

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Alice Jansen  
August 2, 2010  
4:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: At this time I need to inform all participants that today's call is being recorded. If anybody has any objections to this you would disconnect at this time. Thank you. You would may now continue.

Brian Cute: Hello. This is Brian Cute. This is the August 2 call of the Accountability Transparency Review Team.

Alice, would you mind going through the attendees please list?

Alice Jansen: Sure. On the call we have Brian Cute, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Chris Disspain, Cory Schruth, Erick Iriarte, Fabio Colasanti, Feng Guo, James Bladel, Larry Strickling, Louie Lee, Manal Ismail, Olivier Muron, Olof Nordling, Peter Dengate Thrush, and Willie Currie.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much. Is there anybody on the call on the Review Team who does not have a copy of the draft agenda?

Fabio Colasanti: I don't.

Peter Dengate Thrush: No I don't.

Brian Cute: Alice, it was circulated as part of the meeting maker, correct?

Alice Jansen: Yes it was in the invitation, yes. And it was posted online...

Brian Cute: Could you shoot that to Peter and to Fabio right away?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Or just tell me which email it came with. I didn't see it.

Man: It's in the reminder email as well. There's a link to it.

Alice Jansen: Yes it is in the Adobe room as well on the left-hand side.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes good note.

Fabio Colasanti: Okay, okay. I have it.

Brian Cute: You have it Fabio? Peter?

Fabio Colasanti: Yes, I found it in the reminder.

Brian Cute: Okay then let me ask are there any suggested changes, additions or otherwise to the draft agenda?

Hearing none we'll move forward with the agenda as proposed and begin with Item Number 2 which is an update on the budget and the Berkman contract.

The update on the budget is that the budget, proposed budget to the ART was approved by the board. Thank you to Peter for communicating that and shepherding that process.

We - with that budgetary approval we are fully minutes away from finalizing the Berkman contract.

I've been in touch in the past week with both (Amy Stathos) and (Diane Lopez) from Harvard. And to give you some background, there actually were some terms and conditions of the contract that needed to be negotiated between the contract parties primarily because ICANN, we had provided Berkman with an independent consulting agreement.

And Harvard being a University usually conducts research, academic research projects. So they don't typically - either the Berkman Center, Harvard or their professors entered into traditional consulting agreements.

So in fact there were a number of provisions that needed to be negotiated between the parties.

I've been in touch with (Herst Gaser) as well throughout last week. And we literally have gotten it down to the one final point this afternoon.

I'm helpful to hear by the end of the call that it's finalized and the contract itself will be executed.

That being said we also had (Rob Ferris) and is (Rob Ferris) on the call?

(Rob Ferris): Yes I'm on a cell phone so I'm being - I'm muting.

Brian Cute: Okay (Rob Ferris) and Caroline Nolan. Is Caroline on as well?

Caroline Nolan: Yes I am. Hello.

Brian Cute: Hello Caroline, welcome to the call.

Caroline Nolan: Thank you much for having us.

Brian Cute: So both (Rob) - you're welcome. Both Caroline and (Rob) are here as representatives of Berkman to listen in and certainly open to participate during the call.

And I spoke with (Herst Gaser) this morning who's in Japan. I think they'll make this a routine thing that for all of our calls there'll be Berkman rep or representatives on the call with us.

And with that being said are there any questions about the budget or the contracts?

Okay, I will inform the team as soon as we have finalization of contract and we'll move forward to the next item on the agenda.

And the next item on the agenda is the working group reports.

So I observed that there was some communication back and forth on the list. What I'd like to do right now is ask the heads of the respective working teams to report in on what you've been able to accomplish since the last call in terms of organizing your work and the next steps in your work. And let's have a full team discussion on how we can organize the working team.

Working team's work alongside Berkman who will now be beginning in full force.

So the first team one of which is board performance, et cetera, the leader was Olivier. Olivier, if you could report into the team what you've done since the last call and what you see going forward as the next steps for this working team.

Olivier Muron: Okay, so the members of the working group are Willie, Fabio, (Chris), Mr. (Sung) and you Brian.

So what I've done - so I was away from connectivity for a few days. So I just got to mine last week. And I tried to define a little better definition of the scope first of all.

This scope as we define it in Brussels was (board) performance including (unintelligible), selection composition for the board, accessibility, decision-making and dispute resolution.

And we decided at the last conference call that the dispute resolutions would be ended with the (just in) Working Group 4.

So my proposition in my (mail) to the working group was to add a new sub topic that was communication with the community as we hear lot of questions when - a lot of topics with - in the discussion with the community.

For example in Brussels where concerning the communication of the board with the community, for example, the communication definition or the decision or things like that.

So I suggested to the group to add detail that as a subtopic in this working group.

And I got - and then the next step is to analyze all the inputs where we see them, try to solve them and (cut them) according to the subtopics.

So I've got - I think the only reaction I got was from Fabio who made the proposal for the (unintelligible) in Brussels but how the board - so Fabio you can explain that. Again, you're - it's (after) your proposal.

Fabio Colasanti: Well Fabio here, nothing particular. But essentially my purpose was to say that we should be starting putting something on paper. We should be starting putting forward idea for the recommendations and testing them we, within the working group and with the rest of the group as soon as possible.

But to present we have to analyze and solve all the input we've got from (Anna). And then the work for example from (Fiona) that we just got was very, very useful I think.

Brian Cote: So let me ask a question Olivier. And I think this applies to all the working groups. And I - Fabio I read your email.

I think one thing that we could concentrate on short term -- all the working groups and the entire team is what should we be delivering to Beijing, each of the working groups?

We have is it I think four weeks until we're in Beijing together or almost - yes, just a little more than four weeks. What structured deliverable?

Fabio you suggested we should begin the formation of a possible recommendations based on the input from the community and the analysis that each of the working groups is doing.

Is this something that we should put into a deliverable for Beijing perhaps?

Is it too soon to be developing potential recommendations here also noting that we have Berkman's work in parallel that's going to be feeding into our workgroup work as well? What would your thoughts be?

Olivier Muron: This is Olivier speaking. The point is that from the comments we've got from the communities, sometimes they are not really recommendations. They are just comments about some things that are going wrong or not so well.

And so we have to transfer them into a recommendation. And that's not always very easy I think.

But anyway...

Brian Cate: Yes.

Olivier Muron: ...the first thing we have to do this to analyze all the information we got. And there are plenty of it from the Brussels meeting and from the request for comments.

And that maybe we can add that summary is done by the next conference call I think would be a goal we could have.

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio here.

Brian Cute: Okay yes Fabio.

Fabio Colasanti: I think that the working group -- then this is something that we had already discussed, should have essentially first of all, should have the goal of making sure, that all the members of the working group have read and commented the inputs that we have received.

So ideally I'd like to see some emails over the next few days where we comment about some particularly interesting parts of the inputs that we have received which (and opinion) what do certain comments mean.

As Olivier was saying people usually complain about something then it happened. But it's up to somebody else to find a way what's right thing. This - so what could recommendation could be put forward.

This is what we should be doing between now and Beijing. We should be making sure that we all arrive in Beijing having read, understood and commented the input as much as we can.

But then even Beijing we should already be starting discussing at least among ourselves possible recommendations or how - what we think we ought to do with inputs that we have received.

Because after that we will have another relatively short period to arrive at the almost final finished product. That's why I would like us to come to Beijing with some ideas already, those who have them already to put them on the table, some draft recommendations.

Brian Cute: Thank you Fabio.

((Crosstalk)).

Brian Cute: Yes Olivier?

