
DENISE MICHEL: I will indicate that. Later in the call, I may need to give the Chair duties over to Eric as I will be in transit and approaching a [cell].

So are there any updated SOIs or notes of apologies and absences?

Hearing none, we'll – oops, wait a minute. I'm sorry. I saw the notes. We have two apologies listed, one for Don Blumenthal and James Gannon who now lives in Switzerland. Congratulations on your move, James.

All right, so the focus of this call will be in part, the IANA Transition Subgroup. You'll recall that we are rotating through the subgroups, doing a bit of a deep dive into each to enable and encourage all team members to be across the work that's being done in each of these areas.

In addition to that, we have added an item on the ICANN SSR subteam scope discussion. We'll review the work plans and draft reports in place for all of the subgroups. We'll have a status update on the consultants. We'll note next steps for the NDA and capture any Abu Dhabi business.

So do we have Boban on the call?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: I don't see him as of yet.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. I would invite [inaudible]. Go ahead invite ICANN SSR Team members to join in this brief discussion.

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.

As you all know from the last update, this subteam is meeting in L.A. They have a robust work plan they'll be working through with in-depth briefings and discussions from staff over two days in the ICANN L.A. office.

On the wiki home page for this subgroup, there are links to the work plan that this team is addressing. Yesterday, Kaveh indicated that the Board last week, or some sub-set of the Board, discussed SSR Team activities and decided that a majority of the items that were being addressed, apparently by this subgroup, Board members felt were not in scope.

I followed up on an e-mail with Kaveh. I don't know if Kaveh is on the line.

Yvette, is Kaveh on the call?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: No. Currently, he is not.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, I've subsequently followed up with Kaveh. He indicated that the Board will be sending a written correspondence to the team regarding its view of the subteam's work in this area.

He indicated that as he noted on the SSR ICANN subteam call yesterday that the Board members felt that it was not within the review team's Bylaws. So I've asked when we can expect to see this written notice

from the Board. So as soon as we get something formal, we will, of course, bring it to the team for discussion.

So, at this point, we're keeping you apprised of this development. I think until we actually get a written notice from the Board, it's difficult and perhaps not appropriate to take action. But I'll open this up for any discussions or additional contributions that team members may have.

James, I see your hand is up. Go right ahead.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Denise. So I have a couple of different points I want to make on this and I think this is an extremely important – I'm going to call this a turning point for this Review Team.

So, first of all, just a clarification, this hasn't been discussed by the full Board. I know this for a fact. I spoke to a number of Board members last night about this and this isn't something that is currently coming from the whole Board, so that's something that I would like Kaveh to clarify to us at some point. Obviously, he's not on the call with us now. But my understanding, this must be, therefore, coming from this Board caucus group.

And very important for everybody to understand as a number of people here are new to the concept of these specific reviews and the role of the Board in the reviews is to convene the Review Team.

The Board has no role in setting scope. That is not mandated in the ICANN Bylaws for the ICANN Board to do. We are duly convened and independently run by the community Review Team.

If the Board feels that they want to give us input, they are fully within their rights to do that as part of the community as anybody else can come along. We can have inputs from anybody, but there is no formal role for the Board to restrict the activity or the areas in which this community Review Team feels that we are duly authorized to look at.

And the SSR Subteam for ICANN is one of the groups that is really, kind of the core of what we are set out to do here. And I first of feel that's inappropriate for a Board member or, indeed, the Board itself to come along and define things as out of scope. That is not their role.

My two cents, personally, on this to the broader Review Team, this is a plenary call so I think we're going to need to have a plenary response to this, is that we feel that we are operating fully within our remit and [borrowing] the CEO through Board action being told not to support us on this topic, we should continue with our scope as we have defined.

We are an independent team performing an independent set of actions that we, as the community, have agreed are in scope for us. To me, the Board may give us advice but I think that's kind of the start and the end of it from my point of view. We need to continue what we have said we are going to do, see that through to the end.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, James, and that certainly tracks with my comments on the subteam call yesterday as well. I have Eric in the queue, and then Kerry, and I see Boban has joined the call, and Boban, you're welcome also to make some comments. Eric, go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks. Yeah, sorry for [inaudible] for a little bit and for the elevator music that you guys are [inaudible] hear that.

