EN

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

KAREN MULBERRY: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all of you. This is Karen Mulberry. I'd like to thank you very much for joining the second Plenary call for the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team. In front of you, I have the agenda. As we get started, I'd like to ask if there is a volunteer who would want to lead the call from the Review Team. If there is no volunteer, then I will continue on with the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. Why don't we have Chris, if he can do it, since he is not a candidate for the ongoing Chair. It may be the easiest thing.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's [inaudible] I'm on a train.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's extremely difficult for me to do anything other than sit quietly and listen.

KAREN MULBERRY:	Okay. Well, I was just trying to offer, since this is your Review Team, and if someone wanted to take the opportunity to lead the discussion and walk us through the agenda that we had prepared.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Since you prepared the agenda, why don't you continue with the performance.
KAREN MULBERRY:	Thank you, Alan. I shall do that. And hopefully, for the next call, we will have some volunteers step up or leadership in place that could – they can take over. Anyway, in terms of welcoming and opening remarks, that is the first agenda item. I also want to note an opportunity – if there is any interest on the Review Team on a tutorial on what is a review. I know we have several Review Team members that are new to the review process, and if you'd like us to set up a separate tutorial to walk you through what a review is, just send me an email and we'll make those arrangements for you, and we'll get everyone together and just have a separate tutorial on, you know, the background of reviews and the expectations and some other details that might be useful for you.

Okay, moving along, since we only have an hour. Jean Baptiste, do you want to recap the informal session of ICANN 59, please? |
| JEAN BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: | Hi Karen, hi everyone. Yes, sure. So, hi everyone. I'm Jean Baptiste, and for those who don't know me yet, I will be helping the Review Team |

with project management, going forth. So, on the ICANN 59 recap – one more slide – perfect. Considering four members of the Review Team were not present in the room at the time of the informal meeting, we wanted to provide you with a recap of the different topics that were discussed during this session. After a round of quick introductions, Review Team members mentioned planning ahead for the Review Team, and first of all, the items [inaudible] for the Plenary meeting, which is a different time right now [inaudible] UTC each Thursday. There were no objections on time, but there were suggestions to revisit it in the fall, considering the change of hours. There was also an interesting discussion and exchange of views on the scope, and above all, interest to form agreement quickly, before anything else, and the suggestion to discuss it via email moving forward.

We also tackled possible dates of face-to-face meetings, especially the first one, and those dates were shared with Review Team members in attendance, and all were encouraged to fill in the Doodle poll to identify the best date. Also, during the discussion, there was an ask from present Review Team members to Staff to circulate the background materials, which are currently listed on the screen. I just would like to remind all of you that links to these key documents are on your wiki background material page, links to general background on WHOIS RDS, and a glossary of terms current with RDS policies, contractual requirements, advisory compliance materials, and related procedures.

And finally, we'd also like to remind everyone that, due to the format of this informal session, no decisions were taken during that time. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Jean Baptiste. I don't know if anyone who was there at the informal discussion would like to share any more comments or thoughts to the other members who might not have participated in that session? Alan, you have your hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. There was a fair amount of talk, certainly towards the end of the meeting – I'm not quite sure if that was still a formal meeting or not – on exactly what the scope should be. And there was a fair amount of opinions saying that we should restrict it to – reasonably restrict it to the review of the last review, and to current WHOIS topics, and very carefully not try to duplicate the work that is going on in the other activities, particularly the PDP on Next Generation RDS. There was some difference of opinion on exactly what was included within that nominally limited scope and what was not, and I think that's obviously going to be one of our first topics of significant discussion. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Any other thoughts based on that informal discussion that anyone would like to share?

Okay, moving along in the agenda is the Review Team leadership and structure. That was presented in your first Plenary call as something for everyone to think about – either to volunteer or to have some thoughts in terms of what the structure ought to be, and how you'd want to

