
ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. The controls for the slides, should I just ask for advance?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Eric, hi. It's up to you. I can promote you to a presenter or I can move them for you. Whichever you're comfortable with.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: If you don't mind promoting me that's probably easiest.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: You have been promoted.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sweet. Thank you very much.

Alright, everyone. I think we have a reasonably good agenda today and we've got sort of a short main deck and then a bunch of backup slides. I'm hoping that some of the things that are in there prompt people to express opinions. I might start polling people or I might say things that I hope are a little provocative, mostly just to get our juices flowing. I hope people won't be shy. I'll be watching the hand raising, too, but I think we don't have to stand on ceremony more than people want to.

Any updated SOIs before we get started?

Okay. The agenda is on the slide right now. I presume everyone can see it. We'll start off with discussing the Terms of Reference and I think at

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.

some point either within that or following, we'll probably want to start discussing our scope I think more explicitly at this point. My [key] sense is that I think it's going to be very helpful going forward structuring everything from our outreach to even our retrospective of SSR 1 as we start to really key into the things that make up the scope that we all agree on. I think probably somewhere between the TOR and the scope is the work plan, or maybe vice versa. Bullet #2 and #3 in my opinion will probably be a continuum. We'll probably have, I hope, a free-ranging discussion about those general things which I think fall into a spectrum.

And then the fourth one – if time permits – identify SSR issues that members think are important. Honestly, I hope that a lot of that perspective informs the earlier discussion. I'm definitely thinking it's definitely time for people to express what they think the SSR T2 ought to be focusing on from a personal perspective and then we can digest that into something that the team thinks as a whole.

Before I roll forward, anyone have any thoughts or questions or want to do any agenda-bashing or anything like that?

Okay. At this point I hope people have had a chance to look over not only just the Terms of Reference draft that came out from staff – and thank you for taking the lead on that – but also some of the commentary that went back and forth. There was some I think good commentary made on the Terms of Reference strawman, and I wonder has everyone had a chance to look at that or, specifically, has anybody still got it in their pipe if we were to put a stamp on it – which I don't

think we're necessarily proposing to do – does anybody feel like they need more time to iterate on that?

No? Okay, so that means that the staff did a really awesome job and they just nailed it right on the head. So with the [module of] a couple comments from a few folks which I think were very helpful so I think we probably want to start thinking about when we're going to call that one done. I don't think we have to discuss that. We don't have to come to a conclusion on that right now, but I do think it would be useful to get there at some point. So I see James has got his hand up so go ahead, please.

JAMES GANNON:

Just with regards to putting a stamp on this. I think we've given some comments but there may be some more discussion on particularly the scope question that we need to do before we finalize it because there are some disagreements already I think between some of us on how that scope should be reflected in the Terms [of]. I think we probably need to have that high-level scope discussion before we finalize it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. Before I roll over to Denise, do you think that's something that we should start the discussion on now while we're all on the call or do you think it needs to percolate on the list a little longer? Do you have any sense of that?

JAMES GANNON: For me, I'm happy to discuss it. Myself and Denise are the ones that have put it down on paper, so if we want to have a discussion about that today, I'm happy to do that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Denise, what are your thoughts since your hand's up?

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. Yes. Can you hear me okay?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: I apologize. I got disconnected previously.
So we're discussing the draft Terms of Reference? Is that correct?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I'm proposing that we... making sure that everyone hears the perspectives. I think I was asking, sort of soliciting, whether we want to have that discussion on the call or at least broach it here and then, depending on how far we get, we may or may not decide that it's good fodder for face-to-face. But in my opinion today's agenda, the big ticket item I think we ought to get to is scope, and I think this is right along those lines. So I'm happy to defer to the group but I think getting some

of it in discussion format is going to be useful. So yeah, I would say start it here [personally].

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. I would agree. So the Terms of Reference includes the scope. I think that's the most important aspect of it, and I think my personal expectation was that we could use the e-mail list to add red lines and comments to the initial draft and discuss it on this call and wrap it up as soon as people feel comfortable with the document.

