
DURBAN – ATRT-2 Coordination - Wrap-up Meeting
Thursday, July 18, 2013 – 07:30 to 09:00
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

BRIAN CUTE:

This ATRT-2 Wrap-Up Session in Durban. Welcome to those in the room and those online. What we're going to do with our time is have a discussion. Can you take the volume down just a hair? Thank you. Have a discussion around the templates that we've developed and provide any additional editorial guidance out to the team for folks who are assigned to draft templates that we haven't received yet. Also, to discuss out work plan between now and Los Angeles, and also just to have a little light brain storming around the shape of the report, the recommendations, some thinking about what form and direction we think that should take.

And thank you for getting breakfast and coffee for us very much. I very much appreciate it. Are you able – I think that the draft templates were circulated by e-mail. I sent one, Fiona sent one, and Avri has links to Google Docs.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah, I've got two of them in Google Drive.

BRIAN CUTE:

Google Drive. Okay. Are you able to pull them up on the screen? Alice?

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: Those templates work for future recommendations, not review of past ones, though.

BRIAN CUTE: No, actually. Hers were looking backwards at the Berkman Report in both instances.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well they weren't recommendations.

BRIAN CUTE: They were not recommendations, but they were backward-looking issues, if you will.

AVRI: Mine were looking back at recommendations that anteceded ATRT-1.

BRIAN CUTE: Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Brian, you said Fiona circulated something?

BRIAN CUTE: Fiona Asonga, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We did not get that.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, okay. She'll send that to the list. Do you have Internet access?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Avri, when did you send your e-mail? Because I don't have it in my Inbox.

AVRI DORIA: I sent two pointers to Google Drive documents to the full list. It came actually the day before Brian sent his to the list. I'll find you the exact date, but I was doing them in Google Drive and I sent the URLs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, I found them now. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. So let's get Alice ahead of time to pull up the screen. But what I'd like to do is walk through the drafts, have an open discussion about the structure of those drafts so far, and think about how they might be improved, what specific additional work needs to be done to have a complete draft of proposed recommendation and underlying analysis.

Okay. We've got the template coming up on the screen. Here we go. Okay, so you've got access to Avri's, and Fiona just sent hers, and then you have mine. So let's just walk through those four. Is there anybody online?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, just Barbara. Greetings, Barbara. Okay. So Avri, why don't you walk us through what you did here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: "This is Avri speaking."

AVRI DORIA: Okay, sorry. This is Avri Doria speaking again, which has become my new name. Again. No, sorry. This is Avri Doria speaking again. Okay. So the first paragraph was just an indication that – of the origin of this – that it was a recommendation in the Berkman report, not specifically brought forward by ATRT-1, but of course it is part of the ATRT-1 full piece of work, and it was on the cross-community review and basically starts out by quoting the relevant parts, or at least the parts I thought were relevant.

Then it goes on to sort of say since it was specifically called-out recommendation, it does not have a specific staff report, and then basically looks at summary of community input. I'm not sure that what I have there is that section, but some other section, and it talks about the various experiments in creating cross-community groups that have happened over the last couple years and the various levels of success. And then I didn't get any further.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you for that. Interesting point from Berkman, as you note, not a recommendation of the Review Team in ATRT-1.

AVRI DORIA: [inaudible] But the ATRT-1 basically ignored most of Berkman, and also – the outside appearances...

BRIAN CUTE: I'm sorry, I have to correct. We had lengthy discussions with Berkman

AVRI DORIA: But they're not in the report –

BRIAN CUTE: They were tasked with a separate, parallel line of work. We took a lot of their analysis into our thinking as we developed our recommendations, so I have to challenge that statement.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, you can challenge them all you wish, but if you look at the report and you look at the recommendations, you didn't bring them forward. So you may have talked about it, but you focused on GAC –

BRIAN CUTE: We did not ignore the work, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: But you focused on GAC-Board. And there's no criticism. That's what you decided to do, all well and good.

BRIAN CUTE: I'm sorry. That's a qualitative statement. I'm sorry, I'm challenging the qualitative statement.

AVRI DORIA: You did not bring the work forward in the ATRT recommendations, and looking at the whole cross-community drive on this was not something that was addressed in the ATRT-1 recommendations. It was a GAC-Board predominantly piece of work. Now that's a decision you made. I'm sure you discussed it extensively. I haven't gone back to the phone calls, etc., to listen to those or read transcripts of them, I admit. And there's no reason, but if you're going to say that this is somehow irrelevant because ATRT-1 did not cover it, that does not strike – then we're basically saying that, if ATRT-1 did not touch the issue, we'll never touch it.

BRIAN CUTE: Well let's clear the air, because you put an "if" in front of that statement. I am not saying we should ignore this, or we're going to ignore this. In fact, cross-community deliberation is one of the strongest themes that's come across this week.

AVRI DORIA: Exactly.

BRIAN CUTE: But please, let's not quarrel.

AVRI DORIA: I did not start the quarrel.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. You may misinterpreted my observation that it was interesting that you pulled from the Berkman report –

AVRI DORIA: Yes.

BRIAN CUTE: And it was interesting in a positive way because cross-community deliberations this week has been one of the strongest themes we've come across, and in my view, may in fact be a very good candidate for recommendations. So if I didn't make that clear in my opening comments, I apologize.

AVRI DORIA: Okay.

BRIAN CUTE: But I thought it was very interesting that you pulled this forward because it wasn't, in fact, part of your formal recommendation of AT-1, but this is a key issue that's coming to the surface. So I think this is actually a good basis.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I apologize for misunderstanding a phrase that one said, "it is interesting." I normally hear that as the beginning of a negative statement.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, understood. No harm, no foul.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: The question is, you've got this as a backward-looking draft template in process, and if we are to make recommendation on cross-community deliberations, then that would be part of a draft forward-looking template, which is the other part of this document.

So in thinking this through as it's developed, we have to talk about how to further develop this draft, and then what would be the interplay, if you will, from a [substance] standpoint between this backward-looking assessment and then the forward-looking recommendation. Do you have any thoughts on that?

