Eric Osterweil:

Okay, so it sounds like the agenda is a little bit different then it was a while ago but not a lot. I think we wanted to start off since David Conrad sent stuff to Jonas this morning to discuss some of the issues that came up with the [inaudible] report about our terms of reference, and we'll sort of take that as far as we need to take it, at which point, I think the plan was currently to break out into subgroups.

I understand that some of the subgroups met yesterday, and so maybe when we get to that point, we'll see which subgroups do or don't feel like they need to meet, which is nice because there was a lot of overlap of memberships so maybe this will actually split things up.

And then, after that, the agenda talked about having us talk about our scope of work and project management [inaudible]. I think at that point, we will just see where people are at and freeform an agenda will fit because I think at this point we need to identify rapporteurs for subgroups. We have a number of items that we need to actually make progress on, so I think it might be that we'll sort of [inaudible] and reference some eventual progress. So does anybody want to bash the agenda in any particular direction before we get started? That sounds good? That's hard to [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL:

Sounds good.

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.

ERIC OSTERWEIL   First time for everything. Okay, cool. So let's get started with the letter
                        we received from the board about our terms of reference.   Has
                        everyone at least got a copy of that, whether you read it or not? Has
                        anyone not gotten a copy of that?   Does not know what I'm talking
                        about?

DENISE MICHEL: It's on the email list.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, it is. Making sure people -- okay, great. Has anybody not read
                        that?   That's one too many.   Alright, good.   So now everyone is
                        obligated to act as though you've read that. I think at this point what
                        we would like to [inaudible] a little bit more is what's sort of the
                        motivation from the board's perspective was. [Inaudible], I don't know
                        if you could, speaking as the liaison to the board, but some telemetry on
                        where that came from. I mean certainly we've read the text, but is
                        there any sort of background or anything that you can share with us?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So first of all, this is the first of the [inaudible] and we came to the final
                        point that we talked about [inaudible]. In order to get there, we talked
                        [inaudible] that the end result might be something that would
                        [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. So that's a good primer to have. Before I say anything myself, I'd like to make sure there's no one that has any comments or have anything they want to weigh in on before I jump on. James, first start with you.

JAMES GANNON: Thank you. So I want to be careful about how I kick of this because I understand and agree in part on the responsibility of the board to protect the organization with regards to financial, you know, scope mission. There are definite [inaudible].

But I think that there's a very fine line, I won't say constraining in duty, whilst being guiding that's going to be something that [inaudible] is a line we need to tread very carefully because while I don't ever want us to get into a situation at all is more times [inaudible] because the fact that the [inaudible] who was hardly involved whereas now it is between the community and the organization.

And the community is empowered by the bylaws [inaudible] to perform a thorough investiture to the community separate. Even though the board is extremely important helping us understand [inaudible], we're not going to accomplish the recommendations that are [inaudible]. You know, I think we're all okay about that, but what I'm less comfortable about is the -- well, it's almost like an invitation [inaudible] and I think we can look into it, is that "You need to do what we expect you to do", and that's something that I don't like.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So first of all on the staff side, [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Stop. Obviously there is a need for a translator. [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: [Participant speaking in a different language]   We can discuss a lot about differences of [inaudible] and it's not super clear [inaudible] that's why it started [inaudible], if we wanted and we need a board for getting aide. They seek commendable [inaudible] all in the budget for us, but [inaudible] is so low and the cost is so high that we are supposed to look at this thing [inaudible] cost organization $15 million to implement and it's really low priority [inaudible]. We are not free to recommend the organization do that for us. We don't want to end up there so that's why we said [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Before we move on, let's give you a change to response.

