KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Brenda. Brenda is our Secretariat and will be supporting this Review Team. I think you'll become very familiar with Brenda. She does an amazing job keeping us all connected and things moving so thank you, Brenda.

I'm Karen Mulberry and I wanted to welcome you all and thank you very much for volunteering to be a member of the Registration Directory Services – formerly known as WHOIS2 – Review Team. Here is the proposed agenda I have. Please let me know if there are any changes, suggestions, or additions you would like to add to this to guide the discussion that you will be having. I tried to capture as many elements as I thought might be useful for you as Review Team members to discuss and determine for yourself process, procedure, and become familiar with the group that is going to be supporting the Review Team.

Alright. No comments then I'll move on.

This is to give you a sense of the review process and some of the typical milestones and events that you'll need to consider as you look at your work plan – your Terms of Reference, the Scope of the review – and the different steps that you want to in essence make sure that you have planned for as you move forward. The phase we're in right now is getting the team together, so we're assembling a Review Team and it will give an opportunity for you to become familiar with each other and then you can talk through how you want to actually organize the rest of the steps and the approaches that you want to take for the review itself.

Any questions?

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.

Alright, so moving on here's some of the key things that you need to think about as you start planning your review. You have to elect your leadership. You have to determine the modes of communication. We do have the e-mail list set up of the Review Team members which I used to send out the information and the slide deck yesterday to everyone. That's the e-mail list that we would prefer that you use so that we can archive it and have that available for transparency to the community and to uphold our accountability obligations.

Also we need to talk a little bit about the tools that you might want to use and any kind of checklists you'd like to have developed so that we can put those in place and post those to everyone. There'll be an opportunity to discuss your budget, and each Review Team has a set budget and you can allocate that to whatever fashion you think would be appropriate to assist the work of the Review Team. It includes covering face-to-face meetings, any outside experts and consultants that you'd like to hire, any additional research work you'd like to have done, all comes out of that budget.

And then through that is all of the work that you need to do initially to get the review kicked off so you can actually form the direction and the deep dive that you would like to take as part of this process. Initially it's going to be doing the Terms of Reference and your work plan and how you want to schedule your work out.

To give you some sense of the direction of the review, here is the language from the Bylaws. This provides the framing for what the review can undertake. There again, it's up to the Review Team to determine what the scope of the review will be. There's been a lot of

discussion about limiting the scope, focusing it in different directions, or avoiding any overlap with existing community work. So this is the initial framing from the Bylaws. The rest of it's going to be up to the Review Team to determine what it wants to do and what it wants to focus on for its work.

One thing to note is there was an ICANN Resolution in February of this year to constitute the Review Team to appoint a Board liaison, which is Chris Disspain, and to have an [inaudible] Review Team. We know that the Review Team wasn't formed on May 15th so we'll need to communicate back to the Board asking for an extension and letting them know that the Review Team has been formed and that work will be underway on the Terms of Reference. But this provides some context that the initial assignment will be the Terms of Reference and work plan, and then anything that you want to capture in terms of the scope and the timeline so it's consistent with what's in the Bylaws need to be included in that work and sent back to the Board for their approval.

Just let me know if you have any questions as we go through some of this.

Now this is the actual Review Team portion where I'd like you to go and introduce yourselves to your teammates. I know that we are not in person so that you can actually see each other, but this is the way to start building the team. I've got pictures here of where we could find them so everyone could be familiar with your faces so when we do see each other in person you'll know who's who.

Alan, do you want to kick off with providing some background on yourself and maybe why you're interested in being on the Review Team to help your teammates?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. I'll also talk about Carlton who couldn't be on the call right now.

I've been involved in ICANN for a little over 10 years now and been pretty heavily involved in most of the WHOIS activities that have gone on since then. I probably have as much frustration as anyone as to the direction the things have gone or not gone.

More recently I was a member of ATRT 2 and I was the point person who was responsible for doing the detailed review of the WHOIS Review Team process and recommendations. At that point ATRTs still had a responsibility to do a pretty in-depth review of other Review Teams. That's something it does not do right now or will not be doing in the future but it did. I spent a fair amount of time looking at both the recommendations, the staff implementation of them, and the implementation was just starting at that point. And also related to the – I'll try to be proper – the level of dissatisfaction in members of the WHOIS Review Team as to how the Board responded to and reacted to their recommendations and report compare to how it reacted to other Review Teams.

