

---

DENISE MICHEL: Are there any updated Statements of Interest? [Are there] apologies that have not been recorded?

Hi, can you guys hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, Denise. We can hear you now.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. I'm sorry. I had a little phone issue. So, there's no SOIs or updated apologies for absences? All right, hearing none, we'll move on.

As we discussed on the last call and also on the e-mail list, we're suspending most of the subtopic group calls, and instead using our Tuesday UTC timeslot to address the subtopics in sequence to allow for greater insight from the larger team on the activities and to increase engagement particularly where that's lagging a bit on some of the subtopic groups. We'll reassess how this is going when we get together in Abu Dhabi.

So, as has been proposed, we'll be addressing SSR1 implementation on this call. Alain has graciously volunteered to be the rapporteur on this group, so I'll turn it over to Alain for an update on where this work is, and then we can proceed with a discussion on the substance or the bullets that are outlined on the draft agenda. With that, Alain, I'd like to turn it over to you.

---

*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 AINA: Hello.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Do you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, we can.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. Yes, I just joined the call. I had a [bit of] delay, but I hear Denise handing over to me to update on the SSR1 subgroup work, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. Good. From the last call [inaudible] one week ago, when I updated this big team about what we're trying to do for the subgroup, and the decision from the call was that we keep the subgroup because we were not sure how to proceed but I think the decision from the last call was to keep the group, to go for update a work plan for the subgroup such that the subgroup mandate tends to accommodate the work of the consultants. And we all agree now that we need a consultant's help.

---

But the team needs to be reinforced and led to do some preliminary review the implementation of the recommendation, and then [worry] on the Terms of Reference but I think the Terms of Reference for the consultant has to be approved by the global team. And I hope everybody saw a draft of the Terms of Reference of the third-party consultant. I sent some comment. I [did send] a document with some comment, so probably we'll come back to [inaudible] I hope.

And then the subgroup mandate then will be to work with the consultant to do gap analysis in terms of the implementations because the consultant will need [for] this group to serve as contact, because they'll need to talk to us to the Review Team, and maybe it's good that they [inaudible] or some issues where they only [discovered] the subgroup but some reach out to the global team. And when the consultant is interacting with staff, maybe the subgroup also is there to also [liaise] to make sure the consultant follows exactly [inaudible] the writings, to make sure the consultant is doing what we ask for. That means we as subgroup and we as Review Team, as global team agree on what we expect from the consultant so that we can speak the same language and make sure that – because I think and I hope at the end of today, it is the Review Team who is going to be responsible for the [inaudible] the consultant, so the consultant is just to help us. So, we have to agree among ourselves on what we expect the consultant to do.

So I think this for me seems to be the [inaudible] point. Follow up with the consultant, review the report and come back to the group. So, I think based on that, I updated the work plans. This one I sent a copy today for the team to look at it, and I think what we have explained is basically what we have in the updated version of the document.

---

---

So for me, we have received the briefing from staff on all the recommendations. We have asked staff to provide a consolidated version of the document on the implementations, and then staff has provided something, but I think we are still expecting more information from staff to make sure that in one place we can see all the information about the completion date of each of the recommendations.

So I think the way we are now is that as subgroup or as big team, we do the preliminary review and that to understand exactly what happened, and this will help us to work on the Terms of Reference for the consultant. But at the same time, see if we still need more information from staff or from any of the ICANN AC or SO or community members, because I think we cannot only put this on the consultant only.

So, I think this is what I can say for the subgroup. I think one of the challenges and [inaudible] we need to focus on right now is that if you look at the report from the SSR1 group, the report was issued in 2012 and after the Board resolution of [I think] October 2012, the staff started to implement and it took five years to implement it.

I think the implementation of some of the resolution also has probably been affected by internal change inside [or addition] affected by many things. So, I think one of the [inaudible] is to also take the recommendation from the beginning, put them in the context of when they were being implemented, and see if – when the recommendation was not implemented, and when that was exactly [inaudible] or to solve the same problem as it was in 2012, or the recommendation has been adjusted to make new context before being implemented.

