ALAN GREENBERG:	And Brenda or whoever's doing the call management, if we could do a roll call, please.
BRENDA BREWER:	Hi, I just will announce the names who have joined the Adobe Connect room. We have Alan Greenberg, Carlton Samuels, Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, Lili Sun, and Stephanie Perrin, Susan Kawaguchi. We do have an observer, [inaudible] [Hamu] in the observer room today. And from staff, you can see that we have myself, Charla, Jean-Baptiste, Karen, we have Lisa, and Steve has joined for the ICANN org.
	Thank you, Alan. Over to you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. Who has joined from ICANN Board?
BRENDA BREWER:	Org. Organization. Sorry about that.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Org. Oh, sorry.
BRENDA BREWER:	ICANN org.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. The first problem with that name was my hearing. Okay. Welcome, it's Alan Greenberg speaking. This is the second plenary meeting, the first one I have attended last week. I was traveling at the time and could not make it.
	First of all – let me get into the swing, it's early for me to – does anyone have any questions on the agenda? Any questions or changes? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I'll assume the agenda is accepted as presented.
	The first substantive item on the agenda is to talk about leadership. The only people who had expressed an interest – as far as I understand – in leadership are myself, Cathrin and Susan. We met yesterday, and our recommendation at this point is that I be named as Chair and Cathrin and Susan as Vice Chairs. That may get revised as we both get into the full swing of the meeting, and especially once we go through the face to face where we've locked in all of our aims and goals.
	At this point, I believe I have the time and capacity to do it, and there is a general feeling that this structure was sufficient and optimal for us to go forward. So, I would like to put that on the table right now and see if there are any comments, questions. And if the rest of the group agrees, then we will go forward with that structure. I'll open the call at this point.
	We have an agree from Carlton. I see no hands and hear no voices. I'll assume that is tacit assent and agreement to the structure, and we'll go forward with that. Thank you.

The next item is a fact sheet that staff has put together, and we'll have a presentation. I don't know if Charla will be doing the presentation. I see it was done by Charla and Xavier, but I don't see Xavier on the call so I'm assuming Charla will. But if it's someone else, then please speak up. Oh, Xavier is on the call. I take it back. I'm working on a very small screen here. Who will be taking the section?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Hi, everyone. Xavier is going to be doing the initial part of the presentation, and it looks like he muted his mic. So, Xavier, if you're speaking, if you could unmute your mic. I know it's early.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Hello, everyone. Thank you, Charla. Thank you, Alan. Can I have the next slide, please? Next. Thank you.

So, [inaudible] quick and high level, the review team – and not necessarily specifically this review team, for any review team, what we try to put in place to support the work of the review teams is a mechanism that has a primary objective to have a very transparent governance that allows accountability. So, accountability of the review team to the overall community, to the public at the end of the day that the work of the review team is supporting the objective of the review to in this case review the effectiveness of the topic that's being reviewed in that the time spent, the funds used in order to perform the review are used effectively to produce recommendations that are useful and effective for the purpose of the review.

In participating to this review and in leading this review, you, community members take responsibility towards the overall community and the public of performing this review with the intent and desire that it will produce effective recommendations, and engaging the funds and support that this review requires, you also take the responsibility to be accountable of the funds that are engaged to the public.

So, in order to do that, we as a community have developed some mechanisms that are laid out here that are fairly straightforward of having a plan for the review, which is called a project plan, and you have the charter, you have the scope. There is a layout of the timeline and work plan that the review will go through on the outset with a preliminary budget that is the result of the experience of having conducted reviews in the past and using what I would call envelopes or standard type of costs that are expected for the review, and that helps establishing a preliminary budget. With that budget and that project plan, the cost management will then be put in place to manage the costs associated with the review.

As an example of cost, you have if the review members meet at any meeting, there's potentially travel support. Those costs are then managed from the perspective of eligibility of travel, of the traveler to be supported, follow the guidelines and policies of travel support, and so on.

And then the tracking and the reporting of those costs is what helps them of course be able to lay out and be transparent both of course public – be transparent about what those costs are, and have monitoring the costs so that we have an understanding of what are the

costs that have been engaged, and compare those against budget, and then be able to provide this information, of course, to the review team and to the public to be transparent about what the costs are associated with the review team.