approach it. Right now, based on the discussions of interest, we have two responses – actually, three responses – from people who are interested in playing a leadership role within the Review Team. Now, I just wanted to note that it's up to the Review Team to determine its structure. Do you want a Chair and Vice Chair, do you want Co-Chairs? Whatever the structure might be, I think it just might be useful – I'm trying for you to at least have a discussion on that, especially based on the responsibilities of the Review Team itself, and the direction you'd like the reviews to go into, once you determine the scope and the Work Plan and the Terms of Reference related to all of this work. So, I know that there wasn't really a hard and fast date in terms of when you would want to determine your leadership, but I'd like to open it up to see if there's any additional discussion that you would like to have in terms of at least the structure, and then determining some dates when you'd like to make your selection of the Review Team leadership. Any comments, suggestions? Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think I've already said already – I prefer a Chair and Vice Chairs, although two Vice Chairs – two Co-Chairs – might well be a reasonable alternative to that. I'm not sure the workload warrants anything with – a lot heavier in terms of management and that. One of the questions that I think is relevant is, to what extent do we plan to do a lot of work prior to – or even fully develop the scope – prior to our face-to-face meetings? There's been a lot of discussion on – although ICANN had to convene this meeting, it was not obvious that we have a very tight timeline in carrying it out, and although – we certainly would like to get this over within a reasonable amount of time, and not make a

career of it. Leadership is less important if we are going to defer a lot of the work until our face-to-face meeting, and determining leadership in the face-to-face meeting is not unreasonable, as long as the workload is light before then. So, I guess I'm interested in knowing to what extent are we really going to dive into this right now, or wait for the first – presumably a two-day meeting – to really get into the meat of this and have a good briefing. A face-to-face briefing is – and discussion, I think – is always more effective than trying to do this remotely, especially with a group of people who are largely unfamiliar with each other. So, I guess I'm interested in other people's views on this.

KAREN MULBERRY: Cathrin, you have your hand up?

Cathrin, are you able to –

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you – sorry, I was trying to [CROSSTALK] for activating my microphone. Can you hear me now?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, I can. Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Perfect. Just to say that I think that Alan makes a very good point about the possibility of maybe taking a decision on this at the face-to-face meeting in September or October, and one additional benefit might be

that we're still awaiting a possible nomination of the three participants from the CCNSO community, and of course, we would have a more legitimate face for our discussion if they were already on board, and that of course is closely tied into this discussion on the scope, because that community has said that they will only decide on whether to nominate – and whom to nominate – once they have a clear idea of the scope, and thus, the workload that's inherent in the production of this report. So, what we might indeed turn to first is to see whether we can get the scope sorted before the September or October face-to-face meeting, and then see whether we want to decide on the leadership and the overall structure also, [inaudible] of the actual scope of the work, which in a sense, is also logical, because then, we'll have a better idea of the workload and the possible structure – we can decide also on the way we divide up our time for the review.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Cathrin. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There's another benefit, and Cathrin alluded to it right at the end, actually. Certainly, one of the conditions that I will – one of the issues that I will look at in deciding if I really want to take a lead role in this or not – is, exactly, the scope. If we decide on a much wider scope than I feel comfortable with, then it's also going to take a fair amount longer and be a more intense effort than I'm imagining, and I might withdraw my offer at that point. So, I think the scope is really deterministic. And I tend to agree with Cathrin that, if indeed the

CCNSO is going to participate, they're not likely to do that until we come up with a pretty definitive statement of what the scope is, and they said they could act quickly at that point. I think that is another good reason for deferring the leadership issue. To that end, I'm happy to act as an Acting Chair or an Acting Co-Chair if there's any interest in that. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Susan, you have your hand up?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks. This is Susan Kawaguchi, for the record. I agree to some extent with both Cathrin and Alan, but I also think that it'll be more efficient and probably helpful, at that, if we step up now and we can remain as interim leadership maybe, but I think to determine that scope and help formulate exactly what we are working on, it would be helpful to have at least an interim leadership in the – to determine and to move forward. As part of the RDS Working Group, I'm a Vice Chair and I have found that that structure works really well – to have several people on the leadership team. And you can use each other as a sounding board, and also we are heading – we're in the middle of summer and vacations take place, so there would always be someone – if we had at least the three of us that have volunteered to step forward – to work on the scope. I would be fine if we just remain as interim, and I think – it looks like Cathrin and I both volunteered to be Vice Chair or Co-Chair. I am absolutely fine with Vice Chair and with Alan leading the charge, if he's still interested. So, I do think there would be a lot of value in moving

forward now, at least on an interim basis for leadership. And then, if we have the CCNSO representatives join us, then we could rethink that.

KAREN MULBERRY: Alan, you have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to be clear, I agree completely. I don't think we can act without interim leadership; I don't think we can ask Staff to assume that role on a longer-term basis than for a meeting or so. So, I don't disagree at all with this. And I'm happy to either act as three Co-Chairs or a Chair and Vice Chairs on the short-term.