AVRI DORIA: Personally, yeah. I think part of what I'm sort of saying is that ATRT-1, Berkman, One World Trust – all of those things are indeed backward-looking. ICANN has been getting many recommendations over the years from many different things, and so I tend to think that our backward-looking has to include more than just the ATRT-1 because so many transparency and accountability recommendations came through over the years that, in a sense, we have to include – especially if they're relevant to the AoC 9.1 issues that they need a certain amount of backward-looking to pull the incredibly good work that was done by One World Trust, by Berkman and such that was not part of the formal recommendations made by ATRT-1. So in a sense, it is backward-looking, but also forward-looking.

BRIAN CUTE: So ATRT-1 did, in fact, review the prior accountability and transparency look-forwards. We did consider them. They are relevant. We have to also make a recommendation per work stream forward on the overall review process. And since there have been a number of reports and recommendations on accountability, transparency, I agree that taking a backward-looking view of prior reports and a global view of this process and how to improve this process is something we should focus on.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't have the history in ICANN that either of you have – not quite as long. But I have seen a good number of recommendations from external reports that I think the Gods we did not implement. So the existence of a recommendation that wasn't implemented alone I don't think is something that we would want to rely on.

If we feel the recommendation has good meshing with something that we want to say, it's fine to quote it as one of the references, but the existence of a recommendation that ICANN didn't implement I would not want to set as a model that automatically moves forward into our report. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Can I?

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Sure, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: I am not saying that because it was recommended in the past we therefore must recommend it now. What I'm saying is the fact that it was recommended in the past makes it worth reviewing as a possible input to a future recommendation.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. So you've quoted from Berkman in there, but in terms of summary of ICANN input, what do you have up on the screen?

AVRI DORIA: Not much. Basically, and as I said, there wasn't a staff report to go on cross-community reviews. So just an indication, a background, and to be critical, just indicating that, for rather neutral reasons, since the staff reports were on the specific formal ATRT-1 recommendation part [in] the document – there wasn't any. And then the community review is more what we were picking up these last couple days, and that's not in there yet. And so basically, I just started a creating a section that talked about some of the efforts that have gone on in the intervening years, and then, as I say, that's as far as I got. There wasn't a whole lot of time for writing in the last four days.

BRIAN CUTE: Understood. That's understood. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Forgive me, but I thought we were talking about form here, not the content of a specific recommendation and whether it goes forward or not. So...

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. We're not making decisions on what goes forward or not. We are talking about form, but if we're going to provide editorial guidance to the rest of the team coming out of this meeting, at some point we have to talk about what goes into the report as well, not just structure and form. Are we talking past each other?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. For instance, I disagree with the headings we're using right now, and I thought that's the kind of thing what are we putting forward to the rest of the team to fill out, and I thought that was what we were here to discuss – not whether we should do a recommendation on Whistleblower or not or [inaudible].

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. We're not talking about whether we should make a recommendation, so we're in agreement on that. We are going to talk about form. It's also useful to talk about substance – what type of content are you pulling into this draft to underscore so we can give a wholesome set of guidance to the rest of the team in developing the templates. So doing both if that's agreeable. Okay, Lise?

LISE FUHR: I think we're lacking to describe the reason why we want this recommendation, or what we're trying to accomplish with the recommendation because we've been talking about this when we evaluated the first recommendations, and it seems that staff had had a hard time figuring out why did we want to have a recommendation. So I would like to have that described.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, to Lise's point, indeed looking at this form there is no particular line that sort of says, "Why?" And part of what I was ended up doing is here I was saying, "Well, where would particular information go in this form?" And that's the reason for talking about content I think, is because there was content that I thought was relevant to this issue that where does actually one put it? And one of the things I didn't do was create new topic headings, sort of saying, "Well, what's the history of the issue? Well why? Well –" and I wouldn't have dared to write why we were recommending it yet at this point because we were still in that listing mode and that would have been anticipating things we were hearing. I was just basically trying to use the form and see what kind of information would fit into what hole.

And since with both issues that I was working on because – and they are more [inaudible] issues, but I didn't think we were doing just one – Work Stream 1. I thought we were doing any of the work streams. My assignments seemed to come out of as much one as four that how do

we take the information that I think we would need to include in the report, and what one of these little boxes would put it in.

And I admit, when you look at the information that I put in there – and that’s the reason for reviewing content is to see if it accesses the box you’ve stuffed it in – it didn’t quite fit in the box, and I started writing paragraphs that would try to explain putting the information in a particular box.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Fiona? Oh, so before we – Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Listening to this discussion, I think the reason is the titles weren’t correct is because this was the backward-looking one, and as for the discussion that focused between me and Larry, we’re not making recommendations on the backward-looking ones. We are evaluating the implementation. We may end up making the recommendations if it fits within the ATRT scope.

BRIAN CUTE: We have the latitude to make recommendations picking up from ATRT-1 specifically. We don’t have that latitude for SSR or for WHOIS and we have the latitude for new recommendations and new issues, as well as recommendations on the review process.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I would have assumed we're using the template for new recommendations for that, even though the history may have gone back.

BRIAN CUTE: The template as structured is in fact in two parts. The first part, which Avri started to fill out, is the backward-looking assessment. The second part is for recommendation on new issues. I'm correct in that – that's the structure of his document, right? Thank you. Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: [inaudible]. I think our inputs should come in the section that is indicated for [ATR-2] analysis of the issue will now explain our justification and our thinking on why that is an issue and then move to the next part that talks about the report on what we are recommending – the draft recommendation. So I think the structure for me was quite clear on what we are putting where.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, Fiona. Actually, Alice, if you could pull up just the blank template and then we can work thought that. Before we dive into the structure and headings form discussion, let's all just note that this is not necessarily going to be the form of the final report, and let's just note that this is simply a tool to help us organize our thinking. We're not creating the Ten Commandments here, okay? This is a tool. So with that in mind, I think we've already touched on a useful point about rationale, right? So why don't we know walk through the form, the headings, and see what's missing and talk about what should be there. Thanks, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: One thing that hasn't been clear to me until this meeting is that this form was only a form for backward-looking. I thought it was the form for all fishes – oh okay, fine. I thought Alan had said this is the form for backward-looking. I guess I misunderstood.

