MARY WONG:

Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Suzie and Kim. So without much further ado, let's get started. I'm actually going to hand over to Sam. And as you see from this set of slides – you may move to the next one, please, Suzie or Kim – there's not much of an agenda but hopefully we can have quite a lot of discussions. Some of which have already started on the mailing list about trying to settle some of the, I suppose, outstanding questions such as a timeline as well as how you as a community want to select the members of this group. But first, Sam, I'll go to you and get a status update as to what we're seeing from the Expressions of Interest, given that the closing date was two days ago.

SAM EISNER:

Thanks, Mary. I think I'm in the room too so I can see what's going on. We've had a really good uptake on the Expressions of Interest. I sort out the number that we have previously reported which was right around the … We had extended the call, I believe, last time we spoke was at the end of July. But as of the close of business on 31 August, we have 98 applications for a Standing Panelist. We don't yet have a preliminary diversity breakdown but just as we've seen them come in, these are diverse in region. There's not necessarily gender balance but there is a selection of both men and women across the panelist. Just from some of the [inaudible], we have some very high caliber candidates in the mix, so I'm confident that the community will have a very nice host of people to select from in this first panel composition exercise. From all preliminary takes on it, we're very happy with the number of people that have responded along with the quality of the response that we

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

seem to have gotten. So I think that that's a really good starting place. So we know that as the community continues with its work and if ICANN continues with the work then it also has to do – we know we have a really nice selection of candidates to go from.

So we're in the process of locking the Expressions of Interest. The materials received, we want to make sure that we have kind of the uniform set of information across candidates for when we move to that community selection part, and so we'll be taking the time to reach out to candidates to access any additional information if we need that. So we'll do that follow-up and we'll start working on those types of efforts while the composition work is happening on the community side.

We will also start doing some work to identify some proposals for who those experts could be that would assist the community in the work. We will be looking much more broadly than just people that have worked with ICANN on these types of efforts. For example, we know that the NomCom has worked with some recruitment experts and not for their work, but we wouldn't just limit it to entities that have previous relationship with ICANN so that we have a little bit shorter of a runway to go down with that community group as we get to the point of selection. So we want to really start doing some pre-work on that without making any final selections or anything, of course, but really trying to give the community some ideas of the types of things we look for and see if we can come to a quick proposal on the experts that would be in play. With that, if we can turn to the next slide.

I think the bulk of today's conversation – unless anyone has any questions on the composition work to date. I see a question from Keith:

"Will there be triage of the application to determine qualified/not qualified before the Community Selection Committee gets the group of EOIs? Or will the community group be required to review all 98?"

Keith, there's an obligation from the bylaws of the community group can only select from the qualified candidates, and so we will be making recommendations or determinations of not qualified, as well as providing the rationale for that to the community groups so that there's some transparency around that process, as well as hopefully some agreement on how that was reached. But we will be doing some of the initial work to do that calling and making those initial proposals on that.

Donna, you said, "Sam, when you say 'we,' you mean Staff?" Yes. Because the bylaws discuss the ICANN role and the community role, it's ICANN that will be working on the preliminary assessment of that qualified/not qualified. This is also something that we would expect to verify through that expert as well. I think that there's an obligation ICANN for as we work through this to make sure that we have transparency in the process so that we're not getting to a point where we just have a limited set of people that we provide to this community group and say you can't see what else we did on the other information. So we'll really try to balance that both in efficiency as well as transparency and really trying to document our internal work as we do this so that we have some ability for the community group to validate that.

If we move to the Terms of Reference document, there's already been some interaction on list on that formation of the group. I imagine that there's some conversation here amongst this group that you guys will

want to have about the composition issues. Then this slide was prepared yesterday and we noted that there was an additional input that Katrina put in since this was developed and we did not update the slides to reflect that because the e-mail kind of spoke for itself.

Then we do have the other areas in the Terms of Reference where we had identified some decision points for the community. We have some pretty comprehensive comments from the ccNSO Council and most of those were agreed to by the Registry Stakeholder Group and that's the annotated version that you received but you could see both of the comments side by side.