I think this is sort of a foundational document that initially will help guide the teams' work and, of course. It's also a deliverable to the Board. So I think it's something we need to get done as soon as possible.

Having said that, I don't think we should consider it cast in concrete. As we evolve as a group and learn more about these various topics, I think we also should be open if needed to coming back and refining both our Terms of Reference and our work plan. So I would like to see a initial discussion on this call and further work on the e-mail list. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

That's great, Denise. Thank you. Kaveh, I see your hand's up.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yes.

KAVEH RANJBAR: First of all, I agree with Denise that this shouldn't be cast in stone but I agree with [inaudible] but this will be a living document. That's great. And the second [inaudible] because as it has been pointed out, there were some [inaudible] out of it. So I think that if we [inaudible] apply the comments which we know [inaudible]. And then the [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Kaveh, I'm sorry. The audio is a little bit [mired]. Could you repeat the last couple comments you made? I'm sorry.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. My last comment was I suggest that we ask the staff to apply the comments which there are no disputes about, because most of the comments in the current Terms of Reference and the Scope document are just comments which are [no] disputes. So if they apply them and then there are three or four things which there were different opinions. So I think it's good if staff clean up the document, apply all the ones without disputes and then take out the ones with disputes in an e-mail so we can argue them over an e-mail thread. This way we will have a clean document which others can still keep looking to and figure out if there are other issues. We will discuss those three or four points of disagreement separately, and when we are done we will [re-incorporate] them back to the original document.

Does that sound like an idea?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I can see that James is in agreement with that. Do other people have opinions one way or the other?

Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. I think it would be helpful for staff to continue as we discuss it on the list to clean up the document and reflect where there aren't disagreements. However, the Scope of Work part of this document really warrants some thoughtful review and discussion and I think really needs to be just completely written. There's a sort of haphazard list of random questions almost that doesn't really add up to a clear scope that flows from our mandate.

And then in addition to that, I think it would be useful to have a discussion around attacks, misuse of the identifiers, DNS abuse, and I think questions raised about within or without scope, I think are the two main things that I would suggest. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, Denise. I think that's right on. I think that before we get to James who has his hand up – James, I see it – I think one of the things I was hoping to really tease out in the meeting today and I think you've hit the nail on the head already before I got to it was that the scope is something that I think we really need to call out very explicitly and I don't know if it needs to be its own document or, like you're saying, the section in the Terms of Reference document essentially just needs to be very blown up. But I think it's easy enough for the group, think the

team, to try and do the starting point as opposed to iterating on another starting point since we have a clean slate almost at this point.

So yeah, I agree. I think getting that started hopefully with some discussion today that we can capture and then I don't know if people have a sense or preference whether that exists or that persists in the Terms of Reference or because it becomes its own document. I'm not sure if there's a preferred way to represent that already or if we want to take an initiative on that.

I'm hopeful that we can make some beginning stabs at that today and then take it to the list, I hope.

James, yes. Sorry. Go ahead. I just jumped in front of you.

JAMES GANNON:

Thank you. Three quick points. First of all, I agree with everything Denise is saying. That's definitely the way we should take this. Number two, I would really hope that the rest of the review team will weigh in on this review of the Terms of Reference. This is the foundation of everything we're going to do for the next year or so, and at the moment it's myself, Denise, and Kaveh has weighed in, and I don't want this to be something that ends up being hashed out between the disagreements on scope just to be bashed out between myself and Denise. I'd like to hear everybody else's opinion on these and I'd like to see other people weighing in on the actual content of the strawman as well if possible.