ALAN GREENBERG: The way I interpreted it was that wasn't a template, but two templates – A and B, and we would use template A for reviewing the past RTs and, should we choose to make a recommendation or the analysis of whether we make a recommendation, use template B. I thought it was an A or B issue.

AVRI DORIA: I guess I misunderstood. I thought it was an A and B for anything that had been previously discussed.

BRIAN CUTE: Putting aside what this template reflects or not, let's have a tool that allows us to do an assessment of the implementation of a prior recommendation and a tool that allows us to sketch out a proposed recommendation. Do we agree on that?

AVRI DORIA: Yup.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. So part A, which is titled "Analysis of Previous Review Team's Recommendations," is that clearly stated enough? The first dash is recommendation, which I interpreted to mean, "What is the backward-

looking recommendation from a Review Team? State that as it was.”
And Avri, in your case, you pulled from the Berkman Center on an issue that’s live, and I thought that was perfectly appropriate, but I think the way this is structured – that it was ATRT-2 recommended that the Board should engage in regular training and what not and you would state the recommendation there? Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. And I did overlook just the word “teams.” I was basically saying, “Any recommendation that have been made on accountability and transparency were fair game for this kind of approach.”

BRIAN CUTE: So I accept that statement, but I think we have to recognize that the Affirmation of Commitments is what establishes recommendations as a term of art within its four corners, and that, if we were to refer to the One World Trust document, for example, and there were recommendations coming out of that document, that recommendation is qualitatively different from the recommendations this Review Team makes. Are you understanding my distinction?

AVRI DORIA: Probably not, because when I hear the “qualitatively,” I think that that word is actually problematic in this description. They have a different genesis. They have a different ontology. But qualitatively, I would hesitate to judge in this qualitatively different. They certainly have a different ontology; origin.

BRIAN CUTE: One's from a review team, and one is from a consultant who's been engaged to do a study. But in terms of our responsibility and our scope of work, recommendations within the framework of the AoC are the recommendations that we offer out of our report.

AVRI DORIA: Certainly, for ATRT-2, our recommendations will be the recommendations we offer. I have a problem restricting ourselves to just ATRT-1's recommendations as our source.

BRIAN CUTE: I'm not making that restriction. Okay. Is everyone comfortable with the heading A as descriptive any changes starting with stating the recommendation from the prior AoC Review Team that we're looking at? Or is this where the disconnect is, Avri – that you would pull into this piece a recommendation from the One World Trust report, for example?

AVRI DORIA: Yes. Anything – but I would look at it that everything where it's an accountability and transparency issue as defined by the AoC that, in us reviewing – if it's something that we've decided is important enough to consider and possibly make a recommendation on and not assuming we will or will not make a recommendation on any particular issue, but if it's an AoC matter, whether ATRT-1 made a recommendation on it or not, I believe we need to pull in the history of previous recommendations insofar as that is history that we should not lose.

BRIAN CUTE:

And I agree with the last part of that statement and I believe – and we can confirm it by looking at 9.1 – that the charter of this review team is to look at ICANN’s implementation of prior review team’s recommendations specifically. So I believe we’re in agreement, because I think looking at past history that predates that AoC is perfectly appropriate. So it’s where we pull that history in is all we have to figure out. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I completely agree that the existence of this recommendation and our belief that it is a good one or good fodder for one within the ATRT scope is fine, but I would have put a lot of this information under things like “background research undertaken” under B. It’s a new recommendation which may well be based on something someone recommended once, but it’s a new recommendation from the ATRT point of view, and therefore it’s not a retrospective look-back. We’re not ignoring history, but it’s a future-looking recommendation.

BRIAN CUTE:

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think I’m relieving Groundhog Day at the moment. I thought we had discussed this earlier this week, and we had reached consensus on this. In your recommendations coming under B, A is only looking at the older recommendations and making recommendations. If there are new recommendations to be made, they will be made in B, I believe, and this a pointer from A to B.

BRIAN: That was the understanding, as I recall. Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: I think what is important more than the semantics of the titles we're using for now is that we understand the thought process and what we need to have on the templates so that we are all at par on why we are making this recommendation and where we are coming from, and how we arrive to that position. And I think that that is just a guide of what that template should look like for prior reviews and then for new recommendations. But for me, it was very clear. So I'm getting a bit lost with the disconnect we have right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just got lost with your discussion because I thought the Groundhog Day issue was we are not making recommendations – explicit numbered recommendations – on the retrospective reviews of past RTs. We may choose to come up with a new one if it's within the ATRT scope.

BRIAN CUTE: With the exception of ATRT-1, we can look at any of the recommendations from ATRT-1, assess ICANN's implementation of those recommendations, and or one of them, issue a new recommendation that ties logically to that recommendation and recommend to ICANN that they do X, Y, and Z further to ensure the implantation of that prior recommendation. We can't do that with respect to SSR. We can't do that with respect to WHOIS. We're just proving backward-looking assessments. So with that caveat to your statement, are we in agreement?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Except I think for the purposed of this review, it would be useful to start off the assessment of template A by looking at a specific recommendation that one of the previous review teams did, and see whether it fits. This is a forward-looking recommendation and I don't think we can use it as the prime example on to assess A.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. do you want to pull up draft, which is on the public comment recommendation made to ATRT-1, or should we just stick with the form and the discussion on form?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think yours is a marvelous way to start.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is one from ATRT-1, therefore we could make [inaudible] recommendations, but the bulk of it I think applies to [inaudible].

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. I have changed mine. I have deleted the A from both of them. I have moved the information down to B, and I would have never suggested mine is the one to start with.

BRIAN CUTE: Noted.

AVRI DORIA: But they are changed now.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. This one is on the recommendations – actually three recommendations – on the public comment process. Again, it’s not showing up on the screen for anyone online, but in my e-mail I caveated this as this is a draft. This does not represent conclusions. This is really just a sketch of work to provide guidance for drafting templates.

So under the heading recommendation, I went back and copied and pasted recommendations 15, 16, and 17, which were specific to the establishment of a comment and reply comment process, and also with respect to our organization, etc. So that’s all I did – went back and copied and pasted the recommendations.