We have some support in the chat, I see.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, I do. And I can tell you to Stephanie and Cathrin's points, the SSRT Review Team actually determined to have three Co-Chairs, and they are in different time zones, so it's been very useful for those Co-Chairs to actually be able to have at least one meeting or brief discussion while others might be otherwise engaged or on holiday. So, having a good leadership structure is invaluable for that group.

I get the sense that the interim leadership seems to be a very positive and consensus approach at this point for the Review Team. I'm – whatever you want to call yourself, I see there is some thought on Co-Chairs/Chairs – I will leave that up to the three of you, however you want to identify that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I think we don't need to spend a lot of time in this meeting debating that. The three of us can get together in the next few days and come up with something we feel comfortable with.

KAREN MULBERRY: That would be fine. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can always speak on my own behalf; I hope that's acceptable.

KAREN MULBERRY: It seems rather positive in the chat, that everyone is agreeable at least to having interim leadership, and then we can revisit it at the face-to-face meeting in October. And Staff thanks you for stepping up into the leadership role. It's not a role that I think we should play.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan speaking. Just to help us arrange something, what time zones are Cathrin and Susan in? I'm UTC-4 at the moment.

KAREN MULBERRY: Cathrin is in Europe, and Susan, I'm not sure –

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, dear, 4:00 AM for Susan. Alright then, that's a good range.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, at least we can have different coverage, depending on what the needs of the group are.

Alright, thank you all for this discussion, and at least for an interim path moving forward.

Now, moving on, is the Plenary call schedule and the topics you'd like to have on the Plenary call. Right now, we've got – based on the Doodle poll that we have – Thursdays at 11:00 UTC was the agreed time for everyone. And we agreed on in terms of a 60-minute call, and that the call would be cancelled in terms – if there is no agenda for the call. Now, in terms of logistics, if the agenda doesn't go out 24 hours before the call, then the call should be cancelled, just so that everyone has at least an opportunity to review the agenda and prepare for the call. If that's kind of acceptable to everyone, then I thought we can move on to a summer schedule. Do you want to have a call every Thursday between now and the beginning of September, or based on holidays and other things, would it be better to have something every other week? And is one hour sufficient, or do you want it to be longer? Alan, you have your hand raised?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Given what we've already decided – that is, we're going to try to address scope but not do in-depth work prior to the face-to-face, and I think we've tentatively agreed on that – at least, the people who spoke seemed to be comfortable with that – why don't we do a Doodle at this point on availability each week, for the next two

months or so? I sense a fair number of people may be in vacation mode right now, and the attendance on this call does not seem to be all that heavy. So, I'm a little bit worried that we will commit to something on this call that we will not be able to deliver on, and I think the one thing we do need good, uniform work on is making sure that everyone is comfortable with the scope, or at least has the opportunity to voice why it is they're not doing it, and I suspect that can be done to a large extent – at least, the prep for making the decisions on the scope – can be done via email. So, I'm inclined to make sure that we will have good participation on these calls before making a firm decision on whether to do one every week, every two weeks – or in fact, whether we ought to do any in the last half of July and August timeframe, given the vacation periods for some parts of the world.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Alan. Cathrin, you have your hand raised?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you. This is Cathrin. Just to say that I fully agree with Alan that probably having a call every other week would be sufficient, especially if what we want to do before the face-to-face meeting is just discussing this call. While I appreciate it's not an easy issue, it also shouldn't take us more than six phone calls. I think we'll easily have that amount of time before the face-to-face meeting. And then, I guess, the other big task, for those of us who haven't been able to do so yet, is to review all the materials that you have put at our disposal, and then to basically bring ourselves up to speed on all the relevant issues, which

doesn't necessarily require a lot of discussions in the team, per se. So, to me, it would also sound good to have a call every other week. And as Lisa already suggested in the chat, maybe we can have a bit of flexibility on the hour, if we need – if we see that we really need a bit more time, that we can go to an hour and a quarter, or an hour and a half, if we really need to. And I see that Stephanie is also voicing her agreement on this. So maybe that would be a possibility between now and October. But the question for me would then be, really, what we want to achieve until October, and then as a function of that, we should decide what exactly we need in terms of meetings and discussions. If it's really only the scope, then that should be perfectly feasible.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Cathrin. I also wanted to let you know that during the calls between now and your face-to-face meeting, what we at Staff have been working on is setting up briefings on the implementation of the prior WHOIS recommendations, so that we can bring people in that actually work on the implementations, so they can talk about what they have done and what they are continuing to do along those lines, so that you have an opportunity to talk to them, interact with them, ask them additional follow-up questions. At least, that's what we are focusing on and preparing for you, should you want to do that. That way, moving into your face-to-face meeting, you'll have a lot of the background details, and then we can proceed from there.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. May I have the mic?

