RECORDED VOICE:	This meeting is now being recorded.

DENISE MICHEL: [Inaudible] getting underway with the facilitator responsibilities. A number of questions have been raised in the chat, hopefully you can address those as well. In addition to that, we also have on the agenda locking in the face to face meeting and making sure we address any questions the new members have, the interim discussions, and please note in the email list that the Staff suggests the best call times for reoccurring calls. Generally, on these types of groups we lock in a call schedule in advance so people can block their calendars.

With that, Staff, do you have any apologies and administrative issues you'd like to raise before we jump into the substance?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi Denise, this is Yvette. Yes, we can go ahead and do a quick roll call and apologies, just so you know who's on the call. We have yourself, Ramkrisha, Kaveh, Russ, Norm, Rao, Laurin, Kerry-Ann, Scott and Boban currently. For apologies today we have Geoff, Alain and Mr. Matogoro; those are the only people I have apologies from. Currently, we do not have any observers in the observer room, just so you know.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thanks. Eric is on vacation, I think he's connectivity is not good either.

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.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Just a quick note, Boban just a second sent an email, he's having trouble joining the call but he is trying.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, did the passwords throw some people? Apparently, ICANN has just instituted a new security measure that we all learned about today. Are there any other additions or questions regarding the agenda? With that, I'll turn it over to Phil, who has set of slides to walk through as part of his discussion, those will also be sent off to the list.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Can everybody hear me alright?

DENISE MICHEL: Loud and clear.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, great, terrific. Thank you for that Denise and thank you for doing all that work in getting the agenda together and communicating everybody beforehand. The first thing I wanted to say was that the little presentation that I want to just walk through is just kind of steading the universe proposition, it's not completely polished or finalized, I've only just begun to run the structured interviews with people.

I have all of them scheduled but we're just into it part of the way. I've had conversations with Denise and Eric as the Co-Chairs from pre-pause

era. I'm sort of getting my act together, so I apologize if any of this seems a little flat footed. Given the emails and the discussions I've been having and the kind of suggestions and frustrations I'm hearing I thought it was worth just having a conversation about the way in which I think the team should sort of go forward in the next few weeks. At least so that we're all coming from the same place in terms of an understanding with that.

Now, completely happy to have a discussion, debate about that, take feedback, edit, make changes, as the team wants to do it but there's a lot of uncertainty I hear in conversations about what are we going to do next and when are we finally going to get back to work and issues like that. I just wanted to step through this happy this. Happy to discuss it. We don't have to resolve all of this right now but that's a sort of proposition for how the team should -- what the pathway forward should be from here, at least it's a mental model I'm working from.

If that's okay, I might ask for the next slide Yvette or whoever is driving it. This is just a few things that I have found in previous, not exactly the same but similar scenarios for getting teams or groups that have needed to reorganize themselves and sort of restart if you like. We have got new people coming onto the team, so as much as I appreciate people's anxiousness to get on and get the work done, when you've got a really diverse group like this, the only choice we have is sort work back up from the basics, even though that is frustrating for people who've been around far too long already and were keen to move on and get some things done. I think that's coming through in the emails, this is sort of mix of ideas but people are I think keen to get started again with a sort of better foundation then maybe we started with the first time.

The second thing that I found that works is just getting real clear about doing the right thing, what are we trying achieve, what's the scope, terms of reference, however you want to talk about it, that really comes first and from there you can work on doing it right. Focus first on the what is the right thing.

The third thing that teams or groups in this kind of scenario get into is, some understandable want to move on, either don't understand what the driver was about or the end of the spectrum, still feel bruised by the history. It's critical to make sure that we give whatever happened, that's something I still not entirely clear about, it has to be kind of acknowledged and dealt with, neither hollowing in it nor sweeping it under a carpet.

Rule four I have there, recognizing difference in a productive way. Understand that people come from different skill sets, different experience, different backgrounds, different cultures but the driver should be getting the job done. That's the primary driver, is getting the job done. My read at the moment is that there's probably a whole a lot of reasons why the pause occurred and whatever difficulties were experienced were experienced but from where we sit now, really the only thing that's going to properly restore where things are, is to get the actual job done. That, figuring out, reminding ourselves what that is, making sure it's up to date and everyone's agreed on it and using that to drive the other decisions is really only choice for us.

The final thing is that in volunteer, public purpose, values-based organization, values are a critical part of getting the job done. How you go about it is crucial to it all.