Moving onto the next heading – and I’m not putting off a discussion on changing headings, adding headings, but let’s just walk through this. So the next – we can go back up. Thanks. So the next was summary of ICANN input on implementation, including effectiveness, and so here I went back to our meetings in Los Angeles, and went through the transcripts, and as you see in the text, just provided some specific quotes from staff, from Brian Peck. I think this is the important part of our report that reflected in fact the inputs that we received from staff in somewhat some great clear way. Any – stop here. Any discussions on the content? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. First of all, I must admit I read this as the format that would be used in the draft report, so some of my comments that I put – and I just sent them all to you – do not quite apply. It wasn't clear to me whether your term "including effectiveness" was including our assessment of whether they were effective, or the ICANN staff assessment of whether they were effective.

BRIAN CUTE: Which one were you specifically pointing to?

ALAN GREENBERG: The first one. The one we're talking about – summary of ICANN input on implementation, including effectiveness.

BRIAN CUTE: Effectiveness of the implementation.

ALAN GREENBERG: In whose opinion? ICANN staff's, or ours?

BRIAN CUTE: Oh, good question. No, I think that's a great – it should be staff's.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give you my answer. One of the things we need to do is not mix issues, and if we're reporting on what ICANN staff said, then it's fair to say they thought it was a rotten recommendation, or they thought it was good to the extent that they gave the that assessment. in most

cases they didn't, but in some cases they did. So I'm presuming that this is ICANN staff's assessment of the effectiveness.

BRIAN CUTE: I think you're right there, too, because late on we get into our analysis and since we're going to have analysis later, yeah, I would read that as ICANN's – and it could be Board as well, not just staff – in terms of input, and was a recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Board is part of staff from the point of view of our review of them.

BRIAN CUTE: I just want to make it clear it's Board and staff. Yes, it's their view on the effectiveness of the implementation, and among that could be their assessment of whether the recommendation was difficult to implement.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it would also be effectiveness of the recommendation and its implementation. So it's a dual thing.

BRIAN CUTE: Agreed. Any other discussion on this section?

ALAN GREENBERG: My other comment was again, on the assumption that this was going to be used in the report, is the level of detail of who said what could well belong in a footnote or an appendix, but certainly doesn't belong in a report we expect anyone to read without going to sleep.

BRIAN CUTE: And you're referring to the ultimate report now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Any other – Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is the size of the paragraph an indication of the amount of text that we would be looking at having in such a format?

BRIAN CUTE: It's an indication of the amount of time I had to work on it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. the reason for it being that, if we do have more text than this, I would suggest perhaps having a few bullet points to summarize the paragraph underneath. I do know that it's being told to us wearing other hats that bullet points are always helpful.

BRIAN CUTE: Absolutely, I wouldn't – yeah, I think people can expand on this, adding bullet point summaries to make it clearer. Absolutely. And this is part of the editorial suggestions we'll send out to the entire team, so thank you very much for that. I think it probably – yeah, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Brian, just a question. So for each of the recommendations, you were looking to have this form completed for each of the recommendations of the three Review Teams, correct? And there's 27 recommendation, 15 recommendations from who is and however many...

BRIAN CUTE: Yes. Sticking with our lingo of the backward-looking piece, ICANN's implementation of recommendation of prior Review Teams...

LARISA GURNICK: [Each of them?]

BRIAN CUTE: Yes. Ultimately we have to assess implementation of all our recommendations. A draft template for all of them would be desirable.

LARISA GURNICK: Okay.

BRIAN CUTE: We haven't made that specific assignment yet, but that's correct. Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: My understating was that we're going to only focus on the recommendations from the previous teams that we needed to carry forward, not all of them. You are –

BRIAN CUTE: Can you restate that?

FIONA ASONGA: My understanding was, to the answer to Larisa’s question, would be for the recommendations that we have identified that we shall carry forward through as much of the recommendation we’re looking into in terms of giving recommendations to, because if a recommendation was giving by ATRT-1, for example, it’s recommending there are no issues, do we still take it through this whole process?

BRIAN CUTE: We have to assess how ICANN implemented all of the recommendation of all the priority teams. We could conclude in every instance that they implemented it, it’s been effective, and no further recommendations with respect to ATRT-1 are required.

That being said, we still need to go through that analysis and assessment, so preparing a template on each of the recommendation that our prior review teams as part of our working methodology would be an important thing to do. Is that responsive?

FIONA ASONGA: Clear.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Brian, related to that, thank you for putting three of them together, because I was going to ask originally, can we merge them if they’re similar and save ourselves a lot of replication, and I support we should do that.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thank you. Let's stay here, because you called out a good question, Alan, about the heading effectiveness from ICANN staff and Board point of view. Let's just talk a little bit about what should be in here. In my brief stab at it, I pulled some quotes from staff interaction in Los Angeles that reflected staff's report on implementation. I did not include any staff observations about was this recommendation – did it have an effect positive, negative, or neutral, the effectiveness of implementing this recommendation. I didn't put in any staff observations about whether the recommendation itself was problematic in terms of implementability. So with a view toward providing a balanced overview of ICANN input, what are the components that we should strive to include in this section? Just so we're all clear on that. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we have two choices. Either we can summarize in one section the input we got from staff. I think it's going to be hard in some cases to separate that from the belief – ICANN's belief or staff's belief – that it was not implementable, or it was a stupid recommendation, or whatever, because that's governed – that's tightly linked, tightly covered – to the rest of their input.

So that's where I think it is reasonable to have effectiveness and to modify the word effectiveness to say who's judgment is it, and I think it should be including both the effectiveness of the concept and the implementation, because that's all tied together in what they ultimately had done.

If the Board has decided in its input into staff that this was something that shouldn't be done, as is the case in at least one that I'm thinking of, that decision is an important of ICANN not doing anything, or doing a subset. So I think this section should be the summary of what ICANN told us, both in the spreadsheet we got, plus the verbal dialogue that went along with it.

BRIAN CUTE:

I think there's agreement on that point. Are there other elements that we should be sure to bring into this section? Any suggestions? Do you think that covers the waterfront? Lise?