But I think to sort of pile on to what James was saying, I think at some point, we are always going to wind up having to harmonize the subteam activities with sort of the broader view of how they relate to SSR, and I think maybe one of the things that we can sort of push forward in our thinking now is whether in response to whatever we are preparing to hear from the Board, whether we want to sort of share the holistic aspects of our subteam's projects sooner or later.

I think we could probably – my two cents is depending on how the team feels, we could either sort of defer [a thing], like the point of this Review Team is to do a holistic SSR review and the reason we're looking in this direction will become clear when our review is produced. Or we could say ahead of time, we could sort of draw a nice, little map about how the internal management policies of an organization that's responsible for the operational delegation authorities for the root is critical in SSR because, for example, an internal breach or a lapse in policy posture can cause a global SSR problem.

I think it's real easy for us to write that down the road. We could probably do it sooner. I think one of the things we might want to think about as a team is do we want to sort of frontload that now once we see whatever it is the Board has to say, or put them on ice because jumping off what Jen said, we may not actually have to sort of stop the train from rolling out of the station yet.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Eric. We have Kerry next.

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

DENISE MICHEL: It's a little light, but yes, we can.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think I wanted to support the [inaudible] by Denise, James and everyone.

One of the things that was in the call yesterday was that we spent, as a Review Team, significant, significant, significant time since we were instituted, ensuring that we scoped our work properly. I think it was an exercise we ensured happened. It was an exercise that we spent careful time going through the Bylaws and staff was very, very helpful in ensuring that we had all the information needed concerning the scope and the Bylaws.

We spent time attempting to interpret the Bylaws as well, given that they're new, to ensure that we understood what was required of us. We mapped it, we broke it down, and as raised yesterday, that the meeting in Johannesburg was focused on now taking that into action, having put and invested so much work in doing the scoping part of our assignment.

So I think I just wanted to raise that to support what was said by James and by Denise as well that at the end of the day, I think we have concluded, as persons who have been selected to what our scope is, and with all respect, just like what Eric suggested, that we probably just keep the Board informed and we have been a little low in terms of getting our action going. But I think we're not a good place to advance and accelerate our work to conclusion, and maybe we can increase how much we provide feedback to the Board, so [they understood] what we're doing.

And I think as we approach the meeting in L.A., we have been very, very clear in terms of what we hope to achieve. We have been very clear in terms of understanding the limitations that might come out with the NDAs and confidentiality, etc. But I think we have shown good faith by working closely with Legal so far to ensure that we get the information we need and to respect ICANN's Bylaws and what their requirements might be from the public perspective and transparency.

So all of that just to say that I think the path that we're taking is fine and I think as we go along, we can try to work with the Board to see what their real challenges are because if they invite us formally, Denise, the thing is that it will stop our work for a little bit. It will mean that we would need to pause for a bit to actually prepare a response to them and then determine, based on that, what are the next steps.

So asking them to submit it formally may be an obstacle as well, so I wanted to just put that out there for persons to consider because once it's formally written, we're then required to follow what process there is

in terms of engaging the Board and responding to the Board as a plenary.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. Thank you, Kerry. I would note that receiving a response from the Board does not require us to stop our work in any way.

We are an independent community Review Team. We take our authority from the Bylaws and from the community that appointed us. Ultimately, we provide our independent assessment, our review, our recommendations to the Board. But we are an independent Review Team, and as I think both Eric and James noted, we can assess the Board input when we receive it. But it does not stop our work unless the majority of team members for some reason want to reconsider some element of what the team is doing.

All of these decisions in terms of our Bylaws, our charter, our scope, our work plan, the subgroups, audit plan, work plan, meeting agenda for L.A. in ten days, all of that has been done and thoroughly vetted. In my perspective, there isn't an issue. But again, we've just had verbal input from Kaveh representing the Board and an e-mail restating what he says is the Board's view, so that's where we're at, at this point.