KAREN MULBERRY: Please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure on the briefings whether that is crucial. Certainly, if we have the time and it fits, I have no problem with it. But we were told at the face-to-face meeting that the wiki – the web is up-to-date on the current implementation, and I think that's the bulk of what we want to look at. Although we will have to talk with the people who are doing the work, that's the bulk of our work. We know, without a doubt, that we have to fully review the WHOIS implementation. Not the WHOIS, the WHOIS1 Review Team recommendations. So, there's absolutely no question in our minds that that has to be done, but that, in fact, is the bulk of our work, and I'm not sure we need to be off on a running start on that. I don't object; but again, I'm worried a little bit about the schedule and making sure that we have really good attendance at these meetings. I tend to support the idea that fewer meetings and slightly longer meetings – perhaps an hour and a half, if necessary – are a better idea than a one-hour meeting once a week. And to that end, I would send out – I would ask for a Doodle on a weekly basis, if this time is a good one, then use it, between now and the face-to-face meeting – and see what availability people have, and then we can make a decision on the list of exactly when we schedule the meetings or [inaudible]. Of course, we have the option of scheduling meetings and then cancelling well ahead of time, but that sounds like the way to go forward. I'm really worried that we'll try to – we'll make decisions on scope, and then we'll have people participating who were not active in that discussion.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. I also see I the chat that there were quite a few people who actually were in favor of biweekly meetings and maybe a little bit longer. I just wanted to note that. Cathrin, you have your hand raised?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you. I just – I have a question. This is Cathrin, for Alan. On the very last point you raised about people participating later on that would not have been part of the discussion. I would just like to understand your concern, because I think it's an important one. Could you maybe explain a little bit more what precisely you mean?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, certainly. Thank you. I'm worried that there are people – certainly if there are any other people in Europe or in North America – who will be largely unavailable for the next month or so, and we make decisions and then they come back and find that we're going in a direction that they didn't agree with, and we have to renegotiate, and go over the whole process again. So, I understand it's people's responsibility to participate once they've volunteered, but the reality is that the next couple of months, or the next numbers of weeks, anyway, are – tend to be very difficult to get good attendance at meetings.

KAREN MULBERRY: Susan, you have your hand up?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, I just wanted to add to the discussion. I do think – I can understand Alan's concerns, but I think via email and phone calls, we can get a lot of work done on the scope between now and September. And actually, if the meeting face-to-face is really not till October, we will have some – a few weeks to finalize things and get people who may have been disconnected because of vacation time, up to speed in September, also. I think the Doodle poll's a good idea, but we probably should aim towards trying to have calls every week. But I think we'd be a little bit more informed if the leadership team took the time to have a call next week – early next week, maybe – and really start to lay out a plan of attack. And then, we'd have a better idea of what we need from the full team, and how to present it, and figure out what the scope is. I mean, I think there's some reference materials out there that – and definitely, the GNSO Council weighed in on the scope. And so, that would be one of the first discussion points, I would think, so I would like to advocate for setting up a leadership call, and then we could figure – and maybe the Doodle poll – and then we could figure out if we could get enough people per week to have a big discussion.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Susan. We'll take it as an Action Item to send out a Doodle poll using every Thursday as a meeting date and time to see – to gather the information as to who can participate on what day and the time, so the decision can be made then from the interim leadership. Thank you very much for that discussion. We'll move that to an email exchange.

ALAN GREENBERG: Karen, it's Alan. I think Susan got it right on the head, but I think there was a general consensus for doing the Doodle for a 90-minute call, just make sure that people could allocate the time, should we decide to have fewer calls and slightly longer ones.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, and we will do that. Thank you for the correction. We'll make sure that we have all of that laid out correctly, and then the Doodle poll will go out to everyone.

