
YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call Meeting #37 on July 19, 2018 at 20:00 UTC. Attending today's call we have Noorul, Kaveh, Alain, RamKrishna, Eric, Norm, Denise, Kerry-Ann, and Laurin. If I forgot your name, feel free to let me know in the chat and I will gladly add you to the roll. Currently, at this time, we have no observers. From the ICANN Organization, we have joining us Alice, Negar, Steve; and myself.

We have quite a few apologies. We have apologies from Boban, Scott, Amin, Naveed, Geoff, Jabhera Matogoro, and ICANN staff, Jennifer Bryce.

I think that is about it. I'd like to remind everybody that today's call is being recorded and to please state your name clearly before you speak, so that way we make sure we are able to get you in the record when we do the transcript. That should be good to go. Okay, Phil, back to you.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay. Thanks for this. The first item on the agenda is an update. There's a long agenda today. A number of these are really just for mention, get people thinking about them. There are a few on here that we absolutely have to do type things, so I'm going to have to kind of manage the agenda through to make sure we get to attend to everything, but on my thinking, it's not as daunting as it might look. So, I might dive in for now.

Just a quick update I wanted to give on progress with the interviews. Just to say that I've completed all the team interviews [inaudible]. That is not an easy thing to schedule, but all now done and I'm in the middle

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.

of writing up a brief summary of issues raised with me and a little bit about what I think that means for the team face-to-face.

I've had a request, a few people suggest to me that I speak to people outside the team, to pick up on some background and so on. I will follow that as time permits, just to sort of complete my education and see if there's any kind of perspective in there that we need to take account of. But, if anybody has a suggestion for someone that I [inaudible] you to see if they have a view or something we should be taking into account, by all means, please send me an e-mail to suggest who that is and if you have their contact details, that would be great.

The next thing that I wanted to say about that was just that that report back will be initially intended as for team only. So, while I understand there are people in the group who need to have some obligations to liaise with their constituencies, the intention is that this document should be just for the team for the time being. It's not reporting anyone's individual observations, but it is about getting the team organized and so on, and I think at this point we want to encourage people to feel like it's a safe space and everything is, at the end, reported [inaudible] all over the place. So, I would request that from everyone.

I understand that in an organization like this that we can't have [inaudible] type agreements with everyone, but the request is in it for goodwill and success for us at the face-to-face is feedback for the team.

Coming out of that feedback – and I should have it ready by the end of my weekend, so most people's Monday – is that some of the issues just

make no sense to try and tackle on teleconferences or by e-mail, so we're just going to have to bundle them up and think about them and deal with them at the face-to-face. But, we can start dealing with some of those now. We'll try and get people to discuss it at our next phone hookup and to identify things that they think we could start getting interaction on over the next couple of weeks.

The last point I had on the update is the reporting to the board, to ICANN Organization, to the SO/AC chairs. There's expectation in the contract that I was asked to, [that said what I'm] supposed to do, that there be some kind of summary reporting at the end of this process. After the face-to-face and the team is back into something like normal. I've had an e-mail exchange with the SO/AC chairs in which they explicitly said they're not expecting reporting back from the [inaudible] the whole team, they'd be happy with a brief summary report at the end of the process. So, unless [inaudible] comment on all of that, questions, but that's my intention is that we've had one version of a summary for us to work with, and then at the end of the whole exercise, we'll have another version which can go to other players in ICANN ecosphere.

So, I'll stop and draw some breath there and ask for comments or questions. There's a hand up from Denise already, I see. Can I ask people please to from now to the face-to-face to use voice as much as possible? I'm conscious that [inaudible] fairly easier to type in their comments. It would be really good for all of us if we're hearing each other's voices over the next few weeks, so if you could, please, use voice as much as possible Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. I think it would be useful if you could just share with the team when you have a chance the substantive items in your contract, so we're all clear on what your contractual requirements are, nothing confidential, but just the basic contractual requirements that affect what we've been doing with the team, who we will be reporting to, that type of thing.

PHIL KHOURY: Sure, no problem. It's a very brief thing, the note. Most of it is based on my guesswork weeks before about what I thought might have to happen. I'll be happy to provide a summary, put that in as an action item.

DENISE MICHEL: Then, I assume the reports will be shared with the team.

