RECORDED VOICE:     This meeting is now being recorded.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     The agenda is to note any updated any statements of interest, apologies, or absences.  I have received apologies from [inaudible].  Are there any updated statements of interest?

Just to remind team members that updating statements of interest is an ongoing thing, and I encourage you all to reflect on this and to make any updates as our work continues.  Right.

The meeting part of this agenda would be for us to continue the discussion on the subtopic work plans.  There has been some discussion on the email list.  [Inaudible], who is one of the [protagonists], I suppose, in those discussions can't be with us, but we do have other members of the team.

But let's also focus on next steps to address scope, our work plan, and timeline, and think about how we can really move forward on getting those done, whether we need additional help or resources from staff or from others.  And then if we have time, go to the open action items, and please be prepared to address yours, if you have any open action items.

And then let's think about the Johannesburg meeting.  So, with that… Actually, could I have control of the slides please?

Thank you.  So, thank you very much for that.  Let's think about our subtopic work plans, and the open items that we really, the issues that

we need to address to move forward and to come to a conclusion. You'll see that we have got a list of the subtopics in the Google document, which is linked from this slide.

We also have a security work plan, and we're… I've just seen an invite that's gone out for a 16:00 UTC call on Wednesday, this Wednesday. There is also a work plan, the SSR1, and an email list, now for all of the subtopics.

Okay. So, I think that there are a couple of points that I saw coming up on the list, and I see that we have Alain on the call as well. There was some discussion between yourself and [inaudible] about, when we're thinking about the ICANN security subtopic. We seem to make some progress on that last call in terms of agreeing, a framework that we would use to evaluate ICANN's security internally, using the [inaudible] 2001.

On that call, Steve Conte raised the issue that actually the ICANN security team don't apply that framework themselves, and this is something that Alain also raised on the list. So, it would be… Could I just have some more views from other members of the team on this call, as to how we square that circle? I see James has his hand up, Alain as well, I'd like to hear your views too. So, go ahead, James.

JAMES GANNON:              Hi everybody. It's 7 AM here, so forgive me if [inaudible] are not quite corrected. And so, I think that using 2001 and [inaudible] is a good framing for our work. I think that's a good approach of finding what we need to be looking at. And particularly for people who don't have a

security that will come to you as background. [Inaudible] I don't think that we need to go to the level of detail of performing a full on 2001 or 22 [inaudible] audit on ICANN.

I think that's one, too much level of depth, because you know, to the best of my knowledge, two or three people who are intimately familiar with those frameworks as [inaudible]… I don't want to end up in a situation where we just [inaudible] after. I think the concept of leaving them as a direction setting mechanism on what we should be looking at is a good idea, that they are the industry standards. They are used across multiple industries, there are where I think ICANN should be done in the future, plus I think, you know, there is a discussion to be had on the level of detail within those frameworks that we need to be doing.

And I don't think we need to go to the level of depth which is, you know, [inaudible] we were trying to find ICANN right away to those standards. It may be a conversation for the future, but I think that's the level that we need right now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Thank you very much for that James. James, a question. Where you on the last call? I can't remember.

JAMES GANNON:        No, [inaudible] missed that one, I was [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So, yes, very understandable. So, just to let you know, just the point of fact, I suppose, is that when we discussed this last week, there was quite a big discussion about well, okay. We have got a framework here now. Can we get someone in to do this? So, I think that the direction of travel, certainly last week was, we would set the parameters and the scope of work for this inquiry.

We'll separate, end up being, and then hire somebody in with the relevant expertise to do it. So, to your point about, you know, not wanting the two or three people who have actually got those qualifications on the group, to be effectively taken out [inaudible] piece of work, the plan I heard taking shape last week was that this would be a candidate for a third party to do this.