I would suggest that we ask staff to arrange a meeting between at least this Board subgroup, if not additional Board members and the team when we're in Abu Dhabi. I think it would be good to talk through any outstanding issues regarding the Review team's work. And I would invite members on the call to offer their perspective on this.

Kerry, is your hand still up or did you have... or is that old?

Are there any other comments on this topic? Okay. Obviously, this is an important topic for the entire team. I've asked Kaveh to post to the list. If we get anything directly, we will, of course, come to the list with it and this will be a matter for the full team to address. And thank you, everyone, for sharing your perspective on this topic. Again, we'll keep everyone closely apprised.

James, did you have an additional comment?

JAMES GANNON:

Yeah, thanks, Denise. I'm just going to put something out there. I think that this is an issue for the entire Review Team and not just a subgroup, and I would really like to hear other people's opinions on it. I think it's good to hear from myself, you, and probably Boban. But I would like to hear a broader feel from the Review Team of what the rest of the team feels.

There are 15 people on this team and I really think that we need to – at least a majority of people on what their opinions are on this, and that's really something I would push out to the rest of the team. I'd really like to hear people's opinions on this.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. Thank you, James. Yes, I would underscore that and encourage people to share their opinions, if not on the call, certainly on the e-mail list, and I would also like to underscore the fact that this is an issue for the full team and not just a subgroup issue.

Cathy, I see your hand is up.

CATHY HANDLEY:

Thank you, Denise. I apologize. Due to some family issues, I've been out of the loop on most of this. But this seems like this is just all of sudden. Has there been any indication up to this point that things weren't going well or that there were issues? I mean, it seems something as drastic as the way this is being painted, we should have had some sort of indication.

I don't know if that's staff or Denise, you or Eric, from your conversations. I see Kaveh just joined. I'm just curious. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, Cathy. Yeah, this was a surprise to the subgroup members. It was just raised in the call yesterday.

Kaveh, we were just updating people on your... the information you provided regarding the Board's or a part of the Board's opinion that the subgroup activities may have been more out of scope. There has been a bit of discussion this morning about it and I noted, I shared with them that a written opinion from the Board will be forthcoming. Is there anything you wanted to add on this topic before we move on, Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

No, sorry. I was [in the] airport, so just got to my computer now. No, nothing additional. So basically, you will receive the e-mail. We are

working to send as soon as possible, hopefully by the end of this week or very, very early next week.

But no, the main idea is [inaudible] some of the items in that which were between the audit proposal, basically, were not related to what, to SSR, to the scope, and the way we understand the Bylaws or even the scope set by the SSR to the worksheet, basically, they don't match what's expected from the [audit] Review Team.

The audit says many of the questions are info seek questions, which are valid questions. But we don't think the scope fits. If there is such [review], that's Theo's request and possibly even Board's ultimate purview, but they don't fit with an SSR, which would be the [inaudible] of the DNS system. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Kaveh. James, I see your hand is up.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Denise. Can I just ask first, do we want to enter into a discussion about this now or do we want to move on in the agenda, because I'm happy to engage in a discussion of the –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, thank you, James. You read my mind. I'm a little concerned about the time and the number of agenda items we have. So I would prefer, at this point, to move through the rest of our agenda items. I suspect we won't have time left on this call, but if we do, I'm happy to return to this

topic and I would encourage members to share more information and views on this topic on the e-mail list.

And also, Kaveh, I had raised the idea – again, this is just an idea I’m throwing out and would appreciate your and other people’s comments on it – that the Review Team meet with the Board or a sub-set of the Board that is focusing on the Review Team issues when we’re together in Abu Dhabi.

So with that, I’ll leave this topic. Thank you, everyone, for this robust discussion. It was very useful.

Cathy, did you have a comment on this or another topic? I see your hand is up.

