RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Now that the meeting is being recorded, we can totally begin. So, yeah, so – Plenary. Right. We've got apologies from James, Boban, Mr. Matogoro, and Jeff, and I don't believe anybody else has said that they won't make it, so it looks like we have a pretty full house. I don't know if we're missing anyone yet, or [inaudible]; if so, they'll catch up. So, okay – can we move forward a slide, please?

So, first, I'd like to ask if there are any updates to Statements of Interest. Hearing no comment – okay, great. So, here is the draft agenda, open to agenda bashing. SSR 1, we have a briefing this morning, and James Caulfield's going to give us a rundown on newest things, and Xavier and – yeah. So, we'll defer to them in a moment. And we'll talk about the Work Plan template that Staff has been nice enough to put together for us, and I guess – I don't know how many people have had a chance to take a look at the template that came out earlier this morning, but we'll give everyone – I think what I'll probably do is see how everyone feels about giving [inaudible] for any comments and feedback, because I think what we'd like to do is try to use this for each of the subteams, and I think there is potentially some possibility that it winds up being pretty broadly used after this. So, this is a good opportunity for feedback on the format and structure of it. And then, after that, I think we'll get to what I hope is kind of the main meat of the discussion today, which is subteam readouts. And while there may or may not be a huge amount for subteams to talk about today, I'm hoping

there is some. I think, going forward, we're going to be leaning more and more on the subteams to start really sort of making some forward progress. Since we've decided that the work done by the team will be broken into subteams, the subteams get the duty of toeing the line. If people haven't had that sort of thought before today – like this sort of started now – the subteams are where the sausage is going to get pressed.

Then, we'll talk a little bit about Abu Dhabi and outreach meetings, and then finish up by talking about our upcoming – or our down-the-road-ish January face-to-face meeting dates, and go over a point of ambiguity, and see if we can come to some sort of resolution. So, any comments or agenda bashing before we get started?

Okay, cool. Alright, so I believe, then, that takes us straight to the SSR 1 implementation briefing. I'm not sure who is going to lead the charge, there. I'm not sure if it's James, or whomever, but please feel free to [inaudible].

NEGAR: Good morning, Eric. This is Negar. We are still waiting for Xavier Calvez to join us. He is two minutes away. He's on another call. Is it possible to move on to the next topic of conversation quickly, and then we'll get started once he dials in?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'll tell you what. Yeah, the Work Plan template. We could probably do that. I think the subteams could potentially go with the [inaudible] on

us. So, let's leave that one. But yeah, okay, can we jump to the slides on the Work Plan template? This will warm everyone up for the SSR 1 [inaudible].

Okay. So, to just sort of briefly – Staff shouldered all the load on this, so I'm going to speak to all the hard work done by them, so [inaudible] taking credit for [inaudible] good work. Generally speaking, this is supposed to help us structure how we're going to take the work product we produce and make it ingestible by others. And so, it may – the idea, I think, is to generally for it to be helpful in structuring our work, in the sense of outlining milestones and structuring how we will actually achieve an ultimate goal of producing something. It's a medium for us to relay information, but it's also potentially supposed to be a planning tool for us, as well. So, you can take a look at the bullets, here. This is the danger of reading other people's slides; you sound like you don't know what you're talking about. But in general, this is basically supposed to be a tool to help us do project planning with a reasonably light touch, and have the result be something that we can communicate externally. And I think, like I said before, the success of this template may cause it to be more widely accepted across other Review Teams. So, take a close look and see what you think. Can we advance the slide, please?

And there it is. So, take a moment and look at the way it's structured. You can sort of see that this idea is [inaudible] scroll downward, and the gist of it would be that you add your activities left as they grow downwards, and you give a brief description, the start and completion date, and status updates and notes – I guess it's sort of more of an unstructured cell for each task, so that you can annotate it as you go

forward with how things are going, what's important, and what's not. So, it's a weekly type form, in the sense that a lot of the detailed nuance [inaudible] it doesn't have a sort of specific column so that it can be different per task, or per activity. So, I'd love to hear if this hits anybody, one way or the other, so – good, bad, or if it's sort of a little too fast-paced right now.

I'm going to start calling on people.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, Eric. This is Denise.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Is there more? I haven't had a chance to take a look at this template. Is it – is there – ?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think this is just the head of the template, so – yeah, okay, great. Now I'm in control. So, yeah – this is the [CROSSTALK] of the template. Watch out, everyone. I'm totally in control now.

