

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you very much. Okay. Hey, everyone. Welcome to this latest edition of your friendly SSR Review Team.

So, draft agenda. We'll go over SOIs and note the apologies and absences. We'll then go through a set of updates from subteams, and I think maybe right before we get into the Trello demonstration by James, I think it might be worthwhile talking a little bit about the e-mail that [inaudible] Denise and I sent out yesterday about the subteam structure and tenets and some of the comments that Jeff actually worked into his DNS SSR update that was forwarded by support staff. Thank you for that, by the way. And then we'll talk about the Abu Dhabi meeting, opportunities goals, etc.

So, that said, are there any update SOIs? Okay, cool. And a note that Jeff has sent his apologies because of the late hour this constitutes for him and has sent his update to the list for anybody that hasn't had a chance to look at it. Feel free. I think it's a reasonable summary. And with that, I think we'll go on to the updates from the subtopics by the rapporteurs in order seen on Slide 3. So, Alain, if you wouldn't mind giving an update?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:            Anyone can hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:                Yes. We can hear you.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:            [inaudible] can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:                Yes. Can you hear us?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:            Good, so as for SSR1 [inaudible] as for the SSR1 Subteam, we since Johannesburg, we had a meeting, we had a call. I end up being on the call with Denise. But we did proceed and had some discussion among ourselves and staff and the outcome of what you think you've seen on the team [list] from staff to provide a consolidated document on the implementation of the SSR recommendation to make it easy to find all the information, including the completion date and then [inaudible] implementation details. They may have [inaudible] also have [inaudible]. I think staff has provide something and we are still expecting more from them.

And since that meeting, Eric has resigned from the team, so the team has four members, Eric has resigned for over-commitment, and then I have raised the alert. I send the name to the team [inaudible] generate

---

any traffic. It looked like nobody really care or pay attention to what I was saying. Basically, I said that we had a group of four people and one has resigned, then it's left to three, and [inaudible] also seem to be over-committed and for me, I was asking the group that especially the co-Chairs that we look at the structures of the subteam and the question was are the subteams well-balanced. Are we the using people efficiently because [are they] where they want to be? But [inaudible] look at exactly how we balance the groups and I think this can be discussed in the agenda item based on what [inaudible] but this [inaudible].

What we got back from the co-Chair was that we look at things differently and the proposal was that speed up the work plan for the SSR Subteam, get a consultant to do a gap analysis, and then we disband the group and get the whole team to look at the report from the consultant and proceed. But personally, I responded that I don't [agree] to use a consultant. I think we need to get more people in this big group because you also need to draft the term of reference for the consultant, where [do you get] consultant, and [inaudible].

So this is where we stop and I've decided to freeze the work of the SSR1 Subteam for the decisions from the co-Chair or from the group, when we go by groups, so these are what I think I can post today. I'm hoping for questions and comments. So thank you, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thank you very much for that. Did anybody have any comments or questions? James, go ahead.

---

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Eric. Just my two cents on bringing in a consultant. If the group feels that that's something that's valuable and will allow us to complete that subteam's work quickly, then I will be broadly supportive of it. The one piece of feedback for the terms of reference that I would give would be that given how quickly we would want them to move, it would really need to be somebody who is very familiar with the work of SSR1 and ICANN and everything else. I wouldn't want to bring somebody in who is, I suppose, fresh to the ecosystem to do that type of work. It would need to be somebody who's able to get up to speed very quickly and to give us a neutral independent, third party look at it, and then we can move off of that quickly.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, thanks. Denise, go ahead, please.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Eric. I would like to just lend my voice of support and agreement to Alain. I agree with everything he said. I think the challenge here to underscore an important point he made. There aren't enough people in this, it appears in this subgroup to move work forward as a subgroup. I think Alain laid out a very logical progression of work. I think the challenge is that there aren't enough team members willing to work on these matters at the subgroup level to move forward in that order.

---

I think we proposed a potential alternative bringing a consultant in to do a gap analysis earlier would be ideal if team members were able to do an initial assessment and provide a clear and more specific terms of reference for that gap analysis, but I think Alain did a good job of laying out where we are now. So in terms of next steps, if we be great to have people either weigh in now or on the e-mail list over the next day or so, particularly if there are team members who feel like they can either switch from another subgroup or add this effort to their work to help us move through the assessment and keep things up a little more strongly for our gap analysis. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks, Denise. Alain, I saw your hand up and now it's down. Did you want to say something or no? Okay. No big deal. So, then maybe moving on if there are no more questions to –

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:

[inaudible] I was [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Go ahead.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:

Yes. I was [inaudible] when I was listening to Denise. Denise, I think we are okay. For me, usually consultant is not a bad idea but [inaudible] hello? Eric. Hello?