So, that's the [inaudible] principle. the intent is to be transparent so that the accountability of the review team and of ICANN in relation to this review allows to understand the objectives of the review, [inaudible] the review, the [inaudible] of progress of the review against its plan, including the costs associated with [inaudible].

Let me stop there and see if there are any questions at this stage on the role principle, and then we'll move on to the next slide. I don't see any questions at this stage, but if anyone sees any that I'm missing, please let me know. Next slide, please.

As I indicated earlier, the envelope of funds available on the outset for and the beginning of this review are simply is an envelope that's still [inaudible] on the basis of historical experience of preceding reviews of this type. So, it's an envelope on the perspective that it simply is an amount of fund that presumes a number of activities or includes potential expenses that are yet to be determined.

As an example, included in the envelope of $550,000 for this review, there are potential professional services estimated at $200,000. At this stage, it's simply an envelope on the perspective that it is not yet determined whether the review will require to use the services of external consultants or advisors that would be necessary. So, one, we don't know yet if that will be necessary to be spent. So, it may be lower

that we spend against this specific bucket. But at this stage, if there would be such a need, then there is $200,000 to be used for that purpose. Then travel support for potential meetings is at $340,000, and with one already specific meeting identified for Brussels in October.

So, the envelope is – as I indicated – an amount set aside on a basis of historical understanding. Of course, as the review team develops its project plan that will lay out what you intend to do, how you intend to do it, over what period of time, then you will have now a more specific understanding of the activities that you intend to carry out, and therefore a more refined and specific understanding of the potential costs associated with those activities.

So, as this project funding is developed, then the refinement of the amount of resources required will also be available, and you may end up by needing maybe less meetings and maybe more external services, or vice versa, or other type of costs. I also want to point out – it's not listed here – this amount is not inclusive of the cost of the support that is received by the review team from the perspective of ICANN organization support.

Just for the record, you all probably understand and know that the team members that continue to be supporting the work that you will carry out have a cost. The IT infrastructure that supports Adobe Connect, for example, is obviously having a cost as well. All those costs are infrastructure support, any staff support are not included in the envelope but are costs that are incurred by ICANN to help and support the reviews to be conducted.

What if the budget is insufficient in regards of the project plan? If that would be the case, based on any intent or anticipation of additional resources needed for any activity that's not been covered by the original envelope, there will be then a need for [inaudible] meeting would need for more additional resources documenting this, providing rationale, and we will then support submission of a request for additional funds to the Board of ICANN with preliminary review by the Organizational Effectiveness Committee that will assess the request, and discuss then with the Board the need for resources. And obviously, the rationale and the necessity of incurring additional costs is something that needs to be documented, justified and transparently also of course reported. Let me stop there, and –

ALAN GREENBERG: Xavier, do you hear me?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a question in the queue for a while. If we could go to Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. Just a question with respect to the scope of the costs, and I think I get the picture. The accountability with respect to the WHOIS review exercise is quite limited. It's basically in terms

management of the scope of our review, and that is set by the previous WHOIS review, if I've got that correctly, and the recommendations that were included in that WHOIS review. But nobody who's looking at WHOIS in 2017 can escape the conclusion that there must be a risk management plan somewhere with respect to information management practices and wonder about that. And if there is no plan, that would be something that from a corporate perspective ought to be reviewed. Does risk management of ICANN as a corporate entity at all intervene in here, or is that totally separate? And I hope you follow my line of questioning here.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Stephanie. I'm not completely relating. [I suppose] I'm just not understanding. The point about risk management of ICANN in relation to this review, could you elaborate a little bit further on your question, please?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, WHOIS has been a stalemate in terms of the treatment of personal information and how data protection legislation would be accommodated for basically 17-18 years. We have a workaround that we knew at the time of the last review was not working because nobody invoked it. We know that now because it's still not working. That would be the WHOIS [inaudible] law procedure. I believe there have finally been some waivers granted, but it could hardly be called a universal success. And then we have the GDPR coming in in May of 2018, which

imposes considerable financial risks on some stakeholders and indeed on ICANN as data controller.