So I have a fair amount of knowledge of the WHOIS Review Team process last time around and as a result, I have a strong interest in following through the work I started on the ATRT and trying to review how well that work was done. At the same time, I'm a member of the

RDS PDP and I have a strong level of sensitivity that we not try to go in parallel and review the work of that group or predict the outcome of that group and that we restrict our work right now to the Bylaw mandated part that we have to do, that is, review the last Review Team.

Carlton Samuels was a member of the Expert Working Group so he certainly has a pretty in-depth knowledge of WHOIS and as a follow-on to that, because that kind of experience will clearly be useful, he had a desire to be on this team and applied and was endorsed by the ALAC and is later selected by the selectors. I can talk more about him but I'll perhaps wait until he can be on a call and speak for himself. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Alan.

Next we have Dmitry.

Dmitry, if you're speaking we're having difficulty hearing you. Perhaps, Brenda, you can work with Dmitry to help him with his microphone and we can move on and then come back to him?

I know Catherine has sent in her regrets that she would not be able to participate in the call today.

[BRENDA BREWER]:   Dmitry, I believe we can hear you now.

Okay. I am wrong. Apologies.

KAREN MULBERRY:	Okay, Erika. Let's move on with you and then we'll try and come back to Dmitry if we get his connection improved.
	Erika, do you want to introduce yourself?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Erika says she [inaudible] in the chat.
KAREN MULBERRY:	Yes. How about Stephanie. Are you on the call? Do you want to introduce yourself?
ALAN GREENBERG:	I don't see her on Adobe Connect.
CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN:	I don't think Stephanie's on the call either.
KAREN MULBERRY:	No. I don't see her there either.
	Susan?
SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:	Hi. I'm Susan Kawaguchi and I would be happy to speak.
	I sort of live and breathe WHOIS, both in my day job professionally. I recently left Facebook but I spent nine years at e-Bay and eight years at

Facebook in managing the corporate domain name portfolio and working with the Security Team and Brand Enforcement, all of which involved heavy use of the WHOIS records. And so I understand its vital importance and its lack of a WHOIS record would stymie security efforts to protect users, our clients, our customers.

Because of all those reasons I was on the original WHOIS Review Team, various PDPs concerning WHOIS, including currently the RDS. I'm a Vice Chair and I was on the EWG team and the Board GNSO Committee that pushed forward the EWG report for the PDP. So I just do everything WHOIS in my opinion. It's my focal point and I'm happy to participate on this team and agree with Alan that we shouldn't interfere with existing PDPs but I think there's a lot of other WHOIS issues that have arisen in the last year that we can focus on.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Susan.

Volker, you want to introduce yourself?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Thank you. My name is Volker Greimann. I work for Key-Systems which is a large registrar based in Germany. I'm a Veteran of the GNSO Council having served two terms until last year, the last three months of which I co-Chaired the Council. I'm a Veteran of a lot of working groups. I bear the scars of Vertical Integration Working Group. I'm still a member of the Thick WHOIS Working Group. I'm now a member of the new RDS Working Group which is quite an effort that's going on at the

moment and possibly interesting to have an insight when we do our work as well so that we do not conflict or interfere or maybe have something to bring back for their work as well. I'm also a Board member of Nominet which is a U.K. based registry back end operator and ccTLD registry, and I think I'll leave it at that for now and if anything else comes up I'll mention that.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Volker.

I'd like to go back to Lili Sun and Thomas. I apologize slide #11 came up as an error when we showed it so I wanted to make sure that they had an opportunity to introduce themselves.

Lili, go ahead, please.

I don't hear anything from Lili. Thomas, do you want to go ahead?