JAMES GANNON: No, I'll come back up.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. So there's a number of points that are addressed in this letter. If we want to have further dialogue about it, can you give us a

sense of like who drafted the letter, which board members are involved?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So [inaudible] so important, the mechanism [inaudible] this is the first time that the board also [inaudible]. But after dealing [inaudible]. So what we're doing right now, what we decided [inaudible]. The board members who are interested in this [inaudible]. We had this caucus [inaudible]. With that caucus basically came off the decision that [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: So could you email us who was on the caucus?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I can but I don't think that would be [inaudible] for the board [inaudible] because, as I said, this was just when I was working the board would support them then behind us.

DENISE MICHEL: I think for accountability and transparency it would be a good thing to do. I think the board should provide the public, the review members, the caucuses that are most directly involved with the review team. I think as our work evolves, I think that would be useful.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I will propose that [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: So a couple of points that I think would be useful to address. One relates to the terms of reference and one relates to the definition, I think, and then sort of the working relationship. So obviously we have new bylaws, but these reviews are fundamentally the same as they have been for several years. The board and ICANN has gone through two ATRT reviews, one SSR1 review, one UV1 review. We have an SSR2 review that was delayed for well over six months before it started. We have a CCT review in process. This isn't a surprise.

But I was surprised but in a good way that the board has now asked the staff to provide a more robust in terms of reference template. So it raises the question of "Why wasn't this done sooner?" When, as a team member I think you'll recall that, we asked staff for appropriate templates. We were given the CCT review template that apparently the board didn't have any issues with. We have followed that template quite faithfully.

So I have a question to the, why is the board sort of coming late to the party about in terms of reference template? I think it is a good thing to do having more professional support for these volunteer teams by you know people who are experienced in doing audits, assessments, and reviews in a professional template that apparently will meet the board's needs is something that you would expect to have before you start the review. And as a member of the review team, I'm assuming you told the board and the caucus that this review team that you are a part of is following the template that is was provided. Right? Okay.

EN

So I think as a question the staff would like to know, when this new improved template will be provided. It will likely will be too late to factor into our work, since we have so much work to do and a work plan to roll out. The other issue that I'm particularly interested in discussing here is the definition. I know of security. So the review team used the long standing definition of security that has been in place in ICANN for about six years. I know as a SSR2 team member, you didn't like that definition and wanted to change it. So the majority consensus view was to use the well-established definitions.

And these definitions, I don't know if you know, and we're part of the framework that's been in place for I think almost six years, a framework that was developed by first getting input from inside the ICANN community, getting input from outside the ICANN community, publishing a draft, getting comments on it, publishing final.

And essentially following that process every year, it's a lot of public comment and discussion on the framework. It strikes me very odd that then the board seems to be asking the review team to apply a different definition to the security definition and then asking the review team to unilaterally redefine security. That strikes me as a process that isn't particularly accountable or transparent, and also runs counter to the security framework that forms the basis for the operation and budget for all of ICANN's SSR work. Can you unpack that a little bit for us?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think, first of all, you're the second one I've talked to [inaudible]. The Board is not asking, we're merely suggesting, not asking. And these are suggestions. We

can choose between [inaudible]. And the reason that why they think it's better to revise that and it might have been useful for many, many years, but [inaudible] is basically that the current definition is very board and basically any issues [inaudible] any identified can be categorized under the [inaudible].

And we think that that doesn't count because when you review the [inaudible], if you fall back to this review, it's like the discussion we had for [inaudible]. It can be very broad and the end result can be, how do say, unlimited and costly to the ICANN organization, which then the board will have to say no to that [inaudible]. The team might say, "Oh, we have a good understanding of what ICANN does so we don't think that this factor corrupts." That's an answer I can pay back [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: And so did you discuss with staff the request that this review team unilaterally rewrite the definition of security that is used by ICANN?