But I can see Alain's hand up. Thank you very much. I just wanted to make that connection to James while he had made that comment. So, Alain, please go ahead.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     Yes, okay. Can you hear me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Very well, thank you.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     Okay. So, [inaudible] on the mailing list, and I [inaudible]… The problem here is we first make it, we define what is the scope of our work. What is the [inaudible]? And I think we probably end up agreeing that it is not

in our mandate to [inaudible] the ICANN security, okay? Because from your question, James, we're already looking at shall we…? Because we do not have [inaudible], that we engage someone to do something against [me?], we have no…

It's not part of our priorities to go and audit ICANN security. I am fine with the [inaudible], okay, but once again I think, the [inaudible] right now should be, what is the scope of our work on this ICANN security? And as I said on the call last time, and on the mailing list, I think we need to look at what is, what is ICANN doing, okay? What is ICANN doing?

And when we start looking at this, we'll apply this [inaudible] on the apply the same work. Look at what ICANN is doing, okay? [Inaudible] if ICANN is [certified?], and how they audit, and see if there is any [inaudible] analysis. And our work will mostly be around looking at the [inaudible] analysis.

And if this [inaudible] analysis, we need expertise, yes, we will work at… We can get expertise. But I think, let's focus first on the scope of our work. We all agree that we are not here to audit ICANN security.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Thank you for that, Alain. I also see… I saw James's hand up for a bit. I see Kaveh. So, Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR:    Hello everyone. I also sent my question to the chat. It's basically, after consulting with Board, we had this question that, does SSR team, what was our…? Are there any [inaudible] with SSAC, and if [inaudible] to

share the terms of this reference of work with SSAC, before moving further down.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Somebody from staff can take that question.  And it [CROSSTALK]…

KAREN MULBERRY:        This is Karen.  Sorry.  I had to get off mute.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Hi, Karen.

KAREN MULBERRY:        Hi.  We would be happy to send it over to SSAC, if that's what the review team would like us to do.  We have not shared the terms of reference with anyone other than the Board at this point.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        They're published on our Wiki, right?

KAREN MULBERRY:        Yes, they are.  They have been published.  And there have been announcements gone out, stating that you have completed your work on the terms of reference.  We haven't specifically…  [Inaudible], yes, but we had not shared the terms of reference specifically with any of the SOs or ACs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. I think that we have been trying to have a conversation about outreach amongst our group for several weeks, so that… I mean, the practical answer to your question, Kaveh, is yes, they're published. There is absolutely no hesitation from my part to sending out terms of reference far and wide, including to SSAC.

Is there a particular reason why you direct your question in this way?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, because we were going through interactions of SSR2 team, and this is just an idea. We thought SSAC, especially given what they do and they manage, there would be a very valuable reference outside of this organization, to be able to [inaudible], and making sure that we are in the right direction, if we want to use them as a resource.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Noted. James?

JAMES GANNON: Thank you. So, two things. Just on the [inaudible] versus gap analysis, I just wanted you to know, I put it in the chat, but I do agree with Alain. But I think a gap analysis is a good idea. That is something that we can either do ourselves, that's something that we can bring in a consultant to do, and against those two frameworks, we can [inaudible] to work with, to make recommendations with.

That could be the foundation. ICANN should pursue 2001 implementation, depending on the outcome of that analysis. I think that is a good thing. And Kaveh's point. We do have two, I believe, members from SSAC, Don and Jeff. I believe they're SSAC appointees.

And it's probably actually a good point to have a discussion about that. There should be [inaudible] responsibility for members that are appointed from each of the [SICs] to do some form of reporting back to their groups as they progress. I know we have [inaudible] anywhere on the paper the responsibility, but I think that comes with the territory, and for the specific review.

We need to make sure that we have, you know… I know [inaudible] ourselves to be reporting back to our community, as we progress on the big topic items.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          Thank you, James. I have Alain and then Kaveh.


ALAIN PATRICK AINA:       Yes. I think, what the conclusion of James's [inaudible] the questions I had in my mind for a long time. So, are we [inaudible]… because [inaudible]… For me, I don't see Kaveh as [inaudible], I see [inaudible] for example, as an individual participating in SSR2, who have been appointed by the Board.

