

Accountability and Transparency Review Team
Conference Call – Monday, August 2nd 2010 – 21.00 UTC
Preliminary Report

RT Selectors and Members

(PDT) Peter Dengate Thrush
(MI) Manal Ismail, Vice Chair
(LS) Lawrence Strickling
(FC) Fabio Colasanti
(WC) Willie Currie
(BC) Brian Cute, Chair
(CD) Chris Disspain
(EIA) Erick Iriarte Ahon
(CLO) Cheryl Langdon-Orr
(LL) Louie Lee
(OM) Olivier Muron
(ZX) Zhang Xinheng

Assistants invited by RT Members

(JM) James Bladel
(FG) Feng Guo
(FA) Fiona Alexander

Berkman Representatives

(RF) Robert Faris
(LM) Laura Miyakawa
(CN) Caroline Nolan

Supporting Staff

(CS) Cory Schruth
(ON) Olof Nordling
(AJ) Alice Jansen

This Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT) undertook the following:

a) Discussion about the Berkman contract

- ATRT was informed about Board approval of ATRT budget.
- The Berkman contract is currently in the hands of ICANN staff and Harvard so as to negotiate final terms and conditions.
- (RF), (CN) and Urs Gasster are identified as the Berkman representatives and are to participate in all ATRT calls.

b) Update on Working Groups' progress

- Heads of the respective working teams reported their progress in terms of organization of their enterprise and provided the RT Members with an outline of next steps:
 - WG 1 – (Chair - OM): Board performance, including governance, selection, composition (necessary skill set mix), accessibility, decision-making, and dispute resolution/complaint handling:
 - Suggestion to add a new sub topic entitled “communication with the community”;
 - Next step would be analyzing community input and categorizing it according to the suggested subtopics.

- Encouraged Members to start reflecting on draft recommendations so as to trigger intra WG discussions;
 - (CD) appointed as Co-Chair.
- WG 2 – (Chair - WC): GAC role, including interactions with Board and community, the existence of shared and clearly understood expectations with respect to the GAC’s role in ICANN’s decision-making processes, the quality and actionability of GAC input, and ICANN’s responsiveness to that input:
- Reiterated the necessity to go through an assessment phase before drafting recommendations which might not be feasible before mid October;
 - Identified the GAC-Board joint WG as one of its main areas of focus;
 - Indicated that the Berkman study on the .xxx shall constitute groundwork for their analysis;
 - Once the analysis phase is completed, the WG shall need to determine further information that may be required in order to assess the item under review. Berkman research and conclusions would then be included in their study before initiating the recommendation drafting process.
- WG3 – (Chair - CLO): Community/Stakeholder engagement, including effectiveness and quality of ICANN support for the policy development process, the quality of PDP output and the extent to which the ICANN PDP develops consensus, including across stakeholder groups, the level and quality of public input into the ICANN process, and the extent to which such input is reflected in ICANN decision-making:
- Refined the work plan they presented during the last call;
 - Raised the issue of overlap between the WG’s scope and the Berkman assignments; should the RT have a particular liaison point or mechanism for interaction?;
 - In terms of the RT’s own accountability and transparency, proposal to have a publicly accessible working space for each of the WGs;
 - If deemed appropriate, WG3 shall own action item to thank contributors for their input via email. Suggestion to use (FA)’s template in responding to contributors. Building on this template a summary of the feedback received in Brussels could be also made following the same format;
 - Proposal to have intra WG meetings in Beijing so as to deepen their analysis;
 - (LL) appointed as co-Chair (see [chat transcript](#)).
- WG4 – (Chair - WA): IRB Independent Review of Board
- A final draft of its proposed work plan has been circulated;
 - The work plan essentially involves examining the existing mechanisms for board review as well as two mechanisms proposed by the independent review last year and evaluate them based on defined criteria;
 - WG to convene in a conference call at the end of the week – (JB) to issue a Doodle poll.
- The ATRT resolved that by Beijing, all Members should have extensively read all public comments received by the community with a view to assessing the input. This essential stage will lead to the drafting of recommendations in due course.

- As an objective to Beijing, working groups are to identify comments related to the scope of their work, prepare comments on each and bring the beginning of potential recommendations i.e. identify issues and areas that could be turned into recommendations. Working groups are to accomplish as much as they can and report it next call.
- WG co-chairs are to communicate their web needs to (AJ) for their respective work spaces.
- (BC) to take on the task to thank contributors.

c) Discussion about the Berkman assignment

- The initial timeline foresaw the delivery of a mid-term report prior to the Beijing meeting. In consideration of the delays induced by the late signature of the contract, the RT raised the issue of expectations in terms of deliverables. In light of the circumstances, Berkman is to provide a progress report and to schedule a conference call with (BC) and (MI) for the following week so as to refine the timeline and determine feasible deliverables for the Beijing meeting.
- Berkman has been focusing its efforts on relevant literature and familiarizing itself with a number of different resources.
- (CN) and (LM) are project coordinators who will: liaise between the principal investigators and a number of interns; conduct background research; set up consultations with interviewees and experts; develop a repository of resources (document management); and facilitate connections with the RT.
- It was suggested that Berkman communicate with the entire RT rather than the WGs separately.
- (BC) is to prepare an announcement about Berkman and send the letter to Rod as soon as the contract is finalized.

d) Discussion about the analysis of community input

- The ATRT welcomed the index provided by (FA) and staff summary drafted by (ON) to be circulated very shortly by (BC).
- The ATRT Chair instructed the Review Team Members to thoroughly review all comments and to provide editorial suggestions to (ON) and (FA).
- In light of the significant criticism received in Brussels, the ATRT reiterated its intention to remain vigilant regarding the use of language in summaries.

e) Discussion about document management and administrative support

- The Chair and Co-Chair informed the RT Members of their call with Denise Michel as a follow-up on the ATRT's request for additional resources in document management and administrative support.

- (MI) stressed the fact that an extra pair of eyes would be needed in addition to the ICANN staff, a service that Berkman may be able to provide – TBD.

f) Discussion about the face to face meetings in Beijing and Cartagena

- (ZX) and (FG) provided the RT with an update on the state of the Beijing meeting preparations.
- It was noted that Warren and (LL) won't be able to attend the meeting in Beijing and will participate remotely.
- RT Members reflected on the structure of the Beijing timetable. A preliminary agenda will be circulated to the team.
- (AJ) to work closely with meeting staff on accommodation in Cartagena.
- The ATRT agreed that it was highly necessary to meet with the Board as early as possible in the week for 90 min. to 2 hours – (PDT) to enquire about the Board's schedule. The tentative ATRT calendar for Cartagena is as follows:
 - ❖ Sunday 5 December, morning: ATRT meeting
 - ❖ Sunday 5 December, afternoon: Meeting with the Board
 - ❖ Monday, 6 December, 1/2 a day ATRT Meeting → Analysis of public comments in response to draft recommendations and Board input
 - ❖ Thursday, 8 December – Friday 9 December: Members of the RT in Cartagena to take part in the public forum
 - ❖ Friday, 10 December: Remaining Members to discuss unfinished business

g) Discussion about the survey tool

- (BC) to relay a copy of the survey to Berkman as well as the [discussion paper](#) drafted by (CLO) and (BC) in Marina Del Rey so to obtain their advice.

h) A.O.Bs

- The ATRT agreed that their draft recommendations should be translated into the 5 UN languages before submission for public comment.