ERIC OSTERWEIL: All right, I feel like sort of doing a John Oliver introduction. I don't know if anybody watches John Oliver, but I feel like screaming, "Welcome, welcome, welcome."

So welcome back, everybody, and welcome to all of our new members. It's been a while, but I think that a lot of us feel like it's really good to get things back on track.

So I think a lot's changed and like I said, there's some new members so I think the first thing on the agenda is the right thing. I think we should do a round of introduction, re-introduction.

So I'm happy to kick it off first and I guess I'm not sure whether I'll just sort of let people do the sort of contention-based access to meeting for the next round of introductions.

But I'm Eric Osterweil. I'm one of the two legacy co-chairs right now. I have changed my affiliation. I'm no longer at Verisign. I'm now on faculty at [inaudible] University, so that should be news to some folks. And yeah, I'm looking forward to getting back to it with everybody. So how about Denise, do you want to go next?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. This is Denise Michel. I'm also a legacy co-chair. Eric and Emily Taylor [inaudible] lead the team and I. We were the only volunteers for co-chairs at the beginning. Let me see... I run the DNS Strategy and Management Team for the Facebook and its family of companies. I'm based in California and have a long history in the Internet, DNS, and

ICANN space. And I'm looking forward to getting back underway and bringing this paused review to a successful conclusion. And I really look forward to getting to know the new members and working with all of you. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so I can certainly sort of tap people to go, but does anyone want to jump up and go first before I start selecting folks? Thank you, [staff], for putting up.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So my name is Kaveh Ranjbar. I work for RIPE NCC and I'm RSSAC liaison to the board, so from the root server [appraiser] side. And also, I'm the ICANN Board delegate to the SSR2 Team. I think that's my [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Kaveh.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, this is Kerry-Ann from the Organization of American States. I'm GAC-nominated. I really miss talking to you guys and happy that we're started back, and hopefully we can get some progress done quickly this time. Have a good one. Nice meeting everyone.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Kerry-Ann.

EN

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Hey, this is Scott McCormick. I'm one of the new members from the GNSO from BC. I ran a consulting firm for the last few years. I'm actually in process, like you Eric. I'm in the process of changing jobs so I will be sticking in the private sector, but coming from a long breadth of both public and private sector cybersecurity.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thanks a lot.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi, this is Russ Housley. I'm one of the new members from SSAC. I'm past chair of the Internet Architecture board and past chair of the IETF.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Russ.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Hi.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Go ahead.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes. This is Matogoro. I'm working with the University of Dodoma and representing Iraq in this Review Team. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, Mr. Matogoro.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, my name is Laurin. It says Europe here. I'm in the process of moving to the United States. I do research mainly on cyber crime and IT security issues and I'm looking to working with you all. That's it, I think. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you very much.

NOORUL AMEEN: Hello.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We're having a lot of trouble hearing you. It's very, very faint.

NOORUL AMEEN: Hello.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think I hear maybe that you're speaking, but I can't hear anything, what you're saying.

NOORUL AMEEN:	Okay, this is Noorul Ameen. I am from CERT, India. I am working at the time [inaudible] and basically, I look after [inaudible] operation. Okay, thank you.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Thank you very much.
RAO NAVEED RIN RAIS:	Hi, everyone. This is Naveed. I'm one of the new members representing GNSO. I'm excited to be part of this team. I'm looking forward to work with you all. Thank you.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Thanks, Naveed. Welcome.
KC CLAFFY:	This is KC Claffy from UC San Diego. I lead a research group [inaudible] research on the variety of things and also does collection and sharing of the Internet data tools analysis, and I'm a new member from SSAC.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Thanks a lot, KC. Welcome. We're winding down on folks, so I have to start tapping people. How about Alain? Do you want to introduce yourself please?
ALAIN AINA:	Yes, can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, this is Alain Aina. I'm representing from Africa, appointed by ccNSO. I'm still working for [inaudible] but working for the Central and West Africa Research and Education Network and AfriNIC SSAC.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, Alain. How about Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: Hi, I'm Zarko Kecic. I'm working with Serbian TLD registry, CTR, and acting CEO for next two or three weeks, hopefully. I like to welcome all new members and I hope we'll do a good job in next round. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Zarko. How about Norm? Did we lose Norm?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He's saying his mic is not.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. All right, well, maybe later on. I think that's everybody. Am I right? Have I missed anyone? Obviously, we have to introduce Phil, but before we get to Phil, are there any other team members that I missed?