Am I correct? Because if we start reporting to the community, to our constituency, we need to agree what we report back, how we engage, etc. So, we also need to be careful, and maybe let us have clear

understanding of what we are doing. [Inaudible] when we talk here, [inaudible] report back we don't because…

I just want to know exactly if [inaudible] as a representative of SSAC, okay, to be our [inaudible] to SSAC, or chair of the SSR2 [inaudible] SSAC, for example. So, I don't know if you could factor [inaudible] as I'm continuing with my other point.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. We seem to be wanting to discuss outreach and communication with different communities, and both within and outside of ICANN. And that's fine, I'd like to do that. What I would like to do is to actually have some closure on the way forward on our sub-team work, because what we seem to…

What I'm hearing, is that we had agreed in Madrid what we were doing. We spent two days going through a list of items that we agreed to. Our next steps were to develop, you know, to duplicate what we had agreed and get a work plan and timeline. That is still in progress for many of the things. And then, at some point, we're going to have to stop our meta discussions and actually do some work.

And I would like us to focus our discussions now on overcoming those barriers to getting us really started in the sub-team. And then we have a vital conversation to have, about outreach, and our interplay with the different community members, and also our roles as individuals. I see this is a different discussion, which is vital to have, but not the discussion we're having now. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:     No, I'm finished.  Okay.  So, if you're not having that discussion, then I guess I'll drop it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay.  Can we go back to the discussions on the work plan scope and timeline…

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     I'm still speaking.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Oh, I'm sorry, Alain.  I thought your hand had gone down.  Apologies, please go ahead.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     I think we can end, I apologize [inaudible]…  I do think [inaudible] relevant to the topic of [inaudible], we're talking about ICANN security. So, I do think that setting terms of reference and liaising with SSAC is very important of what we are doing here, and I've send a mail about when, and I put a question, [inaudible] interaction with SSAC.

In fact, I think this community is relevant to subtopic because I think in terms of security and stability from ICANN, ICANN community [inaudible].

| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | I think that that's a very relevant question, Alain. And perhaps something that we could think about when we're creating the agenda for Johannesburg. Now, the Johannesburg is short, and it's a particular type of meeting I haven't quite got my head around in the ICANN agenda where you are or aren't allowed to do various things. |
| --- | --- |
| | But obviously, the ICANN meetings do represent an opportunity to meet with, and give briefings to, our perceptions of the community. And this is all vital work that we must do. We must not, in any way, appear to be secretive, even if we have worries about speaking on behalf, or seemingly to speak on behalf of the group. |
| | I think my own personal take on this, is to say, well, members of the… We are here as individuals, but also we are connected with our different communities. We should definitely keep them updated, but be clear of when we're not speaking on behalf of the group, or speaking in a personal capacity. |
| | Could I just get us to focus on this point of gap analysis versus audit? Zarko, please go ahead. Zarko, I think you're still on mute. |
| ZARKO KECIC: | Yeah, I hope you can hear me now. |
| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | Yes, I can hear you beautifully now. |

ZARKO KECIC:                    Okay.  I have two points over here.  Just to say to Kaveh, to be on one topic, SSAC as [a body?] that we could connect with, we are still struggling with our scope of work, and we are still struggling in setting up our teams.  And that's something, if SSAC can help us with, it would be nice meeting in Johannesburg, or even before.

We have one meeting before Johannesburg, so we can call somebody from SSAC to clarify some things.  And I wanted to add to ICANN security framework and our sub-topic.  What [inaudible] did was a comprehensive list of gap analysis from ISOC and 7000 to one, and 2300 to one.

And the beauty of this is should not be applied to all operations throughout ICANN, which is focused on security and stability, and [inaudible] of unique identifiers operations.  So, we can apply those gap analysis to what is the scope, initial scope, of this working group.  And another thing that I want to raise the last time.

I think our approach of meeting sub-teams connected to entire subgroup, is something which will lead us to a lot of hassle, because what we need is to have team, which will be able to fulfill those tasks, not a group, I want to work on this, and that's it.  There is a few times that we should come up with our skills, our skills and what we want to do, and we provide small tasks to those people who want to do that.

I tried to do that with SSR1, recommendations review, and probably did the same thing with ICANN situated stuff, so we should do that with other stuff or topics, and continue work on that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   Thank you very much, Zarko.  There is quite a lot of activity going on in the chat room.  And also, I have some input when we come back to talking about outreach.  Okay, and a little bit struggling about how we move forward on scope work plan and timeline.