LISE FUHR:

Well I don't know if we need to make it specific, but any barriers to implementation? We've been talking about that, and I know it's interested in effectiveness, but you're talking about, Alan, it can be – is the recommendation effective, or was the implementation effective?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I meant both, and I think we probably need two different words to make sure it's clear. What is a judgment called from the Board and staff, whether it is both implementable and does it make sense in the context of what it was trying to address? And then the second part is, do they think they fixed the problems, assuming they went ahead and did something? We probably need better words, instead of wrapping everything into one word of effectiveness.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. So you're suggesting an edit to the heading? That's fine, that's why we're here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Including staff/Board assessment and ultimate effectiveness. So are they assessing it as something that was going to be effective, and what do they believe the final result was?

BRIAN CUTE: If I could take that up and offer a suggestion of modifications. So summary of ICANN's assessment was it? What is your adapt?

ALAN GREENBERG: Summary of ICANN input on recommendation, including its projected effectiveness.

BRIAN CUTE: No, yeah – may I? I think I might have something that might – summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation, including observations on implementability and effectiveness? Is that game? Is that where you're going? Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation, including observations of implementability and effectiveness.

ALAN GREENBERG: That could work. That I think is fine. I think it was – I thought it was also including a third component of assuming they have actually implemented it. They judged it implementable and reasonable, implemented it, and it failed, as an extreme example. That's the third part.

BRIAN CUTE: Is that effectiveness, or is that something different? I'm looking for the word.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have some recommendations that were consciously changed because they did not believe they would be effective, and then there's the second issue of, when they were finished, do they think they've done a good job and it was effective?

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Not to quibble, but I don't believe ICANN changed any of the recommendations. So do you want to restate that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can give you specific examples.

BRIAN CUTE: They changed a recommendation or there was an aspect of implementability that, in your view, didn't follow the recommendation?

ALAN GREENBERG: As an example, and maybe it's a unique example, but it's the one I'm thinking of – the recommendation from WHOIS to put all the policy information in a single place was according to the second input we got from staff deliberately altered by the Board to do something different.

BRIAN CUTE: I just want to be clear that the WHOIS Review TEam made recommendations. They are on paper. We can read them. What I am hearing you say is ICANN changed a recommendation. I'm stuck on that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what we were told.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: So for that particular recommendation, the recommendation was not changed. There were some recommendations in the WHOIS Review Team report that the Board, while agreeing with the overarching objective, gave specific direction on how it could be implemented. Some of them – there was one in particular that was not feasible in terms of ICANN being able to implement it, given its contractual obligations and authority.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not claiming they changed the wording of the recommendation. Their direction told staff to implement something different.

BRIAN CUTE: And I think the focus is on the implementation. I think what you're focusing on is implementing a recommendation, in my own words, WHOIS Review Team members have said they went off in a different

direction. But that's part and parcel of implementation. I don't want to quibble here but...

ALAN GREENBERG: They deemed it unimplementable and therefore did something ` different.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. So in getting back the heading, if we have observations on implementability and effectiveness, the observations on implementability would be inputs from ICANN that we would look for to include in this template as an input, and then input from the WHOIS Review Team. are we square?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, great. Okay. So is everyone okay with the heading as refashioned? Okay. And do we have an understanding on then content we're pulling in to this section? Okay. So let's move to the next section. Yes, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: So I think there's perhaps a distinction for you to consider here, and that is the recommendations go to the Board of any of these reviews, and then the Board decides whether or not to essentially accept and direct staff to implement. So it's the Board acceptance as well that you may want to capture here.

BRIAN CUTE: Yeah. Does everyone agree with that? So it'd be the summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation, including acceptance of recommendations?

ALAN GREENBERG: Acceptance.

DENISE MICHEL: So the Board accepts the report and then approves the recommendations and directs staff to implement them.

BRIAN CUTE: I think that's the better way, because the Board is going to accept the report. They're going receive it, and then one meaning of that term they'll always accept the report, one would hope. So, approval? Okay. So the proposed edit is summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation, including Board approval of recommendations and observations of implementability and effectiveness.

Before we go take this step – [Beth], I don't want to put you on the spot, but we should probably check the AoC on that, because I think the AoC might be more directive to the Board to take action.

[BETH]: So maybe perhaps I can help here. The Affirmation of Commitment commits the Board to take action on the report. Not approve the recommendation, but simply take action on the report within six months of receiving it. Every report.

BRIAN CUTE: And to break that down, theoretically, action could include approval, could include rejection, could include ignoring. I mean, if action is action, right.

[BETH]: Not ignoring.

BRIAN CUTE: Conceptually, hypothetically. I'm just trying to work out of this is the right word – is approval is the right word? Maybe the phrase should be "Action taken."

[BETH]: Sure. If you're referring to a specific recommendation, you want to know if you want to catalogue what the action was.

BRIAN CUTE: Maybe "action taken" is better as long as it's clear to the Board and the staff in providing inputs that the meaning of that is also, "Did you approve?"

[BETH]: Sure. Yeah, I would agree with that.

BRIAN CUTE: Sure, hypothetically. So the edit will be – can we go back to the heading? I thought we were going to get out of here early today.
Summary of –

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, I presume within Word we can't change these colors. Reading red on yellow is virtually impossible for me at this distance.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation, including action taken, and observations on – do we need observations? Including action taken, implementability, and effectiveness.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation, including action taken, implementability, and effectiveness. That doesn't work. So we need observations on. Okay. So summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including action taken and observations on implementability and effectiveness. How's that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

LISE FUHR: Hi, it's Lise for the record. I think we're taking out the self-explanation of the title. Before it was easier to understand. Now you need to know that this refers to the AoC. So if you want a document that's easy to work with for the other guys who are not in the room right now, the rest of the team I think it's easier to have the Board approval. Or am I completely wrong? You look at me like –

BRIAN CUTE: Well "action taken" is meant to address whether the Board approves the recommendation or not. If you're concern is clarity to the rest of the

team members in the e-mail that's sent along, we can certainly make that clear that that's the meaning of that term. Would that cover off your concern?

