

Accountability and Transparency Review – Third Conference Call
JUNE 11, 2010 – 03:00 UTC
Transcript

Coordinator: Good morning all (sides). The recording is ready. Please go ahead.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Welcome everybody to the Accountability and Transparency Review Team Call on June 10. This is Brian Cute speaking. As a first order of business does everyone have the agenda?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay. Could we move to the first item, which is approving the agenda? If anyone has any additions or suggested changes to the agenda please make those known now.

Man: No.

Olivier Muron: There is one addition, it can be any of the business to discuss an extension of the comment period.

Brian Cute: Extension of the comment period. Okay. So noted Olivier. Any other suggested changes or edits? Okay. Hearing none, the agenda is approved. Let's move to Item Number 2. I thought we'd start with just doing a review of the Brussels meeting schedule.

Alice had circulated the schedule to us today and I have made one addition and reposted it to the list. Does everybody have access? Does anybody not have access to the schedule?

Woman: Thank you.

Becky Burr: Hang on.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Becky Burr: Alice, the only question I had was whether we have the MPUC. That meeting is on the schedule or not because that has now been confirmed.

Alice Jansen: We are going to have a meeting but I haven't received the precise time of the exchange I mean.

Becky Burr: I can tell you it's 9:30 to 10:15 on Tuesday morning.

Alice Jansen: Okay. Great. All right, Becky. Thank you very much.

Becky Burr: Yes and I can (staff) the acronym in the new GNSO like completely flipped me out and I cannot follow them. So it's whatever the acronym is that responds to that.

Brian Cute: And if people could identify themselves before they speak for purposes of the recording please. So I'm going to walk through. This is Brian Cute. I'm going to walk through the schedule. On Friday, June 18, we are meeting from 8:30 am until 6:00 pm as a team face to face.

And on Saturday, June 19, we are also scheduled to meet as a team face to face from 8:30 am to 12:30 pm to take care of business items and also to hear presentations from RFP candidates. Moving to Saturday - yes please.

Louie Lee: This is Louie Lee. I just jumped in about 90 seconds ago.

Brian Cute: Thank you Louie. And I'm just going to walk through the scheduled meetings.

Olivier Muron: (Unintelligible) - open or closed? This is Olivier. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Yes Olivier. Well, the rule for the group is that our meetings are open unless a member requests that they be closed.

Olivier Muron: Even the presentations by the candidates?

Brian Cute: No. Good question. And in fact - yes, one of the two candidates who has sent an email to us with questions asked about the confidentiality and of course there are confidentiality considerations with regard to those types of presentations.

So unless there is objection, the times when we are receiving presentations from the RFP candidates should be deemed closed unless there is an objection. Do I hear any objections?

Lawrence Strickling: This is Larry. I don't know if I object but I guess I would raise a question, which is I think the concern would be that if you are one of the candidate firms and you're able to sit there and listen to all the questions and discussion of a firm in front of you, you will be better prepared when it's your turn to speak.

So I don't know if the meeting needs to be closed. But we may need to sequester the candidates.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Well, enforcement is the challenge.

Lawrence Strickling: Right. We'll need that special soundproof chamber to put them in during the afternoon. But I don't know that the actual discussion should be something we exclude the community from hearing if there is a way to sequester the candidates.

Brian Cute: I take your point Larry. Is there a feasible way for us to accomplish that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl if I may.

Brian Cute: Yes Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. So I'm identified. It's Cheryl speaking. The one way of doing it I suppose is to have the actual interviews done in (camera), in other words closed. But tell the candidates that after we finish the interviews the Adobe information and recordings will be made available. And anyone who wants to pull out of that or objects to that, we would have to note that objection and discuss whether we agree or disagree.

Brian Cute: Larry, does that satisfy the openness to the community standard that you had in mind?

Lawrence Strickling: I think it would because it would seem to me the recordings could be made available very promptly after the session concludes.

Olivier Muron: (I agree). This is Olivier.

Brian Cute: It sounds like we have a common sensical suggestion on the table. Any discussion? Any objection? So when we schedule the meetings for the presentations by the RFP candidates, those specific sessions will be closed.

But the recordings and the transcripts will be made available within a 24-hour time period. And every other aspect of our meetings on those two dates will be open.

Becky Burr: Let me just add - Brian, this is Becky. The ombudsman has requested - in as much as he receives confidential complaints and handles them confidentially, the ombudsman has requested that that meeting be closed.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Becky Burr: And that is consistent with his goal remit in the community.