Now, my understanding was that we had agreed our scope, that we had done some really excellent work in Madrid, in identifying tasks that fell into the various five buckets that have now become subgroups or sub-teams, and that we are moving forward on a work plan and timeline, but we still have some major issues.

And my sense from the discussions that I'm hearing this morning is that we seem to be going back in time slightly, to a time before we had actually done these things, and they seem to be restarting or reopening some of those issues, if I understand it.  And that's not a comment to anybody personally.

So, it would be very helpful to hear proposals about how we move forward.  I have James and then Zarko.


JAMES GANNON:   Thanks.  So, if I could make a suggestion, I don't believe we've put into the requirements that the work plans all to be approved by the plenary.  So, let's just…  Putting aside the ICANN security piece, the other sub-teams that are able to get [inaudible] quicker, can we agree that, you know, that is the piece of the work, so that we can actually start making some progress?

Because I'd know I'd want to kick-off the IANA transition stuff with a small team. I think we know what we need to do, and I would like to just start that. At least then, we could start moving some of these teams forward, and the ones that need to have a discussion, then, you know, that can happen over a longer period of time.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, could I just check that I understood what you are proposing, James? You're just saying, can we have a general agreement that any sub-teams that are ready to go can just get cracking? And can move forward. You know, it shouldn't be a surprise that perhaps the more substantive and substantial areas of inquiry, do need more work on scoping and timing.

Have I understood that correctly? James?

JAMES GANNON: Yeah, exactly, so that the ones that are smaller and are already well-defined can go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Anybody object to that proposal? Does anybody want me to repeat it?

Okay. I'd like to record that as something that we've agreed. If I may, staff, that the individual sub-teams are free to progress their work. They don't need anything further from the group as a whole. So, if they're ready to move forward, please do so and keep the plenary team informed.

Zarko, thank you for waiting patiently. Please, go ahead with your comment.

I think you're still on mute.

ZARKO KECIC: Yes. I would like to clarify my point, what I'm trying to say. Okay, we have some teams, and in proposing one of previous meetings, to have sub-task leader. And we've been [inaudible] on that. But that put me really good to have sub-task leader who will engage other people from subgroups to move forward and to [inaudible].

And I didn't say that we should go back, okay, we have sub-teams. Some sub-teams have three or four people, and some have more of that. May be there is more work, or people are more interested in that sub-topic. But what we should do is breakup sub-topics into tasks, and see who will do exact tasks within sub-group.

So, I'm not saying, for example, I selected myself to two working groups, sub-topics, but it doesn't mean that I'm not interested in, let's say, IANA transition, and know what we are going to do there, because we should break that in some work plan. But for example, after [inaudible] presentation in Madrid, I'm really worried how he sees operational tasks of IANA, to go forward, especially for example, a change of operator, of TLD.

That's really scary to me.

| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | Yeah, thank you for that clarification, Zarko.  I think that we have, we certainly have a call out for rapporteurs for each of the sub-teams.  To be completely clear, Zarko, I personally share your concerns about such a small group breaking into such a large number of sub-teams, but we have made those points to the group as a whole, and the majority, I would say, and the feeling within the group is no, we want to work in this way. |
|---|---|

So, let's do our best, and work within those sub-teams in a constructive way, as I know that you will.  I think that your comment about, you know, actually drilling down to the individual tasks and assigning individuals to them, is a very good one.  Also, bear in mind, the discussions that we have in Madrid, to hire in help.

I think that there is a definite piece, which I think Denise, Kathy, and James are working on a statement of work to describe the help that we think that we need.  So, we've just asked for the half hour.  We've got half an hour left in our discussions.  So, we've agreed together that the subgroups can just get on with their work and keep moving, come back to the team, larger team with progress reports, and with any requests that you need help with.

There seem to be an appetite to discuss…  We've got open actions on the next few slides, I think we'll whip through them.  We've got the Johannesburg meeting, and we've got AOB.  There seems to be a big appetite to discuss our outreach.  So, Zarko, do you wish to still take the microphone?  I see your hand up.

