

ICANN

**Moderator: Alice Jansen
July 19, 2010
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The call is now being recorded.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much. This is Brian Cute. Let's open the July 19 call of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. The first order of business I supposed before we get to the (agenda) is for me to introduce Chris Disspain as the new representative from the ccNSO on our call of last week with the recusal of Becky Burr.

My understanding is that the formalities of a resignation letter and approval process by the ccNSO were satisfied and Chris has been put forward to participate in the Review Team going forward. So first a warm welcome Chris to the team. And if everybody on the team could now go through a roll call and introduce yourselves and we'll get started.

Alice, do you want to do the roll call?

Alice Jansen: Okay. So on the team we have Brian Cute, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eric Iriarte, Fabio Colasanti, Feng Guo, James Bladel, Larry Strickling, Louie Lee, Manal

Ismail and Olof Nordling, Olivier Muron and we're trying to reach Peter Dengate Thrush. We haven't managed to get hold of him yet.

(Xinsheng Zhang): (Xinsheng Zhang) is here too.

Alice Jansen: Okay. Great. Thank you (Chang).

Brian Cute: Welcome (Zhang). And one more note before we get to the agenda approval. Chris again, welcome to the Review Team. You are coming in roughly halfway through our work and at a very important moment. As I mentioned to you on email, I'm more than happy to have an offline conversation with you to get you up to speed as to where the work is and where it is projected to go.

I think you'll find a great deal of collegiality on the team as well. And feel free to reach out to anybody on the team for whatever assistance you need to get up to speed as it were.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Brian. I'll just - that's great. I'll read - I'll make sure that - and I've read a lot of stuff in the last couple days but I'll make sure I've read everything and the perhaps we can have a chat.

Brian Cute: At your convenience. Okay. With the agenda in front of us, has anybody not received a copy of the agenda? Okay. With the exception of changing the sequencing as to start with Number 4, changes, additions or modifications to the agenda? Hearing none, let's move forward with the agenda as proposed. Let's start off...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry Brian. Didn't get my hand up in time. Were we reordering the agenda?

Brian Cute: Just beginning with Number 4 until Peter arrives so we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Fine. Okay. Sorry. I see that as an alteration to the agenda. My - I'm obviously more fussy. Yeah.

Man: And that's fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I agree. Yeah.

Brian Cute: Is there any objection to reordering the agenda to begin with Number 4?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank I agree to.

Brian Cute: Okay. Hearing none, let's move forward. Number 4 is the working groups. Alice, can you put up the working groups document on the...

Alice Jansen: Sure.

Brian Cute: ...on the Adobe Connect room please.

Alice Jansen: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Okay. Coming out of last week's call, we had gotten volunteers as leads for the respective teams, Team 1 through 4. And we had asked the volunteers - volunteer leaders to organize - begin organizing the work with their team separate from the regular calls and to come back into the - this call with at least an outline of your work as your organizing it to go forward.

And the first team I think we had Olivier as a volunteer for Team Number 1. Olivier, do you have anything to report for Team Number 1's work?

Olivier Muron: Because I was - like you say, I was away from connectivity for the last week.
So I couldn't do.

Brian Cute: Okay. I know that for Team Number 2, Willie was the reported lead. He is on
a plane. Team Number 3, I think Cheryl if I'm not mistaken...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Brian Cute: ...if I'm not mistaken, you had (raised) your hand. Do you have anything?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And in terms of reporting, we've put together a both an email very rough
draft of a program that I'm happy to paste into tonight's meeting for you just to
give you a general flavor of where we're looking at and where we're heading
and we're running in both a good wave in an email form at the moment.

A couple of questions that we're currently grappling with apart from the
review by each of the members is the very beginning of a work plan is
whether or not we will have some teleconference meetings. And a suggestion
there was to have one of those in the next seven to ten days.

That does prime me to ask what is the basis for facilitation or support and do
each of us as leaders of these workgroups just work directly with Alice and
what does that mean to budget, et cetera, et cetera?

But I will now put the very basics of the work plan in its unedited form into
the Adobe Connect room and wait (past) until later for the response on my
question on facilitation and support.

Brian Cute: That's perfectly fine. In fact, that's one of the issues we're going to have to address a little bit later on the agenda. We identified last week that the working groups can use (come) instead of come in to getting as a basis of their work. We can also use respectively documentation that's been requested from ICANN staff.

There's an open question as to how we organize the community inputs. In fact we're going to need to address that in some detail Cheryl. So if we can put that off as you suggest for just a moment, we'll get to that shortly.

Number - are you - have you completed your summary Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Yeah. I'm just cutting and pasting now. Move on to four.

Brian Cute: Very good. Number 4. Independent review - Four was Warren. Oh, he's on a plane. I know James Bladel may have something to report from Warren. Is that the case?

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks Brian. James speaking and once again Warren has asked me to relay this information to the group (unintelligible). Working Group 4 kicked off with a proposed framework. So for that we have received one response. That was from Cheryl.

Regarding an examination of the existing board review mechanisms as well as two that were proposed during the Brussels consulting report last year and the status of their implementation.

One question that we had relative to the Working Group 4 was that there seem to be a bit of a overlap in the formal description between it and Working Group 1 as the last item on Working Group 1 mentions that it will also be

conducting an independent review of board decisions whereas the definition for Working Group 4 is that it would be an independent review of the board.

So we were just looking for some clarification or maybe Brian some effort to synchronize the expectations for all the working group participants as to the distinction between those two, are they the same? And if they are the same, can we tease that out of Working Group 1 and just make that the focus of Working Group 4?

I reviewed the transcripts from the Saturday meeting in Brussels and it seems like that's where we were going with setting up Working Group 4. But we just wanted to make sure that everyone was on the same page in that regard.

Brian Cute: Okay thanks - James, thanks very much. And so let me take that question to the team. Warren's group has identified what appears to be redundancy between Team Number 4 and a review IRB, independent review of the board and the last item in Team Number 1, which is independent review of board decisions.

Is the assumption correct that Team Number 4 was meant to be that independent review of decisions...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Brian Cute: ...were just left out of the title.

James Bladel: Correct.

Brian Cute: So let's - so why don't - that's just a (Scribner's) thing. Why don't we take care of that by adding questions to Team Number 4 title so it's clear that that's the question, that's the mechanism to be reviewed?

And then going back to Team Number 1 then since we had independent review of board decisions, we could A, determine that that's being covered entirely in Team Number 4 or B, ask Team Number 1 if there's any value in the focus of their work to keep that element in in parallel to the work going on in Team Number 4.

Does anybody on Team Number 1 have a view on that question?

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio here. I think that when we are the Team Number 4, we forgot to take the item out of the Team Number 1. Because the item for Team Number 4, it's a very specific one examining the conditions under which it would be possible to have a legally sound mechanism that would review board decisions.

That is a very specific point. I think in the text of the (remit) of Team 1, we should just stop after complaint handling.

Brian Cute: Okay. Is there any objection to that approach? Just removing...

Man: Yeah. (Unintelligible) just specific that this will be just one team.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. I've taken down my green cross - my green check that was up there for some time. Yes, but I agree.

Brian Cute: Okay. And hearing no objections, then we'll make the corrections to the documents and we now have organization. Since - and James thank you for that report. Is there anything else that Warren wanted to report into the group?

James Bladel: No. I believe that's a good encapsulation of what we've done this far.

Brian Cute: Okay. Then what I wanted to do next and hopefully this will assist the respective team members. I thought it might be helpful to put Manal's email up on the screen because Manal had asked a series of kind of concrete questions about how the working groups could organize their work, their scope of work and begin their work.

