

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Start off with any updated SOIs or do we have any apologies? No? Okay, cool.

We've had a lot of discussion about the scope of work, and so hopefully a lot of you if not all of you have had a chance to look at the draft that's been kicking around – version 3. And I've seen there've been some comments on it so I know some people have checked it out. I don't know if this winds up getting in front of whether we want to wait on having PTI brief us before we get to this or not, but hopefully we can put some of that if not all of it to bed today. That'd be awesome but maybe a little bit ambitious.

Then discuss what our plan is for Madrid and Johannesburg, and we have time still [to] go to the open action items. Does anybody have any agenda bashing they'd like to do on that before we move forward? Okay. I see somebody typing. I'll presume that we can catch up if there's any changes or concerns.

To start off, has anybody not felt like they had a chance to look at the Terms of Reference version 3 that went out, in particular I'd say the Scope, because I'd like to jump into that if nobody feels like they need more time to do so. Okay. Then that's awesome.

I don't think that – I'm just pulling up my local copy now – there were a couple comments that were made on there and one of them I think was pretty substantive, not terribly substantive, but Kerry-Ann I think made one particular comment and I do think we want to try and put this all to bed. I don't know if, Kerry-Ann, you wanted to speak to your comment

---

on the Scope section of the Terms of Reference or not or if you wanted me to summarize it for folks. Okay. Cool. I will go ahead.

I think actually that comment was made on one of the things that I think had a lot of discussion on the group about which was basically where should we draw the line on working with internal systems or things that are not necessarily directly within ICANN's purview. And there was a sentence in the drafted text that I put out there that basically tried to describe – or a couple sentences – that tried to describe that systems rely on the systems that are within ICANN's purview and we may need to consider some of those in order to understand what decisions we actually are going to put recommendations together around actually need to do or look like. And I know we've had a number of discussions about this and I think Kerry-An suggested some slight rewording and I honestly looked at it quickly. I'm not sure that I see the – Chair hat off, just the writing text guy – I'm not sure that I understand exactly where the nuance difference is or why it's so important.

I worry a little bit, though, that if we constrain where we're allowed to look at things then we may wind up not seeing bigger picture, bigger items. And so I don't know if Kerry-Ann, that the text that you drafted was designed to highlight anything in particular but I would worry that it was a little limiting personally.

Did anybody else have any thoughts on that? Has anybody else not had a chance to read it?

Kerry-Ann, I see you have your hand up.

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm just trying to open the document. It wasn't restricted. I think how the language was written was restrictive so I was trying to actually make it more wide. I'm just trying to find it back. I already closed it. Hold on.

What I was suggesting, Eric, how the language was written before it actually said, "You may therefore necessarily need to go to" – I think it was – "consider the issues that may be broader and may therefore necessarily investigate if it's related to elements external to ICANN's direct remit."

What I wanted to propose is that I think that what we're looking at is not external to ICANN's remit but it's because if you say that it means that it's the Bylaws itself of ICANN says it can't go outside of its remit. So if the SSR2 Team is stood up as a result of ICANN it means that we ourselves can't go outside. So what I was trying to propose was language that would allow I think language accepting that what we're reviewing is within ICANN's remit and what we're doing is that we would just consult all the actors that are necessary, not going outside of our remit. I think that's what I have a problem with how the language is written.

It says "that are external to ICANN's direct remit," and I think that's an acknowledgement that the discussions we've been having it seems that what we're doing with the DNS is external to ICANN's remit but I think some of us are saying that it's not external. It may be more work but it's just that we wanted to make sure that we acknowledge ICANN's remit.

So the proposed language I had was just that, "We would consult with all the stakeholders within the community that may have specific

---

---

functions that it performed on behalf of ICANN.” So the language could be tweaked but I just didn’t like how that last sentence was worded. I don’t know if that makes it any clearer or if anyone else on the team understood the suggested language. I could copy the comment [inaudible] into the chat and show the rewording that I gave. Hold on.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. While you type that – okay, great. There it is.

Kerry-Ann, that makes it a lot clearer now. I think I misunderstood. I think that was my bad. I think there was just one word in there that must have taken me in the wrong direction. Not a problem at all. Thank you very much for clarifying that.