KAVEH RANJBAR: It is not unilaterally. I think you're framing it the wrong way because it is not the team unilaterally redefining security. It is just for the purpose of this review, you have a definition of security. It is for the purpose of this review, and that's what the team decides. As I said, you can keep using the terms you have for definition but the risk here is the end result is wider then [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL:

So I think it would be good to get David's input on this. Speaking personally, I think it is a specious statement to say for example that we

could get into copyright infringement when our mission as a review team is tightly bound by ICANN mission at the bylaws. And the bylaws go so far as to specifically state that copyright is not within ICANN's mission. I mean, it actually spells that out in the bylaws, and so to suggest that the long-standing definition of security that ICANN itself uses is too board and will get us into copyright infringement just seems a bit nonsensical.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Let me give you another example of copyright. We've got the bylaws in some parts refers to DNS [inaudible]. Our current definition [inaudible], and again I don't know why you fall back to trying to definite security for the full ICANN Organization [inaudible]. That's all.

DENISE MICHEL:

Right. I see your point, but at the same time though there is a -- you know, the recommendation is ultimately that this review team issues recommendations that the ICANN organization presumably will implement.

So we will have potentially broad impact on the organization, which is part of my concern for this suggestion that the team that according to the board is perhaps behind schedule or not prioritizing as it should seems to indicate that it wants us to set aside our work down and dive into redefining security, and I think that is sort of a separate discussion and one that is misguided and not needed given the huge workload the team has.

EN

David, could you give us the staff's involvement in this and your understanding of the security definition that your teams are based on?

DAVID CONRAD: So, I think this probably isn't related, this is relevant to the SSR2 review, not necessarily about activities of my team unless there is a recommendation by the SSR2 team so of the security aspects of SSR to be redefined [inaudible].

So I think staff's view upon this is, part of activity relevant to security given all the things [inaudible] is supposed to do, it would probably make sense to try to limit scope where appropriate. I don't think there was an attempt to redefine, my impression, the board members involvement putting together [inaudible] redefining security in the context of ICANN as a whole, but I do suggest other [inaudible] limit scope.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, one last question [inaudible], Indulge me, and I'll give the floor. I guess I'm confused as to why the current security definition is not very broad, overly broad, for the OCTO security team, but is overly broad for the review team.

DAVID CONRAD: It may be that the situation that we face is we went through a transition that revised ICANN's essentially operating principles to be much more tightly aligned with its specific agreement associated with a very limited

set of activities; whereas, the previous bylaws were more open to allow ICANN to delve into other areas.

So my impression was that part of this was to align the SSR review with the new bylaws, and as a [inaudible] it may that one of the recommendations of the review team is that the community should reopen the discussion associated with [inaudible], tighten it up to correspond more appropriately with the new ICANN bylaws.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, that's important news to have.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Well, [inaudible].

JAMES GANNON: I'm going to let Don go first.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Okay. Well, so long as we're on the subject of security, we [inaudible] decision make. It looks to me like what the review team has to do is [inaudible]. Somebody as the chair [inaudible], we are not voting. We've got to make a decision. I don't see how we can [inaudible] unless we have a different standard [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: [inaudible] we have to make a decision [inaudible]. What helps us to make a decision or not [inaudible] that's fair policy, and that's not needed in the decision making for this process.

DON BLUMENTHAL: I'm just having trouble with [inaudible]. You don't specify the number of people.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Not really. [inaudible] Go for it. [inaudible]

DON BLUMENTHAL: I don't understand [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: From the board's side of view, what we thought, we have to make a responsible [inaudible]. We have to make it [inaudible]. The decisions that [inaudible] we have direct financial [inaudible], and we want to be responsible and be able to [[inaudible]]. I mean, we have make this there's minorities who want to be able to defend that. Why have one person [inaudible]. So that's [inaudible]. I think if this same thing [inaudible].

JAMES GANNON: So a couple of different points, first of all, I will basically agree with all of you. Minority is, particularly on a team this small, it's anybody who -- I would foresee in our specific circle of friends here as someone who

EN

disagrees on the recommendation and wants to put out their position on why they're disagreeing with that recommendation and if that is one person, then that is a minority group, and I will 100% go behind Don on those numbers. That's not how we work. [CROSSTALK]

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, that's fair enough. That's a good answer because [inaudible].