Would it be helpful you think let's walk through Manal's email so that we can get the work advanced. I know we've got a little bit of a delayed start because of people's schedules. Can you put that up on the screen Alice?

Man: It is on the screen.

Alice Jansen: It's up there.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much.

Alice Jansen: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Okay. So let's see. Sorry. Let's see. Is this the one that we had? No, this is not...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Brian Cute: ...quite what I had in mind. This is not it. It was Manal had sent an email - let me get the date and time for you. My apologies. Let's see. It goes working group structure.

Manal Ismail: Brian, this is Manal. I think...

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Manal Ismail: ...you already forwarded my email to the whole group, not conference call. So if we just check an email from you with the date of last conference call.

Brian Cute: Yes. That's right.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Yeah. I'm sorry. I'm driving so I'm not online.

Brian Cute: No. That's (all right).

Manal Ismail: Otherwise I would have forwarded it again. And meanwhile, can I ask you just if - did anyone tell Willie that he has been volunteered for Team 2 because...

Brian Cute: Yeah. I sent him a note.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

Brian Cute: And I'll touch base with him when he's available after his flight. I'm sorry. I'm sorry for the delay here. But there was an email Manal where you walked through, you had sent it to your working team. You had teed up some specific concrete questions about how to get the work organized. That's what I wanted to walk through.

I know you're driving right now but I'm having a hard time finding that particular email.

Manal Ismail: I can try to remember a few of the questions I posed in the email. I thought we should have one or two leading the group. Maybe one and a backup. I was asking how we can find a mechanism for the group to handle its work for the group to integrate its work with other groups or work - any overlap.

Alice Jansen: Excuse me Manal...

Brian Cute: It's up on the screen now Manal.

Alice Jansen: No I found the email.

Manal Ismail: Okay.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Yeah. So I think we've nominated one person as the leader. I suppose you should - we should let the working group self organize in terms of having a backup, if you will, leader.

You had then said organize - agree on a work plan, a mechanism for reporting back to the Review Team itself; a mechanism for coordinating work overlap with other working groups; a mechanism for final more periodical merging or integration of our work with other working groups; mechanisms of exchanges with the GAC and the joint working group, which I think is specific to your Team Number 2; and publication of publicity of your work.

I think perhaps the first question - the first question conceptually have to make sure we're clear on is do we see any areas of overlap between the working groups that should be identified and called out now. And at that point the working groups themselves can - and with the oversight of the Review Team can merge and compare notes as needed going forward.

The second, you know, more concrete question is how do we - how do we organize the community comments so that the working groups can begin to use them in addition to documents requested from the staff in the past as the basis of their work and developing recommendations?

So first question is do we see in the four working groups any areas of overlap that need to be identified now before the work really gets under way?

Man: We just did.

Brian Cute: We did between Number 1 and Number 4. Do we see any other areas of overlap? We can leave that as an open question too to be developed online as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, Cheryl here. Could I ask if we do see areas of overlap and on a quick scan through with the exception of one and four which we've dealt through with (I don't), how is that going to be dealt with?

Are you pleading things absolutely segregation between them or are was also coming back to what ever second of our - every one of our teleconference meetings and giving a report back to the team as a whole or what way forward do you - even if there is overlap? Overlap's one thing but interaction is another. Because by now we're driving the very important issue of interaction.

Brian Cute: I guess these are the questions, correct? So it could be - it could be a matter of - well I think two things are important. From a working group perspective if there's overlap between two teams that the two teams have an ability to interact with each other going forward to see, you know, how they may coordinate or how the work develops in parallel or if it, you know, cross pollinates. That's one point.

Number 2, for the entire Review Team to have these overlap identified called up and then understanding at the Review Team level as to how the recommendations themselves will take into account these areas of overlap. That's really conceptually I think the two most important things we have to hit.

So I think the mechanisms are up to us to develop. We can have informal interaction between the Review Teams where there's an area of interaction or overlap and then the Review Team can discuss it as a whole as the work comes up from the working groups.

I don't make it - I don't want to make this too complicated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: James has his hand...

Brian Cute: Yes. I'm sorry, James.

James Bladel: Yeah. Hi Brian and I would, you know, beg the indulgence of the working group. I know I don't have a voice in these meetings. But a general question of overlap as not necessarily between the working groups but between the working groups individually and the work that has been laid out for (referment).

Perhaps some standardized guidelines or a protocol or interacting on those might be helpful to preserve the integrity of the Berkman award.

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio here. I think that we had discussed this last time and there is a problem of timing because we will get the results of the Berkman study just at the end. So we had agreed that we would stop working towards some draft

recommendations as if the Berkman work did not exist and we will try and cover all the ground that we feel needs to be covered.

Then when we get the results of the Berkman study, then we will adjust the lead to modify to whatever needs to be done to our preliminary ideas. But we are not in a position where we can leave an item aside and say this will be done by Berkman so we don't need to do that ourselves.

((Crosstalk))

Fabio Colasanti: ...arriving in Beijing with some ideas about all the recommendations that will have to be put forward.

Brian Cote: This is Brian. I - we did discuss it last week. We did - I agree Fabio. Working groups need to undertake the work now. We need to begin to develop our framework, our scope and outline the recommendations if we see them taking place by Beijing and the work comes in from Berkman, when it comes in and we factor in. I can't think it's practical approach. I can't think of another way to handle it.

The only thing that we'd ask working groups to keep their eye on is in looking at the scope of the Berkman work. If there's areas that you are covering that will not likely be impacted by the Berkman review, then identify those areas as such and understand that you as a working group are maybe primarily responsible for developing in full the study, the analysis and the recommendation on those particular parts.

Otherwise I say we proceed as Fabio has suggested. Any disagreement on that approach?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not a disagreement Brian. Cheryl here. But I'd give one little clarification.

I did raise in my response to the workgroup for work plan because there's a clear overlap assuming that we do in fact have case studies as we've designed in the Berkman statement of work depending on other discussions that we'll be having later in tonight's agenda obviously.

That there is an obvious overlap with the Workgroup 4 activities and that of the Berkman. We know that and it's going to be very significant. I wondered whether or not there would a standard mechanism for that workgroup, Workgroup 4 to have either access to or pre-theme - pre main theme or (drip seed) updates from the Berkman team if that wasn't impeding their workflow in any way. Was just a question but it's one that I wanted to let the rest of the team know I had raised within that workgroup just so we don't duplicate a bit too much.

Brian Cute: I understand the question. I understand the potential value of the team getting an early preview of the Berkman work. My number one concern would be that the Berkman work not be unduly impacted by that (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah. Can't impede it obviously. It's just if there is a mechanism I think that would be worthy of exploration.

Brian Cute: We can take a look at that. You know, I'd also wouldn't want to see that then blow out between all of the four working groups and slow down the Berkman train in any way. So that's the ball that I'll be keeping my eye on but we certainly can explore that.

Manal Ismail: Brian, this is Manal. I think also it is safe to have some minor overlap between the workgroups. I don't think it's going to be safe to work in complete segregation because we might run into the risk of missing some points. But

again, it should be a calculated overlap. It should not be a major overlap or a redundancy in work. So I think it is safe to have some overlap that is calculated and coordinated between the workgroups.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thank you Manal. What's the date - today is the 19th of July. And we have the Beijing meeting that's the end of August. Correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thirty, thirty-one August. Yeah.