While I share everybody's desire to get this review over with quickly and not intrude upon the scope of the larger RDS PDP that is going on that is settling the fate of the – or we hope it's setting the fate of the WHOIS one more time, it seems to me that it would be not in keeping with principles of accountability to ignore this rather large risk that is looming on the horizon, and that indeed some of us are on the other committee, ICANN's scrambling to see if it can become compliant.

So, simple compliance with law is a requirement of ICANN's terms of reference, and it hasn't necessarily been doing that. How do we manage that risk or avoid that risk and do a competent review that we're proud to be a team member of? Thanks.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes. Thank you, Stephanie. I don't believe I'm qualified, Stephanie, and I don't want to speak out of term to determine what the scope of the review needs to be in relation to the previous history of RDS activities. And honestly, I will not be able to speak about the scope of the review itself. I would like the team members and maybe others in the team help address your point and your question, which I think my understanding i think are quite relevant, but I'm simply not qualified to answer it. So, I don't know, Alan, if there's anyone else who wants to join in on that conversation. I'm not able to answer that question.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no one else right now. We are now 20 minutes into a call that started late, so how much more time do you have on your particular item?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think unless there's further questions on the fact sheet and on the mechanisms of budget, [inaudible] I'm basically done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then let's go on to the fact sheet and then we'll take any questions at the end.

XAVIER CALVEZ: We can of course review the fact sheet template, have a quick review of it. But if you need to buy time back, we can skip that and let the –

ALAN GREENBERG: Xavier, this is the first time that any of us – including those on previous review teams – have seen the term fact sheet, so if we could do a very quick review.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay. Sure. Let's go to the next slide, please. Thank you.

So, it's small on the screen, but the fact sheet is intended to provide a mobile overview of the review by providing the purpose of the review on the top left of this document, it identifies the review, the nature of

the review, it identifies the references of the wiki page that everyone can find the information relative to the review. It provides [inaudible] on the project plan of the review in section three, for example, at the bottom, you have the various milestones of the work that the review will carry out from beginning to end, and that helps tracking the progress of the review and be able to report it, therefore it's part of this fact sheet.

This section two has the financial resources associated with the review, which we've talked about a little bit earlier. We have here the $200,000 of professional services, we have a $340,000 travel, we have an estimate of the cost of support as well that are also repeated here for a total amount. And then as the plan grows, further updates of this fact sheet will be then provided and published and will indicate the actual amount of money spent against the original budget and allow therefore of course the review team members to see what the funds are that have been spent in the public to have the same information.

You have then the status on the top right that measures the progress in terms of percentage using the milestones that appear in the bottom and provide simply a percentage of progress against the plan, just to have a simple, straightforward ratio or percentage that shows the progress. The progress of course of the work, and then there's the amount or proportion of the budget consumed at the time the fact sheet is presented.

As an illustration, when you look at the review status of the top right, if the review has [inaudible] up to 20% of its work as an example of the first top percentage that has consumed 80% of its resources on the

bottom percentage in that review status, there's probably a problem because you have a lot of work still to do and little resources left from the budget. So, that's an indication of consistency [also] the progress of both the milestones and how much work has been done and remains to be done versus how much resources have been consumed and remains to be dispensed from the budget.

There is also in the section one the measurement of the volunteer participation, meaning the members of this review team and how much they're participating against the scheduled calls or meetings that happen and that's also measured in the section one. That fact sheet is updated on a regular basis, usually on a monthly basis. Then it's provided to the review team members and then is published on the wiki.

I'll stop here and see if there are any questions. Unless there are any, Alan, we're done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Xavier. There are no questions at this point.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless there are quickly, we will go on to the next agenda item, and that is specifically the schedule of plenary calls. There apparently was some confusion, certainly amongst staff, over exactly what – if anything – was

decided in the plenary call last week. There seemed to be a general perception that the decision was to have biweekly calls, but there was some confusion, and as you will have seen, meeting schedules have been sent out and appointments have been sent out for weekly calls.