I understand before we got on to the call that Olga had raised a question as to whether or not there'd be additional time for the GAC to take a look at this. So we were already contemplating coming on to the call that we would hope that the SO and AC Leaders here would have the opportunity to take a look at the comments received and make any final inputs within the next few days or hopefully early next week so that we could move to another level of drafting taking into account the comments. So with that, I think it's important to turn to the big challenging issues that are here which are the method of composition, which again is really for you to discuss. I'm not going to enter my opinion onto that or [Norm] or Liz from ICANN Org. Then I know that there are some questions on timeline. So if you have questions for me, we'll take them and then if you want me to turn it back to you, Mary, I'm happy to do that, too.

MARY WONG:	I think it's just for the community to discuss. And it does seem like the feedback and the outstanding questions center around the mechanism on methods for constituting the group, as well as the timeline. So maybe what we can do is just take these topics in turn. I see, though, that, Alan, you put your hand up so please go ahead.
ALAN GREENBERG:	One of the things that I haven't seen discussed is the size of the group. At one level, one person per AC/SO is fine but rarely do we end up with a group of people who volunteer where everyone actually pulls their full weight and does all of the work. I'm wondering – do we really want two people per community or up to two as opposed to just one each? I think that's something we should consciously decide on, not just accept it without thinking about it. Because this is going to be a lot of work over a short period of time and we really need to make sure that everyone is contributing or at least the significant number of people are contributing. Thank you.
MARY WONG:	Thank you, Alan. As Sam said, this is really a decision for you as the community, so it's really good to see so many groups represented on the call today. Let's go to Heather.
HEATHER FORREST:	Thanks, Mary, very much. In addition to the concerns about timeline, which I've dropped into the chat, is something a bit more substantive that I wanted to raise. I think the one thing that stood out to me that's

missing here is anything in relation to the qualifications or the expertise of this formation of a selection panel in the sense that I think it would be helpful to have folks on this thing who have experience in, for example, appointing arbitrators or appointing mediators, perhaps people who have served on something like a NomCom. It doesn't have to be, of course, ICANN and indeed that would probably be problematic in this situation. But those with experience in selecting people for these types of roles, I think to the extent that we could capture that expertise, I think that would help us with the small and efficient nature of the group and probably give us more robust item. Thanks, Mary.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Heather. Suzie, can you move to the document and specifically to page 3 of the document? Maybe that will be helpful, especially for those who might need to take a look at what's there in the decisions that need to be made.

Donna, I see your comment about preferring a small and efficient group, with support from Rod and Ashley. You also have your hand up so please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Mary. Donna Austin from the Registry Stakeholder Group. To Heather's point about skillset and experience, I think that one thing where we would agree that that's important for this representative group that they actually have the skillset required to do the job. One of the reasons why we only know Expressions of Interest coming from community members and the SO/AC Leaders through that selection

process because – you know, go down that path of saying we want two from the GNSO and one from all the other Supporting Organizations or ACs, we may actually be excluding better qualified candidates to do this job. So that's one of the reasons why we preferred the second option, one of the other options that was provided in this document, the Terms of Reference document that was put out. It's because this is a really important group that we're setting up to consider. Sam is saying there's 98 candidates – even if that's just winnowed down to 50, that's still a big job for this group to identify a slate of panelists. So they have to have some kind of expertise and skillset to be able to do that. So I really strongly agree with Heather that we need to consider candidates for this representative group. So I firmly support Heather and that's the reason why we prefer not some [inaudible] one representative from qualified candidates in this group.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Donna. There were some difficulties with your audio but I think we got much of the gist of what you were saying. So based on the comments, up to now it seems like in terms of composition, there's at least three questions. One is, how many? Another is the criteria in terms of who and what are the attributes, expertise, and knowledge that the folks on this group should have? And third, who makes the decision as to who gets on this group? Perhaps in that order.

I see some comments in the chat as well. Rod, I saw your comment and support of Heather about the criteria for membership of this group, with more support from Claudia, Donna, and others. If we take these questions in turn, in terms of the number of people, it seems like there's

some sense that it should not be an overly large group. The question of course is what's optimal, what's small versus not so small? But there is a fundamental question about whether it should or should not be one per group or two per group. We see the comments here from the ccNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group. So I wonder if anyone from any other group has a sense of what your group thinks is the better or more optimal size and representativeness.