JAMES GANNON: So on the security definition piece, I'm kind of torn between two sets of answers. So in some sense, I do agree with there is a new ICANN. There is a new set of mission and core values for ICANN that came out of the accountability work that myself and a number of other people, we've had this discussion even here on SSR2, believe that has tighten ICANN up with regards to content and how this is managed from ICANN's position.

And that's why in concept I can understand why there potentially was an ask there to say, "Well, what do you know mean by, in the new world of ICANN, what does security mean?" I think the way that it was approached was simply not very good because again we come back to the review team sets itself and at the end of the day it's incumbent on all the review team members to not just read but to understand ICANN's mission and core values and the bylaws, and to understand the constraints that places on us.

And that responsible then comes up to the level of team, as a review team—and this is where I think got annoyed to be in it—that when

something comes up that that's involved in that, I feel like that is not our role anymore or that is just not ICANN's role full stop. That' where, I believe, the balancing of this scope is with regards to what is under the new ICANN compared to maybe the old one. I think that's where that needs to take place, rather than a directive from board or staff because it is up to the community to perform that balancing rather than for it to be directed. I think that is a really important distinction.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think there is a subtle difference so ICANN's security mission and ICANN's organizational [inaudible]. They are very different and they cannot be. They shouldn't be. Because ICANN [inaudible]. But that doesn't mean, for example, that everything [inaudible]. ICANN organization shouldn't, and that might [inaudible] is working. ICANN, you need to have your definition of SSR defined [inaudible] whole big problem. So this is my recommendation. But none of this are related to SSR2's definition that they can [inaudible]. And keep in mind, SSR2 is going to review the ICANN organization, not the ICANN -- and for that purpose, you can either fall back to [inaudible]. If you fall back to the ICANN [inaudible] security mission, I think that that scope is too big because the organization's scope should be smaller, and in reality, it isn't small. If the team disagrees [inaudible]. But that was thinking [inaudible].

JAMES GANNON: So I think this is something that we need to have a little chat about. So ICANN organization, the SOs/ACs, its review team, we're all comfortable

EN

with the bylaws. So we are all bound by the same constraints. So I get that you're all bound by the same mission and core values.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, same bylaws, same mission and core values. Yes, that's correct.

JAMES GANNON: [Inaudible] regarding whether we want to or not, whether it's SSAC, whether it's also the review team, or whether it's like the organization can go by the side [inaudible] it's not clearly defined. So I don't understand the position that ICANN organization would have an even narrower scope within that framework being that [inaudible], so that we have good talks of what ICANN [inaudible] do. That is all bound at the same level. ICANN organization doesn't sit at a smaller scope of responsibility within the framework [inaudible].

DAVID CONRAD: For example, RSSAC keeps telling -- like I get that we should work on [inaudible]. [inaudible] is directed at security and stability associated with ICANN [inaudible] and that's still within the scope ICANN bylaws remit, right? But it's not something that ICANN, the organization has a responsibility [inaudible].

JAMES GANNON: Now now, because there's a difference between the responsibility of what ICANN organization does and what it is bound by [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Let's talk [inaudible] the reality of the situation [inaudible], so ICANN [inaudible] and ICANN organization [inaudible]. We're [inaudible] for a very practical reason. Many of those security concerns that SSAC has, the ICANN Organization has no policy over that [inaudible]. I mean, if they want [inaudible]. If they cannot change that [inaudible] is it still within ICANN's framework [inaudible] that the organization cannot do it. These are fundamental issues that the organization [inaudible]. So I don't know how we [inaudible], but I think that's a discussion [inaudible].

JAMES GANNON:

Did it not come back to the core issue of the reframe of security?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

[Inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL:

No, I disagree.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

DENISE MICHEL: You disagree. So you think SSR2 should also tell SSAC what they have to do, it's sort of [inaudible].

