
JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks very much. Good morning, everyone. It's Jennifer Bryce here. Welcome to day three of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting in Washington. Today is Friday the 24th of August. This session is being recorded, and I'll pass it to Alice, and we'll do a roundtable. Thank you.

ALICE JANSEN: Alice Jansen, ICANN staff.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar.

ZARKO KECIC: Zarko Kecic.

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.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Naveed bin Rais.

ALAIN AINA: Alain Aina.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

STEVE CONTE: Steve Conte.

NEGAR FARTZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia.

RAMKRISHNA PARIYAR: Good morning. Ramkrishna from Nepal.

PHIL KHOURY: Phil Houry.

KC CLAFFY: KC Claffy.

JENNIFER BRYCE: We have no online participants at the moment. Boban sent his apologies, as did Ameen Noorul, and I think we're expecting Kerry Ann shortly. Scott McCormick is here but not currently in the room. He will be returning shortly. And with that, I'll pass it back to Phil. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you. Jennifer. Reminder to everyone to announce their name, please, when speaking. [Message for me.] So, today is a short day, we have [inaudible] to get through. I've emailed to you, Jennifer, suggestions, kind of a loose timetable for the day. And we'll have a quick discussion about that in a minute, we'll get that put up on the screen.

Before we charge into that, any reflections, thoughts overnight, anything you want to share with the group before we kick off? Anything we maybe didn't deal with properly yesterday or anything you're hoping we can get back to and fix? Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey. This is just a quick reminder, it would be great to be clear on what our requested Barcelona meeting details are like. I'm mindful that we need to stay ahead of a quickly approaching deadline for asking ICANN staff and Travel to make arrangements for that.

PHIL KHOURY: Anything else from anyone? Picking up on what we need to get done today. Alright, we'll come back to that in a second.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] ICANN meeting [inaudible] I mean the Barcelona meeting.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah. Recorded, thank you. Just while that's coming up, one of the things that would be really good today is to pick up on somebody's advice from yesterday about keeping focused on what's the best way to spend face-to-face time and what is done relatively uncontroversially by e-mail so we can prioritize our time as much as possible there.

So, the thing we had promised to do this morning was to keep going with the briefings on the chunks of work, scope that had been agreed. So some brief presentation this morning. Before we do that, I just want to agree we got our priorities right on how you want to use your time, and secondly, just to get the leadership stuff underway so we can deal with that.

My apologies. Did that come through okay?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Its on. I think [inaudible] my Adobe room, but I'm not sure why it's not showing on this Adobe room here.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Look, I might just talk you through it, and we might print them out. Is that possible? Just to –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Will do. Alright, I'll send that just straight – it's nothing – [inaudible] just hate when there's too much attention on something that's not very good and it finally emerges to be just a terrible disappointment.

So, look, I wanted to put [– to present] a proposition. It seems to me that of all the things that the external world is going to be looking to the team for coming out of the face-to-face, scope is clearly way up there in the top couple. And some workplan-type product out of the discussion so that there's a sense of what you guys are going to be doing next and that sort of thing.

So, I think that's the – did that come through to you?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. It did.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. That seemed to me to be the sort of priority thing, but any comments? Okay if we sort of tackle the first part of the leadership thing, which is really sort of nominations, now, get that out of the way and then people are left to vote? Did the PowerPoint work, Jennifer?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. It's an issue with the presentation laptop here.

PHIL KHOURY: The room? Oh, okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. So...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. [inaudible] Alright, it did. [inaudible] I'm just going to – let's see. I can just [leave] my screen, I guess.

PHIL KHOURY: So, when we were talking about people nominating and so on, there were a couple of people discuss with me that it would be good to have a conversation about the roles and the sort of criteria [inaudible] for the leadership positions rather than sort of just charging into it, which I think is pretty sensible.

So I just did a couple of slides to throw up for people to kind of respond to. One of them is going to ask the question, just to make 100% sure this is what we agreed yesterday, that we thought the structure of a chair and two deputies. I'm not sure if it was two, but that was what I came away with, but I'm not 100% sure –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah? Two deputies? It was two, not one. Okay. Alright. Great. No one's protesting to that. Second thing is just an ICANN-type protocol issue, which is, what do you want to call the deputies?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Vice chairs.

DENISE MICHEL: Generally call them vice chairs or co-chairs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Vice chairs.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Sorry, I thought at the time we [inaudible] leadership as all three equal. It was like co-chairs, there wasn't like a hierarchy. It was just co-chairs [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: Well, we had the conversation yesterday which was to – preference for having a chair and two vices. Yeah. Russ, did you want to say about the titles?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think this happened after you left yesterday.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. So it sounds like vice chairs is the right title for that. Yeah? Okay. Sorry, in terms of our time for today, as you look at the timetable, we don't have a huge amount of time, so quick few minutes now getting organized, a little bit of time on the leadership – we could probably go faster than that – then we want to get back to completing the presentations around – that people were in the middle of doing last week. So Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Just a question from your experience, because we are a team of maximum 21 people, and I really don't know, I'm just asking, like having three leaders, isn't it too much? Maybe I'm... I'm just asking because I see it might impede the progress of the team. I really have no opinion on it, I'm just asking.

PHIL KHOURY: Look, it's a vexed question. From my understanding of the literature, there's no sort of clear preference to that. I think if you had a full-time chair, that would be the most efficient way to do it, but I don't think you have a full-time chair, so I think it's probably a pretty good balance. It ought to be quicker and more efficient than having three equals who will feel the need to kind of check in with each other on things [inaudible] more.

STEVE CONTE: Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I proposed this structure, and it's based on the draft operating procedures that are out for open comment. That's where the three came from.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: It suggests –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] reviews?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, for all reviews. Yes. I [inaudible] understand that it could probably work with a chair and a vice chair, but you certainly need at least one vice, because inevitably, something will happen and somebody needs to be able to step in and run things when that person is absent.

PHIL KHOURY: It's also really useful to have a little group to bounce ideas off and to have counsel and so forth. So, who do we got?

STEVE CONTE: I have Denise and then KC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, it's strongly recommended to have multiple people volunteering for leadership in some capacity, because people are volunteers and busy, and there is a significant amount of work involved across all of the areas of work for the team. And I support the suggestion of chair and vice chairs. We had three co-chairs at the beginning because we were the only three people who were willing to serve in leadership positions.

You saw the text in the terms of reference and scope that lays out leadership and team responsibilities. To give you a little more flavor for the activities involved, they include tracking the substantive work, creating agendas, ensuring the action items or notes are accurately reflected, dealing with everything from problems with travel letters and meeting spaces, budget, minutes, outreach and interaction with all of the community members and the board, dealing with – well, hopefully not another suspension/pause, and the Wiki, which is potentially a job in and of itself. So quite a variety of activities ranging from organization to substance to potentially overseeing consultants to communication and budget and operations, and those types of things. Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. KC? KC and then Naveed.

KC CLAFFY: Well, I more or less got convinced by Denise just now that we need four co-chairs. But [I wanted to] ask Russ, in the IANA transition team, was it a much bigger group? Or I don't know if the size of the group [has anything to do with it.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know, it was 34 or 40.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, that's bigger. But anyway, I think – I don't feel strongly, but I think two is not too many.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Not something related to leadership but related to agenda. I expect to have a discussion on the next face-to-face, which is Barcelona. So maybe we need to synchronize on that. Especially people like us who need visa and all, so we need to finalize that as quickly as possible, because that can take a long time to settle, actually. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, then just to sort of follow that up, I think unless I missed it yesterday or it's already involved in something else, are we going to talk about the call schedule, rotation, that sort of stuff today as well, or are we going to punt on that?

PHIL KHOURY: I apologize, I was distracted there. Would you mind asking that again?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I was just asking sort of following up on what Denise and Naveed both said about the Barcelona face-to-face, are we also today going to talk about the call schedule, or are we going to punt on that until later?

PHIL KHOURY: I think those things need to be dealt with while you're face-to-face. It should be the quickest and most efficient way to deal with it. So, that is just – let's get something up here just to see what time we have in front of us and we can prioritize as we go. So I'm happy to revisit it every break in terms of getting what you want done done. And by lunch time, I'll be in a hammock relaxing somewhere else.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Really?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Cool, me too.

PHIL KHOURY: That's my plan. Okay. I think Eric has asked the right question that people have raised, at the very least face-to-faces and the team teleconferences as matters to kind of sort out before we go. There are probably a number of others that we want to put into that bucket of how we're going to work together. So we may have to put that into the space either just before or just after lunch. So I'll just keep revisiting that because we're well behind in terms of the ideal outcomes.

So, could we go, Jennifer, back to the sort of leadership slides that were in that PowerPoint?

JENNIFER BRYCE: The one you sent this morning?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. The recording has begun. This is after the morning break session of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting day three. Phil, over to you.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. I don't think we have anybody online. Do we, Jennifer? Just to check that. I'm pretty sure we don't, but I'll –

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible]

PHIL KHOURY: And I've got Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Comment for staff, because for the three days we have been going [on, off in] the recording, so to put this online, I think [we should request] some comment or some justification. Otherwise, people may have a hard time following what has happened.

STEVE CONTE: Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry, I had a phone call so I had to leave the room, but I want to congratulate the new chair and all the new vice chairs.

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Alain. Yeah, we'll definitely work with Phil to capture the essence of the conversation without getting into the confidential content. And obviously, the sessions that are recorded publicly will be posted for everyone to listen to. The discussions around leadership were private, but the results have been announced to everybody on the mailing list for the members that were not in the room today. And other discussions that have taken place, they were internal matters to the team. I think we can just summarize that conversations have taken place. We'll work with Phil to make sure we capture everything without divulging confidential content.

PHIL KHOURY:

I'm not sure, Russ. Is it going to be [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, I'd just like to plant a seed about how things are going to go today. I think that the next thing is we're going to deal with the charts here and get up to speed on the other subteams and where they were up to the [inaudible]. And then we're going to have lunch, and then – so let's make sure we get this done by lunch, and then after lunch, we're going to work on the communique to the outside world.

So, think about what the top messages are, and let's not go way down into the details, but let's keep the high level so that we're able to let the rest of the community know we're resuming, all is well, we're getting on with the work.

PHIL KHOURY: Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Thank you, Russ, for identifying the rest of the agenda items. We still have to talk about Barcelona as well, that has not been finalized.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, so in the interest of –

RUSS HOUSLEY: You've got the Doodle poll results though, right?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We do have the Doodle poll results. I think we still need clarification from the team on the voting results for the last day of the meeting, which is that last Thursday. There was an error with the results that got published. With got question marks for some members' feedback, and we just need to verify that with everyone.

PHIL KHOURY: So, staff, do you have a note you can pass around or an e-mail or something to collect whatever's left to be collected so that we know about the Thursday preferences?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. We've been working on that. I'll just check in with them to see where they're at, but yeah.

PHIL KHOURY: Alright. Thank you very much. Alright, in the interest of speed, I think we need to – I think Zarko is the next person who is going to give us a brief run through on where his chunk got to. Just by way of explanation, we've thrown up on the windows some post-it notes and printouts of the bylaw, the relevant bylaw sections. So hopefully, as a result of all of this, we can kind of map the connections, where each one has got to, just so that we've got a visual summary of all of this so that we know what we are able to say about scope when we come to the end of this. So, is that okay with you, Zarko? Ready to go?

ZARKO KECIC: It is okay.

PHIL KHOURY: You don't necessarily have to write on there, but if you would like to write on it, that's fine.

ZARKO KECIC: I rather sit in front of my computer and speak up. Okay, we were looking yesterday at the document which says how subtopic two [or] ICANN security and stability and resiliency is connected to and related to bylaws, and that's 4.6(c)(II)(a), (c)(II)(b) and (c)(III). So, if you want

me, I can read that, or you just – yeah, I have that [somewhere.] I took that out. So –

JENNIFER BRYCE: Zarko, if your Adobe Connect [inaudible] would be helpful to display [inaudible]

ZARKO KECIC: Yes, you can. Yes, please. (c) is security, stability and resiliency review. The issues that the review team or the SSR Review Team may access are following. A is security, operational stability and resiliency matters, both physical and network, related to coordination of the Internet's system of unique identifiers. (c)(II)(b) is conformance with appropriate security contingency planning framework for the Internet's system of unique identifiers, and (c)(III) is SSR Review Team shall also assess the extent to which ICANN has successfully implemented its security efforts.

Let me bring that –make this a little bit bigger. Review team shall also assess the extent to which ICANN has successfully implemented its security efforts, the effectiveness of the security efforts to deal with actual and potential challenges and threats to the security and stability of DNS, and the extent to which the security efforts are sufficiently robust to meet future challenges and threats to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, consistent with ICANN's mission.

And we have tried to follow a comprehensive approach on information security, and especially on information security and business continuity management. And our approach was based on ISO 27001, which is

information security, and 22230, which is business continuity management system.

And we had, in my opinion, a very successful meeting, two-day meeting in L.A. last October, and what we did, we sent a questionnaire based on two standards that I mentioned, and we believe that use of both standards, we should be able to address all relevant work and items that are identified.

I want to mention that in the beginning, when we were planning tasks that this subteam should do, we used some wording which were unacceptable to some people at ICANN and ICANN [inaudible] And I understand that, because I wouldn't like that some independent review team which does not consist of professionals to do such work.

So, we changed a little bit our workplan before L.A. meeting because there were exchange of letters with board [who raised] questions about this, and I talked to some people from ICANN as well. Actually, connected to ICANN. They're not from organization, they are from ACs and SOs which were concerned about his.

And we didn't change our language, but we just tried to explain, and we finally did it in Abu Dhabi, our presentation that we are not going to go deep, as some people understood. And [I'll] just explain what I'm talking about.

It says, for example, "Perform comprehensive assessment of ICANN's business continuity management systems." Or, "Perform assessment of ICANN information security management systems." So, some people were afraid that we are going to look at firewall configuration and

comprehensive network map and stuff like that. But we just wanted to know, is everything in place, and how it is done within ICANN.

Initially, we had [kind of] different subtasks, but we decided to go to seven of them, and that's to look at information security management systems, to business continuity management systems, risk management, security incident management, ICANN operations process and services, and how effectively ICANN has implemented its process around [vetting] registry operation and services concerning the new gTLD delegation [to the] transition process and to perform assessment of how effectively ICANN has implemented its process to ensure compliance regarding registrar agreement.

As I said, we had a two-day meeting in L.A., which was pretty much successful. We talked to a number of people. If you're interested, maybe Steve can help me, because I cannot remember. I don't recall, but there is recording of that meeting. We had two mic-off sessions, but they were just to decide how we're going to approach, and most of the stuff is in recording. So, it is available.

In my opinion, we did a lot of work over there, we got lots of information. We [had] to clarify some findings that we understood in one way or another, and I believe that we are ready to start drafting final report for this. And who was –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, we'll need to do some work, additional work, but we have most of stuff over there. And who were there, Eric, Denise, Norm, and Steve, if you want to add something, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, it was an extremely productive two days of meetings. Staff provided a lot of really useful information and input, and I think the subgroup is well-positioned to move forward and soon, I think, start issuing some draft recommendations for the team to consider.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I have Steve and Alain.

STEVE CONTE: Just to address Zarko's comment, it's not comprehensive, I don't have it in my head, but I believe the review team addressed –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Okay. The review team had conversations with members of the engineering and IT staff, the Compliance staff, the enterprise risk management staff, and I'm not sure if there's another group you spoke

to. Like I said, it's not comprehensive. So it is written down, I invite the review team to review that portion of the Wiki.

ZARKO KECIC:

We had also a meeting with Compliance staff. What else?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yes, I think Zarko mentioned that part of the issue we had with the scope came from the drafting of the [inaudible] subteam workplan, and also mentioned that the board [inaudible]. But before it went to the board level, inside the review team, we had intensive discussions [where] we couldn't agree, because some of us were saying that it was too deep, what we were trying to do, and that what we communicate also is very important.

What you say, "You know, I'm going to do this," okay, but the way you express it can get you into trouble. Okay? So we will have to avoid for example this kind of "comprehensive" and this "audit." We were using "audit," "comprehensive," but some of us object to this. But we couldn't, as a team, agree to it, so I'm expecting that [a] report from what has happened in L.A. for us to really know if we are maybe in a position to move forward as Zarko and Denise are saying.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. Thanks. Yes, words matter. And I think specifically, the use of the term “audit,” which was more used as a synonym for “review” and “assess,” was misunderstood and misinterpreted by some to be indicating a much deeper dive and much more professional, extensive audit in the true sense of the word, which it was not.

The team tried in a number of different ways to correct that misunderstanding. And ultimately, the work that the team did that was in very large part driven by the requirement that the team assess implementation of SSR1 that got into many of these operational issues was, I think, in my opinion, done very well, done at an appropriate level, and it would be good for the rest of the team to make sure they take time to review the material thus far and surface any additional issues or concerns that they have. Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

I also think it’s good for the new members to reference the e-mail that Alain sent around yesterday where because of the misunderstanding of the terminologies used in the – when we had to go to L.A., we had to kind of explain what we meant by some of the “performing an audit,” that the intention was not to go too deep.

So the language that he emailed yesterday was us trying to actually explain to persons who had concerns what the review or what the mission to L.A. would have entailed. So that would be a good reference

point to kind of see the logic, and probably, when the team begins to write up anything from this, we can – if we maintain this subteam, we can fix the language here to kind of quell the concerns that persons had. But the e-mail that Alain sent helps to kind of summarize where our minds were at.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Phil.

PHIL KHOURY:

So, question for the whole team, but also for the new members. What's the process you would like for validating this? The suggestion that Denise has kind of made is that if you guys, the people who aren't familiar with the work, go and read that material that's there, that should give you a level of confidence around whether you think there's something missing or you're okay with it.

I'm sort of stepping back and thinking, so, if there's going to be a communique come out of this meeting that's going to say we're confirming the scope of work, we think it's sound and nothing's changed in the meantime to make us think something different, what's it going to take to validate that?

So, it's great getting the briefing, but for you guys, what would – starting with the new members – work for you in terms of saying, “Okay, I've seen enough, I'm kind of comfortable with this?” Or, “I want to ask some more questions.”

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Denise, is that a new hand?

DENISE MICHEL: No.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: KC, go ahead, please.