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I can hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Usually, a consultant is not a bad idea technically, so where I want us to decide is what my proposal is that we go to the team to do the initial assessment and write the terms of reference for the consultant and leave [inaudible] and follow the [inaudible] consultant, review the report and now take the report to the global team. But I think this is where... So for me, usually a consultant seem to be probably be the way but the approach I just described if we agree on that, that means we need some people to come join the team by [inaudible] just this [valid] team get the consultant do the thing, do the work, and then we go to the global team so that I think different matter, so I want to hear from the co-Chairs if we agree that we get the team to the work as I described.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, okay. Thank you. And I know there's a little bit of a conversation in the chat room, as well, for those that are not seeing it. Okay. So, next would be Boban, if you don't mind giving an update on the ICANN SSR Subteam, please.

---

BOBAN KRSIC:

Hi, everyone. So [inaudible] update from subgroup from the two ICANN SSR. We had yesterday our second subgroup call and we have agreed [inaudible] how to developing and finishing documents with specific topics and questions what we would like to cover in our face-to-face meeting with ICANN staff in October. And the document is also intended for [inaudible] proposals and to indicate the right persons at ICANN and to help us structure and execution of the workshop.

So, that was the main topic yesterday and we have a good idea how to moving forward and finishing it and we agree also on a [inaudible] today for our face-to-face workshop, and it's the second [inaudible] in October. We've chosen as the meeting date from our side, and it depends on the availability of the key persons at ICANN who are responsible for the different topics and what [we will let you know] about it.

And the third thing, as you mentioned, [Jacques] and I will have a workshop by the end of the week and we'll circulate an outline of different work items and propose [alternative] next steps of that group after it. And yeah, that's it. Team members, did I forget something or...?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, great. Thanks, Boban. I don't see any hands for getting things but does anybody else have any comments or questions? Okay. Great. So, has anybody feel free to raise your hand or speak up, has anybody not seen Geoff's comment to the list about the SSR, DNS SSR Subteam status?

---

So, failure to see hands, I suspect everyone had a chance to at least skim it at a high level. I think Geoff basically did some initial drafting on one or two of the calls. We had a couple back and forth iterations to revise it a little bit and then yesterday we had a meeting with Kim Davies, as you said, to discuss various issues from his Kim Davies's PTI perspective.

And yeah. And so then Geoff made a comment at the end that I think we'll circle back to after we get done this with this subteam update. So, does anybody have any comments or questions before we move on? Okay, cool.

So, Kerry-Ann, would you mind giving an update on the Future Challenges Subgroup, please? Kerry-Ann, if you're speaking.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Ah, now we can hear you now. Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think there is a delay because of my connection, so [inaudible] kind of hope [inaudible]. We had a meeting scheduled for this week. The idea for the meeting was to go through the proposed work plan with contribution from Mohamad based on our previous call to include component of review on contracting and how the whole process is



---

managed from a security perspective. So, our work plan was updated based on that.

Unfortunately, when we had our label, two of our members were trying to get into the call, which we realized after, so the call was aborted because we only had two, the co-Chair Eric and myself on the call, so we had decided to postpone the meeting to ensure that we can speak about increasing participation to ensure we can make decisions in the subteam. After we had terminated the meeting, we realized that Matagoro and Denise were trying to get on to the call but there were some challenges.

One of the things that Eric and I discussed in the meeting while we were there was one, we would want to round robin the updated work plan, which is now on the wiki page, to get consensus from the Plenary that they're okay with the changes we made since the last meeting when the document was created. And then our next exercise would be to go through the work items and reduce them to a manageable volume for all the members. But the other thing that concerned us was that we wanted to ensure we had participation of all the members of the subteam so we can actually divide the work at the next meeting.

