
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Hello.

PAMELA SMITH: Good morning or good evening.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Good morning, evening.

PAMELA SMITH: Who is this please?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Dejan Djukic.

PAMELA SMITH: Good to talk to you.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Hello?

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.

PAMELA SMITH: We will start the meeting in just a minute. If you can put yourself on mute in the short-term, and then we'll get going. And we are recording, just so you know. We're glad you're here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, it's Jonathan.

PAMELA SMITH: Welcome.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see the Adobe Connect wasn't set up for microphone use, that threw me off a little bit. So used to doing it that way.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay folks, this is Pamela and we are ready to get started. And I'm getting feedback, so the, I was asked to do a roll call. You can just raise your hand if you're here.

I'm getting horrible feedback, so perhaps I'm not the person to do this. Hang on. Technical difficulties.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Pamela, can you mute your computer?

PAMELA SMITH: Yes.

I thought I had it muted everyone, and apparently I didn't. So my apologies. And it's still not working.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: This is Charla for the record. If you aren't speaking please mute your line and mute your computer so that we don't get feedback. Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: This is Margie. I don't know if we lost Pamela. We might as well get started.

Check one more time. Pamela, are you on?

PAMELA SMITH: Okay. Finally I'm back. Can you hear me now?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, we can hear you now.

PAMELA SMITH: Can you hear me now? Yes, this is a Verizon commercial.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. Pamela, the best way to do the roll call is just to read off from the participants list who is on, and then ask for anyone how hasn't been identified themselves that way. It doesn't take so much time.

PAMELA SMITH: Sure. Hang on. I don't have, my participant list just disappeared. Sorry, I'm having a little bit of technical difficulties for the moment.

Yeah, I'm sorry. Charla, do you mind going ahead and doing that? I'm sorry, my list has disappeared.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Okay. On the call, it looks like we have Drew Bagley, Stanley Besen, Jordyn Buchanan. Is Jordyn on the call? I don't see Jordyn.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, my microphone wasn't connected.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, this is Jordyn, I'm on the call.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: OK. I apologize if I pronounce this incorrectly, Dejan Djukic? Okay. Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Kaili Kan...

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, thank you I'm on the call.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes, thank you, I'm on the call.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Thank you, thank you Carlos. And I apologize if I pronounce this incorrectly as well. Gaogalelwe Mosweu? Is he on the call? Does not appear to be on the call. Megan Richards. I don't see Carlton. Waudo Siganga, is on the call. It looks like apologies from Fabro Steibel, I don't see him on. David Taylor is on and Jonathan Zuck.

And from staff we have Eleeza Agopian, Jamie Hedlund, Karen Lentz, Margie Milam, I don't see Karen Mulberry yet. Myself, Charla Shambley, and Pamela Smith. And with that, I think I'll turn it over to Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Great. Thank you very much Charla, and welcome everyone to the first review team meeting of the Competition Consumer Trust Review Team. We have a lot on our agenda, and for today's call, I'll be leading the discussion, but as we move into the leadership discussion, hopefully identify a leader rather soon, then we can hand over the chair of the call to the leader, if he or she is identified today.

If not, I'll continue chairing the rest of the call for today. Just as you can see, this is the agenda we've circulated. It's probably a little too aggressive for this call, for an hour and a half. We have a lot to cover, but we thought we would at least share with you information about the review team and where we are from the staff perspective, in preparing you all for this effort.

And certainly these topics are ones that can be carried on to the next call should we not be able to cover them all today. Before I move on to the first item, does anyone want to add anything to the agenda topic?

Okay, well hearing none, we'll go ahead and get started. For those of you that are new to the ICANN processes, as you use the Adobe Connect room, you actually have the ability to raise your hand if you want to be in the queue, or to raise a point on the phone. And so that is how we manage the queue, and a little hand is up at the very top of the Adobe Connect room.

You can click on that and that will let us know that you'd like to join the conversation and say something. So with that, I would like to welcome you all. This has been quite an effort to bring together the review team and to identify the members to handle this particular topic. I thought the best way for us to start would be to go through the list and each of you to introduce yourself, give us a little bit of information about your background and your interest in joining the review team.

And that way we all can get a better sense for each of you and your various perspectives. And so with that, we'll just go in alphabetical order on the list. Jordyn Buchanan, would you like to say hello and tell the group about your background?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure. Happy to speak to that briefly. I know there is a lot of us so I'll try to be relatively concise. I'm Jordyn Buchanan. I have been working in, been involved with domain names for a long time, but actually working the space since I got hired at Register dot com in 1999, shortly after

Register dot com was selected as one of the first five testbed registrars, when competition in the registrar space was introduced.

I was hired as a network engineer at the time. My background is principally as infrastructure engineer. So I've done quite a bit of work on studying up and configuring DNS systems prior to that, so I already had some interest in the space.

But eventually, as Register dot com applied for the dot pro top level domain name and help put together the dot info application as a member of Affilias, I got pulled into the ICANN space, eventually got involved with the policy development process, and was fortunate to serve on the original names council before the GNSO was created, and subsequently on the GNSO council, chaired a few working groups along the way.

And back in 2006, when I left Register dot com and went to Google, I thought I was leaving the domain industry, other than the fact that I was still chairing the WHOIS task force for about my first year at Google, but spent a couple of years after that working just on internal infrastructure Google, before more recently getting pulled back into the space when Google decided to get involved in the domain name industry itself, as a gTLD registry applicant, and more recently, as an operational registrar.

I run Google's engineering efforts related to both of those businesses. And I'm excited to work with all of you to better understand the implications of recent changes in our ecosystem in terms of competition and consumer trust.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you Jordyn. Now let's move on to Carlos Gutierrez.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you. I'm sitting here in Costa Rica in a beautiful summer morning, we are in summer right now here. I got pretty late into the Internet sector, when Costa Rica decided to open up a telecom market in 2008, I became chair of the regulatory agency that was created, and one of the first visits I got was from our software industry representative.

They came to us to complain about the price of ccTLD of Costa Rica. At the time, it was \$100 a year, it is still \$100 a year. So that got me interested into the domain name industry, and all of these differences in pricings and offerings. Then 2011, we started with the ICANN meeting, or preparing the ICANN meeting in San Jose. I became the GAC representative for Costa Rica for the following years.