Yes, thank you, Ashley. Basically, the registrars share the registries' views. Donna, you're saying an odd number and seven. So seven would nicely fall into one per SO/AC but that doesn't necessarily have to be the case. So we're getting a group that should be nimble, relatively small to work efficiently, and preferably an odd number. Alan, let's go to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There's a number of interacting things here. One of the other questions later on is should the chair be selected or should the group select the chair? And then this question of whether the chair has no vote, a regular vote, or only a tie-breaking vote? So even an odd, if you end up selecting the chair from the group and the chair doesn't have a vote then an odd number ends up with an even number of votes. So these things are a little bit interrelated.

I think seven could be a fine number but seven, if you end up with having participation problems where not everyone shows up at a meeting or one or two people are missing in action – that happens sometimes – you're ending up with a really small number of people to

do the work. So I can live with seven but I think there's a downside to it and we may want to be careful. Thank you.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Alan. We're noting your comment about the role of the chair, which is one of the points that was raised in some comments. Also, to your point about attendance, it may be something that can be addressed in terms of the expectations and the commitment level that these group members will have to essentially commit to in order to get the work done, not just in a timely manner but also to make sure that it is the full group that's involved and not just a small subset of a small group.

Does anyone have any other thoughts at this point about either the size or the representativeness of the group? If we go with an odd number, if that off number is seven then, like I said, it does look like it might be one per SO/AC, but potentially with the ability for the selecting body to select the most qualified seven candidates, endeavoring as far as possible to make sure that the selected seven represent as broad a diversity of stakeholders and interests as possible. I'm kind of doing this on the fly so I'm just trying to offer something for your thoughts.

Donna? Donna, you're still on mute. I don't know if you're having audio issues again.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Can you hear me, Mary?

MARY WONG:	Now we can hear you. Thank you.
DONNA AUSTIN:	Okay. Sorry. Kimberly has been kind enough to give me a dial out, so hopefully you can hear me a little bit better this time.
	Rather than focus on the number for this group, maybe we should spend a little bit more time talking about the skillset and qualifications that Heather was talking about. And also there's a question of, if we go down one path then is that the discretion of the SO/AC to make their own selections? But I wonder if we can reach agreement that if we go down that path that the SO/AC makes the selection, that at a minimum, we're looking at the same selection criteria so that the ccNSO isn't going off and just putting out an Expression of Interest with no kind of rails around it in terms of what the skillset or selection criteria is. I think at a minimum, it would be good if we could agree that the selection criteria for this representative group, regardless of where you come from, should be the same. Does that make sense?
MARY WONG:	I see some hands going up, Donna. Stephanie, Julie, and Heather. And I agree that we do want to move on to the selection criteria issue, which is probably very important, given what we're just saying. Stephanie?
STEPHANIE PERRIN:	I'm a little concerned that the non-commercial side of the house, depending on what those criteria are, may not have the same expertise in making appointments that, for instance, a member of the GAC might

have or a member of a large company or corporation or even an industry group just because of the parameters of the actual group. So I am convinced that the issue of balance is actually in the 98 people who have applied for the job. That's where we need the balance less than in the seven people that are selecting them. As long as we have those criteria for a balanced outcome, we'll nail down. I'm not sure that we do as well as being not quite sure. Perhaps I am misinterpreting what we mean by having these credentials in order to be on this group. Maybe we do have people with equivalent credentials. It just depends on whether you're talking about making judicial appointments or picking people for a Board. So those are my worries. I just would like to say that NCSG's view is that the group itself should pick the chair. Thanks.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Stephanie. Julie.

