public input, public comment input, have

EN

indeed all been implemented. They were implemented as of January 1st, 2012.

The specific recommendations, as you can see up on the slide there, deal with incorporating privatization, stratification of public comments forms, creating a distinct comment and reply cycle period, establishing fixed duration timelines to provide adequate opportunity for timely comments and replies, and to introduce forecasts of upcoming public comment topics to facilitate community planning and participation.

The implementation of these recommendations took place over two phases. Mainly the first phase in June through August of 2011, the two key milestones during that period were the redesign of the public comment pages, what site to improve consistency, navigation, ease of use.

The other was the implementation of recommendation 21, which is the upcoming topics complementation process, which is available on the website. The second phase incorporating, basically collecting and incorporating, reviewing public comment forms.

Staff analysis of the comments in terms of how to best implement these recommendations, and then of course getting the approval of both the public participation committee and the Board, which reviewed all recommendations that took place in December 2012. And again, the implementation of the recommendations were in effect as of January 1st, 2012.

Okay. Go ahead. So in terms of public input recommendations, as I said… It seems to me, I think obviously the goal was to improve

participation, effective, ease of use if you will, and efficiency of the public comment process, both in terms of the web page access and actual participation.

I think, as you say, the question is now, how do we measure the success of that? To what extent has it actually generated greater participation? I think overall the response has been positive in terms of improvements both to the website itself and to the process.

There has been some concern expressed over the minimum 21 day period for the public comment as well as the reply period. Some people feel that may be too short, others feel that there hasn't been enough participation yet in the reply period aspect of it.

As a short term answer to that, both staff and the people involved in public comments have been reemphasized that 21 is the minimum required period. It may certainly go beyond, for example, 30 days and have been even encouraged, if indeed you're dealing with a complex issue, that it should be extended beyond the basic 21 minimum required days.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. I'd like to ask a couple of questions.

BRIAN PECK: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: On the reply comment cycle in particular, I've been hearing, we've been hearing that the community perhaps is not availing itself robustly of the reply comments opportunity. They're very specific reasons why the recommendation was made, and it is very specific benefits that this type of comment process provides to ICANN and to the Board ultimately in making these decisions and articulating decisions.

What is your view as to why the community is not availing itself of the reply comment opportunity as robustly as it should?

BRIAN PECK: It's a good question. I mean, I think if we had the answer, we'd be finding ways to try to encourage that. I think part of it is maybe awareness. I think part of it is, I don't want to say fatigue, but I think you should get the public comment process, people are still in kind of that mode of oh they'll respond, they'll see what some of the initial comments are within the regular reply period, and respond within that – and it's not reply period – will reply within the original public comment period as part of their comments.

So I think it's partly just not, maybe lack of awareness or lack of practice if you will, of utilizing that reply period, the distinct period to the original comments that are submitted.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you walk me through how this restructure of the comment, reply comment process was communicated to the community? Particularly the explanations of, what is the nature of the reply? Because I think you

just suggested that some people are waiting to file their comments, the reply comments I call, is something you're observing.

What was the outreach? What was the education? Is there anything more that could be done in that communication front in your opinion?

BRIAN PECK: My understanding, I have to plead a little bit of ignorance here because I wasn't involved in the direct implementation of this, but my understanding was on the website, when they were redesigning the website and the implementation of these procedures in two separate periods, there was some basic explanation on the website itself.

There was some encouragement, there was… At the ICANN meetings that followed the implementation, and even before actual implementation, there were sessions on the public participation process. I believe they were briefing to the various SOs, including some of the advisor committees at the ICANN public meetings.

Again, publicizing what this process would involve. So I think that was the outreach.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: As one of the people, perhaps one of the few people who have actually used it, it works absolutely marvelously if you're an individual talking on

your own behalf, or a small organization where you can get the other in the room and decide what you want to say.

It's almost impossible for an organization within ICANN, one of the constituency stakeholder groups to respond within 21 days, to then respond to a response is a level of both… You know, we don't have time machines and exhaustion.

So for individuals, who – I object, I don't agree, it works fine. Working in the structure, almost impossible to meet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So to summarize what you're saying, 21 day reply comment cycle is not providing sufficient time to construct replies to other comments that have been previously received.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's very difficult, as Brian said, people respond in the…. Have the initial comment during the response period, because that first 21 days is not enough. The second one also is not likely enough, if you have a problem with it, and that of course presumes that you're actually reading them day by day.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Larry than Avri. I've got Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I have a comment, a question. First of all, I've actually… We're finding new ways to work with it. I actually, and this is a strange thing for me to do, saying something supportive. [Laughter]

But I've actually found that we're discovering new ways to use this double comment period. For example, as Alan mentioned, the first period is really enough for an individual to write something and comment. And then the second reply period is enough time for your constituency or stakeholder group to say, "Yup. We endorse that comment." So if you get into different methods and working, the question…

And I think it's going to take a while before we learn how to use these. But the real question that I've got is, often we see that on the last day, or the last day before the last day, I guess that's called the next to last day, all of the sudden the period is lengthened. And I'm wondering what the criteria are for people saying, "We need another two weeks?"

Is it that there has been requests that we haven't seen? Is it that the working group, or whatever it is, is sort of saying, "Please lengthen?" Or is there a staff criteria saying, "Oops, only one comment in three weeks?"

And so I've never quite understood when all of the sudden the announcement comes in. And then the other part of that is I've heard people say, "Please let us know several days in advance." Now one of the things I've always responded is that, "Yeah but then people like me are waiting until the last minute, we'll have another week and a half before my last minute." So maybe that isn't a good idea.

EN

So I'm just wondering what's the thinking that goes into, now it's time to extend?

BRIAN PECK: Thank you Avri. I think… To be honest with you, I think it's kind of a combination of the factors you've mentioned. Sometimes it is in response from a request of the community, that indeed there needs to be more time on a particular issue.

I think other times, it's very important that staff feels it's a very important issue, and they see very little response, they would like to try to encourage or at least provide more opportunity to generate more responses.

So, I mean, you bring up a good point, perhaps there should be published, established criteria of what is used for extension. You bring up one other point though too, and that is one of the criticisms we've received, is that some people, I don't want to say game the system, but if you know indeed that the timing – in order to maybe prevent any sort of replies, they'll wait until the end of the reply period, to that last day or so, and use that as way to get their submission in hoping that it would be closed and then there would be no further response to that.

So that's something else… Even I raise that is because that has been another criticism as well.

AVRI DORIA:	I definitely… I guess I'm wondering whether it's possible when you do an extension, especially of the original comment period, not necessarily the reply, to actually mention the reason for it.

I think the, other than gamers, you have to look at a class of people called procrastinators. |
| UNIDENTIFIED MAN: | Any other questions on this? Yes, Olivier. I'm sorry, Lise first than Olivier. |
| LISE FUHR: | Yeah. I'd like to know, because we've been talking about how the analysis of the comments were made. And I see on the website it says, "Report of public comments." But I never see a link to that, that's my one question.

I can see you put in a report but there is no link for the report. The other one is, is there a limit, a time limit for the ICANN staff to finalize these reports? Do you have like 21 days to do it or is that optional? |

[AUDIO BLANK SPOT 2:36:06 – 2:37:08]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Thank you. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Brian. It's Olivier here. As the chair of a community that has filed 51 comments last year, most of which were in response to public comment period, I would say that public comments are pretty much running part of my life.
	I'm not going to be as nice as most of the other people here, since I have been cursing my computer and cursing the public comments system a number of times, due already to the short amount of time that was given to provide responses.
	But also, because there were a number of things that still don't work in the public comment system, and I think that this committee should be aware of it. The public comment system with having an initial period and a reply period, was started in January 2012. We're now in March 2013.
	In January 2012, we're told that this going to be a test and this was going to be reviewed and there was no length of time by which the review would come, but it was expected that it was going to be one year, and finding out one year on how well it was performing or how bad it was performing.
	The PPC has been following this closely and has held several sessions throughout the year regarding this. Some of the comments which were made here, are actually very much in line with the comments that were made during the PPC. And yet, I haven't seen any follow up on all of the input which was brought in, both with Kurt Fritz running some of the show, but also with some Board members chairing the PPC that run the show.

Some of the things that I had come out, I think in Costa Rica and other ICANN meetings since January 2012, where along the line that, for individual comments this was indeed something that could work. But as far as comments made by SOs, in particular by a [team 0:39:04], those needed more time and therefore could comment outside the public comments system or perhaps submit it in a different time scale than the public comment system.

So they… I'm not going to repeat all of what the reports and the discussions led to, but there certainly is a lot of material for you to work on and for your department to work on. In addition, and I'm going to close because I realize, we've got problems with time.

There is a section which is supposed to be the upcoming public comment period. That's something which is extremely important and that was actually on numerous occasions advertised to the community as a way to make public comments a lot more proactive. And so the communities could be prepared and not suddenly have an avalanche of 20 different public comments happening just before an ICANN meeting which is customary.

Unfortunately, the upcoming hasn't been updated since January, in fact, since December 2012. No, sorry, November 2012 is the last one. I don't know what happened to that, but that must have been a mishap or something. But at the moment, there haven't been any upcoming for quite a while. That's all. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would just like to add one note for myself too before we move on. This particular recommendation, for me, is a very important one as well and it relates back to the conversation we had before the lunch break. Two of the issues that the ATRT 1 focused on was this perception or reality that Board decisions are something of a black box.

That data goes in and we don't know what happens and out comes a decision. And I don't know whether my voice has been heard. It was the black box and my voice had been heard. So whether it's a reality or a perception of a problem, we made this recommendation with that in mind.

And the real function of a reply comment period is that it provides the community to provide a larger basis of argumentation, a more thorough basis of argumentation, in an adversarial type of context. That then provides the Board with a much broader basis of analytical data, upon which it can rest its decision, and articulate its decision by incorporating, specifically argumentation that they accept and reach a conclusion, or reject.

So for me personally, this is a very critical recommendation that benefits the community, and the Board, and the overall process. So a question I would leave you with to think about is, is there more that can be done to educate the communicate very clearly, so that at a minimum they understand the importance of this tool?

And I would leave you with that thought to come back sometime later. Thank you. Any other questions? Yeah David.

DAVID CONRAD:	I'm just curious, what sort of metrics do you collect with regards to the use of the comment, the public comment mechanisms but the initial and also the reply stuff? Do you like keep track of how many people are taking advantage of it? The length of comments? That sort of stuff?
BRIAN PECK:	That's some things I would have to check and see. I'm not directly involved with that. And it goes to what I said earlier, where I could read from the discussions with this group earlier with [Fadhi] especially is that, if there is not we need to create kind of a scorecard as you saying, create metrics to show at least to what extent have these changes effectively increase participation.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. Yeah Carlos.
CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:	I wanted to know, the multilingual access is just limited to this process? Or is… Does it include basic documents of ICANN, or other transcripts, etcetera.
BRIAN PECK:	Okay. Well that's… If there is no more questions in the public info, we'll segue way into… Sure. Okay. Thank you very much. So, in terms of recommendation 18 which is dealing with multilingual access, there are basically of basic, of course, obvious again kind of along the lines of public input process and that is to encourage greater – not only effectiveness of the organization itself, but greater access globally as

well, to reach out to more of the communities around the world that are part of ICANN, and do that through the translation process.

There has been a couple of implementations. The main one, to answer your question is… Is that there was an ICANN languages services policy and procedures document that includes rules and processes for translation, interpretation, scribing, transcription related services.

That basically provides the operating procedures, or the guidelines, what is to be translated. Which would include some of the document that you have mentioned or have asked about. This document, or these procedures have been approved by the Board, it is currently being implemented within staff, and as I say, the scope does include not just, for example, Board decisions, which I think Amy mentioned earlier are now translated within 21 days, but other types of documents and transcripts as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. Great.

BRIAN PECK: That's it. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're all set? Okay.

BRIAN PECK: Thank you very much for your time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks very much for your time. Maggie are you next? Okay great.

[AUDIO BLANK SPOT 2:44:41 – 2:44:59]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Whenever you're ready.

MAGGIE [No last name given]:   Good afternoon everyone. My name is Maggie [Sur-ad 2:45:08], I'm the VP for Contractual Compliance. Thank you for this opportunity to present to you. Looking around, a lot of faces I don't know yet. It's never… [Laugh]

No I'm always careful, Brian knows [laughs]. So April 4th is going to be my two year anniversary with ICANN. What a ride. I come from the automotive industry. What a ride. Amazing. I still love it. it's still amazing. The [house and view 0:2:45:41] was my first exposure when I came to ICANN, and it aligns very much with the efforts that we started working towards when we assessed our current state.

From a contractual compliance perspective, the focus of the [house and view] team, if you are just looking at the numbers from the report itself, we were impacted in the recommendation number one, four and five. Which in the next three slides we hope to address and provide you an update on.

In summary, the focus was about improvement to the enforcement of contractual compliance, and improvement to increase communication. And those, as you know, can range in so many different ways. But in mid-September, let's focus on improvements and enforcement, because enforcement is a critical function that we provide, even though we really focus on prevention up front.

But once there is no collaboration in the informal process, we move to enforcement. So we rolled out comment processes across all contractual appliance. Upon my arrival, and I think you heard [Fadhi] say, one of the things that we experienced here at ICANN when I, that I discovered during the current assessment, we had fragmented tools and ways of collecting complaints and enforcing them.

So we went through a very intense effort to consolidate the tools which we are going to be rolling out shortly. But the other important factor was how do we roll out a consistent process? We left WHOIS inaccuracy for the last. It was one of the most complicated processes to address.

So in mid-September 2012, after rolling out the consistent process across all compliance areas, we took an adventure and stood up the WHOIS inaccuracy reporting process. We did, and that factored sure in the time to resolution, which is very important to the ICANN community.

In the past, WHOIS inaccuracy would be reported, and the process can extend beyond 60 days because there were about five different steps that would be taken. Five days then they follow up, then the 45 day follow up. So we shortened it to align with the process that applies

EN

today to all contracted parties for the [INAUDIBLE 2:48:11] registries across all complaint types.

So the process now starts with, per contract we have to give the contracting party 15 days to pursue and take reasonable steps to investigate and correct. Immediately after those 15 business days, we follow up, if it has not been responded to, and we follow up with fact based decisions.

Not telling you what we think you did or what you're going to do, show me. So the improved process here, improved on the quality, the timing, and the effort.

Another effort we launched this year is the year one audit program. One section of the program focuses on WHOIS inaccuracy reporting. I would like to make the audience, it is not in our contractual scope to validate accuracy. It's for us to follow up with the registrars, they are taking reasonable steps to investigate and correct.

So year one audit focuses on the responses, focuses that there is data there. So it's on the population of the field, and access to the WHOIS data. So from an enforcement perspective, process and systems…

The most critical part, as we all know, we can be doing lots of things but how do you communicate and how do you measure it? I've been listening to this meeting since 8:30. We have defined, and we'll be rolling out, start to gradually roll out some of the metrics. But our objective is to get to a dashboard. We today have over 50 metrics, and we've been reporting at the ICANN meetings.

And the metrics, in order for them to be stood up, we have to have the consolidated tool all stood up together, across all areas to be able to do an apples to apples comparison.

So today we partnered even with the working groups on the consumer trust, and a lot of the metrics we shared with them are already developed here, and we hope to start reporting on them. It's going to be by top-level domain, it's going to be by region, even down to the level of a country and a registrar.

In addition to metrics, which we will publish on our website, we also are going to use those metrics for continuous improvement. Continuous improvement applies outward and inward. We are doing and measuring and will be reporting to the community turnaround time, something as simple as that, to the complexity of the type of issues (inaudible) of issues and across which regions.

So we also improved on our reporting. We published our annual report in February, and also ramped up our monthly updates. I do not want to refer to them as (inaudible). We're updating our website to really refer to them as monthly updates. The idea is to provide on a month-to-month update on the activities without providing the (inaudible) paper. It just gives you an idea of what's going on within compliance.

These updates, and the annual report, are going to be translated. We already started to revamp the website and the web team is helping us set up the code behind it. It's going to be provided in the six UN languages, both the update and the annual report.

The part that will touch each and every one of you, if you've signed onto myICANN, you should in April have access to a first cut of the compliance metrics. Talk about PDP. You guys are having discussions about policy development. A lot of times impact of policy development wants to know statistics and data. We hope to provide that to you without you coming to us.

So we're hoping to do what we call the pull approach versus the push. We provide the data. You can go and have at it. If it's not there, you require different aspects of it, let us know.

You will see what we call an outward facing compliance metrics. We will not share and public the inward facing, because we want to maintain that collaboration and confidentiality as we are working with each and every registrar and registry operator.

So those we have always called report cards that we work directly with the contracted party on and we maintain information. The time we publish is when we issue a breach. That's a commitment that's been publically know. It's in our process and it's published on the website.

In addition to improving on the enforcement, this last slide is really the foundation how we're going to do that. We are rolling out – if you've ever logged a complaint or used InterNIC, it's intimidating and it dates. It's very outdated.

So we're launching an improved and user-friendly navigation system that's aligned with all the improvements to communication. This launch is going to happen within the next few days, and again, it's going to be a

gradual rollout where we'll phase out the old complaint tools and bring them into the new one.

We are also going to be providing on that tool what we refer to ask Frequently Asked Questions and Guidance and that will be delivered in the six UN languages. Filing a complaint will still remain in English for this first launch.