---

This is I think for me I see [these are] issue. We also need to look at it to pass it on to the consultant, but I think [inaudible]. Now I'll stop here, and if there are any comments, questions, but I hope we're going to discuss the Terms of Reference for the consultant. [inaudible] open for questions, comments and [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Alain. Great, we'll start a queue for questions. I don't see a hand raised if there are people – yes, can you hear me, Alain?

ALAIN AINA: Hello.

DENISE MICHEL: Can others hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, I can hear you, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. I think we're having trouble with Alain's line.

ALAIN AINA: I can hear you.

---

DENISE MICHEL:

Could everyone mute their phones if they're not speaking? That'll help the situation. So, we're taking a queue for questions or discussions relating to any of the items noted by Alain on SSR1. I think I have some initial comments myself. Seeing no other hands, I'll jump in.

I've done a preliminary review of the data that has been assembled to date on the recommendations. I found a number of areas where additional information or questions arise. So, I'll put those to the list. Personally, I think we're at the point where we will certainly need parallel efforts. That is, we will continue to have questions that are raised or seek additional information.

At the same time, I think we should move forward with gap analysis, and I think the person or entity doing the gap analysis will in turn likely surface additional questions or requests for information. So, I think we need to treat this as some parallel activities that would occur.

I think it also would be useful to – I think as with all the subtopics work to put some expected dates around the different steps that we'll be working through on SSR1. So, I'll throw that suggestion out there as well. Are there other suggestions, discussions or questions surrounding SSR1?

Okay, so I think a couple of action items that come out of this, one that is mentioned on the list is that there are too few team members addressing the substance of SSR1 and its implementation. So, we continue to request that we add additional team members' assistance and focus on this area of work, which as you know is an important one for the team, one of our shall-dos instead of can-dos.

---

And then the subtopic team members and Alain will work to attempt to assign some broad dates to the work plan that's been provided, and we'll continue to surface the additional questions and requests for information, and then Eric and I need to – we have a few more questions we need to get answered on how the team is going to be handling consultants or contractors, and then we'll follow up with the subtopic group on consulting for the gap analysis. Alain, did you have any other comments on this? Or of course, anyone else on the team.

ALAIN AINA:

Yes, I do have a comment. Maybe more points. So, I'm still surprised that [inaudible] we have not seen any team member volunteering to join. So, I think [it] seem to be a bit worrying for me. And if we'll volunteer, can the co-Chairs try to maybe approach people and ask them if they're willing to join? Because we have to get a team and start moving faster.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. Would the team like to invest the co-Chairs in the power to force team members to work on subteams? That was a bit of a joke. One thing we have, Alain, is we have a new team member I think coming in. I don't know that we discussed this on the list, but GNSO Council is –

ALAIN AINA:

No, please.

---

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry?

ALAIN AINA: Yes. Denise, no, please, don't force. What I say is the co-Chairs to contact people and ask them if they're willing to. So, don't force people. But I think if you look at the team and you look at the distribution, maybe you can find some members who'll be easy to be approached to join maybe. But not forced.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. And Eric may want to speak up on this. So, I view it as each team member being responsible for the team's work overall and their contributions to the team specifically. So, if team members feel that they can contribute to the SSR1 discussion or can take even a part of the recommendations and bring some substantive assistance to it, that would be really helpful to the full team.

I would also note that it looks like we have a new member coming in. So, I pledge that Eric and I will catch that person early and do our best to coral him to for Subtopic 1 Implementation Group if that person feels his interests and skillsets line up. Eric, I see your hand is up.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, Denise. Thanks. I think I was going to basically just kind of pile on to that. I think one of the things that is going to make this I think a lot easier is the consultant's gap analysis. I think that's the whole point. So, I think just sort of speaking for myself – maybe this generalizes to others or maybe it doesn't, but it's a little daunting to play catch-up on five-



---

year-old recommendations and the status that they're in. And so this is one of the subteams that has kind of one of the more difficult, nuanced jobs to do.

So, I think having a consultant come in, putting a gap analysis together, I think it will let us sort of hopefully identify what the salient items are to really start discussions. So, it's my hope personally – and certainly as a co-Chair – that what'll happen is when we start to see some results from this person, it'll help digest the [inaudible] points so we can all see them more clearly, and then I think it'll be a lot easier to start topics.