Brian Cute: Thirty, thirty-one. So we have roughly five - a little more than five weeks before we get to Beijing. I'm going to go with Manal's recommendation in that the working groups get going and come into Beijing with as much review organization and analysis as possible.

And even if there's the framing of a possible recommendation, in the absence of a mid term report, a Berkman, that would be important and that would be useful in order to make sure that we can keep our workflow on time. Is there any discussion or agreement or disagreement with that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can't see it working any other way.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Okay. Well let's proceed on that basis. I think feel free to use Manal's email as a guidepost in work - self-organizing your work. And I really would - for the next call we absolutely need to have some first reports in, some first outlines in from each of the working groups into the Review Team.

This is an absolute must. I know that we worked on a short basis with having a call scheduled last week but please, we have I think now are two weeks before next call. Is that right Alice?

Alice Jansen: Yes, they're two weekly.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'm asking that each leader of the work team to bring to the next call the outline of the beginning of their work. And if there's no - is there any other discussion on this agenda item?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As long as we can come back to resources on how we do or don't access them, not...

((Crosstalk))

Brian Cute: That is the next item on the agenda Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. That's just you know me.

Brian Cute: No. No. No. No, I haven't - I've heard you and as we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And you will continue to hear me.

Brian Cute: ...that is Number 5.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand Brian. Thank you.

Brian Cute: That is Number 5. Has Peter joined the call yet?

Julie Jansen: No, I'm afraid not.

Brian Cute: Okay. Let's move to Number 5 which is the analysis of community input and this flows into the question about resources for the working groups. Overarching question. We talked about this last week. I had said I think we

need one person as a single set of eyes on all of the inputs that are coming in from the community and need to also be responsible from an analytical standpoint but from a management standpoint.

What we need, and I'm sure we need more than just this, is for each of the inputs from the community it needs to be identified, it needs to be mapped, if you will, to the work of the working teams. You know, there could be comments that come in that are uniquely with regard to an independent review of decisions question. And it's, you know, marked Number 4. But we really could use some indexing and mapping of the inputs.

I think Peter had a task item to see if there was an ICANN staffer who could help provide some document management, administration support in this view. In addition to what I just articulated, what else does the team see as immediate needs for managing incoming comment and flowing it into the working teams?

Larry Strickling: Hey Brian, this is Larry.

Brian Cate: Yeah Larry.

Larry Strickling: On the first point, (Fiona) has already volunteered to prepare that kind of abstract of comments for me and I'm perfectly fine sharing it with the entire Review Team if people would like that. And we can make sure it's indexed to the four working groups.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, that'd be fantastic.

Brian Cate: That would be an enormous help and much appreciated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hell yes.

Larry Strickling: And we're looking for an ETA of probably early next week on that.

Brian Cute: Sure. I'm sorry - you were asking for a deliverable timetable on that?

Larry Strickling: I was offering that we would get it to everybody early next week.

Brian Cute: That'd be fantastic Larry. And (Fiona) if you can manage that, that's be more than welcome. So that's kindly accepted.

Man: Maybe if we do that we will need to have some sub categories of some (unintelligible) just we need only one to four.

Brian Cute: You mean sub categories within the - within each of the working teams?

Man: Yeah.

Brian Cute: You're right. Three are discrete independent elements within each of the working teams.

((Crosstalk))

Brian Cute: You're right about that. I would - I guess a question for Larry and (Fiona), is it possible to do that type of granular indexing? Do you think you could index - open question. What do you - what do people think is best?

Larry Strickling: Despite the warning about how hard to look at a gift horse, yeah, we'll take a look at that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Okay. Next agenda item. Thank you Larry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Group 3 will just take what we can get thank you Larry.

Chris Disspain: Brian it's Chris. Isn't - aren't the sub categories really for each work team because they're going to set up their own, aren't they?

Brian Cute: Well they are. They are. Each of the working teams is responsible for each of the elements therein. So, you know, I - yeah. I'd say let (Fiona) take a whack at it and, you know, certainly there's going to be some comments.

There's going to be some comments that are applicable to Work Team Number 1 and Work Team Number 3. So there could be a number of different digits assigned to each comment. So we'll let that work proceed and we'll tease it out when we get it next week.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay. So that's (unintelligible).

Louie Lee: This is Louie.

Brian Cute: Yes. Louie please.

Louie Lee: Just to make work easier for, you know, I'll add her to the private input mailing list also so she can get those comments directly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, that would be very useful. Because we have had a couple of those.
Yeah.

Brian Cute: Yes and we should get those to everyone on the team Louie, you're quite right and to (Fiona). And I - one note going forward is that as we do receive confidential comments from the community, we're going to have to respect that in our calls. So just a note going forward that when we have follow on discussions about the work that is being developed, we need to be very...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Be careful.

Brian Cute: ...careful not to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Brian Cute: ...articulate anything with regard to private comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It'll have to be in camera.

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: On that (Fiona) people - members of the general at large community who are putting points up in the Wiki space that ILAC put up when the review team very first started are probably seeming that once they've put their concern or position point up in that space that we are going to grab it and use it.

I'll put that URL into this chat space or into the notes if you like just so we can all whatever team we're in avail ourselves of anything that comes in here into that space as well.

Because I think it's reasonable if people have put it into what they felt was a mechanism to ask them to redo it into another mechanism.

Brian Cute: Okay. Very good, let's move forward then.

((Crosstalk))

Man: One further comment I was the comment that was posted that the 14 of July very substantive comments that were posted on the website between - before the deadline we had on the 14 of July.

Brian Cute: All right, Peter. Hi Peter, how are you?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Good thanks.

Brian Cute: We're just finishing up, we did a reordering of the agenda Peter in your absence, we started with number four which we've moved through, we're now on number five and about to close out number five.

And when we come back to actually number six we can begin actually hit at the same time we close out number five, then we'll come back to number two and number three in the agenda.

The next piece I think we decided that we need to organize the community input for the purposes of the work teams so that we can mask the (efina) comments to the work teams and they can use those as resources.

Larry has graciously offered that (Fiona) will go through an indexing of comments for the team and provide that some time next week.

And then the other piece of resource that obviously each working group is going to need to refer to, the existing documents that have been requested of ICANN staff going back to Marina Del Rey and any other documentation in the time periods identified by the review team.

Let me just make a comment here, I don't think we need to spend time on it. Clearly that universe of documentation that we requested from the staff and the documents that may inform the work of the working groups, it's a universe that we haven't spent that much time discussing since we made those requests in Marina Del Rey.

I would ask each of the working groups coming into next week's call with their preliminary outline to look carefully at those source documents that they'll need to bring into their work.

Identify them and bring them into their preliminary reports as well. That's a universe that not only the working groups but the review team as a whole needs to have a good handle on in terms of the identification of the universe and how those documents are managed and made available to us as we do our work.

With that Peter you had out of the last call taken an action item to look into whether there was some ICANN staff resources available for purposes of document management.

Any luck on that front?

Peter Dengate Thrush:(Brian), Peter here. No I haven't, I've been a bit sidetracked with this other issue. I can do that in the next sort of 48 hours but that's still alive, is it?

Brian Cute: Yeah, that would be great, we need to know whatever resources we can have available to us for document management, very important.

So please do what you can and report back when you hear something.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes of course.

Brian Cute: Okay. Anything else on items five and number six which I've just brought into the discussion before we move forward or backwards numerically?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Again leave number six (Brian), will we be - will the work groups be getting some feedback on that between now and the next meeting, so sort of a list or intercessional update on any facilitation we might be getting from the document management?

Brian Cute: The entire review team is - should get whatever feedback Peter has for us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks.

Brian Cute: Anything else? Okay, as determined let's revert back now to number two on the agenda and then we'll work through number three and then finish up with the number seven items.

So number two is answers to questions of the board committee on AOC reviews. We've had active discussion on our mail list about this issue. I had put forward a possible proposed response for discussion.

We've had active discussion since, I'd like to put this out to the team for discussion at this point and we'll determine what our action item is. Open table.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The current state of our replies in the room, so for example, was it recall what we're answering at this stage?

Brian Cute: Well we - let me frame it then. I had put forward a suggested response to the board subcommittees.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we've had a number of edits going and I haven't seen a final since Manal's red line of the very first run.

Brian Cute: We've had a couple of edits going and we've also had some discussion around the point that perhaps the response to a specific question should not be provided at all.

So let's - Alice if you can put - so I hate to put you on the spot there, but if you can put up the draft response that I had put together to the board's questions?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's important.

Brian Cute: Yeah. And we also had a suggested edit from Willie that I'll be sure to bring into the document once it's on screen. Is it on screen? Okay. Very good.

Okay, yeah, and the blue is my suggested responses. Willie's edit was that we remove the last sentence in the - let me be clear here. There's two blue paragraphs at top, there is a third full blue paragraph in the body.

The fourth blue paragraph under it was observed that the unique individualized expertise of independent expert team members was not clear and that there may be redundancies.

Willie had suggested that the last sentence of that response which states the ATRT will contact Berkman to determine if any reductions have had counter possible without compromising the quality of the required work that's asked to be removed all together.

Man: I suppose that's possible.

Brian Cute: Manal's edit was if you could remind me Manal?

Manal Ismail: Actually first of all I also support Willie's comments and I just added without compromising I think time or scope. Again I apologize because I'm not online and I just added maybe one or two sentences in support of the case that is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And you also changed ATRM to ATRT where I think that was it, yeah.

Brian Cute: That's correct.

Manal Ismail: Yeah, that is (unintelligible) for that.

Brian Cute: Well let me first - I'm sorry Manal, please finish your thoughts.

Manal Ismail: No, no I was just going to say that the question became in principle whether this should be submitted or not before going into edit, that's what I mean.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Yes, that is the question on the table and let me just add a couple of thoughts with respect to the draft responses.

What I had in mind when I drafted this potential response to be clear what that I saw likewise significant risk in the board subcommittee and the review team engaging in a very substantive discussion about the scope of work.

My attempt went farther than some people actually seem to be comfortable with on the team but as it's written it is intended to avoid as best as possible engaging in a qualitative substantive discussion about this.

Because I see significant risk for ICANN and for the review team if this exercise turns into a discussion of the proper scope of work.

The review team has spent considerable, thoughtful time on the scope of work. I think there's some points in Peter's email that I will get to Peter and address directly.

But from a distance to me this team has taken the time and the care to identify a scope of work that I believe is appropriate. If there were clear error, if we were suggesting that we go off and study the effect of organic timothy hay on rabbits I would see an opportunity for the board to say now wait a minute, you are not doing the work that's properly oriented to this.

But I must say my personal view is that this is an engagement in terms of the defining the scope of work that presents great danger to both parties and I'd like to open up the floor to discussion.

Do we have any additional views or are they all represented on the email threads this morning? Is there any who has not spoken up?

Man: Well let me make a general remark. We are in a situation that is rather embarrassing. Either we can close with the board at this point now and I think your text is fine, okay it could be shorter.

Or we are in a situation where we cannot meet the deadline of the end of the year.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Brian Cute: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I'm just agreeing. As my points to the public reviewable list made I think this is unfortunate timing and it has - you know we can't put the milk back in the bottle but we need to do the best we can with the current timing.

And discussions need to be finalized post haste. And we need to recognize that we are now pushing either the quality of work or the deadline of the work into difficult times.

Brian Cute: Any other thoughts on this point?

Chris Disspain: It's (Chris), I think I've put my hand up in the room, I'm not sure.

Brian Cute: Sorry about that (Chris), please go ahead.

Chris Disspain: It's all right, don't work. (Tom), look I obviously haven't had the benefit of reading all of the background stuff.

But it strikes me that the point you made is an extremely good one which is that in my terms anyway that we have to be very, very careful. The board's role as I understand it was to put together a terms of reference or whatever they were called in order for this team to be set up.

And at that point because there's an independent review team it should be independent. Now of course in an ideal world and I check that we don't live in one of those but it would have been set at the beginning of this process.

And frankly had that happened we wouldn't presumably have had any contact whatsoever with any committee on the board unless we wanted to ask them some questions between the beginning of this crisis and the end.

So I agree with you, I think we need to be very, very careful and timing of course is also critical.

Brian Cate: Thank you (Chris), any other thoughts?

Manal Ismail: So this is Manal again. I'm also I think my voice put an urgency of finalizing this issue because of the deadline.

It is too tight and we have to start on something.

Brian Cate: Thank you Manal.

Manal Ismail: I do know - in principle I do not mind submitting the answers since they are already there and they are not going to consume more time.

But I really do not want to see this going back and forth and delaying our work. Thank you.

Brian Cate: Thank you Manal. There is the question of what response gets sent back to the subcommittee in response to their question so we need to decide on that.

I'm going to just touch on another point and one of them is raised in Peter in your email this morning where you laid out you know in clear terms why the questions from the subcommittee were well founded and should be responded to.

But there was also a reference to the Berkman, some language from the Berkman proposal. This I hope just remains in the realm of commentary and does not become a full blow discussion here because I don't really think it warrants it.

But the team must do what the team must do. I understand first hand that there was some concern from the staff about Berkman being selected.

In fact the morning after we had reached our provisional conclusion that they were the lead, I was approached by Denise Michel at breakfast and she told me that there was some deep concern on the staff about Berkman because of some prior writings.

I have heard that same concern from other members of the staff. I personally believe that this is coloring a large amount of this exercise, if I'm wrong I'm happy to be wrong.

What I want to make crystal clear which I've made clear in the past is that the Berkman Center is going to undertake this work and the (Dick Bates) of the review team with the orientation of the review team, its framework, its methodology and its approach to the work.

That is reflected in the contract that's in the hands of Berkman right now. The language that we developed in the last two weeks or so to frame out the orientation of work is included in there.

I personally don't have a single doubt that the work is going to be done by the independent expert with proper orientation and that being said that's really all I want to say about that.

But my strong feeling as with others is that we need to move yesterday on this and get on with the work. The question is what response do I send back to the subcommittee to allow them to complete their process because they have a process to complete in terms of the review of the budget of the team.

We have my proposed response, we have some suggested edits to it. Are people comfortable with that, uncomfortable with that? Should it be more, should it be less?

Peter Dengate Thrush:(Brian), Peter here, can I just make a quick response? I wasn't aware of the relation to the identify of Berkman, I wasn't aware that Denise Michel it applies to.

As far as I'm concerned that makes absolutely no difference to me and I agree with you completely that that's a perfectly up to the choice of the review team and any attempt to influence that I would try and put a stop to if I were aware of it.

The reality is the critique of the board has come from a different perspective and you will recall on what I think was a useful conversation between the working group and yourself, people like (Kateem Turay) mentioned that he

was doing the review to the United Nations of 12 countries on a particular couple of topics.

And there were three people on his review team and his question was you know why does this review on these topics need nine? And I don't think that's got anything to do with who it was.

And then are some reader's questions come from again a (tense) and this is where you and (Chris) disagree, (Chris) says there shouldn't be any contact with the group that your point was if they were off doing something to do with timothy hay and rabbits then there would be the need.

So the question really is you know where between no contact and steering and incorrectly scoped work does this lie? And my opinion to sort of state out the rational for that is based on that approach.

I don't think the identity of any of the players has made any difference, any of the board members that I'm aware of.

Brian Cate: Thank you Peter.

Chris Disspain: And can I just clarify, I just want to make sure, yes I did say that but I clearly obviously in the circumstances where the review team went AWOL or completely deranged then obviously they would need to be reined in.

I was talking more in day to day sensible terms assuming the team is operating in accordance with its scope.

Brian Cate: Thank you. And Peter thank you for that. Yes, could teams question you know do you need nine people is a different question in the qualitative nature.

As for the rest of it my feeling is that this is a conversation if it was going to happen that should have happened at the beginning of the process.

It didn't. Even if it were a conversation that were to happen at the beginning of the process there are clear lines of risk and danger for the board and the review team for the - if the board is perceived as seeing to be trying to influence the scope of the review.

And what makes this double difficult is that this team has gone through the process of I believe in a very thoughtful manner identifying the scope and trying to set forward in its work.

And now at this juncture is in the very awkward position of having to respond to scope questions to the board. So you know the question of how many heads, this is where we are.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Driving in just a quick response from me, this is Peter, of course for the boards to speak of - this is the beginning of the crisis, this is days after it's seen for the very first time the final Berkman response.

So this is the first opportunity that the board's had to look at the proposed scope of this particular study.

Brian Cute: Well but I mean in terms of the scope of the work we started that process back in April in Marina Del Rey. The independent expert is a piece of this overall work so you know I take your point in terms of what's in the hands of the board.

But the work has started back in April and that's the problem. So again to the team, what do we put forward as a response if anything to the board committee?

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio here.

Brian Cote: Yes Fabio.

Fabio Colasanti: Just simplify I would now say let's go ahead with your proposed response with the added (unintelligible) that we made. There are two issues. One is the legitimate question about the head count.

But that has to be seen in terms of all the other proposals that we had received, the sort of auto marketing tool that we were talking about.

That is a legitimate issue, fine a month ago in Brussels that should have been discussed. We should not now be opening the question of the scope because if we start discussing this I think we will have a major discussion.

And so let's leave aside the question of the scope, I don't think that this is a question - maybe we should not be answering or should be even vaguer on the question of the scope.

Because on that I disagree with Peter's answer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here (Brian), just following on from Fabio and picking up on some of the edits that have been proposed on the list.

I think that we need now and I'm talking in the next few hours now to have a final draft of the current edit text. We have a couple of things that Manal has

put in, the deletion Willie has proposed and the I think well supported but you can do a headcount if you need to reduction on what we say back to the board in response to their very valid questions and we do need to respond to those very valid questions.

But I would like to see us get something back which says what we have all agreed needs to be said as quickly as possible. And if that can be done online I think that would be a very good thing indeed.

But we do have to respond and I think the general view of the majority of us has been clear from the conversation we've had online.

If not do the editing, put it out for final consensus call and it will take another 24 hours but we do need to put this to bed and put it to bed quickly.

Brian Cote: Thank you Cheryl, any other discussion?

Man: Cheryl can I just for clarification do you think that all of the questions are valid questions?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I came in behind Larry and several others saying that we should avoid the discussion of scope.

Man: Right. So simply that says that the simple statement that says that the team believes that work being undertaken by the Berkman Group, whatever they're called is in scope, is sufficient in your view.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. However I also took Larry's point which - and I think the community at large would be interested as well that says and here you can have admittedly the as agreed redacted of confidential commercial in confidence

information proposals that we reviewed from all of the applicants to the request for quotation.

So everyone else can make sure including the board that we have made the best possible choice to get the job done.

Man: But isn't that no - I'm sorry, I just didn't understand that was the issue. I thought the issue was to do with a, scope, b, some content in the document and c, the quantum of the cost, not a question of whether the team had chosen the right people or not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, in terms of the makeup of the team, the amount of people proposed, that sort of thing. I was referring to that not the specifics of making the right choices.

But rather the nature of the other proposals that came in which had particular designs and cost benefit analysis relating to those designs.

Sorry, clearing my throat.

Brian Cute: Okay, any other suggestions as to the response to the board subcommittee?

Larry Strickling: This is Larry, I'll just - I don't want to repeat what I put in my message this morning but I believe the scope questions are out of bounds.

I wouldn't answer them except to say we're not answering them and specifically those are the questions three, four and five that were starting what appeared from the ATRT's early work.

I still believe that for this process to have credibility we have to be autonomous.

It was set up to have people on this committee who all have ties back into various parts of ICANN including the board itself in the form of Peter.

But the idea that the board is going to now pass on the scope of what we want to do I think is - attacks our independence and eventually will affect our credibility.

And I just don't think we should stand for it. The problem is, it's a month since we picked Berkman. We've got to get them on board and we've got to move forward and there has to be some way to bring this to a speedy conclusion.

And I'm not quite sure what the right way is to do it, but we've got to get on with this and that's my piece.

Brian Cute: Thank you Larry and just as a status update, I'm jumping ahead a little bit, I spoke with (Ers Gatzler) this morning. I had sent a draft contract to them last Monday.

He reported to me that they're just about finished with their review. I let him know that we had a bit of a process to go through on our end but my - you know and I have put into an email to John Jeffrey last week and this morning asking for a call with him so that I can expedite as best possible the contract execution piece.

All of those background pieces are moving from my view as well as they can and hopefully once we get a board decision, hopefully an approval we can get ink on the paper this week barring any unforeseen large hiccup.

Any other suggestions with regard to the response to the subcommittee? Right now I'm hearing although not from the entire team not providing responses that are subject to the scope of work.

But the balance of the responses would be fine and there's a proposal to eliminate the contacting Berkman and asking for reductions of headcount on the table.

Any other feedback?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy with going all that along as long as it happens soon.

Man: Me too.

Brian Cute: Okay, anybody else? I'm happy to redo this draft and send it back to the list and ask for one final tally of yes, no or - if that's agreeable?

Man: Sounds good to me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I then ask and then what?

Brian Cute: And then yes, so Peter, that goes back to yourself and then to the subcommittee.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Well so the end one I think is pretty clear. The board working group charges (unintelligible) providing them either staff on all the review teams will provide a report to the board.

Brian Cute: And will there be an approval mechanism at the subcommittee level or the board level and what would be the timing of that?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Well it would be that interview of board approval which can be done if it's urgent by the executive committee which would be to authorize I suppose formally the budget and secondarily the signing of a contract with Berkman.

Brian Cute: I'm hearing my team members and speaking for myself that this qualifies as urgent and if this doesn't happen quickly we are at great risk of compromising not just the quality of the work, just the entire process for this review team.

So we'll get a response up on line right after this call. I'll ask for approval, please provide it quickly. And we'll shoot this out to Peter and he can begin that process.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sure, I'm very happy to get back on the agency issues and anything you can include in your responses about that.

Brian Cute: Happy to articulate that. I'll add that to the response.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy for you to not only add the urgency but just set a deadline. Or a desired deadline, we need to hear by X or Y will happen in terms of our own deadlines and our ability to perform to standards we've already set ourselves.

Brian Cute: That's the way you proceed then we have to determine a deadline.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know. Even a fortnight is maybe considered urgent but that's you know as Larry said we decided on Berkman a month ago.

Brian Cute: I think maybe another way of attacking it Cheryl is that stating that the commencement of the work has already been delayed to a degree that is - you know makes it difficult or is creating difficulties to get a fulsome independent expert's report.

We could just state it another way.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right, yeah. Utmost urgency, that type of language, okay.

Brian Cute: Yep, let me try to noodle something together and I'll throw it on the list very shortly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Certainly. Okay, so look for that and we'll get that taken care of and off to Peter. And again as I said on the contract I've been in touch with (Ers) and I will speak to John Jeffrey hopefully today if he's available and do everything in my power to make sure those processes don't cause any undue delay in terms of getting contract review, any issues resolved in getting to signature and getting the work undertaken.

Anything else we have? We have spilled into Number 3 on Berkman without noting it and covered A and covered B contract in SOW. Anything else on Numbers 2, 3 A and B before we move on?

Larry Strickling: You had said something about coming back to the other issues that Peter raised in his email.

Brian Cute: Well the specific issue was that there was one area where he quoted some language from the Berkman proposal. And that's what I meant to indicate.

So to be clear -- and the language -- again, the language, what I'd like to express Peter is that here's a clear understanding of some of the reaction to the language that was used in the Berkman proposal and as I've communicated to you, some things that I've heard through staff.

In the contract the language is structured that's consistent with the orientation of the Review Team semantically. And the contract and the SOW and the contract and the Review Team will drive the orientation of Berkman's work.

I understand the language could cause some concern. I've had discussions. We had questions with (Jonathan Zittran) in Brussels about this very point that Berkman had issued some critical pieces about ICANN in the past and how could they manage it in the context of their work.

I've had a discussion with (Ers) and he understands clearly what the orientation of the work is going to be. And really I think that's the end of it.

You know, there has to be as Larry said, some autonomy. And personally I'd like to think that there's a little bit of faith in the Review Team that we're going to do good, quality work. And if you can communicate that back to a subcommittee that would be helpful as well.

Peter Dengate Thrush:(Ron), Peter here. You certainly had (unintelligible) faith. And I think you got that fairly strongly when you met with the working group.

If the contract is going to be then different from or specify or qualify this scope of work, then you must make sure that the board working group gets to see that reasonably quickly as well.

Look, I guess again that the fact that there's nothing about the identity of Berkman that I'm aware of that raises these issues. The issue is the - the response seems to be directed to things whoever does them but are not in scope.

Building a framework of decision-making et cetera and the things that I pointed out are seen as things that are not in scope.

So if they're going to change as a result of the contract negotiations that's interesting and needs to be included in the information pack.

Brian Cate: Yes. And actually I think we - those of us on the committee I don't think have seen the current draft. If we have I apologize. But if we could see it too.

But I just want to come back to who - what Peter just said which is that frankly some of these things were discussed with Berkman when we met with them.

And I would have welcomed Peter, every one of these issues that you've raised here today being raised at that time by you as a member of this committee.

But you chose to take yourself out of the room I think for appearance purposes or in some sense that it wasn't appropriate for you to participate in that discussion.

And I - you know, not saying I agree or disagree with that, but we missed the opportunity to have your input as a member of this Review Team back last month to talk about these issues.

For them now to arise in the context of a board review I think's inappropriate. And I guess the one question I'd have is if it was inappropriate for you to raise them a month ago, why is it appropriate for them to be raise now?

But more importantly we all would have benefited from this discussion and your involvement a month ago but we didn't have it.

So I'm very concerned about these issues coming on now a month after we've made the identification and trying - and proceeding with it now because it's - all it's doing now is delaying us getting on with the task.

Larry Strickling: And Brian, this is Larry. Thank you for that. I - the only reason I wasn't present in - at the discussion in Brussels wasn't anything to do with appropriateness. It was just simply time table.

I'm rather busy as I'm busy now at an ICANN meeting, wasn't able to participate in these discussions.

Brian Cate: Well we have a way forward. And to be clear on the SOW question Peter, within the contract the scope of the SOW isn't necessarily being changed.

What is not reflected in the contract is the example of language that you posted to the list today that Berkman had used in their proposal.

So to be clear it's what's in the contract that is consistent with the SOW. I will circulate the draft contract. But the point is that we're not changing the scope

of work. But orientation language such as that which you cited from Berkman is expressly not in the contract and it has been communicated to Berkman directly that the orientation is going to follow the dictates of the Review Team and that the language explicitly that you cited there is not within the (Ken) of the SOW.

So that's, to be clear, that's what I'm referring to. And I'd be happy to circulate the contract. Understand that that contract is in Berkman's hands close to a final review. And I'll be talking to (John Jeffrey) as I said, hopefully today to advance that process.

Anything else on contract and SOW?

Okay, the next item under 3C is the draft letter to (Rod) with the great hope that we may be under contract with Berkman in a matter of days not weeks.

We had put together a proposed letter to (Rod) to initiate and notify (Rod) that the work was starting from Berkman to initiate that engagement.

We had some discussion last week. To be honest I'm not quite sure where we left off. Do we have any suggested edits? Did we make suggested edits last week? And I said wonderful, I'll go change the document and just haven't gotten to it and I hear from the team.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian it's Peter here. Just before we get on to that, I wasn't present at the - on the call for the status and missed out on the formalities. I just wanted to take the opportunity to welcome Chris to the team and to thank him and the (CTNSO) for stepping forward to fill the gap. Welcome aboard.

Chris Disspain: Thank you.

Brian Cate: Okay Alice is going to throw up the letter.

Alice Jansen: It's there.

Brian Cate: I'd like to get this to final form to be sent out to (Rod) as soon as we have - well I would think once we have budget approval. And they should - we should send this out to him. It's being dug up I'm being told.

And again there were three- you know, I had three things in mind. A, this is a proper formality to notify the CEO that work of the independent reviewer is beginning. B, to give him a sense of some of the tasks that the independent reviewer will be undertaking that are going to require access to the resources of ICANN, both human resources and potentially documentary resources are sent to the time table.

And also again, just in the vein coming out of Brussels of working constructively together to get this done in a professional manner.

That was the motivations for the letter. It's now on the screen. See, can I edit in here? I'm happy to take any suggested edits.

And one quick not Peter as you will see in the contract, these bullet points that appear in the body of this letter also appear on the contract as well.

Do I have any suggested edits to the letter? It's relatively brief?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As I said last week, Brian has my support. I think it's in principle a good document. There's a couple of typos but I figured you'd be picking those up.

Brian Cute: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know, we don't have a (now) really staff, ICANN staff meeting. If it's late April, yes, little things like that. But in general I think it does the job.

Brian Cute: Let's do this. This is not a big task.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Brian Cute: I'm happy to take any edits on list by email and work with them to...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Brian Cute: ...to final thought, to final form. And I'll post it in other couple of days with - including any edits you send to me so that it's ready to go out immediately once we've gotten the approvals we need for Berkman.

Any other comments on Item C?

Okay moving forward I think we are now on Item 7, other business. The first one is an update on calendar with face to face meetings Beijing and Boston.

Mr. (Zhang), do you have any specific updates or requests of the Review Team for the meeting in Beijing at the end of August?

(Xinsheng Zhang): Yes and here not too much about the Beijing meeting. And also I asked Mr. (Gorfan) to ask a - (some) party before the Beijing meeting. Also Mr. (Gorfan) to arranging our face to meeting. So also (later) I asked the - some

people from our Review Team to (unintelligible) to contact with Mr. (Gorfan) and so ask Mr. (Gorfan) to ask his colleague is to (unintelligible) our meeting at Beijing or (unintelligible) wanted to tell you Mr. (Rui) sent you.