So improved customer service is going to be launched based on current complaints, but we will be adding New gTLD complaints to it and we will be adding additional features that the community shared with us. They want to be able to log multiple complaints and things of that nature.

So we have what we call a laundry list. It's prioritized by the upcoming events. We need to be able to be scalable and ready for all the new things that are happening at ICANN. So establishing the foundation, rolling out New gTLD is our priority. So the improved customer interface, the backend, we'll have what we call the Centralized Complaint Management System. Once that is stood up, which is also going to be over the next few weeks, our objective is to complete rollout and the (inaudible) setting of current tools, a couple of those systems. And we are targeting no later than June 23rd we shut down the old system. Now everything is on one system, one process, one management. Compliance will, at the next ICANN meeting, start providing you metrics and apple to apple measurements and dashboarding.

These are the three slides that relate to the WHOIS Review Team, recommendations as it relates to improving enforcement and communication.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Do we have any questions. Yes, David.

DAVID CONRAD: So the shopping list of features and systems you're developing, is that publically available or is that an internal document?

MAGUY SERAD: It's an internal document. What we've been doing, David, as you know, you get all kinds of requests and coming from a very diverse community, you have to sort through it and prioritize it. But we do, at the public meeting, share what are the next steps we're laying out, which is similar to this.

The details behind the scene will be what type of multiple complaints, how do you categorize it? That's the details that's not available. But this is part of the list that we're rolling out towards.

BRIAN CUTE: Sure, Larry.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: This is a very impressive list that you've presented to us. I wanted to go back to the actual text of the Recommendation 4 that said "ICANN should ensure that its compliance function is managed in accordance with best practice principles," and it goes on. I guess my question is in coming up with these activities, what did you turn to to find best practice principles. Where are the analogs or the guides to how other people have done this that you could rely on or learn from?

MAGUY SERAD: (Charla) is one of the new faces I haven't met yet either. So very valuable question, thank you. I decided on my experience – I am a Master Black belt Six Sigma certified, I come from a compliance experience of over 20 years in different areas, and when we did a current assessment of our existence when I joined in April of 2011, we identified the areas and we put together a three-year plan. I'm not sure

if you've seen any of our compliance presentations – three-year plan that clearly committed to the community to be able to track us. What are we doing?

And all of these recommendations are part of what you call best practices. The only thing that's missing here, Larry, is a dashboard and that's going to come. I want all this stuff as accomplished. Does that answer your question?

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I guess, other than your own experience, is there accepted set of best practice principles in this area? If so, where would one find them if they wanted to match up what you've done here – which again, on the surface to an untrained person like myself looks very impressive, but I was just wondering how we would actually audit it against what the recommendation was.

MAGUY SERAD: Sure. Thank you. Actually, you said (inaudible). I'm going to speak to that, too. For point of reference, as you know ICANN is unique. Point of reference, you (inaudible) our vision – when we established our three-year plan, we also established our vision and our mission and how we're going to accomplish it.

It's to be able to deliver a trusted – to be a trusted compliance service provider. We deliver a very specific service at ICANN for contractual compliance, so transparency, standard operating procedures, communication, consistency, measurement.

You can look on any compliance. We researched across Internet providers, we researched it across different industries, and the words best practices, if you follow up through some of the continuous

improvements, sometimes it's over rated. I'd rather refer to it as good practice, because you want to be able to have opportunity to grow when you have good. So again, standard operating procedures, centralized tools, communications, publishing, metrics, eventually dashboarding.

On the audit, Larry, what I'd like to say is we spoke here of a one-year audit that touches our contracted party. Think of it like spring cleaning. We're doing a baseline. Brian is one of our – I don't want to say victims because we get picked on all the time.

BRIAN CUTE: Participant.

MAGUY SERAD: Because they tell us, the registrars in North America. The say, "You pick on us. Why don't you pick on other regions." I look at them. I say, "You don't know what happens behind closed doors. I pick on everybody." So we launched this audit to baseline. It's a three-year program because it's very intense across all existing contracted parties. We baseline by the third year, then we start looking at what (inaudible) a factor of an annual audit where you select base on a random selection and behavior.

In addition to that external audit, my team also – we're going through. I'm doing an internal audit. You're going to tell me how you audit yourself. The risk and audit manager in Contractual Compliance is an independent function. It does not touch operation.

Again, based on his knowledge, background and mine, we put together the strategy and the methodology. We're going to audit ourselves and we're engaging through an (inaudible) process the next few months to

engage with a third-party vendor to come and audit Contractual Compliance Services and we will make that published to the community. So all these are good practices.

(DENISE MICHEL): I just wanted to note we're losing Margie Milam in ten minutes, so she's the next largest block of implementation on WHOIS. We can always do this at another time, but—

BRIAN CUTE: Any other questions for Maguy before we go? Okay. Thank you very much.

MAGUY SERAD: Thanks.

BRIAN CUTE: Margie's up next?

(DENISE MICHEL): Margie, you're on the phone.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes. Can you hear me okay?

(DENISE MICHEL): Just a little bit louder and it'll be great.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay, thank you. Charla, if you could pull up my slides.

(DENISE MICHEL): Go ahead, Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Oh, okay, sure. I was just looking for my slides to pop up. I was asked to provide you an update on some of the WHOIS Review Team recommendations that are being implemented, specifically in the areas of the RAA negotiations and the Expert Working Group activities.

And so, Denise will give you a little bit more background on the rest of the WHOIS Review Team recommendations, but I thought I'd at least

highlight some of the activities that relate to access and accuracy as they pertain to the RAA negotiations.

As you know, there's been negotiations on the new contract with registrars and that process has been going on for approximately 18 months. When Fadi Chehadé came on board as our new CEO, he really took an interest in the project to make sure that, one, we were addressing all the areas we needed to address; but two, to bring it to closure very quickly.

And so what we've done since Toronto is engage in negotiations with the registrars to close out as many of the items as possible, and we published last week the series of documents that pertain to the ICANN proposal for the new 2013 REA.

With respect to WHOIS, there are many significant improvements. For example, there is a WHOIS Accuracy Program specification that calls, for the first time, for validation and verification of WHOIS records. So that's a big part of the negotiations that have taken place over this period.

The proposal, if you take a look at it, includes commitment by registrars to validate the field. In other words, the address fields would be tested against some known standard. There's also a requirement to verify the e-mail address or the phone number of the registrant. So that's a big improvement with respect to accuracy. There's also a specification on privacy and proxy services, essentially setting a baseline for those services – and specifically the specification talks about things like escrow of the underlying customer's data, having an (abuse) point of contact for law enforcement to be able to access information. There's also a disclosure element where the Terms of Use of the service

provider will be made available and a requirement to relay the communication specifically that relates to illegal activity. So that's a big step forward in the areas of access and accuracies.

There's also a specification that deals with SLA on Port 43 access. For the first time, registrars are willing to commit to a service level agreement and availability with respect to the Port 43.

And there's also placeholders for transition to new protocols, specifically – and I think Steve Sheng may talk to you about this later today – to the IETF protocol that would enable—

BRIAN CUTE: Did Margie drop off?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

BRIAN CUTE: Just so we're following along, Denise, Margie's covering recommendations five through ten in the WHOIS Review Team Report.

DENISE MICHEL: (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: I can ask her too. Yeah, and just for folks on the phone, too.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, it's Margie.

BRIAN CUTE: Hey, Margie. It's Brian.

MARGIE MILAM: Can you hear me okay? Sorry about that.

BRIAN CUTE: We can hear you. No problem. Hey, just before you get back to it – and for benefit of folks on the phone, too – can you just highlight the specific numerated recommendations that you're walking us through from the WHOIS Review Team report?

MARGIE MILAM:	Oh, I don't know them off the top of my head. I apologize. Maybe Denise does.
DENISE MICHEL:	No.
BRIAN CUTE:	Well, you're covering accuracy and access. Correct?
MARGIE MILAM:	Yes, accuracy and access.
DENISE MICHEL:	I'll pull it up.
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay. Thanks, go ahead.
MARGIE MILAM:	Yeah, okay. So I think where I dropped off was the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities document, and that document actually covers other aspects in addition to access and accuracy. Specifically, it's an educational platform as well to let registrants know what their obligations are with respect to the domain and (inaudible) and keeping their information up to date. And so that is also something that we're very proud of, and believe that the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities document will go a long way in both clearing up the rights registrants have, but also the responsibilities. Next slide, please.

Okay. So that's essentially the RAA negotiations. Where we are is that the document is posted for public comments and we invite comments on all of the proposals. The package includes a fully redlined 2013 RAA against the 2009, which was the last version that was implemented and includes all specifications to the RAA. It's a very detailed package of information.

And now the other part I wanted to talk to you about was the Expert Working Group recommendations that relates to developing what we're

calling the next generation of data delivery services – data directory services. And the genesis for this was the board resolution in November that essentially adopted the WHOIS Review Team recommendations, but noted that because of comments, specifically from the SSAC from their SAC 55 Report that raised questions regarding the existing policy and whether there was clarity on the purpose of WHOIS.

The board took a two-prong approach to dealing with the WHOIS issue. One, essentially enforcing the current commitments, and that's the first part of board resolution. But the second part is setting off a new activity to really take a look at the need for data directory services and to examine the purpose of WHOIS and to start from a clean slate, if you will. In other words, not work with a system that we have, but invite a fresh look to see if we have got the right approach for dealing with data directory services.

So the CEO was charged by the board to essentially start this new initiative, and that was done through the launch of an Expert Working Group that has just started its activities over the last month and is currently going through a series of meetings to try to come up with a proposed model for these new data directory services.

This Expert Working Group would – this information would be used as a foundation for further policy work, and as part of the board resolution that adopted the WHOIS Review Team recommendations and kick off its new initiative, there's a request for an issue report for the GNSO to actually start a PDP on these recommendations once they come out of the Expert Working Group. Next slide please.

And so, as I mentioned, the work is underway. They are engaged in conference calls and face-to-face meetings. We have one scheduled next week in London. There will be an update in Beijing, and so by Beijing, the community will be able to get a better sense of what the Working Group is doing.

It's led by Jean-Francois Baril who is a very talented executive that brings together an outside perspective in his approach. The Expert Working Group was carefully selected to pick those insiders and outsiders to try to come up with a consensus model that could be sent to the GNSO on what the next level of data directory services would be.

And we also have very active involvement with the board liaisons to the group to help guide this Expert Working Group to come up with this new model. And with that, I guess I'll leave it open to questions.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. Just to answer the question that you raised, Brian, all the things that Margie just presented relate to, in part, recommendation one about making WHOIS a strategic priority. Recommendations 5, 6, 8 which all relate to data accuracy and recommendation 10 which is access, privacy, and proxy.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you, Denise.

BRIAN CUTE: Any questions for Margie? Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Hi, Margie. This is Avri. I had two questions on the RAA slide and I just want to make sure I understood. On the improvements, have these been agreed to? Are these reflected in the registrar's understandings or is this just something that's still very much aspirational on the ICANN staff side? And also, in terms of the Registrant Rights and

Responsibilities document, having read that and seen its very strong on responsibilities but I'm not sure about the rights part, I was wondering what privacy, authorities, or standards were consulted in creating these? Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Could you e-mail me your question? And we'll make sure that you and the team get an answer. Is that you, Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, sorry. I'm having phone issues. I didn't hear the question.

DENISE MICHEL: Did you hear Avri's question?

MARGIE MILAM: No, I didn't.

AVRI DORIA: Sorry. Yeah, I had asked two questions based on your RAA slide. The first one had been in terms of the discussion of the improvements you've talked about, I was wondering whether these are all improvements that are sort of already in the mutually agreed upon set or are these things that are still somewhat aspirational from the ICANN staff side?

And then, also, on the Registrants and Responsibilities, having read through that document seeing it as very strong on responsibilities but not quite as strong on rights, I was just wondering what rights, standards, or privacy authorities, etc. – standards – had been consulted in the creation of this document. Thanks.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. So on the first question, which ones are agreed to, if you look through the documents, we posted the documents with some of them not being fully agreed to by the registrars.

On respects to the accuracy program, the registrars are in agreement on the validation and verification obligation, but there is a question regarding an additional part of it that is not technically WHOIS but it relates to validation and verification of the account holder information. So that's where the registrars are still doing further work to decide their view on that perspective.

So that require came from the law enforcement community, essentially to have validation of WHOIS records plus account holder information and that's the part that's still up in the negotiations for further discussion.

On the Privacy Proxy Services, there was a general consensus that there would be a privacy proxy specification with very minimal basic obligation, so things that relate to reveal or not in there, for example, but they're going through it now to determine whether what's proposed in the specification of something that they agree to. So there's agreement on the concept of a specification on privacy proxy, but the (inaudible) is still being worked out.

With respect to the WHOIS specification, the SLA in the transition is agreed to. The Port 43 is an issue where the registrars have asked to remove the obligation for Port 43 for those registries where there is sick WHOIS service, because the registries carry all of the information and the registrars feel that that's a duplicate service. So that's one of the reasons that the documents are being posted for public comment, to try to receive further in in that regard from the community on how it feels about the Port 43 obligations and the request of the registrars.

And then the Registrar Rights and Responsibilities document, that is something that was worked with the registrars. They came up with the language that you see in the proposal. The purpose of the public comment forum is to receive community input, so that would be the time where privacy authorities and others can weigh in on whether there should be additional rights that are specified in there. But prior to this point, we had not circulated that document to any privacy or government authorities.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Does that answer your question?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: Any other questions for Margie? I see none. Thanks very much, Margie.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you very much, goodbye.

DENISE MICHEL: Next we have Chris Gift to go over the recommendations and implementation activities that relate to the Information Portal, and also some new automated tools that are going to be developed.

BRIAN CUTE: So, if I can, just follow the bouncing ball here, I don't think we've touched on – bear with me – recommendation 2, single WHOIS policy; recommendation 3 on outreach. And please correct me where I'm not correct here. Recommendations 12-14 on IDNs, Recommendation 15 on detailed and comprehensive plan for implementation, and Recommendation 16 annual report on implementation of the recommendations. Did I get any of that wrong?

DENISE MICHEL: You are correct.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, good. Just to make sure everyone on the phone is following along, too.

CHRIS GIFT: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, good evening, depending on where you are. I'm here to talk about a number of items detailing with respect to WHOIS, Information Portal, and some automation tools or three to provide more information on WHOIS.

                      The first item is an Information Portal. The Information Portal is supposed to provide a single stop shopping for people who want to know more about WHOIS and where they should go to to either enter in a complaint or who they should talk to if they have an issue with any of the WHOIS records. So right now that data is scattered across a few different sites – InterNIC, some places at the ICANN.org website, and other places in the IDS – to put it all in one place and then promote that more fully so that people would have one place to go to find out that information.

                      Right now we are working on a plan. The plan is going to be published April 7th for how that will be implemented. So we're working on that right now – on a plan to get that done.

                      Data accuracy. Data accuracy is pertaining to – there's a couple of things here. One is we are, again – all this together in terms of a plan. The initial plan is due April 7th. Just in a few weeks.

                      The goal of the data accuracy is to provide dynamic reporting via random sampling. It's the physical sampling of WHOIS records. So it is not supposed to be – at least my understanding right now is it is not

supposed to provide reporting on individual records. The goal is to say within geographic regions or within area, WHOIS – or within certain (TLDs) – WHOIS tends to be this accurate; 97% accurate or 95% accurate.

There are some questions about what does accuracy actually mean. What level is that accuracy? Does it just simply mean that the record is complete or incomplete in terms of data? Is the data itself accurate? Then it becomes a bit of a question. How do you define accuracy? How do we even go and test accuracy?

We can do that. We're looking into that right now on how we can go look at that data. But it would be costly for us to move beyond simple statements around whether the record is complete and simple looks at whether the data itself looks like its accurate, such as the zip code or a name or something of that order.

There is a request that we actually – part of the request is actually we step beyond just statistical sampling of data and reporting on the statistical samples, but that we actually report on individual records and send them to the appropriate registrar, saying that these records are incorrect or inaccurate in some way, shape or form.

Again, there is some issue around that. I'm not quite sure. I know this isn't necessarily this group, but there is a question about is that beyond the remit of ICANN to do that, to go around and sample WHOIS records globally and report on their issues and go back. Is that beyond our remit? And again, the accuracy issue shows up. How do I define accuracy? How do I report that to the registrar? How do I test? We're still working that through, but again, we have a plan by April 7th.

Similar, we will have a centralized WHOIS, a global WHOIS search. It will be on the WHOIS portal. I don't see any issues with putting this together, implementing it or scheduling it. Again, we're working on this plan with the rest of the Information Portal and we'll have a date by April 7th. We (don't) have this meeting April 7th. I have such good news. Last slide please.

IDN WHOIS records. This is following on the IDN recommendations that we're working on for WHOIS. While I am, again, working on a plan for April 7th, the reality is that any automation tools around IDN WHOIS records are going to have to follow on after that recommendation, which I think is – the requirements are due July 22nd for IDN WHOIS. So implementing any automating tools will follow that – well, release the requirements for those records.

But I'm stuck with the same issue as the rest. There was a comment around not only do we sample – statistically sample it – but again, we provide WHOIS records to the registrars and I'm back to the same issues. Is that beyond the remit of ICANN and how do we define accuracy – data accuracy? Yes, (Leela).