Okay, cool. Everyone who's coming aboard is aboard. All right, so well, yeah. I guess this is our official re-launching party. So we shall be super-excited. So welcome to everybody both past and new team members, and I think before we sort of do kind of a summary or a synopsis of where we got to and what our thinking has been up to this point, I'd like to introduce Phil and let Phil then sort of introduce himself in more detail.

PHIL KHOURY: Sure. Can I just check and see that I'm coming across?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. We can hear you.

PHIL KHOURY: Great. Terrific. Look, I just wanted to very quickly say hello. At this point in the process, I've really only been doing some background reading following through from the shared area, some of the background documents and so on. The next thing that's on my list is to get your individual e-mail addresses and make contact with people so that I can have a one-to-one with everyone on the Review Team, which I'm really looking forward to, to get a better sense of where people are coming from and what they'd like to achieve over the next few weeks. But otherwise, that was all. I really wanted to say hello and listen in for a little bit and hear some voices.

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: All right, cool. Welcome. Thank you very much for that and welcome. And so with that, I think now would be a good time to sort of just catch up on where we got to last time. So I guess we didn't do any agenda bashing, but it seemed like introductions was going to be a no-brainer.

So before we jump into kind of a summary of where we got to, does anybody have any agenda bashing they'd like to do, anything that they'd like to point out before we get started?

Was that cross-chatter or was someone trying to say something? Okay. All right, cool.

I'm sorry. Did someone say something?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If we could have everyone put their phone on mute if they're not speaking, that might be helpful.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, if that's not someone trying to say something, but then maybe if someone could mute their mic, that would be very helpful.

All right, so it's funny because it sounded like it was one of those, "Last time, on episode whatever," so it's kind of funny for our re-launch call.

So previously, where we were with the team, just to refresh everyone's memory – and I'm open to people interjecting if I've got something askew or you want to make another point – was we had sort of considered the SSR space that we were going to review and we had

broken it into five subcategories. And we then sort of turned the subcategories into subteams and we were wrestling with the structure of the teams and whether to paralyze them, serialize them, etc.

But nevertheless, as my recollection hopefully doesn't fail me, what we had identified was there were sort of broad Internet-wide DNS SSR issues as one focus of examination. There was ICANN internal SSR considerations. That was another one. There was the IANA transition. That was another one. There were future issues, and finally, there was the SSR1 implementation status.

I believe that those were the five areas that we broke things out into. I think various teams had made a couple of the teams had made some significant progress, both in visits and write-ups and direction. I think we were getting ready to really sort of dive into a couple of the other ones that were not as far along.

But I think our perspective, as I recall as a team, was that these were the sort of general areas that we wanted to sort of subdivide the SSR space into for us to do some analysis. I'll pause there briefly to see if anybody has any comments, corrections, thoughts, or anything.

I see no hands up. I see there's notes in the chat room. I'm mobile so if I don't notice the chat room, please feel free to interject.

Okay, so that's totally fine but if anybody has any thoughts, even if they're just kind of proto form thoughts, please feel free to interject with them. But I would imagine that going forward, we will either try to revisit these as subsections subdividing the work or we'll need to sort of come up with a new approach.

So at the very least, I think that's probably something people ought to be thinking about now, what you think of that structure and if we need to sort of dig up from the archives or send a new e-mail that sort of outlines what those things were in more detail, we certainly can.

But in general, I'm hoping that we can use that as a starting point to at least start formulating questions like, "Are these the right areas? Do we want to change anything about those areas? Do we want to revisit some of the work that we had done already and see if we still feel like it was in the right direction or we want to pick up where we left off?"

Anybody have any thoughts on that?

DENISE MICHEL: I think it would be useful to review. Obviously, we'll need to re-discuss the scope and then from that, the work plan. Given the substantial time lost by the Review Team due to the pause, personally, I'm interested in exploring ways to pare down the work plan, reconsider what our priorities are, and perhaps refocus our work, identifying some clear deliverables and a work plan and schedule that will bring the Review Team's work to an appropriate but expeditious closure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, okay, that makes a lot of sense. Maybe what I can do is try and sort of hold the people in the call here. Denise, don't let me misrepresent what you just said, but part of what I think I heard you say is the discussion of scope and maybe that's actually a fair starting point to sort of get people's thoughts around on that to sort of re-open that

perspective. Is that something you think makes sense? Did I catch that as part of what you were saying?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I think part of what the SO and AC chairs asked us to do was to revisit our scope, reconfirm among our current membership that there's agreement on the scope, make sure that we have general consensus on it and then from there, update as needed the work plan.