DENISE MICHEL: I think everyone can control their own slides.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Really? Oh. Now I don't feel as important. Whatever. Anyway, so –
                      bubble busted. So, no, I think this is just a snippet. So, this would be
                      basically – this shows items 1.1 to .3, and then I guess it would be like a
                      1.4 – you'd add things descending across the page, and then you fill
                      them in as they go. So, I think the idea is that this would be like a big
                      Excel spreadsheet kind of thing, or a Word table, or something like that.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Is there any – I was wondering – I guess this is a question to Staff
                      – is there any additional template [inaudible]? [AUDIO ECHO]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, whoever muted. Okay, so – I'm sorry, Denise. Can you ask
                      that again?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Is there any additional template material? Like I said, I guess I'm
                      asking Staff – did you get a chance to build this out at all?

KAREN MULBERRY: Denise, this is Karen. In response to your question, yes, there is a much
                      more robust document with other sections, and we're starting to
                      populate it with some details, but we really wanted to make sure that
                      the Review Team was comfortable with this format, or if they had any
                      changes to this format before we actually did anything with it. And that
                      would be moving in with what the subgroups have identified as their
                      mission, and some of them actually do have Work Plans and other

details that they've outlined in some of their exchanges that we were looking at capturing. But we wanted to wait and make sure that the Review Team found this as an acceptable format for their Work Plan, and to keep track of their timeline and steps.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, thank you. Personally, I think this is fine. What's more important is that we have some symmetry and some key information across all the subgroups. So, unless anyone has objections to using this template, I would suggest that we quickly move on to a more fulsome template that would be filled out by each subgroup, and then collected and rolled into a major plan. And what this template should include are the key elements that the Co-Chairs had discussed with you previously, and that have been in Chair discussions. We want to capture the information gathering, any research that's needed, any particular outreach that you think is critical to the subtopic, or – and of course, projected dates for that, and its start and completion. I think that some key dates on expected completion would be great on that. And then, that will allow us to roll the subtopic work [inaudible] into a more robust [inaudible] and comprehensive Work Plan that would allow the team overall to have more visibility into our work and help us make sure we have all the work that we need teed up in advance of our January drafting session. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think that makes a lot of sense. Does anybody – Karen, I see your hand is up, but if that's just from before – or did you want to – ?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, sorry. Old hand.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Alright, cool. No, I think that makes a lot of sense, so I was going to say, let's give the team a little time to think this over. But yeah,, to Denise's point, I think moving expeditiously is probably more in keeping with where we actually are right now, as far as progress goes. So, unless somebody – and I see Ram Krishna agrees with me – or, agrees with Denise, so unless somebody sees something now – and it's a reasonably easy sort of template to [inaudible] – unless you see something now, I'll propose that any sort of issues that come up later on, we'll just try to factor in. We'll maybe wind up having to do a projection of this into something else if we may need it later on, but in the meantime, this seems [inaudible] to capture what we need, start and completion dates, with a [inaudible] for a status update.

So, unless anybody objects, I'm going to take roaring silence as approval for the template, and allow our Staff colleagues to move forward with what they're doing. Going once, going twice – cool. Alright, so I'll take that as tacit agreement. And then, if we need to [inaudible] for the call, somebody [inaudible] chat room or raise your hand – but I believe that everyone we need to help us brief – or to conduct the SSR briefing is on the call now. So, if that's the case, can we go to the briefing section, please?

Oh, I'm sorry. I'm in charge. I forgot. I am special. I'll get us back to the beginning, and then I'll cede control to whoever is presenting the SSR 1 review implementation.

Who – was the expectation that I was going to walk us through that, or is – ?

NEGAR: No, Eric. We – thank you very much for moving over to the SSR 1 briefing. We will be covering recommendations 25, 26, and 27 of the SSR 1 review implementation, and for this briefing, I'll turn it over to Xavier. If you can move the slide over two slides to the "Risk Management" slide title, Xavier would be able to get started.

Thank you. Xavier, please go ahead.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Hi, everyone. Can I have the next slide, please? Negar, do you mind confirming which slide we're on? Because since we can all move this – perfect, thank you.