And when my time finished in the government, I joined the different group of ICANN. And I was nominated by the NomCom to the GNSO, where I have been for over a year, 2013, yes, I was also member of the ATRT 2 review team. And I'm very happy to be in this you, and I hope to see many more numbers and figures, and team indicators and work with data instead of words and regulations. Thank you very much.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you Carlos. And do we have Waudu Siganga on the call?

Waudu, if you're on, we're not hearing you.

Okay, let's move on to David Taylor. We can come back to Waudu if he's on. David?

DAVID TAYLOR:

Hi everyone. Yes, I'm David Taylor. So I'm an Englishman but based in France, so I'm not French. Been here for 18 years, and went to my first ICANN meeting back in 2000. I'm an IP lawyer by trade and head of a domain name practice which we've had going 16, 17 years now, out of Paris where we do a lot of global registration work, global enforcement.

And then since new gTLD program has initiated, we've done a lot of work on new gTLDs applications, as well as objections, responses, etc. So quite a wide variety of areas. I used to be on the GNSO for three years, counselor, that was about 2009 to 2012. That's probably it, that's enough from me. Keep it short. Look forward to...

MARGIE MILAM:

Thank you David. Jonathan?

Jonathan, you're on mute if you're speaking.

Jonathan? Okay. We'll come back to you Jonathan because we can't hear you right now. Kaili Kan.

KAILI KAN:

Hi. Can you hear me? Hello?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, we can hear you.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, okay. Yeah this is Kaili Kan speaking. Yeah, I'm in China. And I had a quite a few [inaudible] experience back in telecommunication competition areas of Asia. And also, part of the research, especially introducing competition and consumer protection. That was also IPG [inaudible] in Beijing University of telecommunications for 15 years.

I teach economics and also the telecom competition of Asia as a course. On that side, I consider myself somewhat [inaudible] experienced, but on the other hand, I am pretty new to ICANN and ALAC. I was last year's selectee for NomCom for ALAC. So far, my experience with the ICANN is only about three months old.

The reason I joined the CCT RT is that I can see this new gTLD policy as well, the most important decisions that ICANN made over the last three years. And would have one of the biggest impacts of internet and especially in relation to any users, consumers, and so forth.

So well, this is why I want to join CCT team, and also of course, make my contribution to the team. On the other hand, what I feel is that also an opportunity to learn from everybody here. I feel that maybe everybody here is more senior and more experienced than I am with ICANN. So also, a chance for me to learn from every, each and every one of you. Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you very much. Carlton, are you on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. Can you hear me now?

MARGIE MILAM: We sure can. Go ahead Jonathan, and then we'll give it to Carlton if he is on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm going to hang up the phone. So yes, it's Jonathan Zuck, from the [app?] association. And I have been a part of this process now since Cartagena, when the Board first past its resolution to incorporate metrics into this review. I had the honor of chairing the work group to establish those metrics, and the implementation advisory group, which helped get some things started and putting the survey and economic study.

I've been involved with ICANN since 2005 in Vancouver. And I'm very excited about this review and having a rigorous analysis process that's evidence based. And look forward to working with everyone.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you Jonathan. Megan Richards?

Megan, you're muted if you're speaking.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Can you hear me at all? I'm muted, but I don't think you can hear me.
Can you hear me?

MARGIE MILAM: I can hear you. If you could speak louder, we can hear you faintly.

MEGAN RICHARDS: So it works. Very good. I'm in a very large room here, I'm not in my normal office. Well I'll try to speak very briefly. I am a relative newcomer to the details, the gory details of ICANN. I use to follow it from a much further distance point of view, from a more policy related aspect. And since last year, I've been the European Commission and GAC representative.

And I bring [inaudible], open approach to all of this. [Inaudible] all of the background... so I hope that will hope. And I liked very much what Jonathan said about a rigorous evidenced based approach, which I'm looking forward to. Thanks a lot.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you Megan. Dejan?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Hi. Dejan Djukic. I'm from Serbia. I'm working in Serbian ccTLD. I'm lawyer in domain name industry since 2008, over eight years by now. I was involved in developing our ccTLD policy. I am interested also in [inaudible] process. I am also involved in establishing our commission

for domain dispute resolution also. And I am also interested in new gTLD process.

I attended a few ICANN meetings, my first was Beijing, I'm not sure, I can't remember. I was also ICANN Fellow at the Durban meeting. And I found this review team as a great opportunity to develop my experience and skill set and participate more in the ICANN community.

MARGIE MILAM:

Great. Thank you very much. Gao, I'm sorry. I don't even know how to pronounce the name. [Gaogalelwe Mosweu] are you on the call?

If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

Gao? Okay, well jump to the next one. Drew Bagley?

Drew, if you're speaking, we can't hear you either.

Drew?

Okay. For some reason, we can't hear you.

Are you...? Okay, you're going to try to connect with your phone?

Okay, we'll go to the next one and then come back to you Drew.

Stanley Besen.

STANLEY BESEN:

This is Stanley Besen. Can you hear me?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes we can.

STANLEY BESEN: Good. I'm an economist. I've been working in the telecom industry for a long time, particularly focusing on competition issues. I would like to say that when I started, there were only three television networks and one telephone company in the US, and obviously things have changed.

I also do intellectual property copyright, patents, particularly in the area of standard essential patents. I guess my most relevant connection to this activity is that more than a decade ago, I served on a US nationally academy committee, that reviewed the domain name system.

We produced a book, which some of you may have seen, called *Sign Posts in Cyberspace*. And we made the then radical suggestion that ICANN could add, I think I remember exactly, tens of new domains per year. Too radical at the time. And so I'm very interested in joining this committee to see how it all turned out when you all finally took our recommendations.

MARGIE MILAM: Great, thank you very much. Let's go back to Drew. Drew, by any chance, have you been able to unmute your computer?

Looks like we can't hear you.

We'll come to you because I think you said you may try to connect... Hold on, you're typing.

Okay, he's going to try... We'll come back to you Drew. In the meantime, Rob is not on the call, so we'll move to Fabro Steibel.