Olivier Muron: Yes Olivier. Yes, I agree with that call, yes.

Brian Cute: I think that's a sensible approach. And with respect to the comments as you noted, thanks very much to (Fiona) for putting together the index of the comments and the snippets of those comments to give us a flavor as to what they related to, which working group they related to. That's enormously helpful.

Olivier Muron: Right.

Brian Cute: And also ICANN staff is going to prepare as it does in the normal course summary comments, summary of the comments.

I think it's incumbent on each working team - well I think, you know, each review team member should read all of the comments number one.

But then as Fabio suggests, each working group team with specific focus on the comments that relate to the area of work have read and commented on each of them and are brought perhaps the beginnings of potential recommendations into Beijing.

We could make that an object - objective for our next call as well. Because we've got two weeks time.

And I think I'd like to ask each of the working group teams to bring that into next week's call, a full report on the comments that have been received that

are specific to your area of work and identification of areas that could be turned into or translated into recommendations.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, Peter here. Can I just make a comment? I agree with most of what's being said. I certainly agree with Fabio that we need to have, you note, starting to write down materials.

I just wonder whether starting with, you know, recommendations is pretty high level goal. And if we get there fine.

But what's more important I think is that by Beijing there's a written statement from each team which sets out quite clearly what their team's specification for its work is which would need to outline what are the things, the areas of problem and what the issues are, have a clear description of the sources of information that it has received, would specify what theater information.

And I think we've got to make sure we use the staff channels. All the materials will be made available by (Denise). We've got Olaf here. If there's more staff information required we should be asking for that.

And so a specification I think is probably more important. The frames, the word frames the information and targets the issues. And included in there could be any information that Berkman that might be helpful for Berkman.

You know, if there's something that's emerging that's within the confines of the contract that the Berkman work could do to assist each team that could be highlighted.

And I think if you did that - if we did that by Beijing there would be the platform.

If we could also get the recommendations I think that'd be great. But I think the thought of starting with the recommendations sort of worries me a little bit. I think we need to see that that sort of platform's laid carefully first. Thanks.

Brian Cute: All right, I agree completely with all those thoughts. If not, let's start with recommendations, recognition that it's early in the process but identification of issues or areas that could be turned into recommendations is certainly something that we should do along with the other suggestions you made.

So what I'll do is after the call here pull together what we just laid out in terms of deliverables for Beijing and for the week, that call two weeks from now I think each Working Group Team should endeavor to accomplish as much as they can and report that in next week.

Again, we'll have Berkman representatives on the call next week. And that'll be an opportunity for intersection as you suggest Peter of the work of the Working Teams and the work of Berkman.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Next week Brian? I thought we were on fort nightly calls.

Brian Cute: Excuse me, two weeks from now Cheryl. I misspoke.

So Olivier, any other final thoughts on your working group at this point?

Olivier Muron: The question about to have people in charge of being contact points for the Working Group as the man had mentioned. I mean I'm the only one for the moment.

Brian Cute: So you need a co-chair, a deputy or someone to volunteer from - in your team?

Olivier Muron: Co-chair, yes.

Brian Cute: A sensible suggestion. Is that something you could manage within your own team?

Olivier Muron: Pardon me?

Brian Cute: Is that something you could manage the selection of within your own Working Group?

Olivier Muron: Fabio, Fabio could we...

Fabio Colasanti: No, I was going to say that I would normally gladly volunteer. But between the 12th and the 27th I will have occasional access to Internet. So I will not - sometimes I will not be able to answer for a day or two.

Olivier Muron: Okay.

(Chris): Brian, it's (Chris). I may be able to do it but I prefer to do it on - in the Working Groups that I've actually got a little stuff in front of me and work out which working groups are going to take off which time. But I certainly can be able to sort it out with Olivier relatively quickly (I would assume).

Brian Cute: Okay. I'll leave that to the two of you then.

Okay, thank you Olivier. Let's move to Team 2 which is the GAC rule including interactions with the board and community, et cetera.

Willie, I believe that you are the head of this working team, that you give us an update and a report on where Team 2 is.

(Willie Currie): Yes, hi everyone. Well Manal and I have worked on a number of pointers that Manal put up to think about. The one was we're trying to agree on our scope of work, find a second prime contact and then develop a work plan.

And just in terms of the discussion we just had about recommendations, the AOC (make) gives us to clear tasks. The first is to assist the role and effectiveness of the GAC and its interaction with the board and then to make recommendations for improvement.

So I think we can't really go to recommendations until we have done that assessment. And I would then take Peter's point that we should hold off on recommendations until we've done that assessment.

So that I think is also a descendent on a number of things. It's clear that there's quite a bit of work going on in the GAC board Joint Working Group which we'd want to look into more. And I think in terms of the Berkman case study on the .xxx decision, that will give us some sense about the meaning of advice in a concrete decision-making process.

So in a sense we can't really complete the assistance until we have the Berkman Reports on that case study particularly and anything else they might identify.

So essentially what I'm saying, I don't think we will get to make draft recommendations until October, mid October.

And then just in terms of the basic working plan, the first item there is to analyze the inputs as Olivier was mentioned. And then once we've done the basic analysis from the public comment we would need to then probe more deeply and identify what further information we'd want to gather in order to make the assessments and then integrate the Berkman work into that and then draft the assessment, make the draft recommendations based on that assessment and then we'd be into the consultative phase.

So that's essentially which direction we seem to be hitting at the moment.

Brian Cute: Very good. Any other - so you don't see in terms of recommendations later into the process of October, between now and Beijing putting aside Berkman's work on .triple X, do you see areas of focus and analysis that can be done on team number two into Beijing?

(Willie Currie): I think we can certainly look at the public comments, responses and the input we had in the Brussels meeting as well as look more into what the work of the GAC board Joint Working Group has (been doing).

And that should give us a basic sense of what have - what deeper questions we need to be going into.

Brian Cute: Very good. Okay, thank you Willie. Team Number 3, I believe that'd be Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Brian. Just to refresh everyone's memory and for the record, the topic for Work Group Number 3 is the (Inchi) stakeholder engagements including the effectiveness and quality of ICANN support for PDP processes.

Members of this working group in addition to myself are Louie, Warren, Olivier and Erick. And we did post our very early draft of our work plan to the last meeting and have done a little bit more refinement on that between the last meeting and this.

Action items for us to raise at today's meeting for wider review team discussion and consideration from that refinement is something that we're delighted to see with some contract about to be finalized. Some of those questions really could only have been answered when we had Berkman engaged.

One of those is seen as some of the case studies and work Berkman will be doing will have a strong overlap with our work.

Is it the view of the review team that they should be a particular liaison point or mechanism for interaction between what Berkman is doing and what some of the work teams are doing, but quite particularly our own in Work Group Number 3?

So I'd like to have us consider that if not today in the not too distant future. And it would be good to hear from Berkman what would suit them best for that particular process.

And the other one which I think is most important is our own transparency and accountability, but more particularly the transparency I suppose of what we as work teams or work groups are doing.

And one of the proposals that from our work plan discussion that we've been thinking of is that we really ought to have, each of our work groups should have a place publicly accessible at least linked of the main ATR piece, site

into the information of commitments review team sites so that the work we do and the discussions we have are transparent to the community.

Taking up on the suggestion from the Adobe Room today I think it's quite appropriate that Work Group Number 3 own should we decide to and I think we should recommend a reaction and response by email to those people who've taken the time to put something into public comments.

I think it's highly appropriate that based on what (Fiona)'s from public comments has given us including a template that we reply to those people and thank them for that - the summary that we had there in that template.