Brian Cute: Okay. Let's close up the issue on the RFP candidates first. Is there any discussion, agreement or objection to be noted on the proposed structure of those meetings? Hearing none, we will proceed as discussed. On to the ombudsman.

Lawrence Strickling: Actually Brian, could we just do a parking lot issue, which is that I do think similarly the responses we receive to the RFPs probably need to be kept confidential through the actual beauty contest as well for the same reason. But we can come back and talk about that. I just wanted to put that on the parking lot.

Brian Cute: That is the written responses, Larry, correct?

Lawrence Strickling: Yeah. Right. We don't have to (get into it) now but let's make sure we come back to that.

Brian Cute: Noted.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Peter Dengate Thrush:(This is Peter). Can I just make a comment about the ombudsman?

Brian Cute: Yes Peter. You're a little choppy.

Peter Dengate Thrush:(The thing) with the ombudsman is not to have the ombudsman report on any individual case that he has discussed, which would require confidentiality. Especially with the ombudsman, surely (unintelligible).

Becky Burr: So Peter, this is Becky. We have afforded for example the gap, the opportunity to say whether they wanted the meeting on or off the record and the indication was that one hour would be on the record public and one hour would be in camera.

I think that Frank is concerned that he has some confidentiality obligations. I think like the reports from the consultants, we could make a transcript available quickly after that. But in the interest of having a frank, sorry for the pun, exchange consistent with his obligations to his community with respect to confidentiality, it struck me as a reasonable request assuming that we would as quickly as possible make the transcripts of the meeting with any confidential references removed.

Peter Dengate Thrush:(I believe that's okay). We're not having a consultation with the ombudsman at (any case). (If he wants the rates), he should meet us in the confidentiality. But I'm not (going to officiate it).

Brian Cute: Becky, did he request a closed meeting for the entire session with him?

Becky Burr: Yes and I don't think that there is anything complicated about this. I think it was Frank's feeling. I simply said our default is that unless there is some reason or a request our meetings are open.

And he responded that his remit is to handle these issues confidentially. And that is in fact a tenet of his assignment and I think in deference to his sensitivity about that it makes sense to

have the conversation off the record and then identify anything that needs to be redacted and then quickly make the rest of the record available.

I didn't push him on this because I think it's frankly not unreasonable given his duty of confidentiality with respect to the complaints that he handles.

Brian Cute: And I don't think it's unreasonable either and I don't want to belabor this conversation. But I do think that there is also just some general aspects to what the ombudsman does, what the ombudsman is, how his work is structured that would likely be of interest and should be open to the community.

So as a matter of process I don't have a problem with closing it and then redacting only that which needs to remain confidential. But we should do that quickly and carefully and make sure that everything that should be open is open in our final summary and report of that meeting.

Becky Burr: And I will undertake to go back to Frank and talk about whether we can split the meeting in the same way that we have with GAC if that makes more sense.

Brian Cute: I personally think that would be the better structure. So if you wouldn't mind going back to him and exploring that? Okay. Thank you. Any other discussions on that point? Yes.

Manal Ismail: Brian, this is Manal. Just very quickly, I agree with what you have said. I think we work in an open manner but again we should respect what people we are meeting with are asking for.

And I even think that the one-hour closed meeting with the GAC, I think since the request is to have an open hour and a closed hour, I don't think they have in mind that the closed hour transcripts are going to be posted. I'm not sure. I'm just guessing.

Becky Burr: That was my understanding as well was that the conversation with the GAC according to their request would be that one hour would be completely open and one hour would be off the public record although we'll have whatever record we have of it.

And I mean I do think that there is a balance here that we need to be conscious of with respect to one, being as transparent and open as possible but two, also providing opportunities for really candid conversation.

Manal Ismail: No, it's okay. I totally agree with what Becky said.

Brian Cute: Zhang, did you have a comment? No? Okay. Any other discussion on that point? All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, just to say I'm trying to capture Peter's point from the check to the discussion notes. He was suggesting particularly with the ombudsman it should be open and then closed as required.

That's a good thing with the exception of the RFP candidates to have that to be the rule of thumb that all meetings are as we have stated open and we establish the requirement for it to be closed and then the in camera redacted records to be put out after we know what needs to be redacted.

Brian Cute: I think we're all in agreement on the proposed structure for these meetings so far. If we could walk quickly through the remainder of the schedule just to confirm what we have in front of us, on Sunday, June 20, we have the GNSO council at 8:00 am.