Fabro, are you on the call?

If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

DREW BAGLEY: Hello. This is Drew Bagley. Can you hear me now?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, we can hear you Drew. Why don't you go ahead?

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Sorry about that. Yeah the computer wasn't working. I'm on the phone now. Yeah, my name is Drew Bagley. And I'm a lawyer, and I work for the cybersecurity company Crowd Strike as a privacy council, and also spent a lot of my time helping to run the secure domain foundation, which is an international NGO dedicated to anti-abuse.

And so I spend a lot of time working with registrars and registries, trying to get them to share information about known cyber threats, and basically coordinate efforts on the anti-abuse. So one person, a bad customer, won't be someone else's bad customer in terms of creating a phishing site, and whatnot. And I spent a lot of time on research related to competition and privacy issues in a variety of realms.

And previously worked in law enforcement for several years, at the FBI. So I have a lot of relationships in that world too. And I'm eager to help in ICANN as we undertake our research this next year.

MARGIE MILAM:

Great. Thank you very much. So let's go back to, Gao, are you on the call? I understand you've been trying to deal with some technical issues.

Gao, we can't hear you right now if you're speaking.

Okay. Well, we'll jump back to you in a moment. I understand Carlton is not on the call and Waudon is not on the call as well. So we'll now move down to the two representatives of the, on the review team, under the affirmation of commitment the CEO selects a representative and the GAC chair selects a representative. From Fadi's representative for staff is Jamie Hedlund. He is on the call. And then Lauren Kapin is the representative of the GAC chair, but unfortunately, she was not able to make today's call.

So Jamie, would you like to say hello to the group and give your perspective?

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Yeah, sure. So Jamie Hedlund. I've been at ICANN for almost six years. Originally I was a telecom regulatory attorney. Spent three years in the 90s at the US Federal Communications Commission. I've done policy work in Washington for wireless companies, and Internet companies, and at ICANN I've been both in a public policy role on ICANN's

registered lobbyist. But I'm also working for the global domains division, particularly on the new gTLD program and where issues, the program intersects with public policy issues and GAC advice.

And that's my story.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you Jamie. And now we'll move to Gao. I believe Gao is on now.

Gao, we can't hear you if you're trying to speak.

Okay. Well...

GAOGALELWE MOSWEU: Hello?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, welcome. We can hear you now.

GAOGALELWE MOSWEU: Oh fantastic. Okay, I missed a bit of a good part of the meeting. [Inaudible] these last comment, or talk, that we're introducing ourselves.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, please introduce yourself.

GAOGALELWE MOSWEU: Oh okay. So it's my turn now?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes.

GAOGALELWE MOSWEU: Okay. Great. Okay. My name is Gaogalelwe Mosweu, and I live and work in Botswana. Have been involved with IG Internet governance activities since 2007. And I'm a business consultant with a professional training in [inaudible] communications, so customer service and consumer trust has been my thing, because you can't separate consumer trust from customer service really, because business is all about relationships and it's all about trust.

So yes, that's a bit about me.

MARGIE MILAM: Great. Thank you very much. I want to see if there is anyone else on the call that wasn't able to participate. I understand that Waudu has had difficulties getting on, and I just want to confirm that no one else is on that hasn't been able to introduce themselves.

Okay. So hearing no other voices, we'll move on to the next part of the agenda. I think it was really useful, and I appreciate everyone sharing their perspective. To give you a little bit of background on the staff support, as this is a fairly large initiative, and it's going to require a lot of resources from ICANN to be able to deliver the data and the information

that you need to do your analysis, I thought it would be useful to introduce our team.

As I mentioned, I'm Margie Milam. I'm senior director at ICANN in the strategic initiative department. Our department is responsible for managing the reviews under the affirmation of commitment. And we're really excited to work with you all on this particular project. On my team, I also have Charla Shambley who is a project program manager in our department, as well as Pamela Smith who is a coordinator in our department.

And this is essentially the administrative support from our department. We also have Karen Lentz, the director of operations and policy research in the GDD division at ICANN. And I'll let Karen give a few words about her background and her team.

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you Margie. Hello everyone. So my team, operation and policies research, is part of the global names division in the [inaudible]...

[CROSSTALK]

I'm still here. So sorry about that. So my team works on the implementation of policies, and has worked as part of the implementation of the new gTLD policy recommendations. Currently we're managing several of the studies and reviews of the new gTLD program. And Eleeza Agopian, who you'll meet in a minute, has led many of the studies and activities that are leading up to this review.

MARGIE MILAM: Eleeza, do you want to say hello?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Oh sure. Hi, this is Eleeza Agopian. As Karen said, I have been working on a number of the research initiatives related to this review since I started at ICANN two years ago. This has actually been my primary project, including getting the consumer surveys and economic studies off the ground, and finally published like last year.

So I'm looking forward to working with all of you.

MARGIE MILAM: Thanks Eleeza. And I also forgot to mention that Karen Mulberry is also on the call. She's in our department, director of strategic initiatives. So you can see the IPN team. I think we'll give Carlton a moment, since he's just joined the call, to say hello to the group and just give a little bit of your background Carlton, so we can understand your perspective [inaudible]...

[AUDIO DISTORTION]

Sorry Carlton, we really couldn't hear a word you said. It did sound like *Star Wars* or something. Okay. Well, sorry about that. So we'll move on to the next part of the agenda. As I mentioned in my email, kicking off some of the issues, one of the important things that we need to determine today is how we would like to have this group be led.

As I mentioned in my email, we could go with a chair, vice-chair approach. We could go through co-chairs. There is flexibility here and

there is no set rules on how the review team would like to organize itself and be led. What I have on the slide that you can see, the guiding values.

One of the things that we have done as staff working with the Board, as we looked at some of the past review team work, is that we're encouraging review teams to try to come up with perhaps clear and prioritized recommendations, so that as we work through the process and get to the end result, which is the final report and then implementation, that it's very clear what the review team had in mind when the recommendations were made.