THOMAS WALDEN: Hello. My name is Thomas Walden. I'm relatively a new member to ICANN or attendee at ICANN. I've only been involved about four years or so. I'm a member of the Public Safety Working Group and I've been working with WHOIS a lot how my agency and other safety agencies how it impacts upon their day-to-day how they do their work. I've been working with ARIN, LACNIC, and some of the other RIRs to come up with a policy regarding WHOIS and when I saw the opening for this Review Team, it was something that interested me and I wanted to learn a little bit more so I figured this was to be the best place for me. I appreciate

the opportunity to work with you people and let's get some good work done.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Thomas.

Lili, are you able to speak now to introduce yourself?

Dmitry, have we resolved his communication issues so he can introduce himself to his teammates?

Moving right along, Chris, do you want to introduce yourself?

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Yes. Who's that old guy in that photograph? It can't be me.

Hi, everyone. Chris Disspain, ICANN Board still, formerly ccNSO. I was on the Expert Working Group with Susan and Carlton. I am the Chair of the Board's all things RDS/WHOIS Working Group which is the sort of interface between the Board and community in respect to the staggering amount of WHOIS work that's going on at the moment. I am the Board's appointment as the liaison to this Working Group, principally I suspect because of those things. It's going to be a blast. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you very much.

Moving right along, when you send an e-mail to the staff list these are the people that are on the staff list. I'm trying to keep us moving along knowing Chris has to leave us shortly and the next bit I think is an important discussion to have as many people participate in as possible. So save the specific introductions for the team until later on but when you see us, this is the crowd that's here to assist the Review Team and its work.

Next discussion is a planning discussion, and there's some decisions that the Review Team needs to determine for itself including setting its schedules – weekly Plenary calls – need to identify the when and the where that you want to do that, how long you want the calls to be. Do you want them one hour, one hour and a half, two hours? Do you want to rotate the times or do you want to have a set day of the week and a time? What we've done based on the input we've gotten from the Review Team members on the questionnaire – here is the time zones that need to be covered for the Review Team members to participate. It does make for some interesting decisions. And then need to determine if and when you want to have face-to-face meetings. Those are some decisions that the Review Team itself needs to make.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: So we're going from UTC minus seven to UTC plus eight. Is that right?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. It does make for an interesting decision to make.

EN

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: And that's currently with not an expected time zone change until October, right?

KAREN MULBERRY: That's correct.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Okay. Plus eight being Asia, Singapore, somewhere like that?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: And at minus seven being L.A.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Okay. Just for everyone's benefit then I'll shut up, the general principle that the Board uses and numerous working groups have used, is to try to rotate if possible within a reasonable time zone thing. In other words, no earlier start for somebody than 6:00 a.m. and no later start than 11:00 p.m. I'll just pop that into the discussion for the sake of it and leave it at that. Thanks.

KAREN MULBERRY:	Thanks, Chris. To give you some background, the CCT Review Team has a set day of the week and a set time for all of their calls. They happen to have some people who live in Asia that are very happy getting up in the middle of night. The SSR2 Review Team rotates. They meet on Tuesdays and they have three different time slots that they rotate through to accommodate all their Review team members in their own time zones. So those are some examples of what you can consider.
	For your weekly Plenary calls, here are some suggested slots. These are based basically on the availability of our Secretariat to support the Review Team. In essence, they're open slots that don't conflict with Work Stream 2 or any of the other Review Teams that are in place. I know Volker had a suggestion in the chat on potentially setting a solid date on maybe Wednesdays or Thursdays, I believe.
	Alan, you have your hand up.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I did. You seem to be presuming we will have weekly calls. Certainly on the only other Review Team I've participated in there were not weekly calls. I have no problem scheduling, allotting the slot, in case it's needed but I don't think we want to presume at this point there will be weekly calls. Just to set expectation. Maybe I'm off on a tangent from other people but given that we have a nine hour – if we're going from minus seven to plus eight – we have a nine hour overnight window which we could block out so nobody has an awkward time. So it's not clear we need to rotate. I have no objection if we do but it sometimes makes it easier to schedule if you only have to pick one time. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Alan. What the CCT as well as the SSR2 Review Teams have done is they meet weekly. SSR2 meets weekly for a one-hour just kind of chat and they're trying to use that to catch up on the exchanges and things that they do via e-mail to progress their work. I believe the CCT Team meets for two hours weekly to progress their work and discuss what's going on.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Just to be clear, I'm not proposing necessarily that the calls rotate. I was just providing some input. And in the spirit of providing input as well – and I suspect Alan and others might agree with me on this – two hours is a stretch from the point of view of concentrating and actually getting things done. But that said, if it means you can have fewer calls and it works well, then that's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: I really think the Review Teams' going to have to decide that as it gets into its real work.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: I think that's exactly right. I wouldn't put anything in stone right now. I'd go for a starting point and see where we get to.