And thirdly, the disagreements that myself and Denise have had in the Scope piece is the DNS abuse piece, and while we can have a quick discussion about it here I think it is something we'll need to take to the list to flesh out and come to an agreement or a consensus on, as it's probably a contentious topic for all of us. I'm sure we all have our individual opinions on whether it's in or out of scope and we will eventually have to come to some agreement on it. So I would like us to maybe kick off a conversation on that now, but it will be something we will take to the list before we finalize it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I think that's a great suggestion. I definitely agree that this should be worked out on the list and so that there's an enduring record if nothing else of the way in which we arrived at whatever end point we come to. But like you're saying, I think having a kick-off discussion now might be helpful. I'm hopeful that people that are listening are getting a high band width view of what they may have missed as far as a disconnect or disagreement.

I hate to put you and Denise on the spot but would either or both of you be willing to throw out your perspective on that on the call now so that people can feel potentially [likely] engaged? Is that too much on the spot for you guys? It's totally okay if this is like dirty pool and I'll pull back but it just seems like it might be opportune.

DENISE MICHEL:

Sure. I think that's what our weekly calls are for. James, would you like to go first or do you want me to? If you don't mind, it might be useful to

hear your thought process and questions about the scope that would allow me to respond more specifically.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I see James in the chat room is asking you about... now he's agreed.

Okay. James, you have the floor.

JAMES GANNON: I'm happy to go first.

From my perspective, DNS abuse is in scope but not to the level of anything defined in the Terms of Reference. There's two things [guide] me toward that position.

Number one, DNS abuse is an undefined and very widely used term and we have to bear in mind the new ICANN Bylaws tell us that the content of websites is no longer part of ICANN's mission. It never was. But it is very clear now that anything that is being referred to as abuse through the use of content or anything that is beyond the use of the domain name is not in scope for us, as it is no longer in scope for ICANN in general.

Second of all, we need to be careful that we don't stray into the work of the other review teams or current GNSO PDPs. I don't want us to be the group that goes back and re-examines WHOIS accuracy when we're going to have the WHOIS Review Team. That's not in our scope as the SSR Review Team. I don't want us to go back and revisit everything that

the CCT Review has done, and they have an excellent entire report that they've generated on as a key part of their work.

So there's two components – ICANN's mission and where we define DNS abuse as it is relevant to [SSR], and [SSR] impacts that are not already being examined by other review teams. That very narrow piece of DNS abuse I can see being within scope for us. Any of the other pieces in my opinion are not for us to look at. We are examining ICANN's impact – ICANN the organization – its impact on the [SSR] of the Identifier system. We need to be careful to stay within that mandate.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Denise, [go ahead]. Kaveh, I see your hand up. Do you want to go now or do you want to wait until Denise has a chance to serve her [inaudible]?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I just wanted to agree with what James said and actually what Denise proposed [inaudible], I like most of it. So basically where she proposed [to] have ICANN effectively [inaudible] mitigation and strengthening those systems. I think something like that can work because if [inaudible] strictly to ICANN's mission and the role that ICANN can play effectively within the scope and mission, then why not? We should look into [doing that]. But it's very important the scope that they [give] from the beginning because that can easily [delay] our work and take us somewhere and we can spend a lot of resources looking at the things which ICANN cannot directly take action on.

So as long as it's clearly mentioned within the limits of the scope of ICANN and what ICANN can control, I fully support having that. So my comments are – our goal is removing it but thinking about the [bigger] scope of it. If I'm okay with putting the limited scope [in it].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thanks, Kaveh.

Denise, do you want to [go]?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. I think both of those comments are quite useful. I think if I would agree that we need clarification that when we talk about abuse and threat mitigation we're not talking about website content and we are talking about activities and issues that are well within ICANN's scope. I had proposed some substitute, replacement, language. I'll just read it in case people haven't seen my comment.

On page 10 of the draft, [what] I'm proposing then is that we write something along the lines of – and I'll probably continue to wordsmith this – “Attacks and misuse of identifier systems including the DNS would be in addition to this bulleted list,” and we can explore questions like, “Has ICANN effectively fulfilled its limited role in threat mitigation and strengthening those systems' capabilities?”