To put a final point on it, a long time ago when the Review Team started, there was a lot of brainstorming big wish list issues that team members wanted to delve into that were captured as part of the work plan.

Personally, I'd like to revisit that list once we've, again, put the scope to bed and have a discussion about priorities and objectives and how our list of items that we're going to be addressing fits into a reasonable work plan. I'm concerned that, at this point, given how long the Review Team has been in existence and due to the pause, whether we have enough time to address all of the matters that were in the original list, or perhaps, I'm the only one feeling some pressure to, perhaps, narrow in on a smaller number of issues to complete a first draft of the report.

I think one of the challenges in particular, this Review Team has is a fairly broad mandate or a mandate that is discussed at fairly high levels in the bylaws so it leaves a lot to the Review Team itself to define where within this very broad remit we want to focus our effort.

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think that all makes a lot of sense. So I think there was a number of sort of important points there that I just want to sort of underscore with background for. So just to refresh people's memory and for the new people that weren't with us at the time, the way that we sort of came to [parody] on our scope was a number of brainstorming activities and I think probably it was the one that I think was probably the most formative was when we met in Madrid. Yeah, in Madrid.

And we basically, we broke out all the things that we thought were relevant and we sort of made them on stickies and we put them in buckets and we shuffled them around and we spent, I think it was a couple days. At the very least, we spent most of one day doing exactly that to actually identify what our scope was, what it would be and how we break it down. And that's where we actually got this subteam idea from.

So on the one hand, there was a lot of time and energy and effort was put into doing that. On the other hand, it doesn't have to mean that we have to do it that way. So certainly, reopening scope is an issue, is I think, critical to do. I just think that we should be cognizant of the fact that the last time we did it, it was a very intense operation. It took a lot of getting on the same page with each other. And so I think we should just be aware of the fact that it likely won't come easy to do it.

So we should all spend a lot of time thinking carefully about what we think the scope issues are and then I think you're right. I think we should have that conversation first because a number of the things that came out of that were after we, as a then-team, had thought about things we put on our stickies because we decided that we thought they

were important and then we found out how much [inaudible] there was.

Now the current team needs to basically take the same challenge on. If we follow even roughly the same methodology, I see Mr. Matogoro says that in the chat room that he thinks we should review the methodology. I think that's fair too. But just to sort of recap how we got here, that methodology was everybody's voice matters, everybody's perspective matters, and then we put them in a bucket and we see where the team sort of Venn diagram lines up and where we have the heaviest intersections. And those became the issues of our scope.

So all that being said, I think probably what we need to do, and I don't know if we do it on this call or the next one, is start very focused discussions on scope because you're right, Denise. I recall very clearly that that was an issue that I think in the surveys and from the leadership, came back that we needed to readdress what is our scope.

So I'd love to hear if anyone has any thoughts on that. I don't know if we're going to adjudicate the scope issue here, but definitely this is a great time for people to sort of voice their perspective if you have any. Would love to hear from you all.

I'm watching for hands. I'm waiting for a [inaudible]. Nobody?

Oh, then that'll make the scope discussion real easy.

DENISE MICHEL: It'll be fast.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that was easy. It was way easier than I thought it would be. No, I'm just kidding.

All right, so great. We have a handful of other things on the agenda to talk about. Denise, do you think we need to do any more sort of "where we come from" discussions now?

DENISE MICHEL: I'd like to hear from the rest of the team members what they would find useful in this first discussion.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I see a hand in the chat room. Laurin, please go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, thank you very much. As one of the people who are joining freshly, I do think that considering that there are problems with deadlines and so on, I think it would have been nice particularly for those joining freshly who may be on our first face-to-face kind of recap at least of those things, not necessarily going to two days of kind of rehashing everything.