Building on that template we now - and thank you very much should be recognized I think for all of the work teams, but particularly for Work Group Number 3 for what (Fiona) has put together for us.

Building on that template we can now go through and also add material from the face to face interactions in Brussels in a similar format.

The other thing that I think would be worthwhile us considering right now is exactly how much are we planning to do in work group form in our face to face meeting in the planning for Beijing?

I think it's certainly an opportunity that the members of Work Group Number 3 would appreciate if we could have a couple of hours sector off somewhere in that time where we could focus on and refine some of the gator analysis that we have to do during that Beijing meeting. So I think that's about it as a brief review from us.

Brian Cute: Thank you Cheryl. That actually sounds like a sensible suggestion too in terms of working groups breaking off in Beijing and getting some work done.

So let's make sure we pick that up when we talk about the structure of the Beijing meeting which we'll take up towards the end of the agenda.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Peter here. Can I respond to some of Cheryl's team's very good comments? I agree completely that we need to look at the relations, the formality of the relationship and getting the work done with Berkman.

My suggestion is that that be done through the chair and with staff. I think it's not fair to Berkman to have them responsible to five different bosses effectively, you know, each of the teams and then each of the member team as a whole.

I - so my suggestion would be that that be formalized through the chair. I don't want to be - don't want anybody sort of too artificial about. But I think from Berkman's perspective I need this sort of hear one voice as to what's required.

Brian Cute: Thank you Peter. And I think in a moment we're going to have a conversation about Berkman's work. We need to have a clear understanding of what the expectations are for the midterm report given the fact that Berkman's work is starting at a later date.

We have to understand what we as a team expect from a midterm report and to what extent their work can in fact feed into the work of the working groups at this point in time.

So that's teed up for discussion as soon as we hear from Working Group 4.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Can I move to Cheryl's next point which again I think was a very good one...

Brian Cute: Sure, certainly.

Peter Dengate Thrush: ...about our own transparency and agree completely with her that we should have a - each of the teams should have a small site, somewhere where it's, you know, members are listed. And the - and as reports are really, they should be put up on there.

I don't think there's any difficulty with that is there from a - and that's probably the question for Olaf and Alice in terms of structuring the Web site so that each of those teams and their mandates can be sort of published.

I guess I'm waiting to hear from Alice as to whether there's any...

Olaf Nordling: Well it sounds like it would create then a big problem. So does it Alice?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, could you just repeat that Olaf? I didn't hear. There was some background noise happening at the time.

Olaf Nordling: I don't think that that would create any particular problems. And I'm talking further to Alice who's more hands-on on the Web site.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Brian, could we suggest then that each of the leads, the work groups perhaps coordinate not only with Alice both with each other so there is a sense of conformity and similarity between what we have in mind for this?

Brian Cute: Certainly and make that - each of the co-leads if you will or co-chairs or...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Brian Cute: ...chair and deputy as each of you will be having second person. Yes, of course.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thanks.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks Brian. Peter here again. Cheryl third point again, I disagree - I agree with the - for the diagnosis, the need that we need to continue being accountable and responsible in relation to public comments.

Although I disagree I think with the prescription for that as to one of our work teams to assume the responsibility of the team that's looking into accountability and transparency doesn't have to function as our team's conduit to the public. I think that's (physically) obviously a staff and if necessary a chair function.

We do have to have a whole global team response to all public comments that come in. These - there needs to be a, you know, a formal mechanism for dealing with that. I don't think it's the job of anyone of the individual teams to review responding and acknowledging public comment that's come in. But I think Cheryl's absolutely right that to have identified the need.

So can we have a staff mechanism that can be supervised by - like well as part of Brian's and Manal's job to make sure it's being done properly that all inputs to the team give some kind of formal acknowledgment?

Brian Cute: Yes I'm happy to take that on Peter. And I noted (Kieran)'s suggestion on the list as well. I'll take that on as a discrete task and make sure that each of the

commenters hears back from the Review Team and thanking them for their inputs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, Cheryl here. It might be worthwhile noting for the record that of course we have already reacted with at least sort of a glorified read receipt for any comments that have come in to see the list of addresses as well. So we are already in process to a reactive mechanism there.

Brian Cute: Okay, very good. We'll pick that up as a task to make sure that that happens not just for those that are received but those that are received on going.

Is there anything else on team Number 3's report?

Okay, thank you Cheryl. Moving on, Team Number 4, unfortunately Warren Adelman is not on the call. I have...

((Crosstalk)).

Brian Cute: Yes James, are you in a position to report in at Warren's instruction?

James Bladel: Yes, I have Warren's update to relate to the group if that's acceptable?

Brian Cute: That's acceptable please.

James Bladel: Okay, so team Working Group Number 4 has circulated a final draft of its proposed work plan. We've received comments from a couple of the members, mixed in some comments from Cheryl. Those were refined into the second version and submitted.

I think at this point we've received no additional comments but we would like to consider this our go forward plan which I could certainly submit to Alice or Olaf or the Working Group as a whole for review.

But it essentially involves examining the existing mechanisms for board review as well as two proposed mechanisms from the independent review last year and just evaluating them based on some defined criteria.

What we'd like to do as a next step is convene this working group, working group four, that's (Larry), (Louie), Cheryl and (Chris) along with Warren and myself. We'd like to convene later this week in a brief teleconference to kick off the efforts and I'd like to circulate a doodle poll to check availability for that.

Brian Cute: Very good. Any other comment, and I would encourage the working teams to organize your work as you see fit. We're going to have deliverables for the call two weeks from now. We're going to have deliverables in Beijing so it's entirely up to you how you organize whether it's calls or e-mail or some other form.

Any other comment on working teams four?

Okay. Before we finish out this part of the agenda let's discuss the intersection of Berkman's work or the commencement of Berkman's work along with the working groups work.

We had structured the engagement with Berkman to call for a mid-term report that would be delivered just prior to the Beijing meeting. Since we're about four weeks away from that we need to discuss as a team what our expectations are for that deliverable.

I will circulate as soon as it is finalized the contract but the contract calls for Berkman to do case studies consistent with the ones that were identified by the community. We've enumerated those there, the introduction of new GTLDs including possibly the Expression of Interest Proposal, implementation recommendation team, the role of the GAC in that context, vertical integration.

Number two was about triple X domain application and decision and number three was the DNS cert proposal. In addition to those identified case studies Berkman had also in this proposal articulated a three-phase, three phases of work that they'll undertake that result in a final report in the second week of October with synthesis and recommendations to the review team.

So clearly in starting the work Berkman's going to have to do research on documentation, schedule some interviews, other forms of data collection between now and Beijing for the case studies that they were expected to do.

So I guess the question to the team is with four weeks between now and Beijing what are the expectations in terms of Berkman's deliverables and would specific specificity to how that work will intersect with the working group teams because there's been some noted interest as to coordination on that front.

The floor is open. Let's see if there's any hands up.

(Chris): Brian it's (Chris). Are we able to ask Berkman to perhaps tell us briefly what they think given the change in the timing?

Brian Cute: Certainly. Not a bad idea. (Rob) are you still there? Or Caroline?

Caroline Nolan: Sure. Hi. I'm sorry I think we did lose (Rob). I'm happy to discuss revising the timeline with you. I think Cheryl's points were very well taken over here, we would love to be able to create a liaison with the different working groups and certainly to facilitate the best use of our work and coordinating it with yours and I'm certainly open to moving forward on that in any way possible.