KAREN MULBERRY: There again, it's up to your discussion to determine how you want to organize and manage the work that you have in front of you. Here are the potential open spots that we have that we can support the work.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Who are the people who are most inconvenienced by this, Brenda, from the point of view of coming in the Asia time zone?

KAREN MULBERRY: I don't have that information in front of me. What we can do is actually do you a specific analysis into the Review Team of who is in what time zone.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Yeah, we should probably ask people because 17:00 is 1:00 a.m. – eight hours ahead. That's a pretty tough one.

KAREN MULBERRY: We can provide the analysis to you and then maybe through the list exchange the Review Team members can figure out what might be best for everyone. I know there's been some exchange on the chat. Lili is in plus eight and Volker is in plus three.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Perhaps if we have Lili move?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not in the position to look at these and now say which times there are and we have a fair number of people not on the call. If we're deciding that to start with we will schedule a one-hour call once a week and either rotate or fix, let's send out a Doodle with all of the options and see what people say.

KAREN MULBERRY: I definitely can do this. And I wasn't expecting you to make a decision. These are just things that you need to consider as you start formulating –

ALAN GREENBERG: Chris has to leave shortly and I'm concerned that we get on to other issues.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. I appreciate that. We'll send something out to the list and then hopefully you can have further discussion on that. We'll use that to plan the next Review Team call. I know this is a discussion that started on the list that you'd probably want to participate in, and that's determining the kick-off face-to-face meeting. I know there's been some consternation about ICANN59 and I apologize for that. It was planned as a placeholder because we have to do these things months in advance.

We can't do them with just a couple weeks in terms of the logistics of the Meeting Team.

The Review Team itself determines whether you want to have that meeting or not. We can cancel it. That's not a problem. It's just we couldn't put it in place with the short notice so the plans are in effect to reserve the room and everything else and travel has gone out to the Review Team members there again, because of the logistics and timing required to do these things. If Review Team members have already booked the travel and the team members determine they don't want to meet at ICANN59, there is no problem with that. It will still be supported basically because the focus of this meeting is going to be a lot about WHOIS and there's opportunities for everyone then to gather information that might be valuable for the work of the Review Team.

I turn it back over to you all to decide what you would like to do for your first face-to-face meeting.

KAREN MULBERRY: Chris, I have you and then Volker.

CHRISTOPHER DISSPAIN: Given that I have to go in a second, let me – first of all, I think it is obviously important that the people who are on the Review Team if they can be in Johannesburg should be there because, as you've said, there are a fair whack of things going on during the week that are WHOIS related. Having a Review Team meeting on Saturday and/or Sunday is simply unworkable from my point of view and I think is

unworkable from quite a number of members of the Review Team's point of view. Certainly I know Alan and Carlton are challenged because they've written to the list. I think Stephanie is challenged. Various people are challenged and it's going to be nigh on impossible for anything meaningful to happen if four, five, or six, of the Review Team – I forget how people the Review Team comprises – but if four, five, or six, or more of that Review Team are simply unable to be there then it won't work. In other words, nothing meaningful will come of it because those who aren't there will be unable to participate in the discussions.

That said, that doesn't mean that we shouldn't try and organize for the Review Team to get together whilst everybody is in Johannesburg, albeit perhaps on an ad hoc basis, and perhaps for a relatively short period of time. But the concept of having a formal [inaudible] of putting it – meeting where things are discussed such as the scope and so on just doesn't seem to me to be workable in the circumstances given that the designated days are simply not available to a significant number of us.

With that, and I know that there are others who want to speak and agree, I do have to go. I apologize for leaving on that note, and I will very much look forward to seeing everybody very soon. Thanks.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Chris.

Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Thank you. I think it's still worthwhile to try to determine if we can maybe if we cannot do the full two days which it certainly appears like it and a slot where we have two or three hours that weekend where we could all meet where people could jump out for a short while out of their conflicting meetings so we can have a kick-off start off and get things rolling event that weekend. A lot of us are traveling in early because of the announcement that the meeting would be held earlier. [We'll] probably like to travel later otherwise so I would appreciate it if we could just make use of some of our time. Also knowing that having a face-to-face meeting before we meet on the list will oil the gears and make the flow of the work a lot easier if we had a face-to-face and know each other a little bit better.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Volker.

Alan, you have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I do. A couple of things – the chances of finding a few hours during the week where all of us or a large number of us can participate I think is going to be virtually impossible. Certainly knowing a little bit about my schedule and having an idea about Chris's I can say that with some level of assurity. Perhaps [Inaudible] dinner one of the nights might be possible but other than that I think it's going to be very hard. In my schedule I have one exception, that is the Friday afternoon after the meeting for those people who are still there I would be available. I'm booked in the morning but I don't fly out until 7:00 in the evening so in

theory I could meet for a couple of hours early Friday afternoon after the ICANN meeting.

Other than that, I think it's going to be exceedingly difficult. One of the things which would be useful to know – we talked about budget earlier and I would like to know in rough numbers how many face-to-face meetings not associated with an ICANN meeting our budget will likely sustain because that's a valuable piece of information to know whether we could perhaps schedule a face-to-face between Johannesburg and Abu Dhabi. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, Alan. The budget is, you could determine when and where you want your face-to-face meetings. They do not have to be in association with ICANN meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG: Roughly how many such off-site meetings could it sustain? I don't have an idea what the budget is at all.

KAREN MULBERRY: We can go through that in a little bit more detail on the next call if that's of interest. I believe it can sustain maybe two or three meetings that are not affiliated with an ICANN meeting. If you choose not to do any meetings with an ICANN meeting then that changes some of the dynamics as well, so it could be even more than that. It just depends on what the group wants to do and what they think is their best option for meeting.

In terms of a suggestion, I know that Lisa noted that there are several people on the call that are having some issues in terms of speaking. Maybe we could just do checkmarks whether you're interested in holding the meeting on the two days beforehand to indicate your preference. My sense is at this point that the majority of the Review Team members have some conflicts and will not be able to meet. I do like the suggestion of maybe getting everyone who might be in Johannesburg together for a team dinner so at least those that are there will have an [option] to meet each other and we'll start an informal discussion and then we can proceed from there.

We do have a few people interested but I do believe that there are a lot who are unable to participate.

Alan, you have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The two items that I think we're going to have to do early on in our process are decide on the scope of the review and decide on leadership. I would suggest in the order that I just said them because who may be prepared to be a leader might vary depending on just what the scope is.

That being said, both of those I don't believe should be done where significant parts of the group have said they can't be there. I really have a problem with meeting Saturday and Sunday, meeting in Johannesburg, other than a social meeting to get to know each other and recognize each other's faces and stuff. To start making decisions

with only part of the group there I think had a real problem and a bad way to start the process.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Alan. I do appreciate your comments on that. We do have several Review Team members who were unable to participate in the call today so I don't think that it would be up to this discussion here. We can send a note out to the list to get final confirmation.

With that, we do have the meeting room set aside so there is a place should there be members who will be there early and have time. You could informally meet there if you want to chat about something if you decide not to have the formal Review Team. We can also set up a Doodle poll to go along with that to indicate when people might be available for just an informal team dinner of those who are at the ICANN meeting and hopefully we can align time that way.

Alan, do you have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. Another question that is somewhat related to our making decisions – when are we going to expect the staff analysis of the recommendations from the WHOIS Review Team 1 to be done and delivered so that we can start looking at it an assimilating it?

KAREN MULBERRY: What we have planned for the Review Team is actually briefings on the WHOIS recommendations and the implementation details.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not planning anything in writing?

KAREN MULBERRY: Not at this point. There hasn't been any direction for us to write anything down so we are going to brief you on what's happened. There'll be slide decks and other details provided on that but we have not prepared any final report on what's happened. If that's a suggestion, we can see what we can do to prepare something for you.