KC CLAFFY: I'm going to just directly answer Phil's question. What would help me – and it would help if we could even go to the Wiki page for this subgroup, because I'm pretty overwhelmed by the Wiki, and I often find that I'm in a maze of twisty passages and then I hit a brick wall right when I need to go through it.

For example, what do you want us to read on this page? I see background documents, I see subgroup documents, I see a Trello thingy – God help us – and the conference call stuff. And I'd like to not read everything if possible, so in order of priority, is it safe to go in reverse order from the things that are in red? It says red are latest, but there's a lot of things in red. Do you want us to read all of those? Or just give us some help on how to optimize our time here.

PHIL KHOURY: We're waiting to get that up so people can reference what you're talking about, [inaudible]. Here we go.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible] give us a sense as to which document [inaudible]?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, I'm just trying to recall what's there. Okay, that document from 27th of August, that should be Excel sheet with subtopic activities, which are different than we saw in previous document. But we have only seven tasks to do there, and that was base for L.A. meeting. And I'll find and send either a link or e-mail details on questions that we sent to ICANN staff that should be answered during the meeting. I don't see that here.

And another thing that I would ask you to look at – and I'll [listen to] that again and read this. And I see here only day two notes. Where is day one?

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, also there's also a meeting page for the data page –

ZARKO KECIC: L.A., yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, and then there's also on the briefing materials.

ZARKO KECIC: Yes, I know there are recordings, and also a document with notes from that meeting.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah.

ZARKO KECIC: So, I was there, but I'll have to read that again. It is big. [I don't know,] it is more than 100 pages for reading. And if you listen, that's all the two-day meeting, so all day from 9:00 until –

KC CLAFFY: Is that the transcript, or that's –

ZARKO KECIC: Transcript, yes.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

ZARKO KECIC: So, if you're interested in that, you can read that. That's all stuff over there. And as I said, we need to do a few more things. And if you have some additional idea, just jump in and we'll do that.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So, this applies to all the subgroups. I think that I'm struggling, and I started to struggle in June when these links were sent out about how do I come up to speed. I'm all about research, right? We spend a

lot of time reading related work before we try to – or after we try to do something new, generally.

So, I need more structure to these pages, really. And this is a message to the executive team and to ICANN staff. Help us, please. And there's a lot here. I don't mean to bang on it, I don't mean to complain, because I couldn't do a better job. I'm not saying I could do a better job, but I think it would help us all make better use of our time if we had some consistent structure with all the subteams, including things every team member should read at the top. Like outstanding things that we need feedback on now to move forward. That's [with] action items on every [inaudible] page to the team. And then maybe below that, action items for the subteam. And then if I get ambitious, I can just go there and see actually what's the conversation going on now but isn't ready for the whole team to read.

And certainly, if there's briefings before on some other page, can we make sure all the material that informs one subgroup thing is on the same page? Even if it's elsewhere, just cross-link it here. That would be of great help to me.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Laurin, Denise, and then Zarko.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, as a new member, I agree with KC's assessment. We need to find a way to kind of provide levels of engagement. So it's like you really need

to read this, this is still important, this is more on the side. And yeah, we'll find a way to do that, I'm sure.

DENISE MICHEL:

I would underscore what KC and Laurin said. I think in an effort to provide some uniformity to all the review teams, staff provided – staff has a certain structure for the Wiki, and unfortunately, it's not a structure and it's not maintained in a way that makes it useful for team members. And team members don't have actually write access to our own wiki.

So these are some of the things that were identified as impediments but we were unable to get changes made. But I think this is something that needs to be a priority, because I've been on this team from the very beginning, and I can't even find things on the wiki. I can't even keep track of and understand where things are. It's very disparate, it's really difficult. It's making it difficult, I think, for new team members to come up to speed, and it's making it difficult for old team members to refresh our memory of where we are and what our next steps are.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Zarko, and then Naveed.

PHIL KHOURY:

I just wanted to make a comment about the Wiki. So, I'm a content incompetent new person to the material, and what it looks like to me is that there's a structure there that helps people who are not content competent to kind of classify documents from their, I suppose,

metadata or something. [inaudible] stuff gets organized into, “Look, these are minutes and so they go in the minutes bucket, and these are budget-related stuff and they go in the budget bucket.”

Which is fine, I mean that’s kind of how you want to set it up if a whole lot of people who aren't necessarily familiar with the material and how it’s going to be used are going to be classifying it and posting it, doing all that sort of thing.

My assessment was it’s the connect between that, the knowledge of how to use the documents and how they're important and for what sort of thinking isn't connected to how they're currently arrayed. And my assessment is that that’s a job that has to come from people in the team, that the architecture has to come from people in the team. I don’t think you can ask the staff to do that. That’s sort of my assessment of reading it coming from the outside.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have Zarko and then Naveed.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, fully agree with Phil, and I just wanted to say that, okay, I'm not happy as well with the structure of our Wiki, but we cannot expect that from staff to do everything. And to answer your question, I don’t think you should read everything, because you'll get up to speed next year.

KC CLAFFY: Exactly, so I need someone to help me with what I should [inaudible]

ZARKO KECIC: And – okay, I'll check Wiki, and I'll send the information, because it would help the schedule of L.A. meeting. So, if you're interested in some tasks, you can just pick up the time and listen to that part of meeting in L.A. If you're interested in everything, I cannot help you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alright, I've got Naveed, Negar, Scott and Kerry Ann in the queue.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just wondering if as we go along this – through this exercise, are we also calling the new members to volunteer for a specific subgroup that they are interested in so that we sort that out, or we leave that at a later stage? So this is my question.

And the second thing is like I see that this is kind of in drafting mode [as they learn,] so if you can – this is a question for the team members, the subteam members – highlight maybe later to list what are the tasks that are still pending so that we can just focus on reading the relevant material that are related to what is left rather than picking up on everything. That would really help. So, what is left, we just focus on that, we read the relevant material, and then we contribute. So, thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Russ, I'm guessing you want to respond, so you can jump in front of me in the queue.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, as team members, we all have finite time to give to this activity, so my – the way I was thinking about what we’re doing here is understanding what has been done so that we can then talk about who’s going to do what pieces to move it forward. And so I don’t think, Naveed, we’re looking to see who’s going to join what team. We’re not even sure we’re going to keep the same team structure. We just need to first capture where were we. I mean, some people know, but then there’s enough of us that are new that don’t.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Okay, I'm the queue next, Scott, Kerry Ann, and then Laurin. I just wanted to comment on the Wiki page, the structure, editing rights, and I wanted to provide clarification for everyone that, actually, everyone on the review team has edit rights to the Wiki page. Everyone is more than welcome to edit content or structure the way they see fit.

We as staff help do a lot of the work on the Wiki just because it’s easier to manage it, but everyone, and whomever is interested to do so, you have edit rights. And if you run into any issues, please do let us know. It’s just a matter of consistency across board for the Wiki page. But in terms of this particular review, I don’t mean to compare it to other review Wiki pages, but if you would like to do so, you're more than welcome to. And with that, Scott, you're next.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Thanks, Negar. So, in reference to that, was there a link sent out to actually log into the Wiki? Because I have yet to be able to actually log into the Wiki.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I've tried to reset passwords, still won't – it won't send me –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

SCOTT MCCORMICK: To log in. But for us to be able to edit, we need to be able to log in and have those rights. So that's why I'm a little confused on, was there something sent out to the team members?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Why didn't [inaudible] have this?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Hold on. Let me just bring down all of ICANN Wiki.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're an SSR2 team.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: And then on the other part of this, with the different work streams, obviously, I think Russ made a key point. We need to decide if we're going to keep the current work streams or not. But can we somehow just have like a high-level – you know, for those that have been here since the beginning, just a high-level, like five bullet points of, "Hey, here's where we're at on these issues." Because like KC said, there's so much documentation to read through, and then having to go pull e-mails from the thread as well.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Kerry Ann, and then Laurin and Zarko.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Thanks. I had an administrative question and then a question about the subteam. Based on – ICANN staff, the question is for you – the whole requirement for review teams to be transparent, etc., to what extent can we edit the Wiki page? Because to go to KC's point, it does need some cleaning up in terms of which documents are relevant, not relevant anymore as we drop in and drop out.

As Zarko pointed out, we did have a larger group of subtopics [inaudible] and then it came back down to seven. So I'm just saying, to what extent can we edit it? Because it would mean that the community

won't have an overall sense of all the documents we've dropped in and dropped out. So, I'm just saying, is it that we have like an archive? So it's not a matter of removing documents [unless there was an] administrative procedure. And then do you want to answer and then I continue with the others?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Yeah. Laurin, if you don't mind, I'm going to jump the queue to answer that really quickly. We do have the option of archiving this Wiki page and starting a brand new SSR2 Wiki page with the archived page linked in it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

[inaudible] archived documents, not the page itself. The documents, for example as Zarko has pointed out, he's going to go through and see which ones are current and not current, and then the rest will be archived, and the only ones that are current and relevant will – what this current team needs, and then we can add going forward. But to kind of clean up last year's work and then just leave the ones that are going forward. [inaudible]

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

We can look into it. I'm sure there's a capability, I'm just not positive as to how. Laurin, you're next –

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

No, I haven't finished.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Oh, sorry.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I wanted to address this question on the subgroups. I support what Russ said, but I also wanted for us to consider that as we're getting the briefings, especially the new members, we had spoken yesterday about reviewing the bylaws, because I think once the briefings are completed, the idea is to then step in to identify not just what we've gotten to so far with the workload, but more, was the scope correct?

And then if not, what are we adding to that scope? And then we'll see [inaudible] what work has been done. But more having gotten the briefings, knowing what the bylaws require, what do you think is missing, and if we need more subgroups. I think that's the idea of the briefing. It's not so much substantively, "Did the subgroup get it right and we're endorsing it?" I think that'd be scary, to just endorse the work without thinking whether or not we are correct in the scope in the first place [inaudible] entire team [inaudible] moving forward.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks, Zarko. I just wanted to raise exactly that issue. The communicate is going to be expecting kind of confirmation or refinement of the scope as the sort of first output from the team tackling the work. And we've kind of had a debate about what scope and what methodology and all that kind of thing, but I was just looking at Zarko's example or [ICANN] SSR's example.

At the moment, the scope was written pre-work, so it's quite generalized, the scope that's in the terms of reference. And I just want to test and see. It seemed to me that one of the ways to add some precision to that that reflects where the team has got to is to come down kind of to this sort of level, right? To say, well, we've got these subheads, and we've tested [down to there,] and we're satisfied they're the right subheads. And that's kind of a level of detail which has improved on the previous one, but it's not committing you to necessarily buying everything else that sits below it yet, but it's saying, "Well, we've gone that one level further in terms of scope."

And hopefully – I'm testing that with you, that that's something that the new members kind of come to fairly quickly, is without needing [months of] research to get to it, is some conversation sort of at that level which would enable you to make a statement around scope in the communique, or pretty quickly anyway, that confirms the high-level [inaudible] then the areas you're interested in, are we okay with those? And then you go down to one more level, which is the subheads underneath, and, well, that's what we scope now.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Laurin, he's going to jump in to answer that really quickly. Or why not just wait in queue? Laurin, go ahead, you've been waiting for a really long time. And Zarko, you're next.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Just a proposal for how this might be workable. And I guess what we could do is we do this a bit more homework-based in addition to what

we have here. We talk to each group, we get for each group the three or four top documents that we should read, and the five bullet points sum it up, send this as one thing to the list. Everyone can go through those and we all have a base level of understanding that we can assume everyone in the team has. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Zarko, go ahead, please.

ZARKO KECIC: Just to answer this, I believe that's not an easy task, and I'm not sure, is it going to work or not? But we'll try. I'm not saying no, but it's not an easy task. I would like you to look at that workplan. I'm not sure, did you look? And how up to date is this? Denise, Eric, you're maintaining workplan.

DENISE MICHEL: So, the rapporteurs of each subgroup were asked to provide the detailed workplans and update this workplan, and so it's not up to date, and it's lacking specificity and input from, I think, several of the subgroups.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. We'll try to get that up to date. But it would be good for new members to look at this and see work done and a percentage of how much is done for each subgroup and subteam.

ALAIN AINA: Can I? Or you're in the queue?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Go ahead. Scott, are you in the queue?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: No, sorry.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alain, go ahead.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. I'm not sure how accurate are these figures and [inaudible] look at the numbers, I don't think we should [inaudible] them or give them [any as of my] interpretation where we are right now.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Zarko, go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: Can we have that in next two weeks done?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so first, I'd like to double down on what Alain said. And it also varies per subgroup, so it's really long spreadsheets, so when you look at it, you might say, "Oh my gosh, I'm not going to be able to get through this without falling asleep." So just take it with a grain of salt, because especially when you get to the subteams as different subteams have different levels of fidelity in filling that out. And then certainly, the estimates of completion was a point of a lot of consternation on the team, so don't get hung up on "This one says 87% and this one says..." This should be a low pass filter. If you want to get a rough idea, go through it, get the gist. Because I just looked at a couple of the subteams, and some of them are aspirational, some of them wrong, but just, yeah, grain of salt, go quickly.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We have no one else in the queue, so I think we can move on to the next topic maybe.

PHIL KHOURY: Sure. So, if everyone's satisfied with that for now, we'll move on here. Are you okay? Anything more you want to say, Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: Just, do you have any specific question regarding SSR2 subtopics?

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Zarko, you did mention – and just tell me if I missed something – I know that the language was an issue. Did we get to a point where we actually amended that “perform” language, or is that something that if we do adopt the scope as is, we just have to fine tune the opening sentences? I'm just trying to see if the team agrees that the scope is okay, that's the only thing that we need to revisit in that list of items where you had pointed out that there's an issue with “perform a detailed assessment.”

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, there are a couple of [inaudible]. I didn't go that deep into that [Excel.] There are a couple of lines that we omitted during the L.A. meeting because it goes too deep going in. But only in language.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay. And just to the chair and the vice chairs, I think I've raised the question only because when we get to fine tuning the scope, I guess it's more a matter of just ensuring that we pay very detailed attention to the language for that subgroup, because – well, there you go, because I

think I still pointed out the communique will speak to us kind of finalizing the workplan. I don't think the committee would expect it to be made available publicly immediately. And if that's the expectation, we probably need to form small teams to just work on the language editing really quick. A few persons could volunteer and we start working on that if that's the case and have it publicly available in short order.

PHIL KHOURY:

Could I just suggest [inaudible] process? Let's get the next one up on – I'll try and take some notes or whatever, but hopefully, we've got enough of a map up there to come back and look at that. What [inaudible] for with the communique? That's great. Thank you, [Zarko.]

ALAIN AINA:

Okay. SSR1 review, one of the subgroups we formed, and the members, Denise, Alain, and then Ram, and I've been selected as a rapporteur. This subteam mainly is formed to review the implementation of the 28 recommendations from SSR1.

So I think there are two aspects. Review the implementation is one, and the second one is to look at the impact of the implementation, which is clearly defined as [inaudible] implementation of [inaudible] recommendation [inaudible] result in the intended effect. So, review the implementation, make sure that the recommendation well understood, been implemented. But the second aspect of the impact of the implementation.

So, the subteam came up with some work item, we should collect data, and the data collection mainly came from the briefing we had. So, I think from day one, we started, this subteam started getting the brief briefing on the SSR1 recommendations, so we had a lot of them. And when we were progressing, ICANN was still implementing some of the recommendation, and I think they fully completed the implementation by March the last year. So [they were] still implementing some of the recommendations. So we got some briefing and we had a question and answer, and we had some pending questions available on the Wiki for the staff.

And one of the work items for this subteam was to work on the terms of reference for an independent consultant. We had this discussion, okay, shall we proceed after we've collected all the briefing, after we go through the question and answer? Now, should we go for an independent consultant to do what we call the gap analysis, or shall we then – I think the decision was made to go for independent consultant, and so the team was tasked to work on the terms of reference with staff.

And this subteam also was supposed to, if we proceed with hiring the consultant, is to liaise with the consultant, okay, and then report back to the team at large for discussion, etc. So these are the work item for this subgroup.

In terms of achievement, then we all had the briefings, we all had the briefing and the briefings stopped March last year. The team only had one meeting, and this one was [council.] We managed to [reach staff] to get the RFP, the request for proposal for the independent consultant

adopted by the team and published September last year, and then we got two proposals.

And the review team decided that two was not sufficient to make a decision, then we shall expand the time for more people to apply. And we agreed that the new deadline from October should move to November sometime, and [it's where the question] get posed, so the selection of the [inaudible] those have been posed. So this is where we stopped in terms of the work for SSR1. But in-between, we continued sending some questions to staff, and staff [were supposed] to provide some answers on these.

And my last point on this will be that we got some criticism from the community about hiring this independent consultant, and one thing we would like this group to decide on is, shall we proceed again with hiring that independent consultant, or we should now take on as team the gap analysis? So, KC? That's all I have for SSR1. Do you have [a few follow-up] questions?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I have Denise in the queue. Go ahead, please. Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah, I have some additional. And thanks, Alain. I'm a little hazy on the idea that the community complained about hiring someone. I think there was certainly some discussion at various points inside the team, like Zarko and I had discussed [with you] the option of having team members split up the recommendations and doing it ourselves,

particularly since it took an extremely long time to get an RFP out and even consider hiring someone. And just the nature of our task under the bylaws. So I think that it's a good time to revisit that question, that issue. We also, after all of the main briefings on the implementation of the recommendations were finally done, and we also [did] have a number of follow-up questions that were submitted throughout this process before the pause. They are still outstanding requests for questions and requests for information that need to be – that we need closure on, and it's, again, I think perhaps more of a Wiki issue than a substantive issue, but I sent this material around on the team list. It's not completely clear to me whether the two links and material that I sent you includes all of the questions and requests for information relevant to the SSR1 subgroup, so I'm not quite sure how that's being documented by staff. But for the sake of clarity, I've sent you three links that I'm fairly confident includes all of the requested information and outstanding items in terms of due diligence and information gathering on SSR1.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you. Naveed, Phil, and then KC.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah. I just want to know if the team as a team, the subteam has made metrics of the SSR1 recommendations and data analysis of what actually required the gap analysis and what are directly measurable by the team so that could help in actually knowing that task that is required to be done. Like do we have one to one mapping on what is measurable, what

is already there with the information that we have, and where it actually needs a further analysis to be done by an independent expert? So just [a naïve] question, but that's what I was thinking.