So, Alain, I don't think anyone was trying to put this on you. So, I'm really sorry that that's how it felt. It was more sort of like I think people – speaking for myself again – might have been having trouble figuring out where to start, and so bringing in the consultant sooner rather than later, getting someone to engage as soon as possible, start producing better results, I think should give us the opportunity to start deep discussions amongst ourselves. So, that's my hope, and I'm really sorry if it came across definitely to you, Alain. I don't think any of us intended it that way.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Eric. And I'd like to associate myself with those remarks. Alain has been doing yeoman's work and the heavy lifting on SSR1. Greatly appreciated, and of course if this isn't – so it is not your responsibility to try and recruit other people to join the subteam, but we really appreciate your effort here and we'll do our best to make sure

---

that you and I, and I think the other person on the subteam gets additional support.

Alain, I see your hand up. Is that an old hand or a new hand? Alain, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I don't think so. I have one or two more points, if you'll allow me.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. I think my phone cut out. Could you repeat that?

ALAIN AINA: Yes. Hello?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, go ahead.

ALAIN AINA: Hello?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, we can hear you, Alain. Go ahead.

ALAIN AINA: Hello? Can you hear me now?

---

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Hello?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, we can hear you.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. So, I need some clarification before we move on, because from the Terms of Reference of the draft, Terms of Reference of the [inaudible] it looked like today seemed to be the deadline for us to agree and push the Terms of Reference, etc., and then have one month to hire the consultant, etc.

Are we still on this schedule? Because this will determine the preliminary review implementation and what we need to do. So, are we now – our priority is going to be Terms of Reference for the consultant and what are the timelines right now? Clarification for that.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Thank you, Alain. That's a great question. Absolutely, I think our priority is to resolve the issue around contracting with a consultant and getting the gap analysis underway. I believe that date was one that staff came up with as an aspiration, but perhaps staff can address that.

---

And that was related to an RFP process, and Eric and I are seeking some additional information regarding the situation where RFPs are not required, which we were initially told in Madrid that this level of expenditure does not require the full or even Fast Track RFP process. So, we're just working out a few of the process details. But can staff address the deadline they put in a previous e-mail relating to a gap analysis consultant?

LARISA GURNICK:

Hi, Denise. Thank you. I'm happy to do that. The date was just a starting point that if we got the information from the Review Team input on the overview document – the Terms of Reference as Alain refers to it – and confirmation that that document accurately reflects the scope of work that the Review Team is expecting and the deliverables and the timeline.

Once we have that confirmation, then we would proceed, obviously. It is not a deadline of any sort, and the Review Team should feel free to take whatever time you need to move this forward. But we proposed that date with the understanding that there was a sense of urgency in bringing a contractor in to do the work, and that's in order to bring someone in by middle to the end of September. That was the proposed timeline.

And then as far as the second part of Denise's comment in terms of the procurement process or the process of engaging a contractor, we would be happy to discuss any additional questions, but the proposal to have a document that clearly articulates what the scope of work is and so

---

there's clarity of agreement between the Review Team and the potential candidates of what the scope is, what the expectations are, what the deliverables would be in the timeline, those elements are all still applicable to whether it's a formal RFP or a Fast Track RFP, or really it's just a practice that ICANN follows in engaging outside parties to make sure that the engagement is for work that's clear, and identifies the best possible candidate to do the job. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Larisa. I see Eric's hand up, and then Alain. Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Sorry. This could be my bad, so if it is, mea culpa and sorry for wasting everyone's time. But can we go over maybe very quickly – not in any [inaudible] what exactly gating our ability to engage this contractor? Do we need to have the full scope of work worked out before we even begin the process? What does it take for us to start to pull the trigger on this? What's the minimum we can do to get going on this?

I see Alain's hand, so he'll probably say something that might sound a look like, "The sooner we get this done, the better." So, if we wanted to move forward on this expeditiously, what exactly is standing in our way? What are the outstanding actions that we as co-Chairs can do so we don't have to involve the whole team versus what do we need the whole team's input for? So on and so forth.

---

I know there was a document that was socialized. I don't have a good recollection for what the next move was after that. And like I said, that could be my bad, so I apologize if this is redundant. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, Eric. I think I'll let Larisa address these questions, but I do recall I think there was the question of using a simpler, faster statement, scope of work and deliverables statement and informal advertising to engage the appropriate consultants. I think there's a question of using the faster statement of work process rather than the more formal RFP process we were looking into and trying to get clarity on.