As part of our work plan we still very much intend to begin the data collection that Brian described in particular moving forward on some of the interviews, which I imagine and know that we'll need to work closely with all of you on setting up, particularly I think with regard to that and establishing what sources of data we'll want to review in the process leading up to Beijing.

So to the extent that we're able to discuss that here and I can certainly work with Olaf and (Rob) to facilitate that communication and ideally come up with contact points with each of the working groups I feel would be a great way to move forward in the coming weeks.

Brian Cute: Caroline are you, in terms of your role in the group could you define a bit for us your role on the Berkman team?

Caroline Nolan: Sure I'm happy to. So I'm actually a project coordinator here at the Berkman Center and I believe I'm joined by a colleague, Laura Miyakawa who's also (unintelligible) the coordination of the plan and essentially we liaise between the principle investigators including Olaf and (Rob), John Palfrey, Jonathan Zittrain and Jack Goldsmith who are obviously leading the effort.

And we coordinate between them and a number of interns and others as far as developing the cases themselves, doing the background research, and setting

up consultations with interviewees and other experts who are feeding into the process.

We're also responsible for developing a repository of resources and ideally facilitating connection points with your working groups as the process develops and moves forward.

Brian Cute: Very good. So you'll be coordinating the interviews if you will and the calls and the meetings with any ICANN staffers or other members of the community pursuant to the case studies.

Caroline Nolan: Yes. So certainly during this in recent weeks we've been focusing our efforts on starting to develop a review of relevant literature, familiarizing ourselves with a number of different resources and other things engaging initially certainly with the PI's and their particular interest in developing the case studies.

And obviously moving forward with coordinating various interns who can facilitate the process, certainly in this next stage as we work towards finalizing the work plan and our coordination with you I would love to be able to finalize how we can best liaise with each your team members and certainly set up the different interviews.

Brian Cute: Well I'll suggest then that, I'm sorry someone's got their hand up?

(Manal Ismal): Yes Brian this is (Manal)?

Brian Cute: Yes (Manal).

(Manal Ismal): If I may suggest that as possible the Berkman coordination would be with the entire team and not only with the work groups because I didn't see the work of Berkman has the glue that would integrate the work of the four work groups because as we all agreed the case studies are cross cutting through the scope of all work groups.

So I would really like to see this coordinated as much as possible with the entire review team is colleagues agree.

Brian Cute: Thank you (Manal).

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yeah Peter here. I agree (Manal).

Cheryl Langdon: And there's a green tick next to my name but the attendee list doesn't give us the space to show we're agreeing.

Brian Cute: Oh. There it is. It's, your visible Cheryl.

(Chris): Brian it's (Chris) but I agree too but I still, I have a question, really I missed it but I thought we were, my question was can we get an idea from Berkman about timing.

Brian Cute: Yeah. We haven't (unintelligible).

(Chris): (Unintelligible) I think.

Brian Cute: Yeah that's right. Its timing and substance and how much can be delivered in the time that we have.

(Chris): Yeah I think that's the key question how much can be delivered in the time we have.

Brian Cute: Yeah. And Caroline being one of the persons who would normally set up the interviews as part of the data collection what is your sense in terms of the basically four-week window that we have here of what would be possible in that aspect of your data collection.

Caroline Nolan: Sure. I mean I think that obviously the timeline is more compressed than we had originally hoped. I think we'd love to, to the extent possible, obviously front load setting up those interviews we have done, you know, thinking on it obviously and initial research and to the extent that we can work with you to set those up.

I mean I think we'll do our best to make as much progress as we can in the coming four weeks I think it would be (useful) perhaps to hear from you what your (expectations) are as far as this window goes and ideally how we could best support and feed into your process in the coming weeks.

Brian Cute: Okay. I mean my own sense and, is that what we're likely to receive, you know, putting titles, putting firm titles to the side we had asked for a mid-term report. I think what we're going to be able to receive realistically is a progress report of some nature come Beijing given the fact that there's four weeks for you to conduct as much data collection and interviews as you can.

And the important thing is going to be from Berkman's side being able to identify in the working group streams the relevant data that you can bring to those working group efforts and when they might be available.

You've heard some working groups say look, I can't really come to a recommendation until I have the full Berkman report and that's likely to be October. You've heard others say I might be able to begin developing or identifying possible recommendations in a shorter time frame.

So I think that's one of the areas we're going to need from you some specific input as to what your deliverable timetable is, when it can be received by the respective working groups.

Caroline Nolan: That certainly makes sense from our end, I'm not sure if it's appropriate to do this in this call but I think to the extent that we can connect directly with these working groups obviously I've been keeping minutes and it does feel as though there are some that are more ready to begin moving towards recommendations and operating on different timelines.

And certainly as the next step connecting with those leads, clarifying what the timeline is what the deliverable is I think certainly we'll want to make as much progress as we can in the next four weeks and provide you with a progress report that's useful to your Beijing meeting. So I'm happy to make sure that we get that process underway as soon as possible.

Brian Cute: And thank you. And you've heard there's some sentiment on the team that we not have a decentralized communication stream between Berkman and the respective working groups that this be coordinated through the entire team. So we're going to have to respect that sentiment and I think that's the proper, I agree with that sentiment.

So we'll structure the communications so that they are in the full view of the team and we don't get any splintered communications between (Gerth

Berkman) and the working group that might create some disconnects down the road.

Caroline Nolan: That sounds great from our end too. I think it sounds like absolutely the right approach and would love to work with you on that.

Brian Cate: Okay. What I'm going to suggest with the teams approval is that I schedule a call for myself and (Manal) with Berkman in the coming week in advance of certainly the next call that's two weeks from now so we can put a finer point on what possibly can be delivered and we'll report that back to the team and get a stronger sense of what we can expect come Beijing is that acceptable to the team?

Woman: Yep.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, Peter here, yep Peter, that sounds like a good way to me. I think the reality is that if we agree that we're getting a progress report, not a midpoint report in Beijing, which will still be very helpful, is that we look at when the mid-point report will be coming.

I don't think we want to change that concept, we're looking at changing the timing it seems to me so if you could include that in your discussion that'd be helpful.

Brian Cate: Absolutely. And again I wasn't trying to be mechanistic there and using the term progress report, I'm not trying to change with respect to mid-term report but your point is taken and we'll have that conversation with Berkman.

Okay. Let's discuss, is there any other item, any other discussion on the working groups, point number three, and we can move to point number four?

(Larry): Well this is (Larry). When are you going to take up (Chris)' recommendation because it kind of flows from what you were just talking about?

Brian Cute: Which recommendation from (Chris)?

(Larry): About maybe putting out an announcement about Berkman and...

Woman: Yeah.

(Larry): ...alerting people that they may be contacting folks, that sort of thing?

Brian Cute: Oh absolutely. That's, we'll take that up as soon as we have the contract finalized (Larry). I intend to follow-up on all those items, put out the announcement.

We need a, we have a letter that's ready to go to (Rod) that will go out as well as soon as soon as the contract is finalized, so I think each of those items will happen and I also get back to peoples file comments and let them know that we've heard from them all those things will happen immediately.

And Peter obviously there will be a premium on scheduling time with ICANN staff, perhaps ICANN board members and you know, other members of the community, so obviously anything that you can do to encourage board members, you can encourage staff to make themselves available as soon as possible is going to be very, very important to getting the work moving forward.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yep. Sure.

Brian Cute: Okay. So Caroline if you'd talk to (Rob) and anybody else who can have a call with myself and (Minal) this week so we can put a finer point on what the deliverables are we'll pick that up and report. Thank you.

Caroline Nolan: Great. Thank you very much.