ALAIN AINA: I like your [nice] question, but the answer is no, we have not done that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Not nice, naïve.

ALAIN AINA: Naïve, okay. We have not done that. It was part of the discussion we had inside the team saying that before we hire someone, we should all have a sense of what we are expecting, how we are going to drive the consultant. Otherwise, maybe [inaudible] to bring, or we have our own metrics, then we can – but we have not done that. So I think for me it's part of – I think it's on the to-do list.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil, and then KC.

PHIL KHOURY: As I understood, the 28 recommendations got chunked up into sort of groupings of recommendations as sort of a lesser number. I think that's right. And I'm kind of curious as to whether that chunking or categorization that you did would help in terms of describing the scope.

Is it of a similar order? Is the seven heads of focus under ICANN SSR, or is it really more about the research rather than areas of focus?

ALAIN AINA: Yes, I think the recommendation was categorized by, I think, internal ICANN, [inaudible] some were related to SSR, some were related to gTLDs, and I think so, so it was this kind of –

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah, correct. The recommendations were essentially broken into groups based on subject matter experts and the teams that had to implement them. The biggest chunk of it fell down to the OCTO team, but it was pretty much distributed evenly between five or six different subject matter expert groups.

ALAIN AINA: And to add, I think some of them also are related to budget and finance and so. Yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: KC, and then Zarko, and then Kerry Ann.

KC CLAFFY: So, this is again where I've kind of hit a brick wall last night, and it's not the first time I've kind of hit the same brick wall. Every time I try to review SSR1, I come up with a, "If I were writing the deliverable for this task, what would I write?" So if you go into the Wiki, you end up in this

embedded slide set thingy. That thing, I can't even click on the links. So game over for that one.

But on top, it says to go see the quarterly reports or however often these reports are done, and if you click on one of those, you bring up a PDF file, and that, you can click on links, but it's still a PDF file of slide sets, of basically the PowerPoint deck that is embedded in the wiki, and then it's got some structure around it, which I appreciate. It's got sort of implementation timeline, the recommendation, the status of deliverables with some rows, and then the next page is some project status stuff.

So, I appreciate the structure there, and then it was used to present to a group, but I really strongly believe there needs to be a single document that's a prose document that is, "Recommendation one –" and much of the content may already be here, so this may be a cutting and pasting and editing exercise for somebody, but I want to see – and I believe that the public should see – as part of the end of this review that document with ICANN's view of what they did on that recommendation, and then a commentary on that recommendation by this committee. Do we think this was executed properly? Do we think there's any open issues, or do we think the recommendation was too vague to execute?

And something that shows that we have carefully thought about this, and here is our view, or we think that it doesn't need any more thought or whatever. For example, in some of these, the project status ends with "SSAC and RSSAC have been asked to reflect their roles," bla bla, and [inaudible] this text, April 2015. And then it ends. So, I'm scratching my head going, "Is that really the last thing that needs to be said on

this?" Because it says below the recommendation's complete, but it feels like there's a missing sentence or something.

So in general, I think we need something – and I'm directing this at the [team –] not the executive team, we shouldn't use that word, Kerry. The crazy people.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: To get us something that not only can we use ourselves but that we can present to the public to say, "Look, we did this homework and we did it thoroughly."

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have Zarko, Kerry-Ann, and then Alain, and Russ.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, just want to express my opinion on this task. And I believe this is the easiest task we have of all of that. Alain mentioned that we should judge the impact of implementation of this. There is no requirement to judge [inaudible]

ALAIN AINA: There is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ZARKO KECIC: That's not impact, that's, "Are we satisfied with the way they implemented it or not?"

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, [because] the recommendations are made to address the –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Would you stay on mic?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [This has a] the result. I guess result –

ZARKO KECIC: Result, [exactly.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] the result of what was intended.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, okay, let's use effect, not impact.

ZARKO KECIC: Impact is something pretty wide, and I don't think that we can do that. How we judge that result of the implementation, that's another thing, and I think that most of SSR1 recommendation implementation is just binary, it is done. Actually, we have to have three things. It is done, is it done in a satisfactory way, or it is not done. So, most of them should be that way.

And part of SSR1 recommendations are overlapping with other subteams. For example, there are some requirements to implement risk management and risk assessment and stuff like that. So we have those things then in SSR2 review. So, I believe that we can do that by ourselves. If we find out that we cannot do something, that's it. Review of SSR1 implementation.

And I said I will jump, but it is very difficult for me because there are some requirements to describe or to define something, and it is written in legal English language, and I have to admit that I don't understand even Serbian legal language and I cannot do that. And I believe that Kerry Ann should jump into it as well. Don't hide below the table.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alright, I've got Kerry Ann, Alain, Russ, and Eric.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

I just wanted to go back to KC's point about the wiki for the SSR1. One of the things that at the first briefing we had was that that PowerPoint was really like an end result from the SSR1 review team. It's not something that we could edit necessarily, it's what they've output.

What we had done was to be guided by it, and what they had explained to us – I can't remember who came and briefed us on it, but what they had explained to us is those links were actually the direct result of why they said it was complete. So, for example, the recommendation might have been very specific, and they said that.

And then what we had tried to do with this review was we kind of look at all the recommendations, and so which ones were really critical as well for some [of our work,] which is why that team had sent additional questions to staff, because if those things were not done, it's something that we may have to have picked up in our review as well.

So the idea was, okay, these things were critical. Yes, they were supposed to come up with definitions, checked. So the easy ones were like "Check, check. Document needed to be done, check." So we didn't go behind some of those because they weren't – as Denise said yesterday, that was like a period in time that those things were critical, so we kind of checked the boxes for like definitions needed to be done, bylaws, whatever it might be. Check, check.

But then the others that were not – we weren't confident were done that needed – that may impact on our work, that's where the additional questions that were sent. So the context was, I agree with you, there needs to be an additional document that says we've reviewed what

were our findings, yes, we're satisfied that they were done. But I think if you look at – the workplan's idea was to actually inform the [inaudible] as to whether or not these things were done or not. So they didn't – I'm rambling right now. [How] my brain is working. Sorry. I'm thinking while I'm talking.

But the questions – because you had asked two things, whether or not the questions that were at the beginning of the subgroup, if it had anything to do with the specific recommendations as well. So I was trying to address that based on –

KC CLAFFY: No, I just – again, one of the two things we have as a “shall” is “Evaluate the previous recommendations,” and I find it hard to see from what's been done that we have evaluated the previous recommendations independently. So I, again, would like to ask for a document that we can edit –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: Yes, that's what I'm looking at. I want a document like that with all – if that's all the content that ICANN has, I want a document that has that content in it with the links that we can edit with paragraphs that we quote that document and say, “Check, check.” If that's all we have to say, “Check, check, not check but we don't care, not check –” like that we checked the box and we did that work. That's what –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And agreed. And I think – because you're perfectly right, and I think that would have come as a result of the final briefings that they needed and the questions being answered. Then that document would have been prepared. But they based off [inaudible] would have been what SSR1 had done, so we kind of went along with those descriptions, what they said was done, additional questions were sent, and then the broader questions that [at the beginning] of this review subgroup was to kind of guide the overall thinking while they approach these recommendations. I just wanted to contextualize it for you. Yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have Alain, Russ, Eric, and [KC.] Alain, go ahead, please.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. Okay, I think you [inaudible]. The next step for this subteam was exactly to do what you are saying. We have this slide set of implementations, we have a slide on the briefings, and we have also the questions sent to staff. So the next thing to do was to combine all of these things so that from one document, you should see the status of – see the question, then we can now analyze and [inaudible] and etc.

Then the second thing I wanted to say is that as Zarko said, and we said this in the beginning, for example, some of the recommendations from SSR1 already [cross] what are useful for some of these subteams like ICANN SSR. For example, if we have a look at how ICANN has implemented the framework, etc., and the risk management, this will

automatically help you guys, for example, because you have to know, “Okay, you have been asked to do this. Have you done it? How?” Etc.

So that’s why I say we cannot just put in the blocks, because some of them, from this task, can also help the other one and move on, etc. So I think that’s why it’s very important that we coordinate and look at, because we are not going to review something from scratch, something that’s been done, etc. So that’s why I think moving forward, we need to synchronize and see what we do first, and how this impacts the other teams, etc. I think this is what I wanted to add.

KC CLAFFY:

Okay. I'll wait.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Alright. Russ, and then Eric.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

My reading of the bylaws says we have a logical flow we have to implement on each recommendation. First, was there an attempt to implement it? And my assessment is the answer to all of those is “yes.” If there was a “no,” then we have a branch, but we don’t have to explore the “no.”

Okay, did it have the intended effect? We have to make an assessment there. Right? If the answer is “yes,” we’re done. If the answer is “no,” we have to make another assessment. Does it matter today? If the

answer is “no,” we’re done and we just say so. If it’s “yes,” then we have a recommendation in this report to write.

I think it’s really “if then else,” right [inaudible].

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Eric, go ahead, please.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I just have a meta comment. It’s more of a question to the team right now. So, understandably, I think this is really good discussion, and so we’re understandably getting into a lot of details, but one of the things I’m kind of observing is that in providing a briefing of where we were before, we’re now sort of going down a path of, “What should we do next and how do we go forward?” And I wonder, do we want to streamline just to sort of get through the “How did we get here today?” And then potentially touch back if we have time later on?

Because I think these are really good questions and really good discussions, and I think if we were to follow them through, it would take a really long time to get through. And I don’t suspect [anybody’s] doing this on purpose, it’s just a suggestion to the team. Do we want to try and actually outline, “Here’s a briefing of the subteam from years past, this is where we got to?” The clarifying question is obviously really good, but then in regards to what should we do next, maybe we sort of punt that to later. Just a suggestion to try and streamline today.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil, go ahead.

PHIL KHOURY: Good observation, Eric. I think where we are with this now is that Kerry Ann has given us the future challenges summary of the work that was done, and it's basically on hold, waiting to see what falls into that bucket from everywhere else. The IANA transition, I think Denise's words were "Overtaken by events," and that the team that did the work on it – albeit they're not here anymore – found no gaping holes, risks, anything like that, and that seems to have passed in terms of [that.]

So, if that's right, this really – the DNS SSR, just to have sort of a picture in front of us, and we can go to the – I think we were ready to go to the scope discussion and try and get that stuff right for the communique.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right, and the reason I brought that up is because then we also have the Barcelona discussion to have and we have the team meeting discussion to have, and those things are important, so I just want to make sure we don't run out of time. But just a suggestion to the team, because I don't want to get in the way of healthy discussion.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alain, go ahead, please.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. This is always [inaudible] the problem we have, time management and what is critical, what is important. So for me, for example, I think this, for me, I see this more as important than discussing Barcelona, for example. But we have always to see how we manage. But I think especially for the newcomers, I think what they are doing, because they have been complaining it's difficult for them to catch up and this, so if this could allow them – so if we could achieve from this meeting that they have got enough from us to actively participate, then we can handle the Barcelona, etc. too. This is just my view on things.

PHIL KHOURY: Could I – just process-wise again. AM I right? Do we have anyone who can report on the DNS SSR activity? Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I can go through where it is. It'd be relatively quick, and I'm happy to entertain back and forth. I don't know if we want to wait for KC to come back, because she has a lot of good insight. She just stepped out of the room.

PHIL KHOURY: I think we should. That would just kind of put a line under this. We've done our little guided tour of it, and hopefully, that gives – with some follow-up action that people promised around links to what the critical documents are, that should hopefully give a bit of a boost for the people who are coming to grips with it all. So I think it's worth completing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Are we done with the SSR1, or are we ready to do it now? Okay, sure. So, the document I'd asked to have displayed is the Google word document, the security, stability of the DNS topics, the doc that's linked off the Wiki. I think it's like the second one from the bottom in that table.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, before you dive there, can you tell me which pieces of the bylaws this group is going to answer?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I believe – I've started looking at the bylaws on the wall – the –

ZARKO KECIC: 4.6(II)(c).

ERIC OSTERWEIL: 4.6(II)(c).

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Maintain clear and globally interoperable security processes for those portions of the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN coordinates. And then Alain's [inaudible] was way too small for me to read from here. But what number is that, Alain? Is that III?

ALAIN AINA: III.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: III? Yeah, the SSR team shall assess the extent to which ICANN has successfully implemented its security efforts, the effectiveness of the security efforts to deal with actual and potential challenges and threats [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the first "shall." Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Great. Thanks for putting that document up. So, the document sort of described a perspective on what to do as far as assessing the actual things that are operated and run inside the purview of ICANN, and the outline of the document which was sort of a rough direction that was being pursued is rootzone management practices at the highest level. There's no change management. And I can get into a little detail what the concepts behind these things were.

Roles and responsibilities, and then abuses and threats. For the most part, the first one, rootzone management practices was about how things get into and out of the rootzone, and that includes records like NS sets and DS records and includes also stickier things like strings, labels, top-level domains.

Change management was, I think, mostly going to be filled out. I believe the plan was to interview Kim Davies at IANA and probably was going to result in a lot of the same discussion that the IANA transition team had with him, but nevertheless, it was probably going to be the “Check before you do bla bla.”

And then roles and responsibilities was just going to outline the various parts of operation, deployment, management that ICANN is responsible for, what happens in there. And then my recollection, and a refresher real quick as I'm talking about the abuses and threats was it was largely – yeah, it's, “What are ICANN's responsibilities in this space? More material needed.”

So that really summarizes kind of the positioning that the subteam resulted in before it was self-paused. Not paused paused, like internal – [crap.] Words matter. Yeah, so the team decided to not continue moving forward at the time until an undetermined point later. So that's kind of it at a very high level, and I guess I could get into some of the specificity, because there is a lot of specificity around the actual nuts and bolts of like the NS sets and the DS records, but I don't think that's necessarily illuminating for the team here right now. But correct me if I'm wrong.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil, go ahead, please.

PHIL KHOURY: Just a question, Eric. In the course of the work you were able to do, was the team still satisfied that those four subheads were the right ones? Or was that still open to debate?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That was very much a point of debate.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Scott, go ahead.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: On that, was there anything about business continuity for this?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, that was mostly handled by one of the other subteams. So, in fact, I think this team didn't actually feel strongly that they should do it, that we, us – whatever, that other team was mostly looking [at a lot of business continuity]. This one was trying to look more broadly at what sorts of things cause there to be issues in the global DNS resolution process or provisioning, stuff like that.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Got you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Denise, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. With some of these issues, they're not bright lines, and there's certainly some overlap. Business continuity was brought in on – there's a little bit of it brought in through SSR1 implementations. It's something that was addressed more explicitly in Zarko and Boban's group on ICANN SSR. I'd say ICANN SSR was the primary group where business continuity was handled, and we can certainly revisit that, obviously, if you feel [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I'm sorry, can I jump on top of that? I think the point Denise was just finishing up, there is no reason why it wouldn't necessarily – there would be a vein of it that we'd want to discuss in this place too, for example. We were talking about ICANN's business continuity, but there are certainly other endings in the global resolution space where business continuity might be part of a contractual issue. So if that's what you meant, then yeah, it's a really good point.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah, I think that there needs to be some sort of a – we put together a graph – whether we keep these workstreams or do others, I think we

need to put together a graph that shows the overlap. Because something like business continuity goes across all of these.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I totally agree.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just to answer Scott, I think when we do that, it would actually help us starting to structure what the frame of the report would look like, because if we have – I mean we're into sub streams now, it doesn't mean that the chapters of the report would be on these sub streams. We may come up with a whole different structure, whether it be we're pulling out the key elements that have jumped out based on our research within each sub stream – because as you said, business continuity also affects [inaudible] management for the future challenges in terms of as we go forward and there's something that may be outsourced more by ICANN based on the result of Zarko's investigation or the DNS investigation, we'll kind of see what pulls out. So I think Scott's suggestion is a good one in terms of – because that will help us to frame what the report will start to look like and not have that multiple topics everywhere.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alain, did you want to –

ALAIN AINA: No.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Naveed, go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. I want to ask if we are discussing today about whether some of these sub streams need to go one after another or we decide to do them in parallel. For example, as a future one, it was mentioned yesterday that it is held because of all the other sub streams. So, do we have an agreement of what we need to do, like in a sequential manner, some task, or we just decide to perform all of them in parallel? So, what do the other members say about it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know yet. Right? So, I suspect others don't. I think we are still trying to get our head around where we were, and then figure out how to gracefully restart and be productive and get it done quick. And I'm still trying to get my head around where were. I'm now getting much closer here, but I suspect others are at the same place.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Eric, I think you were next, and then Laurin.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. I thought I'd make just a quick comment on how we got where we are, just in case it's helpful, informative for where we are now. Because I think it was at the beginning of our Madrid meeting where we were at this very similar point. And the way we actually found, came to these subteams was we weren't really sure how to structure the work. We knew it was kind of all over the place.

So we as a team all got together and we sort of wrote down on stickies what we thought relevant, important things to look at as a team were. And then we started trying to put them into a course – into buckets. And that's how we got these subteams, was we basically coalesced things that people on the team thought were important.

And in some cases, we did go a little bit back and forth and we kicked out some stickies, but for the most part, if someone on the team thought something was really important, it wound up on a sticky and we had a whole bunch of them. And then we had a big exercise of how we coalesce these into coherent work streams, and that's how we got where we were.

Whether we want to do that going forward or not, I don't know, but that was something that as a team, we were having trouble finding our stride until I believe that was the point where we first started to come together.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Laurin, and then Alain.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think things will just happen. Right? And I think we have one that's very obvious, which is the future challenges one where a lot of stuff will come up, and I think we just have to deal with that and accept that, where we have to do work and we'll have to do the work and just find out how to do it. I just don't see much point in going on about this too much.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alain, and then Kerry Ann.

ALAIN AINA: Yes. To add to what Eric said, because I'm also a member of this subgroup, one of the discussion points also was about ICANN and the IANA functions or PTI. So, do we, for this review, look at PTI, or we just look at the ICANN roles? So this was also debated intensively, and as you could imagine, [Jeff] has a very strong opinion [of setting] these things. So, I think we need to clarify and decide how we proceed.