JULIE BISLAND: I guess I wanted to comment on a similar aspect with regard to the selection criteria that the SO/ACs may be considering for proposing their representatives to this group. I think it's unlikely that all criteria would be met by every individual from each of the SO/ACs. To me, the important aspect is that the skills are covered in aggregate rather than every individual who becomes part of the representative group has all the skills. So for example, SSAC might be able to propose someone that brings the skills regarding security and stability, knowledge to assess candidates in that regard, but might not have some other specific skills that we might be looking for in the candidate. And that's true, of course,

of the IRP panelists themselves that it's important to have the skills in aggregate rather than every panelist had every single skill. So that would sort of lend itself to a process whereby people with specific skills that are identified are nominated and perhaps the SO/AC chairs then pull together a group which is not too large in size. I like the idea of seven who actually span the skillset. Thanks.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Julie. It was Heather and then I see Alan. Stephanie, I don't know if that's a new hand. But let's go to Heather and then Alan.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Mary. I'm going to say something here that's a bit wild and crazy and certainly controversial. On a bit side, whether randomly or not, that we've hit upon the number seven so quickly and seemed to be fixated on it. I really would encourage us to try and depoliticize this. And by depoliticize, what I mean is not necessarily make this such a representative thing. This isn't selecting people to represent SOs and ACs, or it shouldn't be in my view. I think that we really need to be focusing on the skillset and not the number. While I think the world of you, Julie, I'm not sure that I necessarily agree with the idea that some folks have to have some of the skills and others have others. I really think there's one skillset that's important here and that skillset is experience in selecting people for something. We can argue that whether doing jury duty is enough, I'm not sure where we draw the line on that. But I don't see that that would knock out commercials and non-commercials. I don't see that that would knock out technical versus

other things. I really think that that's what we need to be focusing on. This isn't a representative thing. This isn't something that's supposed to be, you know, these people go off and they hole away and they carry out the interests or the strengths or the whatever it is of their SO and AC. I really would encourage this, even just for this initial call. Let's try and come off the number seven. I know it's very convenient in our community and I know that there's a real trust thing here. But I really would like to see that we focus on the skills. And if that means at a given time that an SO or AC or other SOs and ACs, multiple of them aren't able to put someone forward at that time, I don't think that we should be threatened by that. Because I really think at the end of the day, it's the very unique task that this group is going to be charged with that needs to drive us and not the usual kind of in our whole mentality. So I apologize for saying something so controversial and crazy but please indulge me. Thanks, Mary.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Heather. There's been more comments in the chat and I've tried to refine at least the overall contours of what we might be converging on as we go along. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm going to strongly agree and strongly disagree with Heather on two different points. In terms of the skillset, I agree with her. We need people who are experienced with selecting people from written resumes and written documents. The reason that I and a number of other people said we want expert help is because we can't

expect our community to have all the skills necessary for recognizing good judicial people. That's why we're looking for external help. We're looking for people with essentially regular skills associated with picking people with reading resumes, with a little bit of insight into human issues. And those are the skills we're looking at and I think we'll find those within any of our groups. So I'm not at all worried about that and I don't think we need to be staffing this group with judicial experts or people with very specialized skills. That's why we're hiring outside experts to help us.

In terms of representing, no, I don't think the group is representing. That is, they're not going back and asking the AC or SO, "What should we do?" But remember the bylaws say that AC and SO should be doing this. We decided that's really dumb that ACs and SOs can't do it. Therefore, we're going to have this group constituted of people from and blessed by the ACs and SOs to do it for them. So I really think if we start saying we may end up with people just from two or three of the groups instead of seven, I think we're not honoring the bylaw intent at that point. Thank you.

By the way, I like Keith's idea of targeting at least one from each AC and SO with a target number of 12-15 or something like that. Thank you.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Alan. We're capturing this as we go along. I see that Heather has made a suggestion that maybe taking that into account, aiming for one per SO/AC, if possible, but with a floor and a ceiling, perhaps not to

exceed 15. Not fewer than 7, not to exceed 15, something like that might work.

We probably need to spend a few minutes just closing up the discussion too about what criteria would be some members have to meet. But before that, I see Sam. You've got your hand up so you probably have a response or some advice for us.