We did discuss the whole proposal of maybe a face-to-face similar to Boban's subteam to figure if we can do small face-to-face meetings to advance the work leading up to the larger Plenary in Abu Dhabi or thereafter in [Brussels] in January. But from my part, I think we had the first the meeting that we had most of our members, it was a very good and healthy discussion, so I feel that as the team goes on, I think everyone is now in agreement as to what the work entails and I think

---

we're all on the same page as to how we're going to approach it once we decided the work items. That's it. If anyone has any questions.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Kerry-Ann. I don't see any hands for questions. So, I think, yeah, so let's move on to James to talk about the IANA transition, please.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Eric. Yeah, so we are in a bit of a holding pattern. As you may have noticed, I was on vacation for the last two weeks and [Kathy] is on vacation, as well, and so we're back now. Myself and Kerry-Ann are meeting with ICANN Legal on Friday to, hopefully, finalize the NDA work, which will then feed into the IANA Transition Team being able to get access to the documents that we have requested for. So, once those we get those documents, we will do the review of that and then we will start drafting our chapter of the report.

And I already have a framework that I somehow while on vacation decided to draft, so I'm going to put that up into our team Google Doc and that will kind of give us the structure for how we will approach putting our draft together. But essentially, yeah, once we get the documents available to us, we'll set up some calls to do a review of that and at that point, then we can move forward.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thanks, James. Denise, I see your hand's up.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Eric. Just wanted to circle back on the NDA work. It's been quite a while since we talked about that. Just to make sure we're all on the same page. My recollection is James, Kerry-Ann, and Emily volunteered to meet with ICANN Legal to walk through and understand what their proposal was in terms of the NDA requirements and process, and then bring that back to the whole team for us to discuss either collectively or individually how we want to move forward with and make sure we all understand the NDA options. Is that still the plan, James and Kerry-Ann?

JAMES GANNON: So, yeah. Precisely on point and, basically, we will be meeting to start meeting with them to discuss the feedback for myself and Kerry-Ann on Friday with a hope to having a finalized version of the NDA that we can bring back to the team to brief everybody on by next week.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, and thank you both so much for doing this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Kerry-Ann, go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm trying to understand what the expectations would be the Legal team has been pretty open to discuss it with us, but I think the bottom line is we know, I think [inaudible] conscious and I think I can speak for James that we still may have a situation where not every member of the Review Team may still want to sign it. We give proposed language to

---

---

soften the how they have the phrase about sharing with internal, with your workplace, etc., like your company. Can you hear me? Hello?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, we can hear you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But I think the bottom line is to understand from Legal if we have a situation within the team where not everyone has signed, how do they propose for us to go forward with the work while maintaining the confidentiality of the documents and to not have those members who have signed to be in breach of that agreement, and that would be one of our objectives on Friday, as well, when we meet with them.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thanks, Kerry-Ann, so I see [inaudible] has up, so I'll just throw out there that I need to have my GC and Legal department review anything that I sign and execute as a representative of my company. So, before we I think can call closure on the NDA and various language, I think it needs to probably be circulated to various members or to the whole team so that anybody that's on the team that has to go through their own Legal department has a chance to do so, so just make sure that we have that as a point order, I think. Yeah, I didn't suspect I was the only person. Okay.

All right, great. So, that takes us to the end of the subteam. Did anyone have any comments or questions for James? And Kerry-Ann, I'm

---

assuming your hand is up from before, but if not, please jump in. Okay, cool. So, I will move forward.

So, before we get to the Trello demonstration, which is teed up I believe, hopefully, I wanted to sort of give the sort of the floor around or pass the mic around the floor to various folks to hear any comments or questions about the note that Denise and I sent on behalf of the Chairs yesterday the proposal I made. At this point, they just sort of frame some of the perspectives that was that motivated that e-mail. I think we've heard a couple, a few of the [inaudible] talk about attendance being difficult and certainly Elaine, I again apologize for stepping back from the SSR1 Group, as you noted. It brought the attendance and participation of that list of that group to may potentially concerning low level.

And I think just managing N meetings per week on top of our day job is difficult probably for all of us, and I think the proposal is not so much to defame any of the ongoing work that the subteams are succeeding at, but more like to realize that any number of us might participate more actively in any number of the subteams if we didn't have to spread ourselves too thin, so we thought what we might do is we might try to sort of buff up these full team calls and do the subteam work for those in need, those subteams in need, one at a time in sort of broad view of everyone.