So, it's the consensus certainly of the leadership that we think we would like to start with calls every two weeks and proceed from there, perhaps making them more common, more often later on, and certainly it's something we should discuss on the face-to-face meeting. But at this point, every two weeks seemed to be more appropriate.

Now, did I get that wrong, not having been at the meeting, or is there anyone who disagrees are would like to argue for weekly meetings at this point? I'll give people a moment to either put their hand up or call out. I have a number of people typing.

Alright, Carlton, Volker are supporting it, so unless I hear someone else arguing for something else, then let us presume that we will meet every two weeks, and starting this week. So, we'll meet again in two weeks but not next week, and see what kind of progress we make at that point. And with that, we'll go on to the next agenda item, and that is the terms of reference. I'll turn it over in a moment to Lisa.

I will say there are pluses and minuses to the number of documents and processes that are going along. As a member of the ATRT 2 Review Team, we saw virtually none of this, and we basically were put in a room and told, "Let's do the review."

As I said, there are pluses and minuses. We had to fight relatively hard to even find out if there was a budget, never mind what it was. And

clearly, that's no longer the case, so there certainly are pluses. But the amount of documentation that goes along with this review has significantly increased from past reviews. So, I look forward to hearing exactly what a term of reference is, and we will go over to Lisa right now.

I'm assuming – tell me if I'm wrong – we started seven minutes after the hour. Is everyone comfortable with going for the full hour and continuing the seven minutes after the next hour? I hear, "No, no," so I'm going to assume that is the case. I do note that we were asked in the chat whether the calls going forward should be one hour or 90 minutes, and we'll go back to that item. That's something we should have covered under the previous agenda item, and I'll go back to that after Lisa has finished her presentation. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. If I could have the next slide, please.

As those of you who were on our last plenary call may recall, when we spoke to this slide on the ICANN Board resolution, it's useful to think about the terms of reference and the context of Board resolution and the history of what's brought us here so far. So, the original call for volunteers for this review team actually went out in October, and that led the Board in February to adopt this resolution appointing Chris Disspain to serve as a member of this review team and also to set a target date on the 15th of May this year for an approved terms of reference and work plan.

Terms of reference and work plan are two documents that all review teams are expected to adopt amongst themselves and then submit to the Board. So in setting that target date, the Board of course was looking at the October 4th call for volunteers and what had transpired over the couple of months since that.

Now, as you know, this review team took a bit longer than that to form. We actually formed in May, and so obviously, the May 15th target date needs to be adjusted, and the question that was asked of the review team and that Chris Disspain will then take back to the Board was, what does this review team think its estimated target date might be for producing that terms of reference and a work plan?

In the coordination call yesterday with your new leadership team, it was noted that in order to provide that estimate, you really do need an understanding of what a terms of reference and work plan are, and so that's why I was asked to give you this brief overview of those items today.

Please note that we will also be following this up with an actual template to start your work in fleshing out the terms of reference and work plan, and what I'm trying to do today is just to give you a general overview of what is meant when we're talking about terms of reference and a work plan. Next slide, please.

Alright. So, let's start with terms of reference. What are the terms of reference? In general – not specifically for this review team, but for all review teams – the goal of a terms of reference is to demonstrate how the objective of a review actually be accomplished. That's in

EN

consideration both of the time frame that you apply to the review, as well as to resources that you specify will be needed to complete the review. And you'll see that that's of then linked to the budget estimation, but really, the goal of the terms of reference is to define that objective. And as you know, scope is a very big part of that objective, and I'll be showing you how that fits into the terms of reference in just a moment.

But the idea of a terms of reference is really to provide that clear articulation of what work this review team needs to do in order to address its scope, and also, how will the review team know when it's done? After the terms of reference that any review team produces has been adopted by the review team itself by consensus within the review team, that terms of reference is then submitted to the Board, and that is actually the review team's response to the Board resolution asking for a terms of reference.

If at a later date the terms of reference needs to be changed, for example, your scope is modified or it turns out that something that you envisioned as a dependency changes, then the terms of reference does need to be modified, but that modification simply needs to be submitted back to the Board along with an explanation for why that terms of reference change was needed.

