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The Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 (ATRT2) undertook the following during this session:

1. **Conference call agenda**

The Review Team resolved to adopt the conference call [agenda](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/40935103/ATRT2ConCall2Agenda.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1364375605000).

1. **Questions to the ICANN Community**

The Review Team reviewed the draft questions for public comment circulated by Lawrence Strickling and studied Carlos Raúl Gutierrez’ comments. Xinsheng Zhang highlighted that language should not be an obstacle. Staff confirmed that translations into the 5 UN languages would be made available. David Conrad raised the questions of metrics and Avri Doria requested that a PDP-oriented question be included. The Review Team stressed that the format should be user-friendly and that content should welcome any additional feedback. In an effort to simplify the reading, headings and subheadings will be added. Brian Cute volunteered to be the penholder of this document and will circulate a finalized version, which will encompass Avri Doria, Carlos Raúl Gutierrez and Lawrence Strickling’s questions. In consideration of the timeline, the Review Team resolved to:

* publish the questions on their public wiki;
* insert the detailed questions into the Interaction with the Community Beijing session details;
* open a public comment period prior to Beijing and ensure that the comment period end 21 days after the Beijing meeting, followed by the 21 day-reply comment period. The Team agreed that this time allocation would provide the Community with sufficient time to review the questions and share their feedback;
* circulate the questions to SO/ACs, constituencies, interested stakeholders etc.
1. **Work Streams**

Consistent with their resolution to divide the workload into streamss, the Team reviewed Brian Cute’s proposed work streams document. Adjustments were made in light of comments. The Review Team Chair called volunteers to participate in the work streams:

Work Stream 1 - ATRT1 – review of implementation of ATRT1 Review Team recommendations + any new recommendations – AoC 9.1 (a)-(e)

1. Carlos Raúl Gutierrez, David Conrad
2. Carlos Raúl Gutierrez, David Conrad
3. /
4. Avri Doria
5. Alan Greenberg, Fiona Asonga

Work Stream 2 - Security, Stability and and Resiliency – review of implementation of SSR Review Team recommendations - AoC 9.2(a)-(c)

* David Conrad
* Demi Getschko
* Olivier Crépin-Leblond

Work Stream 3 - WHOIS – review of implementation of WHOIS Review Team Team recommendations AoC 9.3.1

* Michael Yakushev
* Stephen Conroy
* Alan Greenberg

Work Stream 4 – Consider the extent to which assessments and actions undertaken by ICANN have been successful in ensuring that ICANN is acting transparently, is accountable for its decision-making, and acts in the public interest.

* Avri Doria
* Lawrence Strickling
* Stephen Conroy
* Brian Cute
* David Conrad
* Fiona Asonga
* Carlos Raúl Gutierrez
* Olivier Crépin-Leblond

The Review Team Chair informed Team Members that he would assist work streams and stressed that the list of volunteers was not carved in stone: more volunteers are welcome to raise their hand.

1. **Beijing Agenda**

The Review Team reviewed the draft Beijing agenda put forward by the Chair:

* Jørgen Abild Andersen requested that an agenda item dedicated to government-oriented outreach be added. The Team will discuss the approach to embrace when reaching out to a variety of groups and will specifically focus on how to interact with governments following Jørgen Andersen Abild’s request.
* Due to time constraints, the presentation on SSR recommendations initially scheduled for Los Angeles was deferred to Beijing. The Team requested that this presentation be delivered and that Patrick Jones address Lawrence Strickling’s questions. Staff is to follow up.
* Lawrence Strickling requested that the Review Team be given an opportunity to engage in a dialogue with Review Team alumni (ATRT 1, SSR, WHOIS). An initial conversation will allow the Review Team to anticipate the work to be conducted at a general level. All Review Team Members are welcome to participate in these discussions with alumni. Subsequent in-depth exchanges will be held via the work streams. Staff is to circulate a draft invitation to the Review Team Chair and Vice-Chairs.
* Avri Doria extended an invitation from the NCSG Chair to join their Tuesday session. Avri Doria and staff will coordinate on this.
* Fiona Alexander brought the *ATRT 2 Government Representatives meeting with the GAC* to Review Team Members’ attention. The Review Team Chair requested that this be added to the ATRT 2 schedule. Staff is to follow up
* The Review Team Chair and Vice-Chairs will map out and structure the Beijing agenda in light of ATRT 2 GAC representatives’ schedules.
* A doodle poll will be circulated to determine a date for the Beijing social dinner.
1. **Unselected candidates**

The Review Team previously agreed on the email list and in Los Angeles to reach out to unselected candidates with a view to collecting their unique feedback and comments on the ATRT 2. The ATRT2 restated this intent; the Chair and Vice-Chairs will work on defining the modalities of this interaction.

1. **Implementation**

Denise Michel advised the Team that lead-time was needed to coordinate implementation presentations as a number of people work internally on these projects. The Review Team took note of this comment and indicated that this would be taken into consideration.

The Review Team resolved to verify the implementability of its recommendations throughout its mandate following Steve Crocker’s initial offer and resolved to make these sanity checks a regular dynamic (contact with Staff etc).