So, that's sort of my sort of framing for the e-mail that went out. I see Denise's hand is up and I think now will serve a good time to raise your hands to have a discussion on this one because I think we'd like to potentially change structure. So, go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. Thanks, Eric, just to reinforce I guess for the broader group the discussions that you and I have had, given the very low participation and ability of many members to make the subgroup calls and a number of calls each week that we're struggling to keep up with. Eric and I both think that it would be best to try just having our Tuesday calls focusing the bulk of the call in rotation on each of the subtopics that require attention.

That would allow more team members to participate in the discussion on the subtopic issues, have greater visibility into how the subtopic work is coming together, and in no way takes away the ability of any team member to continue a strong focus on a particular subtopic or, indeed, to continue to work as a subtopic group, a key change would be the calls would be on Tuesday and would rotate through the subtopics as needed to focus the discussion and, hopefully, the work would continue both on the e-mail list and as team members have the ability to work together to advance particular issues.

A great example is Boban and [inaudible] find themselves in the same country soon and we'll be doing some more work on one of the issues in the ICANN SSR subtopic group, which is wonderful. And of course, they'll be bringing that work back to the public e-mail list and while I've got the mic, I wanted to [inaudible] people of the idea that they can't talk, meet without a fully recorded, transcribed, and [four] staff people on the call with them. I'm not sure how that emerged but that really is not the case.

---

The team members are encouraged to gather and work as they can and as they're able to advance the work. Everything, of course, needs to be brought back to the publicly archived e-mail list and the full team meeting, which is public, but team members should feel free to advance the work as the opportunities arise.

And, again, for the [inaudible] on the table is to just have our Tuesday call for the next month or so and then reassess how this methodology is working when we gather in late October. And of course, this doesn't mean that one-off calls might not be necessary and these people again are encouraged to continue to work outside of the Tuesday calls. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks, Denise. Hey, James. Go ahead.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Eric. So, I just wanted to give my two cents on this. I'm happy with that for the groups the subteams that have requested it, but I just want to make sure we don't get into a situation where then we essentially disband the subgroups, you know like for example, for the IANA stuff and for the ICANN SSR, I think we're in a good place with it and I'd like us to have the [inaudible] subteams to continue as is or the subteams that wish to do that.

I just want us to be able to continue as normal for the subgroups it is working for and that we're not forced into changing something for the

---

subteams that are making progress and have been able to organize ourselves that we don't disrupt that flow.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. So, James, this is Eric. Yeah. And I have my hand up, just in case anyone was wondering. Yeah, so I don't think the intent is to disrupt any ongoing progress. I think the intent is to rekindle fires that are starting to fade and so it sounds very much like and I'll certainly defer to you and the other team members on the IANA team that no additional sort of full team call scrutiny or assistance or time is needed and should that change, of course, [inaudible] spend whatever time needed on the call. But I think there's certainly a set of subteams that could use an infusion of oxygen and there's certainly a handful of us that could use a couple of hours back on our schedule per week. So I think it's more just trying to sort of find low-hanging fruit and combining things synergistically that way.

So, just sort of as a general comment to all rapporteurs and team members. In the event that you feel like in lining one of the subteams that's happening is counterproductive some way, please speak up. The e-mail list is a great medium. Raising your hand and talking on the calls is a great medium. Anything. I mean, what Denise and I are trying to do is sort of fan the flames and get things moving. The last thing we want to do is put in place a new process or start changing direction that impedes or slows things down.

So for example, I think Alain's brought up a couple of times the SSR1 thing and Jeff has brought up the DNS SSR thing, and I think just we can



---

go on and on. But I those teams I think benefit from more eyes on them than we've had, and so the attendance on this call looks good. I think if we were to break into a discussion on, for example, the DNS SSR, I think any number of people on this call would have valuable input and, it would just be, it just seems like that's sort of the right way to sort of regather our forces. Does that make sense? Does that sort of run afoul of anyone's, bring up any concerns for anyone?

Okay. So, I don't see hands up. I see chat room is percolating, so sort of keep our eyes on the chat room as it percolates, but yeah, so feel free to digest this, to think about it. The e-mail just went out yesterday, so understand that it may be somewhat fresh in people's minds and that you want to turn on a little bit. That's fine.

And as Denise has said, this is aimed at being a team decision, so what we've done is we floated a strawman and we're interested in any alternatives that people may have. Yeah, so James, to your point in the chat room about the potential to be readjudicating things that have already been covered, certainly, I don't think that's the point. I think our main perspective on this is that if the team call is scheduled to talk about DNS SSR and somebody wants to go back in time, then that runs afoul of the team's progress, it's maybe too little too late, but I don't think, I think one of the problems is that a lot of these Sub Teams have not made a lot of progress.