CATHY HANDLEY:

Just a real quick question. I just want to make sure I understand. Kaveh, what you’re talking about is the entire SSR2 effort, not just a subteam discussion that took place.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

No, this is specific to Subteam 2, Subgroup 2 because ICANN SSR and the proposed audit questions. So, and some of them are irrelevant, but the [inaudible] are not.

So as I mentioned, if I remember correctly, items 1, 3, 5 and 7 are, we think they are not relevant. The rest, we think they are within the scope. But those specific items from Subgroup 2, we think are not relevant to SSR review.

CATHY HANDLEY: Okay, thank you. I just, in my own head, wanted to make sure that if everything was under question, but it's not. So thank you very much.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. And we'll put more information on the e-mail list on this as well, so people can find, if Zach could share the link directly to the audit plan, Section 1, 3, 5 and 7 have several action items underneath each one and you can review them on the Google Doc that's linked. And if Zach could share that link again on the Adobe Connect on the e-mail list, that will make it easier for people to find.

With that, I'll turn it over to Cathy and James for an IANA Transition Subgroup update.

JAMES GANNON: Excellent. So if I can have presenter rights, I'm going to walk through our Trello board to give everybody an idea what we've got to and where we're going.

Share my screen. [inaudible] desktop. This is what I want. Okay. Excellent.

So going back to our Trello, can everybody see everything okay?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: We can see okay in the Review group. Would you possibly mind also logging in the observer room so you can share your screen in there as

well? I can Skype you the link should you need it. Would that be okay so that they can see?

JAMES GANNON: Yep, [inaudible]. I will get it up as quickly as I can.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Okay, I'm getting that to you right now. Thank you so much.

JAMES GANNON: Thank you. Cathy [inaudible], while I'm doing this, could you just give an overview of what we did in Johannesburg maybe? Would you be okay to do that?

CATHY HANDLEY: All righty, it's going to be kind of a blotchy overview because, as I said, I've been out for a while and haven't been dealing with any of this.

 Basically, where we are is at a point of waiting to do the NDAs so that we can make our next step which is to looking at documents.

JAMES GANNON: [Inaudible]

CATHY HANDLEY: Are you there?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: If we could have everyone who is not talking mute their phones, please. Go ahead, Cathy.

CATHY HANDLEY: Eric and I are going to meet up with, I believe, Kim Davies while we are in Abu Dhabi to discuss some outstanding items that, sadly, I do not have in front of me and I apologize, which... We are basically, I mean, what we have done up to this point is pretty much finished with the exception of [inaudible]. James, you're back.

JAMES GANNON: Yes, apologies. Sorry, when I tried to go into the observer room, everything crashed on me. So yeah, I can actually take up from exactly where you've just left off.

So we had a number of interviews in Johannesburg. Sorry, I forgot my countries there. And we have completed out the interviews with [Elise] and we clarified some other bits and pieces with them, and we have a follow-up interview that we want to do with Kim Davies in Abu Dhabi, which Cathy and Eric will be taking. I won't make it to Abu Dhabi unfortunately, so it's in good hands with those guys.

We have an outstanding request for training documentation. We've now identified that it will be [Nayala] from PTI that will handle that request for us, so we're drafting together what the specific questions we have on processes and procedures are documented within PTI, and from a risk management and a business continuity management point of view, it's important that documentation is very well fleshed out in an organization, so that [it's just location] for drilling down that.

We have a request for a high level presentation, probably too into the report, on the new relationship between ICANN PTI and the Root Zone Maintainer. This is obviously to differentiate between the SSR1 Review going into SSR2. There is now a new landscape where we have PTIs as opposed to IANA and we have a new form of agreement around Verisign [Root Zone Maintainer] Agreement and so we want to get some – flesh out [inaudible] on that.

On our work in progress, our documents that we have out for requests to staff documentation that was blocked by the NDA process – so this is where we've identified specific documents that we want to look at – but our assumption is, I will admit confidential documents that would not be suitable for public consumption, I believe and we need to have those under NDA therefore, and we'd be waiting for the NDA process to get wrapped up.