Brian Cute: Okay. Number four if we're done with number three, which is the input, the analysis of community input.

We've talked about this a bit already. We have (Fiona)'s very good summary, or I should say index of the comments. ICANN staff, as they do in the normal course, preparing a summary of their own.

I just want to ask the question, I recognize that given the nature of this exercise and given the nature of some of the comments that have been filed by members of the community there would be not that there isn't always but it's certainly a concern within commentors that their comments are properly and fully summarized.

So in putting out these documents (Fiona)'s documents, I certainly would be careful about characterizing it as a summary of comments. It's certainly she's done a good faith effort to identify rough, what I would call highlights of comments and they are in shorter form.

I just want to make, put a note out there that it's going to be very important that each member of the review team read all of the comments, that you read the comments that are specific to your working group.

And to the extent that the staff provided summary, the ICANN staff provided summary, or even (Fiona)'s (unintelligible) can be improved from your

reading of the summaries that we should provide those editorial suggestions for both the staff summary and for (Fiona)'s document.

I think this is one of those areas where the team could or ICANN could get some unnecessary and avoidable feedback from the community, from commentors suggesting that they're not happy with how their remarks have been characterized despite good faith efforts to do just that.

So I'm going to ask and insist on every comment being read and any editorial suggestions for improvements to be made either to the (Fiona) document or to ICANN staff document that will be coming through Olaf.

And I do want to pick up on one point that you mentioned Caroline. You said that part of what you do or going to do on the Berkman team is I thought you said something about document management or resource management, is that correct?

Caroline Nolan: Yes it is.

Brian Cate: So is that an inventory of source documents, community comments, can you give me a sense of what you'd be doing on that front?

Caroline Nolan: As far as creating a repository of information because we have a team here that's working on different facets of this and different case studies, just a repository of information primarily at this stage doing a literature review of academic articles and other pieces.

We have also begun work on mining various elements of public comments, but again I think we would want to work closely with you and the working

group team to determine which sources are the best (unintelligible) resources you have available as well.

Brian Cute: And the public comments that are received by this group could be part of that repository?

Caroline Nolan: That would be great. Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay. Let's make that an item of discussion for our call this week.

Caroline Nolan: Excellent. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon: Brian, Cheryl here.

Brian Cute: Yes Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon: Thanks. Just two points very briefly. One is I think the very careful usage that (Fiona) put in even her title of the column of the word highlight is very important and I think we need to just sort of reiterating what Brian was saying, but be very careful about our use of language.

We've had significant criticism coming from the community during the Brussels face-to-face and indeed in the public comment sessions on what happens when things are summarized. And yet we all know that there is an utter (unintelligible) of things only going in full text is there to be worked on.

So we do have a thorny issue to try and grapple with. And the second point was I wondered if we might have some estimates if not firm dates, even if it's possible minus two or three days as to when these staff comments, when the staff work on the public comments will be completed?

Brian Cute: Yeah. Absolutely. I've just received a summary from Olaf this morning that I'll somehow I'll circulate to the review team.

Cheryl Langdon: Certainly for work group three this is fairly crucial information.

Brian Cute: Yeah. But as, you know, in discussing this with Manal nothing acts as a substitute for reading the comment in their entirety.

So moving on do we have any other comments on item number four? Okay. Number five, document management and administrative support. (Manal) and I did have a very good call with (Denise Michel); this goes back about a week. Thank you Peter for going back to staff and communicating our request for additional resources.

But we had a very good discussion about our need for document management and administrative support. (Denise) is looking for additional resources on that front and Olaf of course has been helpful in preparing the first iteration of summaries of the public comments.

And so we're waiting to hear back from (Denise) on if there is an additional person who can act as that single set of eyes that I've referred to before to really manage the entire universe of sources that we're going to rely on and use in our work and also now who can collaborate with the Berkman team in terms of universal document management and administrative support.

And we'll report back in what we hear from (Denise) in terms of available resources.

(Manal) was there anything else on that?

(Manal Ismail): No Brian that's it. I mean as soon as we hear from (Denise) we'll share with the whole team.

Brian Cute: Okay. Any other questions on document management or administrative support?

All right moving on to other business number...Yes (Manal)?

(Manal Ismail): Brian if I just may add that this is not a substitute for a second person we are looking for. I you remember our call that person from ICANN will be more as acting as the history of the ICANN documents and everything that has to do with the ICANN but that we would still need someone working in parallel with that, with the ICANN staff (Denise) (unintelligible) come back with.

Brian Cute: Agreed. And at this point, depending on our conversation with Caroline, that may in fact be the Berkman or someone on the Berkman team but we'll need to explore that on the call this week and see what's available there.

Moving on to other business, face-to-face meetings Beijing and Cartagena let's start with Beijing. Mr. (Xiang) are you there?

(Xiang): Yes I'm here. Great.

Brian Cute: Good to speak with you. Can you tell us, I know that there were a couple of hotel names put forward, do we have a confirmed hotel and is the meeting, are the meetings to be held in the hotel that's recommended or at some other site?

(Xiang): (Unintelligible) last weeks (unintelligible) it's okay (unintelligible).

Brian Cute: Okay.

(Xiang): (Unintelligible) explanation about the meeting in Beijing.

(Bo): Okay this is (unintelligible) speaking and we recommend at the hotel venue is the Hotel (Nico) (unintelligible) Beijing and we have a lot, we have a lot the meeting room in that hotel and we, we suppose every review team member to be stayed at the same hotel to have the meeting.

Brian Cute: Okay. And the name of the hotel again was (Bo)?

(Bo): This is the, it's the Hotel (Nico New Century Beijing) and I think...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Bo): ...e-mail Olaf you the hotel name and I take this opportunity to I would encourage each review team member to make to you a reservation at that hotel as early as possible because late August it's going to be a very busy period in Beijing.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you for that recommendation. Alice is that something we could talk about offline in terms of getting the reservations done? I think we have, I know that Warren...

Cheryl Langdon: Cheryl here Brian. Brian we did actually have e-mails circulated to the (unintelligible) list on this so perhaps if I was just to re-circulate in case some of us missed the e-mail but (Minal) noted this hotel and did, Mr. (unintelligible) has already today certainly sent out an e-mail concerning the room for the meeting is booked, etc., so I think some of us are sort of missing some of the thread that's all.

Brian Cute: Very good. In terms of attendees and reservations at the hotel per your conversation we'll get those confirmations done quickly. I do know that Warren and is it Warren and (Louie) won't be able to attend?

Cheryl Langdon: They'll be doing remote won't they? (Unintelligible), yeah.

Brian Cute: Yeah. And behind the scenes we've been seeing what technical capabilities are available at the hotel, whether it's a matter of having a phone bridge in the room, a physical phone room for Warren and (Louie) to call into but we're still working on those details to get the technical facilities in place and get them in a place at a cost effective basis.

(Bo): Yes we are, we are (unintelligible) those matters with Alice as, and it's in progress.

Brian Cute: Very good. Are there any issues with regard to visas, paperwork, is everything processing accordingly?

(Bo): We have a process the visa notification paper for most of the review team member who request to apply for a visa to China and are now processing with this invitation letter and we will send out soon.

Brian Cute: Very good. Are there any other items to report on the Beijing meeting?

Cheryl Langdon: Cheryl here Brian. Just a question with the logistics, I've had really positive feedback from a community who liked to listen, watch and be engaged with our activities about how much they like the stream system that this meeting is going out under. Is that something that logistically we'll be able to offer out of the Beijing venue just pose it as a question it would be good if we could.

Brian Cute: This is the Adobe Connect?