So in terms of the scope issue, the first SSR Review that we are obligated to assess addresses DNS abuse and threat mitigation by virtue of that and our assessment of whether it was appropriately implemented and the effect impact of that implementation makes it

within our scope. Threat and misuse of Internet identifiers is part of ICANN's Strategic Plan. It's part of the objectives in SSR framework of the SSR staff. ICANN is conducting research on it. [If] it's charged with ensuring compliance with contractual obligations relating to this. There's a whole host of ways that this is part of ICANN's responsibility. And again, I think it's important to clarify that we're not talking about content here. We are talking about fundamental responsibilities of ICANN and I'd be happy to work with James and Kaveh to continue to clarify and add more details so that's clear.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Thanks, Denise. I see James and Kaveh have their hands up and I can't remember if Kaveh's hand went down and back up or Kaveh, if that's from before. But I saw your hand first, Kaveh. So do you have it up from before or is it new?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes. [I have it was so]. Thank you, Denise. I think on this point we can clearly [agree]. But one thing which, based on what you said, I think maybe we need to clarify between ICANN organization and ICANN because some of the stuff that you mentioned I think they fall clearly within ICANN's remit. ICANN has a big team which includes all of constituencies and all of that. Maybe the question we need to focus is are we [raising] ICANN organization or ICANN as a whole – the whole structure? Because my point is especially for these papers we really have to focus on ICANN organization, not ICANN as the whole body which includes all the other constituencies.

If we limit the scope of that, for this specific one or any other thing, I really have no issues. But if we are going to include all the constituencies, that's a very [different] scope. And the examples you used, all of the text [you] suggest it is good, I think. But the examples you mentioned, some of them actually go to the constituencies and not ICANN organization.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. James?

JAMES GANNON:

Thank you, and Kaveh has basically said 90% of what I was going to say. And Denise, to your suggestion in the document, I apologize. I hadn't looked at it properly. I think that's something we can definitely use as a base to work from. It's better than what is in the Terms of Reference at the moment.

One of the triggers for me, I suppose, was the statement in the Terms of Reference that we will [study DNS] abuse life cycle so that is a life cycle that includes many things that are outside of ICANN's remit and that was what pushed me to ask that we [re]look at taking that out and certainly misuse of ICANN's unique identifier system that is within ICANN's remit, we can look at misuse of those and we can do a mapping between the threat mitigations that are required and what is reflected in ICANN's positioning and ICANN's [threat servers] itself definitely within that context and looking at it from that position I could agree with [this now].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. And just to clarify, I was speaking about ICANN the organization's responsibility. So it sounds like this is a good point to take off the call and trade more details about. So if the three of us agree that we can come up with some better and agreeable language to bring back to the group, I'd be happy to work on that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, yeah. Before we jump straight to that, let me just poll the team and we've had a pretty solid iteration between the three of you. I have a couple thoughts as well but I want to give a chance to anyone else on the call that has some perspectives of their own on this.

Okay. We have a time check. We are halfway through. I don't hear anyone else jumping in. I guess I'd want to throw in a little bit of the discussion – I don't want to interrupt the three of you – but when we're talking about the scoping I think there's an important perspective that, while our recommendations and our findings may need to be very carefully scoped to be within both ICANN's remit and also, as you're saying, not necessarily intruding on the turf of other review teams, in order to develop the perspective that we need to do impactful work we may necessarily have to start off considering things a bit more broadly. We may need to, for example, I think this is where the DNS abuse discussion potentially really goes sideways but I think if you consider

DNS abuse and you consider the sort of things [inaudible] don't think are part of [inaudible].

[Inaudible] we're getting a lot of noise on the line. Could you [inaudible] please? Alright. Thank you.

If you think about things like name collisions, name collisions don't seem like they're really a DNS issue and they aren't necessarily so much as they exacerbate or they're exacerbated by or they have come from issues in the DNS. So I think when we're starting to consider the scope, we should be careful not to be overly constrained to things that motivate our concerns which could just constrain what our recommendations and concerns are. Does that make sense?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, Eric. I'm having a really hard time hearing you. Could you repeat [your main points]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Inaudible] can you please [inaudible] or staff, can maybe we mute his line?