That's note intended to be a lecture for people but at least set out the thinking behind the proposition on the next slide. I might just go to that first and then draw a breath and leave some gaps for people to ask questions and so on.

Could I get the next slide please, Yvette? In terms of the sequencing of this, I know it's not necessarily the most important -- it's not the sort of priority of most important but there has to be a sequence that allows us to get back to building and creating some energy around the work of this review team.

The first question in my mind and again, happy to discuss, is the sort of where are we? We've got new people coming into the team, seasoned people who were here through the whole last 12 months or more of process, are saying to me, "I don't really know what happened. I don't know why Board did what it did or the Chairs did what they did or the team members did what they did." Kind of uncertainty around what the history is. There's some step we have to take to go through all that.

So, the tasks in that, that I've just set out are just -- it's what I'm doing. The first point is really just reviewing the material, doing interviews with people and from that, just doing a report back to the whole group. In that process, try and make sure that the concerns are addressed, issues are acknowledged but to distill down to some simple points. We'll get a chance to debate all of that. Denise and Eric and others have picked up on to get the induction of new team members complete, which we should talk about in terms of anything missing. There's been a digest of background materials provided, which got some good reviews I saw in the email.

I think an important piece we've got to sort is the uptake of the completed review work. I'm already hearing a range of views about what actually got completed in terms documented. I think that would be really useful, people will understand just how much has been done, so that's not thrown out. There's some differing views about what my job is in all of this and I think that needs to be sorted out. People have to be coming from the same mental model of how things are going to work and what I can add or not add. The swallow on from that forth dot point is, the requests of me, which again, I'm asking in the interviews with people.

There's also been some discussion in the email traffic around trying to sort out with Board or with the Chairs of SO AC what is it they expect of the team? What are the obligations to those bodies and so on? The view where you guys is, it's entirely in your hands how this goes forward. There will be very little by way of any kind of intelligent guidance to be got from anyone, either the Board of the Chairs of the SO/AC's really, they have now thrown it back to you, happy to debate this but my view is, it's really in our hands, your hands to sort what you're going to, how you're going to do it and tell people what you're doing and let them comment. I wouldn't be asking them any questions at this point. That's the first piece as to where are we.

Then we had to do some work on what are we aiming to achieve? I think there's different perspectives about that. A number of people have put to me that there's criticisms around the original terms of reference and the scope, that isn't completely agreed amongst people what's intended to be achieved and certainly not around how it should

EN

be achieved. Critical piece. Number of people have raised this. I think that's just a big chunk of early work that has to be done.

Do you mind Yvette going to the next slide and I'll come back to here, just so we step through it all? The third chunk of work that I think that needs to be done is the once we've cleared up the what's to achieved, what do we need to get their piece. There's disagreement, I'm hearing multiple views about the best way for the tasks to be completed. Frustration over people having the time to do it. Frustration over how long people have already put into this and how much more time will be required. Disagreements around leadership structures, leadership and structures I suppose. What's actually needed for the job? Question around protocol. Then the issue of external relationships and how they are dealt with.

The fourth piece is, how do we solve for those in the immediate term and that's around processes that this group uses to discuss those things through, arrive at as close of a consensus as you can and take it forward.

Yvette, can we go back one slide please? The purpose of this is and I apologize if it sounds like a lecture but really sort of thin out and start to separate out all the issues into some logical chunking. I'm happy to take some discussion, questions around these for people to pay the for me and discuss. Around where we are piece. My proposition is that that's the first thing that needs to be kind of agreed, to the extent that new members need to understand enough of a background to sort of get it. I think it's a big chunk of the first piece of what we're doing.

Now, I'm conscious that my interviews with people I think are essential piece of all of this, it's certainly one of the deliverables I've been asked to deliver and they're going to take till the end of next week to complete. Hopefully that process will end a short report returned to you, will sever the purpose of helping people get on the same page, in terms of where all of you are. So, I can I just ask the questions, comments, discussions around that?

Let's go to the dot point, the induction of new team members. We had a digest of background material provided by Denise and Eric, which looked like a great place to start. One of the questions raised in emails during the week is, what else do we need beyond that sort of document and recorded meetings? Has anyone had a chance to have a look at it? Any of the new members identify things beyond that that they would find helpful?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I've been going through it. Just started on the Wiki and on the recent email that we focused that. I'm coming up to speed.

