
ADOBE CONNECT: This meeting is now being recorded.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi everyone, this is Yvette Guigneaux, host in the room. We'd like to welcome you to the SSR2 plenary call number 38, being hosted on Thursday August 2nd 2018 at 20:00 UTC. Attending today's call we have Eric, Laurin, Kaveh, Naveed, Norm, Alain, and Geoff. We have our facilitator Phil Khoury. We have one observer, George Sadowsky and from ICANN Organization we have Alice, Negar, Jennifer, Steve, Brenda, and myself. We also have apologies from Kerry-Ann, Zarko, Mr. Matogoro, and Noorul. I am not sure about Denise, she said she may make it, she may not, so we will see how that goes. Today's call we'd like to remind you is being recorded so please state your name before speaking so we will have you in the transcript record. OK, that's it for me. Phil, I will turn the call back over to you.

PHIL KHOURY: Phil Khoury here. Thank you Yvette, look... I think we have enough of us to sort of proceed with this, the first thing on the agenda is any administrative issues beyond the attendance and apologies. We did not put on there action items, so I will make... ask a question about any outstanding action items from a previous meeting that we still need to put. Still needs to be delivered, can someone help with that or Jennifer or someone who has got the records or we could come back to it in a minute if you need a moment?

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: Phil I am sorry, can you clarify what are you looking for?

PHIL KHOURY: Just any outstanding action items, it's my oversight, I had not put it on the agenda for today.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure, I can go over the outstanding action items, so I am using the tracking tool. I will just drop a link in the chat as well to show you where that's at, but outstanding action items, obviously the review team is to include the budget discussion and [inaudible] meeting objectives, I believe that's an item on the agenda today. Review team members to provide feedback on the draft of objectives for the DC face-to-face meeting that was circulated via email, [inaudible] again this week. Team members to provide Phil with suggestions on how to recommend review work in preparation for the DC meetings. Phil to circulate a request for volunteers to produce a methodology to determine scope of work, provision of work sub group, including the progress of the sub group which I believe is in progress and staff is working with [inaudible] to progress Washington DC meeting planning, and the review team members to review the digest of background information circulated to the list and provide suggestions and questions for anything that's missing.

PHIL KHOURY: OK, thank you. I think we picked up all of those on the agenda to deal with, so my apologies for that. I should have tidied that up beforehand. Alright, the first thing that is shown is the minutes of the previous meeting I have... they were circulated. I am going to suggest we hold over a sort of general discussion about the style and so on to the next, we have a couple of them to look at. But, I have had a correspondence from Denise, just pointing out that there wasn't a full agreement on the decision around ICANN 63, whether to put in a request for that. So I understand what the difference of opinion is about how that's all worked, so we'll come back to that on the next item. Anyone else who has not been in correspondence with me, such as everyone happy with the minutes from the last meeting? No other amendments? OK, I am going to take silence as acceptance, I think we have a problem coming with audio, I'll just wait to see what... alright looks like we're not getting audio to everybody. Geoff is having trouble.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yvette's working with those who will get audio fixed soon for those that can't hear.

PHIL KHOURY: OK. Well I might... Lauren has the same trouble, Kaveh also is... I don't know if that's me, my audio is perfect.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil this is Negar, I am having good audio as well. I can hear you and Jennifer speaking and Yvette of course, but it sounds like a number of

people are having issues, and I'm not quite sure how we can go about fixing it, Yvette do you have a solution for this or do we need to ask everyone to drop off and rejoin the meeting?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Let me try a couple of things, let me also try to get tech on the call, if I need to and let me see if I can figure out this. Give me a couple of minutes to figure this out. If we can't we may have to have everybody drop off and call back.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: OK, thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: [inaudible] this is Yvette, everything seems to be normal in the room, maybe we need to have everybody call back, because there is nothing unusual with audio at all.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: OK, thank you. Would you please drop a line in the chat pod and let everyone who is having audio issues to disconnect and try to reconnect again, which hopefully should resolve the problem. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: OK, just to be clear, please who can hear well would stay on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, I am staying in.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, I just got Geoff's note in the chat. I wanted just to do a quick audio check, make sure there is no silence right now.