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry. One report starts with a summary of the issues that people have shared with me in the course of the interviews type thing, [inaudible] report number one which is for the team, and hopefully the team only. Subsequently, there will be a sort of more general report which of course will be circulated around the team and people will have an opportunity to have input and comment all that kind of thing before it gets settled for any kind of circulation.

It's made clear to me the whole way along my job is to report to the team, work with the team. So, that's the way I'm treating it.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Am I missing anything here for you? My terrible Adobe Connect skills. I'm not seeing any other hands. Okay. So, let's move here, if we can move along on the agenda slide, please, whoever is clicking those buttons.

So, one of the issues that arose in the [inaudible] minute, one of the issues that came up out of an example issue that people put up that we can do a little bit on is that the team is back and forth with staff over what's the right [inaudible] and what are the minutes and all that kind of stuff over some period of the review progress.

Right now, where it is settled is what's turning into, as I understand, a standard ICANN review template approach to it all. So, if you've all had a look at the last set of minutes for the last teleconference for this team's meeting, you'll see that sort of format which is being used now. Negar or somebody else may want to chime in. But, it's being used by at least one other review team. I've had a bit of a look at it. I think it's pretty sound model for this. But, I think there's sort of two issues. One is that the review team is going through kind of a bit of an unchartered period where it's pretty critical that we really mark what we've learned

and put more into the minutes in my view, put more into the minutes than would normally be in ten minutes.

So, what would tend to happen in this kind of environment is you would have fairly sketchy minutes. It would have the guts of what happened action items, kind of what has to be ... If there is a point of contention, a very brief description of the point of contention. That's perfectly fine and it's sufficient, all that kind of stuff. I just think the stage that [inaudible] the moment because there's a lot of uncertainty about what is going on and what it is it means is we need to put a little bit more in there.

As soon as you go beyond what's in the templates right now, that sort of style, it is not fair to ask staff to apply that because we're starting to get into some judgments and distilling what does somebody need and more sensitive kind of elements to the minutes than really just the facts. So, I think that's, for at least I think the next three months maybe, or four months, the team should be operating with more fulsome minutes, so that people aren't getting left behind, getting a better flavor of what's going on and not relying on recordings because I know people are not getting time to ... If they're missing the meetings, they're busy and they're not getting time to sit through an hour of recording.

So, my proposition is to just try and take this a little bit forward, is for me to write up the minutes with the staff. I'll get what the staff would normally have put into the minutes for this meeting and then I will add some stuff to that and then circulate to people for comments, so we can have a discussion at our next call about stability, adequacy, accuracy, all

the usual stuff about the minutes, so we are building a record of what we're all agreeing to do.

Sorry that was a little bit long-winded. Comments, questions, suggestions around that? Eric, you're on.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. Just one point that may or may not be a point of clarification is that I think there's a difference between minutes and action items. So, whereas maybe having some qualitative understanding of the material would in fact what goes into action items, things that are done, I think minutes of what was said or discussed [inaudible] requires a little less deeper insight into what's being discussed. That would just be one observation I might make.

PHIL KHOURY:

Anyone else? I completely agree with that, Eric. That's exactly what I'm trying to get to. In an ideal world, you use your staff report to get the bones of the thing out there and then the chairs of the meeting chair, chairs, anyone who put their hand up would sort of then add to it to give it that flavor, the qualitative depth and then the group can kind of agree, disagree in the normal way. So, [inaudible] go at it for the first one and then see what people think. I'm going to take that as a "let's move on, Phil."

Next item on our agenda is around the induction for new members. That's a really important piece. It's the thing we have to do before the face-to-face. There's some good people on the [inaudible] who are new

to it have now had a chance to spend some time working on, wading through the material that's there, listening to recordings, reading minutes, all that kind of thing. I don't think we have a huge number of those people on the call today. Help me out here. Anyone who has done that exercise now who is new to the team, who has waded through the material want to provide some kind of feedback on their experience? Anything that would help them to get a better sense of it all? I did pick up some feedback on this. So, look, what I might do – I'm not seeing any hands. And forgive me not thinking quick enough on my feet.

Why don't we just ... I'll just take this one and do an e-mail, pick it up in an e-mail circulation around back because I don't think we've got the right people on the call.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Phil, Laurin is raising his hand as he is one of the new members wanting to contribute.