Now, what I have here is just an example of some Plenary topics that you might consider discussing. And we'll postpone the leadership election. But there are some – Alan, you've identified the scope; the Review Team owes the Board it's Terms of Reference. We will walk through the Board resolution here in a bit. You have to kind of frame your Work Plan, you have to figure out your timeline and the schedule to plan ahead, and then we would like to make a schedule of briefings so that we can bring the people in from ICANN Org that have been working on the various implementations so that they can present what they've talked about, what they've done to implement it, and you have the opportunity to talk to them. And then, there's also an obligation for the Review Team to manage its own budget. And as part of that, we produce a quarterly fact sheet that shows progress, as well as progress based against how much you've spent on the budget's been allocated for this Review Team. And this is done to make sure that the work of the Review Team is transparent, as well as showing the community that we'll be accountable for the budget allocation and the work that has

been put in front of you all. So, these are just things to consider as you look at what topics you'd like to have in your agenda.

Now, face-to-face meeting. We've had a brief discussion about that, but based on the input from the Doodle poll, it appears that October 2 and 3 is the best date for the face-to-face meeting in Brussels. We have ten participants who have indicated that they could possibly participate in that date, and we had one participant who indicated that they could participate remotely at those dates. So, if that is acceptable to everyone, we will go ahead and confirm and get the meaty details [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Karen, just for our information, how many people are there in the Review Team? So, are we missing anyone in that list?

KAREN MULBERRY: No. There are ten Review Team members right now, with three pending from the ccNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ten plus Chris.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. So, does that seem to be the best date and time for everyone to participate? If you want to confirm that date, that way, we can work

with the Meetings Team to get travel details started and confirm the meeting space in Brussels.

ALAN GREENBERG: Based on the Doodle, it looks like it's the best we're going to do.

KAREN MULBERRY: Can you put a green check in terms of confirming that this is when you want the face-to-face meeting, please?

Okay, thank you, everyone. We will proceed with confirming that date and get working with our acting Meetings Team to make sure we have all of the arrangements for you to participate.

Okay, so, next up that I'd like to talk to everyone about is ICANN 60. It's coming at the end of October, and the Review Team needs to make some decisions. Do you want to hold a one-day face-to-face meeting prior to ICANN 60? And I say it is one-day, because that's the only availability we have for rooms. Evidently, there is another convention in Abu Dhabi that doesn't depart until the two days before the ICANN meeting. So, we have one day to meet. And then, the second decision – does the Review Team want to hold any two-hour public consultation at ICANN 60, so that you can gather input from this mandate? Would you rather – since you're having your Review Team meeting, the first face-to-face at the beginning of October – postpone meeting at ICANN 60 and consider meeting at ICANN 61 or some other time? Susan, I see you have your hand up.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, I'm just wondering what – if we had a one-day face-to-face meeting at ICANN 60, which day would that be – what day are we talking about?

KAREN MULBERRY: I believe that would be October 27, the date right before ICANN 60 starts.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, is that a – I don't have a calendar – I'll have to look at my calendar.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Friday.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Oh, it's Friday, okay. That's fine. Being on the GNSO Council, Saturday and Sunday are already booked.

ALAN GREENBERG: The meeting – it's a seven-day meeting, officially, running from Saturday through Friday.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. Okay.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: The Friday – the last Friday tends to be reserved for briefings and things for the AC/SOs alone.

KAREN MULBERRY: This is something that the Review Team itself needs to decide. I wasn't sure if you wanted a meeting since it would only be a couple weeks after your face-to-face meeting. I know that a lot of you have a lot of obligations prior to the start of the ICANN meeting that might interfere with holding a Review Team meeting the day before.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's two and a half weeks – just barely two and a half weeks, including travel time, between the two meetings. I'm not sure – I'd certainly be willing to meet, but I'm not sure how effective it's going to be. The only good thing about it is, probably a fair number of ICANN people who we want to meet with face-to-face might already be there, and minimize travel for ICANN Staff. That's about the only reason I can think of why that might be advantageous.

KAREN MULBERRY: And then, the alternative could be to also consider having a couple of public consultations, where you can get input from the community, should you want to do that sometime during the week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Susan has her hand up, I think.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. Susan, please.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sorry, that's an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. Sorry. Alan, you have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I'm not sure the merit on a public consultation at this point. We will have just gotten our scope together, so we won't really have had an opportunity to publish much ahead of time. Well, we probably could, at the conclusion of our face-to-face meeting. I'm not quite sure what we're going to get out of a face-to-face – a public consultation at a time when we are just starting to focus on the actual work. We have not done a real review of the – any analysis of the review of the recommendations. I have a little bit of trouble understanding what we're going to be doing at that consultation and what we might get out of it. I'm certainly willing to do it, it's an easy thing to do – but I'm not quite sure of the benefits.