I guess James, you’re next in the queue.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. I’m broadly supportive of the change but I have one concern with a specific word and just want to get from Kerry-Ann whether it’s an important word or not.

In the modified text it says, “Security, stability, and resiliency, importance and implications of the [inaudible] identifier space.” To me, that is where “implications” word means that we could potentially end up going into this whole thing as a broader piece of looking at end-to-end DNS abuse and everything else. And that’s what I think I want to get away from. Yes, we can look at those things, but I don’t want us to be pushed into investigating those things. As you said, Eric, before, it’s very important for us to be able to gather information and to look at the

---

broader picture but I just want to make sure that our work as this team is focused on what ICANN can actually have a role in and what it can change, and I'm just concerned about that word "implications."

Kerry-Ann, is that an important word in your rewording, or is that something we could have a quick chat about? Because [inaudible] about that, Eric, your wording was perfect from my Scope concerns.

KERRY-AN BARRETT:

James, I didn't change that sentence. That would have been Eric's wording. The only sentence I changed was the last one. I pretty much copied everything up to I think "Administrative Scope will consider the issues that..." I think I copied everything from "in order" up to if the original language was "implications." That would be Eric's, not me. I just kept that sentence [inaudible].

JAMES GANNON:

It was more in conjunction with the change – just from my perspective because with Eric's wording we had just "investigate issues" whereas with the new wording we now have "[inaudible] disclose to seek advice," so it broadens from my mind the initial sentence as well.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

We could not – I mean, Eric, I'm [Inaudible] mostly the second sentence. So I think it could be [merged]. I'm okay.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so I'm not entirely sure where that leaves us. There were two sentences that we're talking about. Is the preference then that we just modify the second one then? Is that what you just said, Kerry-Ann?

Maybe we can push some text around on the e-mail list and that way we can get it just right, and then once that's ready to go we can slip it into the document or someone can –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. We'll take it to the list. Thank you very much.

Alright, we lost Emily's hand so I guess that issue's been taken care of so Geoff, I think you're next up.

GEOFF HUSTON: I actually like Kerry-Ann's wording and the thing that I appreciated about that was removed the kind of open-ended "investigate" and actually created a more definitive, "review, discuss, and seek advice," so that there wasn't a self-proclaimed remit to go out of ICANN's mission but more the ability to allow others to provide input which seemed to me to strike the right balance.

James's issue around "Implications" I think is always there irrespective of the wording. It doesn't worry me either way, to be perfectly frank. I could see arguments for and against that word and, as I said, I could live with either side so I'm not unduly fussed. I did appreciate the remainder of Kerry-Ann's rewording and I thought it was more appropriate in terms of the limits the Bylaws impose upon us as to how far we can go. Thank you.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thanks, Geoff. Emily, your hand is up.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you to everybody who's commented on this and I'm really encouraged. Eric, I think that you did a really great job in just summarizing the sense of the team so far, which is that there really needs to be a sensitivity amongst everybody on the team that no one wants to go outside ICANN's remit. Nobody wants to extend ICANN's remit in this work. At the same time, we don't want to close the door on lines of inquiry which may lead to a conclusion that ICANN could do something, if not everything in relation to problems that might emerge. And I feel that the wording we have is capturing that very nicely.

I take Kerry-Ann's comments. I think they're well-made. I really would dare to propose that we might well have enough to say we're pretty happy with these Terms of Reference and can we propose them to the group and anybody objecting could perhaps take the microphone, and failing that, maybe we could sign them off, would be my proposal. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Emily. I see that we have a couple different perspectives on what the best next step would be. It sounds like kicking a little bit of language around may be something we want, but that at some point we need to decide... We have a couple different modes of opinion here. It sounds like there's a couple people that are online and on board with

---

---

the gist of the text that we have. Geoff mentioned that he is uncomfortable with the text. So we have to come to some sort of consensus about where we're going to head next and whether we can put a flag in this or we can't.

I think at this point, it might be worth putting people's perspective on to the list if we can't do it on the call today. So maybe I can get a show of hands. How many people feel like we are close [inaudible]. Oh, I see. Okay, so we actually maybe are pretty close, which would be great. I think it would be really advantageous for us to try and put this to bed, if not on the call today, on the call today [inaudible] which is I think where it looks like we're heading.