Okay. Can we go through the open action items and have people…? We don't need to go into detail, but it would be nice to have an update from people who own those action items, and let us know when to expect the actions to be completed.

So, the first one is, those questions that we were asking the SSR technical community, also the global stakeholder engagement team, last week, Steve and Karen, who would like to go first?

STEVE CONTE:                Karen can go, that's good.

KAREN MULBERRY:        Okay, thank you. I just wanted to point out question number three, regarding the [inaudible] that Jeff Houston asked. We've done some internal checking to try and answer that question for you, however it seems that the way the question is phrased, it's out of the mandate for the review team.

So, we were wondering if maybe you could rephrase the question and re-ask it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Well, it's a bit difficult because Jeff isn't on the call. Could you…? I mean, this is getting a bit [inaudible] here. How about if I ask the bureaucracy to rephrase the question in the way that it would like to answer it, and give us an answer that it feels able to answer? And then

we could go back to Jeff and ask if he feels satisfied with that. Would that be a way forward?

KAREN MULBERRY:     If that's your preference, then if you give us license to restate the question, we can proceed in an immediate fashion.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Well, restate the question that you're going to answer, and if the answer is you're not going to answer that question, then say so, and then we can review the answer.

KAREN MULBERRY:     Okay, we can do that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay. Steve, did you want to take the mic?

STEVE CONTE:     Yeah, thank you. Just wanted to address the other points. I've been in contact with [inaudible] and Patrick, and they're working on responses to the questions. I don't have a date yet. I know there are a couple of things going on, including a retreat week for the [inaudible] of the CTO group, which includes [IBL?] and not Patrick, so we're working on the pieces of them.

And I'm hoping that we can, you know, get you a date of when the questions will be answered by the end of the answers, or actually the questions answered by the end of next week. That's what I'm shooting for right now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Great. So, we're looking at the end of next week for answers, and you'll keep us informed if that date slips.

STEVE CONTE: Yes, exactly, with the caveat being, and with Karen's statement about number three, working on the different phrasing of that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. I think as long as it's clear how you've rephrased that question and then you have your answer, then we can then review that. We obviously don't want to be out of scope, but if there was a query about the L root operations and hosting, please give us the information that you do feel able to answer.

So, can we note that due date as the end of the next week, whatever date that is?

STEVE CONTE: It's just before we hit…

| | |
|---|---|
| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | The 23rd.  Okay.  So, if we go for the 23rd on that one.  Thank you Steve and Karen.  Okay, so, the next one is down to us, which is sharing thoughts and continued discussion regarding presentation of ICANN security and SSR1 sub-topic work plans.  How is that going? |
| | I may have missed it, but I didn't see any discussion on the list.  Has there been any discussion?  Okay.  Well, can we put a due date of, again, end of next week, the 23rd for that to be done?  And to start as soon as possible. |
| | Okay.  We've got sharing thoughts on the list about how to be more observer input.  There was a good discussion on that, and it seemed to be that we say that we are, is that right?  James, you were part of that discussion, and I think also Don was, but he's not on the call.  James? |
| JAMES GANNON: | Thanks.  Yes, I don't [inaudible] as you know, [inaudible] but I think, you know, [inaudible] to use the phrase, [inaudible] on what we can change and what we can't, I think it's important that we do keep a really strong [inaudible] between observers and members, and the bylaws essentially require us to do that. |
| | But within that, I'm happy to look at, you know, what can we do to be more creatively involve observers in a better way, but with regards to speaking rights and posting rights, I feel like we are slightly constrained by, you know, the fact that these [inaudible] as specific reviews were constructed in a very specific way, with a very… |

We argue for weeks over the number of members, and all of these type of things. I think it's important that we can keep that differentiation, it's important point in the construction of these specific review teams.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I have a question for those on the call about that. And thanks for that background, James, from your experience of being involved in the bylaws drafting, and Yvette has noted that we do have two observers in the observer room, very welcome. Now, how would people feel about giving observers the right to make points, to raise their hands in these calls, and to contribute to the discussion?