So, I think if I try to impute to your comment where the perspective may be coming from, certainly, if we were to have the IANA discussion, a lot of people might throw in a lot of seminal formative ideas that we've already covered, and so that would not necessarily be appropriate or

---

---

helpful, but then again, it's not like the IANA team would not be a candidate to inline into the main calls. So, it's mainly for those subteams that are still at [inaudible] stage. That would be my two cents on that. Okay, great.

So, definitely please feel free to chime up but barring any sort of like suggestions or changes or requests on the list or anything else, it sounds like maybe next week's call we'll start to sort of inline one of the subteams and we'll see how that goes. Like Denise said, we'll give it a shot and see how it goes, and we're interested in feedback at any point down the road or up front, so please feel free to speak up. We're trying to start making things better, so in the event that we fail, we certainly would rather hear it sooner rather than later [inaudible] fast.

And with that, I think we maybe are on to the Trello demonstration.

JAMES GANNON: That is where I come in, I believe.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Take it away.

JAMES GANNON: Just give me one sec. Yvette, can you give it to the other accounts that's logged in as James Trello as opposed to James Gannon? I have two computers in front of me.

---

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay. Hi, James. Are you signed in to the Adobe room with that other computer? Because I can only access what you signed in to here. [inaudible] and I'm not seeing it. There we go. Okay. Then you should be able to drive. Perfect.

JAMES GANNON: Okay, and I can see my own screen, thankfully, that I have two computers. Perfect. So, not that you don't hear my voice as often as I can anyway, but we had talked in Johannesburg about the use of Trello as a means to support doing some basically very simple project management for the team. So I met with the ICANN IT team, who I believe we have somebody on the phone, if there's any questions from that side, and to get this set up for the Review Team.

So, what Trello is, is a super-simple way to do task tracking and so what we have done is we have set up what is called a Trello board for the entire Review Team, and then we have split up into the subgroups within these, so the idea being that each subgroup will be able to track the actions that they need to manage.

So for example, if I go into the IANA transition, and which makes sense [inaudible] log in here, one second. I cannot log on to this. Would have been useful. I do not want to [inaudible] to do it on my own screen.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: James, hi. Really quickly since we're logging in here, if I put a link in the chat to the observer room, would you mind logging in there, too, so I can get it on both screens? Would that be okay with you?

---

JAMES GANNON: Yes, you may. And so within these boards – no, go ahead.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: No. I was just saying [inaudible] chat. There you go.

JAMES GANNON: What you have is a number of columns that you use to track your tasks [inaudible] admin. Give me one second to take care of our observers, as well. [inaudible] George wanting to be looked after. Okay. I'm in the observer now room.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hey, James. While we're doing this, administrative staff. Is Trello a free service?

JAMES GANNON: Yes, so Trello is a free service for the basic features that we need to use it for. So essentially, what we want to use it for is doing task tracking. Now, Trello can be very advanced you can integrate it with loads of services and it can send you automatic updates on this, that, and the other, and it can integrate with Slack and Facebook and lots of various things. But basically, for our purposes, what I think is important is that we have one single place to have these subgroups and the overall team to be able to see at a really easy glance where the work of the subgroups is progressing.

---

So for example, what we've done here is for the IANA transition, we have four columns. We have a backlog of work that needs to be done, essentially. We have work in progress. So, these are items that the subgroup is working on, and then we have either completed or abandoned as I suppose as final state, so complete [inaudible] for things we have an interview in Johannesburg with Kim Davies, so I logged in, I created this over here in the backlog. I can put it in here as demo task and then you can go in and you can comment on this and you can say planned for X date.

You can put due dates on these, really easy to do. You can assign team members to them, so at the moment, just for the testing, we have myself and Jennifer on this board, so I can assign this as an action that I need to take and we can put checklists of items that we can say review by A needs to be done and we can test percentage complete on these individual checklist items, and we can add attachments such as links to Google Drive or Dropbox or anything else that we need to do. We can also put PDF as attachment to [inaudible] depending on what information we may get whilst we're completing these tasks.