Also on this slide are information in terms of timing for our face-to-face meeting. We'll send out a Doodle poll to determine a dinner in Johannesburg for the Review Team as well as just to confirm everyone's position on whether they want to hold the meeting at ICANN59 or not and also provide some details if you're in Johannesburg early, the room will be available. I won't cancel it so that you can meet and informally chat about the Review Team or other issues related to WHOIS.

Okay. Moving along. Alan noted that one of the things that the Review Team itself needs to determine is its leadership. When you start considering your leadership, we need to look at expertise to effectively lead the group and actually focus the group and get the work done. Now there's also some very specific responsibilities for the Review Team leaders laid out in the Bylaws, and in particular, that's determining consensus amongst the Review Team members and moving forward with that the leadership of the Review Team will also be responsible for managing the budget and some of the other financial considerations to support the Review Team.

In terms of the leadership role, here is a general list of attributes and skills and responsibilities of the leader. I won't go into it in any detail but it's something to consider if you're considering indicating to the team that you would like to be a leader.

To give you some sense of how the other Review Teams have been organized, this provides some background for you. I know with SSR2 with the most recent Review Team that that was launched earlier this year, they determined to have three co-Chairs. They're in different time zones. That also gives them the ability to rotate the leadership position as well as for meetings to occur when one or two of the other co-Chairs are unavailable to participate there is always one that can lead the meeting. CCT has one Chair and then for the formal reviews you can see they had Chairs and Vice Chairs to move the work along. So [it's] something to decide for the Review Team in terms of your leadership structure.

In terms of getting the work underway, you need to determine what process you're going to undertake to select the leadership. Will it be by self nomination or by e-mail to indicate you're interested in the positions? You also need to determine if you want a single Chair, a Chair and a Vice Chair, do you want co-Chairs? How do you want the structure to be for the Review Team? And again, the Expressions of Interest, do you want to do it on e-mail list? Do you want to do it in person at a face-to-face meeting? And in essence, how long do you want the leadership process to take before a decision is reached? Because having a leader in place then will allow agendas to be prepared and other work of the Review Team to be managed by the Review Team itself.

Back to the discussion on ICANN59, here's some sessions on WHOIS that might be of interest for those who are at the meeting. We wanted to note those because those would be useful discussions to observe and experiences to [capture] so you could bring back into the Review Team discussions on the scope of work, noting that there is a lot of work that the [community] is already undertaking with WHOIS and how you might want to approach some of that.

There's also another decision that the Review Team has to make for itself, and that's the role of observers and how you want observers to participate in the work of the Review Team. Right now, observers don't have posting rights to any of the lists and they have a separate room where they mirror what's going on here. They can see the presentation. They can listen. But they cannot participate in any of the discussion that you're having. They can indicate things in their own chat room. We can introduce that to the Review Team members should you want us to acknowledge that. There'll be lots of decisions in terms of how you would like them to participate in the work of what's going on.

I know other Review Teams – SSR2, for example – has determined that the Review Team members can actually provide input in their own chat room that will be considered by the Review Team members, so we read that into the records and they determine what they want to do with it. They've actually reached to us to consult with some of the observers to get their opinions on different things that they've suggested. They're also looking right now at furthering that relationship in terms of how they would want them to provide input in some of the sub-groups that they've created to look at specific topics. Just examples for this Review

Team to consider as they look at the role of the observers and how they want them to interact with you as you do your work.

So Any Other Business? That's kind of the essence of what we have in front of us. I know there's been some discussion in the chat about a Chair and Vice Chairs. There again, it will be up to your preference as to how you want to organize your leadership structure and the roles that everyone will play in that.

How do you want to approach having that discussion? Should that be another item that we kick off on an e-mail discussion list in terms of the leadership as well as asking for people to indicate their interest in positions?

I see that Voker noted that e-mail would be best and then Lili was interested in a timeline, so how much time do you want to set up and allow for the discussion on the leadership as well as the confirmation of who you want to choose to play a role in the structure that you agree to?

Any comments, suggestions, for that period of time? What we can do is launch a call for Expressions of Interest for the leadership position and indicate some of the options you can choose for the structure of the Review Team, and doing that by e-mail you could determine the best approach.