Or, you know, I don't see that as the same thing in being involved in making decisions, or even if we ever voted on voting, but being part of the discussions and contributing, does anybody object to that?

Kaveh, please go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, my personal opinion, I think it's a bad form because… In cases it's just to comment, it's fine, but it might be a question, or it might be back and forth, and the person who is not part of the team but was part of the discussion, might end up being disappointed. And then thinks… It might just be bad PR for us at the end.

Our input channels are always open so they can listen in. We have open email addresses and all of that, so they can always send us comments, requests, or things like that, but I think it's better to keep the

interaction on that level, instead of adding additional voices to the meetings, especially because it's also time constraint in some cases.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:            Thank you for that.  Does anybody have a different point of view?

Karen, my apologies, you have your hand raised.  Is that…?  Are you asking for the mic?

Okay.  So, I'm hearing quite a clear point of view from James and from Kaveh that, while we welcome observers, you know, if you like, [inaudible] on the call, and I think that Kaveh also made a very valuable point about the time constraints of these meetings.  With 42 minutes past the hour, that's one issue.

Do we feel like we are being open enough for third-party input from our observers?  Are we making it easy enough for people to make contributions?

Anybody?

Okay.  [CROSSTALK]  Sorry, I just Alain, I'm getting a clear perspective from yourself and James, you know, to be welcoming to observers, to continue to use the channels that we have, but a discomfort with a sort of bringing observers further into the group, which I completely respect.

I was asking one, whether there was a point of view that we should surface now, and I don't hear any.  But also, my question to the group is, you know, are we making it easy enough for observers to join?  And are we comfortable with where we are at the moment?  James.

JAMES GANNON: Sorry, I was on mute. I'm just going to put something into the chat. So, everybody should be looking at this [inaudible] as well, so that is the conduit, I suppose, for observers to input more details, and you know, maybe come into our work.

There is a mailing list there that we can all either be checking, or be subscribed to, or whichever way people want to do that, like there is a conduit there that we should be keeping our eyes on, and I'm sure there is that part as well, but we as members should be as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks for that. Okay. Okay, I'm going to… I'm going to mark this as complete, because we've had the discussion and we've had the thoughts, and we're not really, we're not going to make changes at this time.

The next one is, consolidated items, create subheadings for group topics within volunteer groups. That's to be done by the 30th of May, which is now in the past. We actually made some pretty good progress on that. I would say that's still in progress. Does anybody have an updated due date for that? That we should put in?

Okay. Hearing nothing, I'm going to, again, put next Friday the 23rd of June on that. We've got drafting, work plan with key dates and circulate to review teams for input. That's down to the co-chairs, James and [inaudible].

I've seen a work plan from [inaudible], relating to one of the sub-topics, but otherwise, we're not ready to go on that. James? Any due date to…?

JAMES GANNON:    I have one for IANA. Yes, [inaudible] by Friday, I just want to circulate to the IANA sub-team members first, and so may be Johannesburg for this? I can [inaudible] work plans finalized by Johannesburg. [Inaudible] date.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Okay. So, that's the 23rd, if we get it done by the 23rd, we're good, aren't we? That we've set up then for the Johannesburg meeting, that would be good. Okay, outreach and engagement. We had a good discussion, which I thought closed, on outreach and engagement. I think that there are many ideas and people wanting to contribute those.

Again, please surface those ideas. Could I ask somebody from staff to start a thread on that and capture, from the chat, the discussions around outreach, and also from the discussions that we've had today and get that going? Because that's a very important aspect of our work.

We must be open and engaged with the community that we're serving on this topic. I'm hearing an awful lot of worries that are quite right, about well, you know, to do outreach, we need to have something to outreach with. We need to have decisions that we've made. We have decided on our scope of work.

We have made progress in, and in forming those subgroups and identifying tasks. We actually have got quite a lot to communicate. And I guess, so, I would encourage everybody to continue these discussions because we're short of time, but perhaps again, let's put the 23rd of June on that as something that we'd like to surface the ideas on the list for, and please we could take a few minutes now, if anybody wanted to add anything on outreach.