Okay. Personally, I think that PTI now should be seen as part of ICANN operation, etc. That is my opinion anyway, but it was not the shared opinion at that time we had that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Eric, is that a new hand?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Kerry Ann, then Naveed.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just because Alain spoke out [inaudible] I remember that being a very strong point of [separation] in the team, and [inaudible] my interpretation. So, how we approach that as well if we do go back to that is very important in terms of how we communicate it. That's one of the areas that if we don't communicate it correctly, it will seem like overstepping boundaries. So I think that we had even asked for Legal's opinion trying to resolve that. So just [for persons] to know.

The point I had wanted to raise was [inaudible] the future challenges, I think a way to probably start to resolve the ones that were kind of tiered down and dependent on other work is to kind of start to decide what the roles of the rapporteurs are, because what we could probably start doing – so if we do have those that are dependent on others, the rapporteurs can begin – if it's the same rapporteur or not – to start summarizing findings to date and have streamlines of findings coming from the different subgroups simultaneously. Not necessarily waiting for them to complete everything, but say, "Hey, guess what? This may be a topic that has to go here." Whichever one is dependent, whichever one's – so we could probably think about that, those that were [entitled "waiting,"] that we start to develop a communication plan or strategy that information flows simultaneously so the rapporteur for the on hold ones can start to type at the same time and it's not like waiting [to exhale] kind of thing. So that's just a suggestion.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed, go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I'm only finding that most of my questions and concerns [are futuristic,] so maybe I'm ahead of time. So let me try my luck another time. So sorry for that. So, maybe – again, this could be like somebody could say that we will do that later, but like one of the concerns that caused the pause, as I learned, was that this team is going nowhere. And I didn't find that question being acknowledged by any of the subteams that, okay, we were not going anywhere. What are the learnings since yesterday, since we started this activity? I can see that a lot of work was being done, but can we be realistic and acknowledge that, okay, this was a sub stream that was really causing us a problem, so that we try to address that? Or we are still confident that, no, we were doing enough what was required and what was being asked to us as a team, that we are not going anywhere was actually a wrong perception? So I want an answer to this from the group.

DENISE MICHEL: For each sub stream, [inaudible]?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, as a team. Like is there any sub stream that was not going anywhere because of that we got alleged of not – whatever happened? So I'm just trying that we need to be realistic answering ourselves whether we know this fact or we just deny this, that this is all wrong.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann, were you first? Sorry.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [Yes, just a quick one.]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann and then KC.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Sorry, just a quick one. Naveed, one of the things that I think – tell me if I'm wrong, it may have been not necessarily because of a sub stream-wide thing that we apparently weren't doing anything. Could have been communication. Because as you could see, a lot of the teams were working and we were communicating via the e-mail thread and stuff, but probably weren't communicating that very clearly to the community. So the perception may have been that there wasn't a lot going on in each of them and a lot of the work was kind of slow for various other reasons as well.

so, I think with the communicate that Phil has mentioned, we would be able to say, "Hey, this is where we are and this is where we're going." And that would kind of answer the question of whether or not we were – [acknowledgement or not an acknowledgement,] but it's more a status update that this is where we were, this is our first snapshot, this is where we're going. And I think the communicate that Phil spoke about may address that. I could be wrong. If anyone has any [inaudible]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: KC, go ahead, please.

KC CLAFFY: Are we being recorded?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: [It's recorded?]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda, can you pause the recording, please? Okay, we're resuming the late morning session, the recording is unpaused.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Zarko, go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, I just wanted to add something, because we do not have problem, we have some subteams going faster and some subteams are pretty slow, but there were 15 people, now there are 18 people that can do work, and I strongly believe we can do that. We're ineffective somehow in some way because – I don't know why, probably methodology and how we were communicating many things before. And some subteams

were stuck in making a decision how they are going to approach. I'm not looking who is guilty for that, but we should look how to overcome that.

And I don't see a way how we should communicate or we communicated before, because we started in March – March? Yeah, March 2017. We had that preparation time, then summer come, time of holidays and that, and in September, we really picked up work, and September and October were effective and productive, and we got paused.

So, we have to get to the position of October last year.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Norm and then Kerry Ann.

NORM RITCHIE:

Yeah. I just wanted to chime in because I'm kind of – I guess not a new member but an intermediate member. So my involvement was all of, what, one month before it all stopped. So my assessment at that point – and [my first thing is very much like you, “Where is it at, how do I contribute work and add some value? Where do you need some help?” So I spent a great deal of time trying to figure that out.

And if you look at the mantra – I very much agree with what Zarko just said about where we were at. If you look at the mantra of “Plan, approve, execute, review,” that's kind of the standard thing of any task, right? So the “Plan, approve” was completed. There were just – everyone [was on the new] the stage of “execute,” and then it all stopped.

So that execution stage had just really got into stride, so you see a lot of confusion up there, that's part of the open and transparent nature of dealing with ICANN. Everything's recorded. But it is really all the planning and approvals and agreements. [That's what the tag is, approval is agreement,] and then, "Okay, let's go and do it." So that "Let's go do it" part is what we need to get back to. It was only really like a month in.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

Jut to go back to Naveed's concern, I think it's – I probably will add to what I said before. It's probably a little bit more than just communicating to the community. It could also be that as Norm rightfully said, there was an agreed plan, and I think based on our plan, different subgroups were streamed differently and work effort was being done in different ways differently. And some of the challenges that we did identify had affected some of the progress for each [of it.] For example, participation, number of persons, time zones.

So, Naveed, I think having acknowledged that and tried to fix it with now the diversity among the team and us trying to address time zone issues, meetings, the commitment that we've built into our new work stream, I can probably say that, yes, things were not done as well as they could have been, but I think I have, as an old member, probably confidence that as we go forward based on the new team's commitment that we should meet it, and if we decide to change the

steam behind each subteam or sub stream as we develop them or agree to them, I think that would make a huge difference, and I think that would all go well [to the communication] without us even communicating it based on the workplan that we come up with. So I'm hoping that addresses your concern. Just to say probably everything could have been done better, which is why we're now trying to do better with this. So I hope that addresses your concern.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: KC, go ahead.

KC CLAFFY: I just want to doubly check that your concern is addressed, because I think people are saying we think it's okay, but I think what you're asking is, does anybody not think it's okay?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: So, we really need to make sure we say any objections, any concerns. And Zarko was pointing at Alain?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Take it away.

ALAIN AINA: We all agree that we had some issues, whether we call it communication or whatever, and we are now making progress as some subgroup, and we have agreed not to look back [and] look forward. Okay? But I don't think it would be good for this group to just say [inaudible] of what has happened, because we said from day one, "Lesson learned," and we have, we improved things. So, I think part of what we need to do is make sure that some of these things never happen again.

We know how to choose a [inaudible], we know how we make decisions, and we know how we approach things, etc. So, for me, seeing that I've not had a problem in the past, I think that I will never agree on that, but I agree that we are now in a position to make [the] difference and [achieve the way.] Zarko, did I –

ZARKO KECIC: Sorry, may I just – I pointed at you because yesterday, you said that we finally know where we are going and what we are doing, like we didn't know before. So, sorry, but I wanted to hear from you clarification.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, and [I don't think] I was the only person who was confused [etc.] at some point that we didn't really know where we were going. So yeah, I accept that, to take that role, be a spokesman if you want, but I was not the only person who at some point was totally confused, "Where are we

going? Are we going to crash, or are we heading to the good destination?” So, for me, I think it was clear. And the ICANN board has expressed their concern too, and some of the concerns are still pending. So for me, I don’t think we should just close and forget about with [inaudible] yes, in the past, it was not clear, but now I see we are now drawing a new picture, and I buy in for this one.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Alright, then I have Naveed and Denise in the queue.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah. I apologize for starting this discussion. I'm not sure how many of you are interested in this. My concern was realistic self-assessment is always the best thing, like how you see yourself. And here, we – means our team – is the best perception that you can have other than somebody else telling you that this is what you're doing.

So, my point was if we realize that, okay, this is exactly like – I hear that some of you are saying that we have some problem, we have something, maybe it's the communication, but we are not sure what that was, that will not help, because you're not trying to address that.

And on the other hand, if we realize what the problem was, that will be the best – and if we can clear that in our communique, that will be the best thing to rebuild the confidence in the community and in the board and address the concern, because people would say, “Now you realize what was the problem.” Even if it was small, you can rephrase that in whatever way you are, but that would be the best thing to rebuild the

confidence, and this is what we aim to do. I raised this point just because of this thing.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Denise, go ahead, please.

DENISE MICHEL: With great confidence, I say we will not reach agreement on what the problem was before the board suspended/paused this review team, and so I'm not sure how people want to sort of go forward with that. I had originally just raised my hand as a gentle time check reminder. It's almost 12:30. I think we're losing some people perhaps around the 2:00 timeframe. I can stay all night, but I know we've got some "must do" items, so just raising that as an issue. We may want to calibrate how we want to tackle the remaining issues and how much time we're devoting to what, with no intention of closing down any debate. And I certainly want to and suggest that Russ help decide how to move forward with all of our priorities and discussions on this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [It seemed like over to me,] but are there any questions anyone has that are necessary for them to understand where we were before the pause?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Not why we were paused, where we were. Okay, that's really important, because that means we're done with this agenda item as far as we intended to get before lunch, and after lunch, we need to focus on the communique. So I think that's –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann, go ahead, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [That's third.]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think as we kind of refresh what the agenda is for the afternoon, there was a point Naveed raised yesterday concerning observers. I think we should address it when we address the agenda item that – we probably skipped it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We had to discuss time, the meetings, and how we actually have meetings.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think it's important to just address the observer issue at that point, because when we do have online calls, we have to decide if it's open to observers or not. Naveed had raised that he had seen the observer list, he wasn't sure what it was, and I think we could explain it to him then, and then make a decision based on staff advice as well. The staff had kind of guided us with that, what we do with that. But I don't think we should lose that, because it will impact our meeting structures going forward.

PHIL KHOURY: The process I was proposing for the rest of the afternoon was really to use the communicate as the filter for saying where are we with the various things that should be in that communicate. So tick off the things that say, "Yeah, we're comfortable, we have something to say about that." Where we don't have something to say, can we fix it while we're here? Can we fix it in two days' time, or has it got to be longer than that?

And if we can't fix it right now, what do we want to say about it in the communicate? Because the output from this meeting is a sort of critical piece. We've dealt with a fair bit of stuff, but not to its end necessarily,

so seems to me that that's the sort of filter for that, and people have said very clearly that some of that time before 3:00 or 3:15 has to be dedicated to how the team wants to work together in the next few bits, few weeks at least up to Barcelona.

So, I was going to propose half an hour for lunch.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

PHIL KHOURY: Is that okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure.

PHIL KHOURY: Alright, 1:00 back here. Alright, thank you. Jennifer, do you want to –

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. Just to confirm that we're going to pause the recording and [inaudible] at 1:00 local time. Thanks.

Thanks, everyone. Just to confirm, the meeting is now being recorded. This is the afternoon session of day three of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting in D.C., Friday the 24th of August. Russ, over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. What I'd like to do is not wordsmith and draft every little detail of the communique, but capture what are the points we want to communicate out, and then Negar's agreed to then take our list of bullets, proposed text, send it to the list, we can wordsmith on the list, [it's going to release] there. Okay?

That way, we have a hope of getting people [done] for the people who need to leave at 3:00. Is that right? That's our goal, 3:00?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 3:30.

RUSS HOUSLEY: 3:30. Okay. So, what are the important things that happened these three days, or since the restart really, that we want to share with the outside world?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [New staff, new people.] New people in their roles. Okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. That's it?

DENISE MICHEL: I think addressing the SO and AC chairs' mandate of getting the new members up to speed, validating skills, and reviewing and reaffirming, or whatever language you want to use, about scope. Terms of reference/scope, and workplan, developing our workplan.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Eric, go ahead, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I do think we got the up to speed part and the TOR and the scope, not necessarily totally wordsmithed, but settled. Workplan is underway, I think.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, I agree.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Great. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And maybe a blurb from Phil about his interfacing with us as a facilitator.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Quote from Phil.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm putting myself in the queue.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: And Phil, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe you are asked by the SO/AC chairs to issue a separate report of your findings and your work to date. With that in mind, do we want to also include your view into the communique that the review team is having? What's everyone's feedback?

DENISE MICHEL: I've got an opinion on that. I think Phil should do what he needs to do to complete his contract. The communique is a team communique and really should only contain what the collective wisdom of the team members feels is appropriate, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [So we'll edit his quote.]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Norm, go ahead, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I realize that was a flippant response. Were you saying you don't think this belongs here?

DENISE MICHEL: No, I think it's fine. We're not going to conflate though Phil's report back to finish his contract and our –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, absolutely. Correct.

DENISE MICHEL: First of what will be regular communiques out to the community every time we have a major meeting or move forward with a major milestone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I just – there was an in-between, and I wanted to know where we were.

NORM RITCHIE: I think we should put up a thank you in there, a thank you to Phil, and the ICANN staff as well.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Sorry, [it was] something similar, because – that Norm just raised. I was going to say because I think it's not necessarily a quote, I think, from Phil that we need, but I think it's important to state the fact that he did facilitate that in terms of [the fact that] we met the mandates that we had intended at our first face-to-face. I think that's what's important to communicate, that we had an objective. With Phil's [assistance,] we've met those objectives, and the team and the staff as well. So I think it should be more –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just want to understand, isn't that what these three were intended to do?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But it's more the role of Phil and the staff in actually assisting us in meeting – so the goal that we had for this meeting was accomplished kind of thing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Right.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Not necessarily like a quote.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, just to finish that, that's a really good point, because Denise started the conversation by saying let's outline fulfilling the direction given to us by the SO and AC chairs, and that's actually a good way to serve – that's better than what I was thinking but touches the same base.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, just to make sure – because I'm sure you can't read it – we met the mandate with guidance from Phil, and then leads into the mandate being [the up to speed] scope, the TOR and the workplan development being underway.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's what – “With guidance from Phil” is the –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'll leave it to the editor.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed, you have –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you think I missed something that you really think needs to be here?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We have a queue. Naveed, go ahead, and then...

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Anything about if we try to address the concerns raised earlier? So, do we need to include that in the communique? And second, if we want to point out that apart from scope and TOR, we are also going to review the sub streams and redivide them if it is necessary.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm trying to unpack that a little bit. I don't want to go deep into any one of these. In a communique, we're talking half a page to a page, I hope. If we go any deeper than that, there should be pointers to things we're doing, and I don't think we want to go there in a communique. Okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Norm?

NORM RITCHIE. We need to mention something about next steps or the future, Barcelona or something rather than, "We met, had a group hug and had some beers." So –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]

NORM RITCHIE. Yeah, exactly, but there has to be some future, “Here's what's coming” type of thing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I'm reluctant to say that we're going to be bound by anything, but we can say “Looking forward to our next face-to-face meeting in Barcelona.”

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Something that's future-ish. [inaudible]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alain, go ahead.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so – sorry.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. I just wanted to propose that if it would be possible to mention the aggressive timeline we came up, but I think it is important.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm kind of reluctant to put it in the first communicate just to – not that I don't want to make really hard to make that happen, but if we want to put the [stake] out there and then find out in a month or two that there's no way we can get there. I hope that's not the case, but "Plan to work aggressively" or something like that. I don't know. Help me there.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We've got Kerry Ann and then Steve.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: To Alain, I think when we write a sentence about the workplan, it would be probably captured just to say that the workplan is underway, including timelines, revision of timelines, bla bla. Because if we commit ourselves now, I remember one of the things we discussed, I think Wednesday or Thursday, is when we actually get into the work, we may need additional time. So the timeline right now is like a best-case scenario. And I was wondering if we wanted – the photo would be included, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] “The workplan is underway, which will include a revised timeline.”

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But the final point I have is about the photo and whether or not the first communique that went out when Phil was appointed had like the other members, and since there was [inaudible] a resignation and an appointment, [somewhere it] could be included here, if it’s something that would be sent out, “That’s what the new people and roles are.”

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay. I wasn’t sure. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I think we should just enumerate what the current state is, right?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Just to be clear, the photo probably won't go on your communique. It will be posted on the Wiki page.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: On the Wiki page.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Please, go ahead, [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Just wanted to touch something that Denise said, and not as your main point, but I think it's something that the review team should consider, whether or not you want to set expectations for future communications and to SO/AS chairs or to the community itself, and should that be in here?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if we're going to put something in here, it probably should say something like "Plan to keep the community information as we go along" or something like that. I don't think we need to go any deeper than that.

DENISE MICHEL: And I apologize, I've been multitasking, but do we have leadership on the list?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think a general statement about a renewed commitment for [robust] communication with the community would, I think, suffice, and then as we start – it's a great suggestion. Thank you, Steve. As we start delving into sort of our communication plan, we can follow up with some more details on that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Norm, go ahead, please.

NORM RITCHIE: Your writing is as bad as mine. On the note about the communication plan, did we cover that enough to actually put [inaudible] upper part for basically what we accomplished here and that we have – I don't know if it does or not.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think we really did the communication plan other than agree we're going to do one.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I mean, we could put it in the “underway.”

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I think actions will speak better, most likely. The fact that we’re doing this actually demonstrates] [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anything else? Okay. Thank you, over to you. You get the flipchart.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Yes, the plan will be that we will draft the communique based on the main points that you have identified as a team. We will send it out to Russ and the vice chairs for feedback and comment, we'll incorporate the changes, and the resulting document will then go out to the whole review team for additional comments and feedback. And once everyone has agreed, it will be sent to identified communities.

Based on the discussion we had with Russ, it's going to be going out to the SOs and ACs, it's going to go out to the board, and then we will also publish a blog that just simply states that the review team provided a communication to the SO/AC chairs and to the board and you can find information here, which basically provides links to the documents that are going to be published as correspondence. Phil, go ahead, please.