So my hope is that in the coming, let's say, two or three weeks, everybody in [inaudible] will have our internal legal departments review the NDA so that we can then get ahead with signing that and then we can work with staff to work out, okay, getting these documents to us so that we can review them as quick as possible.

If we look at the “work in progress” column on our Trello, you will see well over 50% to 60% of our current tasks are document reviews. As Cathy said, that is pretty much the main outstanding item that we have before we can start extracting our interim report, which I have here as an item as well.

Cathy will be working on the general [requesters] with Kim. That is part of what we have up here as well. This is something that we haven’t followed up on yet. We wanted some details around staff attention planning, again, from such a small department [inaudible]. We want to make sure that there is succession planning from a continuity perspective in place.

So essentially, we have documents in progress. We have a good bit done and I’m hopeful that after Abu Dhabi, we can pretty quickly get a draft together and then we can ask for another slot on the plenary to come back and share that draft with any recommendations we have coming out of that.

And hopefully then, by the time we get around to Brussels, we’ll have that fleshed out and we’ll have that in a state where it can go into the final report.

I’m happy to take any questions or comments.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, James, and thank you, Cathy, for that update. Eric, go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Hey. Thanks, all. I just had a couple comments. One is I think I just wanted to draw the team, the whole team's attention to the observation that a lot of the spirit of what the IANA Subteam is looking into is, bears what I think the ICANN SSR Subteam is looking into in the sense that continuity, like business continuity, and those sorts of things are being sort of like formalized as an SSR [issue] in multiple places. I think it sort of lends a lot of credence to the notion that this is sort of [appropriate] [inaudible] for us.

But the second thing I wanted to mention is probably a bit of a segue maybe even to point which is, James, have we been told these documents need to be under NDA? Because if not, I think we may want to sort of be told that before we presume that because the NDA is not necessarily going to go over very well with all their legal departments, speaking from firsthand experience. So there may be some obstacles with that going forward, so it might be better to know whether the PTI thinks the documents need to be under NDA, as opposed to presuming it. I'm not sure. I might have misunderstood what your context was on that.

JAMES GANNON:

Yep, so currently, we have seven document requests out. Three of these are related to what I would call business continuity. It's actually what ICANN and IANA call the Continuity of Operations plan and I know for a fact that is considered a confidential document only to be released under NDA by ICANN due to the fact that I filed a [DIDT] request for that about two years ago during the transition and was told, "No, this is an NDA relation document," before we even had this SSR2 related

conversation about it. I know for a fact that's considered a confidential document.

The other one, these are where I'm not aware of what the underlying documents are, so we have a request for generic documentation, and until ICANN makes a call on whether the documentation that is required to fulfill that request is confidential or not, we won't be able to make a decision on those. But for the Continuity of Operations plan, [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, James. Eric, do you have any additional questions? [Inaudible] additional questions [inaudible] information.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi, Denise. This is Yvette, the host manager. You're cutting out a little bit, just so you know. We're kind of getting every other word.

DENISE MICHEL: [Inaudible]

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: That was a little better, but we're still, we had a little bit of static. But it was better.

DENISE MICHEL: Are there any other questions on this agenda item?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: That was very good, thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Thank you, James and Cathy, for that update. And of course, their work plans in Trello and additional information is on the subgroup wiki page.

JAMES GANNON: Yep, and this is just, again, for one second. I encourage everybody to keep an eye on our Trello. We keep it up to date so we can actually look and see how we're progressing and make sure that we're keeping our [inaudible] in the bowl.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Thank you. Could we have the agenda back up, please?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Sure. Okay, it's back online.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Do we have updates for the subgroup work plans? Are there any subgroup Chairs that would like to bring items to the full group's attention, or have a report on action?

Okay, we'll move on to the next agenda item, but I would encourage the chairs to provide any updates or information they'd like to share with the Review Team, the full Review Team on the e-mail list, and would

remind everyone that we're counting on the subgroup teams to update the work plan and we have a template for them to complete. We want to make sure that the Gantt chart and work plan we have posted in Google Docs remains up to date and reflects all the work that's occurring at the subgroup level.