GEOFF HUSTON: I can hear you Jennifer.

GEOFF HUSTON: [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: Hello?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hello, this is Yvette, we can hear you... I can hear you at least.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hello?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hello, can you hear us?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hi this is Kaveh, yes I can hear you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, OK, thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Naveed everyone, was silent for but can you hear me now?

GEOFF HUSTON: I just heard you. I just heard you Naveed.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, it is Jennifer again. A few more people I think seemed to have joined so I am making sure you can all hear me.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Jennifer this is Negar, confirming I can hear you OK.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Great.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: But I can't speak for everybody else, so let's see how the rest of the review team members are doing.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think rather than these protracted silences, it might be useful to actually go through and do a quick roll call to see who is actually able to talk. So, in the absence of anyone else let me go through the list. Alain, can you say something. I saw your microphone unmute Alain and I hear nothing.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hello, this is Kaveh can you hear me?

GEOFF HUSTON: Kaveh, this is Geoff. I can hear you. Denise, can you be heard? Can you say something please? Can't hear a thing Denise, Eric can you say something?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Something.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you Eric. At least my microphone works and Eric can hear me. Denise and Alain heard nothing. Phil?

PHIL KHOURY: I am here Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes I am here now [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: OK thank you. Naveed. Someone typing, I am trying to hear Naveed, can't hear a thing.

RIO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Hello, can you hear me? This is Naveed.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks Naveed, yes we can. Negar Farzinnia.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Hearing you loud and clear Geoff, thank you.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks. Norm? Just disappeared in my list. Scott?

STEVE CONTE: Phil this is Steve, Norm just typed that he is going to switch to [inaudible].

GEOFF HUSTON: OK and we heard Kaveh, so as far as I can see we with the exception of Alain and Denice.

DENISE MICHEL: Hello, can you hear me now? I just dialed back in.

GEOFF HUSTON: I can Denise, thank you.

GEOFF H. & KAVEH R.: [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thanks Kaveh I got that, and Alain. I think we are going to have to proceed as it is now 17 minutes past the hour, time is moving on. Phil, you have a [inaudible], do you want to take the meeting? Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Sure, thank you for the rescue Geoff, very nice. Alright so just to press on, the exchange of emails for item 3, exchange of emails over the next face-to-face at Barcelona. So, my apologies, went off a little bit [inaudible] about the exchange, the process I was following was that there was a record of the decision mailed out to people and there wasn't any complaint about that, at that point. So, I think the right way to fix this now given that we've gone around the houses and shouted at each other is to just simply get three options together for the next hookup, for people to discuss and then have the conversation around

the trade offs between each of the choices with the information in front of us, seem to be kind of an irrational way to do it. With large groups like this interacting like the way, the absolute best way to make decisions is with options in front of people, so that we're not spending quite so much time going backwards and forwards. Can I just put that on the table as a solution to have the staff put say three options in front of people in terms of how you might do that, [inaudible] and then people can choose at the next meeting and we can manage to make that decision in less than a month. Can I just put that out and see if there's any comments about if that's a reasonable way to go, I think Geoff has got his hand up.

GEOFF HUSTON:

OK I will be traffic cop, I think Denise has her hand up. Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks. So, I think it would be useful to get a little bit more clarity and perhaps give staff a little more direction on what they're coming back to us on. Perhaps this is an Australian euthanasia but no one is shouting, but people are just raising legitimate questions and suggestions of how to maximise a team meeting in Barcelona. Just to make sure we all get on the same page here, ICANN meetings are really really busy and I think it's clear if it's easier for staff if the team meets two days before the main meeting starts, that does raise problems for some team members I think, as I said on the list, my hope is that... it would be great if all team members were around the same table in Barcelona, or as many team members as possible. So, I think it would be useful to get a

quick Doodle poll perhaps, get a quick sense of team members who can attend a meeting right before the ICANN meeting, during the ICANN meeting, or again after the ICANN meeting and then focus on the period for which most members could participate and ask, and my suggestion would be to do that and then ask staff to explore what the options are. There are different ways of conducting these meetings, our meetings don't have to be two full days non stop, 8 hours, we could if we chose to break up our team meetings into 2 or 3 hour increments over a couple of afternoons. It would be most convenient to meet after [inaudible] but if we needed to we could also, I think, explore meeting in a hotel conference room nearby. So those are just some of the options that we may want to explore, but I think it's useful to make sure we're all clear what we're asking staff to do. Thanks.