Cheryl Langdon: No. We're streaming at the moment, [stream.icann.org/atit](http://stream.icann.org/atit) and I'm getting really positive feedback from the community on that.

Brian Cute: Very good. Yeah we've asked the question of what tools are available, I'll make sure that that was included on the overall list and secondly are asking independently is there, does the hotel have a technical resource who is capable of operating the platforms, that's an important question that we've asked independently so we'll get you an answer on that.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, Peter here, I wonder if we.

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian Peter here wonder if we could actually start looking at the structure of the time in Beijing and just a very, just an idea I just thought of so it might not be helpful but you know the third task we've got two days it seems, the Monday and the Tuesday.

If the first half of the first day could be spent with the individual working groups working together to compile material and then have the second half then hearing, presenting there and then another half day interfacing with Berkman and then another, the last half you know, doing wrap ups where do we go next or something.

I think we need to start thinking about what the actual timetable for the meeting is going to be.

Brian Cute: Okay. (Unintelligible).

(Chris): Brian it's (Chris). Can I respond to that for a second?

Brian Cute: Yep.

(Chris): Peter I think it's a good idea to try and work out the time. There is a challenge with having the working groups meet individually if you're on more than one working group.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon: Yeah. (Unintelligible) kind of need to be cloned.

(Chris): And obviously look, could, if I could also without wishing to be rude to anybody note that if the working groups are leaving their work until getting to Beijing...

Cheryl Langdon: (Unintelligible) no.

(Chris): ...you know really that works needs to be done beforehand. So I'm not sure there's a lot to be gained, it might be more useful for them to meet briefly afterwards or during rather than before.

Cheryl Langdon: Well originally I'd wondered about taking time immediately after for those of us who were going to be on the ground, but that probably is logistically more difficult so we'll just have to do our best.

Peter Dengate Thrush: I certainly agree with (Chris) that most of the work's got to be done before we get there, wasn't suggesting at all that we hold up until then but okay, well

that was just an opener if people can structure the time better I think if we know in advance what that structure is and if chores have to be allocated (unintelligible) work better to deadline.

Brian Cute: Let's put some thought to that. I think there certainly is merit in having some time carved out to have an interaction with Berkman and my sense would be that having that update too would probably be best because it would give us you know at least a day as a team to have some concrete discussions. So that piece certainly makes sense.

We have the logistical difficulty of multiple memberships on multiple working groups and we will work through that problem, but what we will do is put together a (straw man) agenda for the two days and put it out to the list.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, this is (unintelligible) with a logistical comment about the (unintelligible). If it's not going to be - it's not just about cost savings. But if it's not going to be in the mid-term report, it would be better for Berkman to join electronically. Or would there be value in having them meet people?

Brian Cute: Well we can certainly meet with them telephonically from Beijing, correct. I mean we can have a conference call with them for a period of time during the two days. Is that what you mean?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Well that's - I (unintelligible) team where they should be present in Beijing to deliver the midterm report. And I'm just wondering if they are not going to be doing that, is there still value in having members of their team meet with members of our group? Whether at this point it should be done electronically with meetings such as (unintelligible).

Brian Cate: I guess that's a question we can take up with Berkman this week because it does come down to timing and what they can deliver, so we will take that question up with the Berkman team and see what their thoughts are.

Okay, anything else in Beijing? Okay, let's discuss Cartagena with the questions on the list about the hotel we're staying at. There's two different hotels and (Chris) has a reservation somewhere already. What is the status of the hotels in Cartagena? Alice, do you have that?

Alice Jansen: Actually, meeting staff is going there mid-August to see the hotels, and then they will let us know which hotel matches our needs and expectancies for the (walk- the team basis). So at this stage in (unintelligible) and (in addition) to recommending a hotel, we (will let you know). I mean (unintelligible).

Brian Cate: Okay.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): (Cheryl Langdon-Orr) with a comment.

Brian Cate: Go ahead, (Cheryl).

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): As far as the people who are the sponsors - ICANN sponsor travel to ICANN meetings. We often find out where we are staying from ICANN's Community Travel Support you know ten days out if we're lucky. So perhaps Alice would like to work fairly closely with the team on meetings and perhaps constituency travel support just to ensure that those of us who are you know working under the ICANN team of - supported ICANN team that's Peter as well. You know (it's) all coordinated and synchronized properly.

(Chris): Brian, it's (Chris). I think that's right. I think what we need - as we're talking around this, we haven't really (said) what we're talking about. For a number of

people on this team, so you know we will stay where we stay simply because we are there for all sorts of reasons. So maybe what we need to do is to get clear on who is hanging out to hear about their hotel specifically on this team and get clear about the fact that these reservations are going to be made presumably on - (by ICANN) and therefore presumably are going to come out of what we can loosely refer to as the ICANN allocation of rooms.

And if that's not correct, if we need to make special arrangements, then we just need to get on with - get on and do that. So if we can get clear whether the team's accommodations as needed by this team, it should be dealt with in the normal course of ICANN meeting events. Then the problem is solved.

Brian Cate: Some fair points, (Chris). Let's just take a step back because there was also some discussion about do we meet at the front end, do we meet at the backend, how long are we meeting, and I think that's going to impact this as much as anything else.

(Chris): I agree.

Brian Cate: And to that discussion, my takeaway from the last call that we had was that the sentiment of the team was that we are going to be in Cartagena primarily to deliver to the community, but not formerly deliver. We have to deliver these recommendations to the board by December 31, but we're basically going to be delivering to the community the nearly final recommendations, which will have had the benefit of public comment at that point in time. And that we weren't going to be engaging in the kind of interaction with the community and you know solicitation of community feedback on these recommendations. That this is really almost a ceremonial sort of action in Cartagena.

If that's the case, then you know the need for meetings beforehand - certainly I could see a meeting an hour a half a day sitting down as a team to be sure that we're confident and comfortable with what we're about to report out to the community, but not a need for much more meeting time would make sense. Is a different sense of the review team about what it is we're doing in Cartagena?

(Larry): This is (Larry). I think I generally agree with what you said, but I do think that even if we're near final, there would be a big advantage to being able to have 90 minutes to two hours with the board to talk just to kind of get their feedback. Because I don't see in our schedule anyplace where we kind of hear back from the board. And before going to final, I think that would be a good exchange to schedule, which then might lead to a certain amount of work effort after that to discuss and then incorporate any final changes we want to make based on what we hear from them. But I would hope that could be done early in the week and not require any stay over (past the 10th) in order to conclude that work.

In terms of meeting ahead of time, I don't know exactly when it is we're going to be doing any modifications to the recommendations based on the community input we get because that period closes out when? I can't remember the date, but when is it? (Say again).

Brian Cote: (Larry) if it's 30 days, it will be roughly mid-November. If the (comment period) were extended to 45, it would be right into the beginning of December - right up against the meeting.

(Larry): Yeah, so if we had the longer comment period, there might be some benefit to having - you know before the meeting gets fully underway that we all could get together just to reflect and relate to what we get from the community. Those are my observations.

Brian Cute: I think that suggestion about meeting with the board...

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): I'm sorry. I stepped away from the computer.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you (Cheryl). Go ahead.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): I wasn't sure if somebody else put their hand up. I just wanted to get in line.

Brian Cute: I don't see anybody else's hand up.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): Okay, just picking up on what (Larry) said. This is just saying more and more that what we should be doing is looking at maybe a couple of hours - a half day perhaps at the beginning, which also helps with some of what I thought we were being told about logistics in terms of meeting space, et cetera at the end of the meeting. So it pushes it to perhaps the Saturday morning, or Friday afternoon, or whatever works with travel.