But essentially, kind of seeing how this is what's done, this is what's been there, maybe have a quick discussion, not to go overly crazy but to essentially maybe also, as you mentioned, kind of re-accommodate stuff that might have changed slightly over time.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Absolutely. I'm happy to sort of go into more detail on that right now, but before jumping into that, anybody have any comments or thoughts?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, Eric. I was just wondering, just a follow-up to that one. I think it would be useful, I think this call is just an intro call. I think if we go into too much depth at this stage, it wouldn't give us any justice, especially for the new members. It wouldn't be very structured, so I think if everybody agrees, it's either probably our next working meeting that's designed for us to actually do that overview properly because I think even we would need to staff's assistance to ensure that we have the most current information as the status of each of the subgroups and where each subgroup had actually gotten.

I think with [inaudible] not being here and probably as he is reviewing the documents as well, having his input as to whether or not the scope will meet the requirements of the SSC chairs and the board [inaudible] that we don't get stuck again would be very, very relevant.

But I think to have a scope discussion now and to go into depth with each of them would do an injustice to the new members so they wouldn't have a full picture, just us giving a quick rundown. So I would probably suggest that maybe we put that as an agenda item for even a working group call, if not during a face-to-face, but at least a meeting dedicated to giving an overview on those topics, I think would be a better fit.

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. That's good suggestion. All right, Naveed?

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: It seems that we are talking about the same thing, but I just want the Review Team to do every possible thing to bring everyone on the same page because as one of the new members, before our face-to-face meetings, I would like to have some kind of homework, like documents to read, like previous meeting minutes, the timeline and everything, so that once we arrive there and we can discuss that once we discuss the face-to-face meeting, but once we arrive there, before we start our work, we should have the confidence that everybody is almost at the same page, that way we can contribute in a better way.

I don't want us to have the same excuse again and again, "Okay, this was done previously, we have no idea," or something like that. Do you see what I mean? Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Yeah, that's great. So just to make sure, I captured that for any minute takers. So coming up with some kind of a digest of what sort of salient reading points would be before our face-to-face, like you said, homework, and maybe even some discussions ahead of time to sort of prep us so that we don't get stuck in "this is how we did things" and certainly, we don't get stuck into "this is how we did things and we don't even know why anymore". Does that sound like a reasonable summary of some of the things you were just saying?

EN

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. And Rao means, I think people may have started to recently see the mailing list lighting back up, so don't forget we have that as a very useful mechanism as well for between calls. Okay, thanks, Naveed.

Phil, go ahead, please.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, so I just wanted to sort of throw in that I'm scribbling away as I'm listening and anything that people want to sort of nominate that I pick up on in my one-to-one calls with everyone would be helpful, so happy to pick up action items from this group in terms of collating people's wish list perspectives. Anything like that, that I can do to assist with the prioritizing, let me know.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great. Thank you.

Okay, any other thoughts? I think those are all really good feedback points, and Kerry-Ann, your point is well-taken that maybe now is not the time to get too down in the weeds as we're sort of just lighting the pilot light back up again. So I think we should probably put that down as one of the earlier agenda items for one of the follow-on calls. Does that

seem like a reasonable approach to everyone else or does anybody have any thoughts about another approach aside from that?

No new hands. Okay. Great.

So I see in the chat room, there's additional asks for putting a reading pack together. So I think Denise and I will probably take an action to sort of do a starting point for that and then we'll start doing it more broadly, make sure we've got everything that people think and then we'll get that formalized and sent out ASAP.

Okay, so I think maybe the next step is moving on to the administration section and staff would like to update us on new tools.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So Eric, can I ask a question before you move on?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just in terms of the new folks getting up to speed, I only got today, the access to the wiki. So obviously, there's some reading to do. Terms of Reference kind of is a foundational document. Is there any other foundational documents like that, that I should start with in terms of coming up to speed?

EN

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So off the top of my head – I'm certain I'll get something slightly askew – the Terms of Reference is probably the most fundamentally important document representing where we got to and where the team sort of collective thinking was. I think there were a number of comments about things like the scope is outlined in the Terms of Reference. So if there was only one starting point, that would probably be it.

The subteams also did a bunch of other work and had a number of artifacts that they produced that I don't remember off the top of my head where they are, what state they're in. I think that's part of what we'll have to put together in the reading pack, so what you'll find in the Terms of Reference will probably be less about where we got to and more about where we were intending to head. So that's a good starting point, but we'll have to augment it with other things. Does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Any thoughts, or questions, or comments?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Sorry, it's me again. Sorry for being so talkative today. But I don't know. This [inaudible] to fill in for the two co-chairs to consider. I don't know if anyone else on the team is the position I am. I just wanted to kind of understand based on the question just now that we do have a Terms of Reference.