GEOFF HUSTON:

I had my hand up so let me just quickly say conventionally I am used to resolving these kinds of issues with the Doodle poll, so I am happy with options being prepared. It just seems to make sense to me to put it in a poll and figure out what's possible within those set of options Phil. Not everyone is going to attend every phone call every time. A Doodle poll gives a much more complete picture. Thank you. I resume as traffic cop, are there any other comments on this item? I see no other hands raised, Phil back to you.

PHIL KHOURY:

Thanks Geoff. Look I am perfectly fine with all of that Denise, I think if... what I think is sensible is to pick up the suggestions that you made, pick

up the other ones that you put into the email which we discussed earlier in the week and then put them in front of the team, which as Geoff says a Doodle poll to decide over the many parameters you might use to make this decision. Which one people prefer, accepting with clear eyes the trade off that are innovatively involved in those things. So, if people are comfortable with that in the next few days we'll get that information around to people and Doodle poll and we'll just sign it off at the next meeting, hopefully without further ado. So, could I then... I don't see any hands, I am going to go to the fourth item which is inductions and new members. Thank you to the people who provided those sort of overview of progress by the subgroups previously. That's been very helpful, I haven't circulated... Geoff has provided me with one, I think Norm has sent one through in the last hour or so over. I got an email from Eric as well, so we will wrap those up and provide them to the team. In the meantime there was a reorganization of the material on the Wiki and I thought I would ask if there was any feedback from new members of the team, if they had a chance to look at that and see if that helped with some absorbing up the information from the earlier life of the review team. Anyone had a chance to have a look at that, from the new people? No one has raised their hands, Jennifer, could you just post the URL of that Wiki into the chat screen so folks who don't want to burrow through email have it right in front of them. Thank you. OK, so no hands. I might return to that one if we have time at the end of the hook up. I am conscious we are moving through this quickly, running out of time. Fifth item on our agenda was [inaudible] number of things around recommencing the review work, so we talked previously as an action item for discussion of the budget information. So just a couple of things into the reverse order, I'll come back to the budget

information discussion in a second, so NDA if it's raised with me, the non disclosure agreements that they are not all complete and that for some people there is quite a bit of work involved in completing them. Because they have to go through their own organizations legal departments to get them signed off, so I am not sure how many there are but at least three people raised the issue of the NDAs being problematic and that's something pleased to restart and get under control. Does anybody want to add anything to that area?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, thanks Phil. My recollection about that is if we as a team discuss this at length over multiple calls and I believe actually in the face-to-face session. I am happy to be corrected by the team or I am happy to hear that things have moved on, but my recollection is clear that the consensus on the team was that we didn't feel that we needed this, that if we got to a point where we needed something or we asked for something, or we wanted something, that the provider said required an NDA we would have a discussion about that and decide if we wanted to execute it. But, I've had multiple attorneys look at the drafted NDA and at this point I am not comfortable signing it because of the way it's written.

PHIL KHOURY:

OK. I took the input at face value, that they needed... that they were still outstanding but I apologize if the decision was you're not going to do it, then Geoff... your hand up.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, thanks Phil. I am not prepared to sign an NDA for this particular activity. I have a philosophical position that this kind of review should be open and public and any material that is presented to me under an NDA I am not willing to look at or consider. If that precludes me from further activity of this review team, so be it. But I do not believe that an NDA is consistent with this and I said so at the time, my position has not changed. Thank you.

ADOBE ROOM: The host has left the meeting, to speak with meeting support and we rejoin soon.