(LEELA):   Well, I just have a question because when you're looking at IDNs, you would also look at ccTLDs, right? So here you have the mix of ICANN going into the ccTLD business, right? Or…?

CHRIS GIFT: gTLD records, sorry. IDN records.

(LEELA):   But some of the countries are gTLD-like because they took the fast track or…?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. What a particular country decides to do or how it uses its country code is not relevant for the purpose of ICANN having a contract with the registry and registrar. The IDN WHOIS record effort specifically relates to IDN gTLD.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I, too, am confused. There aren't any IDN gTLDs yet.

DENISE MICHEL: This effort would follow the effort to propose some activities around internationalized registration data and Steve Sheng is going to present some of the activities on that. So we're a little bit out of sequence because Chris is here, but it relates to the work that WHOIS Review Team asked – recommended – be done relating to internationalized registration data.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Interesting.

DEMI GETSCHKO: So together with my participant and colleague (inaudible) IDN issue within WHOIS Review Team and I would say that the recommendations were slightly more detailed rather than (inaudible) here. And of course I always say that unfortunately most of our participants of the WHOIS Review Team, they helped (inaudible) after receiving the feedback from the board on the results of the WHOIS Review Team report.

However, now and after the explanation is given by Steve, I do understand that of course the problem of implementability that exists, and I think all our frustration would end on April the 7th as we are promised.

In fact, answering Elizabeth's question as well, we did consider the possibility of extending what we would like to recommend to offer also on ccTLD (inaudible). However, of course, we don't understand it.

According to the mandate, it's all limited to the gTLD. But we always were in favor of the unified approach because in the world of the IDNs, it's very difficult to meet different (inaudible) and different procedures and different requirements for IDN in gTLDs and the IDN in ccTLDs.

And excuse me, I have another remark which I had to make previously during the review of the ATRT 1 report about the multilingualism. When we worked on our WHOIS Review Team, it was translated into Russian as well to other languages and I noticed that the terminology which is used in ICANN documents is different from the terminology which is used by the Russian IT specialists because it's mostly based on the English equivalence and it does not correspond to the wording of our logistical documents. So we have to translate the ICANN Russian text into Russian explaining what we should read here meaning what.

So, finally, I raise this question, but when the report was ready, I think maybe it's even good that ICANN is a standard. The standard language in Russian on the terminology on the (inaudible) which describe the (inaudible) system is proposed and is fixed by ICANN.

So we in Russia have to adapt our own (legislation) and terminology to what ICANN proposes, even maybe if it seems very strange for the Russian ear.

However, my question is whether such issues exist also for other language, not only Russian. Maybe Arabic or Spanish or Chinese. And who is the final linguistic guru in ICANN who can just really confirm that this Russian is exactly what corresponds to certain English equivalents. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: I'll just answer quickly. I know Sally Costerton had global engagement in communications and has a plan to – or is developing a plan to – address this issue and has some new plans for translation. I'll get some more information to the team on that.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. I just want to ask a question. A couple points in your presentation you said that you bumped into the question of whether it's within ICANN's remit to sample WHOIS data, right? Was that accurate? Was that a point you raised?

CHRIS GIFT: Sorry, (inaudible). It was broader than that. It was do we have the remit or not? It's not just sample. Sampling – I was a little misstated. Sampling is not an issue. I have to sample to provide data accuracy reports to basically sample it. In the recommendation I had read, it went beyond sampling. It was saying uncover and report inaccurate WHOIS records.

So, to me, that means do I request that all the TLDs send me all their WHOIS records and I have a central data store and I keep track of those? To me, that's the biggest question which I'm unsure of whether that's ICANN's role to do that.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. So that's a clarification that there isn't an issue about sampling WHOIS data and that's not preventing you from taking any action here.

CHRIS GIFT: That's correct. There is no issue around that.

BRIAN CUTE: Thanks. Any other questions? Yes, Carlos.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Yes. When you say an Information Portal, is this a WHOIS Information Portal or a WHOIS Information Portal within the ICANN portals with pages – I want to understand what this portal is going to look like. Do I

EN

have to go through the ICANN web pages first or this is an independent portal that ICANN will (feed)…or?

CHRIS GIFT: That's a good question. We're not entirely sure. I can say this. I can say it will be either a micro – it's going to be something dedicated to WHOIS. I' hoping that we could have it stand off to a side from ICANN.org. Or, at least if it is part of ICANN.org, it is highly visible. My one fear of putting it within ICANN.org is we already have a lot of information and a lot of content there and it could easily get lost.

So I don't know the exact implementation. Right now I'm thinking it's a standoff site in and of itself and that we promote that and start pushing traffic to that site for people to understand about WHOIS and learn more about it.

BRIAN CUTE: Sure. Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Just for your information, on the activities that Chris just ran through relate to Recommendation 3 on outreach, also Recommendation 5, 6, 7, 11, and 14 that are relating to data accuracy in various ways. Again, I'll be sending you guys a table so you have all this in writing.

If there are no more questions for Chris, we have Steve Sheng on the line who can continue the discussion about internationalized registration data and the activities in that area if you'd like.

BRIAN CUTE: Sounds good, thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Steve, are you with us?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, I'm on the line. Can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL:	Yes. Charla will pull up your slides and you can start anytime.
STEVE SHENG:	Sure. So I'm going to quickly go over about implementing WHOIS Review Team Recommendations 12-14 which concerns the support for internationalized data in the directory service. So earlier we had a question about IDNs and its relationship to internationalized registration data, so I just want to clarify a little bit.

The registration data (inaudible) WHOIS data and internationalized meaning they can be represented in a language and script other than U.S. ASCII, or English. Today many registrants – for example, in the ccTRD space – have internationalized registration data.

The second point is internationalized registration data is not – doesn't have to be tied with IDNS. So you could have a purely ASCII domain that could still have internationalized registration data. For example, a dot com registered in China may allow internationalized registration data.

But having said that, I think with the introduction of IDNs at the ccTLD and the TLD level upcoming, this problem will become much more prominent. I think the WHOIS Review Team cost is out in recommendation 12-14.

The way we implement the recommendation is we break those recommendations into four tasks. The first task is to have a working group to determine the appropriate registration data requirements. One key issue in that requirement is to whether to support translation or transliteration of the internationalized data.

And following up that requirement, that needs to be implemented into a data model. So that's the first task. The second task is once the data

model is complete, is to put it into relevant registry and registrar agreements (will) have placeholders for those to be implemented. So task one and task two are sequential, so we need to complete task one first and then task two.

Task three and four are to evaluate the current available solutions that support internationalized registration data. These solutions, I think (inaudible) to the ones that currently implement (other) ccTLDs, so those could share a useful example because ccTLDs – although these recommendations applies to ccTLD space, I think the lessons and the experiences learned in the ccTLD space will provide some very useful guidance here.

Another part of the solution we need to evaluate is the commercial feasibility of translation and transliteration systems, (if) policy decides what will happen, how feasible they are. So that's another part of evaluation.

And finally, it's to provide regular updates on the development of this issue. I think WHOIS – this issue touches both the policy and the technical piece and I think both communities needs to be aware of the work the other part is doing.

What we've been doing is, for example, in the ITF, there's a current Working Group to develop the next generation protocol that would support internationalized registration data. We use the ICANN meeting to invite them to come and give updates to the ICANN community. Similarly, ICANN staff also present what's happening in the ICANN community to the ITF so that both sides are fully aware of the activities.

So those are the four tasks. Number three and number four are already started. Number one will start shortly after the Beijing meeting with number two to follow. So that's a quick update on this topic.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Any questions? No, I see no questions. Thank you, Steve.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks a lot, Steve, and thanks for hanging in there with us.

STEVE SHENG: No problem.

DENISE MICHEL: And of course the activities that Steve just ran through relate to the internationalize registration data recommendations which are 12, 13, and 14. And now Lynn Lipinski is here to talk about outreach and communication which relates primarily to Recommendation 3 on outreach.

LYNN LIPINSKI: Hi. I'm Lynn Lipinski. I'm the publications manager on the communications team here at ICANN. I've also been an observer to the side of the room for the whole meeting. I wanted to sit in today, get a broader context. I'm going to educate myself just a little bit more about what the ATRT 2 is doing.

So anyway, it's been a nice ride. Now I'll make my switch from observer to participant and talk a little bit about communications and outreach – the outreach plan we have relating to Recommendation 3.

The communications team – and I work with Jim Trengrove. That's who I report to. And he and I worked on a communications plan related to Recommendation 3. What we saw in the rationale that the board recommendations had was that the CEO needed to have staff create and execute a communications and outreach plan that provides key

stakeholders including users the information they need to use with the collection and maintenance of gTLD registration data.

So we broke it into two planks and those are up there with my two objectives on the slide we're showing right now. One is to raise awareness of policy development efforts to answer questions such as why WHOIS data is collected and what purpose it serves.

Now that's a very broad objective because we're actually trying to talk to people about what WHOIS is. What is WHOIS? That's one of my taglines I proposed for that. But talking to people about why we get that data, why it's important, what purpose it serves and involving people in that discussion.

The second objective is to promote the Information Portal that Chris Gift talked about. As an easy way to access the existing WHOIS information and notify relevant parties of data accuracy issues. Obviously that's not in place right now. We can't communicate what's not there. But we will do it as soon as it is up and running, and also work with Chris on the content of that. A lot of what we do is try to write things in plain English. Sometimes we're more successful than others. But we do try to write things in a very clear, understandable language in English and also in making sure that everything is translated. So we'd be doing that for that portal.

This slide just shows who we outlined as the outreach and communications target audiences, and this is drawn from the recommendations. Basically, the ICANN community, the SOs, and ACs, the Internet community itself, IETF, ISOC. Consumer rights and privacy organizations are obviously going to be interested in this, the business

community and domain registrant. Those are the audiences we identified as being potentially interested in learning more about this. Next slide, Charla, thanks.

So our basic strategy is to use existing ICANN channels of communications to provide updates, receive public comment, and encourage discussion. With that strategy that we're using our existing communication tools, these are a little list of the fun part for communications people which is tactics. What are we actually going to do to spread the word?

Things that we're suggesting here for topics – we're talking about the WHOIS issue, a kickoff announcement, a news release supplemented with social media outreach. This could be both about the policy discussions themselves as well as when the portal comes online and when there's something to draw people to, we would use these same tactics.

We'll want to create a fact sheet and brochure in the six UN languages. We want to work with the Global Engagement Team of which we're a part to develop a list of organizations that would be interested in this issue, work with them to find out who are the business community people, who are the privacy organizations in your regional area that we need to make sure they're aware of this debate and discussion and get involved if it's appropriate.

We want to promote program milestones through announcements and social media. We have implemented a speakers' bureau since January 2013, and through that we're keeping a series of basic slide decks up to date for people to use about ICANN, and I would say the WHOIS issue,

we could do kind of a WHOIS Basics or my "What is WHOIS?" slide deck that we keep up to date on what's going on.

And then when the portal is up and running, what we'd like to do is create a demonstration video similar to what we did for myICANN, have it done by – if we have the budget, which hopefully we will – to use native speakers of Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, and Spanish to narrate those videos for us so that they're available in more than just English. If we can't find the budget to do that, then we can subtitle in the other languages.

Basically, for metrics on this – because I have heard metrics and scorecards being an important part of the discussion today – my recommendation for metrics on this would be to track activities and to be tracking the number of public comments, be benchmarking them against maybe another issue, seeing if we're getting more or different people commenting and then consider that a success. We would also count participants in webinars and forums for benchmark purposes. We could compare those to New gTLD program webinars to look and see, are we drawing enough interest into this? And then also we will track through the speakers' bureau the number of speaking opportunities where the issue is addressed and keep a running tally of that so we can take a look at what we've done to promote it at the end and know if we've done enough. That's my last slide.

So our first phase was talking more about the issue itself. The second phase is promotion of the portal and that is it, actually. What a gracious conclusion. Thank you.

| BRIAN CUTE: | Thank you. Would you track impressions as well in terms of your metrics? |

LYNN LIPINSKI: We can track, yes. I can track – we can certainly track them on the website. We can track website visitors, downloads of materials. We love to do that. Impressions – because I'm thinking that's more of an advertising term to me, so if we were doing advertising, I'd be tracking the impressions number. But we can build impressions from those metrics I talked about.

Say you do a speaking engagement. You get a roll call. Okay, there are 100 people in that audience. And we can keep a tally of that that way and say, "This many people were reached out to through our speakers' bureau." We can also do the same for webinars and forums and kind of put together an impressions number because we're not doing advertising.

DENISE MICHEL: Are you talking about page clicks?

BRIAN CUTE: Equivalence, (rep) equivalence.

LYNN LIPINSKI: Unique page views. No, we track unique page views and we can track how many times. We can track how many times you've looked at a page where a document would be downloaded. We can't quite track how many people have downloaded something, but we can track that.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, Lise.

LISE FUHR: Could you go back to the slide where you had the interested parties or the stakeholders? Because we've been talking about looking at a broader scope of stakeholders like the ITU and I think this could be one

of the issues that could be very relevant to a broader community. I see of course you put in business community and registrant, but the governments are very much interested in the WHOIS data and I know my government is really following the work of ICANN on this one and putting pressure on us. So those are your stakeholders too.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Did you say ITU is a stakeholder in the WHOIS data? Why?

LISE FUHR: Because you have a broader – you have other people participating in the ITU than in the ICANN.

BRIAN CUTE: Sorry, David.

DAVID CONRAD: With regard to the metrics discussion, I was wondering, have you looked at – a lot of content these days – written content – at the end will have a survey, "Was this helpful to you?" 5 star, 1 star, that sort of thing. Have you looked at doing that sort of thing with the content that's being produced in this context?

LYNN LIPINSKI: No. We haven't gotten into that suggestion, but I love that idea. It sums up – no, but I think that's a great idea. We'll look into that.

BRIAN CUTE: Oliver.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier. Hello, Lynn. You've been trying to look for me for the past week or so. Anyway, I'm here. Just a question here because I think at some point I was a bit confused about this. But it might be that other group members here are mighty confused as well. How does the work of the WHOIS Review link in with the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services, which is just starting up right now?

LYNN LIPINSKI: I apologize I was unable to be with you at the start of the WHOIS discussion. I actually have some overview framing slides that answers this question. So in November when the board passed its resolution, it decided to take a two-track approach to this.

So one track is the Expert Working Group, very much focused on New gTLD. Yeah, New gTLD registration data and Steve Crocker is on that group. And then the second track is implementation of, if not the specific recommendations, the objectives of the recommendations of the WHOIS Review Team report. So we have parallel efforts going on here, completely separate really.

BRIAN CUTE: Any other questions? I see none. Thank you very much.

LYNN LIPINSKI: Do you want me to quickly just go back to my slide to make sure I haven't missed anything in this WHOIS?

BRIAN CUTE: Sure.

DENISE MICHEL: 37 I think can go. Thank you, Lynn.

LYNN LIPINSKI: All right. And I'll go through this really quickly. So as I mentioned, it was a November 2012 board resolution that lays out in great detail the board actions and directives to staff for implementing the WHOIS Review Team or Port Recommendations as well is launching the Expert Working Group. As you heard from staff, this spans a whole number of departments, the implementation of the WHOIS Review Team aboard, a whole number of departments within ICANN that we're coordinating.

And as you heard, some are still doing research. In fact, finding and grappling. But as Alan pointed out to me last night, there's still a lot of

questions, a bit of confusion, and rather than wait until all of the plans are fully formed, I think what we'll do next week is lay out the comprehensive plan and a table that lays out staff activity as it relates to each recommendation and we'll just note where plans are still being developed and take an iterative approach. There's more information out there about all the different ways that staff is implementing this recommendation. Next slide.

BRIAN CUTE: That would be helpful, thank you.

LYNN LIPINSKI: And so on Recommendation 1 of the report, which recommends (making) gTLD who was a strategic priority as I think has been mentioned. It is noted that it's a strategic priority, and our existing strategic plan also is highlighted in our operating plan and budget. It's a key focus of the CEO and is part of his performance metrics. And I think Maguy probably mentioned the expansion of the compliance team that reports directly under Fadi. And of course Fadi is very involved in overseeing the improvements to the enforcement of contracts to compliance. Next slide. Excuse me.

He's also weaving this into, as you've heard, to CEO roundtables and has mentioned the WHOIS issue, particularly I think in the registrar (inaudible) registry as well. Brian, you might know. And Margie walked you through in great detail. It's a very important component of the RAA Agreement Negotiations. It's also mentioned in the New gTLD. It's also covered in part in the New gTLD Registry Agreement that's been posted in there, sort of a placeholder there too for potential output from the Expert Working Group.

Ah, the single web page. So our legal team is working on that specific recommendation from the WHOIS Review Team Report, and that recommendation was to collect on one page the relevant guidelines and contractual conditions relating to gTLD WHOIS.

And so, they're working on that and have a target date of, well – a target month – of April. It might be the magical April 7th, but in the very near future that page will be posted for the public. And I think that's it (inaudible). Yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, Denise. On policies, one of the recommendations was that ICANN should create a single WHOIS policy, I believe. Was that Recommendation Number 2?

LYNN LIPINSKI: Yeah, it's a little confusing the way the team worded it. Their intention was not to create a policy as in a policy development process, but rather create a single policy page, a web page – one location that contained all the existing policy and contractual conditions relating to WHOIS.