Great. Okay, I'm sorry, Denise.

Did anybody hear anything that I said? [Inaudible] summary.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just bits and pieces [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We're still getting some noise from Matogoro's line. We may have to do something about that if it keeps coming back.

I see Kerry-Ann has her hand up. Let me just reprise my comments real quick or let me reiterate them real quick.

I was just saying that when we're considering the scope I think it's important to start off observing broadly. Like the DNS abuse comments I think are fair in the sense that not everything that is DNS abuse or is in the life cycle really is within ICANN's purview or remit.

Matogoro, can you please mute your line?

We're not going to be able to have much of a conversation [inaudible].

Okay. I'll try and be quick. I'd like us to not be overly constrained [in] things that we consider motivations for what we ultimately focus on, so sort of high-level comment I think we can take [and] post that to the list but I'll give to Kerry-Ann the floor to comment.

Your hand is up, Kerry-Ann. Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANTS: [Inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Mr. Matogoro, I think if you hit star six it might mute your line for you.

Okay. [Inaudible].

Is staff able to mute [inaudible]?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi all. I'm working on that right now. It seems that when we mute it, it unmutes itself. I'm working on [inaudible] my apologies [inaudible]. If I can't do that I'm going to have to [inaudible] come back.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: My apologies for this. I'm working on it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No problem.

Matogoro, do want to try calling back in? Maybe just hang up and call back? Matogoro, how about you try reconnecting to the call, like [inaudible].

Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me now?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: You can hear me, right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. We can hear you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. I wanted to continue on the lines that you just discussed about [inaudible] limited scope. It was it's not like a legal interpretation of what the Bylaws now say and what they are required to do. I would just want us to still look at what the Bylaws say because it's not – to me it's abundantly clear, for example, where it outlines in the Bylaws in terms of coordinating and allocating the DNS. It also speaks about the commitment of the Board in 4.6C in terms of having a review on security [and operational] stability. I constantly emphasize that we are the first community or team really looking at this [inaudible] but I think it's meaningful if we actually give some amount of reflection and perspective on the interpretation of the language as it is written now.

One of the things that stood out to me more than anything else is that it says that the mission of ICANN is, "Ensure security of operations in [plain] language, coordinate the allocation and assignment of names and domain [and] coordinate the development of policies [inaudible] language."

It also goes back to [inaudible] 4.6, "The Board shall call a periodic review" – that the Board actually [stated or] actually initiating this review of ICANN's execution and ICANN broadly meaning all the

different parties that fall into ICANN – “execute in its commitment to enhance the operational stability, security, reliability, resilience, security, in its global interoperability.”

I know that we’ve had a discussion about whether or not the review team is looking at ICANN org as opposed to ICANN and its entire body, but I’d like to propose another reflection. I’m seeing what James [read] in terms of acting outside its mission and cannot regulate, but I think we need to just consider that before it has the power based on 4.6C, to actually initiate such a review and if the SSR Review Team [is] just not proposed broad just looking at the same language, not doing any insertion of [inaudible] but in [straight] language it is a feeling that the SSR can actually review as the same language as security operational if it means coordination, discussing with all the other parties including PTI because if you look [inaudible] mission statement it says now that PTI is responsible for the operational aspects of coordinating the Internet unique identifier. We do not aim to set policies but implement agreed policies and principles in a mutually responsible manner using the policies set forth and provided by ICANN – ICANN as a whole, not just ICANN Board.

So I just wanted to propose that we not approach this as other review teams have in terms of recognizing that our role is probably to actually reflect I think we have the skills on the review team to reflect on the entire language and then put forth not an interpretation but just a context within which [inaudible] actually do not work.