As I mentioned, there's a terms of reference template that is underway now. Staff has already been working on providing you a starting point to build out for your terms of reference, and what we're doing right now is putting that draft terms of reference into this template format so that there's consistency across all review teams. We hope to have that for

your very shortly, hopefully before the next plenary call that's in two weeks from now.

That template is intended to identify the topics that belong in there terms of reference to give you examples of issues that all review teams tend to address in their terms of reference, provide some best practices for how you flesh out those sections, and again, just serve as a starting point for you as the review team to actually adjust to meet your needs. So, the terms of reference is a skeleton or a framework. The actual thinking – especially in terms of mission, scope and work plan – is up for the review team to flesh out, and then of course, you can extend the terms of reference as you see necessary to address all the issues that are relevant to this particular review team.

Seeing no questions yet, let me move to the next slide, and then I'll take questions on terms of reference. Next slide, please.

So, what are some of the topics that you'll find in terms of reference and in the templates that you'll be receiving? Well, there's some basic information about the review itself, such as when the review was initiated and when the team was formed, the leadership of the team as well as the identified Board liaison. Links to your workspace on your wiki and your mailing list, links to where the Bylaw text setting out this review can be found, and any other important background links are part of the terms of reference. That's fairly boilerplate information that you'll find in the template that we provide.

The next section in terms of reference is the mission, purpose and terms. That will be probably where you'll spend the bulk of your time in

fleshing out the terms of reference, because this is where your discussion on scope will be actually recorded. Whatever the scope that this review team comes up with as agreed then by the review team by consensus would end up being recorded in your terms of reference and then submitted to the Board in this fashion.

Also, to provide context for that, terms of reference does include the text from the Bylaws setting forth a review, and any relevant background, in this case a brief set of background on the fact that there was a previous WHOIS Review Team and that produced implementation recommendations that the implementation will be assessed by this team.

Also, as part of that, there may be some definition of the relevant terms. Again, we'll provide you as much of the boilerplate information of this as we can in the template so that you can focus on the real work of fleshing out what the scope is based on that background and mission.

Terms of reference does also include a summary list of major milestone dates and deliverables, and that is linked to a work plan we'll talk about briefly in a moment. It includes some definition of review team composition, roles, responsibilities of team members, of leadership and of the Board liaison. Much of this is boilerplate, but of course can be amended and adjusted by the team as necessary to reflect your work. And then information on decision making, how this team will operate, how you'll reach consensus, how you'll make your communication transparent, and of course, obligations to the review team members themselves. Again, we'll provide you starting point text in the template,

and the review team can adjust it as needed to reflect your agreements on how this review team will work.

Now, those aren't necessarily all the topics that would be in a terms of reference. You can add to this as you feel necessary. You can adjust it to meet your needs, and what we're doing now in putting the draft text that we have for you in a template is simply to give you a good starting point to work off of. I hope that gives you at least some concept of what we're talking about when we say terms of reference. Let me pause here for just a moment and ask if there are questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are no hands up in the Adobe Connect.

LISA PHIFER: Great. Seeing none, let me move to my last slide – next slide, please – which is a brief statement of what's the work plan. Work plan is actually a separate document, because it delves into with more detail the milestone dates and list of deliverables that are briefly cited in the terms of reference. The work plan serves as a guide for the team to actually plan out its work for the review. It's very closely related to the fact sheet that Xavier went through earlier. The work plan outlines the areas that you'll discuss and the milestones that you think you'll achieve as part of the review process. Those milestones include things like preparation tasks, the actual tasks that would be taken on by subteams once you identify what subteams might be necessary to complete your work, and then the outputs that you'll produce, which will include at least one draft report. That's up to the team to decide. A public

comment period and a final report. And the goal of the work plan, of course, is to actually produce that traditional project plan that actually charts out your milestones, estimated completion dates and any dependencies that you may have.