PHIL KHOURY: I'm not clear – might be my thickheadedness at this point – what is the actual message about the scope at this point? If you're putting a communique out by Monday or I don't know, whenever, something like that, what are you going to say about scope?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. Sorry, I thought we were pretty clear on that yesterday, that the scope is mandated by the bylaws and we've revisited, and we're on track to fulfill that commitment I think is as deep as we should go.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think we [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: We did. We –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin sent the document, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Which is where the scope is documented, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Sorry, we need to stay on mic for communications.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Laurin and Denise.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So just a quick note as the question came up. So I sent around a TOR with some comments and where we had discussions, plus kind of the proposed rewrite for that one paragraph. Please, everyone have a look at it.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Denise, go ahead, please.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I would suggest the communique state that we are in the process of updating our terms of reference/scope to fulfill that request, and as appropriate, in restarting our efforts after being paused for almost a year.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you need me to write any of that on the flipchart?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: It's been captured on the recording, so we can go back to the transcript.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Alright. Thanks.

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry, you're quite right, Norm. [inaudible]. I think that's exactly right in terms of what should be in the communique. What's in your mind's eye about how you will get to kind of validation of those things, fleshing them out and... I'm guessing that if you are going to – the investigations and the interactions you'll have with ICANN org and then all sorts of other people in the process will not be immune from future tensions about things. And so a scope that has got that next couple of levels of detail down below it that you've got approved is going to be a pretty important thing to come back to. So, that seems to me a task that you

want to have nailed down before you start to walk past people's lawns looking threatening.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So I think that depends whether we think the revised terms of reference go back to the board for approval. If that's the approach, then putting that additional detail there would resolve both of those in one go. Do people think [we] are just going to inform the board, saying "this is roughly the same thing you already approved, we're on track," or do we think we're asking for approval of a revised TOR?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I have norm in the queue, and then Eric, and then Kerry Ann.

NORM RITCHIE:

I think that the board will ask for the revised terms of reference, [I'd] almost bet on that one. And I thought we are going to actually revisit the scope today at some point. Was that not on the agenda to actually finish it off?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I would love to, but I think we have to get to the meeting, the call schedule, Barcelona, and then that. So the question is, will we get there?

NORM RITCHIE:

Okay.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Alright. Sorry, Norm, Eric, go ahead, and then Kerry Ann.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So in the spirit of what you just said, Russ, of trying to get there, I'll try and be terse. Just a procedural observation that we did the scope at the very beginning before we really knew each other, and certainly, you don't want to narrow the scope too early or you wind up doing early optimization, but nevertheless, as we start to iterate and we get closer to identifying what a more detailed scope would be, we could certainly keep updating it. But then to your point, Russ, then we're [inaudible] with the board, and that'll necessarily take a long time. So we do have to strike a balance. I don't think we want to have a very detailed scope the day we met each other, obviously. And [we'll find a balance anyway.]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann, Laurin, and then Naveed.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think I forgot what I wanted to say. But I think just like Norm, just as Norm said something, it kind of got me thinking and I forgot what I wanted to say. I think I kind of support in that if we can try to push to get to the scope, it would be good, because trying to resolve this on the e-mail chain will never finish, and I think it's good kind of getting everybody's voice now on it, especially if it's even high level to say these are the topics and we want two additional topics. And then the details

we work through after, but I kind of support – I mean if we can get there, we should try and get there.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed. I'm sorry, Laurin and then Naveed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Phil, I see you shaking your head, so I'm taking that means you're satisfied that we're on a reasonable track.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just a quick note, we're currently looking at, I think, two important words being removed, some tweaking and one sentence being moved from the bottom to the top of a paragraph. Just to say it's not much we're currently talking about.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed and then Norm, and then Kerry Ann.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I'm not sure about the procedure, but as per my understanding, any change that you make to the TORs has to go through the board approval again, because even if you remove a word, that can change the entire meaning or the substance of what somebody could interpret from that. So that's important. And I don't think we have mandate to change on our own without the approval of the board. So I just want the team to consider that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Norm, and then Kerry Ann.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so that's news to me. I didn't know we'd have to get approval for that. So, rethink that. But should we change the scope, I'd like to bring everyone's attention to the e-mail Alain sent out that has some additional words in there that the group had agreed to before regarding scope. And [inaudible] depth versus breadth, and there's two other areas. I thought they're quite good.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann and Denise.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Alright, it was the TOR that I had wanted to comment on. If it is that – the scope is different from the TORs, so I guess the scope we're still working through, which will inform the workplan. But in terms of the terms of reference, Naveed, I don't know if you could – not Naveed, Kaveh, I don't know if you could probably guide us. If it is that we're actually trying to implement the request from the board, is it that the board needs to sign off on our TOR, or does the board just needs to be informed that we've taken onboard your recommendations, here is the updated versions? We're not waiting for them to come back and say "Oh, no, you didn't write it correctly, we prefer this language." Because I think there's a distinction in just indicating to them that we took onboard your concerns as a team [we're about] getting our work done,

we tried to incorporate them as best as possible, these are the revised ones for your note,” and not necessarily waiting for feedback, but more informing them. And I think that’s very important as a team. I don’t think – so just confirmation.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, I should actually formally ask them and get back to you, because I think that will be the best. And I can do that, [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, but I would say at the end, I personally – but I will ask and clarify and send it to the list. That’s the leadership decision as well, because at the end, it is part of the board mandate to [cause the] review and receive the TOR and the scope, basically, and then start the review. We are in uncharted water [inaudible] but as mentioned [also] yesterday, I think, it would be very good if we do that and if we get positive response from the board.

In the meantime, what we do, I will ask, but I think that’s a leadership decision. Personally, I suggest we don’t wait, but yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just a point of clarification. To receive is different from approve, so I'm just wondering because it was already kind of noted and endorsed by

the board except for the things that were articulated in the letter, there's probably a distinction with when you do communicate to them to confirm your language to them would [inaudible] and for us as well, not necessarily asking them, "Hey, guys, the team needs to know if you need to approve [inaudible]."

KAVEH RANJBAR: If you're not changing, apparently, we are not [inaudible] to do –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] update in [inaudible] language.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, so if we think that we are addressing those points, my suggestion is basically to mention that in the e-mail, in the letter to the board, basically.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]

KAVEH RANJBAR: Send to the board and [inaudible] address that, and we are good to go. And the board will – I guess if those points are addressed and nothing else is changed, I don't see any reason to have new items. You shouldn't even bring that up. And so I guess you will get a confirmation that that's [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [Russ,] I don't know, to that point, I was just wondering, the leadership would want to instead of asking Kaveh to go and come back, just do the changes, send it in for their information to not waste time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure, I think we'll just take that advice, we'll send it and assume approval, keep moving, and they'll get back to us if there's not approval.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Do you want me to check that with the board?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: What I would like you to check is say, "This is what we plan to do. Are you okay with that?"

KAVEH RANJBAR: I will do that. Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Denise, [go ahead, please.]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, for the record, I'm a little uncomfortable about the language that's being used. I try and faithfully follow the advice that we always get from Kerry Ann, "Look at the bylaws," and we are an independent community review. We are not meant to wait for or get the board's approval to do our work. There's a bylaw mandate that we be created, there's a specific way we are created, we are required to provide the board with our scope. We'll provide the board with our scope, we'll also provide it to all the elements of the ICANN community and post it publicly, but it's not an independent community review if the board can tell you, "Do this, don't do that," "We will not approve your scope" or "Your scope has to be changed X." The board is one element of the ICANN community, and as a community review, I think it's incumbent upon us to seriously consider any input we get about our scope, or frankly, anything else. But we are ultimately obligated to ourselves and our best judgment as to what the scope and what our work product ultimately contains. And then ultimately, the board can agree or disagree, approve or not approve our recommendations. That's really how this system is set up.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I think [inaudible]. But let me find in bylaws, because the board [cause the] review after receiving – so it's not that – you don't need the approval, because if the board does not receive and does not approve the terms of reference, they will not [cause the] review, basically. So let me find that language first, and –

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

If I may, just a point of clarification, what – and Kaveh, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I think what the board looks at in the terms of reference is the general approach to the review, and because the board – my understanding is that the board just wants to ensure that the work is being conducted within ICANN's mission and remit and it's not going outside of the boundaries of what the bylaws call for, because the board is basically ensuring adherence to the bylaws. And that's what they are trying to gather from any terms of reference from any review.

In this case, I do want to highlight for everyone that the scope of items to be accomplished throughout the face-to-face meeting is something that was listed in the communication from the SO/AC chairs, and there was no specific request to send anything to the board for review. I do think personally that it would be nice to close the loop once the terms of reference document is updated to send it out to everyone as an FYI, [would it be] SO/AC chairs, the community and the board, because there has been updates made to the document. But as far as the ask for this face-to-face meeting was concerned, the communique and later on when the documents are updated [that] we send out essentially to everyone is my understanding of the process.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Negar. That tracks with my understanding as well.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I'm also looking at the bylaws. You're right. So thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Back to you, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, now we need to have the meeting discussion. So, back to you, because you've got the Doodle poll.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. And Jennifer, do we have something to put up in the [inaudible]

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. Let me just load up the Doodle poll.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Alright, so [inaudible] in the time that I had, so it should be pretty straight forward. These are the results that we polled the team on. As

you know, there was a little bit of a problem with the Thursday, but we managed to get everybody's results apart from Matogoro who I have recorded as a tentative in the yellow there. So green, obviously yes, red, no, yellow, tentative. And then I've put those stars there at the most popular dates.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it seems like we should for sure grab the three that have 12s. So the question is, do we need a day and a half or two days?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, then let's grab all four slots.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have Scott in the queue.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: So, it's not official yet, but I will be on the GNSO council starting this meeting, so I'm just going to bring up scheduling conflicts. I assume there's other people that will have other scheduling conflicts. Saturday and Sunday are pretty big policy days though. If we plan to do Saturday and Sunday, I'd much prefer to be in this group than on the council, but I think it'll take precedent.

PHIL KHOURY: So, Scott, that takes one number off the 12, right?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah, so that takes it off for probably Saturday and Sunday.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed go ahead, please.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just for the sake of understanding [planning, I was going to] ask whether we are looking for two consecutive days or we're going just by popularity, like for example two popular might be Sunday and Wednesday which are three days apart and having meeting on both days might be problematic? Like will you need five days then to be there? So, are we looking for two consecutive days there, or [do you think the meeting they're planning is like afternoon sessions?] So it's important that we know this.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have Laurin, Ross, and then Norm. Apologies, I missed Kerry Ann before you.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Thanks. I think it's a similar concern to Naveed. For example, I had selected Saturday, Sunday only because I have a meeting on the 22nd,

and I would have left after that 22nd meeting. I can't be there for the entire week. If it is that we do do like, let's say, persons are available Thursday and Friday or even hopefully Wednesday and Thursday, for example, I could participate in person. If not, I'll probably be remote, because I can't be out the entire time. So it's a similar concern to Naveed in terms of how we split the days.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Laurin, go ahead, please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Thank you. Two interrelated questions. Well, one [inaudible] question. So, the point is, I think with the restart and everything, we have to consider that a lot of us will have to go to relevant constituency meetings, report in, stuff like that. And in relation to that, what are the kind of travel arrangement plans or ideas here? Do we come in for like literally one day? DO we attend most of the meeting even if, say, there is a day where we don't have an SSR2 meeting scheduled? Like what's the plan here? And I think that a lot of people would like to kind of have an understanding.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Laurin. Let me allow Russ and Norm in the queue to go forward, and then I'll put myself down to answer that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think it's important that we meet one week and get as many of the people together as possible. I understand the preference for chunking for travel reasons, but if we have to have some dead time between, hopefully, the people who are in other meetings can give the pen to the ones who are not, and we can get some work done in between. So, let's get it in as small a chunk as we can, but let's just take advantage of the time between.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Norm, go ahead, please.

NORM RITCHIE: I actually like the idea that it's chunked, because it allows us to – we need to meet, but then it'll allow us to actually go out and talk to the community. So the facetime is valuable, not only for ourselves but also talk to others. And then we can come back and see what messages we received and what feedback we got during the week.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. So, to answer your question as best I can, obviously, I can't speak authoritatively 100%, but to the best of my knowledge, any review team members traveling to ICANN meetings who don't have funding from their respective SOs and ACs and if you have engagement sessions or face-to-face meetings during ICANN meetings, will receive travel funding.

For example, if you were to – if you had face-to-face engagements on the Saturday and then on the Wednesday, obviously, we'll cover the

stay for that whole duration. We're not going to say, "Yeah, in the middle of the week, you pay for it, we'll take care of the first two days." It doesn't work like that. So, I do not think that should be a concern.

I do want to just raise a couple of issues. Not issues per se, but just to remind everyone, the schedule for the ICANN meeting gets developed starting September because requests are going to be put in other than the high interest sessions that have already been assigned. The actual schedule doesn't get published until later.

Early September or mid-September, we will get a chance to officially submit the request for any sessions we decide off of this Doodle poll for the Barcelona meeting. But of course, not knowing what the schedule looks like, I would imagine it's very difficult for everyone to assess what their availability is going to be like.

So I have a suggestion for the review team to consider, and that is that perhaps we can put in for engagement sessions with various SOs and ACs at the Barcelona meeting and arrange for a face-to-face meeting after ICANN meeting at Barcelona ends at whatever location the review team decides, sort of like we did here in D.C. for productive face-to-face engagement and to get work done. That's also an option. Eric, go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So, I feel like we talked about this on the phone, so sorry if this is [inaudible], but I'm not able to do that, personally.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you. So, thank you very much for that answer. So it's much more about this kind of logistics stuff than who's going to pay. And I do think I agree with Eric here, like people have other stuff to do, and kind of taking out another one or two days might be difficult. We might have to go for kind of doing this around the meeting and kind of trying to match it up with other things as well as possible.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann, go ahead, please.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Since some of the sessions aren't set yet, is it possible that if we agree on putting our days early, you can actually talk to the constituents to say, "Hey, I have this important meeting on this date, you're very critical to it," and see if we could steer those meetings to other days or time slots, at least [inaudible]. No? It doesn't work?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [No, it doesn't work that way.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But I'm just trying to [trying to see] in terms of how to participate in the meeting [inaudible] won't be available.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have Naveed and then Scott in the queue.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Again, I'm trying to understand what consensus we are having. So far, I see none. Just like before. So, are we splitting the days? But if we do, we are just doing this because of one vote, because even I see 11 on Saturday, so 11-12, there's not much difference. We could even have some dropout from this because people don't know their plans like two months ago sometimes.

So once we do the decision or like a proposal, then we can just say, okay, this is the feasibility so far. We are just doing a general discussion. So let's put a proposal to the team members, and then we comment on what is feasible and what is not.

For example, we can do Saturday-Sunday, and if required, we can do a wrap-up session later Wednesday afternoon or whatever if people feel so. But let's [inaudible] the proposal and then we discuss. I'm unable to comment so far because I want to know first what people's preference are.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Scott, go ahead, please.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: A couple points. Does anybody care about the opening ceremony? I hate to say it, but that's a huge block of time that we could be actually using to meet. I'm just going to throw that out there. Two is with the –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Monday?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Monday, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] one hour.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I feel like it takes a whole morning.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, it's only one hour. It feels like a lot longer.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I know, right? Two is – and I can work with the BC, we have two representatives on the council, so if I need, I can see that that's covered. But my thought is Monday and Tuesday is not up here. I don't know what – obviously, Tuesday is constituency day, and with that being said,

I would say let's plan to divide and conquer instead of the same three people or four people going and briefing every SO and AC.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. I have Laurin, KC and then Kerry Ann in the queue.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, I think this idea is not too bad. We start, then we have two days where we don't do anything where we have time to go to constituencies, speak to people, etc., and then we come back together. I think that's not a bad plan, actually.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: KC, and then Kerry Ann.

KC CLAFFY: Anybody planning not to go to the meeting in person? Or [inaudible] everybody's planning to go in person? I'm just seeing some 14s in the remote call, or at least one 14 and some 13s, so I can imagine if having the gap in the middle doesn't work, you could do a one day in person, fly home, one day at home where everything's still fresh in our head and we have some rapport going on and [save] people. But of course, that's flying to Europe and flying back in three days, which is always a bad idea.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann, and then Naveed.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think – so just one so everyone knows, I'm unavailable on the 22nd as well because of a high-level government meeting which has been set almost three months ago, so that's kind of set in stone. That's on the 22nd. So more likely I'd be the representative there for that. But I like the idea of splitting the days on – if we can, and not just because of the poll.

Because if we do meet, like, let's say on the Sunday and we do our work, and then we have the constituency briefings, Wednesday would be a good day to kind of catch up and say, okay, this is how it went, and then probably have a session to either refine or do something. Because we haven't developed the workplan yet, so it will kind of – if it's just really we're going there for outreach, I don't know, Russ, [whether the idea was] we're going there to work or just for outreach.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: To work. So let's say Sunday would be our workday, and Wednesday would be our kind of briefing day and catch-up day. So I'm okay with that. Beyond that, I wouldn't be able to participate because of obvious reasons.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed, go ahead, please.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Again, if I remember, when we put this Doodle poll, the purpose was to split it into two different schedules, that is Saturday-Sunday, separate with Wednesday and Thursday. I see that we are deviating from that because of maybe the availability, but the plan was to split that into two separate – like two consecutive either in the start of the meeting, before, or two consecutive days at the end of the meeting.

And having a gap of three days might be problematic for someone like me who needs to be there then for six or seven days, one day for travel coming, one day for travel back, and five days to stay there. That means I need to have time off of seven days, which might not be feasible for maybe a number of more people. I'm not sure. But it is difficult for me, it seems.

So I would want us to stick to two days, either at the start or two days at the end. And if required, you can have, as I said, you can have a planning of another half-day session, a wrap-up or whatever concluding, whatever is possible. [inaudible] Again, I'm looking for the actual proposal. I still don't get that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: KC, is that – Eric, go ahead, please.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So just to sort of – yeah, Naveed, I personally resonate with that very much as well, but I'll just sort of point out that's also part and parcel with the whole having a meeting before or after, is if a number of us are

going to be at ICANN anyway, then it winds up being that – this is kind of the justification [inaudible] having a problem[inaudible] so I think that’s just – I’m with you on that one.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil, go ahead, please.