So what I would ask is, it looks like James, Geoff, and Kerry-Ann, have some thoughts about text and I see you guys iterating a little bit in the chat room. So I don't want to try and channel you all if I can get some sort of text from you all. It looked to me like I think – I don't want to speak for you all – but James, it looked like you were going to take Kerry-Ann's gist and put that into some words and maybe fire out into the e-mail and then we can incorporate that into V4 I guess of the draft.

Emily, I see your hand raised.

EMILY TAYLOR:

My impressions looking at the chat and listening to the comments made by Geoff, James, and Kerry, is that we may be able to be slightly bolder and let's say, subject to striking the words "and implications" paragraph we are happy with the text, and therefore we can all sign off the Terms Of Reference. Could I propose that to the group and please do, I

---

---

certainly don't want to railroad anybody. I also don't want us to avoid making a decision if we can.

So my proposal is that we adopt the Terms of Reference Version 3 subject to deleting the words "and implications" from Kerry's proposed insertion, but otherwise adopting Kerry's text? Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have a question. Is everyone from the SSR2 Team online because I don't have the [inaudible] so I'm not sure if everyone is only here, and I would like us to make this decision when everyone is here. Can someone from staff let me know if we're missing someone?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Bernard, you have your hand raised.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. I was just going to mention that the review team may wish to consider this – in some of the other groups we have adopted a policy of two readings to finalize acceptance of everything which allows to compensate if anyone missed any one meeting or if there were other things. So really it's a suggestion to the group. If you want to adopt that, you could [inaudible] it as a first reading today as proposed by Emily and then you could bring it back at your next meeting for a second reading. And once that's done then it's accepted under that kind of a system. Thank you.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you for that. [Inaudible] the queue and maybe circle back to that.  
[It's an] interesting idea.

Emily, go ahead please.

EMILY TAYLOR: Just very quickly to say yes. Thanks, Kaveh, for raising that very key point. I would agree with Bernie's proposal.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: James?

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. I'm going to be awkward and say I would like us to be a little bit more agile than that. How about we agree as in principle on the call here and put out a 24 or 48 hour "no objections" on the list and then if after that period is done we haven't got any, then we consider it adopted formally.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. It sounds like we're coming to a little bit of consensus on this which is great. But the chat room is sort of going forward, it looks like we are missing several people that often times have things to say as well. I think that puts us in a little bit of a tough [inaudible]. Maybe let's see where we get to by the end of the call. Possibly people will join. Kaveh brought up a good point. It looks like the teams' resonating with we need to have... We'll see where we get to at the end of the call. At

---

the end of the call we need to wrap up some things then nothing will probably be written in stone per se so we can probably roll back or incorporate or update. We can talk about making these documents living documents.

What I'll do is I'll propose that we table this until the end of the call and then I'll call for some time out to make sure that we can circle back and if nothing else, we can push forward with consensus at that point.

Yeah, that's true. That's very true. That's why I think at the end of the meeting if we still don't have... Actually maybe we could do a quick straw poll right now. Do people want to, if you go to the "Agree/Disagree" options on the Adobe Connect room then if people want to let me know do you agree with adopting V3 now?

Okay. Does anybody disagree?

Okay. Then I guess that's that. Those people that have chosen to make their opinions known have said we should go through and adopt V3. So we'll adopt V3 [inaudible] any sort of changes we can negotiate on the mailing list. I think that's a good, strong, step forward. I think it's important that we do that.

Can I have the agenda slides back up please?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Before moving forward so I assume that the final version will be circulated? We want also [inaudible] from the Board because this was one of the [inaudible]. I don't know about the other people. Do you

---

want me to send the final version [inaudible] Board or do you want another [edit]?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Does anyone have an opinion? Did anyone not hear Kaveh? And if everyone heard Kaveh, does anyone have an objection to us finalizing the text, updating the final version 3, and then having him share it with the Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sure. Thank you. So as soon as I have the clean version on the list I'll – great – share it with the Board and [inaudible] list. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. Sounds great. Sounds good.

I see a comment that V3 has not been circulated. I think it has been a couple times on the list so it's possible that it's hidden in a folder somewhere or just didn't get noticed.