With that, we'll move on to the next item, consultants. Thank you to everyone who contributed their thoughts and edits to the statement of work for the gap analysis and for Alain's leadership in the SSR1 Implementation Subgroup. ICANN is processing that statement of work and will be soliciting individuals or entities to conduct the gap analysis of the implementation of SSR1 review recommendations.

Are there any, is there any additional items we need to discuss related to that?

Hearing none, move on the additional item was – if we could just roll back to technical writers. The additional item on consultants was the [inaudible] writer/researcher, and we need to complete the statement of work, and move forward on that. We'll keep you apprised of that action as well.

Any questions on these? Okay, we'll move on to the next agenda item.

NDA next steps, who would like to take this item? And I'm going to go on mute. I'm in transit and might be hitting a dead zone, so I'm going to... Eric, are you able to take the Chair duties?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, I'll take that. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Awesome, thank you. I'll turn it over to Eric, and we have NDA, our next steps on the agenda. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. So yeah, so NDA, [inaudible] review nondisclosure agreements. Has anybody run into anything or has any comments about this based on their own perspective, or perhaps, a little [inaudible] or anything like that?

Okay, so seeing no hands raised, James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Sorry, I was a bit late to the game there. Yeah, so just very, very briefly, myself and Kerry-Ann, I think are relatively happy with the overall state of the NDA and this [EDF] of this stage, just for people's interest, my own internal legal team has reviewed this and [are] happy for me to share it. And sorry, to that [inaudible] so if anybody, any joy to hear this, I think it's going to be pretty standard for most.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, James. Yes, so I see another hand is up, but having put my hand up, so my legal team has reviewed it and has called my attention to a number of issues, including anybody who is sort of – there is a number of liability issues that they are having consternation over, so I haven't had direct communication from them with which to send out to the team. But there's a distinct possibility I will not be able to sign, and that

would basically have an implication for my participation in various aspects and various subteams.

And I don't know if that's going to wind up being unique to me or more generally systemic across the team, and at which point we come to one of the questions that was raised early on, which is having kind of a heterogeneous team in which some people have signed, some people haven't, some people can participate more [inaudible] and some people can't, and that would be based on people having executed the NDA. If some of us do and not all of us do, then that winds up fragmenting the team which may be okay or may not be okay.

But it might wind up being one of the things we want to discuss as a team, so I guess I'm sort of laying in wait for my legal department to sort of give me a formal response that I can ingest and potentially regurgitate, at least in some form, to the team. And, but I did want to raise people's attention to the possibility that we'll have this sort of bifurcated team, and if that's something that we want or something that we don't want.

So just in general, people haven't started socializing this with their legal teams. It's probably worthwhile because, for example, if someone is under the impression that their actions in any way being protected by their corporation, disregard the NDA or remove that, for example.

So I don't know if that causes anybody else to want to raise their hand or ask questions, but I want to sort of give people a chance to react to that if they have anything to say.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, Eric. I apologize. I'm not in the Adobe Connect room, but I'd like to be put in the queue.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Go ahead, Denise. You're the only one.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I also have not – [inaudible] has not completed its analysis of the NDA and I do not know whether or not I'll be signatory to it. I think it's very important for the community to be able to appoint individuals to serve on this and other review teams, whether or not they are able to sign an NDA.

I'm concerned that the NDA may be a gating factor for community participation in these Review Teams, and previous Review Teams that had very similar Bylaw mandates were able to conduct their reviews without any members signing NDAs. So I agree with Eric that the broader issue deserves some more discussion and consideration. And even if we decide to move forward with some members having NDAs and others not, I think it's important that we ensure that we carve out space for those who have not signed the NDA to continue to participate appropriately in the Review Team's activities. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Denise. Kerry-Ann, I see your hand is raised.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Hi, everyone. I think one of the issues raised by Eric is the next immediate step that we have to start discussing because I know there was a situation where some persons sign and some persons won't. It's something that we raised with the Legal team.