One of the first frustrations that the team came across in their early days was – it was very disparate and hard to actually locate all the different places that contained the contractual conditions and policies related to gTLD, to WHOIS. So it's really providing a centralized place.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Any other questions? No. Are we through WHOIS?

DENISE MICHEL: That is WHOIS.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Then by agreement, we're going to do the SSR overview from staff maybe on the next call or at a later date that we agreed to.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

BRIAN CUTE:

We'll give you certainly advanced notice of course and time to prepare. Please thank everybody on the staff for all of their inputs today. It's very well appreciated from the entire Review Team. And thank you.

Okay, and with that, let's take a 15-minute break, and then we will reconvene for the last three hour slog of the day and get a lot done before 5:30. Thanks. Be back in 15.

Okay, we're going to get started again for everyone in the room and online. Are we still on, Brian? We are? Okay. Thank you. So for the folks online, the Review Team is going to move into a different phase of work mode. We want to continue some of the work that we started yesterday and develop some documents and prepare for our next call.

So this is what I have for us to do in the next three hours to the extent that we can accomplish it, and feel free to add anything I've missed. We need to review and approve a conflict of interest policy and we need to file statements around individual conflict of interest statements. We want to develop, at least as of this moment, a list of issues that we think this Review Team would want to focus on – potential work stream type issues. We will want to identify volunteers to lead specific work streams. We know that we have the work of three Review Teams that are going to be on that menu, but we'll identify other work streams and (want) volunteers.

We will assign someone to draft our Charter, Terms, and Reference and Methodology document. We'll do that all on one document: the Charter, the Terms of Reference, and the Methodology. So we'll have an author for that.

And the leadership team here, the four of us, will take on drafting an agenda for our next call and circulating that in the short-term. Is there anything I missed that we should be trying to get done in the next three hours? Yes, Carlos.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: Oh yeah. Would you mind? That would be great. So I circulated to the team yesterday the Conflict of Interest Policy that ATRT 1 used and wanted to put that up on the screen. Charla, did you see that? I sent an e-mail to the list yesterday with the Conflict of Interest Policy from ATRT 1. Actually, if you could throw that up on the screen now. Yes, Carlos.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Anything perceived to be problematic or something that could be improved about the Conflict of Interest that you used for ATRT 1?

BRIAN CUTE: I read through this document myself just yesterday and nothing jumped out at me, but—

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I don't want to bias our short circuit of discussion, but I read it too and I said, "Sure."

BRIAN CUTE: That's how I felt. I just want to make sure that other Review Team members have had the opportunity to provide (ascent).

(ALAN GREENBERG):   One question, Steve, would be since ICANN itself has modified its Conflict of Interest Policy since this was done, is this strong enough compared to what you currently require?

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I can't give you a quick answer to that and think about it quite in that context, but that's a fair question to ask. We can get it looked at. I did think about my own situation in that as a board member, as chairman

and a member of this and reviewing the board (inaudible) structural conflict, which is quite obvious and apparent and understood as part of the structure of it. So my plan personally was simply to respond to this and note the fact that I have this role. Not that anybody's surprised about that.

BRIAN CUTE: No, and clearly your participation is contemplated in the AoC.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Yeah. I mean, there's no – nobody gets to wring their hands and say, "Oh, my God, how'd that happen?"

BRIAN CUTE: Yeah. Yes, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: In a word, no.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I remember getting exposed to that somehow more recently than not at the time. I don't remember any of the details. Is anything relevant to the present situation?

BRIAN CUTE: Nothing relevant to the present undertaking, and a member stepped down after some discussion about a potential conflict of interest.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: That was based on (inaudible) so it was a change in their situation.

BRIAN CUTE: It was a change. Just as we will do throughout the course of this process at each call, that leaves us good suggestion. I'll remind everybody and ask everybody if you have a change in circumstance on conflict of interest, please bring it forward now, and that's how we'll do it. And if someone brings it forward, then we'll identify it, we'll talk about it and the right action will ensue.

So has everybody had a chance to go through the document? Why don't we walk through it just on the screen a little bit slowly? It's a bit of a lengthy document. Section 1.1 speaks for itself – the purpose of the policy. Section 1.2, I had defined who a covered person is and this is where we touched on – remember we touched on NDAs yesterday? This does touch on confidential information that we may obtain relating to ICANN. Section 1.3 supplements doesn't replace applicable laws; 1.5—

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Secret 1.4.

BRIAN CUTE: Yeah. [laughs] Secret 1.4. Okay, we will renumber. We will. That's one we're not telling anybody about. I guess this is my responsibility to administer (inaudible) compliance and my three vice chairs to keep me in compliance.

(LAWRENCE STRICKLING):   It's going to take all three.

BRIAN CUTE: It's going to take all three, trust me. So we have definitions here of what a conflict of interest is. If we could scroll up a little bit, it (inaudible) our family members. It defines the financial interest that could trigger a conflict. We are people. So we would have a duty to disclose, and as I said, I'm going to make that part of the working practice. Just a reminder to everyone at the beginning of every call or every meeting, I'll point that out, and if I don't, my vice chairs will.

And then the determinations, Section 2.2. So at the request – B, importantly. At the request of any member of the ATRT shall have a discussed with a covered person regarding the material facts with respect to the conflict and the covered person may make a presentation regarding the facts, transaction, contract, dispute or arrangement that

gives rise to the potential conflict. Again, this identifying potential conflicts or actual conflicts, and the fact that one has a conflict doesn't mean they're off the team, per se, but we need to look at it, address it, analyze it and come to a conclusion as to whether it's a conflict that can be managed or not.

Section 2.4, duty to abstain. Voting on matters with which you have a conflict of interest, being explicit in stating that. Please scroll up. 2.5, violations. So if you believe someone else has a conflict, you have to notify them and initiate procedures under this policy, and although it doesn't say it there – yes, if you need to initiate the procedure, then you'd come to me and/or the vice chairs to initiate that. Keep scrolling.

Records of proceedings. So if we have this issue come up, this is how we are to record what we've done with respect to the discussion. Article 5 statements. We each have to sign a statement that we received the policy, that we've read it and understand it and that we agree to comply. Scroll up.

Yeah. So here is the statement. The essentials of it is that you have no ownership or investment interest in any entity with which ICANN has an existing or proposed transaction, contract, dispute or other arrangement. Two, a compensation arrangement with any entity or individuals which ICANN has a transaction, contract, dispute or other arrangement. And three, a potential ownership or investment interest in or compensation arrangement with any entity or individual with which ICANN is negotiating a transaction contract dispute or other arrangement. Discussion. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: So I just want to make sure I understand it correctly – that any of us that do contracting for or are employed by someone who is an applicant for anything from ICANN would have to record that there also. That is a correct understanding? I just want to make sure.

BRIAN CUTE: That if you have a contract to provide services to ICANN?

AVRI DORIA: No. If you are an applicant for a New gTLD, let's say, that fits into that. I just want to make sure. I think it should fit into that. I just want to make sure that it does fit into that.

BRIAN CUTE: Any entity with which ICANN has an existing contract; or three, is a potential ownership or investment interest in or compensation arrangement with any entity or individual with which ICANN is negotiating a contract. Well, negotiating is a term of art. That's an important word in that. So ICANN is not currently negotiating contracts for any TLDs.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: (inaudible) very narrow, specific argument (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: Yeah. I think – go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: So we added the word "or other potential arrangement" we would have it. But if just sticking that one word in there would, you know.

(SPEAKER):   (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: So is that a suggestion? Terrific. So is that a suggestion that we have the word potential arrangement – or other potential arrangement. Is everyone comfortable with adding that to the text, "or other potential arrangement" in III at the end, and then that would cover any potential New TLD registry operator. Okay.

| AVRI DORIA: | Yeah. The reason I bring it up is since we were asked when we did our SOIs to include that potential fact, it seems reasonable that we continue listing that potential fact here. |

BRIAN CUTE: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Brian. Is there any threshold to share ownership in any company that might have applied? For example, Apple, Amazon, these companies. That's why I'm asking it, because I am a shareholder of many of these companies.

BRIAN CUTE: It says "I have no ownership or investment interest."

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: It's even a little more complicated because you may own – you may have a share in a mutual fund which has got something and you may not know. No, the threshold is considerably below controlling, but there's no safe passage here. Pick your path.

(STEVE CROCKER):   We run into this in the U.S. government all the time and there is a threshold. I think it's $15,000. Any holding above that has to be disclosed. It doesn't necessarily mean you have a conflict, but you have to disclose it. A common sense threshold might make sense here as well.

But what we're aiming at is any situation where your judgment might be influenced by holdings. So there is some number maybe that's a de minimis number we could agree to, but it seems that above that, people ought to be disclosing it as opposed to whether you have a controlling interest in Apple which I assume no one around this table has.

(STEVE CROCKER):	But if I could add, I do know that within ICANN, particularly last year during some of the issues around the award of the IANA Functions contract, ICANN took a hard look at its own Conflict of Interest Policy. I would hope that this team would have as strong a policy as ICANN might have implemented last year, and I just don't have the information to know whether this policy is as strong as what you all implemented last year and I'd like to make sure it is.
LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	Whenever we're done with this, why don't we then run it through ICANN Legal (inaudible) then to compare this against the current thing and identify any discrepancies and bring them back to us. Yeah.
BRIAN CUTE:	We'll send that with the suggested language change from Avri, and also with the question of the zero de minimis amount that you would be consistent with your policy. Okay, everyone comfortable with that? Okay. Then for now, our original Conflict of Interest Statement does include in our application stand. In your good judgment, if there's anything you need to put on the table from a conflict of interest, please do so. Don't let the in-progress work of the policy hold you back from that.
STEVE CROCKER:	And in keeping with full disclosure, I'll note that Larry, Heather, and I didn't fill out any forms to get on this thing.
LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	In my Form 278, it was publically available (inaudible).
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay. So then let's get that to legal with the goal of if they can move through it the next time we can get the call or next opportunity, we'll finalize this and move on.

Okay. Let's move to building our initial list of issues based on our discussion and thinking in the last couple of days. Clearly the baseline is we're going to have work streams where parts of this team are going to be reviewing implementation of ATRT 1, WHOIS, and SSR. So we're going to have three lucky winners. I have three vice chairs. Let's not go there yet. We'll get to the volunteering later. Let's start building a list of issues. Carlos, you want to—

This is our task list for the next two-and-a-half hours. So the first thing is – the first thing now after conflict of interest is list of issues. So that's what we're doing now, building a list of issues. Okay. So we got ATRT 1, SSR, WHOIS. This team is going to review how ICANN implemented the recommendations of ATRT 1.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Okay. ATRT 1 Charter and (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: No, no, no. I'm talking about specific work streams, our work streams. And one of them will be that. The other will be SSR. There will be another one where we're going to look at WHOIS. Implementation of those recommendations. Let's get to other items. Open table.

AVRI DORIA: No, we had an issue on this the other day.

BRIAN CUTE: Did we?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: You're kidding.

AVRI DORIA: The issues list.

BRIAN CUTE:	That was yesterday. How did I forget? Where is it? It's probably on Alice's computer.
AVRI DORIA:	Probably. Yeah, did you have the list that Alice was creating yesterday?
STEVE CROCKER:	It does seem like one other issue that might justify its own work stream is to understand and evaluate the process used by ICANN to review and implement the Review Team reports and the level of oversight that the board has exercised as the recommendations have been implemented. I mean, we've talked about it generally, but I think part of our charge is to evaluation how the board has done that and whether we have any improvements we would suggest or any modifications we would suggest in that regard.
BRIAN CUTE:	So how would you shorthand that in about five words?
STEVE CROCKER:	Board process used to review and implement team reports.
BRIAN CUTE:	You got that Charla? Board process – I'll write it down. Yeah, thanks, you got it?
STEVE CROCKER:	You keep giving her things to—
BRIAN CUTE:	Sorry, Charla. Board process used to—
STEVE CROCKER:	Review, implement, and oversee team reports.
BRIAN CUTE:	There you go. Okay, we can go with the shorthand for now. And while you're searching, Charla – sorry about that – does anybody else recall from yesterday other issues that we began to identify?
AVRI DORIA:	No.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	The ones that – I think this is the list you're thinking of. One was the metrics for continual improvement.
BRIAN CUTE:	Yes, yes. Metrics.
LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	Transparency as a default condition, efficiency and effectiveness of decision-making. I'm not sure whose that was. I'm sorry?
CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:	(Probably me).
LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	Yeah. Somebody had mentioned the policy development process, but it does seem like that really is already embedded in the ATRT charge, so I'm not sure that's a standalone. I think Jørgen raised the question of transparency around financial matters, although again, I think there's some question as to whether that's within the remit of the AoC as well. But it might be worth talking about.
BRIAN CUTE:	Were there other issues?
AVRI DORIA:	You mean from yesterday or new?
BRIAN CUTE:	Yesterday or today. Avri.
AVRI DORIA:	Yeah. One of the things that gets discussed a lot and gets brought into discussion is the whole notion of ICANN capture. People are constantly bringing up the issue and constantly saying that someone else has captured. So I'm wondering if, in some sense – because that certainly is an accountability and transparency issue, so I'm wondering if the whole notion of capture needs to be looked at and understood. Not necessarily deciding that someone has captured, but basically looking at this because it's one of the most common accusations one hears other

than conspiracy theory says that "So-and-so has captured ICANN" or "If this happens, ICANN will be captured."

So I think it would be reasonable to take a look at that as an accountability and transparency issue. Is everything being done sufficiency to avoid capture? So that was an issue that I had in mind.

BRIAN CUTE: Any reactions, discussions?

DAVID CONRAD: I think that that's a good topic.

BRIAN CUTE: How about with any scope? Any thoughts on that? Yeah, David.

DAVID CONRAD: It seems, as Avri said, it sort of goes to the core of accountability. If an organization can be captured, then clearly it's not being accountable to other parts of the stakeholder environment.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: I think there's both actual lists of capture, and more important perhaps, the apparent appearance of seeming to others to have been captured. To what extent do we appear to be captured by business interest in the gTLD space? To what extend do we appear to be captured by the U.S. government more than we actually are, for example? So maybe those are worth – I have a few others points, but I want to just—

BRIAN CUTE: No, please, continue.

STEVE CROCKER: From today, I made a handful of notes as we were going along. The skills and training, we promised to look at that more closely, but I don't think that means we want to drop it from an agenda here. How do you measure? What are the metrics associated with that and where are we

with respect to where we want to go? So that's a work stream item I think, a work item of some sort.

BRIAN CUTE: And I think that's imbedded in ATRT 1 recommendations, right? So the part of that work stream, review of those recommendations.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. So maybe the new reaction to the next one is the same about whether or not the rationales that have been added do provide the level of information and closure with respect to different points of view and public comments and so forth.

BRIAN CUTE: The board decisions?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: That's ATRT 1. That will be covered.

STEVE CROCKER: Visibility of the GAC register. There are some mechanical things that could be done. Then there's the question of a formal process or place in the process where deciding whether GAC advice is needed or desired and how to trigger that and get that in. Some of these are the operational embodiments of—

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, David.

DAVID CONRAD: This actually plays to the last thing Steve was raising with regards to the GAC. Being new to this environment, I'm not sure it actually is applicable here, but the question I would have is whether or not accountability of the GAC – operations, for example, the GAC secretariat, the GAC web, that type of stuff – is something that is appropriate for us to look into. I don't know the answer. That's why I'm asking.

BRIAN CUTE: Heather.

HEATHER DRYDEN: I think if you look at the port to the GAC. So not exactly the secretariat issue which is in front of the GAC – it's an internal GAC matter, really. But there are ways in which the work of the GAC could be facilitated or supported that aren't exactly secretariat support and I think we have touched on some of those already where we might want to make particular mention of that.

                          I have a few points. I'd ask to speak the floor, so I don't know whether you want to give the floor to someone else or whether I should continue.

BRIAN CUTE: Continue, please.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Okay. All right. So just to Larry reminding us about Jørgen's point with financial control, I think that concern in particular is being driven by gTLDs and the funds that that's generating, so that link may give us a better hook to look at it or at least find the right home for looking at it.

                          The point that I had made yesterday about the organization and the work flow and our ability to manage that work or prioritize or focus I do think is one that we want to look at, and whether that's covered by just this notion of how the policy development process is working or whether it's something that we could highlight a little more pointedly – and I do feel very strongly that this affects the ability of the GAC to function because we are not able to keep up and track all what's going on and what is highly relevant to the GAC.

                          On that point, another theme that does keep coming up is to take into account the broader context, and this may include stakeholder

engagement and communications, communicating what is the true nature of the organization, what improvements may have actually been put in place, correcting misunderstandings and I think this is very much along the lines of some of the things Fadi was talking about this morning. I had heard the word "internationalization" in association I think with those ideas as well, so if that helps us as well identify some issues.

BRIAN CUTE: Well, certainly, the external part that you're talking to maps to 9.1-D, continually assessing extent to which ICANN's decisions are embraced, supported, and accepted by the public and the Internet community. So I think we have a natural home if that becomes a work stream.

And on the prior points, David, just to offer – and Heather, your input is welcome back after (inaudible) – assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC and its interaction with the board is 9.1-B. so I think that provides us some range to focus on the issue David raised and other related issues if we think it's appropriate. With that, Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just to go back a little bit to the capture thing, I suppose it's good to have clear (decoupling) between where the resources of ICANN came and to who the obligations of ICANN refers. ICANN has of course obligations to the whole community, but because of the – it was a discussion years ago the board had. Because of course a major part of the resources of ICANN came from some constituencies, of course, but at the end of the day, the (inaudible) ICANN provides is for the whole community, and of course the whole community is the source of the resources that came from hands off of some constituencies. Then it's good to make this (decoupling)very clear that (inaudible) issues where

you get your resources and what community you are responsible in front of.