[Cathy], I see your hand up.

[CATHY HANDLEY]: [Inaudible] I think because I was hunting all over creation for it. The document number still shows, says "Draft V2."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is true. And this is due in direct part [to me].

---

[CATHY HANDLEY]: And so if it really is three which I really think it is, we just need to change that before it goes out.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that's true. The file name should say, "V3" [inaudible]. The document itself says, "Draft version 2." It would definitely need to be updated but if you have a document in your hand and you're not sure which one it is, the file name should just [ambiguate]. Yeah, that needs to be fixed.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry to add to [inaudible] I just wanted to add some [inaudible] there might be a bit of confusion about the version but if you all agreed on the document that we saw I suggest the clean version [inaudible] sent it out, if the Chairs agree we give 24 hours for anyone who might have things to shout but automatically accepted. If someone has something to say because there might be confusion on the version number I think it's good to give them 24 hours. So when you send out the final version, please mention that but you have 24 hours to [complain] or shout.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Does anyone have any objections to that?

Great. Just watching the chat room for a moment.

Okay. Okay. It looks like everyone's okay with that. And so as Emily noted in the chat room, Terms of Reference version three adopted, incorporate Kerry-Ann's paragraph, subject to deletion of "and implications."

That sounds good to me. We'll put a TTL on it when we stick it on to the list and that will be that – 24 hours TTL.

Okay, cool. So time check. We're halfway through. It's 10:30 East Coast Time.

Moving forward, the Madrid meeting schedule – the co-Chairs and staff had a number of conversations to try and come up with what we thought made sense, and what we have right now I think some of this has been... I'm not sure if this has been circulated or not but obviously the slides have been. There is a Welcome reception on Friday the 12<sup>th</sup> from 6:30 to 8:30. Then the ICANN Symposium will be all day on Saturday and I guess our hope is that the team will be able to join for all of that. And then we'll have review team meetings on Sunday and Monday.

That's the broad agenda. And then I think we have a few more comments in here about the details. So if at any point someone has a comment or question, jump in but this is sort of high level framing. We have come up with a handful of agenda topics and folks that we'd like to have come and brief us while we're all co-located and face-to-face. I guess we don't have [inaudible] here, but we don't have that in [inaudible]. Okay, hold on a second. Chat room. I'm going to channel the chat room.

---

---

Monday discuss the Scope of Work [inaudible]. I see there's a lot of active discussion in the chat room.

Yeah, so in regards to... Okay, Kerry. I was just about to channel you. Go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [Inaudible] on Monday we have the entire morning to discuss to talk about the stuff that we just spoke about. I think we have some room freed up on Monday morning so we should reconsider the 9:00 to 10:30 slot on Monday morning. I'm travelling but I might be able to participate remotely but I just thought that we should reconsider that aspect of the agenda right now if we could.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think talking about the Scope on Monday morning would probably be something to do a little bit different but having worked out the Scope we'll have a lot more substantive matters we can attend to.

Go ahead, Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thanks for that, Kerry-Ann. My suggestion would be that we use that time on Monday to really plan our next steps and look in detail about what we need to achieve by when to get our work done. It might also just be good use of that time to think about – for team members to think about their particular areas of expertise of interest that they could

---

---

contribute to, bearing in mind the scope that we have adopted. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Emily. James?

JAMES GANNON: I'm not sure if it's just because we're the two physically closest together, but [I'm] very similar to what Emily just said. So my big thing that I would like to see us achieve from Madrid – apart from the SSR1 recap which I think is very important – is blocking our work.

This will most likely – based on experience – end up with subteams, we take what we have to do – which I think we have a good scope on now – and we cut out into six, seven or however many blocks of work that may be. And then we as review team members are trying to assign ourselves to those blocks so that we can start actually then mapping out, “Well, for this highly technical piece, we have four people and it's going to take X amount of time based on that, but for this more broad group we'll have eight people so that will be done in a shorter piece of time.”