We would then have to restructure ourselves to be able to get the work done, redact or summarize information that can be publicly shared because the same type of information that the review members that don't sign, that's the only tie the information that we can put in the report, anyway, that would be publicly available.

So we have to start thinking how we structure ourselves. The document is going to be reviewed by our Legal team as well within [inaudible], and so I'm going to have to wait for their response.

But one of the things that I think is necessary, and we raised it with Legal when we met with them, is that the document coming after the fact is a challenge and we can decide as the SSR2 Team if we will then raise that point to the Board and to Legal from that perspective as plenary.

James and I worked with Legal to try and soften the language as best as we could. But we did raise during our discussions with them that this document should be during the call of the teams, so that when persons do volunteer to join the team, that they are aware up front what the requirements would be and then they can then determine based on whether or not they're nominated by an ICANN community group or not, whether or not they want to be bounded by those terms.

Having been nominated and then required to sign to be able to conduct the work is a point that I think we could raise. [inaudible] would lead the discussions, I'm not sure, but I think it's something worth pursuing as to whether or not they will be bounded by it or if there will be some allowance to allow some discussion within ICANN Board or the Legal to now consider whether or not as a plenary putting this plan forward, it will be considered and their recommendation as to how to deal with this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Thanks, Kerry-Ann. I put myself in the queue, but I don't want to suck the oxygen out. Does anybody else have anything that they'd like to add?

Okay, I don't see any hands.

I just want to sort of add to that, that I think you're exactly right, Kerry-Ann. I think if you're an NDA or formulating an NDA after a Review Team has convened, suboptimal in a number of ways. I actually sort of wonder if we don't want to, as a team, start thinking about and at some point, have some discussion about whether doing a review is, with an NDA – an NDA is required to do a review and what that actually means for forming Review Teams.

I mean, I think the presumption that we need an NDA is one thing. Discussing the [form] and the NDA after we presumed that we needed an NDA seems a little bit like putting the cart before the horse, so I think sort of challenging how this needs to work for us as a team might inform other teams going forward.

So I think it's worth everybody taking some time to think about this. I think it's very possible we need to put this back on our plenary agenda in the future so that people have time to think about it because the structure of this NDA may – that's only come after we formed the team, certainly informs our abilities after we already started outlining our work. So just to sort of pile on some of the [inaudible] carry on.

I see that James is saying it was not in the plans when we wrote the Bylaws. It was [supposed to precede] the Review Team's starting.

Yeah, and so, I think now we find ourselves in a little bit of a quandary as a team, and I'm just sort of saying perhaps the way we get through it will inform other people going forward. So I just suggest we all sort of take the time to think about this and maybe circle back on it.

Okay, so if there are no other comments or questions, then perhaps we can move to the next agenda item, preparing for Abu Dhabi.

So in the Connect room, you can see the number of confirmed meetings and a number of tentative meetings that are in progress. If everybody can take a look at what's on the confirmed meetings, I think there has been sort of a mix [inaudible] from some of the groups that we're doing outreach to as to whether we'll be solely providing a briefing, being sort of in this sort of a Q&A role or some kind of hybrid between both.

And so, certainly, I think people should take a look at this group [inaudible] can decide whether they have a perspective on whether they want to be asking questions or if they're interested in participating in a briefing. But does anybody, in looking at this, want to offer any comments about what a potential objective would be for any of these?

I think we sort of suggested in one of the previous plenary calls that we have some group discussion, perhaps on the mailing list, about our goal with outreach was. But has anybody added anything into that, that they want to share with the group?

Okay, because one of the things that I think s important is for us, as we sort of go down the road is to be sure that we're informed of the issues that these groups are considering and internalize them as to how they may [inaudible] for an SSR issue that we have or haven't thought of before.

So each of these groups has their own perspective that I think is useful for us to sort of listen to in regards to what the issues that they're currently [inaudible] on. In a lot of cases, a lot of us maybe well abreast of some of the more public groups and what they think are important when they do not necessarily need to hear from them.