BRIAN CUTE: And that's an elaboration of capture or support of capture with additional focus as an issue. Okay. It's a little tedious, I'm sorry, but I think we need to get this up on the wall – this entire list – because we're identifying a long list of things and then we're going to get to that point where we have to prioritize, condense, and figure out what we're actually going to be able to do as a matter of producing work. So Charla, if you would bear with us. Can you type thing sup onto the screen? Yeah.

So you've got a part of the list, I've got a part of the list, Avri. Why don't you read out for Charla? And Charla, right under number one, list of issues, if you could drop in right below that and then just type in the following.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Some of the ones from yesterday that I captured, there was one that relates to how does ATRT 2 make sure that at the outset we understand the ideas the community has regarding accountability and transparency. That was one of the ones that came up yesterday.

"How do we increase the cross-community interaction?" was one of the ones. Actually, I can send these to you. I can send those. No, never mind. I'll just type them.

BRIAN CUTE: Are you going to read them out to her?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. Okay, this is the first set. Oh, God.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. You're on ATRT 2, right Charla?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY:	Yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. (inaudible). Okay, here comes one.

AVRIA DORIA: See, half the things I type are illiterate the first three times I typed them.

BRIAN CUTE: Another one coming. Do you got it?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Not yet.

BRIAN CUTE: No, okay. Should I walk it down to you?

AVRIA DORIA: I'm still capturing. Okay, that's one sec. (inaudible) one list. I just sent a list with a bunch, so when you get mine, it's all together. I'll send another set with a whole bunch of illiteracies in it.

BRIAN CUTE: Is your screen frozen?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: No, (inaudible).

AVRI DORIA: And I sent two mails with a batch of (inaudible), and there is overlap and repetition.

BRIAN CUTE: So just one point of clarity, too, because I've heard some discussion. The Review Team will review the implementation of the recommendations of the three prior teams, and I've heard some comments to the effect that, for example, we really should look at the PDP. We didn't last time. Fine, accepted. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't review any and all work that's been done in the prior review teams. We're not checking a box here. We're going to do a full in-depth review of every recommendation and implementation and may be choosing to emphasize something that the prior Review Team didn't. Right, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:	We added a reminder when we write the Charter to say that we reserve the right to be flexible and prioritize, so not everything that we're putting in the Charter is necessarily going to be looked at in depth.
BRIAN CUTE:	Right.
ALAN GREENBERG:	So we need to remember that, and that pretty well covers this.
BRIAN CUTE:	Thank you. How are doing?
AVRI DORIA:	I sent two (inaudible), and both of them have now come through to me at least. (inaudible) overlaps both my lists (inaudible) today.
(SPEAKER):	(inaudible).
BRIAN CUTE:	That's fine. I guess while we're waiting, who wants to pick up the pen to draft the Charter, Terms of Reference, and Board Methodology document? Remember we went through the Terms of Reference and Work Methodology document. This one. It's one document. Remember it included 9.1, which is effectively the Charter language. We're going to use 9.1 and add some points for the Charter. So I think for efficiency's sake, why don't we just create one document that includes the Charter language, the framework, the work methodology, the terms of reference, our calendar, our interactions. I mean, we've got the basis of it right here.
LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	Are you looking for one draft or for the whole thing or multiple drafters who will put together the whole document?
AVRI DORIA:	I think that one sounds sufficiently process-y, but maybe the four of us should sort of work on getting that cleaned up and then pass it to others as (facility). Because that's a very process-y sort of document. We talked

through it. It's a bunch of notes. A lot of it is changing dates. No, you don't like that idea.

BRIAN CUTE: No, it's fine. It's absolutely fine. It's wonderful. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: It's a process-y sort of thing, you know.

BRIAN CUTE: The four of us will be taking that on.

AVRI DORIA: Now we can get them to volunteer for all the other stuff. Excuse me, the other part is, obviously, if anybody wants to help with that one, welcome. But I'm really hoping that we can sort of keep as much of the process-y stuff out of the mainstream and just get it done and have people check and give feedback, but not burden you all with a whole lot of process-y stuff.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: That does not apply to drafting the final report, however.

AVRI DORIA: That's not process-y.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. So we've got that assignment taken care of. We are also going to draft the agenda for the next meeting and circulate it to the team for review and editing, and then after we go through the list of issues and prioritize and condense and decide which ones we're going to pursue, we will ask for volunteers to take ownership of respective work streams.

So, Charla, the first two are really the same. This is where we're going to review the three Review Teams' recommendations. So if you can combine one and two or just put them next to each other, that's one – it's three work streams.

Then we have transparency mechanisms as default (inaudible) work done by ICANN. Metrics and methods for continual improvement – are we comfortable if we separate those two or do they naturally need to be together? Are they different enough? Are they related? What do you think?

While people are thinking, Charla, could you take the curser down to "efficiency" in the second paragraph and then just hit "return". Thank you. And then the same thing for "how processes" just so we separate out these. Any thoughts on metrics and methods for continual improvement? Should those be combined or separate work streams? Separate? Okay.

Okay. So the efficiency and effectiveness remark, Larry, was a reference to cross community interaction. I don't know where that came from.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: It was in the list, but Steve thinks he's responsible for it.

BRIAN CUTE: Is he? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Brian. I'd split metrics and methods because metrics is passive while methods is active. In other words, in method, you're designing the method to do things and in metrics, you're just looking at things. We're splitting that one item into two, and methods for continual improvement, this is proactive methods as to how to perform continuing improvement. But in the metrics, this is something that we're basically looking at across a number of points in ICANN. I understand the word metrics has come up a number of times. So that is a chapter in itself.

BRIAN CUTE:	So we're splitting them? Let's split them for now, Charla. We can recombine them later. Carlos? No? Okay. So the next one we have is efficiency and effectiveness, cross-community interactions—
ALEN GREENBERG:	Brian?
BRIAN CUTE:	Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	On metrics, we also yesterday, when Jørgen and I were having an interaction, said we're going to include in metrics success criteria. In other words, when it's not really a metric but it's a yes or a no issue.
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay. So could you add that, Charla? Metric success criteria.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Comma success criteria.
BRIAN CUTE:	Success criteria. Thank you. Steve, is that ringing a bell? Efficiency and effectiveness, cross-community interaction. Was that yours? And if it was, what did you mean? Okay. Yeah, cross-community interaction, if you could hit "return" on that and break that out, the entire – parenthesis.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	It's Olivier. There's also in there legitimacy that goes on the same line. Well, efficiency, effectiveness, and legitimacy.
BRIAN CUTE:	Is there a focused point on that or just those three areas to look at?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	I think that they all hold each other together. It could be the organization is effective and is efficient, then it certainly makes it more legitimate. Legitimacy is also a wider thing. I mean, we're looking at the wider picture outside of ICANN.
BRIAN CUTE:	Go ahead, David.

DAVID CONRAD: I think, actually, they were combined and the idea was to actually apply greater emphasis in the analysis of security and stability for the processes when you're looking at the transparency and accountability. So it's tempting to focus on the security and stability implications of the processes that have been derived to be accountable and open and transparent. Is that at all clear?

(SPEAKER): (inaudible).

DAVID CONRAD: Yeah, exactly. Okay.

BRIAN CUTE: Down to the next big paragraph. If you had put the cursor after metrics and hit "return" between metrics and transparency. Transparency is a default condition.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: (inaudible) recommendations of first report.

BRIAN CUTE: Oh, yeah. So change metrics, if you could lose that. Up to the next – there you go. And then write "recommendations" – is that right? Recommendations of the Review Teams? Other review teams. Yeah. Okay, thank you.

Next one down, between condition and efficient, hit "return". Yeah, right there. Boom. Okay. And then before "organization". This has to be fascinating for the listeners, I'm sure. No worries. It's us; not you. Organizational workload priorities.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: We do have efficiency, effectiveness, and legitimacy for the entire organization in a higher line.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:	(inaudible)
BRIAN CUTE:	Just transparency? Okay, transparency around financial matters.
CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:	(inaudible)
BRIAN CUTE:	Oh yeah, after this, we then marry those other related and consolidate. That didn't come out right, did it?
AVRI DORIA:	Just to explain part of what happens, it seems that in the notes I was taking, I was taking them on a notepad and all the carriage returns, basically, didn't come across when I cut and paste it. So I apologize for that, but I was just taking my own notes.
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay. Yes, Carlos, please. Microphone, please. Thank you.
CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:	Just on the graph, I see you put legitimacy up there, but my notes – I took notes of what Jørgen said and when Jørgen talked about legitimacy, he was focusing on the external part, on the outreach, on the relation to governments, on the relation to the larger community – larger community and GAC. That's what I wrote together with legitimacy. It was separate. It was very specific and he related that to the broader community. I don't want to lose this (inaudible) of the legitimacy of Jørgen's comment, please.
BRIAN CUTE:	If you would read that for Charla and she can type that in as its own line item.
CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:	Don't worry.
BRIAN CUTE:	No, let's do it now live because we're going to go through the list and then consolidate and then prioritize.

EN

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: (inaudible) on the outreach and government, and on the larger Internet community. (inaudible) outreach, government, larger Internet community.

(SPEAKER):   Was that government or governance? What did you say?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Governments. Then (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: Community, yeah.

(SPEAKER):   Thank you.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: That's the way I recall his comments.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, Carlos. Let's go down the document and just get through the list once. Organization and workload priorities and management take into account broader context.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: And his comment on financial matters was directly about the income on the gTLD. So financial matters of the gTLD.

BRIAN CUTE: (inaudible) or gTLDs?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: The New gTLDs.

BRIAN CUTE: New gTLDs after financial matters. What's the logical (inaudible)?

(SPEAKER):   Is it just organization and workload priorities?

(SPEAKER):   So after priorities—

AVRI DORIA: It's at the dash. I believe it's at the dash. Right. It's got my illiteracy in it. So it's organizational workload priorities, and management taking into

account broader context. So it breaks at the dash. I think the dash was often a break.

(BRIAN CUTE): Okay, so just leave that line as it is.

AVRI DORIA: And break it at the dash at the end of the line.

BRIAN CUTE: The next one is communication was accepted (inaudible) of the outreach.

AVRI DORIA: I think "what is accepted" should have a question mark. Then there was internationalization of outreach was a second. And I could not type as fast as people were talking.

BRIAN CUTE: Capture the transparency, apparent and accountability (inaudible) issues.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. What happened there is I had written "Are there transparency and accountability issues?" and then while Steve was talking, I put apparent in parenthesis next to transparency and actual in parenthesis next to accountability, but again, it was just me taking notes. That's not necessarily how it breaks, but that's how I mapped it at that moment. And then the next line was trying to catch what Demi was saying, was the source of ICANN. Then source of ICANN resources – where resources came from and then decouple it where you get the resources, from what community you face and such. I was just trying to explain. I wasn't trying to do the typing.

BRIAN CUTE: All right. And skills and training, what's Steve's offering and that's going to be part of ATRT 1 Review. Yeah, those go together, Charla. Source of ICANN resources and (inaudible) family.

AVRI DORIA: (inaudible) of outreach. (inaudible)

BRIAN CUTE: Right. (inaudible) captured, right?

AVRI DORIA: Right, it got merged.

BRIAN CUTE: Oh, I see. Okay. Okay, can you go up to, after internationalization of outreach. After outreach, put your cursor and it "return" and then delete "and". There we go. Thank you. Okay. Can you scroll to the bottom? Is that it? No, okay.

Skills and training, measure associated with that. That's part of ATRT 1, skills and training for the board. Rational sufficiency. I'm not sure what that is. Visibility of GAC register effectiveness relations with the board. Follow a process for deciding when GAC advice is needed, accountability of GAC operations in (scope). Okay. I think that's it. Is there anything anybody else wants to offer as an issue to focus? There's more? Wow.

AVRI DORIA: These were what I recorded yesterday, and the sentences were more or less coherent, but they may to things that are already above I think. So they may – in most cases, they're probably repeats. And they were the ones that I wrote down yesterday in my notes that are less incoherent than what I wrote today.

BRIAN CUTE: I think the first three we know for sure. Maybe this is (inaudible). This is a broader statement of the effective and efficient piece.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, that's the (inaudible).

BRIAN CUTE: Right. I think you can delete the last one – sorry. Are we okay? Yeah, I've got 25 minutes. You can delete the last one. Yes, please. Thank you.

	We can keep these two for now and put them in the larger list, and then our next task is to now go through the list. There are more? Oh, dear.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	My apologies. It's Olivier here. There was some discussion with regards to the GAC interaction with the PDP. And I think there should also be some discussion to do with the actual overall structure of the policy development in ICANN.
BRIAN CUTE:	So is that policy development or policy development process?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yes, strictly speaking, it was PDP for the GAC that was discussed yesterday.
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay, so if we say PDP process, a subset of that could be the effectiveness of the GAC's in the PDP process. Yeah, so just put down – is that okay? PDP process as an item? Or do you want to break out GAC?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	That would be, but I thought that could be as a subset of a wider policy development altogether, i.e., is ICANN structured the way that it should be to be effective and to scale up?
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay, yeah. With respect to the PDP process or scaling up on all fronts?
ALAN GREENBERG:	No, I think they're two different issues. They're clearly very related. If we change the overall structure, the policy development process will likely change, but not necessarily the other way around. But I wouldn't put the PDP; I'd put policy development, lower case.
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay. Well, first, this is Olivier's idea, so I want to be sure we're capturing it from the author correctly first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Olivier again. Yeah, okay, so there are two things. There's GAC and PDP – so Policy Development Process – no, but that was one thing that was discussed yesterday, and there is also policy development.
BRIAN CUTE:	We're just building a list, Alan. We're not at the point yet where we're tossing people out of the neighborhood.
ALAN GREENBERG:	And that's the reason I think you want to use the wider definition. That's the reason I would think you want to use the wider definition, not the narrower one.
BRIAN CUTE:	We can do both.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Policy development might involve PDP but might involve other processes. I think we want to look at the wider concept of policy development.
BRIAN CUTE:	So let's put policy development in ICANN.
ALAN GREENBERG:	And scalability?
BRIAN CUTE:	Policy development in ICANN and scalability. And since we're here – what's that? Yes. No, we're keeping…
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	It's Olivier here. The rest is a subset. So the GAC direction with the PDP is actually part of this whole discussion on point C, evelopment **[inaudible 0:04:00]**.
BRIAN CUTE:	Okay, so you can delete the last phrase. Yes, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	If you're deleting it, it doesn't matter what it said. Who's going to comment on what it said? When it's not there, it doesn't matter.

BRIAN CUTE: Could you add Recommendation 6 from ATRT 1 for me? Thank you. Carlos. Okay, do we have a full list? Any other things to throw up on the wall here? Yes. So what specifically should we write? Yes. Is that not covered by review of Recommendation 6 implementation? Review. Okay, there we go. Okay. Okay, I'm going to call it. Anybody else? Any other items? Going once, going twice, sold. Okay.

All right. Now, a little more painstaking. Sorry. Bear with me. Let's just go through the list as best we can. Consolidate, identify issues that are related to each other and should be consolidated. Can you go back to the top, Charla? Okay. It's going to take an hour. Yeah. Do you want to prioritize? Do you want to do a cut instead? Go through and… Okay, could you put numbers on each of these, in front of each of these? Absolutely, I'm all for that.

Let's see if we can catch some of this while she's doing it. So one other standalone thing. Metrics is a standalone thing. Transparency (inaudible), oh, yeah. Yeah, so we can just delete it from number one. Demi, are these a subset of 15 or are these standalone? Source of ICANN resources, is that part of capture in your mind, or is that separate? Source of ICANN resources, that's part of capture. So 15, 16, and 17 are related. Okay. What is 20?

AVRI DORIA: I don't remember what I was writing. I was trying to jot things down as people were talking.

(LAWRENCE STRICKLING):   But where's the accountability?

AVRI DORIA: I confess. That was transparency, not accountability.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, so we've got them all numbered? Thank you for saving. Okay. All right, back to the top, if you don't mind. Okay, we know we're going to do number one. That's a given. We didn't replicate metrics anywhere else. Is there anything else? I don't think so. Methods for continual improvement, I think that's unique. Efficiency, effectiveness, and legitimacy, we put that down. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Brian. We have two choices. We can either have them as two separate streams, or we can have them all under legitimacy with one sub-stream being efficiency and effectiveness, which is an internal matter, and another one being outreach, government, and larger Internet community, which would probably be mostly an external matter.

BRIAN CUTE: I keep trying to consolidate replicated. So Olivier has just distinguished these two substantively, so let's keep moving. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Brian, but yet both are actually from an external point of view because efficiency and effectiveness are seen from the outside of us. It brings legitimacy to the organization. If an organization is ineffective and inefficient, we've got a problem.

                        Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier. How processes can be verified in an accountable and transparent way is probably a metric.

AVRI DORIA: I think that 18 was "skills and training." Look at it more closely, "measures associated with skills and training, part of ATRT work stream." I believe that those were grouped together.