I think the second issue that we'd asked about was selection. I think under an RFP process, staff indicated that they would be choosing who would be doing this work for the team. There was an understanding on the team that staff would be validating the appropriateness or whether the consultants were qualified, met whatever ICANN requirements there are for consultants, and then from that, the team would be choosing the subgroup which consultant the team felt best meet their needs.

So, I think using a [sort of] statement of work, a lightweight process versus an RFP, and who's choosing the consultant were I know two outstanding issues that we had asked about.

Larisa, did you have any more input on this?

---

LARISA GURNICK:

Hi, Denise. Thank you. To address Eric's question, the information that we circulated last week included answers to a lot of these, so the procurement process or the process of engaging, what we proposed and the form and the document and the timeline, took into consideration the least cumbersome and the most sensible way to move forward.

So, as soon as we have confirmation from the Review Team – and I know that Alain had already circulated some very useful comments on the section of that document that we were looking for clarity, and I think Denis and Eric asked for an opportunity to review that document and provide their input.

So, as soon as we have clarity on the scope of work and the deliverables and the timeline and the skills that gives us everything we need to get the process rolling and deliver within a reasonable timeline like we suggested in that document. But to address Denise's questions more specifically, there is really no additional way or some other way to engage a third party without having written documentation of those elements that I described.

So, the level of formality has already been taken into consideration in terms of simplifying the form and not making it overly complex, but the thought behind what we shared with you was that those are the key elements that would be important for anybody to understand in order to agree to do the work and provide a reasonable bid for the work.

And then in terms of the selection and who would make the selection, this is a pretty standard approach that ICANN follows to engaging third

---

parties. There is a great deal of input and collaboration to make sure that the statements of work and the qualifications and the scope of work and the timeline and all of those key elements make sense and are agreed to, in this case by all of you who will be working with the contractor.

But the actual selection process and contracting is in the hands of ICANN. ICANN is the one that actually enters into the contract with the third party. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, Larisa. Yes, I think those two issues were issues that we wanted to make sure we fully understood as we were previously told specifically that an RFP was not required. I think we all understood that we need the scope of work and deliverables, requirements document to get that out, but that an actual RFP process was not required because the amount of the contract does not reach the amount where an RFP is required.

And previous Review Teams from a pool of consultants that ICANN confirmed were eligible and met ICANN's requirements, previous Review Teams selected contractors or consultants from that group. So, that also I think is an important element that needed to be clarified. I see Alain's hand is up. Alain, go ahead. Alain, we're not hearing you yet.

ALAIN AINA:

Yes. My point here is – okay, I've shared the explanation from staff, but specifically what I want to know is what's going to be the implication of



---

the [remaining] terms of the selection of the consultants, for me to know exactly if we have to have [new] action item.

So, it looks like staff is going to validate clarification for the final selection of the contract of the consultant. It's going to be the responsibility of the Review Team. Is this correct?

DENISE MICHEL:

Alain, yes, that's a question that has been raised. Staff has indicated that they'll be selecting consultants from the Review Team, which wasn't my understanding, so I was trying to work through where the disconnect might be on that.

Alain, did you have an additional comment?

ALAIN AINA:

No comment, but I think Cathy is asking a good question in the chat. What is the deadline for [reviewing] the document? I think this was going to be my follow-up, so thank you, Cathy, for [inaudible]. So, [we need] what is the deadline?

DENISE MICHEL:

Right. So, there isn't a deadline per se.

ALAIN AINA:

Friday [inaudible] end of –

---

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. Go ahead, Alain. Alain, did you have a comment? Okay.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible] by Friday [inaudible] or maybe let's say before Monday next week I think for me would be a good deadline to make sure that everybody read the document and send comments if they have comments. So Monday so that we can consolidate the document and probably have it discussed Tuesday, maybe in Any Other Business or something like that.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Is there any other discussion on that? Are people [comfortable] with that deadline? Would you be so kind, Alain, as to put that on the team e-mail list so we can alert those who were not able to join this call? And Eric and I will strive to resolve the process questions that of course apply to any consultant that the team wants to engage beyond the gap analysis consultant. Are there any other points people would like to discuss on this matter? Okay, seeing no hands, we'll move on to the NDA.