What does Phil probably envision his role being as we reactivate? Because I think [a bit] of this call is now and some of the e-mails that the chair and co-chair will continue to operate in that role and function in terms of driving the team forward and getting what we need to get done based on the Terms of Reference that was there, whether or not we review it.

I just wanted to see if that still would go alongside you. Is it that things would be amended based on the individual calls that are yet to happen? Because based on his recommendations, I figure that the scope will be affected or the terms might be affected, so I just wanted to kind of understand as we push forward to continue working and his activities are sublining this, when does the two converge? And how some of the members understand what the terms of operations will be based on that.

I don't know if I'm clear, but I just wanted to kind of understand that so we know what we're kickstarting from and what we need to accomplish. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that was a really good question. I don't know. Phil, do you feel comfortable assessing that?

PHIL KHOURY: Look. This is probably not going to give anyone great heart, but I would like to have a sort of side conversation with the chairs and co-chairs. It seems to me that we need something for these calls in writing, an

agenda, a sort of proposition for people to respond to. It's pretty hard to steer from where we are now. So I'm kind of available to have those conversations and maybe we can get a second, the next call, set up around some initial documents. It's going to take a while to get face-to-face with everyone done so I'd hate for that to be slowing down on our progress.

So maybe I could do a little bit of work with chair and co-chair offline to come back to you with something in writing to help guide the next call.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, that sounds great. I see Zarko and Denise in the queue. I don't know. Zarko, do you mind if Denise jumps? Because I suspect since we were just talking about her, that she has something to say with that.

ZARKO KECIC: No, Denise, go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. Denise? I think you're on mute.

Okay, Zarko. Why don't you go ahead? Because I think Denise might be having connection troubles.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, okay. I would like to point something out. We had discussions after the closing with chairs, Supporting Organization, and Advisory Committees, or some talks to the board about issues and what is

expected from us. And I believe they pointed out the scope. I believe the depth of scope and we discussed that in our face-to-face meetings in Abu Dhabi as well.

And as Kerry-Ann pointed out, we need to know what has been changed since pause because it was more than 18 months ago, and okay, I remember what we were doing but what is expected from us and how fast we have to do the rest of our work.

So I believe that we should use ICANN meeting in Panama and try to arrange a meeting with chairs, boards, verify many things that left open and are still not clarified for me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Well, so I think the question of the Panama meeting looks like we're sort of wrestling with and I think a few of us are trying to get together while there, so yeah, we'll see what we can do about formalizing anything there but at the very least, we should all definitely look for each other, shake hands. We're on the same team, so regardless of sanctioned or not sanctioned, I think absolutely. I think the face time is critical.

Denise, are you good?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: And apologies for that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry, just real quick before, I'm about to have to disconnect. I have to run, so Denise, can I also hand the meeting over to you at this point?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry about that. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. To follow-up on a few points, I agree with Zarko and I think it would be useful to use our e-mail list to make sure that we surface issues for which we need clarification and follow-up, either with the SO/AC chairs or with the staff. And I think it's important to acknowledge that what the Security Review Team has gone through is unprecedented. And there is no sort of road map for this and how to do it, both how to pause a Review Team and how to unpause a Review Team.

So in the spirit of acknowledging that we're all sort of feeling our way and trying to figure out the best path forward, I would really encourage

team members to surface on the list, questions and suggestions they have on how to move forward as a team in the best way possible. And I noted a number of questions and issues that have been raised and the facilitator, which we've never had before, and there's some questions around the role and objectives and methodologies of that. And we should certainly address that as a team and with Phil as well as we move forward.

So I would really encourage all team members to be a part of this inquiry and this restarting effort since Eric and I were co-chairs before the pause, we're jumping in and helping to get things started.

But members should in no way think that your sort of responsibility as a working Review Team member is in any way supplanted by us facilitating calls and facilitating restarting work. I hope that every team member has a strong sense of ownership and commitment in tackling these issues along with us.