Some of the experience from the last review teams, and I think probably Carlos can attest to this, having been on, served on a prior review team, is that there is often a disconnect between what the review team was looking for and what staff ultimately implemented. And so, some of the thinking that has evolved since the early days of the reviews that were kicked off in the past, is that we're trying to come up with a smarter framework for coming up with recommendations, those on the review team side as well as on the implementation side with staff.

And so one of the things that the Board has asked is that recommendations that come from the review team be prioritized and be clear. And so, one of the approaches that we've been taking as staff for all of these efforts, is to encourage these review teams to work within the smart framework, which means essentially, I think many of you are familiar with this methodology, that the recommendations are specific.

They're measurable so we know exactly what is looked for and we can quantify it. We want to make sure that they are attainable so that the goals and the recommendation can actually be achieved. And we also would like to ensure that the recommendations are time balanced, so that we know what the expectation is as to when the recommendation should be fully implemented.

And as you can see from past reviews, I'll give an example from the WHOIS review team that was convened in 2012, some of the recommendations that stem from them are still being implemented and are very much a long-term recommendation or program that may take many, many years to accomplish.

And so as all of you are doing your work, we want to try to keep that in mind when you develop recommendations that we get an expectation from the review team as to how long it should take to get some of these recommendations completed.

And then the other thing that we shared in the slide, is what the roles and responsibilities are for both leaders of the group and members of the review team. Review teams are different, for those of you that have not participated in them before. They're much different than working groups because there is an expectation that the work takes probably a lot more effort and activity.

And it's time down. We are hoping that the review team can accomplish its work within about a year time period. And there is a lot of work that has to happen between now and the final report. And some of those items are on the slide. I won't read them all to you, but I

just want to share them with you so that you have an idea as to what's involved.

One of the things that Elisa shared with you all yesterday was a template for a terms of reference. That is a document that we encourage the review team to pull together so that we all know what the review team is driving for, what the deliverables are, and how the review team would like to conduct its work.

Review teams, in order to develop the recommendations, need a lot of information and so, and Eleeza has shared with you on the email list over the last week, you can see that GAC has compiled a lot of background information to help you in the analysis that needs to be conducted.

The other thing that I think I'll point out from this list, is that some of you are here as part of being a representative of a group. So if you were identified as a representative of a GNSO, for example, or ALAC. There is an expectation that you will be going back to your group to provide information, and to share what is going on in the group and gather input from the communities that you represent.

If you've been identified as an independent expert, then that would not apply to you. But certainly, for those of you that have been identified as representatives of one of the supporting organizations are advisory group. The hope is that you'll be communicating with your group in gathering input so that information is considered as a review team as its work.

The other thing I would like to point out that is a little different from past reviews, is that in order to ensure that the recommendations are implemented properly, we're looking for input not just up to the final report stage, but even afterwards as staff develops an implementation plan, that we continue dialogue with the review team members so that we ensure that the implementation is specific of what the review team was looking for. And so, I really at the end, we would like to designate some review team members to actually serve, to consult with staff in the implementation discussions, so that we develop implementation plans that continue to reflect the perspective of the review team.

And with that, I'll pause to see if anyone would like to make any comments about the two flags that I just shared.

If you would like to speak, you can raise your hand and we'll start a queue.

Jonathon, you had some notes in the chat. Would you like to share your perspective?

JONATHON ZUCK:

Sure. I didn't want to be redundant. But I guess I was going to say that I think this, that both of these slides are very solid and represent a path that we should follow. I think we're probably going to find ourselves not only prioritizing the recommendations in terms of importance, but coming up with different timeframes and also different execution strategies for them.

Some of them might require PDPs for example. We might want to recommend sooner, as opposed to waiting until the end of whatever our process is to create a big set of recommendations. There might be processes that we might want to try to launch along the way that can be happening in tandem with the review on areas that are already noncontroversial to the group.

So that more can be happening at once and we aren't coming up against a huge time crunch at the end of the review process, the beginning of the implementation process, prior to any additional, you know, new gTLDs being put into place. So there it's around an ongoing process.

So I just, I want to be supportive of what you have here, but on top of this actually, have interim recommendations that launch parallel processes. Something that occurs to me.

MARGIE MILAM:

Great. Thank you Jonathan. Any comments or reactions to Jonathan's statement?

Okay. Well, hearing none, we'll move on to the next topic. Review team leadership. Again, as I mentioned, there is flexibility in how the review team will be led. And that's something, I think, merits discussion right now so that we can get your thoughts on how you think the review team should be led.

Obviously you could do chairs and vice-chairs. You could do co-chair. I think Carlos shared on the list that in the past, ATRT 2, I believe, there was one chair and a vice-chair. Any thoughts from you on what you

prefer and how we should go forward in trying to identify the leadership for the team?

Jordyn, would you like to speak?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure thing. So I haven't followed the work of the previous ATRT that Carlos referred to, but I like, I really like the notion of having a chair to drive scheduling versus some vice-chairs to drive content. I think that, personally I think that would be most helpful with vice-chairs focused on particular work tracks.

Unfortunately, there is a little bit of a chicken and an egg problem that I don't think we've established those work tracks yet. But particularly, perhaps complicated structure to suggest right off the bat but one that might be useful, would be to start with a chair and a temporary vice-chair, and tentatively just ramp up and get to the point where we better understand the work tracks, and then once that's done... develop a vice-chair and designate a number of, sorry, yeah.

Designate a number of specific vice-chairs intended to drive the concept of each of the work tracks while the chair drives the overall schedule.

MARGIE MILAM:

Thank you Jordyn. Carlton has got some notes in the chat about how many work tracks would you be anticipating?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I don't pretend to presuppose what the answer to that question is. I think one of the early things that we would need to figure out would be what we think about tracks of work. I personally think that there is going to be a number of distinct areas of investigation for this review team. And I wouldn't want to presuppose what those would be.

MARGIE MILAM: Great. Thank you. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. These are murky waters, I guess, to some extent. I think that defining a role for a chair and vice-chairs as Jamie, as Jordyn suggested is probably the right way to go. It may be more than driving the schedule, it may also be helping to keep things in scope and driving the process as well.

I guess I'd be interested in, as crazy as it sounds, listening to myself say it, I guess I would be interested in playing that role as chair, if there is interest in the group. Because I think in this particular case, my history with this review is such that my interests are as much about the process as they are about any particular aspect of the substance.