NEGAR: Go ahead, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. So, I believe that this specific section relates to the recommendations 25, 26, and 27 of the SSR 1 reviews, and as a brief and high-level overview of the presentation, these recommendations

were basically related – at the time they were formulated – to having a root management framework in place, and for ICANN to put in place a risk management framework and not exclusively, but also addressing DNS-specific risks. So, in the foundation of the recommendations, you see the that the risk management framework was the topic of recommendation 25 and recommendation 26. And 27 really also related to the risk management framework, and basically indicates, in addition to recommendation 25, that this risk management framework should have – follow some standards of participation and transparency, and that it should be within the SSR remit and the scope of ICANN's mission, which is a [inaudible] requirement for the organization, so it does not only result from this recommendation. It simply is a requirement for the organization that it's within its mission.

So, the recommendation 25 is really the core of these three recommendations, and so, either – to put things back in context – ICANN has had a governance for risk management for a while in the sense that there was [inaudible] of the governance of risk management from the Board since 2008, with the creation of the Risk Committee of the Board – of the ICANN Board – in 2008. More formally, then, a risk management function was purposefully created in mid-2013, which represents an evolution from the risk management activities that were carried out in [inaudible] for a long time, but then these activities being carried out were structured and organized in a formalized risk management function. This risk management function was formalized simply by the creation of a department within ICANN that had, at the beginning, one person and then two persons staffed in this department that allowed [inaudible] the formalization of risk management

framework, and that ICANN initiated at the time the elaboration of this framework, using – developing a risk register, which resulted from being [inaudible] from the Board, who provided input to all the types of risks that they expected the organization would face. The community provided also input, and then the management of the organization, of course, provided input, and that allowed to create a risk register. And that risk register has now been in use and is being updated on a regular basis. The [inaudible] reevaluated severity and likelihood of the corresponding risks, and [inaudible] mitigation [inaudible] in accordance with what those risks are. There is, further elements of this risk management framework that are in development. Oh, sorry, backing up a second – this risk register covers also – of course, not exclusively, but also – DNS-related types of risks on an ongoing basis. We need to continue updating this model of this register with updates to the existing risks, as well as, of course, possible new risks that they've identified at any point of time.

There was a more specific work performed around the 2014 that was a bit more specific to the DNS risk assessment. Some of you may have participated to conversations that happened at the time, and these risks – or this evaluation – led to incorporating into the register that I mentioned earlier, risks that are more specific to the DNS risk assessment. And knowing to report that recommendation 27, the risk register that I'm mentioning are risks that pertain to ICANN and that may be related, in this case – in the case of the example that I'm taking to the DNS – they are not [inaudible] all the DNS risks. They are the DNS risks that ICANN, as part of its mission and as an entity, faces. I see that

DENISE MICHEL: No, actually, it's a question – and thank you, Xavier. Thanks for jumping on the phone early in the morning with this. I'm just [inaudible] at a bit of clarification. So, in the implementation report for these recommendations, there is reference to a DNS risk management framework, and then an enterprise management framework, and a DNS risk model, and risk assessment, and a resilient model. Could you clarify, I guess, what these terms mean? Or are they just interchangeable, or – ? It's a two-part question. This is my first question; I have a second [inaudible] [CROSSTALK].

XAVIER CALVEZ: I understand. Thank you. So, that's [inaudible] – I'm sure everyone or others may have the same question. So, to try to paint a broader picture, what I'm describing was developed [inaudible] and more formally with the creation of the risk management function of ICANN is the risk management framework for ICANN. Ignoring for a second the SSR review that is here – the SSR 1 review or even this review – ICANN is an organization like many other organizations, has developed a risk management function. It's also addressed – helped address – the recommendation from the SSR 1 review of the recommendation 25. But its creation is also addressing much more than simply that [inaudible] part of the best practice to have a regular risk management approach in any organization independently of even the type of activity

that any organization – you have many companies, whether they are nonprofit or for profit, that have risk management functions. And ICANN pursued that best practice and implemented a risk management approach – either a result of that best practice and the need to manage risks, irrespective of the recommendation from SSR 1, but also addressing at the same time, the recommendation 25. So, that's the ICANN risk management framework that we're talking about here.