KAREN MULBERRY: Cathrin, you have your hand raised?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you. This is Cathrin. Just to say that I fully agree with Alan. I'm a bit unsure as to what we would get out of it, especially because as opposed to the work of some other Review Teams, our work is very closely connected to some other ongoing work, and we're getting public feedback on related questions already from other processes where we can fit in, for example, for me, the public meeting of the [inaudible] at ICANN 59 was extremely helpful to hear from other parts of the community what their concerns were with the process, and their issues. And I think, while it's not precisely relevant to all the parts of our review, it's definitely very good information for us, and I'm even wondering whether at this point – also given the separate tracks that are now going on – to somehow address the compliance challenges of the current WHOIS before the [inaudible] comes into full force in May, I wonder whether we would risk creating more confusion than we would actually add benefit to the community, if we now also start consulting and have to first explain, "No, this is not for the PDP; this is also not for the current [inaudible] compliance effort; we're doing a separate review." So, I would also prefer to maybe hold any public consultations for the next meeting. And it looks like we're still going to be busy writing our report by the time ICANN 61 rolls around. So, the meeting before – on the 28 of October, I think it would be quite challenging – I see in the chat a number of people wondering whether it's a good idea, and whether it maybe there would be a possibility to have another small, informal meeting or whatever you want to call it on the sidelines of ICANN 60, but during the day, when we will all be there. Because, I

have to say, I found that meeting extremely helpful, and just to quickly touch base during that week for an hour or two would probably be very helpful, even if we've met just three weeks before, to reflect on the input we're getting during the week, and maybe see what else we want to tackle.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Cathrin. I'd also like to note Lili's comment in terms of, it's not compulsory to meet with ICANN meetings. The Review Team can choose to meet face-to-face outside of ICANN meetings. It's not something that you have to do; it's your choice. And while Staff might be available at the meeting, Staff is also very busy as well at the meeting. So, it's up to you, and we can make arrangements to have Staff available to whatever date and time you think is most appropriate for the Review Team to meet. Alan, you have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. First of all, I think we've determined that Cathrin has an excellent sense of humor, saying that we will still be writing the report in March. So, I look forward to working with Cathrin. I think, given that we're not sure exactly where we're going, there are so many hot topics regarding RDS that are not within our scope, or have to be dealt with before we even get close to being finished, and [inaudible] is one of those – that I think it would be problematic to try to have a public consultation. I strongly agree with Karen that if we can schedule something on the sidelines – perhaps two hours, or something like that – but let's try to do that early. It's so hard adding a meeting in once the

rest of the schedule is firm. So, please, let's try to do that really early. But I like the direction we're going in at this point. I will point out we're not obliged to meet during ICANN meetings, but it significantly helps our budget if we do, so I would presume that the norm will be that we will try to meet at ICANN meetings, if only to reduce the impact on budget, if it's practical at all. The proximity to our face-to-face meeting this time, it just makes it not as useful as it might otherwise be.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Alan. Susan, you have your hand up?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. I would agree that having – I don't think we need a full face-to-face meeting on top of – too close to our face-to-face in October. But having a two- to three-hour meeting could be very useful. Hopefully, if we determine our scope in the face-to-face meeting in October and start some work [inaudible] to [inaudible]. I don't know. We may not get much work done in the face-to-face except agreeing on things, but we do have the Terms of Reference agreed on. So, I think it would be helpful to have time set aside in the ICANN meeting, first of all, to meet to do some work on the Terms of Reference.

ALAN GREENBERG: Karen, its Alan speaking. Do we have number son how many people are going to be at the meeting, anyway, and how many we would have to arrange travel for if we wanted the whole team to be there?

KAREN MULBERRY: No, but we can add that to the Doodle poll and ask. I believe that there was some comment in the chat – I can go back – that someone wasn't able to attend the meeting in person in Abu Dhabi. But we can just follow up and get the confirmation as to who is already planning on being at the meeting, ICANN 60, and who is unable to be there, who was not planning to be there, could be there, should we plan for a Review Team session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, whether we fund them or not for a two-hour meeting is one of the questions we have to answer, but we have a fair amount of time to do that.