I'm very interested, and excited, and invested, five years at this point, in having a more rigorous process. And I'd be interested in helping to drive that process, more so than necessarily being an advocate in a particular outcome and the recommendation. So I guess I throw my name into the hat as a potential chair, with that type of responsibility in place.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you Jonathan. Does anyone...? Would anyone else like to put their name in the hat, as you call it? Jonathan has mentioned that he would like to be considered as chair. Is there anyone else that might have interest in leading the group as well?

Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry. I'm not going to volunteer, but I do think as just a point of process, it would be good to get consensus of what we think the role of the chair is before we decide who it's going to be, I think.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure, I think that's wise. And the other thing that I think is wise is to at least open the call for potential chairs, once we identify what the role is on the list. It would give others an opportunity to weigh in if they were unable to participate in today's call. So let's go with that topic first, what we think the role of the chair should be.

Jonathan, is that still your hand from before or did you have something else you would like to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. Old hand.

MARGIE MILAM:

Okay. Jamie?

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Sorry, I was having trouble unmuting. This isn't so much about the role of the chair. This is about the role of the vice-chair versus the possible roles of the heads of working groups. It seems like the group will be able to get its work done more quickly if it divides work into chunks, and has leaders from each of these.

And one... So instead of having multiple vice-chairs playing specific roles, it might make sense instead to have multiple leaders of the different working groups. Obviously, we don't have those in mind now. And certainly, if there are multiple vice-chairs, they can play that role.

But in terms of just getting work done, it would seem to me to make more sense to have people engaged in driving the work rather than serving in administrative roles.

MARGIE MILAM:

Thank you Jamie. Anyone else would like to weigh in on this? Carlos, I'm sorry, your hand is up. Go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes. I hope you can hear me well. I appreciate Jonathan's voluntary spirit, and he would make a great chair. There is a very positive aspect of Jonathan's background of all of these previous efforts that he can guide us through all previous reports and meetings. There is only one

thing I would want to put on the table, Jonathan, I don't know if it's the right moment or not.

But there are many parallel things to this review that has started after the new round like the discussion on the auction proceeds, the discussion about the lack of participation of underserved areas. ICANN has started to make new indicators after your wonderful report, they are now working on a health index, that is somehow related and not identical to the indicators.

But the most important part that I want to put forward is that we should not forget that many areas of the world need not participate, not only in this call, but did not participate in the new gTLD round. And ICANN has started to promote or to develop markets, and so on. And this is one issue that is very important to me, and I guess to other people from underserved areas, how are we going to deal with that?

And I would hate if we said, "No, no. We're just dealing with the new gTLD rounds, and everything that happens afterwards, options, health index, Middle East market study, African market study, Latin American market study, we are not going to deal with." So I give you a conditional support as the chair. Thank you very much.

MARGIE MILAM:

Thank you Carlos. Carlton, your hand is in the queue.

Carlton?

We can't hear you.

Carlton?

I'm sorry. Perhaps you can put your comments in the chat since we can't hear you.

Would anyone else like to weigh in on this?

[AUDIO DISTORTION]

Sorry Carlton, we can't hear you. Perhaps you can type in your comments.

Any other one in the queue that would like to speak to this topic of the role of the chair?

So, as I can tell, from the chat, I think we're... If I can summarize where I think we are. It sounds like, at the moment, everyone is interested in, or there is some consensus in having a chair that's both in charge of the agenda and the process. And then possibly breaking up, having either working group leads, or vice-chairs, or other leadership roles based on work flow, once we've developed a work plan and identified what subjects might be, the right ones to focus on in different streams.

Is that a fair summary of this discussion?

Jonathan, would you like to share what you're typing in the chat?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure. I was just sort of a strawman to get the conversation going, the possible definition for the responsibilities of the chair, be a management schedule, the terms of reference and scope and be a

liaison to outside of the group, whether it's Board recommendations to GNSO, and then other work groups that Carlos mentioned, for example.

Does that sound like a reasonable place to start the conversation about what the chair might be?

MARGIE MILAM:

Thank you Jonathan. For those of you that may not be familiar with Adobe Connect, as you can see in the participants, you can actually check if you agree. Carlos just did that a second ago. If you agree with Jonathan's suggestion, can you please mark a little green check, and that way we can get a sense for where the group is.

Or you can do an X if you don't agree.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And just to come in behind Megan's chat. She said that the terms of reference have to be agreed by all, and not the sole responsibility of the chair. And that's exactly right, Megan, I think it's more about being the enforcer of them once they're established by the group.

MARGIE MILAM:

Okay. So it's look, from what I can tell, there is consensus for that, for your strawman Jonathan. And so, I think the best way to proceed now is to take that information and share it with the list, and see if anyone else would like to volunteer to be chair. And so we'll give a couple of days on the list and...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are you going to do that or are you asking me to do that? I'm sorry.

MARGIE MILAM: No, Jonathan, I'll do that. I'll send that out, yeah, as staff, we'll do that. And then assuming that there is no objection or other, or anyone else that would like to serve as chair, then we'll make the decision then and announce who the chair is.

Gao, you have something you would like to say?

Gao, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

Okay, she put a check. So perhaps you can type in the chat if you have something else you would like to say.

Does that sound like a plan? I think that's probably the best way forward.

Okay.

Sounds good. So let me... So I think that's probably all we wanted to cover for the leadership discussion on this call. We'll now turn it over to Charla to give you some background information on the review team itself. Jonathan, would you like to chair the rest of the call, or would you like us to continue on the agenda that we posted?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think you guys should go ahead until we've chosen a chair, probably.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay. Well I was thinking more of a temporary chair, but that's fine. If you don't mind, we'll go ahead with the rest of the agenda. We have some background information we wanted to share with the group. And so Charla Shambley on our team will walk you through some of the timeline and expectations. Charla?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Hi. This is Charla Shambley for the record. So in the Adobe Connect room is a high level timeline for the review. Obviously we're in the first balloon, there it says January through March 2016. This is the time that we have assembled the review team and kicked off the review with our first call here.