There was, then, more specifically related to ICANN's environment, a more specific DNS risk assessment that was initiated in 2014 with [inaudible]. I think the [inaudible] of the resilience model that was [inaudible] established in May 2014, and that informed in the overall ICANN risk management framework. So, the DNS risk assessment was a one-time exercise that occurred in 2014, and it resulted in a certain amount of work, including what was called at the time this DNS resilience model, and the risk assessment exercise – which, from my understanding, was [inaudible] completed, but it was initiated in 2014 – [inaudible] the risk register that is being – that was developed as part of the creation of the risk management framework by ICANN that incorporates, as a result, some of the DNS-specific risks. So, the DNS risk assessment was a one-time exercise. It then informed the ongoing risk management framework that ICANN has developed since – [inaudible] since 2013, and is ongoing now. I hope this clarifies your point.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, thank you. Maybe pictures are needed. That's a fairly complex series of events. So, what the Board approved in 2013 can be viewed

more as a framework within which there are periodic updates of DNS risks?

XAVIER CALVEZ: So, the framework is not just about DNS risks, right? Again, the risk management of ICANN is not specific to DNS risks, but incorporates also DNS-related risks.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. Is there any other questions? I still see your hand up, Denise, but I suppose this is the hand from a previous question. Is there another specific question to this recommendation? So, to conclude on this specific recommendation. One thing that we are in the process of developing and organizing is related to the last part of the recommendation 25 – I'm simply assuming that everyone has that on their screen – is the part of the recommendation that relates to the [inaudible] of information about the risks, and it says in the last part of the recommendation, "recognizing the sensitive nature of some of these factors," so [inaudible] independently of the recommendation – of the SSR 1 recommendation – one element of the risk management framework – and in accordance with recommendation 26 as well, which was talking about participation and transparency – was more in the process of defining and organizing, is how ICANN shares with the public the information about its risk management framework. And the last

part of the recommendation 25 illustrates the challenge related to publishing information about risks is that [inaudible] the defense system for a country, or the more we talk about it, the less effective it is – or the more you describe the risks that you face, the more you make them big. Let me take an example. If you describe the risks that you think you would have the risk of being sued for whatever reason, and how you intend to mitigate that risk, to prepare and avoid that risk, it actually informs and provides strategic and confidential information to the people that may actually want to sue you. So, it helps. That's a little situation of the sensitivity to sharing information about risks, and about also the mitigation action that you put in place to mitigation the risks.

So, as we are developing the model of transparency and communication, we are trying to provide as much visibility to the risk management framework, to the [inaudible] that ICANN uses, while [inaudible] to share information that then increases the [inaudible] of the risks for ICANN simply as a result of having made those risks [inaudible] public. So, this is the decision that we've had with the Board a few times, and as we are [inaudible] developing the risk management framework, one of the elements that we are in the process of designing – we have not finished yet – is, how do we engage with the public – and of course, more specifically, with the community – on risk management? So, what will be clear is that we can very easily speak about the risk management framework, its components, the methodology, and [inaudible]. When it comes to sharing a list of risks, this is where the challenges start, as well as when talking about how we mitigate those risks within the organization, and we will need to find ways to be able to share as much information as possible without

appearing, obviously, and affecting the [inaudible] of the organization. [inaudible] and let ICANN [inaudible] ask a question or make a comment.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] thanks so much [inaudible] think that the important [inaudible] concern [inaudible] because of [inaudible] –

XAVIER CALVEZ: I apologize, Kerry; you sound very low. We can't hear you very well. Or at least, I can't.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me now, Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: It's a bit better. If you can speak maybe closer to the mic, or a bit louder, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

I cannot hear you anymore at all.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me now?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Perfect. Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think your caution that you just ended with is very important to [inaudible].   What [inaudible] and whether or not there is any independent audit of the implementation of the risk [inaudible] identified. While there is a [inaudible] to the Board, is there any other factors [inaudible] there's an audit [inaudible] identify [inaudible] within the framework [inaudible] reduce [inaudible] whether or not this is a low, acceptable risk, or whether a higher risk [inaudible] intolerable [inaudible].