SAM EISNER: Thanks. I'll be quick because I think some of the discussion about the floor and ceiling and maybe some agreement that there should be someone, at least one from each SO and AC might cover this, but one of the intents that ICANN Org has had in coming to this conversation with SOs and ACs all along is that there's that recognition that we need to process the SOs and ACs less to be the process that creates the slate given that the SOs and ACs won't have the opportunity to necessarily vote on the slate. So it's really up to you whether that means a representative group or not that we don't know the bylaws necessarily require representative group. But again, I think that's really an internal decision I think that the recommendation that it's going to be that floor and ceiling and that some minimum requirement might cover that. So with that, I'll turn it back to the group. Thanks.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Sam. It seems like we might want to spend a little bit of time at least brainstorming about criteria, bearing in mind some of the comments that have already been made, and then what we can do is we can then take some of the suggestions to the mailing list and see

how we go from there. Then we can close off by seeing if there's agreement that however you come out on numbers where there's an aggregate skillset or what the criteria is that the selection of the group, whether 7, 9, or 15 falls to the SO/AC chairs, but we can also take that to e-mail.

Does anyone have additional suggestions or comments about the criteria that you think members of this community representatives group ought to meet either individually or in the aggregate? Heather, I see your question. That's what I'm trying to get to. So, please take it away, Heather.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Mary. You and I clearly had a mind out there and I appreciate that. I guess as a basic starting point, I put on the table the idea of some experience in selection. As a starting point, can we all get behind that? Is there anyone that objects to having some sort of experience in selecting candidates for something and do we need to define the thing. So maybe that's the starting point, Mary. Thanks.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Heather. Do we have reactions to that? Julie, please go ahead.

JULIE BISLAND: Mary, I have a feeling that in one of the previous discussion papers provided by ICANN Staff for consideration that there was such a list of skills – or it might be I'm thinking of the skills of the panelist – but I'm

not certain that we haven't already considered some of this in previous discussions.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Julie. As my colleague, Sam, has noted in the chat, the focus was the skillsets for the panelist but we, as this group, haven't had a in-depth discussion about the skillset you might need for the group. Thank you. Sam is also saying that there was, however, agreement that the group itself might be more highly specialized. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Mary. Can you hear me?

MARY WONG: We can indeed.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Just going back to what Sam said earlier. Those that have submitted their Expressions of Interest already to be an IRP panelist, ICANN will do a check to see that they meet the criteria. So I think it might be helpful if we had some idea understanding of what that criteria for the panelist were. And then the representative group is going to have to narrow down to the set of panelists. My understanding is they're seven at a minimum. It could be more and maybe that would be at the discretion of the representative group how many panelists they appoint.

I guess what we need to understand in terms of skillset, I agree that somebody who has some experience in selection is important and that could be somebody that's been in the Nominating Committee. I think the Nominating Committee experience might be helpful because processes are going to have to be developed for how the representative group selecting the panelists themselves. But I think what's not clear in my head is the job of this representative group. So obviously, it's to select seven or more panelists out of a group of – Sam is saying if all 98 meet the criteria that was put out there in the Expression of Interest, that's a big job, if you're trying to winnow down 98 qualified candidates. So some kind of organizational skill or other types of skills associated with winnowing that down, it's going to be important as well. So I don't have a clear understanding in my mind of what this role would be and that's what I need to get a better understanding of what the role of this group is in order to understand what selection criteria would be beneficial. Sorry, that's really long-winded but it's around kind of shaking out on it. Thanks, Mary.

MARY WONG: Not at all, Donna. Again, there's more chat and I think there may be responses to some questions that were asked in the chat as well. Thank you, Heather and Olga for plus one in my summary, which is something that I'm just putting out there to see if this is a fair representation of at least what was said to try and move us along.

Can I ask if anyone else has any other views on the criteria that you would expect to see in those that serve on this community representatives group, bearing in mind that the previous agreement

was that this group will be the one that will select a proposed slate of panelists and it is that slate that will go up to the ICANN Board for its approval. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Just reinforcing what was just said about not quite understanding the criteria for selection of the actual IRP panel members. I presumed – and I may be taking a lot for granted here, including my own rather passive reaction to the lack of representation on the community reps group. It's possible that my group does not feel quite so passive about that. But if we don't have a methodology and a set of criteria that we are looking for yet and we are relying on the outside consultants to give us assistance in coming up with that methodology (the grid, the marking, all the rest of it, of the interview questions, etc.) then it's a little hard to figure out what criteria we're looking for in – I'm going to call it the seven-member group just to be clear, even though I recognize it isn't seven if you follow me. In other words, working backwards, it would be good if we had a better sense of what we're asking them to pick. Thank you.