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio here.

Brian Cute: Yes, Fabio.

Fabio Colasanti: I agree with what (Larry) said that we (tentatively) have two sorts of input that we have to take into account in Cartagena. One is the public input that would come from one source. The other one if you want is the interaction with the board that's not a formal input that we have that (they can put down). We will probably need as Brian suggested just an hour before we meet with the board, but I imagine after having met with the board we would want to spend at least a half a day going through the input that we have received. I don't think that

there will be anything spectacular, but what if there were two or three very good proposals that would turn upside down our recommendation.

So we need to proceed an hour before the meeting with the board - the meeting with the board and then perhaps half a day. But the results are not the point. I certainly agree with everybody that we should not be staying over beyond the (ICANN) period, but some of us are there just for the face-to-face meeting of the review team and not for other ICANN business. So if we could narrow down the period where we physically have to be in Cartagena to say to three days that would help.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, if I could just help. I think the (agreement) of this there are at least two (positions) that need to be had. One is feedback in some form of public forum, and I think (staff) are working on the priming of that. The logical - the big days for that are Wednesday and Thursday when there are public forums, and I'm fairly sure with enough notice we can schedule a 60-minute or 90-minute presentation, which would be a presentation - a discussion on what we've published (and the public comments). That's the usual ICANN way.

If we then looked at some time with the board, it would be possible again early enough if we get onto it to schedule some time on Friday with the board after the board meeting closes. You may not get (Rob) and I for all of that, but most of the board would be available some of that time in the afternoon. And then the team could meet again on Saturday to finalize anything that's been learned as a result. That would be possibly Wednesday, Friday, Saturday. That seems to be the timetable for those events.

The only other alternative is coming early and meeting with the board the weekend before things start, but I think that's going to drag (things down).

Brian Cute: Peter, what specific days were you pointing to? I'm seeing that it starts on Saturday, the 4th, correct- of December.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, I don't have the dates in front of me, but the Wednesday or Thursday when there are public forums scheduled. You know we have a (conflict) in the scheduling of group time. So if we get some of the group time (unintelligible) Wednesday or Thursday and then meeting with the board on Friday after the board meeting, and then a team meeting on Saturday to say what have we learned, what changes do we need to make, what do we do between now and finalizing our report. That would be a fairly tight timetable for those of us who are not there all week.

Brian Cute: Right, (on the backend).

(Larry): This is (Larry). Is there any chance of doing that though at the front end? I mean if we will have just gone through a 45-day public consultation and have gotten comments back, I would - while I certainly see the benefit of doing a public forum sometime during the week, in my mind it's almost - it's a little more than a formality. We need to do it, but I don't think we're going to get much of new substance in the course of that. The substance will come in in whatever written materials we get. If it's a chance to sit down with the board earlier in the week when perhaps they are less frazzled from whatever their work schedule is, I would see that as a big advantage.

And I know last time I think we did them on a Sunday and that seemed to work well before the rest of the ICANN meeting got into full gear. And so I'm just wondering if we could try to collapse our work into the front end of this as opposed to the backend.

(Chris): Brian, it's (Chris) here. Can I respond to (Larry)'s comments? I agree with you (Larry). There's a couple of possibilities it seems to me. I think the point about the public forum is interesting. I hadn't thought that we would be doing that. I had assumed rather that what we would be doing is effectively a presentation, which would actually be on a Monday, which is when the normal sort of stuff like that is done.

And I'm also - I also have a concern about meeting with the board on the Friday after the board meeting. I mean by that stage, anyone who has been at the full ICANN meeting for that whole week is - yes, is not going to be in great shape.

So - and I also think that from the point of view of getting board input, the earlier in the week that we do it the better. But you know, it's just a question of getting clear these meetings with the board.

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio here.

Brian Cute: Yes, Fabio. I would support what (Larry) has just said. That would mean if we could meet with the board Sunday, the 5th, in the afternoon, we could have a short meeting amongst ourselves Sunday morning. In the afternoon, we could meet with the board. Then on the 6th, we could meet as a team for three or four hours - half a day. And that essentially would be it.

Then those of us - those of the team who are still in Cartagena for other reasons might have a public forum on the 8th, or the 9th, or whenever that is possible, but on that occasion not that the whole team has to be there. So essentially, the face-to-face meeting would be the 5th and the 6th.

(Manal): Brian, this is (Manal). I think also on the logistics, of course we're going to be challenged if we run (up against) the ICANN meeting. And so I think Alice already mentioned in her email that we might be challenged to find space and Internet connectivity.

Fabio Colasanti: So Brian, what are the arguments against going for the 5th and the 6th?

Brian Cate: I wouldn't say arguments against. I would echo the point that others have made, which is I'd much rather meet with the board at the front end of the week than the backend of the week when everyone is (washed up) physically. To meet them when they are at the beginning of their week and of fresher mind makes much more sense to me.

Peter, you're in a better position to understand the board's schedule. Is Sunday or Monday of that first part of the meeting feasible?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Well I just - I will check online, but I do want to be - I think (unintelligible) energy (exercise). We're here all week, and we work all week, and we meet on Friday, and we keep working through the rest of the week. And many of us work on the Saturday and the Sunday afterwards, so let's not get too carried away about that (unintelligible). (It's the fact - not a very important one).

The difficulty with the meeting earlier is getting into the schedule. So I managed to do it last time, but I'm not sure we'd be able to do it this time. I mean (pretty open) to trying. What we had to do last time - we had to shuffle all of the board committee meetings and various other - you know we've got a fairly well trodden track for the Saturday and Sunday. But if that's what people want, I can - you know it's not - (if we can get it to go) and that works for other reasons to do it on the 5th, Sunday.

Fabio Colasanti: Brian, (comment again).

Brian Cute: Yes, Fabio.

Fabio Colasanti: Brian, (unintelligible).

Brian Cute: Fabio, first and then (Eric).

Fabio Colasanti: There doesn't seem to be any counter indication against this idea of meeting together on the 4th and together on the 5th and the 6th or something like that, but what we need is some confirmation from Peter about the possibility of meeting the board ideally on the 5th. And we need that rapidly because our needs in terms of accommodations and (slides) depends on meeting on those two or three days.

When could Peter give us a confirmation that the meeting with the board is indeed possible on Sunday, the 5th?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I don't know. I will in a couple of weeks I would imagine.

Brian Cute: Okay, Peter if you could explore that for us.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, I'm happy to try.

(Chris): Peter, it's (Chris). Would it help you instead of you having to do it Brian wrote to (Diane) and said that we've discussed this and could she start the process.

Peter Dengate Thrush: I think that's (unintelligible) a letter from an outside (unintelligible).

(Chris): Fair enough.

Peter Dengate Thrush: But thank you.

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio again. Clearly, we are in the hands of Peter. But if he could anticipate on those two weeks because I understand the situation in terms of accommodations will not be easy.

Brian Cute: Yes, we just - we need your feedback as soon as you can get it to us Peter so the rest of the arrangements can be made.

Peter Dengate Thrush: (Unintelligible) possible to get time with the board on Sunday.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Fabio Colasanti: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay, are there other points on Cartagena?

(Eric Illiante): Me, (Eric).

Brian Cute: (Eric), there you are. Please.

(Eric Illiante): Yes, thank you. Well I am the only one that suggests the other end of the week to have the meeting. Not only because to have meetings with (our) people, in order to have time to - like a group to prepare our final report with the input and comments that we receive in the Cartagena meeting.