PHIL KHOURY: Just an observation about decision-making. This would be probably one of the most difficult decisions for a group of 18 people to make kind of around a table. There's a lot of moving parts in all this stuff. It’s a horrendous proposition. But I had an attempt at changing the way you do this. It didn't work very well. But really, I think for the future – it’s good to have the conversation because you can hear from people, but for the future, I would suggest you want a leadership group, a small group of people who can problem solve to come up with two proposals, simplify the thing, and just say, “From the data, these are the two best options, pick one.” And then you can do this, three people get tied in knots for an hour, everybody else gets tied up for five minutes instead of 18 people trying to make – to problem solve in this way, too hard.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don’t think we need to go off in a room. Just going on the data on the slide, we have numbers greater than 10 for a clump of a meeting on Saturday and Sunday, or a meeting on Wednesday and Thursday morning. So, if we need to clump and not do the Saturday and Wednesday thing – so there really are three choices. Meet Saturday and

Sunday, [B,] Wednesday and Thursday morning, or [we have] a split meeting Saturday and Wednesday. Can we just do a straw between those three?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Somebody – Steve, can you count hands for me please?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: But there's no one else in the queue. Eric, is that hand old? Yeah, there's nobody else in the queue, Russ, you have the floor. Go for it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, raise your hand if you can do a Saturday-Sunday meeting.

DENISE MICHEL: Saturday afternoon meeting?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, Saturday and Sunday.

DENISE MICHEL: So just Saturday afternoon though?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We have a 10 on Saturday and we have an 11 Saturday morning – or Saturday afternoon, so I'm taking all of Saturday, all of Sunday. I know you can't, alright? You already stated that. So, alright, if you can do that, raise your hand, please. Okay, I see six.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: [We can do remote. We don't know about in-person yet.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, let's focus on in-person or we'll go crazy. So, are you trying to ask a question, Norm? Okay, so we're at six that could do that. How many could do Wednesday all day and Thursday morning in person? The same number. Oh, seven. Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But I see we have a lot of dropout. I wonder where were those 10 or 11.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We are putting all that [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: How many people can do the split meeting Sunday and Wednesday?
That didn't help.

DENISE MICHEL: [Hey, you have a lot more people.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, then let's do that. We'll go with the Sunday and Wednesday meetings. Staff will put the request in, and hopefully, we'll get the meeting room.

DENISE MICHEL: And staff, could you get back to chairs as soon as you can on the protocols for this, the changes over the years? If the meeting staff is waiting for some approval or other input from the SO and AC chairs, we'd like to know as soon as possible so we can communicate directly to the SO and AC chairs what our needs are and why we feel it's important. Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Denise. Yeah, we can definitely get you the dates from the Meetings team by which this process transpires. The high-level is the internal form opens up to submit requests for meetings, the Meetings team gathers all the requests from various groups within ICANN who submit meeting requests on behalf of review teams and different constituencies, and then the overall schedule, I understand, is submitted to the SOs and ACs for approval. Things move around, and

I'm not sure by which date they get the final approved schedule back. Things always seem to change until the last minute, but they are aware of the SSR2 request, and hopefully will give it due attention to make sure you guys get some good time in the schedule. But we can definitely provide more details in terms of time and due dates to everyone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Just a question, Russ. For the people who can't do the split, is the intention that they try and make it for the full day, for a single first day? So for Naveed for example.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That will be Sunday and Wednesday, right? So if you're unable to make one day, make the other room [inaudible] or as much of it as you can. Right.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Eric, go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just one observation about that, the fact that they're split apart actually makes that possible. for example, like if we did back to back Saturday and Sunday and you couldn't do Saturday, you probably had no chance

of doing it remotely because you're probably on a plane. So in fact, this might actually work out better for people.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have Naveed, and then Kerry Ann.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Are we also planning to have some engagement sessions? Because that also requires some scheduling if we – just like I was told yesterday that some of those were planned for Abu Dhabi but didn't happen. So, are we just planning it for Barcelona? If we are planning, the new require the ability of team members for those days as well, that may be between these Sunday and Wednesday.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann, and then Denise.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [I don't know if] Denise plans to answer Naveed's question, then she could probably go before me.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: [Can't really say I have] an answer. It's a great question. I think it's a bit premature in terms of where we are in completing our scope and terms of reference, addressing the previous subgroup workplans. I would suggest it's something we revisit in the next few week as we get a little further along. It may be premature to have official engagement with the community, but it may not. And I think it's something we should sort of put a pin in and address later.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I know we had taken a vote, and probably- I don't know what has been decided, but if we do split it, I think it would be important to kind of take the numbers of who will opt to do remote for the second day. For example, I'd probably be one of those who opt to do Wednesday as remote and do the Sunday, because I'd be out too long. But as I said, I think it's Important to probably count both numbers if you do get a lot of participation remote as well, then to see what makes sense and what we're actually accomplishing on that Sunday. I think it'd be important to [spend a lot of time] to make sure that Sunday is effective. If some persons – [inaudible] if that makes sense.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I'm not sure I'm understanding your comment. Is it about making sure there are accommodations for remote participation?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, it's more numbers that would be – so for example if it is that you're doing Sunday, Wednesday, are you going to have more in person on Wednesday, or are you going to have more remote participation on Wednesday? So I think it's kind of important to see, that way we can determine whether or not Wednesday, if we needed any at all or –you get me? I'm just trying to see –

NEGAR FARZINNIA: My personal recommendation would be, given how difficult it is to get meetings scheduled during ICANN meeting to have whatever days the review team thinks they have availability, get those put into the schedule, get it reserved, because it's a lot easier to cancel even two days before if the review team decides they don't want to meet on Wednesday, if they decide to cancel on the Tuesday, it's a lot easier to cancel a reservation than it is to add it back in.

So whatever number of days you guys think there is a possibility of you wanting to meet face-to-face, even if some members are participating remotely, I'd recommend putting that request in and just get space reserved. Scott, go ahead, please.

SCOTT MCCORMICK. Just an FYI, there is – well, it's in draft mode, there's a draft version two schedule at least up on Barcelona's page. So if people want to look at that. I've just been kind of scrolling through and seeing what is tentatively in certain areas that might be able to help us as well.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct. So the high-interest topics are on there. One day, for example, is the constituency day. I believe that's a Tuesday. We've pretty much left that out of the options because everyone has to attend their constituency day with all the meetings going on. But yeah, some known sessions are there, but the rest of them, the major ones haven't had the schedule yet. But definitely a good place for everyone to check from time to time.

Denise, is that a new hand? I have no other names in the queue right now. So, apologies for asking this again, which days did we finalize we want to submit as possible meeting dates?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sunday and Wednesday.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Do we know if we want to do AM and PM?

RUSS HOUSLEY: All day.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. Sunday and Wednesday, all day.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [The stars.]

NEGAR FARZINNIA: With a champagne fountain, I'm guessing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. Smoke-free, windows.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay, Russ, so I think the Barcelona discussion is now put to bed, we can submit the request to the Meetings team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I'm going to ask Phil to give us context on where we are in the phone thing. We decided we were not having three times. Did we settle on two, did we settle on – where did we get?

PHIL KHOURY: The co-chairs from before probably have more of this, but my understanding was that a couple of times, in an attempt to share the pain, the team has decided to go forward with cycling through three times for the weekly call, and that's turned out to be – and the idea was to share the pain, but basically what turns out is it shares the absenteeism rather than the pain.

So, the fallback was to two, alternating between two, which is the 13:00 UTC and the 20:00 UTC. Is that right? I think that's right. Which I think gave us a bit more attendance, but it didn't concentrate the pain on

people in Central Asia I think were the worst hit by those particular combinations.

And it got too hard and we were wasting too much time on timing. I just made it kind of – intruded on the whole thing and just [inaudible] let's just solve until the face-to-face. And we picked a few dates for that. And we kind of – I don't think we're any further advanced in terms of which is the least worst solution.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think least worst is the right wording. Is there anyone who cannot stick with the two times that Phil picked?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Russ, before you started speaking, Kaveh had his hand up. I just want to give him an option.

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, I just wanted to point out that the composition of the team changed, epically with Jeff's resignation. So it might be good to even think more or stick with the two, but I just want to mention that I think – I'm not sure, but I think – the latest time we had is moved, at least to [inaudible]. So, please check.

PHIL KHOURY: That's right. The Australian time zone is like five hours out from everybody else, so it was an extreme on the thing. So there are probably other options that now become more practical.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: May I propose we re-Doodle right away, come to a conclusion within the next two days? Everyone answers this tonight if possible.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Next hour, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] the Doodle.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We can certainly make the Doodle poll, but the [eyes] on getting people to respond in the next hour or two, it's all on you. Okay, we do that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Wait, there was a suggestion to just go off what we had. Though imperfect, it was something we had and we all locked and loaded on. So, do we want to just do that instead of opening a new can of fish? Or kettle of fish, whatever it is. Or do we really want to renegotiate?

STEVE CONTE: I'm sorry. KC.

KC CLAFFY: I vote for renegotiate.

STEVE CONTE: Can I make a suggestion to the review team to ask the outliers? There's a chunk of us that are within U.S., European time that pretty much has a nine-hour window that works. And [inaudible] suggest to the review team to maybe speak to the outliers where the times aren't as... Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think [inaudible] really just getting old. What were the times agreed? If we could just refresh our memory, because I know it was like a million time zones, time options that were up, and I cannot recall what was the final conclusion.

STEVE CONTE: With authority, I'm going to pass that on to Jennifer.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just to confirm, what were the dates and times? I can't recall.

JENNIFER BRYCE: So, we had Thursday – yeah, I believe it was 13:00 UTC, 6:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JENNIFER BRYCE: And I don't know if this is going to be helpful or not, but this is the time zones that everybody is in with sort of like acceptable or what you would say is helpful [times.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But I'm just [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: Yes, so Jeff is the top one as we're looking at this document that was just noted. So –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [He's not anymore.]

STEVE CONTE: There we go, now he's no longer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Those are daytime hours.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, what is that range?

STEVE CONTE: Okay, so we're going to google on those green times. Is that what we're going to do? So let's capture that, and then I've got Kerry Ann. Jennifer, Russ wants to google off the green times in the middle of this document.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry, what do you want me to do?

STEVE CONTE: Not google. Sorry, Doodle. Okay, Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I can't see from here, does that include days or just times?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Times.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So the dates that should be Doodling would be every day of the week for all of those times, or are we agreeing that the Tuesday, Thursday with those times?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Actually, just skipping Saturday, Sunday. Just –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So five days –

JENNIFER BRYCE: Also, Monday, Friday because of different time zones are not usually great. I would suggest maybe those green times for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You have a spread here, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Take the center of it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure.

STEVE CONTE: If I could put on – I think it's really useful for this team just to be chatting about this, so I'm going to suggest for the purpose of this exercise that we don't [inaudible] the mics and we just talk, and then we recap for the record.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Brenda, can you please pause the recording?

STEVE CONTE: There we go. Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just for the record, as a team, we've agreed to Doodle the scheduling to be sent around. We have an agreed time slot based on availability and the time zones of everyone, and staff [is required] do that. And everyone should answer that, hopefully by the end of the day. Those who are remote, I guess we can give another day. Everybody agreed?

STEVE CONTE: Is everyone who is about to run off and get on an airplane able to respond to a Doodle poll within the next 12 hours? Okay. Thank you. Kerry Ann, continue.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Since we're on meetings and scheduling, I wanted to just raise again the question Naveed raised, I think throughout the meeting, concerning observer list. He had asked for clarification on what the observer list was, and if it is something that we need to consider for the reinstated team that we have here. Anyone has an explanation? And I remember the discussion as to what we agreed and didn't agree, but I can't remember why we had the – what was the official – Naveed could probably clarify your question before anybody tries to answer. I was just trying to bring it back on the agenda.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Thank you, Kerry Ann. Actually, I've been part of the observer group, by the way, so yeah. So, I was with the team since the start, so as an observer. I just wanted the team to consider the clarification of what is the purpose of having the observer list and what purpose do they serve. Are we trying to use them as the first step to get some feedback? Or if not, then we are drafting something, we are getting community feedback, so why are we having that observer list? Do they serve some purpose? We need to think about it. If they are there, we need to take advantage. If they're there for nothing, why [to] carry that list?

STEVE CONTE: I'll pass this to Negar. Eric, are you in the queue?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Negar, and then KC, unless you have a clarifying question before we...

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Naveed. Observers have been defined in the bylaws. The specific reviews as part of the list mandated in the bylaws should have or can have observers. The purpose of the observers is to be just that, to observe the proceedings, to listen in. Observers don't get votes, they don't get to actually even speak up. There is a separate Adobe room for the observers.

Oftentimes, interested community members who just want to see how the work of a given review for example is proceeding, they attend as observers into a separate Adobe room. They will hear the audio conversation of the review team. If at any point in time review team wants to have off the record conversations, while the recording is paused, the audio in the observers room is also stopped so they will not hear the confidential discussions. But in general, it's just that. Think of it as going to an ICANN meeting and just going to sit in on a session. You don't necessarily get to stand up and speak to anything, you're just sitting there to listen, and that's what observers are meant to do as defined in the world of ICANN.

STEVE CONTE:

So just to restate that a little bit, this is just a livestream methodology for open and transparent process within the ICANN model and not necessarily specific to this review.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

That is correct. It applies to policy development work and applies to all reviews.

STEVE CONTE:

Okay, I have Denise, I have Kaveh and KC. Okay, I have Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I know the answer, but just a clarification for the room. For physical meetings, face-to-face meetings, we would have the same, people are allowed to sit in, or they should join the room and observe?

STEVE CONTE: For the face-to-face meetings at ICANN meetings, we allow observers. And again, if we go off record, we would ask them to step out. For face-to-face meetings like this, I believe we don't facilitate observers because we don't fund them, but I'm going to get your attention again. If an observer is self-funded to come here, would they be allowed into this face-to-face meeting that is offsite from an ICANN meeting?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Generally, if the meeting is open, even if it's at an offsite location, we would allow observers to come and sit in the room. For this particular face-to-face, we specifically did not want it because the review team had some private work to do, and therefore, we just restricted that. But generally, if this was a face-to-face meeting, let's say, in any location for that matter and observers wanted to walk into the office that notify us beforehand that they want to attend in person, they could come and sit in in the room.

STEVE CONTE: I have KC and then Denise.

KC CLAFFY: Just a clarifying question again, how does it apply to like the e-mail archives and the Wiki? Do they have access to those? Or I guess those are public anyway.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: They're all public. Okay, fine.

STEVE CONTE: Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: I would just note these are not decisions that are made by staff – especially for the newcomers. Open and closed meetings of the SSR2 team are decided by the SSR2 team. And so when we have open meetings, people can come, or they can join remotely. And if we feel that we need to address something out of the public sphere, then we close our meeting. So just to be clear, this is a decision that the review team makes based on our work and our needs to move our workplan forward. Also, observers are addressed in the terms of reference scope, really briefly just noting that we have an observers e-mail list that's open.

STEVE CONTE: So we call them out at the calls because they're populating an observer room. We call them out just for open and transparency's sake that we do have observers for that moment or we do not. I believe at the face-to-face meetings, we've also identified that there were observers in the rooms when we had Madrid and we had Abu Dhabi, we had observers there. So, does that address your questions, Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I was just trying to understand if at some point, we can take advantage of if there's any observer willing to volunteer for work or something, like providing feedback, do some reading, or whatever, the first-hand feedback. Something like that. So, can we do that at some point? I know they're not as committed as the team members might be, but are we planning something like that or not? Just curious.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann and then Denise.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just to address Naveed's question, I need a clarification from staff. Is the observer list for this review team set, or is it that any observer at any point can come in and attend? So it's open to community?

STEVE CONTE: Yes. It's not different, per se, than my mom coming to the Wiki page [inaudible] and listening to the recording, it's just in a live mode of transparency.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Thank you. So with that said, Naveed, to probably answer your question, my first answer would be probably not as a resource, because it's the community at large. So it's not as if we have a set of experts that attend regularly that we know their skills. When we had the Copenhagen meeting, [inaudible] a group, initially, the observers there were the persons who had applied but didn't get to – weren't selected, so they came in. And I remember them specifically.

But observers are generally the community at large, so I think when we do our communication plan and outreach strategies, it would be included that if there are persons within various community groups that we could reach out to, we would. But that would probably be my short answer. I don't know what the other team members feel about that.

STEVE CONTE: I have Denise, KC. Okay, Denise, and then Alain. [That's right.]

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, that's how we have operated to date, and is in line generally with the protocols of review teams. I also just wanted to note that this review team has always had on the wiki an e-mail address, anyone, observers or anyone in the public can always share input and research and anything else and views that they want to share with the review team.

STEVE CONTE: Alain.

ALAIN AINA: Just for clarification and to refresh my mind, I think those we have as observers have been selected, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

STEVE CONTE: Those have applied to be on the observer mailing list, which I believe gives them notifications on when meetings are and a URL to the observer Adobe Connect room. And I believe – Negar, please correct if there's more to that.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, that pretty much sums it up. You're correct.

STEVE CONTE: I see no further questions. Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, I'm glad to see we have a little time. I've asked Laurin to put up his document where he has the changes to the TOR so we can hopefully put that to bed.

STEVE CONTE: KC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC.

KC CLAFFY: [As someone who] asked for these changes, or [as someone who] triggered them in some way, I want to thank you for doing all this editing of this, and then make two comments. I think you did capture the discussion, but on the first one, the definitions, you have a little comment on the left, right? Oh, you have a much bigger comment than I'm seeing in my [inaudible].

Okay, so anyway, I'm just going to focus on the text, not your comment right now. I wanted a citation for all the definitions, not just misuse or abuse, okay? If it's four different citations, fine, I just want it to be sort of academic, geeky there.

And then on the second big one about moving that sentence around, I want to retract my comment that triggered the suggestion to move that sentence around, because I think Denise was right when she said the "however" sentence covers it in the position that it was. And now that it's moved, the flow looks broken to me because you've got the word "then" at the first part of the paragraph, and the "then" literally refers to that sentence that we removed, the authoritative stuff.

So I would still maintain I would want to remove the "authoritative" and the "clearly" text, but just leave the rest of it, fine. And I take Negar's point that I had commented on before, but I do think that if you read

the whole paragraph, it's addressed pretty quite well. Sorry, Denise, for not catching that yesterday or whenever we talked.

STEVE CONTE: Naveed, and then Russ.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Not about this, just as Any Other Business item. Internally – I don't want it to be committed as a communique, but internally, do we have a deadline set for Barcelona, what do we want to achieve? I wanted to have a discussion on that. So, can we just spend 10-15 minutes on that, like setting ourselves the first deadline of what we want to be achieved by Barcelona, so in two months' time or something? So, anybody interested in doing that discussion, it'd be great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm interested in doing that, but not to lose this time.