NORM RITCHIE: Sorry I listened to a recording there for a second. So, yeah I did sign the NDA without legal guidance and since I talked to others about it and I regret doing so. I would advise anyone else to actually seek legal guidance before they sign it.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks Norm, Negar only lightly be [inaudible] on this, I apologize if I... if...

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No problem at all Phil. The ICANN bylaws clearly... there's a section of it that I am happy for staff to share with the review team, just that the point of reference indicates that if there's any material pertaining to the review work that could be deemed as requiring non disclosure

agreement, that the review team members must sign set non disclosure agreements in order to proceed reviewing that material. On this topic of SSR2 or SSR review in general, given that some conversations could and do pertain to a security of the domain name system or sensitive by nature and as such there are some discussions that could require non disclosure agreements as it could harm the domain name system if such information became public knowledge, might require NDAs to be signed before we get to that point. What we had established with the review team members for this review and other reviews is if there's a request made for access to certain types of information that we deem to be requiring non disclosure agreements for various reasons for which we will disclose, we will ask a non disclosure agreement to be signed. Again, this is something that is in ICANN bylaws for specific reviews is not a staff request on a whim, and we are happy to share that portion of the bylaws with the review team members. Barring that, if review team members are not comfortable signing non disclosure agreements, we may not be able to share certain information requested again, because it could be a risk to the security of the domain name system.

PHIL KHOURY:

OK, so could I just jump in for a second and just say look, ask the question, is that specific to particular chunks of information within the review team task or a blanket issue. Presumably you can isolate the sharing of sensitive information to people who are OK with an NDA. Is that doable?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I am sorry Phil, I am not sure I understood what you said, could you repeat it again please.

PHIL KHOURY: The question is, that presumably if there are sensitive pieces of work that has to be done, each piece can be dealt with in a way that maintains whatever security and privacy is required without the entire team having signed the same NDA, or is ICANN's view... is this a debate about everybody having to sign it in order to share information?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: As the bylaws dictate it does not have to be signed by everybody on the review team, but again if material is being requiring non disclosure agreements, said review team members cannot discuss the subject with others that have not signed NDA within the review team.

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah thanks Phil, thanks Negar. So, I just... a couple of things real quick, so one, we did have extensive discussions about this, so I think as far as certainly in my opinion for a facilitator to decide we should adjudicate these things, especially some people brought them up and there's any sort of [inaudible]. I think it might be most helpful for anybody that brought up it to Phil's attention to bring their thoughts forward at this point because I think we're kind of reaching things from first principles again

and if there were particular points that somebody had concern over, it just would focus our conversation for those people to come forward now and just sort of make it clear what their concerns are. But, you know, in the spirit of full transparency of what we talked about, we had one of the bylaw drafter previously on the team, James [inaudible] he gave full insight into why that bylaw item was written that way and this was not the spirit that he had in mind. So, I am not sure what the court of law with spirit versus letter matters less or more, but nevertheless his point was that in the event that something absolutely needed to be looked at in order to conduct a review a NDA may be necessary, and we as a team, just to sort of rehache my perspective of where we got to, my recollection. We as a team said fine, if we get to that point, we'll figure out what to do. But, nobody has to sign it right now. Certainly if that gave anyone heartburn and they want to address it now, this would probably be the right time and maybe we can put it to bed after this, but it also in the bylaws, it doesn't say what the NDA should be. In fact, the NDA that we were all given was extremely difficult for anybody with any understanding of what it said to sign. Perhaps before we need to get to an actual NDA, if we ever do, maybe ICANN stuff could socialize this with various legal teams of constituency members and have their legal team massage it into something that's actually palatable and executable, and by the time we actually need it, maybe we can have an NDA in place we could actually sign, sort of.