Kerry-Ann and James had an opportunity to discuss this again with Legal staff last Friday, and I don't know if James is on the call. Kerry-Ann, I think the review indicated that an updated document would be provided to the team. Is there any additional background you'd like to share with the team on this?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, everybody. Can you hear me?

---

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, we can.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: All right. Thanks, Denise. Just as a quick update on what James and I were proposing in terms of going forward. We brought the concerns raised to the Legal Team. They've been really good in terms of listening to us and making the amendments based on their [wider structure] for what's going on in terms of using not just the NDA document but the confidential disclosure process that they're developing under the new Bylaws.

What we agreed to as our next steps is based on the discussions we've been having, they're going to make some changes to the language. There are certain things they actually are unable to change, for example you're entering the agreement as an individual, but we've given them suggested language in relation to assignment to the SSR2 team, etc., oh how you are actually nominated, who you represent while on the team, how the information is to be shared.

So, two things that they took away from the last call that they have to come back to us on, one of which is what they proposed as a procedure when you have more than one person on the team that has not signed the NDA, and how it would [impact] our work.

They're also to come back with us in relation to how we actually disclose the information that is shared with us under the NDA, especially if we also have members on the team who have not signed

---

the NDA. So, one of the things that James and I are proposing is that once we've gotten the updated draft from Legal, we would then put it on the agenda for the SSR2 Plenary, and then we'll walk you through each paragraph that explains the various discussions that have happened.

They did indicate we could have shared a marked-up version, but we kind of decided not to, because they are still making further adjustments to it. So, whatever version we would have shared last week would not have been updated enough that it would warrant getting feedback from the team.

So, James and I when we discussed it on the call, we said that we'd wait until the Legal Team from ICANN sends the new, updated version. Then we'll ask ICANN staff to circulate that to the plenary, and then we'll discuss it in detail at that point. But I think overall, I could say that the Legal Team has been very facilitative, open, and they have been [listening] in terms of trying to find a way forward.

I think that would be it, unless I have any questions from anyone.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Kerry-Ann. I have a question, and then I'll... Eric, I see his hand is up as well. In having these discussions and reviewing the NDA process, do you have the sense that the process is something that can be triggered and triggered relatively quickly on an as-needed basis? And to provide a little context for my question, I note that most previous Review Teams, including the SSR1, did not sign NDAs in the course of their work. So for me, that just raises a question of whether we will

---

absolutely need to do an NDA in order to carry out our work. I suspect there will be points where we will need to [inaudible] I'm wondering if we can treat this as a matter of moving forward, and then understanding what the NDA requirements are and dealing with the NDA when we reach a point where team members feel that it's needed due to information we need access to. Did you get a sense of that?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Denise, I could be wrong – and staff, do correct me based on the meeting we had – that came up. Our understanding is that it's now a new requirement under the Bylaws. I think you had raised this question in another chat, and I think someone had replied to say that it's now a new requirement under the new Bylaws. So, the confidential disclosure framework that they're working on is now a new requirement in the new Bylaws, and the NDA will be a requirement going forward.

What I think they're using our experience to do is to actually see some of the basic things that should be as the standard comfortable enough for most persons to sign. And if there's need for individual negotiation, I think Legal would probably have to address that directly [inaudible] but I think the first approach right now is that it's going to be a standard part of operations going forward. That's what I took from the meeting so far.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Kerry-Ann. And thank you so much for working on this. Eric, over to you.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks a lot, Denise. And yes, I agree, thanks Kerry-Ann and to James – even though he’s not here – for picking this up. I just wanted to float a couple of general questions, and I’m not sure how easy it’ll be to answer them now so much as just sort of put them in the hopper for the next time you guys may talk to whomever.

One, do we have an understanding that once the NDA is complete that it may take time for the Legal Teams, the general counsel offices of various companies to go over the agreement and actually get back to us? In other words, the comment that sort prompted that for me was when Kerry-Ann said that one of the points of discussion was what if more than one person on the team doesn’t actually [inaudible] the NDA. Like [inaudible] NDA is only done when [RPC] says it’s okay. So, it might take some time.