I see Negar has a hand up.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:　　　　Thank you, Denise. I just wanted to address the comment that Zarko had made about meeting with the board in Panama. We can certainly try to schedule something, however, knowing how close we are to the meeting date, it might be very difficult to get on their calendar. But I wanted to highlight that if not possible in Panama, we can certainly schedule a telephonic meeting at a time that is suitable to everyone's schedules and availability. So I just wanted to put that option out there.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Negar. Are there other comments? I don't see any other hand up, but please feel free to just raise your voice if you have additional things to contribute.

Under administration, I think I would call people's attention to I think a number of issues that were raised by Matogoro soon after the unpause. I think it would be useful to address several of those as a team and I'll pull that out and recirculate it on the list for any of you who have missed it. I think there's been a question of both the basic things like ensuring that we have staff support for taking and distributing notes from our calls to larger issues of our interactions with the SO and AC chairs and our official unpause and how we move forward.

Again, I think it would be very useful for people to make use of the team's e-mail list and make sure that we surface these issues and start to address them in a more organized way. Other thoughts or comments on this issue?

If not, we'll move on to, I believe staff had some contributions to make in terms of tools under administrative items.

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, thank you, Denise. I hope you can hear me okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you. So let me start by saying that the Support Team is looking forward to working with you again. I wanted to highlight some of the improvements that we have made to the tools and resources available to Review Team and these enhanced tools and resources have been used in the RDS WHOIS2 Review Project and have proven most effective.

So let's take notetaking as an example. I've seen it brought up on the list earlier today and on a chat here on this call.

So we will take notes of the decisions reached and action items in the Adobe Connect [inaudible]. But we would also seek the Review Team's confirmation and consensus on the items listed prior to closing the call, so we all leave the call with a clear understanding of what the highlights are and then we will produce a meeting report that includes the high level notes of the meeting that will be published to the list within 24 hours of the call.

In addition, we will also be creating a page where all the briefing requests and associated materials will be posted for either reference, leadership action items and call recordings, as well as materials, will be posted on the wiki. And we also have a much more comprehensive [inaudible] available for Terms of Reference as well as the work plan.

And for the work plan, we plan to update it on a monthly basis and edits will be highlighted for the leadership to approve. In terms of templates, we do have the structures for subgroup reports as you will have

subgroups, a structure for the draft report, as well as planning [efforts], generally speaking.

Another enhancement we've made that I'd like to bring up is mentioned in the RDS WHOIS2 successfully as well. It was that we selected a partner from the leadership group to help develop the fact sheets with ICANN Org on a monthly basis. This helped create a corporate environment where there's clarity around where the data is coming from and also how it is captured on the fact sheet.

And then before we move on to the next topic, I would love to call your attention to the e-mail Negar sent yesterday – or is it today? I don't remember – given the recent developments pertaining to GDPR and in compliance with ICANN Organization policies, we've updated the onboarding questionnaire. So all Review Team members will be asked to complete it, and the questionnaire also includes a question pertaining to your statement of interest, whether it is still up to date, needs updating, needs to be resubmitted, and so on.

So with that, thank you again for your dedication to this project. The [team] and I are really looking forward to working with you all and we can be reached at the usual e-mail address which I will post in chat shortly. And I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Alice. Any questions at this point for Alice or other staff?

Okay. So what are people's thoughts on the utility of conference calls, the frequency and the time slots for the call? This is not a particularly

good time for the few team members we have in Asia Pacific. We have quite a geographically distributed group so it's going to be difficult to find a good time for every single member, but what are people's thoughts on having a more structured schedule and agendas for calls?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, during the IANA transition, we had the same problem and we dealt with that by picking three times and rotating through them so that everybody took a turn being in pain.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Thank you, Russ, for that good suggestion. So previously, before the pause, we had two time slots and we rotated our calls between those two.

Why don't we tackle the frequency of calls? Do people feel like we can make progress on some of these issues via the e-mail list and have calls every week, every other week, with agreed-upon agendas in advance? What are people's thoughts on that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's hard to tell whether we need to do that before we know how active the subteams are going to be.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's a bit of a challenge because we don't, I think part of our unpausing efforts are to have another discussion, well first, get the new

members up to speed on the previous work, have a discussion about the scope, and then the objectives and items we want to address, and then I think look at whether adjustments need to be made to our work plan, and then I think in concert with that, what's the best way to address our work items after having had that discussion and made those decisions?

It may be that we would stick with these subgroups. It may be that we would not have subgroups or we would have different subgroups. I wouldn't presume, but I think that's part of the issue. And Jennifer has posted the two times and the rotation previously.