PHIL KHOURY

Thank you, Steve Conte.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks Phil, and review team please keep me honest on this but I feel that we exercise this pretty well when we had the Los Angeles meeting last year, there was a couple of things that were business confidential that some of the ICANN Org staff was reluctant to discuss with the review team, and I think through discussions off the record discussions on what the review team was looking to accomplish by asking those questions, I think we got a good place and we got to a place where the relevant staff were able to produce information that, I believe, satisfied the questions of the review team at that time. So, we have... and I'm not going to speak to the language part that Eric just brought up because I'm not a lawyer, I don't play one on TV and all that. I think that we can move forward with proper discussions on having firm understanding on what the question is being asked and what the... where that line of questioning is going so we as ICANN Org staff have an understanding on who do ask internally to provide that information and at what level and what layer is that information being provided, so we don't compromise any part of ICANN security system, but we have the point... example that I made was about enterprise versus management, so we clearly don't want to expose all that stuff too. But I think we landed on a happy place and I think that was a good model to use moving forward. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY:

That sounds perfect sensible to me. Geoff, further comments?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I am a little bit concerned about the shifting nature of what I am hearing. A year ago, more in line of what Steve just said, it was a discussion around documents and material that was considered, I suppose one way of saying it is commercial incompetence, this represented agreements or specific arrangements and materials that ICANN felt were confidential to ICANN and if the review team wished to see them a NDA was appropriate. I now hear the statement that the reviewer of the DNS shall be, if you will, [inaudible] upon the security and stability of the DNS and therefore by its very nature subject to an NDA. If that truly is the case, if that really is the case, that this is not about generic documents, this is not about commercial incompetence, it's about the way in which those parts of the DNS that are under ICANNs remit are managed, I must admit that I have an amazingly large problem at this point in time. I believe that if you want an open community review, you cannot slap an NDA across that, that's a philosophical issue, but nevertheless a very substantive one. If, as has been represented, this entire review of the stability and security of the DNS intrinsically requires an NDA to conduct its business then I think ICANN has a remarkably serious problem, and I for one do not wish to sign an NDA under those conditions. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I think what Steve was saying is that you had actually worked out, or at least some of the members of the team had worked out a more practical doable solution to how to manage that issue. I think that's...

GEOFF HUSTON:

I am not objecting to what Steve said, it was the comments that [inaudible] had made that really raised my alarms here. Because as I said, if what [inaudible] said is true that investigations and reviews of what matters pertaining to the security and stability of the DNS, by its very nature require us to sign an NDA, then I think that's a problem. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Geoff, if I may make a statement here. I do not believe I said everything pertaining to the security and stability of the domain name system requires NDA, I clearly stated that as part of the investigation the review team is doing, there could be items the review team may choose to look into or may need to look into that could require an NDA based on the nature of whatever it is, given that they are dealing with sensitive topics here. It does not mean that everyone has to sign an NDA right off that for any research that you want to do, evidenced by the fact that a lot of the review team members have not signed an NDA and a lot of what has been done on this review today, or at least prior to the call. The clear point I am trying to make is, and that's what the bylaws state also if there are items that are deemed to be requiring NDA, at that point in time the person asking to have access to this and others who may wish to discuss it, may need to sign a non disclosure agreement and if people choose not to for various reason, that particular document information may not be shared with them, but that can all be discussed as the time such need arises. If it doesn't arise, that's perfect, but if it does arise, here is what's stated in the bylaws. I hope that [inaudible] the clarification.

PHIL KHOURY:

I am going to bring that conversation to a close, I think... that's... my apologies... I thought that was a very minor outstanding task issue, not a 20 minute philosophical debate reopened, so I do apologise for slipping that in, in my ignorance. I think, an email summary of where we're upto would be a better way to deal with this than protracting this meeting, so can I just... let's put that aside, maybe call on Steve to give us a summary of where that ended up with the team that were working in LA, and I think that probably satisfies the concerns. So, can we please move onto just to finish item 5, outstanding tasks, anything else that we need to get done that is needed, so that the review work can recommence as soon as you are ready to fire away? Any other outstanding tasks?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

I have something Phil, that I would like to bring up. On the outstanding items, towards the middle of October, almost closer to the end of October last year, right before the review of [inaudible] we had circulated a note to the leadership team to let them know about the transparency process around leadership calls and communications. We were in the process of standardizing how we support all the specific review for transparency purposes, and also to showcase the work that the review leadership team does. We wanted to post all the archive emails and meetings of SSR2 leadership, much like we do for not only the rest of the review team plenary calls and emails, but also all the other specific reviews that we conduct. This item did not go any further, this request, because the review was paused shortly after, and it is

something that I thought we probably should proceed with archiving on the SSR2 Wiki page to have a cohesive picture for the new review team as to where everything has landed on the SSR2 before the pause.

PHIL KHOURY:

Any comments on that, or any items people would like to make sure get done in the next couple of weeks? OK. I am going to press on. So the preparation for the face-to-face. How are attendances going, please staff?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, it's Jennifer here. So, we have one review team member who is unable to attend in person or remotely and one review team member who has confirmed he will attend remotely. We're working with one review team member to finalize travel arrangements, but aside from that everybody has their flight booked and we expect to see them in DC. I should note that on Wednesday... we've been working with leadership with Denise and Eric to talk about cost and things like that, I just wanted to flag as well on the Wednesday night we are planning a review team dinner, that's the 22nd of August.

PHIL KHOURY:

OK, great. Now, just for item B on there, the... we will have remote attendance, I've requested that until the team is... while the team is dealing with its internal processes and dynamics that the recording of any sessions is kept private to the team and not sort of posted publicly, and you would return to normal ICANN transparency conventions once

the subject matter returned to the work of the review. Happy to take comments or suggestions, whether that is smart or not, just so people know what the protocol for that is, is going to be. Not seeing any hands or comments but I'll press on because of the time. Did anyone have... I have not received anything other than a single nod really to the draft objectives to the meeting. Mr [inaudible] has provided me with a number of issues that he would like to see attended to in the course of the session plan, thank you for that. I will circulate a session plan before our next meeting for people to look at and comment on, any... let me put it another way, can I assume that people are OK with that set of objectives? That we haven't missed any major. OK, so the other thing that was circulated as part of that was the notes from my interviews, which I've sort of [inaudible] upto a fairly high level, again I've not heard any direct feedback about that. Does anyone want to make a comment about that at this point, or raise a question? Happy to take it by email to sort of work as goes up into, but it would be useful to have some discussion around that. Denise, do you mind if I call on you... just think that you would like to see in the session plan for the face-to-face?

DENISE MICHEL:

I am sorry Phil, are you talking about the DC meeting?

PHIL KHOURY:

Sorry for DC, yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: I generally don't have any issues with the draft objective you circulated, did you have a specific question or?

PHIL KHOURY: No, I just thought I'd start somewhere and see if anyone had particular things that they would like us to be dealing with at the face-to-face, if they wanted to raise here. Happy to move on if that's not...

DENISE MICHEL: Sure, well... I'd like to make sure that we address the issues that were raised as part of the un-pausing by the SO and AC chairs, so that includes the scope and the skill-set. Those perhaps need to be highlighted on the face-to-face meeting objectives.

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry to put you on the spot like that, anyone else want to raise their hand. OK, thank you. What about say Norm, can I call on you Norm, are you there? Any sort of observations you would like to add to the conversation.

NORM RITCHIE: Can you hear me OK?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: OK. Sorry, never know if my microphone is on or not. I totally agree with Denise, I think that probably the biggest thing for us to move forward from here is to look at the reasons why we're paused, which seems to be centered around scope and make sure we're all in agreement around that and modify as necessary. Secondly, to... because of the amount of time that's elapsed since, I guess October, which is pretty substantial, in internet years that is quite a bit, going to be close to a year by the time we get going again. We should make sure that what we are working on is still pertinent, do we need to add, subtract, or remain the same on what we're addressing.

PHIL KHOURY: OK. In the... sorry Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, I hope you can hear me.

PHIL KHOURY: Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Good. I think that for me, from my perspective it's just very important for us to get together kind of redefine or agree with prior definitions of scope, I think what I've read... I think the main thing is we come to look at it, discuss, and move on because... it's just time to get back with and some time as the last, so we have to recheck, make sure everything makes sense. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: OK, great thank you. I am going to send a question around, a couple of questions around by email over the next few days to start some thinking, but also just on some questions that I have, where I'd really like to tap into the collective wisdom in the group. In particular around the issue of approach and methodology. ICANN recommended processes for review for such reviews are quite detailed and cover lots of aspects of review activity and [inaudible] and so on, but I pretty much leave methodology and approach to the team and seems to be the area where we have the most disagreement so I'll try and assemble some options around that for people to look at. I will circulate that by email it's too complicated for teleconference. Now I wanted to ask a question about a tool that we could possibly use at the face-to-face and one of the issues [inaudible]...

ADOBE CONNECT: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

PHIL KHOURY: Sorry Laurin, did I cut you off? Your hand is still up.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry it was a mistake, no worries.

PHIL KHOURY:

The... one of the things that is comes out at the end of views of everyone on the team is that there's a kind of a categorizing of people, there are new people coming into the team but there's also I think a bit of a... a rising from some probably bruising experiences and all, a bit of... sort of lack of awareness, I suppose of what each person on the team can, or could possibly bring to the work that's here, and I was looking for a way in which we can kind of refresh getting to know each other and how people work, and kind of understanding where people are coming from. There is only one sort of tool that I'm actually personally certified using and it's a tool you've probably done dozens of these, some of you may have even used this one, it's just a short questionnaire diagnostic that people fill in about their own work preferences and from that you get a little profile of how you individually like to work and strengths and preferences, and that can be used as a way to kind of really get to know the people in the room. So, look... however... I know that sometimes people are horrified by these sorts of group dynamic tools and there are people around who have had terrible experiences with them for all kinds of reasons. So, I am going to put that again by email, I will flick around to everyone, just saying look I am thinking about using this but I am not going to do it if people are either uncomfortable with it, or massively sceptical about the use of that kind of tool. So I just wanted to really say something about that, not just throw it around by email. Anyone comments, experience with that, had a view that they would want to raise now? Geoff. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON:

I am certainly aware of my own strong preference to do as much work as possible in email, and not in coordinated face-to-face. Part of the

issue really comes that between us as volunteers, between us as basically I think from most time zones, and between us as folks who have day jobs, the fiction that progress is going to be made when we're all either sitting around the table, or on calls such as these is largely... is nonsubstantive. There are two other SSAC nominees, Russ Housley and KC Claffy who aren't on this call, for example, and who have some sort of opinions and views and I'm not willing to represent them, they can speak for themselves...

KC CLAFFY

KC Claffy is on this call. I missed the roll call, but I totally agree with everything you just said though.

GEOFF HUSTON:

You are not on this little Adobe Connect list but thank you. My point was that, you know, there is an implicit assumption carried around for the first year and a half that decisions for something that were made in some kind of phone call or some kind of face-to-face and the email was merely just a background noise. In my own sort of style of working, nothing could be further from the truth, the exact opposite. The best ways that I can accommodate and work with others in this kind of desperate global set, is to actually do the bulk of the work on email and formalizing the decisions that are made by Doodle poll or any other mechanism, if you do want a poll vote and less reliance on face-to-face because it simply doesn't work very well. Thanks.

PHIL KHOURY:

Laurin.

ADOBE CONNECT:

The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Just from my point of view there are some staff where the face-to-face might actually be helpful, so for the new members like me, it's really important to have the Washington meeting, set things up. I think it also helps generally. I think after that is done, I agree that what we can do via email and I'm not sure people are interested and if we're allowed to, use something like Slack and [inaudible] if someone wants that, OK. But you know, deal with what we can deal with via email or something along those lines and really reserve those things where it makes sense to meet to those meeting so that they run efficiently.

PHIL KHOURY:

Sure, thanks Laurin. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE:

I kind of agree with everybody here, so we need all forms of communication, we need the face-to-face for our... that's how people work and every so often that's required, especially when you're new, having joined in September, I would... I found this difficult at first, from the... get my head around things and just been told to read tons and tons of documents and emails, and trying to catch up during conference

calls. I found that very difficult. Then since we had a face-to-face I found that accelerated in my navigation fairly quickly. But I also got the feeling what Geoff was saying regarding emails, I think they're very important because they kind of get you around that temporal barrier, so they can actually exchange ideas, independent of being in real time. I think the two are absolutely needed and I don't think there's one or the other. They are both needed.

PHIL KHOURY:

OK. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I was going to say largely the same thing as Norm. I think I was going to say one thing slightly different, so, in concert with what Norm was saying and Geoff I think as well, I think we have different kinds of work that we do, and I think at certain points we need to all get on the same page and get on base with each other. In the past as the team sort of evolved, we started off face-to-face not knowing each other and that actually might have wound up being a little premature, but nevertheless, we struggled to find our pace with each until we all [inaudible] at the face-to-face again, and as a team what really worked for us and maybe will work going forward, or maybe it won't was getting a lot of work done at points in which we need to sync, having calls at points we really need to get on the same page or at least to sort of formally ratify something big, we will wind up face-to-face with each other. That works really well with the ICANN period yesterday, and other things like that. So, to sort of form what Geoff said, I think yeah

doing a lot of work over email is probably critical from a [inaudible] perspective and the calls probably help us go over point focus items that there are issue of [inaudible] over, and face-to-face meetings help us get on base with each other, it's sort of like a tiered system. I am kind of rushing as I am watching the clock at the same time as talking. So, I think that's the way the team kind of evolved [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY:

[inaudible] switch that off or mute please. Alright [inaudible]. I think that is one of the things you would really want to make sure you sort of establish at the face-to-face, the protocols for how you work and what stuff gets done. Ideally in email document exchanges what stuff gets done on a teleconference, and what stuff you really need a face-to-face for. So clearly that is a... one of the things that you do best in a face-to-face, that sort of sorted out, and get to know each other on that front. So, I will circulate a session plan that will hopefully move our next conversation along a little bit in terms of how we best use the face-to-face and my sort of working assumption around that is that the amount of time we spend on team, team dynamics, team protocols, and the amount of time we spend on getting the work organized, we would aim to get as much of the time as we have available to us for getting the review tasks underway. So we will try and get through the things we need to get through first as quickly as possible, use the right amount of time. Alright, so... we're going to wrap up, it's 7AM here, some other times there, people need to go. Any other business, anything we've missed, anything people would like to raise? Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: [inaudible] before we wrap up, I would like to just run through the action items that we've recorded here.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you Jennifer. I just have a very quick note to add, it's an announcement that to the review team, we are realigning our secretariat resources and [inaudible] from the beginning is switching to a different set of responsibilities within the MSSI team. So I wanted to let the team know that starting the face-to-face meeting in DC, Brenda Brewer who is on the call with us today and has been on many other specific review sessions, is going to take over the secretariat responsibilities for SSR2. I wanted to take this moment to thank Yvette for all of her hard work on this review and welcome Brenda to the team, and with that Jennifer, I will hand it over to you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thanks Negar, just quickly I wanted to run through these action items I've recorded here. I can see them in Adobe, staff to share information about options to meet in Barcelona and circulate a Doodle poll to the team with those options. Staff to provide an email summary of the review team discussions so far regarding NDA and include an attachment of the NDA in the email. [inaudible] to circulate a draft session plan for the DC meeting prior to the next review team meeting. [inaudible] to post record of leadership meetings [inaudible], and Phil to send questions in email to the review team to react to regarding methodology and approach to work. Please let me know if there are any edits and [inaudible]. Thanks.

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you Jennifer.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise, I am not on Connect room, can I ask staff just to... I may have some questions or clarification on those action items, if the staff could just put them into email, I would be happy to follow up on email. Thanks.

PHIL KHOURY: Thanks Denise. Jennifer, you've still got your hand up, do...

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sorry, no. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: No problem. OK, I am going to close the meeting. Thank you everyone for your participation and there will be email exchanges to follow back [inaudible]. Naveed I see your request for changing the time, the next meeting is not at this time, so hopefully that helps but this was the most popular time and that's on the Doodle poll, so it is quite difficult to find a time that suits the entire globe. So, hopefully the next one will be better for you, and Naveed I hope you can get back to bed now. I am sorry. Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