And sort of in a related question, do we have any kind of process or your understanding or mechanism for what happens when [RGC] kind of perhaps inevitably wants to make [line] item changes or anything?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: HI, Eric. We did indicate to them that some team members would need to take the document back to their companies to have it reviewed, so that was put on [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

---

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

So, I think what I understood from Legal is that point when there are [inaudible] individuals [inaudible] need to happen based on [inaudible] requirements, etc. They would then have to take it on board. But in terms of negotiating or talking to the individual who may have difficulties signing it as is, but one of the aims that we're having now is to address some of the more broader issues and to ensure that it is a document that is [inaudible] as individuals will be more comfortable signing as is. Even we indicated I think clearly that each person may need to take it back to their own Legal because it's the same on our end as well.

So, Legal is aware of that. So, I think the short answer is they are aware, and I think when that comes up, they'll be taking it maybe on a case-by-case basis based on the request that's come in from the company.

But what we can emphasize to them is that we need an interpretation from them as to how do we, one, extrapolate the information that is shared with someone who has signed the NDA to ensure that it's captured correctly and not breach any confidentiality agreement the person would have signed if there are members on the team who have not signed, and there are mechanisms that we discussed on the call that may be possible. We're waiting on legal to just get back with us with the updated draft, and then we'll be going into more detail on those other areas.

---

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Are there any other questions related to NDAs, or issues people would like to surface at this point? I'm not seeing any hands. Okay. So, as is indicated in the slide window, apparently we'll be getting final updates from ICANN Legal next week, so we'll have this on the agenda again for team members to address, and I'm sure there'll be additional discussions on the e-mail list on this point. Thank you again, Kerry-Ann.

We've reached the Any Other Business portion of our call. Do people have any additional items they'd like to raise on this call? Kerry-Ann, is your hand new or old?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's new.

DENISE MICHEL: The floor is yours. Go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Thanks, Denise. I had a general question in terms of the subteam meetings going forward, there was an e-mail chain where you had replied to a question I think by Boban or someone in terms of – are we supposed to cancel all the subteam meetings going forward?

So, I wanted to just get an understanding as to how the subteams have been working. Is it that we would have the regular plenary and place on the agenda of each plenary a subtopic that may need addressing? I'm not clear what the process is going forward. And we only have our



---

subteam calls on an ad-hoc basis as needed. Are we suspending all recurring subteam calls given the challenges we've had? I just wanted kind of more clarity going forward. [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: How will the subteams be working full stop? It's not clear to me. We've suspended the calls based on the challenges we've had, but are we planning to put it on the agenda of each plenary meeting to have the topics advance? This needed some clarification.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Thank you for the question, and I'll invite Eric to jump in here too if he'd like. This call focused on SSR1. In subsequent calls, the plenary calls will largely be devoted to a single subtopic. So, in effect the plenary call will replace a subtopic team call. We've suspended all the various subtopic team calls that people are finding very hard to follow without clearer notes, and many people simply couldn't make multiple calls each week. So, we've suspended –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Pardon me. This is the operator. Mr. Matogoro has joined.

---

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. So, we've suspended the subtopic calls except where the rapporteur has indicated that specific workstreams require a separate call to advance the work. And we're dealing with the substance of each subtopic in the plenary call.

So, next week's call will be addressing DNS SSR. September 5<sup>th</sup> will be adjusting ICANN SSR. We'll be addressing on September 12<sup>th</sup> future challenges, and then September 19<sup>th</sup> is IANA transition. We propose that schedule. It's on the e-mail list posted last Friday, August 18<sup>th</sup>. I'm happy to move those around if it's not ideal for people who are particularly interested in addressing one of these topics or if a rapporteur has a conflict. But that's the plan going forward.

Again, this doesn't preclude additional calls if it's needed to advance a particular issue or other activities where team members want to work together on particular topics for the team. And of course, everything as usual will be brought back to the full team and the e-mail list. Does that respond fully to your question, Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

It does, Denise. But just one further clarification. For example, we've circulated for a week now the future challenges work items, just seeking confirmation from the plenary. Is it that we can wait for that in an e-mail confirmation so it's done in the e-mail list, or do we wait to have it on the plenary agenda? Because it would mean that I will just then suspend any work on it until September when it's on the meeting. Are the works suspended until they're on the agenda, or do we continue to try and get approval from the plenary through the e-mail list on the

---

work items so we can then advance what the work plan should look like?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. The e-mail list is intended to fully advance work. People should not feel like they have to wait to discuss things on a team call. And in fact, especially because of the broadly distributed nature, geographically distributed nature of this team, it's often difficult to get everyone on the call. We're relying on people using the full team e-mail list to work and advance the issues. So, I think as long as we have a clear directive what action is being requested and by when, you should certainly feel free to move forward using the e-mail list.