We have the ombudsman from 9:30 am to 10:30 am. We have the joint board and GAC working group from 12:00 to 12:30. We have the ALAC and lunch from 12:30 to 2:00 and we have the meeting with the board from 2:00 to 3:30 pm, a meeting with the GAC from 4:00 to 5:00, which is open and a closed meeting with the GAC from 5:00 to 6:00. That is Sunday. Alice or anyone, are there any corrections or additions or changes pending to that day?

Alice Jansen: No. This will be the final version Brian.

Brian Cute: Very good. So Monday just to continue, we have 10:00 am to 11:00 am the registries, from 11:00 am to 12:00 pm, the registrars and then from 1:30 pm to 3:00 pm meetings with the community, 60 minutes allocated to the AMPRT, 30 minutes allocated to the selectors of the forthcoming reviews.

Becky Burr: So we have 60 minutes?

Brian Cute: And we are meeting with the community.

Becky Burr: That's an open ICANN forum.

Woman: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay, with an open mic and 30 minutes allocated to selectors of the forthcoming reviews. Could someone elaborate on that point?

Becky Burr: This is Becky. I think that has nothing to do with us. It's about a discussion about how the subsequent review teams are going to be selected.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: This is Olof and I can confirm this. For the selectors of Review Team 2 and Review Team 4, which have recently had a call for applicants opened and for Janice and Rod, extra to lead that session or that part of the session.

Brian Cute: Is that for Janis and Rod to describe the process for selecting members of the follow on review team?

Olof Nordling: Indeed. And the structure and well, timeline and such.

Brian Cute: The question that comes to my mind - thank you (Orlaff) for the description and understanding - the question that comes to my mind is 60 minutes enough time for the community? Any thoughts?

Becky Burr: This is Becky. I would have strongly preferred a longer period of time. But I think given the fact that we have also arranged to meet with various members/constituencies in the community that we can make this work.

Brian Cute: Thank you Becky. Any other thoughts on that?

Manal Ismail: Because the other question - this is Manal, Brian - would be do we have the option to change it I mean?

Brian Cute: I'm not sure. I'm just asking whether people think the allocation of time for the community is sufficient. Becky's point is well taken in terms of meeting with the other ACs and SOs.

Manal Ismail: Okay. I thought you were asking about longer meeting with the community.

Brian Cute: Right now we have 60 minutes allocated for what would be equivalent to open mic if you will with the community. And I'm just asking if people think that's sufficient time. If they do, that's fine. We can move on.

Becky Burr: This is Becky. If I can elaborate, I do think that one of the instructive things about being the first review team out of the gate is that it probably would have been useful for us to have had earlier discussions, which were impossible frankly given our timing, with ICANN about scheduling.

These things are necessarily going to parallel and be part of the ICANN meeting, which are obviously already jam packed. But I do think that we have had to - that it hasn't been a completely easy thing to reconcile the competing interests and those discussions in the future I think should take place earlier because I certainly do think a longer period of time in a public forum setting would have been appropriate. An hour is not a very long time as we all know in that setting.

Brian Cute: Okay. Any other thoughts? We can move on and take the 60 minutes and we'll just structure that hour to be as open for the community to provide input, minimize the talking on our side of the table and move on.

Xinsheng Zhang: (I have a contribution) Brian.

Brian Cute: Yes Zhang please.

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes. What happens if we don't achieve any kind of comments? We stay there for 15 minutes?

Becky Burr: I think we're going to receive comments.

Brian Cute: I'm not worried.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: I am worried because until today we don't receive any comments to our request in the Web site. So maybe I am pessimistic but I...

Brian Cute: No. Your concern is appreciated. I think with regard to the written comment responses from the community there is a tendency for those comments to come in closer toward the deadline.

I see written responses to our public questions as somewhat different from the dynamic of an open session at an ICANN meeting where people can step up to the mic. My anticipation, which I hope is fulfilled, is that we will have a strongly attended event and plenty of input at the microphone.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: I follow you in that hope.

Olivier Muron: Olivier - the point with this session is (unintelligible) - they are not to be (objected). And the people interested by suggesting I think are quite different. We'll see.

Brian Cute: Any other comments?

Olivier Muron: There is a big debate now at least within the GNSO about the second topic.