PHIL KHOURY: Anyone else?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just quickly, I also kind of slow. I'm process of an international move, in about one and half weeks from now I should be done but currently it's a bit tricky to like do it quickly.

EN

PHIL KHOURY: Anyone else? Can I make a request for those people who are doing that, who have sort of come on to the team, as you go through it and see gaps, questions, all that kind of thing, that you're making notes on that and go back to Denise or Eric or Staff, whoever is appropriate with sort of questions or suggestions in terms of picking up on anything that's missing and all of that?

I would hope that the brief report back that I'm going to provide everyone will distill the grips and some points that people will have with how the process is run. Hopefully that will serve that purpose there. Can someone who has been around on the team for a while, just say something about the completed review work? What's the best way get a sense of the work that is done?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm not sure I completely understand your question.

PHIL KHOURY: The I'm a little concerned about is to get a handle on is on the 18 months or however long the team got to work, what got completed, what's halfway through that really needs to be sort of just picked up and run with? What are the things that didn't get progress? Is there some place where that's set out, documented, a slide deck, something we can use as a, "Well, this is where we got to."?

DENISE MICHEL: I think I have a high-level slide deck from late last year, I'll try and find that and put it up on the list. I think the different subgroups are at different points in their work. I think I noted the all the details of that work are only captured in various degrees on the Wiki.

I think one of the suggestions that has been raised was to take some time for the new people and do a few focused groupings on groups of work that have been progressed and I invited other team members to jump in on this too. I think by far the sub group one focused on a section, implementation of the first review and sub group two I believe focused on ICANN SSR related activities, were I think the most robust in terms of large sets of work. I'm less familiar with what two people did on IANA and a couple of the other sub groups.

PHIL KHOURY: Can I just flag, we don't have to resolve it tonight but I can just please flag that that's something we need to get ready for the face to face at the least, probably earlier but we certainly need to have some kind of common way of describing where we are up to on all of that. If the group needs to rethink -- go back to its terms of reference, be satisfied it's tackling the tasks in a right way and all that kind of thing, it really needs a way for the members of the group who were not intimately involved it, to understand what got done, how it was done, at what level it is and whether it's ready -- what's the priority for capturing that in the restart.

DENISE MICHEL: Kerry-Ann and Naveed have their hands raised, I'm not sure if you can see those.

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry, my apologies.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me?

PHIL KHOURY: Yup.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just to add to the discussion. Some of the other sub groups, for example the one that I chaired with [inaudible], a lot of the work that we did was identifying what are the areas we needed to examine, recognizing that a lot of our work was dependent on some of the conclusions of the other working groups. For example, we have documentation that [inaudible] our group would be the scope that we were working on finalizing and then meeting times became problematic for many of us and then we had gotten the freeze.

For future, having the best reference would be the scope that we had kind of carved out. Persons have commented, we were trying to get feedback from the other members on the scope because we were trying to decide what exactly is the future threat because it was going to feed into the recommendations of the final report.

I think overall, if it is based on how you described the steps going forward, it seems to be a dual process. We just have to decide if we're going to just continue [inaudible] pick up and continue but the first part of your presentation also made it seem as if we needed to clarify before continuing, so I just need clarity as to whether or not we are stopping, reviewing, clarifying scope before picking up where we left off?

Because maybe where we left off will be changed based on other clarifying where we need to go. I hope that by the time we get to the face to face there's clarity on that as to we wait on the interviews to be completed, then your recommendations, then we finalize a new scope or confirm the preexisting scope and then continue working.

PHIL KHOURY: Completely agree with that Kerry-Ann. My issue around the completed work is to make sure that we're not throwing out valuable stuff that's been done. If the group agrees -- I suspect there will be different answers for different pieces of the work and it will be really important piece of the whole decision making to kind of understand what was achieve.

My sense is from the discussions I've had so far is, not everybody was engaged in all the pieces of work or really understood quite what had been achieved or done. I don't want to prejudge the group's decision about the terms of reference or scope, changes that may or may not occur. I don't think we want to assume the answer at this point but either way, however you go forward, you don't want to lose the work

EN

that's been done if it's valuable and I suppose that's the question I'd like to pick up.

I certainly understand that people are -- some people feel they've done good work in this space, that the jobs half done and would be dismayed to think that that was just all going to go back to some kind of restart and that would be lost. I didn't mean to imply one solution or another. I completely accept what you're saying. Those decisions have to be made but I think gathering the information on the way is what I'm trying to do with all of that. Naveed, can I go to you please?