KAREN MULBERRY: A little bit of time, because with the scheduling [inaudible] going to ask these questions, because the Meetings Team plans far ahead, and they're now already working with the SO/AC leadership in terms of the block schedule for the meeting, so I want to make sure that anything that the Review Team, itself, would like to have, or arrangements it needs, we can make sure I get you on the schedule.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and travel arrangements are starting in early August.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, they are. So, we want to stay ahead of the curve. You can also determine whether you want the meeting to be another informal

session, much like you had at ICANN 59, where it's informal and working without – will any decisions be made? – but you're progressing the work informally, and then we can pick it back up again afterwards in a formal Plenary session, where we cover what transpires, so you can have a full discussion with the whole team. And so, you have many different options to consider at this point in time. We will do another Doodle poll here, and then you can move forward with making decisions as to, how do you want to approach ICANN 60?

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent.

KAREN MULBERRY: Alright. Thank you very much. Now, moving right along, I've got Lisa Phifer, who's going to walk you through the Board resolution, so you have some sense of the initial ask that has come down when the Review Team was convened. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Karen. This is Lisa Phifer, here. The Board resolution itself, is actually fairly brief. To back up, prior to this resolution, there was the call for volunteers. Many of you are probably aware the original call for volunteers for this Review Team was actually in October of last year, and that call was delayed a few times to allow for broader participation. But in view of that call for volunteers, the Board did pass a resolution in February of this year, which appointed Chris as our liaison from the Board, and Chris is actually a member of the Review Team, but does

serve as the liaison to the Board. The resolution also asked for the Review Team to, as one of its first activities, to develop a Terms of Reference and approve it. The Terms of Reference is where we'll memorialize our decisions on scope. As well as the Terms of Reference, then there would be a Work Plan corresponding to that Terms of Reference. The original ask was for that to be done by the 15 of May this year. Obviously, that didn't happen because of the delays in forming the Review Team, itself. But one of the activities that we do need to take on very soon is to plot out when this Review Team, now having been assembled and we know when our face-to-face meeting will be, to project when we might have Terms of Reference assembled, ready for approval by the Review Team, and then ready to provide to the ICANN Board.

Now, for those of you that are kind of new to participating in Review Teams, you might be wondering, what is a Terms of Reference? So, I just wanted to give you a brief intro to that. The Terms of Reference will include some background on the Review Team's mission, as well as ICANN's mission, relative to this Review Team. The Terms of Reference will include a set of definitions on related terms. It will include primarily a large section on the scope of work, as yet to be agreed by this Review Team, but that's where the scope discussion will actually be memorialized and tied back explicitly to the ask in the bylaws. The ask for this Review Team – and as has been noted several times, the bylaws do ask us at least to look at the implementation of the previous Review Team's recommendations, as well as to consider the OECD guidelines for the protection and the sub-privacy and transporter loads of personal data. The scope may, of course, include other things. Once we have

that discussion, that would be memorialized in the Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference also will include a timeline that plots out the work based on that scope, and some information about the operation of the Review Team – for example, the responsibilities of leadership, the responsibilities of individual Review Team members, and discussion of how electronic tools might be used by the Review Team to conduct its work, some rules about meetings will be held and transparency of those meetings, how subteams might be used by the Review Team, how independent experts might be used, and also any agreements regarding travel support.

Now, in preparation for your work, Staff has actually already developed a skeleton Terms of Reference for this group to fill in, but there is considerable work to be done to actually define that scope and flesh out a Work Plan that would correspond to that scope.

Hopefully, that gives you some context for the Board resolution and what we should be striving for out of the scope discussion. Any questions? I see Alan has his hand up. I'll turn this back to Karen now.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Lisa. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Lisa, you said that there is a skeleton available. Is that posted with the rest of the documents, or can we make it distributed to the list?

LISA PHIFER: It is not yet posted. We can certainly distribute it to – we have a skeleton available that's been through a number of clean-up iterations among Staff, but one thing we're working on right now is aligning it with the standard template that will be used with for Terms of Reference, so it might take us another day or two to get that to you, but we can certainly distribute it for your consideration.