So, once we have a task set up and we have set up a due date to us, we can say, "Okay, I am ready to now work on this task. I'm going to drag it over here into work in progress." And as we work through the task, we can track the dates, we can say these will start going red as it starts getting closer to the date. It will alert you when your due date is overdue, so it's a nice, easy way for team members to be able to follow along with the work and particularly to have adequate glance whilst the actions that you have taken are that I can log in to this very quickly and I can go okay, this task is mine. Okay, it's due by Friday, I need to work on

---

---

that today. I can say, okay, right, I need to give an update in the comments on this saying I'm going to have to push this out by a few days or I've completed this and then I'm going to drag it over into our completed column.

When we complete this, we can literally just very simply drag it over. It's very, very simple to use. I don't want us to start using something that's overly complicated, but I think it's a very easy way for the team to manage our work and what we have done is we've set up one of these boards for each of the subgroups and I think we've spoken to staff and the co-Chairs about it. I think it's a good proposal on how we can manage the administration going forward because I know a lot of us want to try and minimize the amount of administration we do, so I think this is a really good way to do it.

Do people have questions, feedback, features that they want to know if it [goes] or not? Please go ahead. Denise, you're up first.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. Thanks, and thanks so much, James, for doing this. It looks really promising. I know you're involved in the Accountability Transparency Group work at ICANN. And in the course of work, have you used Trello?

JAMES GANNON:

I don't believe so. I used it on something to do with ICANN but I can't remember specifically what it is. But I believe there is existing use of it somewhere.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Just curious. So, you have had – I’m sorry, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Sorry. Just on the topic you mentioned be aware of transparency. The idea is we have made all of these boards viewable to the public, so anybody can go in and look at our status and cards, however, [inaudible] by Review Team members when we add you all to the boards so that we have control over whilst, yeah, we’re putting into it, but obviously, with how we should be working, everything is viewable to the public to be able to keep an eye on how we’re doing status-wise.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Well, thank you. You just answered my next question. And it would be great to hear from team members on the e-mail list if there’s any issues in terms of their operating systems or company policies that would preclude them from joining Trello. Thanks.

JAMES GANNON: Eric, you’re up.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, sorry. I just wanted to channel Kerry-Ann from the chat room. She asked if – she said she needs to check to make sure it’s permitted inside the office and she asked if the ICANN staff would be updating it or it’d be the rapporteurs.

---

JAMES GANNON:

Yeah. So, there is total flexibility in how we do this. My suggestion is the rapporteurs can get involved in setting up the actual tasks because that's probably the easiest way to do it, and then I would highly encourage everybody to manage their own cards. So, if you've taken ownership of a task, you make sure you're keeping it updated and that you're moving it as it's going through work in progress.

You can, obviously, have multiple people assigned to a single card. It doesn't have to be one-to-one relationship, so you can have two or three people working on a card, putting it in I can say on this one, "Oh, James has done this." Eric can come in and say, "Oh, I've worked on this and it's a nice, easy way to keep management of the task." So, I would strongly encourage the whole Review Team would be involved in updating the cards and keeping them up to date. Again, it's supposed to be lightweight, it's supposed to be low-effort, and the just to Kerry-Ann's point that she's just put into the chat now, and the hope would be that we would be able to just embed these boards into the SSR [inaudible] and so that we can be able to feed them from there, as well.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Sorry, James. I was just trying to summarize what you're saying in the chat room, so please correct me if I got it wrong.

JAMES GANNON:

No. That's perfectly right. Does anybody else have any other questions or feedback or concerns? And to the point of we need to make sure that everybody can actually access this and yeah, for sure, and Trello.com is the address. Please reach out to your internal teams and make sure that



---

this is something that everybody's able to use [properly] and [inaudible] as I do corporate security for my day job and I [inaudible] internally so I would hope that this is a whitelisted site for most of you Review Team members. If there aren't any more questions, Eric, I will hand it back over to you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Great. Thank you very much, James. That was really helpful and speaking for everyone I think, I appreciate you taking the time to put this together, suggesting the first place, running through a demo, etc. and so forth, and we'll just count on you to be 24/7 support staff, does that make sense? [inaudible] tell me if you have any questions or comments, we'll just call you up on your personal line, right? Wake you up in the middle of the night, that kind of stuff.

JAMES GANNON:

Yeah, that's right [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, good. The pause made me think you were taking me serious for a second. Okay. All right, so we're winding down the agenda I think the last [substantive] slide. Hopefully, everyone can see Slide 5 that I'm on now, the Abu Dhabi slide.