STEVE CONTE: Is that a quick response, or should I put you in the queue? I have Laurin –

KAVEH RANJBAR: Put me in the queue.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, Laurin and Kaveh.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Okay. I thought I would start with this and kind of go through what I've put in the document so we're all – one thing, I did include your comments, KC, so essentially, we only had changes on pages three and four, and we already looked at, essentially, the definitions part where KC was speaking to we have to kind of consider proper definitions.

And then we had a long discussion about the remit of SSR. You can see the kind of – well, if this was working, yes. Now you can – well, or not. I'm not doing anything. So essentially, it was about what can we really do, what can't we do?

There was what I felt was a solution, which was Phil's idea to say, well, we provide an accurate report and we can recommend to advocate to the board which is possible for them to do. And that was kind of the end of that one.

Then we had a quick discussion about explaining the order. So I just put in on the next page, which again is not showing yet, like a quick note kind of telling people why things are in the order they're in, and then the main discussion was on [said] very red paragraph on page four, which again is not showing on screen. Oh, yeah, it's coming. Okay.

Where essentially now KC already mentioned we might not want to move that sentence. And essentially, that was all we really discussed. So just that everyone's on the same page.

STEVE CONTE:

Okay. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I'm sorry but I have to discuss another item because I have to leave. So it's not related to [inaudible], but just a few minutes. So first of all, thank you, I'm leaving in a few minutes. On behalf of ICANN board, I want to say congratulations to the team for the progress the past few days, and I also wanted to channel on the record that we're looking forward to seeing results from this team, and if there is any support that board can provide, formally or informally, please let us know, because this is basically – the board is here to support, and we really – it's in our benefit, and obviously, we have a common goal here to get [inaudible]. So I just wanted to state that. And I already had a short chat with the board, and a few members who saw that, they were very positive and very happy about what's happening. So we'll see. Thank you very much, and yeah, let me know. I just wanted to reiterate, as Negar mentioned, there is an informal channel for the board, so if there are any impediments, the board has [this caucus about] SSR2 which we can through staff informally communicate, like issues. Even if they're issues about staff, if the team feels, "Hey, we are not getting proper support," you can, through me, communicate that to the board. And that doesn't need to be formal letters. When needed as well, you can obviously use all the formal channels. So, I wish you the best. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you, Kaveh, and safe travels to you. We'll see you in Barcelona.

DENISE MICHEL: Safe travel.

STEVE CONTE: Laurin, I turn it back to you for – you have open mic, and then if anyone wants to comment on your proposed changes, we'll keep that open.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I don't want to call them my proposed changes, I would call them my interpretation of what I believe we said we wanted.

STEVE CONTE: Words matter.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Can we – I think it would be great for me – because I'm trying to edit this live – if we could discuss the three things we had in order so I don't have to jump around, and because as we've seen, this won't work with Adobe Connect. So, please stick on one, and go ahead.

STEVE CONTE: KC.

KC CLAFFY: Well, okay, I'll repeat what I said before. My one thing is I want to make sure that we get a cite – the three things are the cite, what are the other two? Okay, you tell me what the order is. You say what you want to discuss first.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Let's then start with the definitions, because that's the beginning.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, so my comment is I want a citation to wherever we got them. That's all. Somebody go do it. I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: So, are we all done with that one? Can we declare it done? Okay, what's number two?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Number two was the following [inaudible] terms of bylaws and [inaudible]. It's a terrible sentence, please give me a better one.

KC CLAFFY: I don't see that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: For what?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How do we put this nicely?

KC CLAFFY: Oh. I don't care about the sentence. Somebody else has to –

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, essentially, the problem was that people were commenting on how this stuff is ordered and if it makes sense. The reason for that order is that this is in order of appearance, and that's that comment [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I would say remove at least "will." "Will" is not fitting.

KC CLAFFY: Can we remove “in order of appearance” in the bylaws? It’s not technically in the order of appearance, right? If we did the “musts” first?

DENISE MICHEL: May I suggest that we say the following section addresses the key sections of the ICANN bylaws related –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The mandates of the bylaws.

DENISE MICHEL: Mandates of the bylaws regarding SSR2 review.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Kerry Ann, you're in the queue.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I’d probably suggest something completely different, only because it’s – I think the problem I had with this section when we revisited it yesterday is that it was as lot of words with no context. So I don’t think – for example, the header is focus of the SSR2 scope of work. I think it’s really mandate of the SSR2, that's what it is. And then according to the bylaws, and then have – properly quote the bylaws section so it’s not just subsection – I think below instead of – scroll down a little bit, Laurin. So, for example –

NORM RITCHIE: Couldn't we just change –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Go again, Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Sorry. Couldn't we just change – I just scrolled away, sorry – I think it said "requirements [inaudible] the bylaws."

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, just say "Requirements arising from the bylaws."

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay. [That's it.]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And it has to be properly referenced, because –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Section numbers.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, so full section numbers. Instead of saying “From the requirements” [inaudible] delete “From the requirements in the bylaws” and just say “Bylaw 26.whatever.” And then I would put a note in the front of the sentence so the sentence doesn’t have a reference. So that explanation is an explanatory note or expansion or something. We have to say that this is us interpreting what's required of the section above. So we need to contextualize [inaudible] note, we put the word “note” in front of it, but the paragraph in-between doesn’t really say if it’s leading to the section below or it’s referring to he section above.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. Okay. Quick question. So, we are changing the title that’s currently focus of the SSR2 scope of work to, Norm, what was your proposal?

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible] scope of work had to be in there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I just want to say requirements arising from the bylaws as a title.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is it a requirement? [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: I don't know that it's actually requirements. It's what we were doing, if I recall, in terms of reference was we were breaking out the actual work, scope of work, and tying it to the most relevant bylaws section. Eric may have more memories [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. So, what we were doing was we were defining the work that we were going to do, and then these were the elements that supported why we were entitled to do it. So our scope is a lot different than requirements that we're required to fulfill. It would be nice if it was that simple, but it's not. So I think we do need those elements in there, but I don't think we should conflate them into saying these are the requirements when we start talking about our scope.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed is in the queue. Naveed, go ahead, please.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. What about putting these bylaws and the explanation that we got in a table form that we put on the left side the actual bylaw, and on the right side, the paragraph that follows that [inaudible] or gives us better readability of the document? By just putting this four, followed by its explanation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I need to jump in on that one. We want to be clear, but let's not rewrite this document. The point is to give it to the board and say, "We heard you, we're moving on." And if we just – "Here's a completely new document," it's going to be really hard to defend that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. To that point, so if that's how we all feel, then can I suggest one way to do that –and to clarify the note, comment from Kerry Ann and what refers to it, we can just put horizontal rules, a line that says, "Here's some quoted text, here's some text from us," and there's two lines above and below, it's pretty clear what that's referring. I think that might be the smallest footprint delta that gets you what you want.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: KC, you're in the queue, go ahead, please.

KC CLAFFY: In the spirit of smallest footprint, who objected to the scope of work? Because that seems like the right title for this section.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [Oh, no, I'm sorry.] We didn't object to the scope of work, it was focus of the SSR2. Focus is not –

KC CLAFFY: Oh, so if we remove focus of the SSR and just have the title of the section be scope of work?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It can be scope of work, yeah.

KC CLAFFY: Is that fine with everybody? And we can move on?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, [inaudible] focus on –

KC CLAFFY: Okay, let's move on.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Could I put myself in the queue and ask a clarifying question for staff's benefit? We talked about a new template for the terms of reference. Does the review team have any interest in us transferring everything into the new template, or would you like to continue using this template as is?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, the one that –

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, there is a new template for terms of reference. Denise, go ahead, please.

DENISE MICHEL: I don't have a strong opinion on this, but I would note that the current scope terms of reference was based on the template that we received from staff when we started. And then we got some comments from the board indicating that they didn't like that template. Although it's the same template that the other review teams continue to use. So my question is, this template that you've just given us, has it been approved and endorsed by the board of directors?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: To answer that, the board never asked to endorse or approve it. The new template that we developed was used by the RDS review team, and there didn't seem to be any concerns raised by the board about the content or the format. The templates are not that far apart in terms of the way they are laid out, they just have some additional sections that are probably more comprehensive.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. [inaudible]. The template used by the CCT review team before us was the same template that we used. The board didn't seem to have

any problem with them either, but yet expressed displeasure at the template that we were using, which was identical to the CCT review.

So, we actually asked staff in South Africa to please work with the board, get very specific clarity on what template the board wants the review teams to use and to validate, to come back with us with confirmation. And I think it sounds like that slipped through the cracks.

You can understand that we're in a similar position that we were way back when, we're given a template by staff, previously the board had no problem with it, then the board seemed to have a problem with it, and now we're being given a new template by staff. The board didn't seem to have a problem with another review team using it. Based on history, that's no guarantee they won't have a problem with us using it.

I think it's reasonable for the team to again ask the MSSI staff to go to the board, the appropriate board committee – whose name I can't remember – and say, "This is the updated template we are giving review teams to use. They would like you to validate that this is the template that you are comfortable with them using."

I think it's reasonable for us to ask for that in writing. Is that something staff could take care of in short order?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I would like, actually, to provide a little clarification. I'm sure we have the action item that resulted in the conversation about the terms of reference, and my recollection was – and I'm sure we can find this somewhere – that when the board provided comments or asked

questions about the terms of reference after the review [inaudible] ICANN said, "Listen, this is the terms of reference template that the MSSI team had provided to us." They had just directed staff to work on an improved template, which we did. There wasn't supposed to be a circle back to the board to ask for approval, because I don't think board actually provides approval on the content or gives opinion as to the content or the format of the template, they just wanted some clarifying information, which we think the new sections address. I cannot speak on behalf of the board or assert whether they will have questions on things or not. And if you would like to continue to use either of the documents, we have no preference one way or the other. Denise and Kerry Ann.

DENISE MICHEL:

Okay. So my head's spinning a little bit. Perhaps if we could just short circuit this and put in a request for staff to communicate with the board committee that has responsibility for reviews, send them this new template, and tell the board committee that you are recommending that this be a template used by review teams, and tell them that the SSR2 would like confirmation from them that they're comfortable with us using the current template or this template.

I think it's a reasonable request. If you want to make that an informal request, I think that's great, but I think that's an important box to check given the history of this review team.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I have Russ and Laurin in the queue.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if the board would be happy with it, my preference is to use the same template, again for the same reason, I didn't want to do a rewrite, to show that – so that it's easy for them to read it and see, "Yeah, they've made the things that we're interested in." If they say, "We want the new template," I'd even rather that be a second step.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: If I may address that again, I don't think the board had comments on the template. The board had clarifying questions on the content. For example, if I recall correctly, scope wasn't explicitly identified in the original terms of reference. The board never said the terms of reference is missing sections, it just asked some clarifying questions. So I personally don't think anyone on the board would have any issues with the template used, and again, it's up to the review team.

STEVE CONTE: I have Laurin and then Kerry Ann.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin is not on, sorry.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT:

Sorry, I just wanted to ask the team though, the entire time, I looked at the template, not [barring] Denise's request, because I think yesterday, the request was to look at the template, see if we're okay with it, and staff would have transcribed the content into the new template. I looked at the new template, and structurally, it just looks [nicer.] So I'm just wondering if persons have any major objection to the structure, because really, it's content that we're working on now.

And if we're okay with the structure, because it actually has good sections that the public can easily refer to what is our mandate based on what we've written up here, our scope. So I just wanted us to – not barring Denise's request, because if it is that staff was asked to do an improved template and it's a good template, you should get approval from the board to recommend it to other review teams. So that's not barring that.

But in the interim, I just recommend that we probably look at it, and if Negar comes back and says to us that, "Yes, the board likes the template, you guys could go ahead and use it, they'll try and standardize it for all review teams," we could then give instruction if we want to change it, transfer our content. And I liked it. [But not because I liked it means anything.]

STEVE CONTE:

Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Reading the board letter that we received in June, “As a terms of reference in general must provide a clear articulation of work to be done and a basis for how the success of the project will be measured. The board proposes that the ICANN organization – that would be the staff – include a template for terms of reference in the operating standards to aid all review teams.” And then before that, there's some noting of the need for terms of reference to have clear articulations of a few different points.

So, I think just closing that loop with the appropriate board committee on templates would be – still, I think my request stands.

LAURIN WEISSINGER

We resolved the stuff on page three. We have a new title. We will add the [explanatory] note and we will use horizontal rows in the future to kind of divide things up. I can't do that right now, obviously. So, what remains of the stuff we were discussing yesterday is essentially the paragraph that includes the “clearly” and “authoritative.” On screen now.

KC CLAFFY:

[I paged out] to do the Doodle poll. Correct. I want to put [inaudible] and put the “however” back. I want it just like it was before I mucked with it. Except for the things – the words I wanted removed. I still want those words removed, I just think it doesn't break the flow too much, or at least this is worse than [this.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, exactly.

STEVE CONTE: I have Norm. Denise, are you in queue as well? No. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: I raised this point before, and there's an e-mail that Alain sent before regarding breadth versus dept, capability versus behaviors and perspective versus prescription. I think they're very good clarifying words on the intent of what this group – [inaudible] everyone agrees with it. I think they're very good words. And this may be a good section, maybe after it, I don't know, to add in those for clarity, this is what we believe.

KC CLAFFY: I'm not sure I totally understand what's behind those words. So I'm not prepared to put them in public yet. And I don't even think we have time to talk about it today. Unless somebody can give me a simple – what motivated those words?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, so there was some concern about how deep we're going in some of the analysis. Particularly, I think there's concern – the ICANN SSR letter which talked about doing an audit and comprehensive something,

and that kind of triggered some fears. I think the words are probably more grandiose than what we actually did, of course. So, we clarified that on what our scope was, we aren't going to super duper detail, we're going more for breadth than depth. And you can read the notes there. So that's what precipitated these words.

STEVE CONTE: I have Kerry Ann, KC, Denise.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] kind of reminded us that Alain sent that e-mail. I don't think – for the purposes of expediting the terms of expediting the terms of reference, I don't think it should be here. I think it should be included in the workplan. So I think the clarification when we do the workplan, we can carry across some language from the TOR and use that clarifying e-mail as a part. Because I think it would defeat our purpose of just writing to the board to say, "Hey, these are the minor changes, we're moving on."

So I was just thinking that [inaudible] the e-mail that Alain sent around, it' critical for us in terms of when we do our language and our drafting especially, but I think just for the sake of what we agreed to earlier of not messing with this too much, maybe we shouldn't import the language into this but import it into our workplan. Just for the interest of [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: KC:

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, that would cover me, because to the extent that I understand these words, I don't think I agree with them, but I don't feel strongly enough to say so without understanding them more. So if we just punt this, I'm fine.

STEVE CONTE: Denise, and then Naveed.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, thank you. I also am concerned about such broad commitments of not going in depth or not providing more detailed recommendations given the quite huge – you know, we have a lot of issues to cover with a lot of complexities and nuances. I think it's really premature before we actually sort of dig into our work to commit up front that we're not going to go in depth, not going to address things in detail.

If I'm understanding this correctly. And I agree with KC, I'd prefer to close out the scope of work here and continue a longer discussion of what the intent is in this e-mail. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Naveed, then Eric.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm trying to understand what we are putting in the communicate. Are we saying in that that we are working on updating TOR? This is what I

understood. If that is the case, then why we are trying to finalize it here? Why don't we give it like one, two days, be able to think on the text and all that? Because whatever we do in 30 minutes or something, people would disagree to that later, and we'll be like this [time.]

I will again ask team members to consider setting a deadline for Barcelona. Like what is the next step? I'm still not clear about after all these three days what we're going to do next in next two months. Like what are the immediate things we need to resolve? So, at least personally, I'm still confused about how we're going to set up that work to start with. We have done a lot, we have understood what is done to some extent, we have the leadership and all, but what is the next step? So, can we consider this, please?

STEVE CONTE: I have Eric, Alain, and then Russ. And Russ, unless you want to take chair priority and respond.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, I'll do that quickly. I think what we tried to say in the communicate is our team's up to speed, we finished the TOR and scope, which is why we're trying to finish the TOR and scope, and that our next things we're working on are the workplan and the communications plan.

STEVE CONTE: Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So as someone who wrote pretty much all that text with close collaboration with various people on the team and have a vivid recollection of its origin and intent, I can tell you that that text that we worked on was in order to defuse the concern that was arising over the misspoke word “audit.”

And so that was text to make it clear that we would be looking broadly but that we wouldn’t be conducting a formal audit. And so we’re conflating at least two, maybe three things here. And so my words are only cautionary in that sense. So as someone who wrote those words, I don’t think they were bad words, they just were aimed at something else.

So we’re talking about scope now. Those words were not scoping words except for that particular effort we were undertaking at that time because we were trying to allay concerns that we were going to go in there and wreak havoc. So as we try to work towards the scope, finishing it right now, I don’t think those words were ever intended to be scoping for the whole team.

And so I think we should probably not presume that they are now. We may like them and they may show up somewhere else, and that’s great. I love it when my words show back up again. But nevertheless, I just don’t think that’s what this is for. And then all those other things, [picking out] the workplan and picking out the next things we worked on, let’s kick that to the next stage.

STEVE CONTE:

Thank you. I have Alain an then Scott.

ALAIN AINA:

Yes. I want to – about what I sent, the e-mail I sent I think was the consensus – we got a consensus on this point, and this point is supposed to serve as a guidance point for all of us anytime we look at the work we're doing. So, I see Denise' point saying no, we shouldn't commit now until we continue. And so I'm just worried and wonder when and where are we going to make the decision on the [inaudible] of what we are going to do.

Because we had the issue in the past where we were giving the impression that we're trying to do or trying to go too deep [inside] to look to particular details. Then we said, no, we should do this, we should look at things more broadly. And [issues] of for example giving prescriptions, for example, no, we are not going to give a prescription, etc. So we're trying to put this thing in written to give the team members an idea of how we should move [inaudible].

If we remove this, I don't know, but we have to have a discussion on this because I think it's important for all of us to know anytime we are looking at what we are doing here to know exactly where are we going and where are the limit. Otherwise, the same thing will happen again because we all have our [inaudible] perspective on what should be done.