I think that, in reading the bylaw mandate for this review team, we can recommend that SSAC look into issue X. That is within our purview.

EN

KAVEH RANJBAR: But not as the ICANN organization [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: And of course, if you look at SSR1, they did indeed recommend actions for a variety of elements of ICANN, including the Board some AC's as well as the staff. It does come through in the letter.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we can talk about this as we did a couple of times in the past. And in terms of a reference, we actually do [inaudible] as we crafted that team, so I think we [inaudible] all this stuff. [Inaudible] sort of relaying the mechanism [inaudible] do you represent the team in a sense, I think we talked about all this. So [inaudible] if we were to be channeled, we'd have answers to all of these things, I think, because we talked about them. In fact, when we worked out a scope in the [inaudible] of reference, [inaudible] and we had back and forth. It was a good sort of [inaudible] input, that was out team input that we wanted to be sure that we had useful observations , useful analysis that we would then digest into recommendations that would be very carefully within the scope and the remit of ICANN. In other words, you know, look properly and then focus clearly at the end.

And we talked about why we would even do that. I mean, that could probably save the [inaudible] meet with other people, unless you want me to do that. But again, we came together to kind of craft that. Like that was sort of the team [inaudible] and I don't think anyone sort of said like, "That's exactly what I thought," because it was a team effort, at least I hope it was.

And so, it's sort of what are we going to do with it because as I look at the letter, the letter seemed to not really ingest that spirit, and I was hoping that since you're both on the Board and on the team, you could sort of represent the team. So, I'm wondering how did that go over when you portrayed it.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think that would basically [inaudible]. The main thing that we have here [inaudible] how we can make it, so how we can measure there are two different measures [inaudible]. One is the [inaudible] the report is very important [inaudible]. That's why the suggestion to actually have [inaudible]. That's one.

The second one [inaudible]. We had an agreement that this scope might be bigger, but the Board will always check back [inaudible] to for permission to make sure that the work was not [inaudible]. That's an agreement framework we had is channeled there. [Inaudible] team decided to not discuss this be [inaudible], but we had an agreement that we would always check everything [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Sure, and if that's the case, let's document it.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

That's fine.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

And I think that our intention has been. And I definitely want to encourage anyone to jump in if I misrepresented it, but I think the

team's perspective is that we are [inaudible], but certainly early optimization could be [inaudible] a lot of evil we're trying to produce sort of a [inaudible] result of the SSR review team. So we want to do some of that basically [inaudible] SSR issues. And to do that, we need to look around broadly. I mean, that was the perspective and I think that's what we're tried to [inaudible] in terms of [inaudible] and for us to say, we're now allowed to look outside at things that we can clearly draw around them as being within the community's [inaudible]. That's a slippery slope from just a measure of perspective.

And so, in measuring our results, it is a product of us actually focusing up on what it is that we need to dive into and choosing how we're going to dive into it. Certainly, it's not [inaudible] for that. We can absolutely do that if we want to, but we can't start off saying, "What we could possibly build a [inaudible] agreement, whatever, without running the risk of missing something very very important that starts with at [inaudible] in the ICANN community and [inaudible] deeply into its remit?"

So that is what we're actually I think trying to do and to be fair, it's taking us a little bit of time to [inaudible] on, but I think we're getting momentum now. I mean, we've got the subtopics identified, we've got most of the rapporteurs [inaudible] and will by end of the day [inaudible]. So, if you're thinking about throwing your hat, you might as well do it now because I'm going to [inaudible] by the end of the day.

But just to sort of finish that up -- well again, I can start [inaudible]. I think you want to jump on that as well.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Two things. First of all because I heard what the [inaudible]. These are all suggestions, so it doesn't matter that [inaudible] because really the caucus that we discussed it was on [inaudible] less constructive. It wasn't really a critical point. But what I get back is like negative words [inaudible] about that. But the whole idea was, let's make sure we have something that we can both probably stand behind [inaudible] yet.