Well, let's start small. When would people like to have another call? Next week, some of us will be in Panama but depending on the time, we may be able to join a call.

Or do people feel like they need some time to work through some of these issues and talk a week after next? I'll start a queue like Mr. Matogoro.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes, thank you, Denise. I already posted in the chart. I leave comment that we'll stick on the previous schedule. However, I remember in the previous schedule there are some of the time slots which had low attendance. Maybe we can find out if we can eliminate and reduce the [sequence] on the previous time schedule. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, Mr. Matogoro. Thank you for your comments. I referenced two time slots because one of the time slots, very, very few people actually showed up and so we ended up focusing just having calls on two time slots. And Jennifer, if you can update your post on the schedule.

Noorul, I see your hand is up.

NOORUL AMEEN: Yes, it is. I have one [concern] because since we have members on the board, we have to consider their opinions because they have [inaudible] places so we should take their –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Denise, I'm unable to hear him. I don't know if anyone else can.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm sorry, Noorul. The voice is quite faint and is also breaking up. I wonder if we can get the operator's assistance in boosting the volume. No? That's okay. I know the challenges of international calling.

NOORUL AMEEN: Can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's a little better.

EN

NOORUL AMEEN: So my point was that since there are a number of people on the board, so their opinions of [inaudible] should have been considered for scheduling the time [inaudible] because there are enough number of new members on the board.

DENISE MICHEL: I wonder, Noorul, if you could possibly put your comment in the chat room or follow it up on e-mail. I want to make sure that we all capture your contribution.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: I just heard him saying that since there are a [inaudible] RT, so it might be better to take their opinion to do [inaudible] whatever before texting the new schedule or using the same as we used last. He thinks that since there are many new members, it's better to take their opinion.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. All right, I also see a suggestion in chat of a call, a week after next.

Any other thoughts, comments on the next call? We can issue a doodle poll with various time slots to make sure that we capture the best time for new members as well as old?

Yeah, please go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, so probably a week after next, once you guys probably get to have a chat with Phil and we can start the proper agenda probably after you

guys go to [inaudible] each other in Panama. I think next week would probably be a bit too soon, but at least [inaudible] the following week, we have a bit more structure on the way forward. Based on those discussions will be useful at least. The next meeting would be very specific and could be [inaudible] extended meeting where we actually do what the new members have requested, to give them an update as each chair for the subteams, however their approach will be. I think a week after next will be more appropriate than next week while we put our, as [fast] as possible, how soon [orders] to kind of go forward.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Kerry-Ann. So that would be the week of July 3rd. I know that covers a holiday in the U.S. Is that a problem for board members, for team members, rather? We'll follow-up on that on the e-mail list and we'll do a Doodle poll so you can identify not only the best time, the time slots, but also the best days for team members.

I wanted to make sure before we lose our time – we've got five minutes left – to address the face-to-face meeting and a couple of other administrative items.

We asked members to just fill out a simple "here are my blackout dates over the next several months" to see if there is a sooner slot than three months for this team to get back together. So we have some initial results, but we're missing results from several members. Kaveh, KC, Norm, Kerry-Ann, Zarko, Ram, [Geoff], Noorul, and Alain. So we'll, I think, defer discussing that and ask that those members fill out those

simple questions of what your blackout dates are in June, July, August and your ability to potentially do a meeting in either D.C. or Brussels.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: For the information of the team, I informed staff. I haven't informed the team yet. Just so you guys know, good news. I'm expecting mid-July, which is why I haven't been able to provide blackout dates because I'm not sure when the baby will be here. I've already informed the SSR2 Team, the staff, so at least they know that I would be available to have meetings locally in August in D.C., but I wouldn't be able to travel between now and delivery.

So the staff is aware, but it was difficult to put the dates in the Doodle poll only because of that. I have no certainty right now. It doesn't affect me working. It just affects me traveling anywhere, so just so everyone is aware. Full disclosure.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Congratulations, Kerry-Ann, and thanks for sharing. Another reason why, if we can, it would be nice to have a meeting in D.C. if we're able to accommodate everyone's schedule.