So, currently what we're set up for, and so this might be your last chance to make any kind of concerned objections or whatnot is we'll have SSR face-to-face meetings on both bookend Fridays, that's October 27<sup>th</sup> and Friday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>, and this will give us the ability to do

---

informal subgroup team meetings throughout the week, 28<sup>th</sup> through the 3<sup>rd</sup>, and various outreach activities as we can schedule them. So, I hope that this isn't news to anybody. I think we've talked about it a couple of times on the list, but I think we're certainly interested in some feedback. I see Denise has her hand up.

DENISE MICHEL:

Just some added context that might be helpful for some team members. So, the Abu Dhabi meeting really in the early days of our team's gathering has been on our schedule and in subsequent conversations, we teed that up as the meeting in which we would make sure we did outreach to the ICANN groups and community, make sure we received any input that they had at this stage in our work.

Obviously, the first Friday and the last Friday is not our choice of team meetings. At the same time, it's pretty clear that this group is productive when they get together face-to-face, so given the length of time in between our meetings and the pace of our work, we feel strongly that today, face-to-face meetings are needed.

ICANN Travel is contacting members now to arrange for travel. In between our Friday and Friday team meetings, we, again, a previous decision was to do outreach and meet with as many of the ICANN groups that were interested in meeting, so the period in between these two meetings, we're hopeful can be used not only for people to continue to work on particular subtopics and other work related to the team, but also that the team can meet with various constituencies, stakeholder groups, Advisory Committees that may be interested in not

---

only hearing about our work, but also discussing some elements of it or providing us with input. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Denise. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: No substantive feedback. I just need to put a placeholder in I just accepted a new job and with the SSR potentially [inaudible] I'll be starting on October 1<sup>st</sup>, so with the SSR of ICANN potentially meeting in LA and then potentially more than a week in Abu Dhabi, I may only be able to attend one of the two Fridays and which one, it's still to be determined. I'm going to try and work that out as quickly as possible, but I may not be able to attend for the whole meeting.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right on. Got you. Thanks. Okay, so Denise, I think your hand is up from before, but if not, please feel free to go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, cool. So, it sounds like there are not any comments about that. One extra thing to underscore is just I think I've glossed over this a second ago. Face-to-face drafting session is currently scheduled for the 22<sup>nd</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup>, and 24<sup>th</sup> of January. So, that's a little far out but this is

---

probably the best time, best time to start thinking about it. So, okay. So, with that, I am prepared to release you all with five minutes left in your calendars unless there's any other business. Is there any other business from folks? Ah, Boban, I'm sorry. That's right. Boban, I'm sorry. I said I would come back to you. Yes, Boban had wanted to circle back on ICANN SSR things. Sorry about that. Yes. Please go ahead.

BOBAN KRSIC: Thank you. What I forgot. As I mentioned, we would like to organize a two-day workshop in LA with [inaudible] subgroup member and he's from ICANN, and what we need is permission by the [Review] Team to moving forward and organizing it, so [Review] Team, can we agree on this to hold this workshop or not? That's the only question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm sorry. Is this a subteam meeting or are you talking about a full team meeting?

BOBAN KRSIC: No. It's only a subteam group meeting with four to five people from ICANN [staff].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I see Denise's hand up so I'll let her say what I think I was about to say. Go ahead, Denise.

---

DENISE MICHEL:

So, the subgroup has highlighted this as an important element of their assessment of SSR as it relates to ICANN IT and systems, having a meeting with them and working through issues with ICANN staff in LA. I think the steps that I would propose the steps that we need to take here are and they've already identified the date and availability of team members. We need to do the same and staff [is what you're saying] with identifying who on the staff needs to be there, ensuring that they're available for the period that the team members are available to be in LA, and then we need some type of costing out of so we can check against our budget and availability of travel funds. So, just to get people the clarity on the steps that need to be taken in order to move through this. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Does that leave anybody with any comments or questions? Okay. Great. So, again, Boban, I'm sorry about that. I told you two minutes ago I would remember and then I totally forgot, but thanks for jumping in there. I hope that in the event that anybody has any thoughts or comments or questions about that, we will exercise our duty to use the or our ability to use the e-mail list. Okay, everyone. Thank you very much. I look forward to chatting with you again very soon.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**