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Can you hear me, please?

PHIL KHOURY: Yes.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: I am one of the new members. The material has been just shared recently and seems to be quite a lot reading. I'm going through it and it might take some time. I was just wondering why we are going through all this, are we going to have at some point in near future an analysis of what actually we need to take forward and what we are leaving behind in terms of what was useful, what was done actually already and was not?

So that we can only take that forward and on the other hand there might be some policies that could impact the approach of the group

that it can take before the review team was formed. Are we going to think on these lines? This might be one of the agenda for face to face meeting, I'm not sure. I wanted to highlight what I was thinking on this line. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks, Naveed. That's exactly what I'm hoping to achieve in the steps leading up to the face to face, is that we've done that analysis and importantly shared it across the team, so the team has a common understanding of exactly that. What of value has been done that we don't want to lose and what the priorities are going forward once we've agreed if there are changes to the terms of reference and scope? I completely agree with that.

Anyone else for questions, discussion contribution around this sort of question of where we are?

I might just address the facilitator role dot point for a second. There's just in the email exchanges we've been having in the last week, there's different mental models of what job I've been asked to do. I just wanted to be clear, the job I've been asked to do is really to help the team to sort any remaining issues, make sure that the right thing is being done, so the terms of reference and scope, everyone satisfied they're the right things to be done. That there's agreed approach to the work and that the team has a shared understanding of all of that. If there are missing things in terms of support, expert advice, anything else, that that's clarified.

In terms of the work planned out for, there is the right sort of processes in place and leadership structures are correct for what the teams trying to achieve and that's it. I think Geoff, who I don't think it is on the call, talked about a much more far reaching roll, which I've not been asked to do. That's my best understanding of it.

I should also say, my philosophy around the last two dot points is the same. This is in our hands or your hands. If there is something you want different from what I'm proposing to do, speak up by all means. We'll do what we can to sort of meet those needs. I see that Boban has put in some comments prior to leaving. Which is a suggestion that Denise and Eric's … Please, go ahead.

BOBAN KRSIC: Thanks, unfortunately I have to leave but I put some comments on the chat so you can read it. I would like to thank you and wishing you also a good conference call. Thanks.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks, Boban. Questions or comments around the facilitator roll from anyone? Also, happy to do this offline. Okay. Can I just skipped to the second point in here, around what to achieve? This is the meat that people have been raising around this. There's dissatisfaction with the vagueness of the terms of reference, that people put. There's some experience about some of things that have worked and not worked so far on the review. It's been put to me as well that the eight months or so that the review's been on pause, that's a long time in intimate time

EN

and so there are probably changes that have occurred in that time that have to be taken into account.

There are quite different views about how the work is supposed to be done or should ideally be done in this review. I think those are really big issues that need to be resolved. I'm very skeptical about we'll be able to do that in a teleconference discussion. I think that's number one priority issue for the face to face meeting in terms of outcomes. I put that sort of proposition out there, happy to have debate about it or discussion but that's sort of what's been forming my thinking, is that those are pretty important, fundamental issues.

To achieve agreement on them, you really need to build that up in layers and I can't see that working on teleconferences. Times when we are only getting perhaps two thirds of the group attending a teleconference, sometimes even less. I'd liked to see us using some written communication to help build that up. To get us to a point where we can debate the sensitive issues and get that consensus in place. Can I ask for comment or reaction to that sort of proposition? I don't see any hands there.

Could I get the next slide please Yvette? If I can go to the first dot there about what we need to get there, what I'm getting at this early stage is, one end of the spectrum is we need to just put our heads down and write this thing, get onto of it and write it. It requires people to be able contribute quite a bit of their own time in really conducting the review tasks themselves. At the other end of the spectrum, people who think this is an undoable for the diverse team of globally distributed volunteers and that the heavy lifting in the review team work should be

being done by consultants or some matter experts, technical writers, by resources that the review team oversees. Quite a different mental model of what's happening here.

Again, I think the only way to resolve that is to have people in a room, reasonably understand the work that's in front, understand worked before, what didn't work and come to a view about what the best way to take those jobs forward is and I think the critical piece, the history is littered with the wreckage of groups or teams that tried to do undoable jobs and it's just a recipe for disaster if it's not being tackled in the best way.