LISE FUHR: Mmhmm.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Then I'll make sure we put that in the e-mail.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I understood Lise correctly, there may well be merit in separating up Board action/staff action.

BRIAN CUTE: Are we saying make it Board and staff explicit?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm saying two separate headings. One related to the Board assessment and action, and one related to what staff [did]. I'm just saying it may well make it simpler and clearer to fill in the blanks if we do that. I'd move with what we have here. It's just a thought.

BRIAN CUTE: So if we made it "summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken by the Board" – yeah, that's...Beth, feel free.

[BETH]:

I think this section – we don't even send in our template because it's still kind of embarrassingly drafted. So we have a template as well. We've been working on it. Larry has kind of still embarrassingly in draft form.

In this section, I don't know how much you want to limit yourself by being so specific in the heading. When we were doing this, we took it more as ICANN as a whole . When you say ICANN; staff, Board – what was the process they went through? I looked at the monthly summaries, the progress, the different feedback – Denise was very iterative with us and we had a lot of discussions about how that was going and where they were finding difficulties, and then there's also the 2012 Yearly Summary Report. I think all those things could live there in a little bit of a story. For each recommendation, I think that might give people a little more room to include what they like, as opposed to limiting yourself.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thank you. Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA:

I'm just getting a bit concerned. As [inaudible], this template looks like this template has gone back to where we started. Remember the templates we developed for staff to fill on different issues? Now when we start being very specific, we are actually going through each of those questions, and you know what I'm going to do? I will copy-paste. And when I copy-paste, we'll just end up with the same big document and I don't know how much widely that will add to what you want to accomplish.

So my thinking is that can we change the approach a bit and do this general top-level summary for this? Because that is what we have agreed during the week, and that is where I thought we'd pick it up today. But we have gone back to the beginning and we may find ourselves doing the same work over, just in a different style. Really, that's repetition.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I view this as the heading tells us these are things that are appropriate to put here. We're not demanding that each box be filled in. So I think it is a summary of, not the cut and paste, but it may depend on the style of how you do it.

BRIAN CUTE:

If we can step back from this a bit and look at the entire template, what are we trying to capture? Input from ICANN, input from the community – can you scroll down, Alice? – and other research. That's what we're trying to capture. Input from ICANN, input from the community, other research, and what's our analysis. So those are our building blocks at the highest level. Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA:

The only things that no one [inaudible] critical on the wording, we start moving from all that you're seeing, what you want to capture, so it starts looking like a different kind of document. And then when I open the other documents we started off with the ones staff were using for presentations during the first meetings in LA, and they're putting the

same thing. I just need to know how this is adding – we need to be doing something that is adding value to our activities.

BRIAN CUTE:

Your comments are appreciated. The more granular we make the heading, the more potential there is for narrowing things and excluding things, and the more potential for creating a dense report. At the same time, if we – okay. So a heading could be summary of ICANN input. Stop.

Okay. And then in the e-mail on top of this that goes out the Review

Team members who are not here, I need to say, “Be sure to include, among other things, but not limited to, ICANN Board’s action taken, assessment and observations on implementability, and effectiveness, etc., etc.,” But in that description, I need to be as complete as I can be. Olivier?

FIONA ASONGA:

Fair enough.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. You could make use of square brackets. No, no, no – this is a serious solution or a serious suggestion. You may have the short header underneath in order to advise the people who are not here today, have in square brackets “Please make sure you include X, Y, Z,” etc. So then we all know that this is not going to be in the final text – that this is just an editorial note.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. We need to be clear for the members who are not here today. Avri?

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri speaking, Mr. Chairman, since we're becoming much more IT-like, I totally support the recommendation of my distinguished colleague. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: I never had control of this meeting. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I completely disagree with both of those, because I suggest we use round brackets.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that's a good idea.

BRIAN CUTE: The suggestion is summary of ICANN input with a descriptive in the cover e-mail, versus summary of ICANN input with the descriptive in brackets as part of the heading. Can I see a show of hands for A?

AVRI DORIA: What was the question again?

BRIAN CUTE: If you're not listening, you don't get it. A was summary of ICANN input, and in the e-mails to the Review Team members, a clear description of

what should be included in that section versus summary of ICANN input in brackets with a similar description. Show of hands for A. Show of hands for B. We'll go with brackets and a descriptive. Thank you very much. Moving onto the next section...

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not going to debate the shape?

BRIAN CUTE: I'm about to go walk in traffic. Can we move to the next section? I'm glad we're laughing – that's good – but can we please, for the next few minutes, try to be a little bit better about this.

The next session is community input, correct? Summary of community input. So it will be summary of community input, and I'll put in brackets and a heading, "Be sure to include, among other things, but not limited to..." What are we going to include in community? We got public comments. We've had face to face meetings. Is there any other form community input that I'm overlooking?

FIONA ASONGA: E-mails.

BRIAN CUTE: E-mails, thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Mr. Chairman, thank you. How do we incorporate into this any anonymous or any confidential info that we might have received by e-mail? Would this be included here or elsewhere?

BRIAN CUTE: Since it's confidential and we have to hold it confidential, or at least think through what parts we'd hold confidential and what parts we don't, because these templates are going to be circulated to the full team in the full view, and we have to respect confidentiality. That's an important question. I'm not sure I have an answer in this moment in time. Does anybody have an answer? Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just with a caveat that, or course, this relates to the review of the previous ATRT-1 recommendation, so I might be asking a strawman question here, but we still need to be aware, if that turns up, that we know what to do with it.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. You're correct. That's the focus of this section of the document. I think there was one confidential input. It may come up. Noted. Clearly, if it comes up and you're handling the confidential information and you're not sure as to how to handle it in the core context of the template, leave it out for later discussion. Thank you. Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: I was actually going to suggest that we discuss it on the confidential list. We still do the same and circulate on the confidential list.

BRIAN CUTE: Good suggestion. David?

DAVID CONRAD: The only caveat on that would be the confidential list is not the entire team.

BRIAN CUTE: Right, and I have one addition for you. Stephen Conroy asked to be removed.