So this whole report is very positive, but that's all we've got. If it's not there, that's [inaudible]. [Inaudible] make sure I see everything and it's fine, but more important [inaudible] spend a lot of time and resources [inaudible]. As I said, that's fine, but let's not [inaudible]. That's what I think matters.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so I'm going to be the bad [inaudible] chair 'cause I've lost track of who's got into the queue. But I will say that, you know, in parting I think this is a really good opportunity to sort of establish the type of points that we need [inaudible] liaisons to make we and stay on track. Because, I mean, just like any ISCBM, once we get closer to our target, we can track our trajectory better. Right now, it's subject to be [inaudible]. [CROSSTALK].

KAVEH RANJBAR: I hope I'm not getting blamed Samantha, you said you had another example [inaudible], so I had something against you [inaudible] if

anything they might be able to just look it, that's all, like this is a possibility that's the maximum. But if you wanted I go to [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sometimes.

DAVID CONRAD: Even beyond.

KAVEH RANJBAR: The board's going. Which is fine, ICANN really needs that, ICANN needs that but that doesn't directly translate to something that organization should and can do. [Inaudible] James?

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, I now need to wrap up this conversation so I wanted to note a few action items to suggest. So one is I guess a clarification or follow up information is the Board asking, does the Board intend to ask the staff and the Community to change the security framework definition of security, I think that is one question. Second, I guess from David's perspective as Managing SSR if you have plans to redefine security and what the timing and process for that is so we factor that information into the securities work. I guess the Board Members of the Caucus that have lead responsibility looking at the SSR Teams work is another action item request and then I guess for Theresa, when will the staff be providing a Terms of Reference in the Operating Standards to aid all review teams? So I think that's question as well.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, just a quick comment on number four that was a condition, it's really not a objective, measureable objectives, they need to respond, there is no need that's in ink. [Inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Sure, so I guess then that question needs to be reframed since the Board has purposed ICANN staff that it provide an template for the Terms of Reference I guess the question is, is the staff going to accept or reject that proposal and if it's going to accept it, when will it be issuing it? Likely it will be too late for this review team but it would be—since the Board has flagged this that I think is an important and relevant question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, James then Catherine.

JAMES GANNON: Two points and first of all I checked, I went back and checked the ALC's level, no reference or ICANN has a whole [inaudible] and second of all I think it's a little bit clearer now what the concerns are. I think methods to solve them in my mind are probably a little but different. I think thus, yes this is a new world for ICANN to an extent. We are touching an area which is relatively sensitive to board, to soft community, what we do and what we don't do, [inaudible] everything else.

Personally, I'd hoped that this would have been resolved through a little bit more collaboration. I would like to flesh out these issues when we

come to them with yourself as support liaison, can bring David in from the Optimum SSR side and that we talk through them and we come to recommendations that everybody agrees on. And in my mind, you know, people might feel free to disagree with me, I'm want recommendations that not just the 15 of us as review team members agree on, I want ones that the Board had looked at and went "yeah, that makes sense".

I want ones that David's team, that Ashley's team, that everybody had gone, "Yes, this is a good thing" because that's what I want the objective of the review team to be. Something not necessarily perfect, but that works for everybody. It works for both as the community on directing where ICANN should go over the next five years from a business perspective. That the Board feels from a corporate point of view, [inaudible] and that we have framed them in such a way that staff know what we are talking about and that staff are able to given the authority and support to do that by the Board.

I think the only way we can do that is by [inaudible] and working together on and I understand where the Board is coming from, this is a formal response to the Terms of Reference, this is formal response from you guys and us. Okay that's in stone. In going forward I'd hope that it can be more of a conversation not sorta you know, "Here's what we are saying" I want it to be more of a collaborative agreement.