As I said, it’s just a reflection from me but to kind of rethink to look at [the same] language [inaudible] language may not be as strict or as rigid

concern as [he had] in the chat concerning not wanting to go outside of the scope but I just wanted to reflect again that based on the fact that the Board initiate this review. We have been initiated, although prior to the Bylaws to now look at the Bylaws in the context that we are now initiated and it sets forth what [inaudible] said. So as I say, the language is changed [inaudible] in 4.6C. So I just wanted to reflect on that again as we – to the other suggestions everybody has [inaudible] discussion in the e-mail.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you, Kerry-Ann.

James, I see your hand's up.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. I just wanted to agree with Kerry-Ann, and as long as we meet the requirements of Section C which I've pasted in –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

JAMES GANNON:

Okay. But we're all still here. So as long as we stay within the boundary of what ICANN can and cannot do, which is we cannot look at anything regarding the services that use the unique identifiers or the content that they carry. That's the big thing for me is that. That is not necessarily for

us to debate because that is the scope of ICANN and we are reviewing ICANN. And it's Section 1 in the new Bylaws and we spent a long time writing that and we need to respect that that is a finalized decision that anything that we do cannot be looking at the content or the servers that use the unique identifiers. Our scope also has to be within the scope of ICANN the organization.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So James, if you don't mind I want to push on that just for a second just to get clarity. Is that one of those things where I think it's important for the work that we do to be informed by those things that depend on the identifiers and the items that are within ICANN's purview, even though those dependencies might be outside. So while I understand your point, we certainly don't want to get dragged into the business of going down rabbit holes and chasing content issues that are well beyond our purview, but if they inform us through looking at them of a critical dependency or an SSR issue that is within ICANN's remit, that we understand because we've been made aware of something...our recommendations clearly need to be within our scope but the motivation or the intuition that drives them may come from outside that. A more broad, systemic view might be important in understanding real deep SSR issues, right?

JAMES GANNON:

[I don't know] if I can come back yet, but I agree that there are pieces of information that will be outside of ICANN's scope that will inform us because they have an impact on what ICANN does. That I [completely]

agree with. We can't just [inaudible] outside of ICANN's scope if it has an impact on [ICANN]. But my concern is I just don't want us to stray into an area where we go out and we look at all of the larger picture of DNS abuse, for example, and we don't slice that into what ICANN's new and unique mission is, and we start working and spending our time which is very limited on trying to solve what is a bigger problem than just ICANN because we know from [there was] the worlds of ICANN and ICANN policy that there is a long-standing thing that ICANN should be doing more than it is. Well, yes. But only within ICANN's mission. And I don't want us to be rehashing that argument within this review team.

ICANN has its mission and we need to fix the things that ICANN can fix within that mission for sure. Or we need to make recommendations that will fit within that mission that are informed by the overall [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I sense that we are actually all in violent agreement on this one, so I think yeah. Thank you very much, James. Kaveh, I'll get to you real quick and then maybe it would be a good segue to the list.

Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I just wanted to mention something because the approach you mentioned, I like it but the way I think about the [inaudible] actually [I may] be wrong because I see all of this – the ICANN mission and Bylaws and all the documents we are working with right now – as my outside

limit to what we do. So those are hard limits, but in my thinking actually we might act as a team, we don't need to even be [inaudible] expanded as that limit because we have limited time anyway and limited resources so we can choose to say, "Okay, ICANN org is involved in these activities but we are really interested in these things." So why don't we focus on that as our scope on these things?

So in the document starting with Bylaws and the mission and all of that and then try to see if we can get input from outside, I think we should actually within the team we have all the expertise so we should try to define the scope within that hard limits just say okay, do we want to cover all of that or do we want to focus on special part of it? And then [inaudible]. I think that should be the mindset. I think that's how I'm approaching this whole [thing].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So I think those are topics that we definitely need to dig into. I think we probably want to start transitioning this conversation to the list. Kaveh, I don't know if you want to kick off the thread with those thoughts or we should start somewhere else. But if you wanted to fire something off on the e-mail about what you just said basically as the last word in the conversation from the call, it might be a great place to pick up if you're okay with that.