BRIAN CUTE: Well, it also could be a method for continual improvement. Can we delete 20? Come on. Have some courage. Make it go away. What does

20 mean? We don't know. No, we really don't know, and the author can't remember. Right?

AVRI DORIA: I was checking what someone else was saying, and I lost (inaudible).

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. The stenographer can't remember. Okay. Are we seeing any duplication? Anything that should be put with something that came prior? Should 21, 22, and 23 just be condensed into one item? Yep, let's do that.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Yeah, I agree with that.

BRIAN CUTE: What's that?

HEATHER DRYDEN: That you can have issues there that aren't specific to the relations with the Board. So you might not be able to put them all together.

BRIAN CUTE: Oh, so break it into two. Break it into two, perhaps? Put the cursor before "formal" and hit "return." No? Before "accountability" and hit "return." Sorry. There we go. Is that better? David.

DAVID CONRAD: So the way I was doing things is the GAC register is part of the operation, and I don't want to be specific. I was trying to get at a higher level idea. There are accountabilities of operation within the GAC. There are potentially some transparency issues in some of the operations of the GAC that separate it from the policy development. I was trying to get a…

BRIAN CUTE: A broader sense.

DAVID CONRAD: A broader sense, yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: Yeah, I think that's captured. If you can delete "in scope." Just leave that parentheses. Okay, 24 seems unique, right? Moving on, 25. Did we have cross-community somewhere else? We did, didn't we. Could you just slowly scroll up? I think we had cross-community somewhere else, didn't we?

(ALAN GREENBERG): How is this efficiency effectiveness different from the previous one?

BRIAN CUTE: Cross-community interaction. Yeah, so do you want to deleted 6? Delete 6, Charla, unless someone feels strongly otherwise. Okay, good. And then if you can go back up to 1, see transparency mechanism as default condition, just delete that because it already appears elsewhere. There you go.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have efficiency effectiveness twice, one in number 4 and one way down 20-ish.

BRIAN CUTE: We do? We killed 20. 21?

ALAN GREENBERG: 24.

BRIAN CUTE: Oh, but that's specific to…

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I took the first one to mean that one, but maybe not.

BRIAN CUTE: Yes, Heather.

HEATHER DRYDEN: I have a question about that point, accountability of GAC operations. What is meant by that?

BRIAN CUTE: David.

DAVID CONRAD:	Basically, trying to ensure that the support of GAC enables the accountability of ICANN-GAC relations. So one of the things Fiona raised which may not have been an issue was the fact that there appeared to be broken links on the public side of the GAC website and looking at who is accountable for that, for example. Did that help?
HEATHER DRYDEN:	Yeah. So what I hope we can do – because I'm the type that likes to read through and think about it – that we can refine this a little bit after, because I was reading that point differently. I have no issue with what you're suggesting. But I think there's a bit of refinement needed to get to exactly what it is we want and probably to organize the information as well so it leaps out at us a bit more clearly. And therefore others as well may benefit from us working on it a little more. Thanks.
BRIAN CUTE:	What I thought we would do now – I'm open to suggestions – is we could go through and do a quick first prioritization and really single out the work streams that you think are at the level of priority or importance that this team should focus its work on them. Is everyone okay to go through that one time? So, okay, what I've asked for is indicate if an issue in your mind is of that very high importance. And let's go through the list once and see if we can start sorting. Yes.
(LAWRENCE STRICKLING):	So this is basically a partitioning into sort of an A group and a B group?
BRIAN CUTE:	Yes.
(LAWRENCE STRICKLING):	B, by implication that it's not an A.
BRIAN CUTE:	Yes, they would be in B, right. Thank you. Carlos? Just two groups. We'll do a first pass. Those that you really think are at that high level of important and criticality. Okay, so let's go. Well, 1 we're doing. We

don't have a choice there. 2 – any votes for metrics? You're going to vote for metric. So could you just highlight them or something in yellow?

ALAN GREENBERG: Brian?

BRIAN CUTE: Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we really going to look at metrics as a separate stream and entity, or are we going to make sure we are thinking about metrics in all of the other ones?

BRIAN CUTE: What do you mean all of the other ones?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, in the other issues that we're looking at and try to attach metrics where applicable as opposed to thinking of metrics as a separate study.

BRIAN CUTE: My point of view on metrics is the first review team did not offer any metrics for the organization to implement to use in implementation and then to measure. We're going to review what the organization did in terms of metrics, but we heard today from Fadi that they really didn't put them in place. This team has to offer recommendations which could include suggested metrics from us. So I think metrics to my mind is a critical issue in the work we're going to do. That's the question. Right. What do you think, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier. I think the team should design what metrics should be there but, of course, not supply them. It's not for us to do an audit, but it's certainly for us to say what needs to be monitored closely at all levels.

BRIAN CUTE: Questions? Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I think we're going to end up doing what we can. If we can recommend specific metrics in some cases, so be it. Otherwise, we may recommend that ICANN and the community develop metrics for certain things. So it's not that we can't mention it if we can't come up with a specific metric. We can do what ATRT 1 did essentially but make explicit that we believe there should be metrics. We're not developing them in our work plan.
BRIAN CUTE:	Is your position that they shouldn't be a priority issue for the work?
ALAN GREENBERG:	No. The thing I originally raised was I think in many of the items that were going to come out on our laundry list, we should be able to either attach metrics or recommend that metrics be developed. And it's a sub-item of many of the others, not a single study in its own right.
BRIAN CUTE:	Not its own unique work stream. I see. Yes.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Brian. It's Olivier. Metrics is one of these things which, as you said, Alan, will be covered in many different streams. But in order to obtain, I would say, a uniform type of insight through each one of the metrics, I believe that a special team specifically dealing with metrics for each one of the other parts would be a good way to go.
BRIAN CUTE:	Yes. Shall we move on for now? Okay. Methods for continual improvement, are there any votes as this being a critical issue that this team really needs to address? That's a question. That's a B? Okay. No, don't highlight. No, it's not an A. Thank you. Okay, 4.
ALAN GREENBERG:	If highlighting our As, number 1 has to be highlighted.
BRIAN CUTE:	1 needs to be highlighted too, yes. Yes, go.

AVRI DORIA:	On the continual improvement, I'm actually not sure that that isn't one of the higher ones given that that is one of those words that shows up in the AoC that we haven't talked about. I mean, there are three other phrases that say "continuing," and I think we have to look at continuing because it has not been looked at. So I'm not sure that it's a secondary issue.
BRIAN CUTE:	Any strong objection? Carlos.
CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ:	If you say "looking at methods for continuing improvement," it's different than this team should provide or ask for methods for continuous improvement. If you put "looking," I could agree. We are going to look. I'm always in English I have a problem, I'm missing the verb and the subject. Who is going to act on what is on that line? And I suppose, I'm assuming, the team is going to look at the recommendations. The team is going to provide metrics **[inaudible 0:24:07]** and the team is going to…
BRIAN CUTE:	Recommend methods for continual improvement.
SPEAKER:	Okay. Our work is done then.
BRIAN CUTE:	So we're highlighting? Okay, all I'm going to say is if everything is highlighted when we get to the bottom of the document, somebody's in trouble. We need to prioritize, people. It's got to be really critical. We've got three already. Number 4. Well, before we get to number 4, I hate to say this, but I have to depart – a really cruel, cruel, cruel thing to do. No, I need to go to the airport. I'll be calling in on the way to the airport. Thank you. My battery died. No, thank you all. I'll dial in from the taxi and carry on with you and turn it over to Avri. Goodbye.

AVRI DORIA: Lucky, lucky me. Yes, please, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Avri. There was a question earlier with regards to, are we meant to actually just say there should be methods for continual improvement or to design them? I wondered if any of the people on the ATRT 1 who might still be in the room or others who were in the ATRT 1 would be able to tell those who were not which one of the two is the task of this working group.

AVRI DORIA: Anyone with a clue? I guess, if I understood the question properly, when you're talking about methods for continual improvement, was it that we are supposed to be designing the methods or just recommending?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Recommending that ICANN gets an organization to design methods for them. So the question really is, how deep do we go down the rabbit hole? Do we go all the way down to the end and design the whole thing and give it on a platter, or do we make just recommendations that say, "We need to do that?"

AVRI DORIA: Isn't that an issue for the people that get involved in that as a work stream to sort of think about it and make recommendations to the rest of us on whether we do one or the other?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's an issue with regards to the prioritization that we're dealing with right at the moment.

AVRI DORIA: Can you explain? Would you prioritize it higher as one than as the other?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I would because if we had to go all the way down to the end of the rabbit hole, it would take a lot more time. So I would prioritize it as

being an A thing because it would be a long stream rather than a short task.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So that's actually an interesting criteria in itself as that being the reason for prioritization. Yes.

(STEVE CROCKER):   Well, I'm still not entirely certain what this exercise is we're doing, but three of the five tasks in 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments involved the Board's engaging in activities that are continually assessing various things. Now because the first Review Team was looking at it at that point in time, there really wasn't any opportunity to evaluate the Board's continuous assessment of things.

But it seems to me that in going back through these same five specifications, there are now three of them where there will have to be some evaluation of to what extent the board has put in place a process to continually assess and improve the Board of Directors, to continually assess and improve the processes by which they receive public input, to continually assess the extent to which ICANN's decisions are embraced, supported and accepted by the public.

So at the first level, there's going to have to be some sense of, is there any effort being made at all in that regard for those categories? And if yes, does it appear to be satisfactory or are there gaps, problems, people have identified. And if they're not doing it at all, then it would seem that there would need to be some comment by this Review Team to the fact that that's not happening.

Now if beyond that you want to go and say in the absence of the Board having put these in place, here's what ATRT 2 would recommend,

it seems to me that's entirely within the discretion of this group to do. But I don't know. You may want to do all this other work first before you get to that point. Plus, you may want to hear from the board. They may well have thought a lot about this and have concluded it can't be done for whatever reason, so you'd want to have that information and evaluate it as part of the review.

But I'm a little worried about how this list – people shouldn't be looking at this list as a substitute for the guts of 9.1, which is still the fundamental work that's got to be done by this group.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: As long as we focus so much on the "continual" that shows up, who wrote those words into the original Affirmation of Commitments? I mean, there's confusion as to what that actually meant, what the intention of that was. In the extreme, continual means you're just doing that all the time and it's hard to measure.

(DAVID CONRAD):   I hope we're not getting to a question of original intent and what the framers thought and all of that. I think what's important is the notion that there should be some regular review of how things are going and an effort to improve them as part of the regular process. Now is that done every day, every minute, every hour? Maybe it's once a year. Maybe it's once every two years. It seems to me that's all within the board to be making a judgment on in the context of what they have to do.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm 100% comfortable with that. That makes perfect sense, and if we reverse positions and say, "Okay, we're in the process and what's the

frequency?" and so forth. First of all, is it built into the process, and then is the process actually run, and what are the results of that and so forth? All of that makes sense. The "continual" has the possibility of an extreme interpretation of which every second all the time you're looking at it and you can't get anything done. So if that's the clarification, that works for me. And I'm happy putting on my chair hat to say, yes, I believe that ought to be on our agenda to implement and make happen and should have maybe already, but definitely we'll put it on the list.

AVRI DORIA: Perhaps what needs to happen is that that one needs to be reworded to say what you guys agreed to. And yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I don't want to go to war over it. Fine. But now that turns that into something, and I don't care whether it's an interpretation or whether you amend it to, "Damn, that wording." I'll leave that to you. You have the more sensitivity about the words.

(DAVID CONRAD):   Is Number 3 really the rationale and to some extent the methodology that goes along with metrics and setting targets? I mean, why else are we setting metrics other than to understand are we getting better and, if not, why? That seems to be the background for why are we setting metrics and targets and measuring things and having a second review every three years. I'm not sure it's a stream in its own right is what I'm saying.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. I guess I still see it as a separate stream in that the metrics may be what you're using to do that, but do you have a process? So I think if this turns into, you know, reviewing methods for continual assessment, and then perhaps metrics is the reason but perhaps metrics isn't the

only process. How is that done? Okay. Perhaps can we just change that? Would it be okay to change that to review methods for continual assessment? Right. Okay. Thanks. Did I see another hand? No? Okay. So do we leave that as a highlighted, or does it get un-highlighted now that we've had this discussion? Leave it? Yeah, it seems fair, okay.

Moving down to Number 4 – and is this 4 and 5 we're looking at together, or are 4 and 5 separate? But are they high priority, or are they in the secondary? The efficiency, effectiveness, and legitimacy. And then in terms of legitimacy, I guess we're looking at various aspects of legitimacy. Who was first? Okay, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Larry, I know you…did you want to? Okay. All right, well, I don't know why everyone wants to hide behind me. I think the two have to be batched together. They're two parts of the same thing but looking at different parts. These are subsetted. I believe they are high priority due to what we've seen at WCIT.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess for efficiency and effectiveness, I put those in – again, I may be preaching this too many times – not as a separate entity but something we have to keep in mind in all the others. There's no point in saying in relation to one of the other items that the board must give 400-page rationales and tick off every box if it's going to be a completely impractical thing to do. So efficiency and effectiveness, I think, are something we should be considering throughout the whole document. Legitimacy, I'm not sure.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I've got Larry, Fiona, then David.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	Well, 9.1-B talks about continually assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are embraced, supported, and accepted by the public and the Internet community. I think that's saying legitimacy, so I think it's part of the mandate already – legitimacy is.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, thank you. Fiona.
FIONA ASONGA:	I think in view of the discussion we've had on review methods of continual assessment, that should cover issues of efficiency and effectiveness and tie together with the issue of metrics. So that the first part of efficiency and effectiveness would be something that we can look at throughout everything else that we go through. Then our legitimacy becomes the point that we focus on as our key issue to work on.
AVRI DORIA:	Do I understand correctly, you're basically saying that 3 gets ganged with 4 and 5, or 4 and 5 gets ganged with 3?
FIONA ASONGA:	4 doesn't get highlighted.
AVRI DORIA:	4 does not get highlighted? Okay.
FIONA ASONGA:	Yes, but we go with 5 because a large part of 4, effectiveness and efficiency, will be something we'll do continuously. Then I would focus on the legitimacy part as number 5.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, thank you. Okay, David, then Demi.
DAVID CONRAD:	Yeah, actually, I agree with Fiona, and that sort of reiterates something that I was going to say. But I would actually also, skipping ahead a slight bit, I'd actually lump 6 into the same sort of category. The review of the security and stability aspects needs to be integrated in with the same

	level as the efficiency and effectiveness, I believe. So applying the same rationale that Fiona had used to 6 so we can actually leave that one out of the stream.
AVRI DORIA:	I'm trying to understand. So you would make 6 a bullet under 5? That 5 would get highlighted and 6 would be a bullet under 5? No?
DAVID CONRAD:	No. I was actually saying that when we're going through each of the streams that has an aspect – we're looking at it in terms of effectiveness and efficiency – but also in terms of the impact of security and stability to whatever that stream is looking at. So it's sort of intrinsic to the actual analysis that we're undertaking of each of those streams.
AVRI DORIA:	Thank you. Demi.
DEMI GETSCHKO:	I have the same problem that Carlos had because there is no verb in the number 4. I suppose we're trying to review a continual assessment of efficiency and effectiveness of ICANN. Then I propose to have the 4 imbedded in Number 3, and legitimacy remains in 5. And we can eliminate 4 if you put efficiency and effectiveness as part of the review of continual assessment or something like that.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay. I'm admitting to being totally confused at the moment. Okay, please.
(FIONA ASONGA):	I think what we are agreeing on is the fact that efficiency and effectiveness is something we have to look at throughout. It has to be…
AVRI DORIA:	We're coming up with a notion of cross-cutting issues that cut across everything.

(FIONA ASONGA):	Yes, and David added security and stability. So what that does is then we make a note of that somewhere, and as we are working we should always remember to look at those four areas. Then we have 5 is now going to review issues of legitimacy in terms of outreach, governments, and the larger Internet community.
AVRI DORIA:	Yes, Steve.
STEVE CROCKER:	Yeah, so just to capture the point and turn it into an operational thing, I think the pragmatic thing to do is to take those things that are cross-cutting and create a separate column – desiderata or something – and that will have the benefit of holding those in a place that's visible, reducing the list that we're dealing with, and then we can focus our attention on the streams.
AVRI DORIA:	For now, we could just give them a different color and say that they're cross-cutting. Charla, would that work for you? For now, just take I guess it would be 4 and 6 and make them purple. Why not? It's my favorite. So they're the cross-cutting. Oh, see? They're great. They go away. No, that's a better purple. Thank you. Okay.
	So now we're still on 5. Is that one in the high priority? Yes, David. Okay. I'm glad we've got the cross-cutting notion, and we'll see what else belongs in the cross-cutting notion as we go through. Now the legitimacy, that was a different wording of something that was in 9.1. I think, as Larry was saying, it's in the high priority group. Yes? Yes. Cool, so that's also colored mustard. That is mustard, isn't it? It's yellow?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Colonel Mustard and Miss Plum?