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. So, I gathered from what you pointed out to the part about having the risks identified [inaudible] – having the risk management and the risk identification exercise been [inaudible] externally. This is not the case; it's not happened, as of yet. As part of any risk management framework – and one element of risk management, which is not exclusive to risk management – is to have the internal product of the risk management framework in order to be able to well ensure that you – that there are processes in place in your organization to identify the risks, and that there are processes in place to ensure that the risks identified are being mitigated, and that the mitigating actions taken on by the organization are effective.   So, this is part of the risk management framework. This is the high-level approach that ICANN is in the process of developing and implementing. An external audit of the risk – of that risk evaluation process has certainly not occurred yet at ICANN. I would argue that we're not yet mature enough to be able to do this exercise [inaudible] effectively because there are some

[inaudible] that are being [inaudible] implemented, so I believe that [inaudible] actually make more sense once there is something related to [inaudible] to the full extent, but I think this is something that can be continued. I think that prior to ordering an external audit, [inaudible] implementing fully and doing risk management in the full extent, rather than having it [inaudible]. But I definitely think that this is something that can be considered down the road.

Is there any other or further questions on this topic of recommendation 25, or 26 and 27?

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise with a question –

XAVIER CALVEZ: Other than that?

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. I do have a question, and I apologize; I'm [inaudible] the phone now. [inaudible] just a follow-up one to Kerry-Ann's. So, I guess, four years ago, the [inaudible] risk management [inaudible]. What – and I appreciate your point about fully implementing before auditing – what's the timeline on [inaudible] structure that's been created for risk management? That is, when is it appropriate to take a look at full implementation and identify the areas that may need improvement?

XAVIER CALVEZ: [inaudible] and that leads me to the next slide, but that's not a problem. We can stay on this slide for a second. We have a new resource in the – that leads now the risk management function of ICANN – James Caulfield, who's also on this call with us. [inaudible] week ago, and we are revisiting the implementation plan of the risk management framework that we've in place. So, we are basically in the process of adjusting and expanding, really, the implementation of the risk management framework in the [inaudible] and we will present this update to the [inaudible] over the next week. The timing is still yet to be defined, so I think that – I'm hoping that by Abu Dhabi, will have a better understanding of the elements of the roadmap, the timing of implementation of its components, [inaudible] we also have feedback from the Board's Risk Committee – and of course, from the management – on it. So, [inaudible] so I'm hoping to be able to answer your question more specifically and more directly, probably once we have had these reviews of the roadmap – of the draft roadmap – with the Board. So, it's not the end of the [inaudible]. But I'm hoping that by the end of the [inaudible], we will be able to share more information about that roadmap – and as we do, then we will also be able to provide a more specific briefing to this Review Team.

I think we have a question – or we had a question – from Eric. I saw your hand up and then down. [CROSSTALK] question. Go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, no, that's okay. It's not – no worries. No worries.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay. Thank you. If there's no further questions, that's it on my end. I simply wanted to make sure on the next slide, or after the recommendation 27, that I just mentioned the fact that we have a new VP of risk management at ICANN, who has arrived a few weeks ago, and [inaudible].   And James will be participating actively in providing information down the road to this Review Team, as it is relevant. Thank you. Negar, back to you.

NEGAR: Thank you, Xavier. This concludes the briefing on recommendation 25 [inaudible] 27. Are there any other questions or comments from the team for Xavier or James?

If not, and you think of something at a later time, please feel free to email us your question to the mailing list that is typically used for the SSR 2 Review Team, and we'll be sure to get you an answer from the right subject-matter expert. Thank you very much, and I'll turn it back to Karen for the next item on the agenda.

KAREN MULBERRY: Eric, I would say that it's back to you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Alright, cool. Okay, so – yeah. Definitely forward any questions to the list, and we'll take them back up. Now, I think we're moving to the next area, which is the subtopic team readouts, so let's take a real quick look at whether we structured the order of this – I don't think we did – one second – okay, yeah. So, sort of the order on the slide here, on slide 15,

for those of us – in case this thing isn't moving forward – doesn't have to be followed directly, but [inaudible] volunteers to read out from the subteam. I think, [inaudible], you probably have something locked and loaded to talk about from the SSR 1. [inaudible]

No, I don't think [inaudible] on the call. Okay. So much for that. So, [inaudible] Boban –

DENISE MICHEL: Eric, this is –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes?

DENISE MICHEL: Eric, this is Denise. If there is no other SSR 1 subtopic people on the call; I can give a quick update.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, yeah, that would be great. Please.