DAVID CONRAD: He already had been.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay, Great. But to your point that list doesn't include all members of the—

DAVID CONRAD: Yup.

BRIAN CUTE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is what we're going to be using to create the assessment that we'll put in the report. So I think what goes in here is a reference to "We were also told," in some vague terms, and we may need to keep quiet private records to document it should we feel that's necessary. But this is the fodder that goes into their final report, so we've got to keep it

suitably vague. But if we think it's going to be a substantive input into the report, confidential or not, it should be referenced here, clearly not violating any confidentiality.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Okay. Anything else on this heading and section? Okay. Next is "Summary of Other Relevant Research." That's clear, right? Okay. Next session is – Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: In reading this, I wasn't quite sure how relevant it is, and on further thinking, it is, but I think it's going to be, in many cases, an empty section. Does that sound reasonable in terms of how you created this? What you were envisioning when you wrote the titles.

BRIAN CUTE: You may be right. I'm not sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

BRIAN CUTE: Are you okay with leaving the heading in for this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I have no problem leaving the heading in. There's a heading – before we go any further – that I think is missing, though, and that's our belief of what still needs to be done.

BRIAN CUTE: Our belief of what?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry – what still needs to be done.

BRIAN CUTE: I actually think I included in my draft in – can you scroll down a little bit Alice? If I'm not mistaken, I think it was in this. You'll see in the commentary that, at the end, staff should consider the quality of comments debate and inputs when implementing new tools. So that's where I placed it in this first rough draft. ATRT-2 Assessment of Recommendation and Implementation.

So the first paragraph is an assessment of how the implementation went, and then you'll see in the second paragraph there's actually some suggestions about how to move that activity forward, if you will. That's how I chose to do it. I'm not saying it's the right way, I'm saying it shouldn't be a heading. I'm just noting for you that's how I fit it in there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it might be clearer if we separate into two sections the ATRT-2's analysis of the implementation, and analysis of the effectiveness as to separate items.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Beth?

ALAN GREENBERG: The reason I'm suggesting separate them is one is an assessment of how well staff did, and one is in fact a retrospective assessment of the recommendation, and I don't think we should note those. Staff may have implemented the 21-plus public comment perfectly, but it is not working. That's not a staff issue, necessarily, and I just think it may be useful to separate the two.

BRIAN CUTE: So ATRT-2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation, ATRT-2 Assessment of Effectiveness of the Recommendation. Is that where you're going?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Effectiveness of the Recommendation and the Implementation, I guess.

BRIAN CUTE: So isn't that captured in that heading? ATRT-2 Assessment of Recommendation Implementation. For example, complete/incomplete effectively addressed issue or not? I think "effectively addressed issue or not" is calling for our assessment of was it effective, or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think of completeness as blind to the previous title. I'm analyzing the implementation.

BRIAN CUTE: I just think we're in violent agreement. I believe we are. Is this a turn of a phrase, or is this really a new heading?

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I'm commenting on that complete/incomplete. I think it's a part of our assessment of their implementation.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. I think I see Alan's point. If we took the word "complete, incomplete" and put it in brackets after ATRT-2 Analysis of Recommendation Implementation and then had ATRT Assessment of Recommendation Implementation, e.g., Effectively Addressed Issue or Not?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that would capture what I'm saying, yes.

BRIAN CUTE: Folks, does that clear – for everyone, does that make sense? Any other edits or suggestions? Avri?

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. I have a question. In other words, there's certainly things one could say other than "complete" and "incomplete." Does including that mean that we cannot? So it's inter alia complete or incomplete. If I can continue. For example, means that you don't have to discuss complete or incomplete. Inter alia means you need to discuss

incomplete and complete, and can optionally do other stuff. Just to make sure because inter alia is including but not limited to.

[BETH]: And of course, some recommendations, implementation is ongoing for the WHOIS and SSR. They're in the process, yeah.

BRIAN CUTE: Yeah. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. May I recommend the use of standard terms, so we would have complete, incomplete, ongoing, and perhaps a few others that this community would identify, and then make use of those throughout all of our recommendation so as not to confuse the reader?

BRIAN CUTE: Very good suggestion. Let's do that. This is a matter of interpretation and language. Can you explain the distinction between incomplete and ongoing? I'm not being facetious here. I'm really not being facetious – the distinction between incomplete and ongoing.

[BETH]: Right. Well, if you want to parse words, I think there's a difference between implementation that is ongoing – we're in the process of implementing – and there's potentially a recommendation where we're done, but it wasn't fully implemented. It's incomplete.

BRIAN CUTE: That is complete. I really want clarity here, because this is going to go out to the rest of the team. Olivier, then Avri.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Incomplete might be as incomplete but the process has stopped, nothing is going on anymore. Ongoing in both incomplete, but things are still moving forward. There's a distinction to make between the two.

BRIAN CUTE: Concurrence? Okay. So is everyone comfortable with complete, incomplete?

ALAN GREENBERG: Terminated.

BRIAN CUTE: No, no.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have twelve minutes left.

BRIAN CUTE: We have twelve minutes left in this session and we've got more to talk about. [Beth]?

[BETH]: I think just we need to bring it back to this is a tool to get your thoughts on paper, I think at this point. So I know it's all of our nature, and all our nature is to really focus on the semantics of things, but I think it's a tool to get your thoughts down. You guys are going to meet again. You can edit to your hearts' content. I think it's just a way to get you going.

BRIAN CUTE: Wonderfully said. Okay. Are we okay with the headings as edited? Olivier, your point about standard terms and using them throughout is well taken. Okay, Olivier?

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Beth said, we can always think until we meet if we need to add any further terms.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Can you just go through the – yeah, finish that off for them. Let's skip through the rest of the document, and then have a discussion about – what?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BRIAN CUTE: There was one other substantive point brought up earlier about a heading as to rationale for a recommendation, but that's where we are making a recommendation, which is in part two of this document – part B. Correct? No? I'm sorry.

LISE FUHR: It's Lise, for the record. I think we should still have the rationale for the prior recommendations, too. It might not be specifically expressed, but it would be nice to think of the rationale. What was the rationale about having the recommendation, and do we think they may [inaudible].