MARY WONG: Thank you for that, Stephanie. And that's a good point and a good question. Sam?

SAM EISNER: Thanks, Mary. We'll recirculate to this group the call for Expressions of Interest, which included a list of qualifications that we stated to the

panelists or to those responding to it that we were looking for in the aggregate to be served by this group. We will be making our initial assessments, as we discussed earlier, against those in the primary and also against some of the Conflict of Interest concern. So one of the things we heard clearly from the work that we did a few months ago with this group was that there is a concern, not just to people who have worked with ICANN Org but also those who have been active in the community that they might not be appropriate to be serving on the Standing Panel, if there's not enough time between their service and the community and their appointment on the same panel. We do know that we have at least a couple Expressions of Interest that we've received that would be deemed to fall within that.

So we have some objective, things that we'll be looking at. We'll try to be as objective as we can in looking at this and trying to evaluate. If someone purports to not come with the technical expertise that we have identified as one of the composite things, and then they also don't have a deeper substantial practice in law or in arbitrations or anything like that, go look at what they purport to say that they bring to see if there is any sort of substantiation. If someone comes with only two years' experience and never having done an arbitration but they also say that they're not bringing the technical expertise or other things, that someone who would likely be deemed as not qualified because they're not really hitting any of the points. But anyone who seems to fit within that composite group, I would imagine would be moved likely to that qualified stage. That's where Donna's discussion of given that we have big numbers, this becomes actually a more important – or it's not more

important but it could be a substantial job, which is also why we're looking to rely on the experts for this.

So those are the things that we'll be testing it against. You might want to think about who from your communities or those that you would think about putting onto this community selection group have the best skillsets to identify their thoughts of how people are meeting those qualifications that are laid out in that expressions of interest documents. That might be one test. I know that someone from this group, I think, had mentioned earlier about the need for some management expertise in working with a recruitment expert or something. Because I think that will also be a substantial amount of effort so that the group has some confidence in their ability to manage the work of that expert and not just rely solely on ICANN Org to serve in that management role.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Sam. We'll go to Alan, and then maybe what we can do is pick this up on e-mail, as Sam said, and spend a few minutes talking about the timeline. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Mary. You read my mind. I was going to suggest as riveting as this conversation is we really need to look at timeline. I understand the timeline in the document was done at the end of August and it's a month later now. Sorry, not a month later, but it's later now. And clearly the timeline I don't think is reasonable. I have a question for Sam related to this, however. Normally, the process with an ICANN to look

for new vendors and then establish a working relationship with them takes quite a lot of time. I'm wondering, to what extent has that been factored in this? Thank you.

SAM EISNER: Thanks, Alan. That's one of the reasons why we want to start developing some of that work now so that we're not starting that afresh in a few weeks or months or however long it takes for the community portion of the selection of this group to get done. We think that this is actually a very specialized skillset so it's not really a skill that we think would be best identified through an open RFP. So we don't think that we need to go through that part of our procurement process. We have the ability to run procurements without doing a full RFP. But we want to start taking some of that work on now but also, as I expressed earlier, providing some transparency to the community on that and not just making the decision. That's not at all what we want to do, but we want to do some of the legwork to identify some good candidates for the community group to select from. Again, we acknowledge it's going to be very important that this is not just candidates who are already within ICANN's realm of contracted vendors because I think that'll be an important method of independence as well.

MARY WONG: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, Sam. There's a question from Stephanie in the chat. Sam, I don't know if you want to address that quickly or to put it back in chat. Donna, I think – sorry. Sam, go ahead.

SAM EISNER: Not yet. We're starting to work on it now but we don't have a completed one that we can share at this time. But we will be able to share it once we have it.

MARY WONG: Thanks. Alan, a quick one, and then let's spend five minutes on the timeline.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that was an error. I was pulling down my check and somehow my hand went up. Thank you.

MARY WONG: No worries. Thank you so much. Suzie, can we go to page two of this document, please? Thank you. Just that table where the timeline is, so just a little lower down, please. Yes, thank you. So can we just see the actual table? Maybe can we see the comments on the right? Thank you.