DENISE MICHEL: The subtopic group had a conference call this week. It started as mapping out work and next steps. The general approach we want to take on the SSR 1 recommendations – I think was recommended by either Boban or Zarko, or perhaps [inaudible] gap analysis approach. We've asked Staff for more detailed information on gathering all the

SSR 1 recommendation material in one place. We need the list of due dates, delivery dates for those various items, and we're – I think in our next call, we planned on diving in deeper and building out a more specific Work Plan, as we've discussed, identifying where we need more information, where we need research, how [inaudible] conduct the gap analysis on [inaudible]. And I'll stop there. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That sounds like an excellent approach. Does anyone have any thoughts, or comments, or questions for Denise? Or, for that matter – if not, then we can move on. Is somebody else from the ICANN SSR subteam on the call that's willing to speak to any aspect of the progress made so far by the team?

Kerry-Ann, were you there? Do you feel comfortable talking about – or maybe Zarko? Actually, Zarko, you were heavily involved, right? I know you mentioned a number of commitments, so if not, we'll find someone else. But do either of you feel comfortable reading out some status from the ICANN SSR?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, this is Kerry-Ann. Can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I don't have any specific updates on that. I know that Zarko could probably provide it. I don't think Zarko is on the call?

ZARKO KRCIC: Yes. Hi, Kerry. I don't have much to say. I was on [inaudible] call with Boban a week ago, and we agreed that we should [inaudible] a bit with this stuff.   And since the embarctaion of two weeks, starting next weekend, Boban and I will meet on August 17th, 18th, and probably 19th to set up the main issues for this subtopic, and to speed up a little bit work. But it will have two weeks [inaudible] two weeks, at least for me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Anybody have any comments or questions? Okay. So, moving on to the DNS SSR. I know Jeff is not on the call; we did have a call – does anybody that was on the call feel like they'd like to read out the status?

Okay, well, we are coming up to the end of the meeting, so I definitely understand. So, I'll go ahead and read out the status from the DNS SSR. There was a document initially floated by the Rapporteur, Jeff, and we had a – I think it was a reasonably healthy discussion about a gap that I think some of us perceived exists between what was in that document and some other people's expectations or pre-existing notions of what the group is going to work on. So, I think maybe on the next DNS SSR call, we'll get down to this ambiguous [inaudible] and hopefully, we can get the right people in the room to sort of find common cause. And I think, finally, we had actually settled on a recurring meeting time as of the end of the last meeting – I believe we're all good with that. So, the DNS SSR team is in the beginning stages of getting a good handle on

where it's going to start – but that's sort of just a nice way of saying, "No progress yet."

Kerry-Ann, do you feel comfortable talking about the future challenges progress?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yes. So, we met yesterday. I think it was a very fruitful call; most of us were on the call, except one. We were able to go through the proposed topics, and I think the discussion was very healthy, because we actually evaluated the topics [inaudible] and I think all of our experiences, we amended by [inaudible] adding onto the [inaudible]. We divided the tasks [inaudible] of subteam members would be circulating some additional language, and our intent is to circulate that to the subtopic team members for sign-off and approval. The next phase that we're trying to do is to actually set up a recurring meeting. ICANN Staff will be sending out a Doodle poll [inaudible] start actually doing some of the work. But I think we made very, very good progress yesterday on evaluating the topics that were identified, having a clear idea, I think among us, what our outcome – what is our common goal in terms of what we think the team should be doing, and what we want to come out of it, in terms of actual product. So, I think generally, it's progressing, and I think the next phase [inaudible] set up the Doodle poll, find a recurring time, and then set time markers for us in terms of actually producing some reports for the wider team on our review and analysis.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That was excellent. Does anybody have any comments or questions for either Kerry-Ann or – I kind of blew by that [inaudible] either of those last two? And I note that [inaudible] said that the Doodle poll was sent out yesterday – so, I missed that, as well.

Okay, thank you very much, Kerry-Ann. IANA Trans? I guess James is not on the call. Do we have Cathy on the call? Yes, Cathy – do you mind doing a readout on the IANA Transition subteam?

CATHY HANDLEY: I can tell you pretty much we're at a standstill, with day jobs providing major interference in getting things done. But IANA will be working along on it. Not much else to say.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, yeah. But I'll augment that, if you don't mind. I think we – also I'm on the subteam – and I think we did some good work as far as identifying from PTI – I think some of this might have been read out before, but just for completeness – from PTI the sets of spaces and identifiers that are relevant to the SSR Review Team and what aspects of it are worth covering, from registries, to service identifiers, to names, etcetera. So, I think the scope is probably the biggest accomplishment of the IANA Transition subteam. Right, Cathy? We sort of identified the scope, right?