I think I heard someone else speaking about meetings.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It was [CT]. I am so sorry. I really thought I answered the last mail on that, so I'll go back and look at my mail. Let's see if I can find it. But the

last [inaudible] answer was a Doodle poll so I missed some survey questions. Yeah, I'll follow-up. Sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. And again, it's just a suggestion so we can determine if we have an availability potentially among team members to get together sooner and also whether we might be able to get together in D.C. Any other comments on the face-to-face meeting? We look forward to discussing that further on the list.

And a couple of other just odds and ends. We also ask staff to build a more fulsome list of team members, including their location and their time zone and their e-mail address so it would be useful if that could add Russ to that and send it out directly, of course, off list, to team members. That would be useful.

And Jennifer, I see your hand is up.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi. Thanks, Denise. Yeah, just to that point actually, I wanted to let you know that as part of the new questionnaire that we're sending on that Alice mentioned – well actually, it's an old questionnaire but it's been updated slightly and we'll ask everybody to fill out – it does have time zone and location information in there, so once we have that information collated from all the Review Team members, that might help with scheduling a regular time slot. And obviously, we can help to collate that and help write a proposal to the Review Team.

Secondly, just a small administrative point, and I know we're kind of reaching the end of the call here, but for next time, if people could remember to just state their name before speaking on the call, it's really helpful for our notes.

And I just want to mention as well that one of the new tools that we have in place or processes is that at the end of the meeting, we'll wrap up. The decisions and action items, so Denise, just [agree] on the call, if you wouldn't mind just handing over and I'll just recap those to make sure that we're all on the same page and that I've captured everything. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Jennifer. Instead of waiting for another full survey, could you please just contact directly the new members, add their time zones, countries and e-mail address to the old spreadsheet so we have it updated in a more timely fashion and send it out? It's an important tool, not only for our organizational efforts, but also just to enable team members to contact each other directly.

Naveed, I see your hand is up.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: I just want to know if we have a consensus on the next face-to-face meeting because I don't see that being discussed here. So are we going to have a round of e-mail attendance to finalize the venue and the duration? For some of us, like me, since I'm a new member, it's very important for people like me to attend this meeting, but we also need

to have some time slots, as I mentioned in my e-mail, to go through the Visa processing, so it might not be as trivial as many others of us.

So I just want to record this thing, so to have enough time given to all members so they can easily participate. For me, the best time will be in August. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Naveed. Yes, and so we've asked some of the members to complete the quick little question we had about blackout dates and then we'll be discussing the next face-to-face meeting. There was also that in the next face-to-face meeting plan on the list. And thank you for the reminder about what's needed for your travel. I know Matogoro is in a similar position of needing more lead time and an official letter from ICANN.

Other discussions, issues to raise before we close out the call?

Seeing none. Okay, Jennifer or Alice, did you want to highlight action items?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, and for those in the Adobe Connect room, you'll see we've been taking the action items in the [part] on the right-hand side. So at the moment, we have five action items.

So Denise and Eric are going to draft a digest of reading materials before the face-to-face meeting and start [inaudible] the Review Team for feedback.

Phil will work with the coaches to prepare materials ahead of the meeting for Review Team members to respond to.

Staff to explore options for the Review Team to meet with SOs and ACs on the ICANN Board as needed in Panama or if we have remote meetings shortly after Panama.

Staff can work with coaches to circulate Doodle poll regarding the team's next meeting's suggested date, week of July 3rd, and staff to collect time zone and location information to support scheduling of next call and regular calls.

If there is anything that has been missed or captured inaccurately, please let us know and we can update. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I think it's premature to state that the team has agreed that staff should explore options for meeting with the SO/ACs and the ICANN Board in Panama, which is just a few days from now. Since we're out of time on the call, I'd like you to remove that action item and I'd like to have a more fulsome discussion about it on the e-mail list so we can make sure that everyone is clear about that item. I viewed that more as a suggestion and something for the team to discuss, but I really welcome other team members also weighing in on this.

And if you could reflect that the next Doodle poll you're circulating is for the team's next conference call meeting and that we have members who have not done so yet need to fill out the blackout dates for our next face-to-face meeting. And that the collated time zone, location,

and e-mail [address, phone] needs to be sent out directly to all the team members and staff, it would be useful.

Any other action items? We can always add to this or correct it on the e-mail list.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Hearing none, I'll bring the call to a close. Thank you so much, everyone, for participating. We look forward to continuing our discussions and addressing these issues on the e-mail list and look forward to talking with you, hopefully week after next. Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]