Because I don't think we can actually work out our scheduling until we've blocked our work into big schedule blocks, and then look at who can actually work on those blocks of information. And once we have that, then I think we're actually starting to look at getting a schedule together and then we can actually start our real, substantive work.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, that sounds excellent, James. That sound exactly right, and I note that Kaveh seems to agree as well in the chat room. Go ahead, Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: To follow on from the point that James made which seems to be getting a lot of support a chat, would it be possible for someone to volunteer to lead those discussions and to do some pre-thinking about potential blocks?

One person or maybe two people who could just volunteer to lead the discussions during that session and make some proposals to the team, that would be really helpful, and especially anyone who might have project management type of background or experience in this area. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Emily. That's a great suggestion, so while that percolates out, James, you have your hand up again?

JAMES GANNON: I think that might have been a slight poke at me. So yes, look, I'll take that, and I would appreciate if anybody else wants to help me with that. That would be great, but I already have kind of thought about it that way in my own mind, so I'm happy to tick that off.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, that's great. Yes, I think that sounds excellent. Thank you very much, James. And if anyone feels like jumping in the fray with [him], I think that would be really helpful.

But yes, while we were sort of discussing, the document came up on the share. I guess everyone should have seen it. The first day, we'll spend a great deal of time being briefed on SSR-1 recommendations and their implementation status, and then the day two we'll move more briskly on to the work that we'll do.

And so that's what we're discussing right now. I think it'll be really interesting to start to actually break out these blocks that James just described and start really the sort of core of our work. And then I think we might wind up with a handful of subteams breaking out as you guys can see from bullet two, and then it'll probably move us into [inaudible] a bit.

Does anybody have any comments in addition to or changes that they'd like to see to the agenda that is in the Connect room?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have some. I'm not suggesting we have [inaudible] but the review team lunch, I think it's very short, and it's not because I want to[inaudible] but I think it's a very useful socializing opportunity as well, and we won't discuss issues anyway. So, I think 45 minutes is not real. It's too short. I don't know what kind of lunch. If it's standing, it might be good. But if you're sitting at a table or something, I'd prefer to have one hour or one hour and 15 or something. Very small comments.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Is there someone from staff who has looked into sort of the facilities or layout [as of] comment about whether that's feasible as far as what the plan for lunch was and whether we can be accommodated to have an hour for it. Karen, I see your hand is up.

KAREN MULBERRY: I apologize. I had a little trouble getting myself off mute. Yes, what we've arranged right now is there is an adjoining room to the main meeting room where the review team will be that we can set up the meals in, and you can go over there and grab what you want and bring it back to the main room. You can eat in the small subroom. We try to be as flexible as possible, but the food will be close so that you can have working lunches should you want to do that, or you can eat quickly, should you want to do that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Does that put everyone's mind at ease, if we sort of basically have a softly defined break for lunch whereby we can sort of shuttle back and forth and work through it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. Thank you very much, Karen. I appreciate that. Okay, great. so I have a feeling that while having a very well described agenda will give us a lot of [thoughts] right now that it'll probably change a little bit as we, A) get closer, but certainly B) start to walk through it.

But following what I think will be a really big part of what we do, which is breaking it out into blocks and having lunch, we are planning to have discussions about timeline and outreach plan, and then discussing what we're going to be doing going forward as far as face-to-face meetings and next steps.

So at a high level, I think it's probably better than [leaving] a slide for people to just sort of ingest on their own, but that basically sort of means day one will be a lot of hearing from folks about where things were before we started, planning out where we're going to go next, describing amongst ourselves how we're going to get there, who we're going to reach out to and what we'll do next time we run into each other, where and whatnot.

At a high level, does anyone have any objection to that or any thoughts? I'm assuming, Karen, your hand is just up from before, but if there's something you want to jump in on, then sure, go for it. Okay.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have some comment. The next face-to-face meeting, I suggest we keep that open for now, because if we basically do what [inaudible] so have the blocks and have people maybe groups, like four people for this technical thing and things like that, I think it would be very important that we give the groups a bit of face time. Not saying a lot of hours, but

---

---

at least each group has like one hour so they can discuss issues and where they want to go to get aligned.

So I suggest we spend some time, and that I think naturally comes very close to the edge. So, I suggest we take some of that time in our next face-to-face meeting, and actually use it for the possible groups that we might have formed by then to talk about and get aligned.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I think that would be really good. James, I see your hand up.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. So, just from my perspective, more of a broad comment on I suppose the afternoon. To me, face-to-face meetings are the best time to bash out issues between the team members or to build relationships and to do the harder things.