PHIL KHOURY: Great. Thank you, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you. Can you hear me?

PHIL KHOURY: We can, but it's feint, so if you can speak up, that would be great. I think we lost Laurin there, so if we might press on and come back to this one

when he is able to log back in again, hopefully with some audio. Okay, we'll come back to that one.

The fifth item has [inaudible] review work, if we could go to that agenda item. So, a part of the input that I got from people in the course of the interviews and so on is that some people are quite anxious to get going on review work and really frustrated about the delay, waiting two months for a face-to-face, all that kind of thing. I think we have Laurin back.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, I'll try again. I'm connecting in via mobile Internet over my laptop because my home doesn't have Internet yet. I hope you can hear me now.

PHIL KHOURY: That is better.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, good. I had a lovely chat with Phil about my catching up on this stuff. I have the impression that we need two parts of this story. One is what's going on in a technical level, but we also need to count additional story that I think is more difficult [inaudible] because how did we get there? What's the narrative behind what's going on, particularly for new people, to see this is why certain decisions are made or this is how we arrived at. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, I think that's correct. There are two streams of work that may not be complete. Happy to take suggestions for more. But, I think it may be helpful for people if we did kill two birds with one stone if a couple of people were willing to put together just a couple of bullet point type slides, two or three, that set out how each of those bits of work progress and what they've done, the problems. We'll try not to be pointing fingers at people, but just sort of say whether we've got stuck. Would that be ... Just to ask Laurin if he still has some audio whether that would be a useful piece of information. We've lost him altogether again. What I might do is take it offline as well. If you've got any comments about that, I'm happy to take now, but if not, I will circulate it as a request for people because I think that's one other bit of activity that we can do for the face-to-face is to try and get a kind of stock take of the work that was done and progress on all of that. I think that would be quite helpful for the new people coming on. Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just to add to that. I think it would probably be important as well if we also provided a summary as to how we had developed the scope of work, not just the two streams, because I think when we finally have the face-to-face, it's to ensure that the team composing of new and older members on the same page in terms of the work that's left to be done. So, I think it's important as well just for the new members to get enough background as to ... In addition to the minutes and the reports that we

would have produced, if there is [inaudible] presentation from the chairs at the beginning of the face-to-face concerning the methodology for the development of the scope. So, [inaudible] everyone is on board and it won't come up again as we progress the work.

PHIL KHOURY: Good. Thanks, Kerry-Ann. Any support, comments? I think that's a yes from Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: It is a yes from me. I think that's a great idea.

PHIL KHOURY: A couple more. Excellent. Good. Okay, great. So, that's one of the items under number six as well, so that's excellent. Anyone else want to comment? Great, okay, so we've got some ticks coming. Excellent.

So, sound like people are pointing their fingers at Eric and Denise to do some of that work, but I might have a ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I didn't see any fingers.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, I have a real special screen here where I can see [inaudible] fingers.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I did not see any fingers. As long as I'm talking, it would be helpful, just on the SSR1 subgroup work if staff could take an action item to pull all of the presentations related to SSR1 implementation and all of the questions and answers together in one place, so we could have an easier – especially for the new people. I think [inaudible] raised this issue, so we can have an easier review of the material provided by staff and the questions asked by the team.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, so you're talking about the material provided by the technical staff in response to the SSR1 queries.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, we're talking about review of the subgroup work, SSR1 and SSR ICANN. And on the SSR1 subgroup, work with that group primarily constituted a lot of research, a lot of information gathering, a lot of questions to staff, and it's spread out I think in different places on them which would be really helpful for staff to put that all together in one place. And I think there are questions that have not been answered and I think it's time to answer those questions. It would be useful.

PHIL KHOURY: Let's take that as an action item and we will sort through all that. In terms of the narrative piece, short slide deck kind of overview of the pieces of work being done, I might just be obnoxious and out of session track down people and ask them if they're able to do that sort of work

and the staff will have picked up that as an action item I see there.
Okay, great. Excellent.

So, I'm going to tick off four for now. I think that's making some progress on that. We can keep adjusting as we go along.

If I could go back to the review work slide that we have there, the work plan tasks list, I think these are just my dot-point question marks here about what's the best way to do this because I [inaudible] had a look at it, but not familiar with the depth of all of that.