Especially because all - in all the week, we will have our own teams from our constituencies, especially the people within the Cartagena meeting not only for the review team meeting. So I really (unintelligible) to have an internal

meeting maybe one more day of the final - of the last day, the Friday, to only working with (unintelligible).

Brian Cute: You mean a team meeting as opposed to the meeting with the board.

(Eric Illiante): Yes. Yes.

Peter Dengate Thrush: We can do that electronically. That's how we - we don't have to necessarily do it in person.

Brian Cute: We can. We can do it with the members who remain on the ground in Cartagena and bring others in electronically. We certainly can do that. I think the key right now is when can we meet with the board. If Peter comes back and says Sunday is on, I think we structure accordingly. And if he comes back and says Sunday is not on, then we will switch gears.

(Eric Illiante): I understand (unintelligible) the decision to have the meeting with the board, and so I do not only want to have the meeting with the board (unintelligible) Cartagena meeting. We can have more comments and more time to (unintelligible) with the different constituency groups. But if we believe that is only a meeting with the board, (unintelligible).

Brian Cute: Well I think we've talked about meeting with the board, which makes sense, and we've talked about the possibility of you know a session with the public where recommendations are read out or near final recommendations are read out. There's an opportunity for some feedback.

I don't think there was any discussion about other meetings as we did in Brussels about meeting with each constituency. I think on the table is meeting with the board and possibly a meeting with the public, which I would be in

favor of. I think that makes good sense. And then the meetings that the team has to have of itself.

(Eric Illiante): Well I will follow the majority.

Brian Cute: Okay, anything else on Cartagena? Okay, I think we're just about at time. We have a couple more minutes, and we have the survey tool So (Cheryl) I assume this is something (unintelligible).

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): Yes, thanks. I'm just bringing memories back to earlier discussions on budget and also the test run that some of you looked at - a set of sample questions drawn from the questions we posed to the public comments - the community to the public comments on how we may or may not be able to get some measurables so that a future review team can look at a shift of opinion on a number of questions.

At that stage, such a tool was - it cost about \$3000 U.S. (unintelligible). It is now with Berkman going to be a duplication so that's great. We don't need to worry about it. It's the sort of tool getting some measurables you know on a scale 1 to 5 how do you the community feel about X, Y, Z. If Berkman (unintelligible) have any formidable (alternative) metrics for us to get out of this work at this time to use as a (safe line) and then future (data stocking), was the approval of the budget inclusive of that amount or not.

Brian Cute: Well there was no amount that was earmarked to this type of a tool. There was an amount that was at one stage - which is generically for - it's document management and administrative support.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): Okay.

Brian Cute: And I think there was sufficient dollars in that category to cover this sort of thing if we wanted to, but I think we should ask Berkman as you suggested (Cheryl).

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): Okay.

Brian Cute: You know to the extent to that they may be doing public surveys or attitude surveys. Caroline, are you still on the phone?

Caroline Nolan: Yes, I am. Yes.

Brian Cute: Yeah, could you - I know I talked with (Orris) about this a little bit this morning. To what extent can you suggest we be doing outreach to the public or a survey of public attitudes or community attitudes as part of your work?

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): With measurables.

Caroline Nolan: You know I'm sorry. I think I will defer to (Orris) on that. I haven't been in the loop in this morning's conversation. I think certainly the part of the original proposal incorporated some version of having stakeholder feedback and broader public outreach, and I think one of the conceptions was a series of working meetings. But as far as metrics goes, I'd be happy to speak with him about that and report back to this group.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian it's Peter again. I think it's a helpful discussion because (neither of us) are a bit surprised at the (unintelligible) because we didn't understand. We hadn't had a discussion about the purpose of this. If the purpose of this is to (fill out the benchmarks) and the (continuing reviews), which I think is actually a good idea, I don't think it's the job of the review team to do that. I think remembering that what we are reviewing is ICANN's ability a bit in

reviewing itself. This is (simply an obligation) on the information that comes (in to do these things and to check) how well they are doing.

And if this is something ICANN isn't doing, then it's a very good (unintelligible) and this might even be a specific recommendation. You know to use a tool like this to ask questions like this and do the measuring. I'm not sure it's the job of the review team to do a one-time sample of that, which is different from Berkman taking other samples about what the current status of the community's views on these things is. So I think we've got a number of issues tangled up a bit here.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): (Cheryl Langdon-Orr). As one of the co-authors review on the original discussion on measurables and their worth for the ATRC to have access to and for future ATRCs to have access to that we discussed in Marina del Ray, I must say I'm disappointed if we had got issues tangled up.

The team - what I'm particularly concerned about who or how got metrics, but I did believe we were all in agreement that some form of metrics should be sought. Brian perhaps as co-author of that, you should take off your chair hat and make a comment.

Brian Cute: Well I will certainly make a comment. Yes, metrics is something that we discussed in Marina del Ray. I don't see it outside the purview of the review team to integrate the discussion of metrics into its recommendations. Whether the review team makes a specific recommendation about it in fine granular detail as to this type of metric should be adopted by the board is a separate question in my mind, but bringing metrics into the recommendations in some form and using this sort of survey tool as possibly a source of information about metrics seems appropriate.

Peter Dengate Thrush: But Brian, the discussion (around) metrics was what are the standards that are going to be used for measuring you know the board's self-effacement. The board has a self-effacement process that has to be measured and (unintelligible). The issue is what standards and what metrics are going to be used to assist the board's use of that particular tool and the way it publishes the results to take one example.

Now a community (unintelligible) generic questions doesn't get anywhere near (meeting) that, or take the board's you know process for electing and appointing new directors. There's a process for examining there. Sampling the public on those doesn't answer the question as to what are the metrics that are going to be used and all the different effacements that are going to be made.

So the much more important question about metrics is what are all the metrics that are going to be used for all of the effacements. And this kind of general sampling about what you think about high-level questions of members of the public. I think it's quite useful and it would create standards for future measurement (unintelligible). But that cannot be the answer to the metrics question or discussion that we had in Marina del Ray. This is a (unintelligible) topic it seems to me.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): Brian, it seems that the hour is coming up - a half hour coming up, but we have a (unintelligible) our next meeting.

Brian Cate: We are at the half hour. What I will do is (Cheryl) if you could submit it. I've got a copy of the tool from you, but let's - I will submit it to Caroline and (Rob) at Berkman as we have a call within this week. If we could get their thoughts about...

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): Could you also pass on to them the discussion paper that we as a team looked at in Marina del Ray so they have a sense of where we were coming from?

Brian Cute: Yes.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): And I see there's also some transcripts for recordings. Is that a discussion that might also be of use to them?

Brian Cute: We will have a (full on) discussion. Yes, we will have a (full on) discussion this week with Berkman, yes.

(Cheryl Langdon-Orr): Great. As long as we get measurables out, that's fine.

Brian Cute: (I heard an intervention).

Peter Dengate Thrush: Obviously me agreeing with (Cheryl).

Brian Cute: Okay, I'm sorry. It was muted. I didn't hear. Okay, any other discussions on the survey tool. Any other business.

Fabio Colasanti: Perhaps - Fabio here. I put that in one of the (mails) that was sent around. I think we should not be forgetting to translate into the languages that we have used for these questions to the community. The draft recommendations that will be put out for public consultation.

Brian Cute: Absolutely, so noted. Any other business. Okay, hearing none, we will call this call to a close and speak with you all in two weeks' time.

Man: Thank you Brian.

Man:           Bye.

Man:           Bye-bye.

Woman:        Bye. Thank you.

END