I'll stop there. Hopefully, that gives you just a foundation of what you'll see in the terms of reference and the work plan template, and when the Board resolution asks for a terms of reference and work plan, what specifically they're asking for.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Lisa. Are there any questions? I'll make just one comment: as I said before, the process around these reviews and the documentation around them has grown significantly over the last couple of years. I am optimistic from what I hear that a lot of this work will be done – in terms of the formal presentation – will be done by staff. Obviously, with the content directed by the review team, but the paper workload itself is not being transferred to us. So, since that is what I gather is planned going forward, I'm quite pleased with that. Thank you.

Any further questions, any questions at all? You've obviously been exceedingly clear. Either that, or the people for whom it's early morning have fallen asleep.

LISA PHIFER: That happens. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I won't ask for who's fallen asleep. Alright. Let us go back in the agenda then, because we obviously didn't complete some of the items, and I'm one of those who may be half asleep.
	The first thing is the length of time of our meetings. The options that were presented there were 60 minutes weekly or 90 minutes going forward. My preference is to schedule the biweekly meetings for 90 minutes and do our best to try to manage them so we typically end in under 90 minutes, perhaps closer to 60, but we have a little bit of leeway so that we can exceed if necessary to make sure that we cover issues thoroughly. Does that sound like a good plan? So, we will schedule 90 minutes but do our best to turn some of that time back to you most weeks. If that's agreeable, then we may well find that we actually use the 90 minutes, but let's play it by ear at that.
	Lili and Carlton are okay. Volker, you said you prefer 60 with an option to extend. I'm considering the 90-minute scheduling as an option to extend. If we schedule them formally as 60, there will always be some people who have another meeting back to back. Okay, thank you, Volker. Anyone with a verbal comment? Then we'll take that as decided.
	We will try to have the agendas out, at least 24 and preferably more, preferably two days ahead of time. And we will also – if we cancel meetings, then we will certainly try to do that at least 24 hours ahead of time to give people a heads up. Certainly since some people are setting alarms to get to this meeting, it would be nice if people don't get to the meeting and find out it was canceled three hours earlier or something like that, which does occasionally happen on other meetings. We'll do our best to make sure that does not happen. But that means that if

people cannot attend, that we really do need apologies ahead of time. So, we need to be able to gauge whether someone's going to be here or not. And if you look at this meeting, we have several people who neither said they would not be here, nor have shown up. And I think we have to try to keep those to a minimum. It's a relatively small group, so it doesn't take many people not showing up to make the meeting not viable.

And that I think is all we had on the items that we skipped over too fast. Seeing no hands, then the next item is the RDS, and it's moving around on me so I'm having trouble reading it.

RDS guidance for determining scope of review. Not quite sure what that means, but I think it is a review of the discussions we have had on scope so far, either comments by the ACs, SOs to the initial proposal to reduce scope, or things that have happened since then. We decided we would try to present this late yesterday, and to whatever extent, Karen has managed to go back and put this together. I do appreciate it. It was requested on rather short notice. Karen, go ahead.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you very much, Alan. What I have here for you on the next two slides is just a summary of how the limited scope proposal really got started, and in terms of the guidance that was received back when it was circulated out to the SOs and ACs, that might be a good grounding point for your discussion on scope. This is tied to the document that was shared with the review team yesterday that we pulled together earlier

this year. It's a summary of what happened with and ask for to consider a limited scope for this review and the feedback that was received.

Now, this kinda outlines the substance of what was in the limited scope, and the proposal was to limit it to – at least this review – to a postmortem of what was implemented from the previous WHOIS review. And there were some very particular assignments for the ICANN organization to report on implementation and to review the recommendations in terms of how well they identify the issues and how well they were addressed, as well as how well the recommendations were implemented.

It also noted that the review scope should exclude what has already been covered by the GNSO RDS PDP effort, so this is kind of a framing of what was in the limited scope proposal that I know several folks have talked about, but I thought it might be useful to have some background of such and such to what it is.

Now, based on that proposal that was circulated out to the SOs and ACs, there were responses that came back. In terms of the feedback that was received, ALAC and SSAC both indicated they supported moving forward with the limited scope as it was stated. The GAC provided specific feedback that they have no real objections to the proposal, but they did have a number of expressed concerns and about excluding issues that were covered by the RDS PDP effort. So, and I think they raised that into the review team to talk about that as a [inaudible] scope.