BRIAN CUTE: You're correct. It's a necessary component to help our analysis, absolutely. Again, this is a tool, and it's not meant to be a cumbersome document. The ATRT-1 report is there with all the analysis in that report. We can certainly ask that the drafter bring in a clear and concise summary of that rationale. That might take a little bit of reading and work. I don't want it to be too laborious, but I think you're right. That's an important element of our analysis. Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: You just finished the right word – analysis. ATRT-2's of the recommendation captures the issue of the rationale. So we don't need another phrase on the rationale. But that should fall under that.

BRIAN CUTE: So under that heading, include the rationale and the analysis of the implementation.

FIONA ASONGA: Yes. Sorry, I'm trying to keep things short and brief, but I think it helps me work with the document better.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thank you, and Larisa, is this all being captured? Okay, great. Thanks. We'll have a sidebar after this meeting to make sure we've got it all. Okay, anything else on this? Okay, can we skim through this part B? I really do want to have a few minutes to have some open brainstorming about the shape of the ultimate report, etc.

Okay. So part B is where we are making a new recommendation, whether it ties back to ATRT-1, or whether it is about a new issue, or whether it's about the review process itself. We've got a hypothesis of the problem, background research undertaken, which again, summary of ICANN input, summary of community input. Thanks. Summary of other relevant research – those three mirror – I can make the necessary edits, pulling off the edits we just made.

The rest of these I think track, to a large degree, what ATRT-1 did. The importance is not what ATRT-1 did, but what are the elements in this that we need to create an analytical foundation for recommendation, relevant ICANN bylaws, relevant ICANN published policies, relevant ICANN published procedures, and an ATRT-2 analysis, a draft recommendation. And then this presumes [inaudible] I believe, after we've posted in October, public comment on this draft recommendations and final recommendations. So for filling out the template, you would go up to draft recommendation, [inaudible] in the last two blank. Anything missing? Anything for edit on these headings? Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA:

Being that I worked on this, I found it very clear and straightforward and it was easy for me to put in all the input, but not put in everything. But

subheadings – that’s [inaudible] easy to understand. But of course I know you’re going to make amendments as per the discussion we’ve had. [inaudible]. So for me it was easy looking at that, and that is [inaudible] can see where everything falls into. I worked on the multilingual quality and it was easy to put in the input, but I don’t have all the material.

BRIAN CUTE: Very good, thank you. Any other suggestions on these? Yes, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Draft recommendation and rationale perhaps would be good there.

BRIAN CUTE: Draft recommendation and rationale including rationale?

LARISA GURNICK: Including rationale to capture Lise’s point.

BRIAN CUTE: I’m seeing nodding heads on that. Okay, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: My experience is that until each of us actually goes through and tries this for a couple of cases, it’s hard to assess whether it’s really the right titles or not. So with the caveat going forward that we shouldn’t be tied to this at the expense of not doing our job properly.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Anything else on the headings? Okay. All right. So, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Are there supposed to be links, then, underneath those headings? Links to documents, or is that text that's going to be drafted?

BRIAN CUTE: Well I think these tools are to organize our thoughts and provide the basis for fulsome discussion and debate in Los Angeles. You can put links in there and they'll be circulated to the teams, so as long as the link works and the reader is being directed to precisely the text that you want them to consider as part of the document, fine. If it's sending them to a document that's not clear, there's question – do I read the whole report, or just page 5? Then I'd say copy and paste page 5 and put it in this template for that for the ease of the reader. Makes sense?

Okay. So with staff after this, we'll make sure all these edits were incorporated, circulate this template to everyone on the team with some notes about the discussion here in terms of elements to include in given sections. Are we fine? Okay.

Let's take the few minutes that we have to have a very open brainstorming kind of just sense of the members of the team right now about the ultimate shape of the fourth year, where our thinking is on this. This is for the purpose of kicking off discussion. This is not prescriptive in any way. This is my own brainstorming.

In just reflecting, I think the left of the report is something we need to think about. The structure – I’ve heard some say that the structure of the ATRT-1 report was a bit laborious, clunky. And Carlos in particular has said that he put some thought as to the structure of this report and looked to improve that, and I said, “Feel free.”

So length of the report, structure of the report – these are my words. Focused comes to mind. Targeted comes to mine. The number of recommendations. ATRT-1 made 27 recommendations. It’s a large number. It was at a point in time where that Review Team felt it had to be a bit more prescriptive and detailed. I’m not convinced that’s necessarily the approach we have to take, but again, these are loose thoughts I have.

In looking back, I think it’s important to note successes and call those out, and to encourage continuation of successes. At the same time, a theme that’s come up is, “Does it look like ICANN just checked the box on this?” I’ve heard that enough. But when we use phrases that, I think we owe it to ICANN and the community to really define what we mean by that, get underneath that and give a qualitative assessment of, “This is just a check the box, and here’s why we think that’s the case.”

And then on the review process itself, and these are just some forward-looking things, having – this is now the second one I’m participating in. It’s not a terribly efficient – next meeting in here?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I thought we had until 9:30.

BRIAN CUTE:

It's not a terribly efficient process. It's volunteers. We haven't started on time twice. There's a lot of ramp-up time. You all see how the calendar works – not necessarily in our favor. I think we really need to take an open approach to the review process and how it might be improved from a number of different vectors. And maybe even different types of review. Sorry, we're getting squeezed on time. Those are my loose thoughts right now. Can we just take a couple minutes for anybody, or do we have to exit? Okay. I apologize for that, but we're out of time. All right.

So we'll make sure the templates get circulated and get that off to the entire team. Thank you all very much for a very hard week of work, and particularly the staff for your excellent support throughout the week. Thank you very, very much. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

As people recover from this week, maybe we could put an e-mail some of the thoughts that we haven't discussed right now. I think it's really crucial. The report is going to be really, really long, no matter what we do, just because of the retrospective assessment. We really have to be careful.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thank you, Alan. Please do that. Please, everyone, share your thoughts on the shape of the report, your high level thinking. Let's get that dialogue going. Thank you.

[END OF AUDIO]