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands on that. So, could we put in the date of the 23rd of June, and get cracking… Alain, sorry, please go ahead.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     Yes, okay. I have a question or comment about… While we are talking about outreach, I think we also need to refine the [inaudible]… For me, I don't see that [inaudible] seem to be part of like, no matter [inaudible] like we did with the staff. So, we also need to define what we call outreach, not [inaudible] the general outreach, okay?

With people we have to interact with to get it done, or to [inaudible]. So, we may need some definition or clarification [inaudible]… Talking to SSAC or me is not a normal outreach forever.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay, thanks for that. I think that it is important to all agree what we mean by outreach. From my personal perspective, talking to others, even if it's informally, or a necessary part of work, I would view as part of outreach and engagement. But I don't know. Does anybody else have any input on that?

I think your comment, Alain, highlights that part of that discussion on the list, and I'd also like to say thank you to your personally, Alain, for your contributions on your list, and your efforts to get discussions going in the last week or two, which is much appreciated.

I think that, you know, these are all aspects that we should be surfacing, particularly our assumptions about, you know, Alain, you're saying, I don't regard that as outreach, but I do regard it as something that we should be doing, i.e. talking to SSAC, talking to perhaps other groups within the ICANN community and beyond.

So, we did have a discussion on that, and so perhaps we can revisit that, and get that going again.  Karen, this is probably a good moment to say that Karen has just, a few moments ago, informed me that actually the Johannesburg meeting itself is a very constrained one.  It's a short one, and the leadership of the various supporting organizations and advisory committees, have already turned down other requests for meetings from other groups.

It's not that kind of meeting.  So, when we're thinking about actual meetings, face to face, then we should be thinking about the meeting in October, but that doesn't mean we have to wait until then to start the outreach, and perhaps this is a topic that we can revisit when we're face to face, or try to conclude on when we're face to face in Johannesburg.

Which brings me on to the next thing, sharing topic.  I though, from the list, regarding Johannesburg and agenda item, I didn't really see very much on that, and so, I spoke with Denise yesterday, who is not on the

call, but she has offered to pop out a strawman onto the list, agenda that we can then interact with.

So, and that takes up the next action item. Draft note and summary of SSR one implementation for ICANN to send into SSR one team member, invite them to share their assessment with the SSR2 team. I don't have Denise on the call, I haven't seen that. So, we can park that.

So, now, schedule remainder of briefings related to SSR1. This is something that we've been talking, as the co-chairs, with staff about, in terms of the Johannesburg meeting, and could I just ask whether there is any objection to trying to get some of these briefings onto the agenda in Johannesburg?

Okay. I don't see any objection to that. Karen, thank you, please go ahead.


KAREN MULBERRY:    Yes, I just wanted to provide an update for the review team. I have been working to arrange the remaining SSR1 briefing. We have created a Google Doc for you, that outlines the remainder of the briefings that have been asked for. As you well note, when you look at the document, you'll see there is a blank where a schedule will be put in place.

We're working with people right now to line up the experts who can come and participate in your meeting. We have to line up their schedules, and a lot of them, if not all of them, are focused on Johannesburg at the moment. So, it has been a little challenging to try and make sure that we get all of these lined up, but I just wanted to let

you know that we are working, and if it's all, at all possible, we will see what additional updates we can provide for the review team on SSR1 implementation in Johannesburg.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     That would be great.  Yeah, let's just try to get people in the room in Johannesburg who can speak to those items.  Thank you for the update, Karen, so we'll just keep going for that.  And perhaps we could pop the due date as, you know, prior to Johannesburg, the 23$^{rd}$ of June, that we're now putting everywhere.

And also, do you have an update, while you're on the mic, on how we're doing with relevant articles that's still in the future on threat litigation and [inaudible] of threats?  Steve.

STEVE CONTE:     Thank you.  Yeah, that one is my teams, office of [inaudible], and I think the person that was asked too was Dave [inaudible], who has been travelling and doing training.  So, I'm tracking that one to get back on his radar to release those, or to provide some links.