Throughout the next couple of months, we'll be publishing the results from several surveys, phase two of those surveys. And also, in between, we'll be having some face to face meetings scheduled in LA and at some upcoming ICANN meetings. In October, we anticipate that the draft report will be published by the review team, and then with the final publication scheduled for December.

Any questions on the timeline?

Okay. So the next slide, just briefly... Oh Carlos. Did you have a question?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Can you hear me?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: We can. Yes, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Okay. Yes. I want to raise the question right now. We have not only those studies, but other studies, as I mentioned just before, the regional market studies, and you mentioned face to face meeting, and before you go into that, I mean, what are the chances that we get to see face to face, the people critiquing those studies? Get a presentation from them for the first stage, and get a feeling of what they're doing from the second stage?

When we look at the terms of reference and request for proposal, they look all fine. From past experience, like the GNSO review once you disagreeing what they have produced is maybe too late. So what are the chances that when we meet face to face, we get certain presentations directly from those consultants. That's the question. Thank you very much.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Margie, do you want to answer that, or Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, Eleeza. Hi this is Eleeza. Thanks for the question Carlos. This is actually something we have anticipated with the consumer survey and our study vendors who are Nelson and Analysis Group. And we are

planning on both of them providing briefings to the group on their findings and on their methodology.

And in addition, we're just in the beginning planning phases of the phase two versions of those studies, and we do plan to have them speak with you as we're getting going there as well. So those are definitely in the works. I don't know whether they'll be at face to face meetings, or whether we'll do those on calls.

It kind of depends on the timing of our planning, but we do anticipate them speaking with the group.

MARGIE MILAM: Charla, Stan has his hand up.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Okay. I don't see that. Stan, go ahead.

STANLEY BESEN: I take it the phase two economic study is being done by the analysis group, is that correct?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Yes, that's correct.

STANLEY BESEN: As you probably know, I have some, well I think the first study they produced had a lot of interesting stuff in it. I think there are some

things that can make it a whole lot better. I hope the committee will have an opportunity to influence the way in which that study was conducted.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, this is Eleeza again. So I did share your note with the analysis group, as well as my comments back on the data that we do have and that we don't have access to. But I do think that you will be talking to them before they launch the next study, and I think any comments or feedback this group has will definitely be taken into consideration, and will certainly shape the next report.

STANLEY BESEN: Okay, thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Charla, if I could just back in for a moment. One of the things that I forgot to mention on one of our prior slides, let me just go back for a moment, is the topic about budget. One of the things that we've done as staff is to try to identify specific budget requirements for the different review teams.

And we will be sharing budget information with you over the next few weeks. As part of the budget, there are funds to do additional

professional services, be it research or whatever the group decides it needs to do. So I just wanted to flag that as part of this discussion that just because we've done all of this metrics collection and studies, that there is still a possibility to do something further if there is a gap.

Charla, back to you.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY:

Okay. This is Charla for the record. Are there any other questions before I move on?

Okay. So just quickly, I just wanted to point out that we do have a page on the ICANN website, if you want to look at some high level detail, high level information on the review team, you can go to ICANN dot org. And then under resources, you'll see these three boxes. And over on the right, the right arrow, under AOC reviews, the fourth bullet down is competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.

That link will take you to the actual webpage with, that we'll be posting a draft document from the review team final report, any kind of RFP or anything that we post will be linked on there. So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hi. Thank you so much. So there has been a lot of conversation in the chat about data gathering, and I agree that's the most important part of the work you'll be doing. So I would like to spend the next few minutes talking about that. I don't seem to have forwarding capabilities. Could someone advance the slide for me?

Thank you. So I, as I said in my introduction, I've been working on this review for two years now. I'm really excited to actually get it started. One of my first projects was working with the IAG CCT which Jonathan chaired. And that group was tasked with coming, not coming up with metrics, but evaluating a group of 70 metrics that were suggested by a GNSO and ALAC working group for their feasibility and their utility in guiding this study.

So that was about a year long process of deciding on those metrics. And ultimately, 66 of them were adopted by the Board. I'm going to get to that in just a moment, but I wanted to come back to that point because that's a lot of the sort of preparatory work that staff has been doing for this review.

And a lot of the decisions that were made with regard to those metrics really came back to the mandate that comes from the affirmation of commitments, which was what you see here. So we've been trying to focus all of our work in making sure that the preparations that are done for this review really do draw from this notion we're reviewing whether or not the introduction or expansion of details, these are prompted competition, trust, and choice as well as the application evaluation process and the safeguard.

So I think this just an important point to keep in mind that this is really our starting point for this review. So moving forward, I'm going to get down a little bit further and talk about the terms of reference. But in preparation for actually doing the review and doing the data, we wanted to make sure that everyone on this team had a good sense of

history and background of where the program came from, how it was developed and ultimately implemented.

And then get into a little bit more about some of the reviews that are going on now. So we've come up with what is ultimately basically five briefing sessions that we're hoping to present to you, starting with your face to face meetings in Los Angeles next month, and then ending with a session at ICANN 55 in Marrakesh in March.

And we've grouped them really in four topic areas, but the last one is a discussion about the PDP process, which was a long and very involved process with the past chairs in the GNSO. So really the first four topics that we're going to focus on at the Los Angeles meetings, will be about around history and development, in particular the development of the applicant guidebook, because that was such an important part of this program.

Another session on application processing and contracting, so how evaluation was conducted, any objection processes, that type of thing. What the applicants went through during that process, and then post contracting, actual detail via start up, implementing, rights protection mechanisms, pre-delegation testing, and working with ICANN compliance staff.

The last session will really focus on reviews of the new gTLD program. And there have been a number of different reviews that have been done. For those of you that have been at recent ICANN meetings, we've had a number of sessions detailing all of the different angles that we

have been reviewing the program, both internally and externally. The program implementation reviews report was published very recently.

There has been a GNSO discussion group to prepare for an upcoming PDP, which is going to be starting very soon. We have a study of the root stability, or the root system, the stability of the root system, which is underway now. Another one on DNS abuse. And all of these are producing data that we think are going to feed into and be very relevant to the discussion that you're going to be having.