My intention would be over the next couple of weeks that we get enough of this done so that there is a reasonably complete picture sitting at our elbow once we're at the meeting in Washington, so that we can begin to work from there as we get going. That might take a bit of ... A few more passes through that to get it to a state where it's satisfactory. Anyone wants to contact me in or out of session about ideas or clever ways to do that, I'm happy to add that dialogue there. For now, let's just record that that's our objective is to try and get that into shape.

Could we go to the next one, please, Yvette? Wait a minute. This is why I'm not the chair of anything. The last dot point on that is around the SSR2 scope. So, scope gets a heap of air time in the interviews. There's a lot of confusion and misunderstanding about what are we really talking about under scope and what is it that's either wrong, not wrong, and so on. So, that is a big task that I have on my to-do list to get some preparatory work done on prior to the face-to-face, so we can all be talking from the same definitions about what we mean in that space.

Again, can I throw out an invitation to anyone who has a brilliant idea about how we can rebuild that scope definition for the face-to-face meeting? I'm going back through, rereading some of that material, but if anyone has a suggestion or ideas about a sensible way to build that up, if you could contact me, please. Let me know by e-mail or direct contact by phone or whatever.

Anyone want to say comments, questions so far? We need to press on to get everything done that's on this agenda. We have Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Hi, Phil. Just to your last question to the team, I'm not sure I understand what you needed. Is it that you wanted just a scope of work or [inaudible] scope for the next meeting? Like an agenda for the next meeting. I wasn't clear if it was overall scope you want to revisit or the scope for how we will actually address and do real work during the face-to-face in addition to [inaudible]. I wasn't clear.

PHIL KHOURY:

My apologies. I meant for the face-to-face. The SSR2 scope, not the meeting scope. I've had people say to me, just to clarify, I thought I'd understand what's wrong with the scope or what people are not getting about the scope or where the disagreement points are about the scope. Other people are saying there's nothing wrong with the scope, it's about the methodology. It's really at a high level, it's fine, but as soon as we get down into the detail, there's sort of disagreements about it. Other people say there's actually nothing wrong with any of that, either, it's just that people misunderstood what the words meant or thought

we were going to dig up the graves in the back of ICANN's parking lot kind of stuff. I think it would be really good to just have a way of stepping back through the scope discussions in a way that we all arrive at the same place and we can draw some distinctions about what we mean underneath that term, scope, because people are not talking about the same thing when they use the word. So, that was the intention was to be able to get to that.

We've got two people with their hands up. Kerry-Ann, you're first.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Might I suggest, then, a variation to your proposal. Given that it's more about uncertainty about the scope and probably not a meeting of the minds for everyone for kind of scope, I don't think the best methodology would be for persons who individually [inaudible] scope outside of probably the face-to-face, I think. I would suggest [inaudible] for the rest of the team that it be an agenda item. Once the overview is given on the methodology for how the scope is developed, then during the face-to-face, I'm hoping that those would could join or connect online who can't make the face-to-face, at that point, everyone is able to hear and that we can help to reshape the scope. I think individuals contacted [inaudible] member scope would probably be a lot for you to absorb and amend. Plus, it could go in many different directions at this point. So, this is a suggestion that I think if it's the actual scope of work that it be addressed as a [inaudible] three days, I think, staff [inaudible] would be a significant agenda item during the face-to-face, we try and not redo the methodology we did, but at least to see the specific points of contention and address both specifically and the ones that are not in

contention, that they either be absorbed, reshaped, reworded, reallocated in terms of where it falls, but not to have a whole background discussion on it, because to me, it would be [inaudible] a bit difficult to then present it at the face-to-face to get consensus.

PHIL KHOURY:

I couldn't agree more, Kerry-Ann. I apologize if I gave that impression. I was really looking for help in how to present. So, your suggestion is perfectly fine. It sounds pretty sensible to me. I wasn't remotely thinking that we would adjust the scope in any way. I was really looking for a way of pulling it apart, just so that we've got a common set of terms that we're going to use when we're having that discussion. So, that was all I was after. But, I think what you're suggesting is pretty close to what I'd like to do, so that's good. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. I think probably just to pile on to what Kerry-Ann was saying, it sounds like ... Yeah, I'm on the same page with her. I would just say I'm not entirely sure that trying to revisit how we got to this scope is actually going to be very helpful. I think at this point it might be most helpful to say if someone has a problem with the scope, it's time to speak up. What's the problem? What's the [inaudible]? What would you prefer? And we can sort of understand where this consternation, but if what you're saying is [inaudible] a lot of people, so I don't know what the problem is or I was really talking about something else, then maybe it's time to say, "This is what the scope is," going back and trying to figure out how we got there. I'm sure that we could do it. I'm just not

sure that it would add a whole lot because that won't necessarily make people feel any differently.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay. That's fair enough. What I'm trying to get at is a definition in which you separate out what we're talking about. That's the one thing that I can detect from the conversations is people are not talking about the same thing and that's all I'm really trying to get at. So, let us think about that and move on. But, I'm certainly not interested in randomly changing the scope or anything offline and then asking people to agree to it. There will be none of that. That has to be a structured conversation I think at the face-to-face to resolve that, but appreciate your council on that.

Let's see if I can [inaudible] in the minutes. Alright. Can I just go to the next slide, please? So, we're going to run out of time, I can see. I put in an attachment to the agenda, which hopefully you've all seen. We've just [inaudible] some draft objectives about what we're intending to achieve at that meeting. Now, they're just my scratching notes. I want to put that out there, so people can look at it. That's not an agenda. It does not imply how much time we'll spend on any of those things.

Number 12 is where we want to end up, able to sort of progress and review tasks and everything else should take no longer than is needed to, to get to a satisfactory point of it. But, I really did want to put that out there and just get some feedback from people over the next week or two. Anything you think of, if you think it's worded wrong, you have other things you want to add to it, whatever. People haven't had that in

front of them for very long, but I just want to start having that conversation [inaudible] connections.

If anyone wants to comment straight away, I'll throw the floor open, but I'm happy to just put that out there as a place marker and start to get people thinking about those things. No takers right now. Okay, good. Excellent. Tick that one off for now but we will revisit. I will put in front of the team a proposed session plan and agenda, some more materials over the next few weeks, so you can get ready for that. There will be lots of other opportunities to have a say about how you want to tackle all of that.

Can I progress to the next item, please? Okay, so this is just for staff to kind of update us. Negar or Alice, who's going to run with that?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I'll actually let Alice run over these items for the review team.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Phil. This is Alice. Can you hear me okay?

PHIL KHOURY: Certainly can.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay, great. Thank you. So, I'd like to let everyone know that you will be receiving your hotel confirmation in the next few weeks, hopefully, and we've secured [inaudible] and we are asking all of you to make sure you book your flights as soon as possible. The tech support has team have been booked as well for the event. We've got the Washington DC meeting there, the largest room in the DC office for the meeting. I think we're all set. We've spoken with [inaudible] meeting costs, so we're [inaudible] estimate and so on. So, I think we're in good shape and I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Any questions on all that? It does appear that we have ... Kerry-Ann is asking the question about number of persons concerned. At the moment, everyone on the team is listed by ICANN travel as intending to attend.

ALICE JANSEN: So, [inaudible] that there's no one [inaudible] the meeting, from what we've [inaudible] information.

DENISE MICHEL: We've asked everyone to make their travel arrangements by the end of next week – by the end of last week. Obviously, it greatly impacts cost. Could you, when you have a chance, send to the full team list who's confirmed, who's travel arrangements, how many outstanding travel arrangements we have and if you could touch base with those people to make sure that plans haven't changed and they're still coming?

ALICE JANSEN: Thanks, Denise. Happy to. I note [inaudible] in touch with [inaudible]. We'll continue doing that.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Excellent. I hate to use team time for offline matters, but at some stage, could I ask for some details of the room, what the meeting room looks like, size and configuration and all that kind of stuff?

Alright, I think we're done on that. No other questions. Excellent. Let's move along on the agenda.

The next thing that's been raised by a number of people, and of course the co-chairs, are anxious about this, quite sensibly, a number of people have raised the issue around what's the timeline, what's the budget. Clearly, this is all going to change because of the pause, teams been in place – already been in place for what was its original title timeline and clearly that's going to take some time.