And then if [CROSSTALK]…

While I'm still on the mic, ITHI, which will be coming up, I think, on the next page, I'm also…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay.

STEVE CONTE:  Also tracking that one [CROSSTALK] and will ping Alain again, Alain [inaudible], not Alain Aina, to see if they have any update on that one as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:  Okay, thank you very much for that. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:  I just wanted to say, quickly, to add an action item, because Board is, we are preparing a reply to the term of reference, just for information, and we will send it to you probably next week, but send it before Johannesburg takes place. So, you will receive that, and I think it's good to track here just for the sake of completeness.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:  Thank you very much for that, Kaveh. Please could staff add that as an action item? I'm going to just, Steve, give us an update on those ICANN Org action items on this list. I think, James, you [inaudible] something on the non-disclosure form, and we've got a draft statement [inaudible] specialist technical writer, I spoke with, Denise, yesterday.

And with staff, and we are moving forward with that. So, we're trying to get that done as quickly as possible. Okay. So, this is where we are for Johannesburg. Please note that the meetings will be held on Tuesday in two separate rooms. Kaveh, were you asking for the mic again?

Okay. Got it. Just trying to whip through and get to AOB with two minutes, because James wanted to raise an AOB. Did you as well, Kaveh?

Okay, James, go ahead with your any other business.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. [Inaudible] here. So, please forgive. [Inaudible] for everybody and [inaudible]… this morning [inaudible]… I think it's truly disappointing, that we only have six members on this call. And I think it's something that we need to have a discussion about, and I think it's something that I would like us to put on the agenda for Johannesburg, because we've had, two months now, of the team being formed.

We have had numerous discussions on the list, we have, you know, as evidenced by today's call, some quite poor attendance figures. And I'm really starting to get concerned about our ability to deliver on the timelines that we have promised to the Board, if we continue to have a level of engagement from the team at this level.

You know, there is always bad time for everybody. There is always, one or two meetings [inaudible], but to be honest, six person a 15-person team showing up to call is, I have to say, very, very poor and it's very disappointing. I think it's something that we need to have a very serious discussion about.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, James. I've got two other people in one minute, but a very quick one. It might also be the scheduling, because it is, nobody from

North America on the call, and we have four members from the team from, at least four members of the team from North America or based there.

So, perhaps that's something that we can also address the scheduling. Kaveh and then Alain. Very, very quickly, because we are absolutely out of time.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, first of all, we have observers from North America now, but yes, I fully echo what James said, and just for your information, this also was brought up in the discussions with the Board. So, Board is also, [inaudible], although not in this call, but in general, because we know that [inaudible].

So, if you observe in chat, I've asked staff to please compile a detailed list of attendance per attendee. So, we have it public like many other groups that do that. This shows, from the very beginning, who attended each meeting, who sent apologies, and all of this. We have many things like that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Alain.

Alain, you're on mute. Thank you, go ahead.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:    Yes, okay, I plus one for Kaveh and James, especially that we know, we didn't get apologies from some of the team members, I don't think. But I also want to put on the table that, at some point, we need to start now [inaudible] information collecting, information to going to, collecting the data we need for work.

For example, I think we're talking about this health indicator. The health indicator for [inaudible] the project, and we have heard about it, but there is nothing going on [inaudible] project. So, we need to prioritize. Let me put it like that, we need to prioritize what is going on. [Inaudible] about the project, so I don't think we should spend more time on project, on [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Okay, thank you. Thank you for that, Alain. I'm going to draw this meeting to a close, but just to summarize those very strong AOB comments, thank you for raising those. It's difficult to raise controversial issues, but I thank you for it.

Perhaps, Alain, we can move from talking about information gathering, to information gathering, to information analysis, to writing up. We are still at the stage where we are talking about how we are arranging our work. I think a lot of the…

Just for clarity, this timeslot, which is 6 AM UTC, was actually put in place for our participants from Australia. And so, it may be that when we review the attendance, we also go look at the attendance on each of the call slots that we have, maybe consolidate under those.

But thank you all for your input. Sorry for going over the time. And look forward to discussions on the list.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**