GNSO feedback was a little more explicit in terms of they indicated their support for excluding issues already covered by the PDP efforts. They

definitely wanted to avoid duplication of [work]. So they also proposed some other items that would be useful for the group to consider as you develop your scope. In essence, the GAC and GNSO indicated it's really up to the review team to determine what the scope of the review might be. This is more guidance to consider as you go through what the scope ought to be.

The point that Alan raised earlier, we are combing through all of the e-mail archives and records on what the review team has exchanged to date on their positions around the limited scope, and we're preparing a document so that we can share that with everyone, so at least you have a summary of all the exchanges and items that have been noted related to building the scope of the review team.

I think the document just actually went out to the review team members' list. It's four pages long, so we'll get that out to everyone so you can take a look at the summary of the exchanges. Since it is four pages long, it wasn't put into the slide deck itself.

So, I'll give everybody an opportunity to get that summary document so you can build upon that, and Alan, maybe that is something that would be useful to discuss on an upcoming plenary call when other members are able to participate as well. Stephanie, you have your hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, hi. Thanks. Does the last bullet, the effectiveness of any other steps ICANN org has taken to implement WHOIS recommendations, include the Expert Working Group that a number of us served on?

KAREN MULBERRY: Only to the extent [that] the Expert Working Group input was considered in the first review. It was my understanding that the Expert Working Group input had moved off into the GNSO PDP work and became a foundation of that. I may be wrong, so please correct me.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, the determination to strike a review followed the release of the WHOIS Review report, the one that we're supposed to be reviewing. Yes, it was a Board-activated endeavor, but it costs a lot too. If I'm looking at this sort of with an auditor's look, it's something that somebody ought to review. And if we don't review it, then I don't know who does. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a queue, but just a very quick comment, Stephanie. A major item in the charter of the RDS PDP is to review what is in the Expert Working Group and consider the [as] parts of it which it considers appropriate. So, effectively, they are doing a review of the Expert Working Group and passing judgment on it. So, I do think that is covered there. But let me go to the queue. We have Cathrin first.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you, Alan. Can you all hear me?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Perfectly.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify because I see that the GAC feedback comes here on the slide right after the ALAC and the SSAC saying that many [members] have no objection to the proposal. And just for the sake of clarifying, what the GAC members had no objection to was the GNSO proposal for the scope. It was not the limited proposal that was set out in the resolution, but rather, the GNSO's approach to it, and one issue where we didn't have agreement on was this exclusion of the RDS PDP efforts entirely, because the opinion of some of the GAC members was that we would inevitably have to address a number of issues that would also from a different perspective be relevant to the RDS PDP, and they just wanted to make sure that the scope didn't go as far as to include those issues that relate to the current functioning of the WHOIS, but are also relevant to the RDS PDP's considerations. Just to be very clear on that, the GAC's agreement was not largely with the resolution, but with the GNSO proposal for the scope.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cathrin. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. I just want to note, the Board's action plan stemming from the original WHOIS Review Team's recommendations specifically identified a two-prong approach, one prong of which was addressing recommendations through implementation of the existing WHOIS

system, the second prong of which was to initiate the RDS PDP and form the actual working group to lay a foundation for that PDP's work.

As already has been noted, the EWG report has been used as input to the PDP's work, and there's discussion on relationship of this review to that PDP effort, but I just wanted to make clear that there was very specifically in the action plan for implementing recommendations that two prong approach, and what you'll find in the implementation of recommendations that you've already talked about reviewing in-depth, you will find actions taken on the existing WHOIS system, that being separate from actions taken to lay a foundation for and then launch the RDS PDP.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much, and thanks for that clarification, Lisa. Yes. So, that kind of means that the review of the EWG's effectiveness as a – let's call it a research mechanism is within our scope. Correct there, or does the two-prong already lead us out because of the limitations of our charter? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll try and answer that. I don't think there is a definitive answer. If you consider the EWG part of direct implementation, the unrequested implementation of the recommendations or unrecommended recommendation of the RDS Review Team, then it is within our charter.