CATHY HANDLEY: Yeah, basically – something that was talked about at the last meeting – but basically, we're going and doing another path through our last

meeting to make sure – in our last meeting with the IANA folks – or PTI folks – to make sure that we've done all the asks that we need to do. And actually, James and I, and Eric and Jeff, are all invited to meet – James, I know is coming – I don't know about Eric or Jeff – they're going to meet in September while I'm in Geneva for an extended length of time to work on writing up some of our results, and such. So, we've actually, as Eric said, we've gotten – we're well-scoped and now working on just the final set of asks to go back and make sure we've done everything we need before we start writing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thanks a lot, Cathy. Yeah, that sounds excellent. Does anyone have any comments or questions?

Okay. So, I know we're about five minutes out from the end of the call, so I'm going to try and expedite things just a little bit to try and hit the last things. So, Abu Dhabi. So, as far as work meetings, we have October 27th tentatively scheduled for the face-to-face, and then we have outreach meetings that are sort of in flight right now. There's a discussion about a sort of community engagement session, similar to the one that we had at the very, very beginning, but now we kind of know each other a little bit better, so it hopefully won't be as much of a surprise. And then, I guess, SO/AC constituency outreach, and I think there's a couple of other ones that are trying to find their place, maybe, possibly. So, does anyone have any comments or questions about that, or any concerns? I'm not sure if that hand there is Denise or Cathy. I see Denise first on my readout, so Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Eric. So, I think we've got a couple of issues that would be good to take to the email list and sort out. This October 27th day has been assigned to us. I think, as a team, we need to think carefully about – it will have been about four months or so between our two face-to-face meetings, and given that, we'll need to likely bring work together from multiple subtopics. And you four with the Work Plan is one day [inaudible] is one day of face-to-face meetings [inaudible] we need to articular that very quickly and make sure we understand the travel of who's trying to – a majority of members.

And then, on the outreach, I think what we've had – the idea we've had pending, which is an action that most Review Teams take – and that is, emailing all the various constituencies and stakeholder groups and letting them know we'll be at the meeting, and asking for a brief time on the schedule to update and answer any questions, sort of have a dialogue. I think this will be particularly important with groups like SSAC and some others that have some [inaudible] even more relevant than some other groups in our work. And so, for outreach meetings, the idea on the table is to basically do a round-robin to those groups that are interested in meeting with the SSR 2 team, as well as having a session that's open to anyone who wants to walk in and hear an update and talk to the team. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, good points. Excellent. Cathy, go ahead [inaudible].

CATHY HANDLEY: I'm mostly concerned with the fact that we've got this on the agenda as "tentatively scheduled."   There – we need to make a decision really soon.   Some of us have already got reservations for meetings surrounding this, and we have a tendency to keep putting off making a decision, and I don't know – since we'd only indicated one day, I don't know if that's been – if we have more than that, or if that's the only day that we can meet. But I just – I'm almost begging to confirm the date within the next week.   And I can't imagine we couldn't do that. [CROSSTALK]

DENISE MICHEL: Cathy, this is Denise.

CATHY HANDLEY: And –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. Just to follow up – I share your concern about this and the meeting structure that ICANN apparently adopted last year and the way it's been interpreted is that things cannot be added to an ICANN schedule without a discussion, deliberation, explicit permission of SO/AC Chairs [inaudible] a lot of – a lot of time to what would be a pretty short decision-making process. So, I think at this point, we need to decide – one day of working meetings or two?   And a round-robin with SO/AC groups, and an outreach session. I guess I'll take this decision to the list, perhaps, and we can hopefully get a quick consensus, and then the Chairs will do our

best to try and get the ICANN [inaudible] to work more quickly [inaudible]. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'll jump over to Karen real quick, and if other hands need to go down or up, please do so while Karen goes in.