And I just don't want to stand up – so like the first day is great because that's a task for the review team that we have to do, is to get us all [inaudible]. The second day to me just almost feels like all admin, and I think I agree with Kaveh then that maybe that's bullet five, let's try and keep that bullet five a bit more moveable.

We can always just go to the next face-to-face meeting on a call like this, but that's pretty easy, so let's look at the after-break time from 3:00 on as more of a, "We'll see what we need to use it for to do spillovers possibly from earlier in the day for the more substantial things that are less admin-y."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sounds great, James. Thanks. Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I won't be able to participate in that last afternoon session, so I wanted to put food for thought. So when you guys do discuss – I agree with what James just said, but I wanted to put food for thought that when we do have the subgroups, that when the team discusses the face-to-face meetings, we could probably see if we could start doing [inaudible] more region oriented.

For example, Cathy, me and a couple of other persons who are based in the kind of GMT area, [inaudible] we are grouped, James, we could think about grouping, and based in the insight of team members as well. Could be based on [inaudible] geographical location, so maybe we could just face to face in those geographical locations rather than the entire team [inaudible] start to work in subgroups as well. And I know that James and a couple other persons are in the UK, and if someone is in Africa, then we can probably see how we can merge those groups to see how we can actually merge the new teams and by time zones as well. That way, we can actually progress some of the work a little bit faster. [inaudible]

But we could just think about it. I just wanted to throw it out [inaudible] but I won't be able – I will be offline at that time, so just [inaudible] to think about until we see each other again.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. Those are very good comments. Okay, I think this is actually an excellent segue to the next topic on our agenda, the Johannesburg meeting. Can we get those slides back, please? Great, thank you.

So, as you all may recall, we had a Doodle poll about review team members' availability for meeting before, during or after the Johannesburg meeting in Johannesburg. And basically, it came out very close. It was sort of a tie between before or during, and then just sort of a fractional drop for people who were willing to stay around after the Johannesburg meeting.

And I guess why I think this is a good segue is that based on what I just think I heard from Kerry and James, I wonder if I can get a sense for how many people are very interested, not interested in meeting during a face to face during Johannesburg.

Should I take the comments that we just had a second ago as that people aren't sure that we are necessarily going to want to have a face to face in Johannesburg? Or what you're saying structure around that [that] face to face is with the presumption that Johannesburg is something that the team is interested in.

I'd like to get a sense from the team whether you all think that this is something we should do. Kerry-Ann, I'm not sure if your hand is up from before or if it's up again. Okay, cool. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON:

For me, Johannesburg is the opportunity for the subteams to meet face to face, and as I said, flash out those substantive issues. Maybe start

---

really getting into detailed drafting, that type of thing. So, [inaudible] it works easier for me to do that in line with Johannesburg because I've already got time off work for that, but if we wanted, I think the timeline is good, so you know, end of June, start of July for the subteams to come back together, and obviously, a Plenary session as well, but to start looking at the issues and start delving deep into things.

If the review team decides to meet somewhere else, that's acceptable as well. There is obviously a cost impact for that is the only thing, so we would have to – if we wanted to start looking at doing face-to-face meetings outside of outside of ICANN meetings, then we need to look at the cost implications of that and how that factors into our budgeting.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yes, I think that those are really [inaudible]. I think just to sort of throw in there other things for considerations include one of the reasons that there was some interest from some of the team in the meeting in Johannesburg was that we would be potentially co-located with other groups like SSAC, RSSAC or some of the groups that we might want to have briefings or get direction from or advice from, or hear perspectives on things from.