So I think, or me, okay, as I said in the e-mail, it's open for comment to the newcomers, but I think we have to maybe agree. So maybe, KC, I don't know, because I'm calling you to look at them and see if there's any changes you want. But I think we need, at some point, narrowing

down things like, “This is what we agree on we’re going to do in terms of scope.”

Otherwise, if we keep it open again and again – because remember that most of the time, we work online, remotely, and sometimes, it’s difficult to get everybody to agree. But these three or four points on that mail for me was a group consensus. But I’m open for discussion. But for me, I think it’s very important that we have it either here or in the workplan, as Kerry Ann said, so then we all refer to it, and I think it’ll probably end up in the report to justify why we didn’t do this or why we did this, etc.

STEVE CONTE: [I’ve got – do you want to –]

DENISE MICHEL: Just quickly, can we commit to address this issue and discuss it as part of the workplan? Would that be acceptable to move us along on the scope?

KC CLAFFY: It’s acceptable to me.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, I just want to call them all out because cards went up. I’ve got Scott, Laurin, KC, and Zarko. KC, are you going out of queue now?

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]. Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Scott, Laurin, Zarko.

SCOTT MCCORMICK. I just want to make a comment about Eric's comment about audit. Audit is – having done plenty of audits in my career, audit's about checking the box, and we're not coming in to make sure the boxes are necessarily checked. I think one of the words that I would like to propose we use is assessment. We're coming in and assessing what the ground is. Right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [The bylaw issues.]

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah. See? So, I would say from a formality perspective moving forward, if we use the word "assessment," define that in our vocabulary and put that out to the community and the board and ICANN as a whole. I think that would probably help satisfy some stress of using the other a-word.

STEVE CONTE: Just to interject on that from a staff perspective, and having gone through some of the – just really quick here – "words are hard" or "words matter" part, I think using "assessment" would lower the hackles of some parts of the org. So as we move forward, I think that's a wise statement. I have Zarko. I'm sorry, I have Laurin and Zarko.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just because it's actually – what is currently left in this document that we haven't discussed is essentially three things. Do we remove the brackets, yes or no? Do we remove the word “clearly,” yes or no? And then – although this will probably take five minutes until we can see it – the last thing we have to do is to change the timeline.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [No.]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: And we don't have to do this now, and this is easy. So, what I'm saying is essentially, we're looking at, are we removing these brackets, and are we removing “clearly,” yes or now? This is the only thing we need to resolve at the moment.

Open brackets, the elements that are within ICANN's scope was before ICANN's authoritative scope. So it is in yellow. I'm sorry, this is small.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. I have Zarko, and then Kerry Ann.

ZARKO KECIC: I'm off this topic, but I'm against putting any limits how deep you're going to go. We just have to watch our mouth what we are saying in scope, and just continue.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Zarko threw me off.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, that was Zarko's fault, it wasn't my fault.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [We had something before.] What were we talking about?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: "Authoritative," "clearly."

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Oh, no, the timeline. Timeline [inaudible]. Someone could clarify, probably staff, does the timeline need to be in the TOR, or can it be in our workplan? Because we haven't gotten a signoff from – I mean I don't know if our two years kick off from June or two years continued from last year. Then this one, do we need to put a timeline here given that we know we may adjust it as the workload continues? Or we put it in our workplan, understanding that the workplan is a document in

progress, so it gives us more flexibility to change it? Because I would want to suggest that probably, we delete timeline from the TOR, not from the workplan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, for now, I think we just put an “under revision” there, because the workplan – but ultimately, we’re going to have to tell the board when we’re going to be done.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Sorry, I don’t disagree with you, Russ, I just wondered if it’s better here or is it better in the workplan.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or a reference from here to the workplan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: A reference from here to the workplan is totally fine.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay, so probably state that then.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So the timeline is [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Alice, did you want to add to that?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes. So, we should include a high-level timeline in the terms of reference as a point of reference for the readers, but then the workplan is very detailed and goes into the level of depth that you need for planning out your work.

STEVE CONTE: Alright, I have KC, and then Eric, and then I'm asking you all to reevaluate your cards. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: [Do you mind going back to] try and resolve [inaudible] text?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: KC, please.

KC CLAFFY: Can you bring it up? So, I'm the one who wanted to remove this, and I'll just say again as an outsider coming into this, the parenthetical comment, even without the "authoritative," it makes it look like we're being defensive, that somebody has told us to stay in our swim lane,

and I frankly resent it because I haven't done anything wrong yet. So I want to take it out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: And it's certainly covered in the second instance of that, and I guess I'm fine with that. It still feels like we're being defensive, but I just don't want it twice. So I'm okay with the second one if...

STEVE CONTE: Laurin, I've got Eric. Do you need to respond right now, or can you be in the queue?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so Eric says I can go ahead. So, can we have a show of hands if we delete the brackets, (the elements that are within ICANN's scope)? Who is for doing that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Deleting it?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Deleting it. If you raise your hands, and more hands than no hands, I'll delete it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How about who's against it?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Who's against it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You don't care.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, okay, a majority. Therefore, it goes. Consensus.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Can I continue? So I still have Eric in queue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Eric is so nice to let me do the second one. We have the other discussion, which is that “are within ICANN’s scope and remit,” that’s what we currently have, there was a “clearly” there. Do we remove and delete the “clearly?” Could we have a show of hands on that one too?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I’d like to go before that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Going to Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I personally don’t care, but I vividly remember both of those being inserted and the punji sticks that were under our fingernails by various folks. And so taking out one’s totally cool. Taking out the other one could wind up coming back to us when someone says, “You’ve materially changed the scope,” because they’re there because they were strongly advocated for.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: By...

ERIC OSTERWEIL: People that are not in the room right now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The word “clearly.”

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just clearly that’s –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, the word “clearly.” I distinctly remember it. I personally don’t care, I just remember that this was a hard-fought compromise.

KC CLAFFY: Part of our charge is to decide what's in scope, right? I think the “clearly” is offensive. I'm sorry.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so let’s take it out. But one thing that might happen is we might get –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] KC’s fault.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, we're all in the same team. So, the second thing I was going to say was I think going back to the timeline, I really think we should stick a fork in this if we possibly can. And so I really think it's hard to do almost anything with the timeline right now, except punt it with a reference. And as much as I think that doesn't normally happen, I think that one, we could totally plead exigent circumstances, exceptional case, and just say –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right. So, I would say let's punt that. It's better than getting something wrong or being so vague that someone gets upset about it. Just say, "It'll be referenced in this other document." I really strongly –

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. If we don't remove the "clearly," we could add something along the lines of that the team considers after appropriate consideration – or whatever we want to call it – to be within scope." Could that be something that might work?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, that [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just yank it or don't yank it. That's [inaudible] It sounds like yank it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I just was reflecting on the past, not trying to advocate for the direction.

STEVE CONTE: Alright, I'm losing track of who's in queue, if anyone. KC and then Naveed. Is that all we have right now? Okay. KC.

KC CLAFFY: I'm going to assume that Laurin just said, "Okay, let's go to the next thing in that paragraph and resolve that."

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry, the "clearly" is unresolved at the moment, and that is the only thing that is not resolved.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I thought we're yanking the whole yellow thing.]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No. Just the "clearly."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The yellow thing [inaudible] sentence "clearly."

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. It's only about "clearly," not about that sentence. But I marked it all because that's the relevant bit.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What happened with the "however?" I think [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I know, but what I'm saying is I believe this sentence was....

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, there was "authoritative" [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm not talking about the – okay, I need to go look. I'm going to look at Russ'.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [inaudible] my edit when I moved that [inaudible] didn't make sense [inaudible] I brought it back.

STEVE CONTE: So, do you want to reflect what you were just about to say in the mic or no? No? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the old document [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: So, I don't believe we need to pause the recording, but I do suggest we go off mic at this moment. There's so much energy going on from the various people, it's going to be hard to track. Do you have something for the record, Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, so I'm going to call on Naveed, and then just for the record, we're going to off mic while they work these changes out. Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. I want them to settle down, actually, because –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Settle down.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Naveed wants to say something.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, I just wanted to say something about that, and I want everybody to listen to that maybe. Yeah, it's actually about this "clearly" word. It came yesterday as well. So, "clearly," as I understood, even I said this yesterday, means that there are some boundaries and you don't want to touch those boundaries unless we know what are those boundaries, and it means there are some edges that are vague that maybe means we are stepping into somebody else's space. We don't want to go to that.

"Clearly" means whatever is defined explicitly, clearly, very clearly. We're just considering that, and if something goes beyond that, we are not touching that. If we're clear about it, then we can include this "clearly." Otherwise, there's no point of having this word.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. I have Eric and Kerry Ann.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I think "clearly" is a very bad word for us to have there. I don't think it's appropriate, I think it causes more problems than it solves, because among other things, it's very hard to know what's clear about any of these things at all, whether you're talking technically about the systems or politically about the purview or anything. So "clearly" was a bad thing. So I'm happy to see it go. I hope we never say the word ever again, "clearly." I don't ever want to hear that word again.

So yeah, so Naveed, I think – let's just be careful we don't accidentally wind up doing an impedance mismatch and wind up trying to justify the thing we didn't want to justify so we know when not to use it or something like that. So yeah, I think if we strike it, maybe that's good.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann, and Scott. Okay, Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Sorry, this is just a word for future drafting. The fact that we're actually going to be just quoting the bylaws, our mandate is coming from the bylaws. So once we put "That are within ICANN's scope and remit," I don't think we want to put "ICANN's scope or remit," but "clearly" doesn't really matter.

But I'm just thinking that – just a note for future drafting that when we do draft, when it comes down to the bylaws, we don't have to explain

too much. I think we had tried before to overexplain, and I think going forward, that won't be our intent. Our intent would just be to be clear.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: What are we doing with the “clearly?”

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's gone. The “clearly” is gone.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: 100% gone. Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is the whole team. Take “clearly” out. Okay. Timeline, I hate to say it, but just to finish it up, timeline, can we put a forward reference to another document? Can we do that, Russ?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Russ is telling us not to. And I'm trying to see if we can get it to...

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So maybe like ask for forgiveness instead of permission?

STEVE CONTE: Norm. I'm sorry, guys, I know we're on the home stretch here, but we are still [inaudible]. Let's try to stay as a review team. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Part of the timeline' still relevant because it's the past. So it's actually a record of a past event, so we shouldn't delete the whole thing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But this whole document's changing, so it's not like the document's like archival or has revision attached to it. Right? I mean we're changing the scope right now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Wait, I'm sorry, are you saying we should keep the timeline as is because it represents where we've been?

NORM RITCHIE: I don't think we should just blankly say "delete it" or – there are elements in there that are past events, and they occurred at a certain time, so it's actually a record of what's happened now.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Fair point. How about in the document that we refer to, we have a whole timeline in there that includes past, present and prospective future? And that way, it actually is a timeline document.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alice –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was under the impression we had to –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] what we should do is put a snapshot of where we're going here, and that the workplan then does the whole – spell it out. So, what I proposed yesterday was that we are finishing the workplan before Barcelona and engaging with the community in Barcelona, and then having a first document Kobe, and then start the public comment, and then update before – is it Marrakesh?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Marrakech, that's right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Barcelona, Kobe, Marrakesh.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, if that's what we want to say here, it's foreboding.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann had her hand up.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I defer to the chair's suggestion, but in terms of the concern that Norm had, staff, can you confirm? Would we be putting on this document "As updated X date?"

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I hope so.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So I think once we put "As updated as of X date," the timeline issue will be a non-issue, it's being kept as it was when it was originally approved, because [inaudible] the pause wouldn't be accounted for in it. So unless we're going to say there was a pause somewhere, keeping the timeline as it was when it was approved is – because we've already put "Updated as of today's date" or whatever the date is, it would kind of fix the issue you have, because anyone who wants [inaudible] documents will go to

the originally approved one with the timeline. Because right now, because of the pause, we're on a completely new timeline.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's exactly my point.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So I just want to kind of clarify that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Totally agree.

STEVE CONTE: Any other comments on this? Russ or Phil, I pass it back to you, one of you guys.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, we're supposed to end in 20 minutes. I think we can finish the timeline words in those – I mean, you could start typing now from what I said, I hope. Is there anything useful we can get done in those 20 minutes, or should we wrap now?

STEVE CONTE: Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just to go back to Naveed's point earlier, maybe we can agree as to what the next steps are in resolving what will be accomplished in Barcelona. So either we say that the chairs – like make a decision here that the chairs will talk about it and then circulate points for the rest of the review team to consider, but I think our methodology as to how we'll resolve the things we want to accomplish in the next couple of weeks, and at the face-to-face, we should decide – if we don't decide what it is, we should decide how we go forward. [inaudible] the chairs –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let me just share my plan with that, because in doing the workplan, I think that will become obvious, and the communications plan. And so those are the two things that the group will tackle on the phone calls next.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So the agenda will speak to it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

STEVE CONTE: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's awesome. And one last thing is, maybe I just missed it, but when do we anticipate coming to closure on the Doodle poll? Which I know not everyone's necessarily completed yet, but that'd be good to know before we leave as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think everyone said they could fill it out in 12 hours, except of course the people who aren't here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I see.

DENISE MICHEL: So yeah, I'd suggest that we clarify on the list that people have 12 hours to complete the Doodle poll, and then within 24 hours, I suggest that the leadership confer with staff and issue the reoccurring calendar invites to hold that time on everyone's calendar. Does that sound like a good plan?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: That seems fine. I forgot who sent the Doodle. Did she send it?

JENNIFER BRYCE: It came from the MSSSI secretariat, Brenda sent it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if there could be a follow-up to that that says, "Please fill this out in the next – now 11 hours so that we can pick the time for next week's call."

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just one thing. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Note, I will send around the timeline afterward, and...

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I just want confirmation from staff, are we going to start the travel plans right away for Barcelona? I mentioned this earlier, we might need some time. So, when are we starting these travel plans for Barcelona?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We will have to get back to you on exact dates when SO/ACs make the final decision on the meetings that we are putting into the system, the [records] for the meetings that we are putting into the system. So allow us to take that as an action item and get back to you with some approximate dates. We don't want to wait, obviously, until too late before ICANN 63 to make arrangements, but I'm hoping we can have some tentative dates and answers sooner than that.

STEVE CONTE: Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I'm just going to real quickly – just for [operations,] can we ask to have just a touchpoint on that on the next call? Even if it's sort of like, "Here's why we need more time" or something. To Naveed's point, the sooner the better, because a lot of us are really juggling stuff. I know you – I appreciate how much effort it must be, so just a rapid update if it's going to take a while, if you don't mind, that'd be awesome.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That sounds great. We can definitely put it on the agenda to follow up on at the plenary call.

DENISE MICHEL: In the interest of saving a lot of money for our budget and also locking in a time on volunteers' very busy schedules, I'll just offer a suggestion for people to think about, and we don't need to discuss it now. We could reserve a conference room in a connected hotel as a backup. So just in case something goes wrong with the meeting schedule, we'll still have space to meet and have a backup, and based on that, we can move forward quickly with planning our schedules and making travel arrangements. So, something to think about, and I'm happy to reserve the conference rooms myself as a backup so we can move forward with our plans regardless of all the machinations that occur around an ICANN schedule. Thanks.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks. Phil, any last reflections, tearful goodbyes or anything like that?

PHIL KHOURY: No, look, I don't have a great deal to say. Thank you for a really fascinating period of time. It's been good. I enjoyed it. I hope that for all the exhaustion, that you come away from this feeling like you've got some better basis on which to get this thing done.

I suppose a couple of things, just for what they're worth. There are many things that will slow this team down. It's hard to make this particular machine go fast. It's good at lots of things, but going fast is probably not one of them. And given the pressure that you have to do a lot, I'd encourage you to self-govern on the time that you spend on stuff

and the deciding how to decide piece when you're coming up to something.

So, some triaging around how to resolve on some things would be really useful. And calling each other on when you're going down the same alley that you've been down before. Some self-governing can make a huge difference in this, because it's a crappy job – sorry, Russ, now that you're locked in being the chair and trying to juggle everything and manage conversations and what people are doing and everything else.

So, in a group like this, having each other have permission to say, “We’re wasting time here,” or, “Can we [inaudible] someone else?” Or whatever else contribution you might want to make about things.

And then the other one I was just going to say as an observer is at some point, real soon, I guess it's probably Barcelona or once you're really getting back into the work or whatever, you're really going to put the whole pause thing behind you. That just sucks energy out of the room when you're kind of looking back at and trying to sort why it happened and why it didn't happen.

I appreciate you've got to do that now, that's sort of part of the game, but you can really feel when you step back and observe that there's some stuff that you guys get into that just goes [inaudible] and the whole room slows down. And at some point, [inaudible] got to forgive your [parents and relatives,] forgive the board, whatever it is you have to do to move on. I encourage you to do that.

But other than that, that's me. Thank you very much. I really enjoyed it.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks. So, Russ, any last words from you? Otherwise, I'll turn over to Alice and Jennifer for housekeeping.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thanks for the confidence you've put in me, and let's get the job done.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

STEVE CONTE: So, it doesn't need to be [inaudible] so let's go ahead and finish off this, and then [inaudible]. But Denise, please, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I just wanted to, again, thank Phil for his facilitation and helping us restart and put some of the difficult past experiences behind us. I appreciate the foundation that you've helped us lay to be a successful team moving forward. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi. So, I wanted to confirm one thing. [I saw that] we've followed up with IT, so those of you who were having problems with the Wiki should look out for an e-mail that will be inviting you to sign up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible] I'm glad I mentioned that then. In general, do not ignore e-mails from us. So, Alice and I, as you have noticed, have been taking notes. We've got some action items and decisions. They're in a little bit of a messy state at the moment, so I would suggest that we send those around to you all via e-mail and then I would ask that you please take a look at them, confirm any edits that you have to those, and we'll put a deadline on there and ask you to get back to us by a certain date. If not, we'll assume that you're in agreement.

I do not have anything else further to add other than thank you for your time, and I'm looking forward to seeing you all again soon. I think with that, we can – does any other staff have any other comments? Okay, great. I think with that, we can close.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you all. And Brenda, you can stop the recording or close the room or whatever it is that you do to make us happy. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]