But, I think the logic has to be that we address all [inaudible] as parallel to the face-to-face reconfiguring. Once the team is in a position to kind of settle scope, agree what all the tasks are, confirm the work that has to be done going forward, there's a process which the team will have to engage in to get a new timeline put in place and to really negotiate a budget that reflects what the team is all agreed they need to go going

forward. So, there are a lot of curly issues in all that, like whether there's going to be contract resources involved, how many face-to-faces. There's a whole lot of issues that probably need to be sort of put into some sensible frame.

Did you want to say anything, Negar, about the steps that have to be taken when you go back for budget?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Certainly, Phil. I'm happy to. The process is actually not that complicated. The general process for seeking additional budget is to send the request to the ICANN board with supporting rationale for the amount being requested. So, my recommendation is once during the face-to-face meeting, as a whole review team, we've had a chance to finalize scope and work plan which allows us to plan out how many more face-to-face meetings we're estimating would be needed and financial support for travel for the review team members that are requesting it, etc.

Once we have those numbers detailed out, we can compare that with the amount of budget that remains in the SSR2 review budget envelope, find out what the difference is, how much more needs to be requested from the board, and put that data together to go to the board essentially with a letter that accompanies the request asking for the additional budget.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay. Any questions?

DENISE MICHEL: What budget was included in the current fiscal year for the SSR2?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Denise, I don't know the numbers offhand, but I'm happy to look into it and provide the information to the team via e-mail.

DENISE MICHEL: And does ICANN's fiscal year start July 1 still?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct, yes, July 1.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Norm is asking ...

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes. Correct. So, Norm, yes, the current budget started July 1st and it's running through end of June 2019. That's the end of fiscal year, runs through from the beginning of July to end of June of the following year. Again, I'm happy to go back and find out exactly what was budgeted for this fiscal year for SSR2. But, regardless, when we do the budget assessment and for us to determine how much additional budget we

may require, we will do a comparative analysis of what's been spent to date on SSR2 and how much we made of the overall budget and then compared to that, how much additional budget we are going to be needing to request for and the breakdown of the budget for each fiscal year is something that we can work out based on the number of face-to-face meetings and all other factors that go into it. Denise, you have your hand raised. Go ahead, please.

DENISE MICHEL: No, it's a ... Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay.

PHIL KHOURY: I see some [inaudible]. I just think ... I can't speak for ICANN, but I can't imagine that the board can pause a project of this scale and expect that there's not going to be some financial consequences that have to be accommodated somehow. I wouldn't get too stressed about that right yet, but it may be a sensible thing to do to have some dialogue in parallel with all of this to put the board on notice about what will be coming back out of this.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That is correct, Phil. Eric, I wouldn't worry about it that much. I personally don't think it's a major problem. Of course, I can't speak on

behalf of the board. But, once we have the data in place, I think it would be wise [inaudible] for us to continue [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay. I think we've sort of agreed that one of the things, the aim to come out of the face-to-face is resolution around the work plan and tasks that [inaudible] completed, timelines, and the bones of a ... As well as a communication to the board about what's been resolved by the team, what the consequences are in terms of budget. So, let's put that down as an objective for coming out of the face-to-face. Alright, we need to move on.

This is we've got to decide now. In order to get a face-to-face booked for the review team at Barcelona, which is in October, we need to put in that request basically today. Can I just suggest that is most likely a no-brainer, that given where the team is and the amount of work that's going to catch up, I would be ... I'm struggling to think of a reason why you wouldn't do that. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. I would agree, Phil. Part of the discussion around [inaudible] meeting in DC was that we have our next meeting would likely be around ICANN meeting in October in Barcelona. I would suggest that we all agree to notify staff that we'll need to meet in Barcelona, ask staff to investigate and let us know if there are any particular [inaudible] or restrictions to whether we meet before, after, or during the Barcelona meeting and then quickly come to agreement on the exact dates and nature of our meeting on e-mail over the next ...

PHIL KHOURY:

I think that's all good. My understanding is that it works [inaudible] be doing it beforehand, if possible because a whole lot of people on here have other ICANN involvements which will mean that [meeting during it] is problematic. I understand.

So, let's call that ticked off. I'm not hearing anyone object. Everyone is ticking the box, so let's just call that done and move on to the next dot point. I just wanted to just leave for people to think about. The [inaudible] by about mid-September, which again fall out of a face-to-face meeting needs to decide whether you want to have any kind of open engagement session with the community around the work of the review team. My gut feeling is that might be a little bit early, but there may be some value in having the discussion at that time. Just file that one away to think about because I think one of the big things that we've got to talk about at the face-to-face is the external communications from the team to the rest of the community on what constituent bodies and things. So, please file that away.