I think people just need to have that chance to have that discussion and be clear about what the best way to do all of that is. I think the leadership and structure again, should fall out of the first discussions about what to do and what's the best way to do them. That makes it much clearer about what leadership and what structures you need for it going forward.

There is a whole stack of material in the confidential survey, in the email exchanges back and forth and so on about behaviors and how the team works and how it works together and who's respected and whole bunch of things like that. Which again, need a bit of time to work through but much better done in my experience, falling out of an agreement about the work that needs to be done and how best to do and those make a whole lot more sense once you've got that context agreed.

The last one there I talked about before. I just think the external relationships do need to be discussed. I'm not clear yet about how they

work and what's the best way to deal with but I think that would really help in terms of giving people I suppose permission and confidence that they're doing work that's going to be appreciated and acknowledged.

Let me throw it open again for discussion or questions. If you guys would all like to have a think about it, I'm more than happy to pick this up in our interviews or to be approached by email or skype out of session to discuss all of that. The main purpose was to put this in front of you and say, "Here's where I think this should all go, roughly in this sequence. This is the mechanism I'm suggesting for resolving the issues that people are raising." Anyone else, comment? Any requests from anyone? I'm hearing nothing. That was really the main thing I just wanted to do in that discussion. I'll return to the agenda.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil, if I may, there are some comments in the chat. The people on the call are either acknowledging your comments [inaudible] in the chat in the Adobe room are putting some comments down. If you are unable to see, please let me know and we are happy to read them out. I'm not sure if the Adobe room is working well for you or not.

PHIL KHOURY: I was a little lax there. I apologize for that, I'm not an expert at this. Thank you for patients with listening to all of that. I'm really looking forward to talking to all of you. My interviews so far have been fascinating I have to say. I've been much heartened by even the few interviews I've had with the level of frustrations, the level of

commitment to doing a good job in this and delivering a good result for ICANN. Can we go back to the agenda now Yvette?

I think we'll have a proposition, if we go to item four, we've dealt with item three earlier. We'll have a proposition for -- the moment, is a suggest that Denise and Eric as the surviving Co-Chairs just keep going in the roll for the time being until we sort of got ourselves ready and up to the face to face organized and so on and that we make a call after that, once people have seen the whites of each other's eyes at the face to face and got a clearer idea of how the works going to be done going forward. Have we got anyone who would like to make a comment about that or agree or disagree?

DENISE MICHEL: Is there anyone who'd like to share the duties of facilitating conference calls?

PHIL KHOURY: I don't see agree coming up on the screen. I don't think you're going to pass that task off Denise but the sound of that. Again, I'm happy to take feedback offline but I think that's the default at the moment and absent anyone suggesting an alternative. I think we might take that as accepted for now as long as Denise and Eric are happy to do the work for now. I mean I will be able to assist more as I get on top of the issues and get to know everybody better in terms of all that. But this very much need to be content competent Co-Chairs.

If I may, just move to the next agenda item, which is the face to face meeting. The first issue is the date, 22nd to the 24th, that still looks like the correct time or the best time to do it, it isn't going to get everybody but that seems to be the accepted one. Do you have any better information Staff or Denise? Any change to the Google Doc?

DENISE MICHEL: Not that I'm aware of.

PHIL KHOURY: Alright, if that's our days, then that was originally planned for Brussel's. There's been a proposal put that that be moved to Washington DC, as more convenient for the majority and then I subsequently heard from a few, a contrive that there were people who preferred to stick with the Brussels idea. The reason why that slide was up there with the funny colors, is I was just trying to look through it to see what the consequences for people would be and who would have the more difficult job if it was moved to DC. I guess it depends who you are really and where you're sitting. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: In addition to preference, it says there are a few other things that factor into making decisions about these meetings, that includes budgets for the Review Team. Since a Review Team has never been paused before and now our work period is significantly extended, it's unclear what our total budget is going to be but we attempt to chose locations that attempt to control travel and other expenditures and other costs, that's

a consideration of course that goes into this and one of the reasons we were focusing on a couple locations that have ICANN offices that can accommodate one factor. As well as the geographic distribution of Review Team members in terms of travel time, those types of things.