If it's something the Board decided was a necessary part of the process before starting any design work and specification work in a PDP, then it's not part of our charter.

I would say since it's straddling the two, it's certainly within our scope to critique it, but not to redo its work. At least that's the way I read it, anyway. So, we can identify strengths and weaknesses of it. Since the PDP is doing that in perhaps infinite detail, I would want to be very careful that we don't try to redo the PDP's work and assess all of the detailed recommendations and the detailed dialog in the EWG report, because that I think is duplicative of what the PDP is doing. But certainly, some level of summary of a critique of whether it was a useful exercise or not is something that we could do, I would think. And that remains to be discussed when we look at the detailed scope discussion. Does that sound reasonable, Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, Alan. Thanks. I just typed in the chat that clearly, our role is not to develop policy, our role is [inaudible] actions taken to develop and implement policy. At least that's the way I see a review mechanism such as this. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I personally would like to see a minimal amount of time expended on this, because the amount of time that is being expended and will continue to be expended in the PDP on the details of the EWG report is something a little bit scary, and I wouldn't want to take it on within our scope. But Cathrin, go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, hi. Thank you, Alan. Just to suggest that [in a way to] take this forward – and maybe this is my structured German approach getting the better of me, but I think it would be really helpful if we used this also as an input for the terms of reference, and we just try to sort of write down the options for the scope as we see it, and taking into account what has already been said in today's call, but also on the list before, and then we start looking at the concrete text and hammering out the different ideas that we do want to cover or don't want to cover. And that might help us to actually move forward on this discussion rather quickly, because I'm still conscious of the [four] ccNSO people who may wish to join in time for a face-to-face meeting, and the sooner we can get some sort of movement going on the discussion on the scope, the better for them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I can't claim a structured German approach, but I think what you're describing is exactly what I was going to be proposing. That is, we need to lay out what all the options are that have been proposed, and if someone has scope issues that have not been raised yet, then I would suggest you raise them on the e-mail list very quickly, and we will develop some sort of process for that to make sure we can discuss them all and come to closure.

We are now at the decided ending time, and we still have one more very critical item that I'd like to do. So, Karen, if you could talk about

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you very much, Alan. I thought it would be useful for the review team members in particular, the new folks who have never participated in the review team process before, to get an understanding of travel funding.

We've got your first face-to-face meeting now scheduled for Brussels in October, the 2nd and 3rd. My dogs are waking up. What ICANN will cover as part of the travel funding process as the economy airfare, the hotels and meals to attend the meeting, and it's in accordance with the ICANN travel policy. You can click on that link and it'll take you to the page where the travel policy is stated.

Now, constituency travel folks have been given the list of names that will be participating in the meeting, and they will contact you to assist you with your travel arrangements. I believe that should be happening in the next week or so, [as they have to contract] with the hotel and do some other details before they start that.

Now, if you need a visa letter to come to Brussels, you can contact staff and we will facilitate that for you. Also, if you need any additional information about the per diem, you can click on that, and what that is is a per diem to cover your meals and other travel costs will be provided by every day that you're travelling. So, it gives you some funds to deal with that instead of trying to collect receipts and get it reimbursed for something.

I don't know if you have any particular questions on that, but I thought this might be useful for the review team members who are new to the process to at least have a summary idea of what to expect and when to expect it. Alan, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I see no hands at this point. My only other comment under Any Other Business is to reinforce that I would certainly like to see the e-mail list being used heavily. Different PDPs, working groups and review teams have used mailing lists differently. Some of them used them exceedingly heavily, some like the RDS PDP I think used them too heavily and put demands on people by absolutely huge volumes, but others have used them almost non-existently, and I think our work can be more effective if we make sure to voice views over the mailing list and not just wait for the teleconferences or face-to-face meetings.

I have no other issues to raise. I'll be sending out a number of e-mails in terms of a summary of this, and I assume we'll see a staff summary including all the decisions, any decisions we've made. And if there is no one else, then we'll see you in two weeks.

Last call for any comments. Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, thank you all for attendance, and we'll see you on the mailing list. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]