KAVEH RANJBAR   I mean, you are completely right and this is what we want. David, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: [inaudible].   They're completely right and this is what you want. [inaudible]. After a few meetings I raised [inaudible] and I was reporting back but I said, "Hey, I need more concrete direction" because my opinion went deeper than this proposal so how do we deal with that and then the response from the caucus took some time but as I said, very positively from all staff if you really want to have a great [inaudible] this is not going to be.

JAMES GANNON: That is the one point that I hope as well that the Board empowers you to engage with us rather than —

KAVEH RANJBAR: They have, they have but this is just, this was basically based on [inaudible] but now we have the mechanism, so I'm personally convinced that they will be no problem going forward. I apologize for not being able to do that – yeah, but this wasn't fair, we did tell the Board we had a lot of those issues.

CATHY HANDLEY: First off, Kaveh, thank you for bringing us in, I know it had to be difficult cause you sat through the conversations that developed this and you knew it was going to be – a bit of a confrontational discussion and David thanks for coming in and spending your time.

To some of what James said, I think it's really unfortunate that we're evening having this conversation. I'm not sure that either SSR2 Team or the Board is – I think we are equally responsible for where we are. I don't think – I kinda like to look to going forward and not focus on everything that happened in the past. Personally, I don't really care if we have the names of the – whatever they are that [inaudible] because you've said repeatedly, "This is a decision of the entire Board" and it may have been drawn up but over the years I've been around long enough to see the Board, when the entire Boards get's something, it may look totally different then what the smaller group came out with.

And to that point, I wanna make sure that when you leave and you respond to the Board we give you the things that we want you to look at. Are they crystal clear? And is there something that you need from us – not just us saying, "Here's the questions we've got, we don't like what we heard, tell us more". I think there's little onus to you to come back to us and say, "Hey, I don't get" and for what it's worth, I think the template thing is great and I think if we maybe would've done this earlier on and shame on us I guess, if it's been around, that that may have helped us in our decisions of trying to get things around because I think we're all in fairly strong agreement that you know, having 30 odd, 30 or 40 odd items under something is just a little ridiculous, it's not gonna happen.

And so anyway, thank you and please contact the team if you got, you know, got questions. Please, you know come back to the team and say, "I don't understand this part," or whatever, so done.

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, cool. I do need to move it along so.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you so much for your time, this has been really helpful. I appreciate it.

DAVID CONRAD: And let me know if I can be of help, my schedule with ICANN meetings seems to be out of control but outside of that, but I can respond on email.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So we're a little ways away from where we have our first break but we also don't need to have to [inaudible] the agenda so at this point based on where the sub team broke out yesterday, how many of the sub teams represented here feel like they would like to meet today? I will go down the list. The SSR1 Team, the ICANN Security Team, the MS Security Team, the Future Team and IN Team. How many of those feel like they need to meet in sub?

JAMES GANNON: I know I do [Inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Anybody else? The ICANN Security Team, Charles Security Team is that is it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: ICANN Security Process, sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: Actually we changed the name. We should reflect that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL   Yeah, he's probably printing stuff out. Okay, but the team formally known as Prince doesn't need to right? Okay. So the ICANN Security, I guess I heard there leaving us today so things get kinda like put into a holding pattern. It seems like, I guess I heard [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: Can you hear me, Eric? Can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: It might not be feasible for all the teams to meet; however in terms of the work that we have this morning, I think a few of the teams need to actually do some rewriting and rephrasing. Need to add additional information under some of the work items that they retained. We need to --

[inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Clarity work plan that we need to complete now-ish, as soon as possible so it'd be worth it if there's enough people here in every sub-topic or at

least sub-topics that are represented to put some more flesh on the bones while we're here face to face.

I just have to note that the team members Broadly, Team Broadly has not been too great, in terms of working on the email list and that's gonna become even more critical as we leave Johannesburg and we don't see each other for four months.

DENISE MICHEL: ICANN -- ICANN SSR Ruth could do [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, so that's three sentences. They're small enough—there may not be much [inaudible].

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION - RECORDING CUT OUT DUE TO TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES]