
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is now being recorded.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi everyone, this is Yvette Guigneaux, the host of the room. Welcome to the SSR2 review team plenary meeting number 39. Today is August 9th, 2018 and the meeting is at 13:00 UTC. Attending today's call, while I'm going on the roll of attendance, I have a 6597 number, can you just identify yourself real quick for the record. Denise, is that you by any chance? Perfect, I will make sure I get you in the roll, let me go ahead and do that. OK, so attending today's call we have Alain, Ramkrishna. Narool, Mr Matogoro, Kaveh, Laurin, Naveed, Eric, Norm, and Denise. We have our facilitator Phil Khoury as well, we currently have no observers at this time, and from the ICANN Organization, we have Alice, Negar, Jennifer, Steve, Brenda, and myself. We have apologies from Kerry-Ann, Zarko, Geoff Huston, and Boban. We'd like to remind you that today's call is being recorded, so to please state your name before speaking. Okay, Phil, I will turn this meeting back over to you.

PHIL KHOURY: Thank you Yvette, Phil Khoury. Thank you everyone for being on the call. The agenda is out in front of you there, the first thing on the agenda is minutes of previous meeting, and we've had a... some exchanges over the accuracy of the minutes, the record, the last couple of times and I've had some conversations with people, made a few edits to records but if I could just put this to the team and just say that while we can all disagree about the detail of what should be in the record and I think

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.

that's perfectly legitimate and I would ask for your indulgence for two more weeks, until we get to the face-to-face. My advice for the team is that... the record of the meeting is kind of an analog thing, it's trying to achieve lots of things at once, in particular, at the moment and I think that it's... while there might be important points to be made, I think it's more useful to sort of go through with the kind of style of record that we have at the moment, that's my judgement and I'm asking you to rely on me for two more weeks and then it's over to you and your team leadership to resolve whether those records are satisfactory to you. But, I just wanted to put that on the table and I am happy to take comment back. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Hi Phil, thanks for that. I'll be brief... I put some of my thoughts on the list, I don't want to sort of rehash them again, but, hearing what you just said, I think then there's a little bit of an impedance mismatch, in that I think it makes sense to me that we should sort of follow your lead for... as you describe as some kind of interim period. On the other hand, when we bring up items that [inaudible] record, or important things that are sort of like, be representative of our thoughts going forward or certainly reflective of our thoughts in the past, maybe from like before you joined us. I think it's difficult to then sort of let there be an inaccurate representation. So, on the one hand if we want to do sort of like a low pass filter of things we've discussed, and you're saying, give some leeway so we don't get into the wheeze on this, then I think we should probably try to avoid getting really into historical and substantive matters, because those are important. I think, we kind of probably need to have it one way or the other and you know, I'm happy

to discuss what I think is important going into minutes and notes, but I sort of sense from your comments that you'd rather delay that conversation until later.

PHIL KHOURY: Anyone else? I can't see anyone with their hands up. Anyone else have a comment on this?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry, this is Laurin, I have problems with my hand up, because I am in on the phone. Essentially, I think that what Eric was saying is generally, we should strive to be as accurate as possible and to say... you know... stuff like, disagreements on when to hold things, which is obviously something that is important to the group, we should make sure that this is represented appropriately. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY: Anyone else? Denise is a plus one. OK. I said that, I asked that you bear with me for a couple of weeks. I will... separately, I had a suggestion from Eric about correcting the record further for the last meeting, and that's probably pretty sensible. I am happy to make a few more edits to that and then I'm going to ask your indulgence to let it go through, until we've got somewhere in terms of some of those discussions at the face-to-face. These are things that are much easier... more easily settled in an environment where there is progress. So, let me leave that there, if people want to come back to me with... I will recirculate the record for that meeting to make sure that I think we sort of picked up some of

what was raised, and if you want to come back to me on the email list on that, or let's deal with it in that way. I don't think it's a discussion we need to pursue further, I think that it's a pretty clear message from that. Look, if people are okay with that, thank you Alain. So, let's go on to the next item which is the discussion everybody had about the face-to-face, and in Barcelona. Look maybe the sensible way to think about this is just the teams next face-to-face. Unfortunately, around ICANN, you have to do this months in advance, so this is a bad time to be making a decision on that, given its pretty uncertain what work will actually need to be done and how much progress will be made, and all that kind of thing. But, nonetheless, there are deadlines and [inaudible] to sorting all of that. So, look I made a suggestion about trying to bring this discussion back to some sort of, you know, some concrete proposition that all will fly [inaudible] long winded paper, so I've made some... hopefully people have had a chance to look at it and that appears to be, from my understanding, the logistics... you know, what the trade-offs are in any of the options that they put forward. Can I throw the floor open to questions or comment about all of that? The first thing I guess is, if people... just to take it logically, through the objectives and background that I've put in the document, sort of reasonable decision making, just the popularity decision making, there's some trade offs that to go [inaudible]. So, can I ask for just some feedback on the first part of that? Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

I am sorry, it is very very early where I am, so I may not be following this completely. What are you asking for feedback on, which part?

PHIL KHOURY: That the decision making isn't just about doodling which would suit people, there's more to making a choice about how this would work than just that. I was trying to get on the table what the issues are, in terms of... so people are making a clear eyed choice about which of the options that work for them. So that... the intention was to have in front of people, the choice, three choices say, that could all work and people understand what the trade offs are for them, for each of them.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, are you asking for input on what the three choices should be, or, whether we agree with the [inaudible]? Haven't had my coffee yet...

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, look... I think the... I would appreciate some feedback on just the logic first before you get to the options, so the Doodle poll. Is this a sensible way to choose between ways in which the team could schedule its next face-to-face? Sorry, Eric? Didn't spot you there, sorry.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No worries. I think I am going to, maybe repeat a little bit of what happened on the mailing list, just maybe jump start this a little bit, because I share some of Denise's confusion about what you want us to say. Maybe to sort of go back... I can't make it over a week, at this point we've been on the review team for over a year, it's sort of like we have dollar day jobs and sort of setting a week aside for ICANN is one thing, but setting aside additional time as well, we voiced this for over a year,

that most of us, some of us, varying degrees of us at different time, have had a lot of difficulty with having over a week worth of travel, and so I floated that on the list. I am struggling now to find the thread, because I wanted to sort of get it, to refresh my memory, [inaudible] who on the team echoed this, but there were other people on the team who said, yes we can't do it either before the meeting. So, the problem is, a lot of us will be at ICANN and we won't be able to be there before ICANN. So in a sense, there will be an opportunity, an organic ICANN meeting where we're all there to meet with each other and there is some discussion about maybe breaking it up into smaller session, there was some discussion about being creative about finding spaces. I mean, there's the will, at least among some of us and so the Doodle poll might help us figure out how much of us that represents, how much of the team that represents. But, there certainly was the team saying that some of us would prefer to meet during the ICANN week, and the sort of the coming back, other people in the past and staff would prefer... this is a team that's been put through a lot with the pause, the extended duration, etc, and we're asking for an accomodation, some of us and I think the Doodle poll might help us understand, is that a minority report, is that the majority, what the real sort of sensitivity is around there, but I think right now there's a bunch of us saying, this is going to be difficult and we're getting pushed back again and again, we've been saying it for a long time. That's kind of where I start, like, I cannot attend the SSR2 face-to-face...

PHIL KHOURY:

So, Eric, do you mind if I cut across. Sorry about that. Look, that was heard loud and clear, and the propositions that are in the note, don't in

fact include that anymore. So, the proposition here is, that if you want to have it during the Monday to Thursday, and I'm happy... I am guessing that's people window for arriving, there are some limited options about how you can do it. The document that was circulated has got a proposition for two ways in which you can do it, Monday to Thursday, and you have to accept what the trade offs are with that. The current schedule for ICANN 63 is attached, went around with the minutes, so people can see what their obligations are, but not everybody goes to ICANN 63, not everybody has spare time at ICANN 63. So, it isn't just a matter of the days that are best, it's also a matter of how you organize it, and it's... from my investigations, it is a long way from straightforward to organize at the meeting and to improve participation. So the proposition [inaudible] include Thursday, Friday anymore... not Saturday, Sunday even anymore, so...

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, my bad then, I apologize again. [inaudible]. Thanks for clarifying that then Phil.

PHIL KHOURY:

My point really is that at the end of the day was to say, look, if you want to have a Doodle poll to decide how you're doing it... instead of sort of starting with just what days could somebody do, let's have a look at an actual proposal so that people are picking something and understanding that if you choose, for example, to use the sort of ICANN pop up facilities, you won't know until three or four days before, whether you get one or not, and where it will be and you will have to act quick to

grab that. So that's a set of issues that has to be dealt with, but it fits into the window. That was really the proposition. If people haven't had a chance to sort of look at it, then maybe we need to finish the conversation on email, but... Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. So... I think the table lays out broad options, so is the intention then to acknowledge the options broadly and decide what the Doodle poll should contain on this call, what are you proposing as the next step?

PHIL KHOURY: That's what I would use... the next step... there's three options which are worth testing, whether people can do them and which one they prefer, and use the Doodle poll. Or, the logic is that you have to do multiple Doodle polls to sort of, narrow down your options, you know, there are lots of ways to do it. My observation was, right now the argument was going in a circle.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, so my experience is the last two days of an ICANN meeting, particularly in the afternoons are much lighter. I would recommend that we pull people's availability to attend, either all day or half days on October 24th and October 25th, if people would also like to include in the Doodle poll the two days before the ICANN meeting, or after. I think those are three reasonable Doodle poll options. I also think that, if I am understanding the material correctly, SO and AC chairs have some sway

in who receives rooms, I think the team can send a note to the SO and AC chairs and if the Doodle poll, for example, is for... prefers Wednesday and Thursday, we ask that they make accommodations for the review team to meet and help us to clear rooms. I can also reserve a conference room at a hotel next door if staff needs assistance with that, understanding that there are limitations. I think that's also an option. I would suggest that we do a Doodle poll with those three options.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I wish I could raise my hand but it's not possible. I would also support the idea of say, just maybe trying to do [inaudible] at ICANN so we make some leeway, and then we're that at the meeting and we [inaudible] shouldn't bring us over a week, and that would be useful. I would support this idea of trying to make something happen around the ICANN meeting, and I would also like to remind people that [inaudible], at the same time it is important for us to speak to other people, to speak to our relevant constituencies and so on, and that just was [inaudible], when we're able to do that in person where everyone is there. Thank you.

PHIL KHOURY:

Sorry, Alain? [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA:

Yes, okay [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY: I am sorry Alain, we are having trouble hearing you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil, this is Negar for the record. I think Alain just noted that he has posted his question in the chatroom. I am happy to read it out loud, he is asking, do we have an idea of work plan for the face-to-face at ICANN 63? Would it include some community engagement?

PHIL KHOURY: If I may, I think you would need to be pretty clear in your minds about what you were going to do at community engagement at this point, my guess is that's probably premature that you would want to be clear at the DC meeting about whether you were in a position to do that. So, Denise and Eric have suggested that topic. I think that one of the critical things, if I may, for this team is how the community are going to perceive you for the next 9, 12 months and I think the... everything you do in front of the community needs to be pretty carefully thought through. I think we're getting some agreement there. Can I just get... so Denise's proposition is that one of the options for ICANN 63 facility should include the Thursday and Friday. Okay, we need to find out if people are planning to be there and how many to do that. So, I am happy to edit this to do it, right now the... you'll see in the table that the offering, you might want to pick up on this Negar, but the offering at the moment from ICANN meeting team is only including times Saturday, Sunday, Monday, part of Wednesday, and the evening sessions. So...

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct Phil, we have reached out to the meetings team to find out and given their experience, what days of the week are more likely for us to be able to get meeting times scheduled for face-to-face engagement, and the days you just read out are the ones that they said are more preferable given the high interest topic sessions that are in place, the consistency day, that's going to be a whole day event, and other sessions that they are anticipating that would need to be scheduled, that might be a conflict for review team members. Of course, we won't know for certain until the request forms are open some time in September and we submit whatever times and dates the review team decides on. We can submit that and see what the community decides in terms of scheduling.

PHIL KHOURY: I got that, sorry about my dyslexia there, that's Wednesday, Thursday, I got that recorded. Sorry, Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, thanks for noting that. One other quick thing in regards to what Negar was saying and apologies if I misunderstood, but I just want to make sure that we don't conflate two separate things that may themselves both be important, but are nevertheless, different. One is the extent to which the meetings team needs to work additionally to accommodate our requests, so if it's difficult to get a room on Monday, etc, that's one concern, but I'd submit that's [inaudible] from the review team saying there's a preference for the review team. So I mean, I might have misunderstood what Negar was saying but it sounded like the

meetings team was going to struggle to do something, because of contention for rooms, and what would be best for the team. I am just saying those are independent and separable, so I think it might be useful to keep those separate, especially considering Denise's comments about being able to go outside to other venues if space really becomes a problem.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thanks Eric, this is Negar. The comments I made only pertain to if the review teams preference is to meet at the ICANNs venue itself. The meetings team will always do everything they can to accommodate us, but there's also all the meetings that the community would need to have and space availability will have to be factored into that. A part of the options that Phil has provided is meeting at an outside venue, which, if that's the preference of the review team, we can certainly start working on that. So, I'll let Phil take over the conversation, so hopefully we can reach some form of conclusion on this or, decide how to proceed forward.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay, that's fine. I mean, I'd just like to move it along, to big a committee to settle in this kind of way, but I think what we're hearing is that there can be effort made to get ICANN facilities provided, but the option of using an external one is potentially a fall back, a hotel, and whatever the cost is for non ICANN tech support in that space, and making sure there's enough bandwidth and whatever else is needed to run a meeting. So, can we take that... I am not seeing any hands at the

moment, Steve's made a suggestion about a way to do it, can we just take that away and put up a come back by email and just modify all that, so that it reflects the discussion and picks up, so you guys can have a poll and pick the thing you think works best for those days.

DENISE MICHEL:

Hi, this is Denise. Could we get an agreement on when we'll be making a decision issuing the poll. I am mindful that there was an initial sort of deadline for indicating space needs for Barcelona, I would not want us to delay too long and [inaudible] getting something that the review team wants.

PHIL KHOURY:

Looks like we'll have to get it back out tomorrow...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Okay, so we're getting a Doodle poll out tomorrow, is that the plan?

PHIL KHOURY:

It seems to me that an email saying some description around what is the... each are the options are and a Doodle poll. I guess is the way to do it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Okay, so that's something you are going to do Phil?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, I will get some help from the staff to clarify. I think at the moment we have request in, don't we Negar? With the ICANN Organizers?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Phil, the request that we put in was initially for the two days prior to the meeting. Yeah, the form to submit official requests for meetings during the week has not been opened yet. But we can of course, submit the information to the meetings team once we have the data.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay. Denise, do you think there's value in some lobbying to the SO AC chairs?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure, I wouldn't call it lobbying but they have created some process, I think, where representatives, or SO and AC chairs, also weigh in putting the schedule together, so I think it would be useful to them to both SO and AC chairs and staff [inaudible] the review team decides that it needs to meet during the ICANN meeting.

PHIL KHOURY: Okay, I don't see any other hands. That's long enough on logistics, and we might move on and fire emails back, or I will get something back to you guys in the morning. Alright, conscious we really blew our timing last time, let me press on. Item four on the agenda is around the induction for new members, can I thank the people who have put in their summary slides, with got four of the five sub teams have now got

summaries in, so thank you everyone. I just need to paste in the latest one into the single document and I have one other request which is IANA translation. I think there is the fifth one which we don't yet have a summary from, if anyone who is on that subgroup want to volunteer to send me a few dot points on what was done, [inaudible] got my terminology right here. Okay, I am not seeing any hands, I will use email to seek a volunteer for that. No other comments, alright, excellent. So preparation for the face-to-face, I've circulated a draft session plan, that's only been a couple of days in the [inaudible]. Denise, would you like to comment?

DENISE MICHEL: Just to hop back to your previous questions, sorry wasn't quick enough. The fifth subgroup is, [inaudible] IANA transition, not translation.

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, sure, sorry.

DENISE MICHEL: No problem, and the... I wanted to get a clarification on what the purpose of these slides are, are they to... at a high level encapsulate what the sub groups did, or are they intended to be material for the new members? It would be helpful to clarify that.

PHIL KHOURY: Look it's two purposes really, initially it was for the new members, just sort of a starting place before they waded through the material on the

Wiki, but subsequently, it is useful for me, for the face-to-face meeting just to have, sort of a shorthand summary of what was done and steps that were done, but doesn't have to be polished or anything like that, but it would be quite useful for the face-to-face as well. Other than that, no other purpose really. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you Phil. I just wanted to note that of the subgroup four IANA transition, two members are no longer with the review team and we do have two other members that are on the subgroup still, not sure if either are interested in [inaudible] summary, but I just wanted to note that some of the members that originally worked on that team are not part of the review team anymore, and in fact the person who was the [inaudible] for the subgroup specifically no longer with the review team.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay great, thanks Negar. I'll chase it up and look if it doesn't get done, we'll figure it out in DC. Denise, you've got your hand up.

DENISE MICHEL:

Sorry, that's an old hand. But, so... we should email to the list if we have additions to these slide?

PHIL KHOURY:

Yes please, that would be great. Again, this is not going to be the minutes, or used in evidence against anyone, so it's really just where you think there are sort of gaps with people's understanding on... to

make a working summary from all that, if there's things you need to fix then please by all means, email, just email to the list. Okay, so if I can move onto agenda item number five. Preparations for the face-to-face in Washington. Update from staff on attendance, are we still going okay?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, it is Jennifer. Yeah, the same update as last week so all review team members we expect to be in DC minus two, one of whom will be attending remotely.

PHIL KHOURY:

Okay, that's excellent. Outstanding. So look the draft session plan is here, we don't need to resolve it today, but I just wanted to say a couple of things for your consideration, thinking about it. The first is, this is a work in progress document, so I am editing it as I am thinking through what we need to cover. I think it's always good to have people who are participating in it, be able to stick their nose in and have a look, ask questions, make suggestions, all that kind of thing. So, sharing that with you in a very raw state, I should say that the times are completely unimportant at this point, well, in general these sorts of things are like building blocks, you need to step through some things to get to a place where you can actually do some work. We might get through those much faster than this, or it might take us longer, don't know, but the intention is to sort of work through any backward looking that we have to do first, following those objectives, figure out... refresh how we're going to work with each other and then begin to get into what needs to

be done going forward. So, that's roughly the sequencing here, I am happy to take any questions now or ask for people to have a think about it and come back to me on the email list, and we'll aim to sort of have this pretty firm by the next teleconference, which is the Friday before, so we've got 13 days, I think, before Washington and I'll be continuing to work on this for that period. So, I suppose the other thing is, in the feedback, it's difficult to design these things with 18 people, so in the feedback it would be kind of good to get the sense of what you think you want more of, what you think you want less of, and you know, of course any questions if my shorthand doesn't make any sense. So, can I throw that open, does anyone have a chance to put through it, got any questions or comments? Denise?

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you Phil. I can't get... looks like a productive agenda. One suggestion that comes to mind is to add perhaps on the third day, after we get a chance to discuss open activities and such, consultant support, it's been raised by other members on the team as well. I think it would be a good thing to address upfront at the DC meeting.

PHIL KHOURY:

OK. Got it. You're talking about how the projects sort of goes for, and how the review tasks gets done, sort of be in that section there on day three. Great. Look, on that, something else I should say is that, my ability to assist on this face-to-face is... will diminish over the course of the three days. So once you have sorted out protocols and behaviors and whatever else, you know, about how you want to work together,

and you figure out what kind of leadership you need and all that kind of stuff and you get into the detail, I will be kind of stepping back and letting people lead with this. So I'm inviting people, you know, team members to be thinking about this, not in a passive way, but to be thinking about this as a transition back to the team taking charge of how they want this to run going forward. I am going to try and get calls in over the next 13 days or it will be less than that, over the next 10 days I suppose, to people. Reach out to you to have very brief conversation with people in the team to invite you to, you know... invite you to contribute some stuff during the course of the meeting. So, some of you obviously have strengths in whole lot of ways, but you also have a kind of persona, you have a reputation in the group and part of what we'll do by way of preparation is to have some discussion about how you are all going to contribute during the course of those three days. Anyone else? It is also opportunity for people to make any requests of me in the next 10 days, in terms of anything in particular they would like to do or not do, or avoid, or you know, all that sort of stuff. Any absences people know they are going require during the time we are there, you know, for whatever, teleconferences or, you know, family stuff, or whatever it is that you've got on. If you can't be in the room for a period of time, it would be really good to know that beforehand and we'll try and work the schedule around that. So, any other comment? That's pretty small to see up on screen as it is at the moment. Okay, look I am not going to labor it, people may not have had a chance, you know [inaudible] not had a chance to go through and form a view about any, but I invite you to. These things always work better if people are sort of thinking ahead about, what we're talking about, what needs to be said, and all that kind of thing. I will leave that and invite either email comments on the email,

or questions on the email, which can go to list or directly to me if you prefer, otherwise we will have another brief conversation about it all next Thursday. Okay, so I am not seeing any other hands. I am going to take it that people are satisfied with that, any other business? Okay... Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi Phil. It's just to go through the usual action items at the end of a call, if nobody else here has any other business that they want to share. So, noted in the Adobe part here is the action items that I recorded is, Phil to update the meeting record of the previous meeting and recirculate. Staff to work with Phil to circulate an email regarding options to meet at ICANN and a Doodle poll with the options. [inaudible] and Phil to add consult and support to the discussion topic to the DC agenda, and team to share any outcomes [inaudible] during the face-to-face meeting via email with Phil as well as any additional feedback from the draft session plan that was circulated to the list. Let me know if I didn't catch anything correctly or if there are any additions.

PHIL KHOURY:

Denise.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes, sorry again I was a bit slow. This isn't related to Jennifer's [inaudible] of the action items, but jumping back to your previous request about other issues. One thing I'd like to raise since we have a couple of minutes is previously new members indicated that it was

difficult to find material on Wiki, get up to speed on work previously done. I'm concerned that new members are still in that state. I had suggested previously that perhaps we could ask staff who have been on all of the calls and at all of the meetings to draft a more fulsome report, update, summary of activities in the different areas and progress. I'd like to put that back on the table to see if that's something that is feasible before we get to DC. Something that staff could do an initial draft of the work and activities and discussions of the various teams and different areas, team members could add to it and that could assist in particular new members with understanding the work that has been done to date. I'm concerned that the slides are too cursory, that had been an incomplete in part. Wiki is very difficult to find information on, and I think staff, given their consistent participation on all of the activities would be a logical source to start a more fulsome activity report and summary of these activities, and then... so that's one suggestion. Then also, previously Phil, I think you indicated that you were going to be emailing material or suggestion on methodology and approach to work. I just wanted to circle back on that and ask if that's... if I misunderstood, or if that's something that is going to be forthcoming and is the intention for the team to review that and factor that into our DC discussion. Thanks.

PHIL KHOURY:

Phil Koury here again, [inaudible] a great question, I should have had that on the note. I have struggled to find quality sort of material on review methodologies so far. So, I am still hunting and tracking down my network, trying to find something digestible, that's actually useful in an environment like this. I would come back for a question, you know,

really to sort of throw out to the team, given all of your experience, if you come across that. So, I didn't find in the ICANN stuff, a solid discussion around the choices and methodology for reviews, so I've been hunting elsewhere. I'd be happy to hear from people who have some kind of resource, that they would like to... that they think would be useful to contribute. Mostly what I am interested in there is to have some common language for us to use when we're talking about different approaches to different pieces of the work. Nothing I can do to help you guys sort it, but that's what I was looking for. Is that an old hand Denise, or a new one?

DENISE MICHEL:

It's an old hand. The first part of my suggestion was that we have for the newcomers, that we ask staff to assist with putting together a more fulsome summary of work to date [inaudible].

PHIL KHOURY:

Great, so Denise I jump to the second question first. For my benefit, so I understand it, would you like more detail around the sort of activities that happened? When I was asking people for it, it was probably why they're, as you say, a bit cursory. I was really asking just for the... you know, where did you get to [inaudible] fulsome record of all the work that we've done, shorthand where we're upto, kind of thing. So, could you say some more about what you think extra needs to be in those?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, so I was... and the new members should certainly weigh in here, since I think they would be an important customer for this. Not only, what occurred but the substance of what was addressed, and what the team, or subgroup addressed and where they got it. [inaudible]. No, go ahead.

PHIL KHOURY: Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't want to cut anyone off, so, as long as... my quick comment would just be that the sub teams, kind of, they didn't all proceed to get to the same point of maturity at the end. Some of them sort of staggered a little bit, and so, I think SSR1 has a lot of energy and product that came out of it. It may or may not have achieved all of its goals, but for example, the DNS SSR... it struggled, it sort of... I just want to make a comment, I am not sure how we represent this or if we do, or we don't bother, but when we put all five of the sub topics together, it sort of maybe implies they all got to the same level of resolution, but for example, the DNS SSR really never got started. So, I mean, it sort of presents itself so, like hey there were lot of problems and we [inaudible], but there was actually a lot like, hey, I don't think we should do it this way, hey how come [inaudible] are not holding any meetings, that kind of stuff. I don't know if we need to do a name and shame, so much as this represents. That one is still kind of wide open versus like the ICANN SSR, that one had the LA meeting, it was really good, it was really productive etc, so, not all sub teams really got to the same point

which is why we're right about to inline them and go through them more carefully. I don't know how or if it's worth memorializing that [inaudible] or what your sensibility on that is. I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of it incase it was worth, sort of, annotating something. Does that make sense?

PHIL KHOURY:

Yeah, look Eric, it's Phil here. It makes perfect sense. I didn't want to make it look like a report card on who got further or who achieved what, and maybe, I think that might be better done in a discussion at Washington, rather than try to push people to sort of arrive at a conclusion about that. I certainly think, I completely accept what you're saying about each stream of work had quite different experience and outcomes, and I think that's sort of part of what we all need to kind of have a shared understanding of. Some point, I suppose day one at Washington. So, I am a little bit reluctant to have a lot of work... [inaudible] amount of work done about, you know, what had happened with all the teams, maybe what we could do is, is have... let me add in the last of the dot points that we have now and circulate that, and then lets come back and see what's missing out of that. I think that's probably a good step in doing that, and then I can have a bit of a look at, you know, is this something that's easy to get ahold of, out of the Wiki that we can add to that, that would help. I certainly don't... I'd say thinking out loud, I was a bit reluctant to have staff doing it, as I really think it's sort of, it's got to be judgement about where you go to, qualitative judgement about where you got to, I'd see that wasn't staff making that judgement, I'd sooner that was team members and you can all disagree with each other. Eric, you're next.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I totally agree with you on the qualitative judgement. I guess one of the things that may or may not make sense, sort of submit to the team, are that some of the subgroups produced artefacts, like some documents, like write ups and sort of like the IANA transition, for example, did and maybe to Denise's point earlier, those exist somewhere between the Wiki and the email archives and if we were to pull those together, we wouldn't have to ask our staff friends to interpret the level of progress, but they could certainly collate the documents and the artefacts that were produced and put them all in an easy to find place, and that might also help us in the DC meeting. Does that make sense?

PHIL KHOURY: Yeah, thanks Eric. Denise, hands up again?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so I'm not suggesting that staff write a piece that includes any judgement but I remain concerned that busy volunteers still are having a hard time figuring out what has occurred on the team before they got here, I have a hard time looking at material that has been provided, figuring out where to focus and [inaudible] SSR1 implementation, we've got no less than, I don't know, five different web pages with varying degrees of links and questions, and briefing material. It's very difficult I think to track this just basic substance through the Wiki and figure out where everything is, so I think the... more can be done to summarize and pull together work so it's easier to review and get a clear sense, just

factually of what was reviewed, and what was done, and where it can be found, and what's outstanding.

PHIL KHOURY:

Thanks, so why don't you leave that with me and I will fix up the documents that we have right now and take a look myself at the... with some help from the staff at the Wiki, I will need somebody to help me through that because that's not anything I understand. But, let's take that on, if you don't mind Jennifer, to add that. That's an action item for me. Alright, I think we're at the end of our allotted time, so I am going to call a halt to the discussion. Sorry Ram, did you have something? Okay. Great and thank you for being part of it all and your patience. So, look I am going to call it to a close, team. Do you want to do the formalities?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Hi, it's Jennifer here. I just added that final action item there to the Adobe. So Phil to summarize the size of the work, to finalize the size of the work, subgroup progress and then [inaudible] any edits and additions that might help new members understanding where the work is to date. Then with that I think we can close the meeting.

PHIL KHOURY:

Alright, thank you everyone, good night.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you very much, this is Laurin. By the way, if one of you is [inaudible] let me know I would love to meet for a coffee or something like that to say hi. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks everyone, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]