Great. Okay. Time check is we have 15 minutes left and we only got through slide three just now. So I probably lose my rights as moderator in the future.

We also had the work plan come out very recently and so that I think in large part sits on my shoulders. So I apologize to folks for that. Did anybody wind up having a chance to glance at the draft work plan that came out not too long ago? There was an initial posting, I believe, about a week ago and then some comments just came out, some annotation that I had made. But have people had a chance to look at it at all?

Okay. I guess that's a big no.

Denise, your hand is raised.

DENISE MICHEL:

I just skimmed it but again, I think it's a strawman, something to get us started. I think, at least how I'm approaching this, is I'd like to get a clear sense of the team's agreement on the scope from our Terms of Reference, and then it should be fairly easy to translate that into a work plan once we have a clear sense of what our scope is and big buckets of issues we want to address. Again, similar to the Terms of Reference – I think even more so with the work plan – I see it as a living, breathing, document. I would recommend that we do a first draft, do a draft that we're comfortable with, issue it as our initial work plan with a commitment to regularly revisit it, and continue to update it as our work evolves. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

That sounds like definitely fair observations. Before I get to the other hands that are up, just real quick I just want to throw out to the group that just in case it's not completely clear the scope is going to be

incredibly critical and everyone's contribution can start off with just your own perspective on what's important and I really encourage everyone to follow the line of there are no such things as observations that are inappropriate. If you have a perspective, that's why you're on the team. So by all means please if you're biting your lip and you have something that you're not sure you should say, please say it. This is going to be really critical. I think this is the most important time for people to be engaged. It's at the beginning when we're setting our direction and everyone who's on the team's perspective is critical. That's why you're on the team. So please if you're feeling like you're not sure you should throw in, please, please, do and just sort of meta comments.

Kerry-Ann, I see your hand is up.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

The only thing I wanted to suggest, [I would] like some hard comments on the [inaudible] assigned [inaudible]. We tried to assemble the finance because it only means that we have [inaudible] it means that we only have to then [May] is almost done, even though we're already in April. I think April and May will go by really fast, especially with [the spring] meeting that we have in May. I think unless we plan to dedicate time to actually start drafting in May while we're actually seeing each other, I think August may be a little bit too soon to have the things finalized.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, definitely too soon to be finalized but I think we're just trying to get the conversation going. I was throwing barbs by saying maybe we could put a stamp on it. I was hoping people would stand up with opinions. I agree. I don't think we need to close it out right now. Is that what you were concerned about?

Okay. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. I just have a question. The work plan that was sent out to me – I'm a Program Manager so maybe this is just me being a bit [picky] about it – do we plan to then take this document and turn it into a timeline or what [inaudible] for how we turn that work plan into a timeline with resources and milestones and reporting times, etc.?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that nothing is remotely cast in [stone]. I think it'd be really hard to come up with a timeline without having the scope at least under discussion. Without knowing what the scope of our work is, there's really no way I think we could reasonably commit to anything other than when we might have that scoping done, to be honest. That'd be my two cents. I don't know, does anyone else have any perspective on that? [This is] mostly just my own personal view on it.

JAMES GANNON: If I can come back in?

Yeah, that was kind of a pointer for why I was asking that is I see us being able to finalize our scope soon enough but I don't think that the work plan will come together properly. [I think that's] actually useful for anybody for us to send it to them. We can keep discussing it amongst ourselves and the team but [for] something that we communicate externally or to the Board with regards to a work plan, I think that will come after we finalize our scoping discussions.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Fair point.

Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

I would agree with James. I would also my personal opinion is that we should work very hard to wrap up our work within one year, as has been requested of us and included in the ICANN plan and budget. So I think we've got some boundaries to work within to the best of our abilities and I agree, we should tackle the scope and Terms of Reference, get that first cut done and then turn our attention to a work plan and I think it would be useful to get a high-level work plan into the public sphere to make sure that as part of our outreach commitment we continue to give the interested community members a sense broadly of what our work plan is and we can continue to add details and evolve it as needed. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah. It sounds like again we're starting to come to a very solid sense of agreement on this. I think that's good. We should probably start to... I think this will shape up a lot over e-mail hopefully pretty quickly.