So we have a sort of, I don't want to call it a syllabus, but kind of an agenda that we're planning to follow when you're in Los Angeles next month. And the background material that I sent out to you in one of my early emails, kind of follow the contours of this discussion, and a lot of materials are grouped based on these discussions.

So these are kind of a high level topic that we thought would be most interesting to the group. If there are any topics that I'm missing, or if there is anything I didn't cover that you would like to hear more about, I'm most definitely open to them. We can talk about that now, or we can certainly discuss it on the list.

I see some typing. I see Stan's hand up. Would you like to say something?

STANLEY BESEN:

That must still be my hand up from before.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks. So I dare say this, acknowledging the fact that I lived through this process, and therefore these briefing sessions are probably a little bit less useful for me than for others. So if other people disagree with the statement I'm about to make, I will quietly defer to people who will find that these briefings are more useful.

But I would certainly prefer to have as many of these sorts of briefings as possible, outside of the context of the face to face meetings. Ideally, before them, if we could arrange that. I think the in-person time that we're going to have is incredibly valuable, and it's mostly due to the interactivity that we have in that space where we're all together in a room.

And using that for relatively one-way transmission of information and background material, I think is quite a poor use of that limited amount of time. So I would certainly encourage us to try to do these briefings outside of the context of face to face meetings if at all possible.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you Jordyn. I see Carlos, you have your hand up and a plus one in the chat as well.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes. I'm very interested in spending a lot of time during the face to face meeting going over data. Data sources, data studies, indexes, and

numbers. And also, I want to, I don't know if it's under others or number four, and these are discussion for you Eleeza. Where do we put all of these activities derived from the last round, in terms of what wrong, or what was missing, or what was not planned?

And I already mentioned three areas, and in the regional studies, the auction proceeds, and the new set of appendix under the market help. I don't mind if somebody, if the end we decide not to touch in time with me, I just want to know where they belong and we will have a discussion over those parallel issues that happen afterwards and were not planned in the applicant guidebook, so to say. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you Carlos. I certainly think that the topics that you raised on the list, including the original analysis, the marketplace health indicators, those are topics for discussion. Any other thoughts from the group?

MARGIE MILAM:

Eleeza, this is Margie. One of the things that I wanted to point out is that these are not meant to be one way conveyers of information. I believe in the past, when we've had briefings like this in other review teams, it has been an opportunity to actually ask questions of the people that were involved in the program. And so it was meant to be interactive.

Carlos, as a member of ATRT review team, is that your recollection as well? Because you've lived through the types of briefings that we're talking about.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: In the case of the ATRT 2, it was pretty difficult because as somebody, I think it was you, you mentioned before, we jumped immediately into the lack of progress in the follow-up of the recommendations. And these were the first constraint. The second constraint was that our terms of reference were pretty much limited by the first review team.

So let's say it was, and the result was obvious now that we have the cross community accountability review. We see that we missed of what is being discussed today. So it really is a question of the terms of reference. I don't know if I am answering your question with that, but we have to be very careful with the scoping part. Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you Carlos.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. I just wanted to add on to one point that Jordyn made. I certainly appreciate that many of you are very well versed in a lot of the history here, and in fact, were present for a lot of the history. There are others who are a bit newer, and so the other thought behind these sessions is, even though they may seem somewhat elementary, or not even elementary, but basic understanding, the idea was to really get you all to a level of some common understanding of what happened, and not just that you all agree with the outcomes, but that you have a base understanding of where other members of the group, you know, may

have gaps in their knowledge or what their perspectives are of some issues.

So as Margie was saying, was not sort of meant to be a sort of lecture series, but really a chance for some discussions about these topics as well. So thanks Margie for pointing that out.

But I do think the point about, you know, using up valuable face to face time is a very valid one. I think one of the next things we need to do, and I do want to spend the last minutes of this call, is to decide on what our call schedule will be moving forward. So I think once we have a better sense of how, what are frequency is there, and we set an agenda for those calls, maybe we can set some of these discussions to happen on the calls and others to happen when you are together in person, both here in LA and in Morocco.

And I also should have mentioned, when I was going through these briefing sessions, we were envisioning about a max of an hour on each topic. Some of them maybe longer, some of them maybe shorter, it depends on where the discussions take us.

And sorry, I'm trying to keep up with the chat at the same time here as I'm talking.

MARGIE MILAM: Eleeza, I see that Kaili Kan has his hand up.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm sorry. Kaili, please go ahead.

Kaili, can you hear us? We can't hear you. It seems you're on mute.

KAILI KAN: Hello? [CROSSTALK]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, please go ahead.

KAILI KAN: Okay. Yes. Well I have a question about the impact of the new gTLD, what the impact...? Also about the part we mean by consumers, and where do we put the end users? [Inaudible] who use the Internet, whether the new gTLD has any impact on their interest. Because in my impression, my understanding is that no matter the registries, registrars, registrants, all is to serve end users, you know, from ALAC I wonder whether we could put that [inaudible]? Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. I have, I only have a few minutes left, so I want to get through this a little bit quickly. I think you raised some good points that are discussions that I think need to be had with regards to the terms of reference. Unfortunately, we're running short on time and I also want to allow time for scheduling.

But one point I wanted to make on this call, with regard to the terms of reference, I sent around the draft of the ATRT 2 document that was used on that team, which I think is a helpful template for us. I think this

will be a really important guiding document for this group, and I think may also help us to determine the work streams that some of you were mentioning in terms of dividing up the work in chunks, in whatever way you may think that might be best or most useful for the team.

So you all have a copy of the document that I sent around. We thought it might be useful to maybe have a smaller group working on this separately, and then present it to the larger group. And you know, staff is always here to help. We can certainly help put together a draft, put some language in there and start circulating that to a small group.

I want to get, kind of take the temperature of the group on that. Would it be useful to draft a smaller group to work on this document and then have them report back perhaps on the next call on any progress? I want to hear what the group has to say about that.

And some of the key elements of the terms of reference, as I have listed here, would be target completion and adoption dates, defining terms, obviously, competition, trust, and choice. We had some discussion about this on the list, and there is some definition that was adopted by the previous working groups.