PHIL KHOURY: Anyone want to make a comment to this discussion? We got some people typing. Can I just say, I should say that I've had conversations on the phone, so far and for what it's worth, there's -- here we go, we got Kerry-Ann. Can I just say, Naveed, I completely agree, we absolutely have to sort this tonight really. We're already passed people's deadlines for getting Visa's to travel. At a practical level it's crucial we sort this and do it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: For me, I think what Denise explained a while in terms of practical and getting everyone a central location and cost, I don't know if the Staff can guide us as to what would be more feasible and if that would help the team make a decision. Either way, for me personally, if it's in DC I should be able to participate, if it's not in DC I'll participate remotely but we still have to look at the majority to see what is more feasible to either take everyone to DC or for persons to meet up in Brussels.

I don't know what will get the majority participation, I think that's what we need to look at because as you explained the face to face is a critical face to face, so we're looking at majority attendance. I don't know if you saw Norm's request in the chat, he's asking -- whether or not coming to the US -- can you hear me now?

PHIL KHOURY: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Norm's question is critical, whether or not it would be more problematic for persons to go to Brussels or persons to come to the US but I think if Staff could help in seeing where we would get the majority attendance. I think physical face to face attendance is what we are going for right now. I think that should be what our decision should be based on, how do we get the most bodies in the room?

PHIL KHOURY: I think the issue that I was picking up on while people are typing is that for some -- it's [inaudible] in terms of attendance. It's plus or minus one from looking at the Google Doc. I think the issue is probably more the fact that it's convenient to have it in North America is probably unarguable. The real issue is for people who are on the other side of the world, there's a fair bit of extra pain involved in getting there, I think that was the issue that was being raised with me.

I see more people typing. Just from my read of all of that, we have some strong preferences to the US and neutrality, by in large neutrality from the rest. A couple prefer Brussels, I have a couple that spoke to me who are not here preferring Brussels, but I think Norm's is the most practical suggestion I've seen on this.

This is a table where I can make a decision like this but it looks we've got a weight of numbers wanting to do the US. Let's just pick that, unless

someone wants to protest, let's just do that, get it done and kind of move on from there, get it out of the way. What I'm going to do is, forgive me Denise, I'm running over top of you here, the idea I think, I'm going to call that a decision and wait a minute and if nobody protests or speaks up, let's do it.

Okay, the next thing that we had on our agenda was the plenary calls. We've had different views about Tuesday's or Thursday's. I have heard, so I've see there are three rotating time zones there. I think the problem was reported to me that if you have three rotating time zones, you end up with one of those not working, meeting times. One of these never attends even though it's sharing the pain equally, we don't get attendances. Anyone want to speak up on the plenary calls?

DENISE MICHEL: Unfortunately, I'm going to have to hop on another call soon. We need decisions both about the frequency needed at this point for the calls as well as the time. Is this something people comfortable thrashing out of the email list today and tomorrow?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, I think that's a good suggest. Let's give everybody 24 hours to put in their comments by email on the proposals for the calls. My advice is that scheduling the slot is a good idea, you may not use every one of them. If material isn't ready, issues aren't ready to discus you just cancel it but you put in people's diaries.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Yup, that's what we usually do.

PHIL KHOURY: Everybody okay if we do that? 24 hours to put in any views on the plenary calls. It sounds like we don't have any disagreement Denise, I think that sounds right.

DENISE MICHEL: Before I jump off, just wanted to clarify action items and the couple that I have are again, take a look at the digest and add any additional background, particularly any that would help the new members get up to speed. New members have an action item to let us know on the list what they would feel would be most helpful in getting them oriented, up to speed in addition to what has been provided.

In the next 24 hours we'll lock in the frequency and time of our conference calls. Eric and I will work with Staff to move the administrative items forward for the August meeting in DC. Phil, I imagine you have action items you want to reflect.

PHIL KHOURY: Sure. For me I have things I have to do, which is get those interviews done and to report back to people with a brief summary of all of those. Another action item to sort out the stock take of where work is at the moment, I will do that offline and talk to Staff. I've already spoken to Staff, Staff are assisting where they can with Visa's and try and accelerate those. I think [inaudible] is the biggest problem with the amount of time required to get a Visa. That's it.

DENISE MICHEL: Great. I hate to jump off. I wanted to thank everyone for participating in today's call and a special thank you to Phil for doing all the heavy lifting on the call and helping us move forward. Of course, thanks to Staff for helping us run a successful call. Look forward to continuing on the email list. Bye-bye.

PHIL KHOURY: We've gone over the hour by 10 minutes almost. It looks like everyone is out and gone. Thank you all and we'll talk again soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]