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

1. **Agenda & Preliminary Reports**

The Review Team resolved to adopt the following:

* Call 05 meeting agenda;
* Los Angeles preliminary report with the caveat that amendments be made to the section on outreach and the list of participants be rectified.

1. **Declaration of Interests & Conflict of Interest Policy**

The Review Team called for any updates. None were raised.

1. **Follow-up Questions on implementation**

The Review Team reviewed a set of proposed follow-up questions on implementation and agreed, with a view to ensuring uniformity throughout work streams, to hold a full Review Team discussion on the topic prior to segmenting off to work streams. Alan Greenberg suggested that staff address the following question: can you identify any recommendation where the implementation was significantly larger than initially estimated or originally envisioned? Carlos Raúl Gutierrez will circulate a note formulating follow up questions to the discussion that was held with David Olive in Los Angeles on 3 May. Follow-up sessions with Christina Rodriguez (ATRT 1 Implementation – Multilingual services) and Patrick Jones (SSR recommendations) will be scheduled to take place during the next full team call. Responses from Patrick Jones will be provided shortly. The Review Team discussed the role of an independent expert in assisting with a deep dive into certain topics. The Review Team discussed mid-June as the deadline to gather data from staff in anticipation of the outreach sessions with the ICANN Community that will be held in Durban.

1. **Timeline**

Durban will provide an opportunity for the Review Team to collect data. In Australia (21-22-23 August) the Review Team will dive into the substance and analyze data to tease out draft recommendations. The Review Team added a milestone to its timeline: in September, a session with the ICANN Board and staff will be held to cross-check preliminary findings, to address metrics but also to receive guidance on how to shape recommendations so that staff do not run into resource, time and legal constraints. The Review Team flagged 20 December as the target date for issuing the final report. The Review Team agreed that the Community ought to be given sufficient time to provide comments in addition to sessions in Buenos Aires. The Review Team stressed their commitment to convey the message that all comments would be considered when factoring in and incorporating feedback received.

1. **Translations**

The Review Team noted that it is essential for the report and translation to be circulated simultaneously and tasked ICANN staff to share guidance on translation timelines. Alan Greenberg suggested that it may be possible to provide the translation team with early drafts followed by redline versions, reducing the amount of time needed at the end to provide the final translations. Staff has the action item to coordinate this with the translation team.

1. **Work Streams**

The Review Team Chair emphasized the need for work streams to kick off their activities. Xinsheng Zhang volunteered to participate in work stream 1 and more specifically in subsection 1. Olivier Crépin-Leblond will chair work stream 1, David Conrad work stream 2, Fiona Asonga work stream 4 and the name of the work stream 3 Chair be revealed as soon as possible. Work streams ought to organize their activities. The Review Team Chair indicated that the first order of business should be to identify for ICANN staff, specific aspects of the new issues to explore and analyze, since historical data and background documents will be needed to preliminarily assess whether or not a recommendation needs to be developed. The reading and initial analysis will follow. Work stream Chairs were encouraged to relay any follow-up tasks to ICANN staff.

1. **Independent Consultant**

The Review Team pre-discussed the utility in engaging an independent expert to potentially develop a survey mechanism that could serve the review process or just generally assist the Review Team in the development of metrics as well as assessment and analysis of data as it develops recommendations. Avri Doria invited the Review Team to first determine the areas that ought to be explored i.e potential use cases. Lawrence Strickling would welcome the potential help of an expert to tackle the policy development issue, in particular benchmarking against other multistakeholder organizations. Alan Greenberg recommended a use case on policy vs. implementation. While acknowledging the Review Team’s ability to dive into the analysis of issues, the Review Team will decide on 23 May whether there would be any value in hiring a external consultant. The Review Team will also need to consider elements before launching the process such as the timelime, size of the contract, nature of work etc. Coordination with ICANN staff is foreseen. Review Team Members were invited to circulate one-page summaries on topics they deem ought to be explored by 18 May. The following list was established during the call:

* Lawrence Strickling to circulate a document on PDP;
* Brian Cute to share a one-pager on metrics;
* Avri Doria to suggest topics for case studies.

Lise Fuhr emphasized the need to include the public comments in the equation and Jørgen Abild Andersen raised the option to extend the external consultant’s task.

1. **Schedule**

The Review Team revisited its conference call calendar. The call initially scheduled for 4 July will be postponed to an alterative date. The slot will be used for work stream calls instead.