Obviously you are welcome to tweak those as you want. And then we would get into some of the more meteor items. There is the methodology, the tools we will be using, how we'll be reaching consensus, or coming up with decisions, and how you'll be engaging with the larger ICANN community. So I see some agreement here in the chat, and I see some volunteers too.

Drew has volunteered. I also received an email earlier from Waudo saying that he was interested in volunteering. And Jonathan points out that part of this will be a scoping decision that will probably require broader consensus, and I absolutely agree. I think we have to discuss the larger document with the whole group.

Jordyn, we're happy to take you as a volunteer, if you're interested.

Gao asked, "How many people do we need?" We have 17 members of the review team in total. So if we have perhaps maybe four or five, if that sounds good, that might be a good, small team to discuss with. So I see, Gao, are you interested in volunteering? I see Jonathan is as well.

Carlos yes, I think we can develop a draft in a cloud based open document, maybe a Google Doc would be appropriate. I think that would be a good idea.

Okay. Let me make sure I have the list of all of the volunteers before the chat gets away from me. So I saw Jordyn, Jonathan, I had Waudo from earlier, Carlton was volunteering as well. Are there any others?

Carlos, were you volunteering as well?

And please feel free to speak up. Okay, Carlos is not volunteering. That is a perfectly respectable option. And I see David as well. Okay. That's at least five right there. If there are any others, please feel free to email me directly.

We only have a minute left, and I wanted to be sure to leave time to talk about the next call. Margie, did you want to take over?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. So, as we circulated the Doodle poll, it looks like, for the face to face meeting, the first choice is February 22nd to 23rd in Los Angeles, with 12 votes. And the second choice was February 8th and 9th with 10 votes. And so, the rest of them were unable to gather as much as support.

For all of these, we will have Adobe Connect and remote participation, so to the extent that others can't make all of the meetings, they can certainly find where it fits their schedule. Based on this, is there any objection to having the meeting set up February 22nd to 23rd?

If you agree with it, February 22nd and 23rd, can you please put a little check by your name? That's probably the better way to do this.

David, you have a question?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah. Sorry about that. I put in the Doodle, when we did this, whether there is a possibility of the week before. I presume there wasn't, which is why it wasn't picked up, but it was just on the off-chance. And I said in there, it was just my problem. It's my daughter's birthday on the 21st and we're going skiing on the 21st, 22nd, 23rd, and 24th.

So to disappear for those two days is almost impossible for me, and I'm a little bit concerned to even try to be on the Adobe if I'm with her for that thing. So it wasn't just for me, it was more the point of whether that week before was a possibility, but I obviously don't want to undo things if we're 90% to choosing a date.

MARGIE MILAM: I believe, David, there were other conflicts. For example, most of the staff in my department is at a retreat that week. So that's part of the problem, the staff support is not available during that week. And then I think the earlier part of the week, there wasn't enough coverage, and I believe there may have been some holiday at that time as well.

Pamela, do you remember what else, whether there was anything else?

PAMELA SMITH: Well Margie, you hit the nail on the head. There is a holiday at the beginning of the week, I'm sorry. It's the issue of the retreat is the main thing, and then I believe there is a holiday on Monday. And so there was no way we could accommodate the timing. These were the best possible dates we could come up with for the largest number of people, and not run into Marrakesh.

Because we certainly don't want your first face to face to be in Marrakesh. We'd rather you meet with each other once before.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay. Thank you Pamela.

PAMELA SMITH: You're welcome.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, with such a large group, David, sometimes it's hard to find a date that everyone can participate.

DAVID TAYLOR: Pretty much impossible, I think, I fully understand.

MARGIE MILAM: So we'll do our best to keep you apprised, but I think it looks like from the checks that everyone is onboard with the 22nd to 23rd. So we'll go with that. Let's talk now about the future of telephone conferences. How frequently do we want to hold them and do we want to do them in a set time or rotate because of the diversity of time zones that are reflected on the review team? So first let me ask, weekly, biweekly? Multiple times per week? What is the preference?

Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Two comments. Before we have the face to face meeting, I would ask how many modules can we get presented in these calls? So if we can, we have an agenda before the first face to face meeting, that's necessary so that the people who are not so knowledgeable about it [inaudible] and so on can get up to speed.

And the second one, that I think it's very healthy to rotate time zones, but no more than two is my experience. Of course, we should rotate time zones. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. I think we can do at least two of the briefing discussions before the 22nd of February, if not three.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay. So on the chat, it looks like there is some consensus for rotating time zones. What about weekly versus biweekly calls?

Okay. So it looks like we're going to start with biweekly calls at least, on the list, making them 90 minutes. Is that...? If you all agree with that, please put a check by your name.

Right. And then wrapping up late, with the possibility of wrapping up later as we start working it out into different groups.

Carlos, you suggest 30 minutes AOB. Would you like to address that point?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. I would Eleeza to suggest three calls for modules, but to make them interesting enough to dedicate only one hour to the module, and leave some time for other business. The time I suggest that Eleeza comes back to us with the next three calls for the three modules, but also allowing for other issues to be dealt with on the second hour. I don't know if that's clear.

I can write an email if you want.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think that makes sense. So in terms of the briefing sessions, we had planned one hour briefings. But when I say one hour, I don't mean one hour of someone speaking. I'm thinking 15 to 20 minute presentations and leaving the rest of the time open for discussion. So again, these are more discussion sessions.

Does that address your point Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay great. And I will work on the schedule. I have to confer with the colleagues who we are intending to have make the presentations, and make sure they can make the date. So we'll send out some dates shortly for the next call with agendas.

MARGIE MILAM: Thanks Eleeza. And then the other point I wanted to raise is that we've identified, based on the Doodle poll, that all day face to face meetings in Marrakesh would be on 9th and 10th of March. So that's Wednesday and Thursday of the Marrakesh week.

Okay. So hearing... So basically that's the plan. I'm sorry we went over time, but I think we made a lot of progress on this call. We will send a Doodle poll out to schedule the next call so that we can identify the time that works for everyone.

All right. And with that, I think we'll end the call. Thank you everyone for participating, and we look forward to working with you on this group.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]