Let's get some comments here because I think that the general gist of it was that this may now be unrealistic. Sam or Liz, I don't know if based on the initial feedback, there's any sense of how we might amend this but I'll open it to you as well as to any member of this group.

SAM EISNER: From my side, clearly on the 30th of September is aspirational but I think that the rest of the dates can hopefully move in sequence once we identify that date by which the community group can be put together

and run the selection. We'd like to see this happen as soon as possible. We're clearly not going to meet this but let's make sure that we all come to agreement on what can be our feasible amount of time to meet it.

MARY WONG: Exactly. Thank you. I think in the comments, Katrina had said that it might take the ccNSO up to three weeks. And Donna, for the registries and the comments by the registrars, you were thinking that overall it might be more six weeks. So we're looking at that and we're now in September, it looks like maybe mid-October might be the outside date. Someone correct me on my math or come up with a better date or a more achievable date.

Stephanie says that there is an ICANN meeting coming up and that is in mid or late October. That's one reason why not just doing the math, but looking ahead, whether mid-October as the outside date is something that you all think is achievable, somewhat realistic before the ICANN meeting consumes everyone's attention.

Donna, please go ahead. You might be muted again or double-muted again, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Mary. Thank you. Sorry. I think it is going to take us a little bit of time to wrap our heads around what we think the criteria reason to get this representative group together. I think Alan's already said it, this is going to be a heavy lift for this group. It's going to be a concentrated

period of work that has to go on. Sam, I think the last time we heard from you, you might have said that there were 20 Expressions of Interest. Now that we have 98, that really is a concern to me and that increases the workload for this group. So, that kind of ratchets up to some extent to start this work earlier rather than later. But I am worried that one of the failings I think that has come to in review teams is that the scope was unclear to start. And a lot of time was lost in that initial kind of "get together and work out what the hell we're supposed to be doing" period. So if we can take a little bit of a breath here and understand exactly what it is that we want this group to do, and set them up for success the best way that we can then maybe this timeline is achievable. I think it's important that we take a little bit of a breath and don't push ahead too quickly. Let's just take a little bit more time to understand what the role of this group is and set them up to success.

MARY WONG: Thanks very much, Donna. I guess one asked from us in Org, we want to be very respectful and careful of the roles of the community versus the roles of us as Org is if you have a sense of anything that we can do to help you come to that sense of agreement about all of these things – number, criteria, and even individual groups, how to identify the members to this group – please let us know. I mean, that's not necessarily in the next 30 seconds. But what it seems like we should be doing – and I'm going to ask Sam a question in a minute – is that we'll take this back to you on e-mail, hopefully with a summary of at least some of the discussion points and some of the suggested criteria from this call.

Here's a question for you, Sam. We could give folks a few more days – apologies for that, I actually have another call – a few more days to come back with additional thoughts on the draft Terms of Reference and then we can continue discussions on e-mail, possibly another call if need be, to see if we can work towards that realistic timeline in a sensible but effective fashion. Sam, is that workable?

SAM EISNER: Yeah. I think that makes sense, Mary. I think we'll work with Mary to summarize the next steps out of the call. But I think that the other open points on the Terms of Reference, let's set a deadline for that so we can get the remainder of that Terms of Reference kind of put to bed, and then do identify how we can support you and identifying skillsets or if there's other information you need for that conversation, we'll do whatever we can to help move that forward. But I think it'll be good, Mary, maybe if we summarize the areas where we think that there's more work to be done so that we can see how maybe we can support a lightweight work plan of this group to help achieve those outputs. From the Org side, we'll help with that however we can.

MARY WONG: That's that sounds good. So I'll circle back with Sam and Liz and we will do our best to provide information updates in summary. Perhaps for the sense of the other open items here that we haven't discussed or that we haven't received much feedback on, would a week from now or say something like next Thursday be doable for everyone? In the interest of time, I guess I will just take that as no objection and suggest that and if

something does come up, we can certainly try to work that out. Thank you all for your time and for the feedback. Please keep it coming. As Sam noted, we will come back to you with as much information as we can to try and help close off on this and move on to the actual working stage.

Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Suzie. Thank you, Kim. Please take care all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Mary.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]