AVRI DORIA:	Okay. Moving down to 7. Board process used to review, implement, and oversee recommendations of review teams. Yeah, that's the same as Number 1. Does it need to be…. No, it's not? Okay. Yeah, 5 is yellow.
STEVE CROCKER:	I view those as different because 1 is to go through all the actual recommendations and evaluate how well they've been implemented. This was to get at the question of, has the board established a process that it uses when it gets these reports in front of them and, if not, should there be a more documented approach to how to deal with these reports as they come through? So I think it's a higher-level process question.
AVRI DORIA:	It's a higher-level process, but is it a lower-level priority?
STEVE CROCKER:	No.
AVRI DORIA:	You think that's also a top priority. Agreement? Yep? Okay, mustard. Yeah. So I guess change 7 to put "has the board" in front.
(SPEAKER):	Note: you haven't found a single low-priority one yet.
AVRI DORIA:	Yeah, I note that too, but we did manage to come up with a couple cross-cuttings. Okay. Transparency a default condition, is that high priority? I personally think it is, but what do others think? Or is that a cross-cutting? So that's a plum. Thank you. Okay.
(STEVE CROCKER)	Professor Plum, by the way, not Miss Plum.
AVRI DORIA:	Adjunct professor, please. Transparency around financial matters of new gTLDs, high?
(SPEAKER):	Well, transparency is a cross-cutting issue.

AVRI DORIA:	Right. Okay, but financial.
(SPEAKER):	And I think the other one is covering all.
AVRI DORIA:	But you're basically saying that it really should be analysis of financial matters concerning new gTLDs, and transparency is one of the cross-cutting issues that one would look at in that. Yeah. Would that work, Larry?
LAWRENCE STRICKLING:	Well, there is a fourth review team yet to be formed which will be the team that looks at the whole implementation of the expansion of top-level domains. I don't know whether this is really an issue that ought to be reserved for that team once it gets started or not. I don't feel strongly one way or the other, but I do want to point out that there's yet another review team that hasn't yet come into existence that's supposed to focus on the overall issue of the top-level domain expansion.
AVRI DORIA:	Great. David.
DAVID CONRAD:	So my interpretation of that was that it was sort of focused on the success criteria of the gTLD program. And I think this was specifically targeted to the legitimacy of ICANN that's being adjudicated based on the fact that there are these financial transactions occurring. But that might have just been my interpretation.
AVRI DORIA:	If that's the case, would that make that a part of the legitimacy question as opposed to a separate issue in and of itself, one of the issues?
DAVID CONRAD:	Probably, but I thought it was – was it Jørgen who raised it?
AVRI DORIA:	Yeah, Jørgen.

DAVID CONRAD: Yeah, and I thought he was sort of focused on the legitimacy side of things, so maybe it would fall into that category.

AVRI DORIA: I mean, looking to try and group things and perhaps not have everything at top priority. So the possibility that it is the subject of another review would tend to indicate that it's something that we should look at, but perhaps it's not in the highest priority for here. But the fact that it is a legitimacy issue may make it part of that. So what if we don't color it but just add a bullet to 5 that says reference 9.

(SPEAKER): Yeah, try that.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Does that work for people? Okay, going on to 10. It wouldn't work for you? Oh, excuse me. No, but I think I just got a…Olivier said no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I woke up again, yes. Olivier, for the transcript. You can't give it to the numbers because we've been changing the numbers as we've been moving things around so it might not remain as being 9 if you say "reference 9."

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so you're objecting on an editing principle. Okay. Why don't we just call it – right. Okay. Just reference financial matters of new gTLDs as opposed to number 9 and not color 9; leave it white or black or whatever it is. Organization and work load priorities and management taking into account broader context, high priority or secondary? Anyone? Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Avri. The interesting thing is this is exactly what we're doing.

AVRI DORIA: It is. So I would just leave it alone and keep going.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. 11, communication, what is accepted – isn't that a part of, in a sense, the legitimacy issue about communication and what has been accepted and what has not? Is that true? So perhaps we leave that alone and leave it white but just put it as a bullet under 5. Does that work? Yes? No? Olivier. And I had it, but I'm not sure whether that was a request for the microphone.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: By whom? Simply by the board?

AVRI DORIA: I think there, that's just it. If we're talking about legitimacy and we're looking at…

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: I'm talking about communication. What is accepted by staff? By the Board? By the larger community?

(SPEAKER):   The larger community.

AVRI DORIA: By the larger community I believe was the question.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so we leave it alone for the moment. We can't put something. I mean, it doesn't seem to be at the high priority and it does seem to fit somewhat under legitimacy and outreach and such. Yes, Fiona.

FIONA ASONGA: I think when we talk about outreach, we end up talking about communication, so I think we leave it alone. If we put the outreach, then we can leave that alone, communication. Just leave it as something to look back to, but it's not our top priority.

AVRI DORIA:	Anybody have an issue with that? Okay. Then moving to 12, internationalization of outreach. That would seem to me to be part of outreach. Right, so that goes with 5 too. Yeah, actually, I would put a bullet under 5 – one for communications and one for internationalization of outreach or something like that. Well, just leave them there as a reference but not color them, not change numbers – just leave them. Does that work for people? And those will all become mustard at some point, but that's not important at the moment.
	Okay. We can, but I didn't want – once they're deleted, they're gone. I'd put a line through them if anything at the moment, just because we don't want to lose it to make sure that when we go back and look at things that the content is still there for us to say, "Yep, that was covered." Also, we're only half of us here at the moment, so as we go back.
	13 was capture. Are there transparency and accountability issues? The source of ICANN resources. It should be where the resources come from and then decouple where you get resources and what community you face. I think this one is a high priority, but what do others think? I see head nodding. I see a hand. Fiona.
FIONA ASONGA:	Isn't it tied to the issue of the financial transparency? Part of it?
AVRI DORIA:	I don't think so because the capture, sometimes it may be, yes, the people with the most money sometimes, but it may also be the people with the loudest voices. It may be the people best positioned to do something. So I think capture is sort of separate from a financial. Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I'm not quite sure what the task is here. Is it to put a recommendation in saying ICANN has to be continually wary of capture, or are we going to inspect ICANN to see if it has been captured?
AVRI DORIA:	I actually thought it was sort of a third thing is to understand the notion of ICANN capture and then, yes, to analyze the issue of capture and review whether there is a susceptibility to capture. Does that make sense?
ALAN GREENBERG:	I'm not quite sure what the recommendation comes out of it, but I like that better than what I had here.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay. That's just it. So basically I guess capture would be highlighted, and then we need to add the words in – kind of the ones I said.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Olivier here. Do you think that's high priority?
AVRI DORIA:	I think so. You don't. The way you ask the question, I have the impression you don't.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	We might be disagreeing, yeah, on this. I certainly see – maybe I might be naïve – but I see less capture today than there might have been in the past.
AVRI DORIA:	What I'm actually worried about, and I think that it came out very well in the discussion, was sort of the difference between transparency, I mean, the apparent capture. You hear capture all the time. I don't think I have any conversation about something serious going on in ICANN without somebody claiming capture. Is it just an apparent capture? Is it a transparency? I juxtapose it to transparency because I think half the

time the claims are coming out of capture because people don't see what's going on and therefore they assume capture.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, at the risk of shortcutting all the work, would it be sufficient to declare that it's not captured because it's not under control of anybody? I can tell you that firsthand. It's definitely not under my control.

AVRI DORIA: I'm sure it would satisfy all the people who believe it's captured to be told that the chairman of the board said it's not. So if people don't think it's high priority and I'm the only one, then obviously de-color. Yes.

(ALAN GREENBERG): Well, I think this falls into the category of the legitimacy question, right? I don't actually remember. Is that a separate bullet or not? But if it is, I think that can be part of an analysis within the legitimacy side.

AVRI DORIA: Within legitimacy, you'd add a bullet for capture or perhaps say a bit more but possibility of capture or something like that. Risk of capture is much more business. Okay, 14, skills and training, look at more closely. Yes, Larry.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I would just propose that 14, 15, and 16 are already imbedded in the review of the individual recommendations from before. They're all subparts of them. They're all going to be pieces of what's covered in number 1, so I don't know that they need to have separate color coding.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So probably the easiest way to handle this one is on 14, 15, and 16, just add a note "part of 1" as opposed to moving them as bullets. Okay, part of ATRT 1. So just add that "part of ATRT 1" work that's at the end of 14 to 15 and to 16 also. So you just copy and paste.

EN

LISE FUHR:	Was 16 a policy of ATRT 1? Accountability of GAC operations?
AVRI DORIA:	No.
LISE FUHR:	No?
STEVE CROCKER:	I mean, not precisely, but the issue is certainly there in 9.1. So it should be there as part of the (inaudible)
AVRI DORIA:	What do people think of leaving, are you okay with that?
LISE FUHR:	I just want to make sure that we touch upon that accountability thing because I don't find it being brought into the ATRT 1 review with this emphasis, but it might.
(ALEN GREENBERG):	So I think if there's any ambiguity then we ought to keep it separate and highlight it as Lise suggests.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, sorry. So delete from 16 the part of ATRT 1 stream. And we're highlighting it?
(ALAN GREENBERG):	Yeah.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, and highlight, please. Make it mustard. Okay, 17. I would say that was purple, no? That was plum? How can we be effective and efficient while improving full multi-stakeholder participation, accountability, and transparency? That's kind of one of those cross-cutting motherhood and apple pie things. How do we increase cross-community interactions? And also, if I look down at 18 and 19, I see them as related. Am I the only one that would see cross-community interaction, policy development at ICANN, and scalability as part of the same issue? Yes, David.

| DAVID CONRAD: | So just for clarity, 19, was that the topic that Heather was raising with regards to just the scale and scope of work that is impacting? I don't recall. |

AVRI DORIA: I think so, yes.

DAVID CONRAD: I actually see that independent of cross-community interaction. That in and of itself I think is a critical issue that ICANN is facing. Maintaining transparency, particularly when you're completely overwhelmed with a zillion things to do can be really challenging, not to mention accountability. The cross-community interaction adds a couple orders of additional magnitude to the scalability problem. So I guess I tend to agree that they're related, but of the two I actually think number 19 is actually a higher priority.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So you would put 19 in mustard.

DAVID CONRAD: Yeah, I would mustard it.

AVRI DORIA: And would you make 18 perhaps subordinate to that or separate or what would you do with it?

DAVID CONRAD: Actually it just dawned on me that that actually also plays into legitimacy, right? Because if you're dealing with issues that are siloed, that potentially has an impact on legitimacy. So it could fall into 5.

AVRI DORIA: But it also – if I can, and then I'll go to Alan – it also can have an effect on the scalability problem and such because you're doing things in a staggered sense.

DAVID CONRAD: So maybe cross-cutting?

AVRI DORIA: So maybe it's a cross-cutting, yeah. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, in terms of how they fit together, I think 18 and the first part of 19 are a single entity. It's how do we make the policy development process effective, legitimate, and all those other things, which may involve involving people. It may involve changing the process enough so that – using Fadi's terms – that we have equal or balanced stakeholders. I think scalability is a completely separate issue.

It's related to the policy development one, but we could only have one policy development issue going on a year and we'd still have the problems that are talked about in 18 and 19, acceptable scalability. So I think the scalability is a separate one. I think the rest of it is merged together. It falls under legitimacy because it's what allows us to claim we are a multi-stakeholder operation that is to be trusted to implement what we're doing. But it's a big enough item that I think it deserves its own line.

AVRI DORIA: Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Professor Plum claims scalability.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so scalability – so policy development and just the word scalability by itself gets plummed. Okay. But now what do we do with – I didn't get a concrete suggestion on what to say.

STEVE CROCKER: I suggest we put scalability as a separate item, plum. And the rest of 19 that's left, without the second and, and 18 become a single entity.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Does that work for others. Let me see. So in other words, you put a carriage return before scalability, and it becomes a plum of its own.

And then you would combine the policy development, ICANN, and how do we increase cross-community interaction? I don't know. I'm trying to get to Alan's suggestion.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay, ICANN policy development and a subset of that – one of the items within that, not the only item, but the only one we have listed here – is cross-community interaction.

AVRI DORIA: Does that work for others? And then perhaps there will be other things under that later. Okay, Olivier's not agreeing. He's shaking his pen at me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not at you – waving it at you, shaking it at you. It's Olivier, for the transcript. The policy development, you have to be very careful with the semantics here because we're using uppercase P and uppercase D. I've heard Alan mention PDP suddenly. You did. Well, you said Policy Development Process, which translates to PDP.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe we should only be using lowercases in this case.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So in this case, it needs to be lowercase. Exactly, yes.

AVRI DORIA: So the recommendation is that P gets lowercased and D gets lowercased. Okay, and we eliminate 18, is that correct? Yes? Yes, please. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And, Avri, to make it clear for those who are going to read this afterwards – not listen to the words – maybe instead of that star we should put including cross-community interactions.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Okay, and then that brings us to 20. Yes? Are you saying you want to speak, or are you saying it should be?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: I would put 18 under 20.

AVRI DORIA: What do others think of 18…?

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: I've been waiting a long time for this.

AVRI DORIA: You've been waiting. I'm glad we finally got there. Okay, so what do others think? Why did I get the comic part of the meeting? Fiona.

FIONA ASONGA: I think it makes sense being that 20 was actually looking at the distinction between the policy development process, not the capital PDP and (inaudible) issues. And one of those issues can be the ICANN policy development issues and looking at one of the issues including cross-community interactions. Does that make sense?

AVRI DORIA: It makes sense to you. Alan, how do you feel about that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a comment. I believe ATRT 1 used PDP incorrectly. It should have just been policy. So I don't think we need to look at the PDP as such, but we do need to look at policy development.

AVRI DORIA: And I think when people start working on these, there's going to be a lot of refinement and looking at it. Yes. Hello, Brian. Welcome back.

BRIAN CUTE: Hello, I'm back. Thank you. I'm going to keep it on mute so you don't get distracted by the airport noise. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so chime in any time I'm doing the wrong thing here. So all of 19 is now mustard. By the way, mustard means high priority, but I guess you knew that. We've also since you left, we've added plum. Plum is cross-cutting issues, and we've defined many of the things as cross-cutting issues. We've just hit the end of the list, so now I suggest we go

back up to the top of the list, look at the things that are there colored mustard – high priority – and actually start attaching names of people that want to be part of further delving into these issues. And also while we're looking at it, I would recommend that we think about it and say, "Do more things need to be grouped or refined than we've done?" But also think about this as something that the people that volunteer can work on as we go out of this. Yes.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: As a process, I would rather take this list, make a matrix with the five points of 9.1 so I have boxes there, take it home and put the names in the boxes or other ideas in the boxes. I don't feel we can under this time constraint just jump into the names. This would be my preferred way of action, and we have a telephone call on the 28th. Just jumping from this list to a number to a person, I think we're risking one of the main feedbacks we had from Larry particularly. How does this compare with a, b, c, d, e of 9.1? I need time to reflect on that.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, now I've had other people who have come and said, "Hey, but if we have people volunteering to work on things" – it doesn't mean that everybody has to volunteer even. But I'm wondering in terms of developing ideas further whether there's any notion. Yes, Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: The same question I do all the time, under legitimacy I see no mention about IPv6.

AVRI DORIA: Is IPv6…?

DEMI GETSCHKO: It's part of the mission of ICANN to distribute addresses. We're talking about new gTLDs.

AVRI DORIA:	Okay. Do people object to IPv6 being put there? We're talking about legitimacy. I don't understand the connection between IPv6 and legitimacy, but that might be my ignorance. Okay, I had Olivier and I had Fiona.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Avri. I support the suggestion by Demi. The legitimacy of ICANN actually hinges on IPv6 due to the fact that the ITU has asked for IPv6 to be part of its remit as part of its being an RIR or even distributing IPv6 addresses. So it's something we might need to look at.
AVRI DORIA:	I'll put my skepticism in abeyance. Fiona.
FIONA ASONGA:	I think the discussion on IPv6 will come when we talk about outreach, the issue that ITU has raised around that. Because there already is within the ASO and MRO a process of getting a new RIR on board. So as we interact with the different supporting organizations, and specifically the ASO, that may be something that comes in at that level. I don't know.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I'm usually the last person in a room to say we need to look at IPv6 and push it. You may be the last, but I'm pretty close. But I think it is a legitimacy issue because of other people bandying it about, and we must be able to defend our position.
AVRI DORIA:	Yes, Fiona.
FIONA ASONGA:	And that is exactly why I say it is an issue that we should not overlook. When we are addressing issues of legitimacy and outreach and going to the different supporting organizations, specifically the ASO and the Member Resource Organization, because those are the ones that are really involved in that distribution and policy around how that gets

done. And whether or not ITU will end up being (inaudible), we have to go through procedures within that particular supporting organization. We will end up dealing with IPv6 whether we like it or not.

So then I think it is a substantive issue, and what I don't know is whether we should capture it separately because (inaudible) the gTLDs. But I know we'll end up touching on it under the outreach and under the discussion of the different supporting organizations.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I'm getting the impression it needs to be there because people will want to see it. I had David and then Demi.

DAVID CONRAD: So I'm probably, for people that don't me, I have made a pain of myself within the context of the addressing world for many, many years, both as pro and anti in some sense of the existing regimes. I'm having a little trouble. I can't. It's a fatal character flaw. I'm having a little trouble seeing how IPv6 would play into our remit reviewing accountability and transparency, in particular for Number 5 and legitimacy. I think I definitely would agree that ICANN has given the addressing side of its business short shrift, but I'm not sure how that plays into our tasks within the ATRT.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just to make the parallel. We are the source of the new gTLDs. We are also the source of the IPs.