Now, in terms of the next agenda item on here, [inaudible] is the next teleconference meetings. I noted that as people were responding to the Doodle poll and everything else, it had the flavor of people signing up for a life sentence. So, I think it might be helpful just to think about what do we need to do between now and the face-to-face and just focus on that.

So, I'm suggesting that we have three meetings, teleconference meetings, between now and then. The first one in a fortnight, roughly.

Then, weekly after that until we get to the face-to-face. Then, you guys can worry about your ongoing teleconference schedules close to the face-to-face when you're clearer around the kind of what work is still in front of you. Does that sound okay as a sort of a proposition? Not hearing objections. I'm seeing some ticks.

So, one of the issues is the timing for all this. This has been problematic, I understand, since day one trying to get these meetings to work. The two most popular dates, the problem with popularity contests on the Doodle poll, leave everyone in Central Asia [inaudible] for both of those time slots, so they're having to get up at 3:00 in the morning or some horrible time as a consequence. The 13:00 hour one is pretty convenient for North America, as is the 20:00 UTC time as well. Look, [inaudible] forever. It's just three meetings. It sounds like everyone is okay with that. I think the best way to deal with that is we'll come back to you via e-mail with the best result we can tick out of the Doodle poll for the next three weeks meetings as invitations and see how we go in terms of getting people [inaudible] to those. [inaudible]. Excellent.

So, the first one meeting, we will have a bunch more factual information about the face-to-face and who's coming and who isn't. We also have the report on the interview stuff and we should have progressed some of that background information for the new members and so on. That should be hopefully a pretty productive meeting with some substance in it.

So, we've scrapped in the hour having probably skated over a bunch of things. Can I just throw the floor open for questions, comments, requests?

I'm going to take that as ... Thank you, Kerry-Ann. Isn't that great? We managed to [inaudible]. I'm not sure we're going to win any awards for it, but I think we can call [inaudible].

So, thank you very much everyone who did manage to get on the call. There's a string of action items there, so you will be hearing from us, those of us who have done action items over the next sort of week or two. Excellent. Well, if I might call the meeting to a close. There's no other hands up. Anything you need to do to close it off, Yvette?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Phil, Alice has her hand raised.

PHIL KHOURY: Oh, okay, sorry.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you. Before we close the meeting, I'd like to read all the action items we have for this meeting and confirm that this is in alignment with what we've decided.

The first action item is for Phil to provide a summary of deliverables established in this contract. The second one is for Phil to circulate the request for volunteers to produce a narrative of methodology used to determine scope of work, division of work, subgroup's increment progress.

Then we have an action item for ICANN Org to put together an SSR1 [inaudible] package including briefing materials, SSR1 communication related questions.

We have an action item for Phil to [inaudible] on how to [inaudible] review work. There's a [inaudible] on slide eight that [inaudible] refer to in preparation for the DC meeting.

Review team members are invited to provide feedback on draft set of objectives for the DC face-to-face meeting. ICANN Org should continue to [inaudible] as soon as possible. ICANN Org to provide [inaudible] information on meeting room size, etc. The budget discussion should be included in the DC meeting objectives. ICANN Org should submit a request for a two-day face-to-face meeting prior to ICANN 63. And ICANN Org should provide an overview of restrictions [inaudible] during ICANN meetings.

I apologize, but I'm not sure I captured the takeaway from the briefing call related agenda item. So, Phil, if you could clarify that for me, that would be great.

PHIL KHOURY:

I think the action item will be for ICANN staff/Phil to put forward proposed times for the meetings in the next couple of days. The only other one that I had was just the minutes, if ICANN staff could complete the minutes as you normally would and then [inaudible] them to me for some editing or trial editing anyway.

Denise had a comment, [inaudible] as well, just about the SSR1 package, if we could put the package together on the Wiki somewhere that people can see.

DENISE MICHEL: Also, action item to find out what our current fiscal year budget is currently and just put that to the list.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you very much.

PHIL KHOURY: Alright. Well, thank you, everyone. We'll talk soon.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Thank you, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]