And also, Kerry-Ann, if you feel like the future challenges group would benefit from a discussion with the full team earlier than September 12<sup>th</sup>, I'm happy to look at switching around the order and the date for addressing it. So, please feel free to follow up online and let me know if that's the case. I see Eric has his hand up. And I'm sorry, I see Karen has her hand up as well. I missed that earlier. But go ahead, Eric, and then Karen.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Shall I go?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. All right. So, Kerry-Ann, to sort of just jump back to that point real quick, I think our hope is that by putting the plenary calls under the subtopic [inaudible] we're going to try and break, widen [inaudible] lack of progress. So, I think our hope very much is that progress is made on the mailing list. I think that's absolutely what we hope is the primary mode of progress at this point. And [inaudible] any progress being made on the mailing list, we have the plenary calls that'll focus on subtopics.

So, exactly to Denise's point, if it's helpful to advance on the future challenges subteam, [inaudible] pushing on to one of the earlier plenary calls, I think we are definitely happy to do that. And we really hope that in the meantime, both before and/or after, people are progressing all of the work on the mailing list. [inaudible] hasn't seemed to work that way so far. Does that make sense?

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Eric. Karen, did you have something on this topic?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, I do.

DENISE MICHEL: Go ahead.

KAREN MULBERRY: Sorry. The ICANN SSR Subgroup meeting in L.A., we have a drop dead date. We need to know whether you're going to want to schedule that

---

meeting or not today. Travel after [inaudible] an exception, within 60 days of a meeting they will not schedule travel. So, we need to know today whether you're going to hold the meeting so we can proceed with making travel arrangements, or we can just consider holding the meeting after Abu Dhabi.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Karen. So, the action items that we had agreed on previously were the confirmation of issues that need to be addressed and staff that needed to be there to address them, and their availability. I may have missed that on the list. Has that been done?

KAREN MULBERRY: We do have staff from a variety of departments that are being lined up pending the final list of issues and questions that Boban's group was developing.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, let's circle back on this on the e-mail list and try and get an answer by tomorrow.

KAREN MULBERRY: Tomorrow is too late. We need something [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, it's today? Okay, thanks for raising that. All right, we'll –

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, today. So, we've got experts from the CIO Engineering Department from IANA, from risk management [and] the OCTO department are all lined up to participate depending on what the questions and the specifics that Boban's group had determined. So, they are ready to go, we just need to have the final list and then get going and start travel. Otherwise, it will not happen.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Could you share those names, please, with the group involved? And we'll circle back with Boban after the call is over. Don, did you have a question or an issue? I see your hand is raised.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Yes. I put it in chat, but it kind of got chopped up. I don't like the idea of shifting around our schedules, but I just wanted to toss the idea out that the week in any given subteam is supposed to have focus over the next few weeks, you look to find times that work for as many of the subteam members as possible. Not critical, just a thought.

DENISE MICHEL: Absolutely, Don. And if you have specific suggestions of changes to the proposed schedule, please do let us know. We'll do our best to accommodate all of the interests. Rapporteur availability was part of the consideration, but again we're really happy to consider changes to accommodate more people.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Geoff is specifically who I had in mind from the DNS group. So, okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I thought I'd done... Yes, thanks. We'll definitely follow up on that.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Okay. It might have looked that way already. I haven't... I just wanted to toss the idea out while we were online.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Excellent point. Thank you. Are there any other additional questions or issues to be addressed while we're on the phone? Okay. Great. Well, we have our action items from SSR1, and we'll be addressing NDAs again next week. And Boban and I and staff and Eric need to address the L.A. trip before close of business today. Anything else?

Okay. Thank you everyone for participating. I look forward to talking to you next week, and please don't be shy about participating on the e-mail list. Thanks again. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

---