And I don't think that all the groups we want to get briefings from are necessarily going to be at ICANN in general, like APWG or M3AAWG or anything like that. So, it's something I think that it might be worth putting our collective heads around and coming up with a perspective on. Maybe if we can, e-mail before we get to Madrid, because as you just mentioned, James, the longer we wait, the bigger there is an

---

---

impact. Folks who either have made travel plans will have to change them, people who haven't made travel plans who need to make them, and the timing is definitely good for us to have a face to face in that it will have been a little while since we've seen each other. We hope to have had a bunch of work gone on. It's good to sync up, but if the sense from the team is that we should discuss in Madrid when we want to meet again, then I kind of [inaudible] that it's not clear that we know for sure we want to meet again at the end of June in Johannesburg. So, could use some input from folks. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, I [inaudible] because I like planning ahead a lot, and it also helps me a lot, but I think the group is not – we need a lot of admin work [inaudible] and then scoping the [inaudible] we have other stuff to work on and everything. So, I think right now, it's too early to be able to plan ahead that long for this group. So, I think it's best that actually, basically, [inaudible] close to end of [inaudible] which is we have the discussion, because exactly as James mentioned, we have the subgroups. The subgroups might decide to actually meet in Johannesburg where the whole big group doesn't want to or doesn't need to. As soon as we have some time left, we have [inaudible]. So before any of those, I think it's premature to make a decision. I know it's not ideal, but this is the situation. So, I suggest we make a decision on the second day.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. And I just want to be real quick, What Cathy said, back to [inaudible]. Okay, I'm actually just interested in channeling the group on this one, so Kaveh, I think what you said makes a lot of sense as well. Emily, go ahead.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yes. Kaveh, [inaudible] that we are very early in [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm sorry, Emily, did we lose you or was that –

EMILY TAYLOR: We don't know exactly what we would be saying in outreach meetings, but if I've understood you correctly, I think I disagree because I think that we probably need to try to –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Emily, if you're speaking, you're cutting –

EMILY TAYLOR: [Try to get going] in the schedule of these other groups if we do think that we're going to have some outreach in Johannesburg. [inaudible] Many of us are going to be here –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Emily, if you can hear us –

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Emily, I think we're having trouble with your audio. I'm not sure if you're able – okay, cool, thank you. So, whilst she's typing, James, did you want to say –

EMILY TAYLOR: Can you hear me?

JAMES GANNON: Yes. Just very briefly, just from a planning perspective, the earlier we can make the decision –

EMILY TAYLOR: Sorry. You can hear me now? Okay. I think I disagree with Kaveh. I agree with [inaudible] obviously we don't know what we're going to be asking people. We don't know where we're going to be by Johannesburg, but just knowing how quickly the schedules of these groups like RSSAC or SSAC do fill up.

If we think that it's possible that we want to talk to them during Johannesburg, now is the time.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. I think we probably lost part of what you said, Emily, but it sounded like basically – if I try to fill in the gaps – that maybe what you were saying was that we actually want to have some outreach [inaudible]. From these groups that we pretty much need to tell them sooner rather

---

---

than later to ensure that they have time to brief us. Certainly get on their agenda, it'll certainly be packed just like everything else. So, I think that's definitely –

EMILY TAYLOR: Meeting time with them [inaudible] closer to the time itself, end of June, we will know what we want to be saying, and in the very worst case scenario, we can free up their agenda. So, apologies for the mic.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we got that, Emily. I think we heard you, but hopefully we didn't miss anything. I see Karen and then James in the queue. Karen, please go ahead.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. Thank you very much, Eric. I just wanted to raise that in order to make sure that everyone on the review team has hotel room and that we have meeting facilities in Johannesburg, we need to know now whether you want to meet or not. Otherwise, the longer you delay the decision, the harder it actually will be to arrange both the hotel rooms and the meeting facilities, but also everyone's travel to get to the meeting. So, we would prefer sooner.

Actually, I was hoping that we'd have some sort of decision today as to whether you wanted to meet and the days that you would prefer to meet so that we can actually start then planning for all that travel and arrangements required to support the review team. I don't know if that's possible, but we would definitely like to have that, if it is.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. I understand, Karen. That's a good point, let's try to circle back in the next few minutes to see where we can get to on that for sure. James, go ahead, please.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. I'm kind of building on both of the other comments. For those of us who don't work around the ICANN policy sphere, we do really need to have some long distance planning. I just booked the time off for Puerto Rico next year with my job, so [unless] we need to be a little bit flexible, but for things like that face-to-face meetings, I think we really do need to lock these down, and certainly I know that if we're going to be saying, "Well, it's going to be after Madrid," I then don't even know if I'm going to be able to make it. I booked it off with work now, [inaudible] have to be changing this and moving it around, that would put my attendance at risk.