I see a kit of comments from the chat session that sound like they are headed in that direction.

Okay, so then in our [waning] moments I'll pass to slide four and the brainstorming capture document. I think we're probably not going to have a lot of time right now to go through the brainstorming capture issues stuff like that. I think we're within five minutes of closing out the call

Open action items – I don't know if it makes a lot of sense to try and get through this stuff in any kind of detail in the last five minutes of the call, so I'm actually –

Denise, is your hand up again or is it just left over from before?

DENISE MICHEL: Left over. Sorry.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I don't think we have enough time to really go through these open action items, to be honest, right now. I'm just scanning through them real quick. And then we've got our next meeting schedule, I think we probably will plan an agenda that either picks up from here or maybe there'll be some stuff on the e-mail list between here and there

that will just sort of pick some other topics with the Chairs and I'll go to the Chairs and I will discuss this for sure.

So the next meeting will be for [the time] from here so for a lot of us it'll be evening, some of us it'll be night time, and then the next one will be the rough one, the early morning one.

I'm not a huge fan of burning the last five minutes on something if there's nothing to talk about so let me open it up. Is there Any Other Business worth discussing on the call or do we want to reclaim five minutes?

I see there's a deadline conversation going on in the chat room. If we want, we could discuss it in five minutes or we can have that also floated [to] the list.

Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

I think Kaveh had a suggestion of the co-Chairs suggesting a deadline to help focus the team's work on developing and finalizing the initial Terms of Reference and then the work plan. I suggested that we take up his suggestion and the co-Chairs talk and then come back to the list with some suggested deadlines to see if we can work as a team via e-mail and through our next conference call to wrap up the Terms of Reference, and then after that the work plan. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I think that's an excellent idea and I think hopefully if we produce a deadline, that will be a good motivator for anybody that needs to [sort of anybody has] any thoughts any thoughts to express them and if we wind up having [to slip it] because we have a flood of new input then that's a good thing. But deadlines drive action. So definitely I'm in agreement with that.

James?

JAMES GANNON: Sorry, another quick topic and do we have a number from staff on how many people we are going to have in person in Madrid so we can get an idea of what we should start thinking about what to put on that topic and what's going to be on our slate at that point?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's a good question. Does anyone from staff that's on the line have any sense of that? I'm taking notes [and follow up] and ask them.

KAREN MULBERRY: Sorry. It took me a while to get off of mute.

I think the majority of the review team members have indicated that they will be there in person. I have not seen any that have said that they will not be there. There are a few that may be coming a little late or have to leave a little early.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Excellent. James, do you have another one or is that a hand from before?

JAMES GANNON: No. That's great and it just means then that we can plan as well to really bash through some of any contentious issues that we come up with in the next few weeks at that face-to-face rather than trying to do them virtually. And so if we have the majority of people there in the room with us, I think we can make some really good progress on finalizing some things there while [it's fun] to have some deliverables for those deadlines then that we can then finalize in person in Madrid such as [what] you're thinking about putting deadlines on things [or] have some things that we can finalize and actually hopefully get out to the community after our face-to-face in Madrid as [inaudible] Denise put here is what we've done and here is [where] we're showing to you the community that we've achieved.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, definitely. Absolutely.

Okay. I see no more hands up. We've done the AOB slide and we have a minute and a half left on the call. I see Denise is typing. I don't want to cut anyone off, but okay.

Let's call the call then and the rest of the Chairs and I will convene and we'll be back on the list with results of things like timeline suggestions and what not, but hopefully long before that we have some active discussions on the list about scope which I think we've proven is a

pretty important point and I really hope that anybody who feels like they have a perspective on that feels like voicing it.

We will talk to you all in a week. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]