Brian Cute: Thank you Mr. (Zhang). So just to follow-up Mr. (Gorfan), is there anything that you need from the Review Team at this time? I know you requested people fill out the form in order to get Visa processes going.

I'm hoping that everyone has done that. I did mine finally. But please if you haven't done that, do it right away.

Is there anything else you need Mr. (Gorfan), from the Review Team to get prepared?

(Gorfan): And I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Review Team members who have not submitted the forms to fill out the forms quickly and to email those forms to me.

I have after the last conference call I have received forms from (Fiona) and Larry. And I would like to ask who have not submitted the form to submit it quick, ASAP.

Brian Cute: Thank you (Gorfan).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, we'll probably need to send a form to Chris obviously because he wouldn't have been in the distribution.

Chris Disspain: Alice is doing that right. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah, thanks Chris. Thanks Alice.

(Gorfan): And I - I think I haven't received a form from Louie.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Louie's not attending...

Louie Lee: I will not attend in person.

(Gorfan): Okay, okay. And (Warren).

Brian Cute: Okay James?

James Bladel: (Warren) will also attend remote.

(Gorfan): And also James, are you coming to the Beijing meeting...

James Bladel: No, (Warren) and I won't be participating remotely.

(Gorfan): Okay, okay.

Brian Cute: Okay...

(Gorfan): That's all about...

((Crosstalk))

Brian Cute: If there's anybody on the Review Team who's attending and you haven't filled out the form, please do it immediately. Mr. (Gorfan) if there's anything else you need from us or Mr. (Zhang), just make it known to us on the list and we'll...

(Gorfan): Yes.

Brian Cute: ...get it to you.

(Gorfan): And...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

(Gorfan): Excuse me?

Brian Cute: No, please...

(Gorfan): Okay.

Brian Cute: Please continue.

(Gorfan): And as to the (badges) for the Beijing meeting, I have asked a couple of questions to Alice. And I have - I received an email from Alice I believe one hour ago. I will forward the email to my colleague to see what to do next.

Brian Cute: And that's with respect to lodgings or accommodations or what's the...

(Gorfan): Yes, I think so.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So the requirements to the meeting, I thought that is, you know, what he's required, what type of (facilities) been used et cetera.

I thought it was very - I don't know what Alice sent, but that's what I thought she was sending based on...

Manal Ismail: That was sent a couple of weeks ago already.

(Gorfan): I will...

Manal Ismail: Brian?

(Gorfan): ...start with my colleague and come back to Alice later.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you very much (Gorfan). Manal?

Manal Ismail: Yes. I think we have to also update our online calendar because it's already mentioned Cairo and Asia meeting to - still to be defined. So I think we have to update this with the new venue.

Brian Cute: Ah, thank you. Alice could you send that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Venues and dates. Yes, the dates changed as well. Yeah.

Brian Cute: Could you take care of that Alice?

Alice Jansen: Yes of course, yes.

Brian Cute: Thank you so much. Anything else on the Beijing meeting? Okay B, moving on to B communications - yes Manal?

Manal Ismail: Can I just ask something on the Cartagena meeting?

Brian Cute: Sure.

Manal Ismail: But I was just wondering whether we concluded that we are going to meet at the end of the meeting or not because I think the hotel's are already online and maybe some of us would start booking their accommodations.

So it would be helpful to know whether we're going to meet at the beginning or at the end.

Brian Cute: Begin...

((Crosstalk))

Manal Ismail: Is it too early to decide?

Fabio Colasanti: I - Fabio here. I was the one who made the proposal to meet towards the end of the ICAAN week to allow us more time to processing (put) so that we might have received following the public consultation.

Manal Ismail: Yes. And I was just asking whether this was - has been agreed finally or is it still subject to discussion.

Brian Cute: I think it was still subject to discussion.

Manal Ismail: Okay.

Brian Cute: I don't think concluded anything on this. And I think for our primary job in Cartagena is to report out as I think Fabio's characterized what will be our

near final if not final recommendations but for the fact that there may be some open community comments going on.

I know that sounds inherently contradictory. It's not meant to be. But the fact is we will have articulated, you know, our recommendations on the basis of all the working group work and the Berkman final report.

So we'll be - they'll be in a near final form at that stage. I don't know what else we have to do in terms of work as a team in Cartagena unless somebody can articulate that for me.

There may always be some loose ends. I don't know. I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would have thought it was just loose ends if any at all, yes. But then again, it does depend on when our final deadline is.

Brian Cute: Right. Well let's take that - we can take that into the next call as well as an item. I don't think there's an urgency in making final determinations on Cartagena unless someone...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Only those of us that are making our travel arrangements and air accommodation need to know do we arrive a day early or stay a day later or - and it does make a bit of a difference when it comes to the accommodation I would have thought.

Brian Cute: Yes. I mean I would envision the team at least meeting, you know, once, whether it's, you know, for an hour, for a full day or half a day. I would certainly envision the team meeting, going over what's going to be communicated to the community.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For example, the ALAC and regional leaders are most probably doing something on the Saturday because we're piloting a new program that ICANN wants us to be the test run for.

Now that would mean that I would be, you know, if we met on the Saturday for example, that would be - the first Saturday would be more complicated in my life than the second Saturday. I would still be in the ATIT meeting. But so there are choices to make and the sooner we make those choices the better.

Brian Cute: Okay. I also don't see, unlike Brussels, I don't see a burning need for the team to meet in advance of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Brian Cute: ...the Carte - yes, I mean I think it's quite possible that we could get a timeslot to make a presentation to the board...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Brian Cute: ...a presentation maybe to the community on...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Brian Cute: ...Tuesday and squeeze in a meeting on Monday that covers all those bases. So I don't...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If we can do this we need to know about that. That's fine. That's great. Just, you know...

((Crosstalk))

(Gorfan): That means that we should be having at least an additional two or three days where we should be in Cartagena and then we would try to meet during those days.

It could be 6:00, 7:00 to 8:00, 7:00, 8:00, 9:00 to 8:00 9:00, 10:00 to something like this. Do we want to do a doodle on this provided people fill it in rapidly?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well like Peter, I mean normally an ICANN meeting and Chris as well, you know, we are chocker block booked during the normal work time of an ICANN meeting.

(Gorfan): So Cheryl, what you're saying is that to have a meeting of the Review Team, for you the possibilities are either the 4th or the 11th?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not looking at a diary but if we're going to be more...

(Gorfan): That, that, yes. That...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...than an hour or two, then I'd probably say before or the day after or the afternoon of the whatever, yes. But it depends when we need to meet with the board because it needs to wrap around the other meetings. And they're more likely to be at the beginning of the week.

We just need to sort it. We can work around it but we need it sort of sooner rather than later because then I can fiddle with my ALAC agenda and Chris can know what's going on with the CCNSO and all that sort of thing.

Brian Cute: Well is the best way to go a Doodle here?

Fabio Colasanti: But even for the Doodle, Cheryl has just said something and she's right. We need to know when we're meeting with the board. Because probably we would need perhaps to meet for a couple of hours before the meeting with the board and maybe for a couple of hours half a day later.

So the meeting of the board - with the board, is crucial for us to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Grant).

Brian Cute: Yes.