The face-to-face meetings are something we should be planning well in advance. Also for ICANN purposes like for example for constituency travel. If I wanted to go with my GNSO constituency it's actually too late for that now because I thought we were broadly in agreement. So maybe before, maybe after, but we would be around Johannesburg. So, I do think we do need for face-to-face doing long range planning.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Thanks, James. I think it's a good perspective. In the last few minutes, what I would love to do is to try and put a fork in this. Can I get

---

---

an agree/disagree poll real quick? How many people think that we right now are in a position to – either yes or no – just decide on this call whether we will meet in Johannesburg or not.

I'm not saying how many people want to meet, I want to see how many people think we can come to a decision about it today. Only James. How many people? Okay. Can I get a couple more people jumping in just so we have a proper dataset?

Okay, so let me reset the question then. How many people think that we should meet in Johannesburg? Clearly, it would be just those people who are saying they're ready to make a decision.

We have a reasonably [inaudible]. Okay. Well, what I'm going to propose is that in the last five minutes, we probably aren't going to be able to resolve this. Thank you, everyone, for agreeing/disagreeing. But that maybe can I propose it by the end of the week, by Friday this week on the e-mail list we can have everyone's perspective on yes we should or no we should not be in Johannesburg? Because the Chairs have worked with staff a bit on making sure we could line this up. We had the doodle poll, we had a lot of momentum moving towards this, so hopefully this isn't a surprise to anybody that we're discussing this. It certainly shouldn't be something people are strong armed into, and I noticed in the chat room a number of people said that they're not planning to be in Johannesburg regardless of whether we meet, so clearly, that won't be an effective face to face to those people. But I would like to say, by the end of the week, I'd like it to be unequivocal – if we could – that the team has decided whether or not we will meet in Johannesburg, because I think the presumption before today was that

---

we were, and it sounded like there was some consternation about deciding when we'd have face to face, and it's why I wanted to call on the question whether Johannesburg was on the table or not. Sounds like maybe not all in line yet. Yes, James, go ahead, please.

JAMES GANNON: I'm going to be [contrary] as usual and say that – put a counter-suggestion that the Chairs make a decision on this ASAP, and you have the doodle poll, we have some feelings from various people on the list and on the last two, maybe even three calls for [planning] purposes for ICANN's side, because I know how difficult getting these things are. I think it's almost at a stage now where the Chairs can make a call. I don't think you're going to get much more insight from the actual members other than the doodle polls and the people who have actually spoken out in favor or against. [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Those are fair comments, James. Thank you. Alright, I will reach out to the other co-Chairs. Emily is on the call and we'll get a hold of Denise, and we'll hammer this out and we'll get it back to the group right away. I think that's a constructive comment, James. Thank you.

Okay, we have three minutes left to sort of just review the open SSR-2 action items. I'm not entirely sure what to review about that. So, I guess I'm inclined to just move straight on to Any Other Business. Hold on a second. Let's see, Emily has some comments in the chat room. To Geoff, okay. Yes, I see Jeff saying that – okay, James, go ahead. I see your hand is up.

JAMES GANNON: No, sorry, I have an AoB item, so I'll let you finish up whatever first.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, I was just commenting on what was in the chat room. [inaudible] to that point. Go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Okay, cool. Just for the rest of the review team to note and to be aware, I've raised some issues with the co-Chairs and with ICANN staff about the non-disclosure and the conflicted disclosure process that was sent around yesterday or the day before.

I want to have a discussion with ICANN Legal about that, because it doesn't really meet what the intent of this non-disclosure framework was supposed to be in my opinion as the person who wrote the Bylaw. So, just so that everybody knows that I'm having a chat with co-Chairs and with ICANN Legal about that, and we may come back with a revised version of it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Thank you very much, James. Indeed. Okay, so yes, so we're in the Any Other Business section. So in the last minute, is there Any Other Business from anyone else?

---

---

Okay, everyone. Well, thank you very much, and we will hammer out the version 3 of the draft, get the corrections in place, send it around the list with the [TTL]. I'll talk to you all soon. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           Thanks, bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**