Stephanie noted that maybe you could use the Johannesburg meeting for informal discussions on some of these issues, including managing observers.

So is your preference then to indicate that we will kick this off by e-mail?

ALAN GREENBERG: Karen, I have my hand up.

KAREN MULBERRY: Sorry. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's raise the issues on e-mail that have to be decided. People can contribute or not. It's really hard to decide how we're going to decide when we still don't know if we're meeting a week and a half from now or when or for how long. Let's get the critical issue of what we're doing or not doing in Johannesburg settled, and I think the rest of this will start falling out from that.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. And we will get that note out immediately, and asking for a very quick turnaround, in essence, a response so a decision can be reached by close of business tomorrow so that everyone will have a good idea of how to plan their time for Johannesburg. Is that acceptable to everyone? And then we'll follow up with all of the other e-mails that the Expressions of Interest for the leadership, a Doodle poll for your next call, as well as indication of interest as to rotation and time zones where you'd like to hold those calls.

Does that seem acceptable to everyone? Is there Any Other Business that you would like to raise?

ALAN GREENBERG: Recognize we have a fair number of people not on the call right now so even agreement from everyone on this call doesn't make things definitive. Let's start it off and see if we can arrange anything for Johannesburg and if not, we're going to have to try to arrange something somewhere else between then and Abu Dhabi.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, Alan. Thank you very much for that suggestion and maybe arranging the next Review Team call probably after Johannesburg because I don't think we can get one in next week because of everyone's travel arrangements at this point. There could be further discussion along those lines.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we decided we were going to do a Doodle to try to set up a weekly call.

KAREN MULBERRY: We are. But it probably will not start until after Johannesburg.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. And what I have here is just various pieces of information for the Review Team. Here's your e-mail list and exchanges on that list are publicly archived. Here is your work space – the wiki page where we post all the information, the meeting details, and everything else. We have some background materials posted so that if you're unfamiliar with all of the activity that's going on around WHOIS, all of that reports and things that have been prepared in the last couple of years, you can go there and find a lot of source material.

If you want to find out more information about observers, they have their own wiki page as well where you can find out who's subscribed as an observer, and that might help you in determining how you want to approach integrating or using comments and input from observers in the work.

And then lastly is the e-mail list where you can reach the staff. And if you have any questions or other things you can reach us through that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Karen, can I ask that the slide deck be sent out if it hasn't already to the mailing list?

KAREN MULBERRY: It was sent out yesterday to everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: And it will be posted on the wiki page so you can find it there as well if you have problems opening it in your e-mail.

Let's recap the action items. Our first action is to send a note out to the Review Team members regarding ICANN59, and we will ask to have a indication Expression of Interest so that a decision can be reached by close of business tomorrow – and that would be close of business in L.A. Then we'll send out an e-mail that will include a Doodle poll for the Review Team to determine its weekly call and what the best time zone might be or the rotation of time zones that you would like to have for that call, including a date that we can determine to set up our call after Johannesburg so that everyone can get that on their schedules.

Then we'll send out an e-mail on Expressions of Interest for the leadership position including the various options you can use to for the leadership structure as well as asking the Review Team members to express their interest in a position based on the structure they think would be best for the Review Team.

Have I missed any action items or follow-up items that we need to do at this point?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nothing. We're good.

KAREN MULBERRY:	And the Review Team dinner in Johannesburg. I was going through my notes here. So that's it. We'll follow up with that as well. But the first one will be specifically to ICANN59 and holding the meeting or not.

Is there Any Other Business that you'd like to discuss?

Alright. Hearing none, I'd like to thank you all very much for volunteering for the Review Team. I look forward to working with all of you and in supporting the work moving forward and in particular, I look forward to a very quick response by close of business tomorrow on ICANN59 and whether you want to proceed with that meeting or not or just doing something informally.

That's all I had to cover to get this Review Team formed and kicked off so thank you very much. And if we pass each other in the halls in Johannesburg, let's stop to introduce ourselves in person. You have the pictures of the Support Team so we're very eager to meet all of you. So thank you very much.

You can stop the recording now, please.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]