Fabio Colasanti: Who - does Peter have information about when this meeting is scheduled?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, Peter here. But to (cover), I'm completely with Cheryl on the general principle about business and scheduling. And so extra time alone if it's not the second Saturday is likely to be very difficult for me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Peter Dengate Thrush: To Fabio's question, no, we don't have that yet. But if the normal routine is followed then it's likely that the board will be meeting all day Sunday and we might be able to schedule if there's a visit. We might be able to schedule some time with the board on that first Sunday.

Brian Cute: Well that's fine I think. That's on - more on the front end. That tends to work better for most people's schedules, perhaps not everybody's.

But could you look into what the open spots would be Peter? That'd be a great place to start. When will we be able to meet with the board potentially? And then we can work the rest of our schedules around that. Does that make sense?

Peter Dengate Thrush: It will be some time before I can give any more specific than that.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Fabio Colasanti: Yes that's - but Manal is right about meeting at Cartagena will not have thousands of hotel rooms.

And also there is another thing. There is also case perhaps for us to be all in the same hotel as much as possible.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it does make ad hoc meetings and extending, you know, oh do we need to do this a lot easier, yes.

Fabio Colasanti: So we need - who could take the initiative of identifying a hotel we're going to book in? And then I think we'll probably have to say that we need to be there from Saturday the - at least apart from being there for longer periods for other reasons.

But the members of the Review Team should be available in Cartagena probably from Saturday the 4th to at least Monday the 6th so as to wrap around the meeting with the board which will probably be on Sunday the 5th.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Fabio, the difficulty with that is it depends what you think's the most important meeting. The time with the board at the beginning of the week would be a kind of reporting time. The time at the end of the week would be the work - the substantive work of the Review Team.

So I presume that the more important of those is the standard work aspect for the whole team. So that would shift the time requirement to the end of the week rather than beginning.

Fabio Colasanti: Okay that's fine with me. It goes in the direction that I was suggestion. But then we still need an indication of when the crucial meeting with the board can take place so that we can have our own time around that. I would say at least a meeting before and a meeting afterwards.

Woman: So this is just beyond - just on the logistics of your meeting. So normally there's someone at ICANN. I don't know who it is since (Paul Levin)'s left that actually organizes the schedule and books all the rooms and everything.

So what I would suggest is maybe someone on the Review Team find out who that person is and talk to them now about what hotel's they're recommending.

I'm assuming there's always an ICANN (specific) hotel on the Web site. I haven't looked. But they can get you a block or rooms to do all this just to make it easier. It's probably better to find out whoever that person is and go to them now?

Brian Cute: That makes complete sense. And if what I'm hearing is Peter, you really can't give us a sense of when we might meet with the board just yet. It's too soon. I understand that. It would be good to know as soon as possible.

But if someone can take on - Alice, if you can check with the hotel and see that we can get those arrangements taken care of. We are at the half hour so I don't - I want to get through the last item quickly and close the call.

Is there any other burning topic on this issue?

Larry Strickling: Yes Brian, this is Larry. If anybody needs an invitation letter to come to Boston they should get in touch with (Fiona) with that so we can get that taken care of for folks.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Anything else on Cartagena?

Yes?

Larry Strickling: I had one thing on Cartagena which is - and this is really a question to Peter. But he ought to - Peter I would recommend you start thinking through what your needs are going to be in terms of getting the board members up to speed so that whatever time we have with them which I hope would be, you know, 90 minutes to two hours if possible will be productive for them and us which I assume would mean sometime to look at the draft recommendations and perhaps some discussion time among the board itself before they meet with us. But that's for you to determine.

But if that effects when we could sit down with the board, that needs to be factored in.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks Larry. I will do that. I'm also thinking about as (Sierra) said, getting some time on the public comment, public slots. So I'm sure the team will want to do some kind of reporting to the community and some time for some Q&A and feedback. So yes, I've got that on my to do list.

Brian Cute: Absolutely. Okay any other points on this before we move on? Okay, the last item, communication with CCNSO regarding (Becky)'s replacement.

Chris has been formally appointed and welcome to the team. (Becky) had provided a letter of refusal.

I guess all I would ask Chris is if you can provide to the Review Team anything in writing that you have or will have in terms of your nomination, the formalization of that and a copy of (Becky)'s refusal letter so we can have it on the record. That would be welcome as soon as you can provide those.

Chris Disspain: Yes, Brian, you should an email from me on - as chair of the council already.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Chris Disspain: What you might have is an email that is (Becky)'s email which I'll organize.

Brian Cute: Okay thanks very much Chris. Any...

Woman: Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes? (Unintelligible)?

Woman: Yes, just a quick question. Have we added Chris to our mailing list?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I believe I have been.

Man: Okay.

Brian Cute: Yes Louie and Alice, if there's anything that Chris needs access to, please take care of that so that he has full functionality as a Review Team member.

Alice Jansen: Okay, sure.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, there seems to be just a slight difference in what you just said. I think as a matter of formality, the chair of the (GAC) and the chair of the board need to point members to the team.

I've already been in contact with (Heather) and explained what's happened and had a message back from her. So I don't think there's going to be difficulty with us going through that process.

So I think Chris if you could copy me on - I'm just looking just recently got on line and don't see what you - just if you could send them to (Heather) and I the nomination from the CCNSO council, then we'll grind the wheels and make sure that all happens.

Chris Disspain: Will do.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks.

Brian Cute: Yes, you're quite right Peter. We do need to take care of those two pieces of the approval process. And please take care of that if you will. And we look forward to the documentation thereof.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know. It will all be updated on our Web sites as well.

Brian Cute: Yes. Alice, if you would take care of that once we have those documents in hand.

Alice Jansen: Sure.

Brian Cute: Okay, any other business?

Hearing none, just a reminder, outlines from the respective working groups coming into the next call are expected and look forward to having that discussion. Thank you all very much for your time.

Man: Brian, Brian...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sorry.

Brian Cute: (Unintelligible) Yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can we just- can we just assume that we as workgroups can start accessing the input from the community and we can start getting on with our work and we can run a teleconference between us if we need to or get a wiki page put up or whatever? Or do we need to wait for some sort of permission for that yet?

Brian Cute: No we're not waiting for permission. And I'm seeing (Karen)'s question on whether we (unintelligible) the community input.

The answer is that the - two answers. Number one, any Review Team member I hope can start reading the community input as of now.

In terms of organized work we agreed earlier in the call that (Fiona) was going to do an indexing of all the community input that's been received to date...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Brian Cute: ...provide that sometime next week which will allow us to map the community inputs to the respective working teams. So that's mapped on a subject matter basis. Those...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And then Brussels input. The Brussels' inputs the other huge amount.

Brian Cute: Yes, exactly. But all of this is being funneled in to the work teams and the Review Team. And there's a bit of organization that needs to take place in the next week or the input so that they are properly mapped to the respective workstreams.

But any Review Team member who wants to drive into the community input and start doing that is - should be doing so. And that's what we have for now. Any other questions on this?

Chris Disspain: Yes Brian I just - it's Chris. Just to confirm, I'll just jump in to where (Becky) was on the review groups if that's okay.

Brian Cute: Oh certainly yes. That's - those are teams one, two and four Chris.

Chris Disspain: One, two and four, yes. That's fine.

Brian Cute: Yes. Yes? Anybody else? Okay, any other business. Okay we'll see you...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Other than thank you.

Brian Cute: ...call in two weeks.

Okay, thank you all very much and welcome again Chris.

Chris Disspain: Thanks guys. Bye. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks everybody.

Man: Thanks Brian. Thanks everyone.

Man: Bye all.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: (Unintelligible).

END