ALAN GREENBERG: Doesn't sound like a problem to me.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. Any other questions or items you want to note in terms of the Board resolution?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. Clearly, we're going to have to come up with a potential deadline. Clearly, it's not going to be till, I would say, at least a few weeks until after the Abu Dhabi meeting. Hopefully, by the Abu Dhabi meeting, we will have pretty well the scope defined, but at that point, we're going to have to start putting together the timeline and Work Plan, so I think we're looking at something late in the year. Early December is probably going to be about the earliest we're likely to have it ready. [CROSSTALK] Just to set expectations. But I don't think we can consider setting a real date until we see our meeting schedule and other things like that.

KAREN MULBERRY: And thank you, Alan. And what you might ask is, have Chris just staying as the Board liaison – just keep the Board apprised of when you anticipate having a response back to the [inaudible] the question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know he's dropped off; I guess his train is in a tunnel.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. But I just wanted to make sure that everyone was aware, and that if possible, you just keep the Board informed that you do intend to do this, and that you will let them know when you will have a better date to manage your expectations.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we can say with assurance that this will be the next Board that we are delivering this to.

KAREN MULBERRY: [inaudible] I will leave that up to you. Okay, moving along – observers. Now, we've had a couple of discussions on observers, and I just want to keep that in front of you, because we've actually had six observers in the Observer Adobe Room, following the discussions of the Review Team, and the bylaws do note that while there may be a limited number of members on the Review Team, there are an unlimited number of observers that are encouraged to follow the work of the Review Team. So, I just want to keep this in front of you so that you can have an understanding of the observers and consider as you move through your

EN

work, how you might want to include or encourage comments from the observers, or allow them to participate in any of your discussions. So, just something for you to consider. Cathrin?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you. This is Cathrin. Just to ask who the observers are. Did you just say there were six observers already?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, Brenda just let me know that there were six of them following the discussion. Brenda, I don't know if you posted the observers in the – ah, here they are. Their names are in the notes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Alright.

KAREN MULBERRY: And what we did was, all of the applicants for the Review Team who were not nominated and chosen to be members of the Review Team, we did go back and ask them if they wanted to be signed up on the observer list. Now, note that the observers do get sent out the agenda, and then they get links to their own observer room. Only the Review Team members get links to this room.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay, so they can follow our discussions, but they cannot actively participate? Is that correct?

KAREN MULBERRY: Well, that's the way it's set up right now. They have their own separate chat room and everything else. Now, what we have done, and what the SSRt Review Team is doing is actually having the observers capture questions or statements in the chat room that are then read in by the secretary to the main Review Team room, should you want to consider [inaudible] comments they're making, or you can ask them at a certain point to do that, if you want comments from them. But again, it's up to the Review Team to determine how you would like to interact and engage with any observers that might be participating or following your work. It's not a decision you need to make now, but I think that, as the work progresses, it will be useful to have at least some decisions made framing how you want to work with your observers. Alan, you have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I think what we're doing right now is fine to go ahead, and it probably will not be till the face-to-face meeting that we come to a head and decide whether – exactly how we're going to work. I suspect we're going to end up with something close to what we have right now, but – the concept of accepting questions from observers and things like that sounds quite reasonable. I also suspect the interest will drop off as we continue working.

KAREN MULBERRY: I can tell you from the other Review Team that interest comes and goes. It's like a wave. There's a lot, and then there's none, and then there's a

lot, so just to manage your expectations along those lines. But I just want to keep that in front of you, and what we can do is just for the face-to-face agenda, so we can bring it up again and it will no longer appear on your weekly agenda as a topic you might want to consider.

Alright. So, last item is any other business that anyone would like to raise. If there is nothing else, we're actually at the top of the hour that was scheduled for this call. I'd like to thank everyone for the discussion and for participating, and we will get this Doodle poll out so we can determine whether there's going to be a call next week on the 20 of July, or you want to postpone that to the 27 or whatever the schedule might be, and we'll circulate the Action Items to everyone. And then, Alan, and Susan, and Stephanie – we can be back in touch with you on how you might want to set up any leadership calls and discussions, to see how you would like us to work with you all on all of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for taking the lead on this, Karen.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Alan, and thank you all for stepping up so I can step back a little bit. Alright, everyone have a wonderful rest of your day.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

UNKNOWN: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Karen, can you include Gisella on the mailing list for setting up any meetings, both leadership ones and regular meetings?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. I'll make sure that her address has been included.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

UNKNOWN: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]