LARISSA GURNICK: Eric, this is actually Larissa Gurnick. I'm here next to Karen, and I can address and hopefully clarify some of the comments that are being made. Back at the time that there was a call between the leadership of this team and various other community leaders, other Review Team members – other Review Teams, for that matter – we all understood that there are some limitations for the Abu Dhabi meeting, specifically that have to do with when the contract was negotiated and what the parameters were for the space considerations. So, because of that limitation that was communicated back in January, I believe, we were – all the Review Teams – were given the option of this one day. So, unfortunately, we have to abide by that space limitation. So, the October 27th date for the SSR Review Team has been confirmed as far as space availability. Should the Review Team want to proceed with the meeting, that has been confirmed and continues to be on the books. So, space is set aside, resources are available to support your meeting on the 27th, but because of the various space considerations that have been communicated quite a while ago, there is not the ability to do two days at Abu Dhabi, and of course, there are various other options that are being researched at the request of the Chairs and Co-Chairs. Staff

will come back with updates on that, but also, certainly, if you are looking for a block of dates to do your work, that's more than a single day, then we would be happy to research other options of other locations besides Abu Dhabi. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, Larissa. Cathy, go ahead, please.

CATHY HANDLEY: My only comment was – and maybe I didn't say this clearly – but I thought we'd already agreed on earlier calls that the 27th was the day we were going to meet, on Friday. So, if I was confused about that, I apologize. I thought that's [inaudible] going; that's why I was confused. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Cathy. So, [inaudible] in there. So, yeah – there's just been a little back and forth. I think – technically, I think [inaudible] to blame, a little bit. So, I think, to Denise's point, I think the broader issues are, is one day going to be enough time for us to get as much done as we need to? I think the expectation and the hope is that after four months [inaudible] face-to-face, we might have a whole bunch of stuff to start a whole lot of rubber to put down on the road, and one day may or may not be enough. And like Larissa said, we can start thinking about an investigation about other options. That's probably a little premature to get into the details about those right now. I think what's starting to shape up is, basically, the question of, "Will we have enough time to get

what we need done in that one space?" And I think we'll just also mention that we may eventually have to decide whether there's another [inaudible] that we have to consider. But we need to kick that can down the road a little bit, and I think the actionable question to the team right now is, "Do we believe that we will need more than one day after a four-month gap in seeing each other to really hammer our work out?" And so, that's something we probably need to sort of discuss, like Denise said, on the list. I think that's a fair comment, personally. But yeah, I think nothing's set in stone, and nothing – we don't want any [inaudible]. Yeah, and it's just that January's just another couple of months down the road beyond that, so at that point, it's just a question of, are we keeping the irons hot enough? And if worst comes to worst and we just don't have enough time, then we'll figure something out. I think that's, at this point, the biggest rut.

So, we're out of time – we're over time, so I'm just showing you the last slide right now. Sorry, I hope nobody has comments that I'm sort of buffaloing. But we do have this [inaudible] Cathy bringing up the January meeting. We do have a bit of a split decision on the January that we need to probably either take to the list or take up next week. And maybe over the list, we can figure out whether we need to pick this up on the call next week. But we basically have a split between Monday to Wednesday, or Friday to Sunday. I think the margin there between one and two votes is negligible, so I'll all that a dead heat. I think it's worth people putting on their thinking caps and thinking about the possibility of the weekend, because it's starting to look like that one might be a realistic consideration.

So, I don't want to keep you guys any longer than I have; I'm sorry we ran over. If we can't come to parity on this over the week, then we'll pick it up in the next call, I think. Any other comments or questions?

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, this is Denise. Just to note – we've blocked in Brussels in the ICANN office for our meeting. We just want to give people two more days to indicate whether any of the reds are green or any of the greens are red on Monday – the 22nd through the 24th – Monday through Wednesday, and Friday through Sunday – the 26th through the 28th. And we will have both the dates and the locations blocked in. So, we really need everyone's – any changes – by Thursday, at the latest. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, much better done [inaudible]. Thank you.

Alright. Sorry I'm rushing, everyone. I suspect we have [inaudible] waiting. I see Kerry-Ann said that she's going to be updating. So, is the Doodle poll going back out? Is that the plan?

[CROSSTALK] Sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: Would people just email Staff directly please if you have any changes in your availability between the 22nd and the 28th of January? Just address the email just to Staff, and then we'll lock this down.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That sounds best, yeah. That's a good call.

Alright, everyone. Thank you very much for staying a little longer, and thank you to Staff and everyone for the briefing and the support, and we'll talk to you all next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]