DAVID CONRAD: Right, but in the context of what we're looking at, we're not looking at the gTLDs themselves. That's 9.3; that's another review team. We're looking at the financial matters associated with new gTLDs, and one could argue that there might be financial matters some day in the v6

space. And I'm not strongly, again, I'm just having some trouble seeing the relevance to our tasks.

AVRI DORIA: Since I'm playing chair at the moment, I'm keeping my views on IPv6 out of it since they count as heretical. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Avri. It's Olivier, for the transcript. One of the main weaknesses of ICANN today with regards to this information war that we have out there is that not enough has been done in the past years with regards to promotion of IPv6 and with regards to the pushing of v6 to the edges. And this is something which ICANN has been accused of on several occasions recently.

                              So the question, really, is whether ICANN should do more or not because that is directly related to the issue of legitimacy if ICANN does not see the numbering side of things as being core to its mission. And we only keep talking about gTLDs, but not enough members at that point. I don't see the other organizations outside of ICANN seeing as ICANN being interested in dealing with the numbers, and perhaps the numbers could be given to another organization to run.

AVRI DORIA: Alan and then Fiona.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it is a matter of connect the dots. And the only reason – not the only reason maybe – but certainly a very significant reason why we're looking at accountability and transparency is to ensure our legitimacy and perception of legitimacy. And IPv6 is one of the areas that we are potentially vulnerable, so I would suggest we look at it. I'm not sure what comes out of looking at it.

AVRI DORIA: Fiona, then Steve.

FIONA ASONGA: I am a bit mixed up right now because, honestly thinking, I think when we deal with issues of outreach, a number of issues have come forth to us. I would want to see if IPv6 comes forth as something that the when we're asking the questions, we'd be asking community and the feedback. And then let it be something that comes in for us to look into because I think ICANN has done a lot, being that I sit in the address supporting organization. We've (ranted) a lot on IPv6. There are a lot of initiatives and policies around that. There are some pending implementation because of specific challenges and how to go about getting them implemented. But that is something that the ASO addressing with INR and the different RIRs. However, the issue of ITU wanting to be an original Internet registry is something that you're aware of not because you're not (inaudible) yet. But I don't think that makes IPv6 something that we should really pay high priority. It would put it B; it would put it plum.

AVRI DORIA: As a cross-cutting issue?

FIONA ASONGA: Yes, something like that.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. Steve, and then I'm going to put myself in the queue and then David, thanks. Although you probably had your hand up before.

STEVE CROCKER: My original reaction on IPv6 is, why is it sitting here in ATRT when it sort of (inaudible)? But having listened to all of this, the mere fact that some number of people say that's part of our legitimacy, it's very hard to say, "No. Dismiss it. Don't address it." Then we put ourselves on the wrong side of these kinds of questions. I think there is an IPv6 story. I think we ought to make it a stream. It's not purple – it's its own – it's white. It's in the B group. I think that's what you probably meant. Yeah. And then

switching hats, from my role at ICANN, I can tell you that there has been a lot of attention on IPv6. It has been a priority. We've pushed it. But it's certainly worth looking at. And so schedule the time. Make it a stream. There's a story to tell there. And then at the end of that story, you can then – switching back to the other side – we can take a look at how we feel about how far that has come and whether that's sufficient.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. Putting in my own – this is non-sharing and personal view – if we're putting IPv6 in there and putting it in as a separate line, and that seems to make sense, do we also need to take account of the IPv4 address redistribution issue as well? Because as soon as you bring up one, you've got the other. It's sort of the other side of that same coin. And so do we need a line that says IPv6 deployment and IPv4 address redistribution? David.

DAVID CONRAD: So the point that I get hung up, as I mentioned, is sort of how is it relevant to accountability and transparency, which is the focus of this work team, right? The way I could get my head around it is saying, "Look, there are a series of policies existing – or there should be a series of policies existing – within ICANN that are specifically aimed at dealing with v6 and v4 transition issues and whatever. Are those policies transparent? Are they accountable to the stakeholders associated with addressing?" And in that context, I'd actually be okay it being mustard. But just IPv6 itself it seems not. There's a verb missing there.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Can we go to (inaudible) with it?

DAVID CONRAD: Yeah, I was just going to say accountability and transparency of policies associated with IP addressing. Given the interest within WCIT, within the ITU, about being in the RIR with the discussions about the Middle

	East, NIC, and the really more, to me, fascinating issues of IPv4 address markets, I think it should be sort of yellowish.
AVRI DORIA:	Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Avri. It's Olivier. Just for the record, I think that David has nailed it.
AVRI DORIA:	Fantastic. Thank you, Demi.
DEMI GETSCHKO:	Just for the record also, I remember your point about capture. We avoid to be accused to be captured by names, just would have numbers here.
AVRI DORIA:	Fantastic. Thank you. No name capture. We have a list. We had a sort of request that this one not have names attached to it yet. I think it was Carlos. Did anyone else? The other place we did want to look for volunteers was on the three main threads that we already had. So do we want to not attach names to this but do as Carlos suggested? Which was build a table, map it to the issues in 9.1, etc., and then come back to this at the next meeting. And that would mean that this issue was done. But I see a semi-hand from Fiona and a hand from Alan, so please.
FIONA ASONGA:	Okay, I just want to(inaudible) that if you're going to go to put the table, can you assign somebody to just read through – or a group, either one or two people – to read through and just attach in the table the different areas in item 9.1 and these items and assign them to issues? So that by the time we're having the next meeting, we already have that circulated and we have given our comments and it's easy for us to finalize maybe faster.

AVRI DORIA:	I think that's a great idea. Is that something you're interested in volunteering for?
FIONA ASONGA:	No problem.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, so that's one volunteer. Is there anyone that would like to work with Fiona on that exercise? And you guys could pass things back and forth or whatever. Or leaving Fiona to be the only volunteer on that effort at this point?
FIONA ASONGA:	(inaudible) with Carlos.
AVRI DORIA:	It was your idea. Because we already took the whole drafting charter thing and the agenda. So over the next two or three, we're sort of…. Please, if you don't want to volunteer, don't let me force you. So okay. So at the moment we have Fiona volunteering.
FIONA ASONGA:	And Carlos.
AVRI DORIA:	And Carlos. Thank you so much.
FIONA ASONGA:	Thank you.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay. So we can call this piece of work done for the moment. Oh, I'm so sorry, Alan. Please, forgive me.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I'm not sure.
AVRI DORIA:	I'll live with it.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I agree with Carlos on the fact that at this point, I think we need to see this in print or on the screen, digest it, and do a sanity check. But I do point out we do have some white items, some of which were to move

somewhere else but left as white items. So we really need to clean that part up. In terms of volunteering, if anyone is dying to start working on one of these sections, let them put their name up and they can start a little rump group working on it. I think we need to see it digested and then look for volunteers.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Okay, so we call this piece of work done for the moment? And, Charla, if you can send out that list to the list.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: I will.

AVRI DORIA: That would be great. Thank you so much for putting up with this editing exercise. You did really amazing. Another thing that was on Brian's list was volunteers for specific work streams related to ATRT 1 review, the SSR review, and the WHOIS review. Is that something that people are willing to start thinking about now? I see a great jumping up and volunteering. So you guys have already volunteered for something. We've got something. So basically we are saying we'll leave it to the next time.

I recommend that everybody look at the specific work streams of ATRT 1 review, SSR review, and WHOIS review and think about volunteering for those work streams. Because those are serious first parts of our effort here is to review those and to take what we received today from the staff and to delve deeper into actually doing that review. But for the moment, I do not see hands going up. So let me see. And, Brian, if you're on the phone and you want to comment on that, please do.

BRIAN CUTE: No, not at all. Thank you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA:	Okay. So another. We had assigning drafting charter, and the chair/vice-chairs group took that on. Assign Terms of Reference and Methodology document. Yeah, that's all in that. That's right. Okay, so that's taken care of.
BRIAN CUTE:	Avri?
AVRI DORIA:	Yes.
BRIAN CUTE:	This is Brian. Has someone volunteered for that document?
AVRI DORIA:	And that's different than the drafting charter? I thought the drafting charter – I was just told – and Reference and Methodology were all the same document.
BRIAN CUTE:	Correct.
AVRI DORIA:	I – to your not complete happiness – had volunteered us to do that.
BRIAN CUTE:	Oh, correct. That's right. We're already covered. Thank you.
AVRI DORIA:	Right. Okay. So that leaves one other item, and that was the item of the calendar. And I'm not sure where we are on calendars, and I don't know if we're ready to talk about calendars. Did we rework the calendar from yesterday to be Thursdays instead of Wednesdays? This was for the phone calls.
	Also, while people are looking at that, I wanted to throw one other suggestion up into the calendar of face-to-face meetings or partial things we would do. We talked about this a bit this morning – and it's an idea that this sort of fits into the outreach and the legitimacy issue – is both in May and in June, much of the international Internet governance

community will be in Geneva. At one point, they'll be there for WTPF and IGF. At another point, they'll be there for the CSTD enhanced cooperation meeting. And one of the possibilities was the notion of holding sort of an IGF-like open consultation for those international Internet governance communities at that time. Yes, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: With respect to those two meetings, several board members including I think myself will be in Geneva for WTPF. The board is holding one of its three yearly workshop retreat things at the end of that week, and it actually overlaps with the last day of the WTPF meetings.

So if you're going to schedule something, the next question is, when and how are you planning to do that? And doing it at the end will not work so well from my point of view, and I don't know where you're going to find that time. I don't have any plans to be anywhere near Geneva in June because I'm scheduled to be on the other side of the world for whatever it's worth.

AVRI DORIA: One of the things that had come up in the discussions is, if we did. The problem with doing it during the first, the WTPF/IGF week, is it's also the WCIT's recap week. So there are a lot of things going on. It could show up. The other idea that had come up was the CSTD. And it wasn't necessarily that we all necessarily had to be there if we had the whole support, as long as there was a critical of people there.

And the discussion, basically, the idea would be to explain to that community what it is ICANN does with the ATRT and to hold an open consultation on the issues in question that we had developed by that point and basically as part of the outreach to the community to collect their views on that as a half-day or day of open consultation.

STEVE CROCKER:	It's I don't believe absolutely essential that I be there, but I could imagine that there may be some sense of "How come?" or whatever.
AVRI DORIA:	So anyhow, that was just something to throw out. Yes, Alan. Oh, sorry.
ALAN GREENBERG:	It dawns on me that if we were going to do that, we would have to make a decision real soon and distribute enough information about it to make sure other people's plans do not preclude attending. I mean, yes, some people will be there for both weeks, but a lot of people will be planning on leaving right after the end of one of them.
AVRI DORIA:	I was actually thinking more of the CSTD event in June, which actually doesn't have a firm date yet but probably will. Actually, the CSTD meeting has a firm date.
STEVE CROCKER:	When is it?
AVRI DORIA:	In June. I don't have the exact date. But the enhanced cooperation meeting that may occur then has also not been scheduled. The reason I bring up the enhanced cooperation in this context is the enhanced cooperation is all about us. I mean, it's not just about us. It's about the RIRs, it's about the IETF, etc. It's about us. It's about how they get more cooperation between – especially governments – but all stakeholders and the institutions that are responsible for managing Internet resources. Yes, Fiona.
FIONA ASONGA:	I'm actually thinking and the hand is going up as I think. But I'm just thinking back a bit to the issues we've raised in the streams. And I'm looking at what Brian had mentioned yesterday in terms of (inaudible) outcomes of this discussion, one of which was being able to develop the questions for public comment.

And I'm just thinking that to do that it means individuals which take on streams and start thinking of all those questions so that by the time we next meet – because going through questions to edit and agree which are the right questions, it may take some time – so that by the time the next meeting – it may not be during the conference call, it could be - during the first for the ICANN meeting – we have an idea of what questions we should be presenting to those that we'll talk to in Beijing.

AVRI DORIA: Okay.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Yes, Brian, I'm not sure you were here yesterday when we talked about this, but we volunteered to put together a first draft that will go out early next week to everybody on that with the idea of trying to get them put out to the public before the end of the month so that they will have been in circulation for a week or two before Beijing. I guess maybe a week before Beijing. And I don't think that this will be that complicated or lengthy a document.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. I had forgotten about that myself. Thank you for bringing it up again. Yes, Brian.

BRIAN CUTE: No, I just wanted to thank Fiona for raising that. That should have been on our to-do list to check off our actions today. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. But you probably also heard Larry's comment on what he had, or they had, volunteered to work on before our next meeting, in fact by next week, in terms of putting together the initial set of questions.

BRIAN CUTE: Sounds good.

AVRI DORIA: So I think we're set on that, and it had slipped my mind so thank you for bringing it up again. Well, thank you both for bringing it up again. Okay. So then, Fiona, that would be adequate for what you were concerning yourself with? Okay, great. So we're set on that one. So back to calendars. I'll leave open the issue of the open consultations to CSTD. I'll have more facts on it by the time we have a phone call, or I'll send them out on e-mail as soon as I do. I just wanted to broach the issue to people now so that we can start thinking about it and people can start thinking about whether it's worth doing or not and the value of such an activity.

Back to the calendar. And we're almost, I'm told that the buses come at 5:15 and they leave at 5:30. But, of course, if nobody is in them, they probably won't leave. But we have to finish. So the last thing we have is the calendar, and I believe that's the last thing. Somebody tell me if I'm wrong about that being the last thing. Okay. So we have a calendar. We certainly have an agreement for a meeting, 28 March at 1:00 UTC. Is that correct? Is there any problem raised with that at the moment? Okay. Yes, David.

DAVID CONRAD: So according to iCal, 1:00 AM 28 UTC works out to 6:00 PM. on the 27th.

AVRI DORIA: In some places.

DAVID CONRAD: In some places. I mean, I don't know where you're going to be.

AVRI DORIA: That's fine with you? In terms of the rest of the calendar, obviously not everybody can make every meeting, but we talked about it yesterday. The shift was made for Thursday, I believe. Are we fine with this as our calendar? Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Avri. So the shift will be made on that? Because at the moment it's all...
AVRI DORIA:	It hasn't been made?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	It has not, no.
AVRI DORIA:	Oh, this is the original one?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	The 25 ninth, 23rd sixth, 20th fourth, etc.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, so we're really saying the next meeting is 29 March? No, it is 28? Okay. Oh, this one has been changed, but that's the only one that's been changed? Okay, I got it. I'm sorry for being slow. Okay, so people are fine with the notion that it's this plus one day on every line but the first two?
(ALAN GREENBERG):	And except for August, which already was Thursday by mistake.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, fantastic. So no issues on the calendar? We're accepting the calendar as written? Okay, thank you. Okay, so any issue? No? Anything else we need to talk about before we pack up and leave? Yes, Fiona.
FIONA ASONGA:	Now I'm very excited that Larry and Fiona are going to do the questions, and we shall be looking at them very soon. Does that mean that we have the opportunity of beginning to interact with the community in Beijing? And what plans have we made for that in terms of are there any particular supporting organizations that we want to interact with to get us started?
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, I think there are two parts to that. I think that certainly as individual members interacting with the individual organizations we

come from, we certainly can all do that. We did have a brief conversation about trying to do something organized, and I think the conversation sort of got fizzly at the end in terms of whether that was still possible to schedule within the schedule as it currently stood. And I don't know where it was left. Brian, are you listening?

BRIAN CUTE: Yes, I am. We didn't have any firm plans for our meeting in Beijing. We had a placeholder to interact with the community or hear from the community that Alice had built in. But other than that, we hadn't really talked about structured work or other outreach.

AVRI DORIA: So do we want to try and plan something structured? Is that something that people that are at the table now think we should be doing? A structured general community meeting? Or do people think it might be too soon? Do you think we ought to talk about it some more?

BRIAN CUTE: I don't ever want to shut down discussion before it happens, but my own sense is that it may be a bit aggressive for us to try to do any other structured interaction with the community other than at most a listening event, if you will. It really does take time and preparation and thought to both present what the community needs from us to help focus their input back to us, and I wouldn't want to rush that process in any way.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. So what I'd suggest is at the moment we hold that in abeyance but ask the staff to look at whether it's even possible so that then we can discuss on the list over the next week – and I think if we're going to do something, we'd have to jump on it soon – but look at it over the…yes, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think you guys forgot that Alice told you that right now a spot's being held on the agenda for an 11:00 AM. Wednesday open discussion with the community.

AVRI DORIA: Oh, okay. Oh, that's right.

DENISE MICHEL: So in the next few days - I'm not sure what the deadline is. Alice will e-mail you. But in the next few days, you're going to have to either say yes or no to that slot.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. I had forgotten about that slot, which I shouldn't have since somebody already told me it conflicted with something else I had already agreed to do. But, okay, so we're holding that. So I guess you've heard, Brian, and we'll put it out on the list and ask people and see if we can do it on the list. I think Larry's right. To try and plan it at the moment in the last couple minutes is probably not wise. Anything else to add? Yes, Carlos.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: We started this session with the agreement. Do we have to leave it signed today?

AVRI DORIA: No. As I remember, we're sending it off to legal to have it checked for consistency with what the ICANN new conditions are for conflict of interest and transparency. Anybody else? If not, I would like to thank the staff for hosting us, for giving us all the reports, and especially Alice and Charla for doing all they did and putting up – especially you – today with the massive editing exercise. I thank you all on behalf of Brian and the rest of us that got elected or appointed or whatever by you all. And thanks and good travel and happy dinners and talk to you soon.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, all.

[End of Transcript]