And also [inaudible]. I think each of the rapporteur should be prepared to sort of have sort of a [inaudible] pitch level summary of where your Review Team is. Some of the teams are probably more eager to do it than others, but I think regardless of whether people are there for any or all of these briefings, I think the people that are going to be there should be prepared to have a high level summary of where the subteams are for those cases where there needs to be a summary let out to these external groups.

And that's something that rapporteurs are capable or interested in being able to do prior to the Abu Dhabi meeting so that the rest of the team has sort of an executive summary or elevated pitch level of what

the subteams are working on. I could get the acknowledgement from rapporteurs either in the chat room or audio would be great.

I see Kaveh has got his hand raised.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So I think the Board is not on list, is there any special reason or has it been discussed not to have a meeting with the Board? Because I think, actually, it's a very good point, both in the progress of the project [inaudible] and being physically there to report back to the Board and have a discussion with the Board on the progress.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay yeah, we should put that in the queue of outreach. I think it must not have been in there for some reason, but it sounds like that might be useful.

James, I see you said you won't be in Abu Dhabi, so yeah, either if Cathy is ready to do it or if you don't mind sort of prepping somebody, anybody that can – I'm not saying all the rapporteurs need to be there – I was jus proposing that rapporteurs ensure that the status of the subteam is codified enough that somebody can sort of say, "This is what we think."

Great, thanks, [Nolan]. Yes, I have said that yeah, that's going above and beyond. Yeah, that's awesome. Thanks.

Okay, well we're in the clock-out and yeah, this is all collegial, so yeah, there doesn't need to be anything formal. I just want to make sure that

if we wind up just doing a smattering [inaudible] in a room of people, that we can sort of cover the things that they may ask about. That was it.

But okay, let's maybe move on to Any Other Business.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hi, Eric. This is Yvette, the hosting in the room. I just had a quick question. We have ICANN SSR on the 10th in L.A., as you know, and we usually have a plenary call on that same day. So I'm just wondering for scheduling, if you and Denise kind of just want to let me know if you want to move the plenary call to another day or if you just want to cancel it for that week. However you guys want to do it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, sorry. I'm going to have to circle back with you about that.

Yeah, so I think Denise was planning to be at the ICANN SSR meeting, so I don't think we'll be able to run the call effectively, so I think barring any major, massive objections from folks, I think we may just want to cancel that week.

I see Jennifer, you have your hand raised. Thanks, Yvette.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi. Thanks, Eric. If I may, I just wanted to do a quick recap of the decisions and actions from today's meeting. Can I go ahead and do that now?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm sorry. Say that again? Sorry.

JENNIFER BRYCE: I just want to run through the decisions reached and action items that we captured on today's call. Can I go ahead and do that now?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that'd be great.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, thanks. So we've got an agreement to proceed with the release of the Gap Analysis Execution document. Can I just confirm that that's correct?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Release a gap analysis, yes, I think so. Does anyone have any objection to that? Yeah, sorry. Go ahead.

JENNIFER BRYCE: No problem. Moving on then, so action item, ICANN to share the audit plan for the ICANN SSR subgroup to the e-mail list. We're going to explore whether a meeting with the Board caucus group in Abu Dhabi can be arranged. The team members are to share thoughts on the ICANN SSR scope-related discussion on the e-mail list and then subteam

rapporteurs to prepare a short status presentation for the update to the SO/AC groups in Abu Dhabi.

Is there any other action items or decisions reached that we should capture before we wrap up?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I think that's probably all we really would need. And everyone, just for clarity, the action items that were being discussed will be codified on the wiki page, the public wiki page, so that's why we're going over them in broad view. So if people have thoughts on this, this is probably an important item to dial into.

Okay, sounds good. All right, I see there's a lively chat discussion I have not been able to keep up with. Does anyone want to raise the chat discussion? Oh, we're over time. Okay, never mind.

Okay. Thanks, everyone, for joining the call today and I look forward to speaking to you all soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]