Brian Cute: Yes Peter.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Just a comment that this session follows the fairly intense individual sessions we have had with all these groups in the Friday, Saturday, Sunday sessions. If we are concerned at all about the amount of time one thing would be to ask in our private sessions to if they want to make a comment in the public comments to put them in as early as possible.

So that we don't get five members of each group standing up and saying the same kind of things so that it's more organized and that will also make sure that we deal with Erick's question, which is that somebody will stand up and say something.

Brian Cute: That's a good suggestion. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl here. That (sounds fine). I think it's probably worthwhile if we also as we discussed in other awareness risings and availability forums is that we might be attending that if during that somewhat minimal amount of 60 minutes we ensure that we're all identifiable and are easy to be approached throughout the ICANN meeting with any specifics, that will also help alleviate the problem.

Brian Cute: Certainly. Certainly. Okay. Any other comments? Yes.

Manal Ismail: Shall I? This is Manal. On the point Erick mentioned just one suggestion would be that maybe a fall back scenario we could have the questions posted online.

We could have it in sort of a presentation or something like driving our discussions and we can try to make people from the floor comment. I mean we can try to trigger the discussion along the same questions. I mean we had a session like this with the IBM issues paper and it was very interactive.

Brian Cute: So putting the questions for public comment up on the screen and using them as a guide of the discussion over the 60 minutes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Manal Ismail: Yes. Unless people would rather speak freely, I mean we can decide that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I think Manal's proposal is a very good one. And I'd also still like to think that we could get the questions out in a survey form with some measurables associated with them.

Brian Cute: Thank you Cheryl. Peter, you have the most experience here in running that type of a session. If you wouldn't mind after the call just taking a look at the questions we put out for public comment and giving us a sense as to whether we can cleanly manage those 60 minutes with that list of questions. I'd certainly appreciate that feedback.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sure. Happy to help.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Manal Ismail: One more point Brian. This is Manal again.

Brian Cute: Yeah Manal.

Manal Ismail: I think if we get to go through the questions with the community this might even encourage later comments. I mean the deadline is going to be after that and I think this brainstorming or discussion even people if they don't comment during the session, I think this would encourage them to comment even later.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Yeah. I agree with Manal. We need to helping the people to try to spread and it will be important to use the Web (digital) ways to receive comments.

Brian Cute: Thank you Erick. So Alice, as you have heard, our intention will be to put the questions up on the screen. And I know that you are tending to all of the audio/visual needs that we have for each session so if you'd make a note of that. Any other quick comments before we move on?

Alice Jansen: Sure.

Brian Cute: Okay. Moving to Tuesday then, the last day of meetings, from 10:30 am to 11:15 am, 45 minutes, meeting with commercial stakeholder group - IPC. Becky, can you clarify does that include the BC or just the IPC?

Becky Burr: It's a cross constituency. It's the BC, the IPC and the IFP.

Man: (Of the commercial stakeholder group).

Brian Cute: Commercial stakeholder - very good.

Becky Burr: But before that we have from 9:30 to 10:15, we now have confirmed the non-commercial stakeholders group.

Brian Cute: Okay. Alice, would you make that adjustment to the schedule please?

Alice Jansen: Yes.

Brian Cute: And then Becky, do we have meetings after 11:15? Is that where we go into a series of other meetings or are we done (after that)?

Becky Burr: As far as I know right now we are done. There is still a question with respect to the address supporting organization but I think that the schedule is pretty much gelled at this point.

Brian Cute: Okay. Very good.

Olivier Muron: This is Olivier. Just a (clarification) to Becky. So ITC will be with the others, right for at least one group?

Becky Burr: Yes.

Olivier Muron: Okay because at one point you said they were different.

Becky Burr: Yes and I just think our time was getting so constrained.

Olivier Muron: That's all right to put them together because of the time constraints.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, I agree with the issue of having them all together but not because of the time constraints. I just think that the stakeholder group should be dealt with as a stakeholder group and not tiny little subsets variably between commercial and non-commercial with various perceived values of the information they give us. I think the equity is treating both the commercial and the non-commercial stakeholder group is very important.

Becky Burr: Yeah. This is Becky. I think I agree with you Cheryl. I do think that where there were strong feelings about separating this out it made sense to do that and my inclination is given the amount of time that we have to be sent that there are groups that want to have us available.

But I think that the business constituency, the IP and the IFP stakeholders all together made steps and that was a time that was easy to arrange. And so hearing no major objections to that I decided that that was the right way to proceed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm glad it worked out that way. Thanks Becky.

Brian Cute: Not hearing any major objections I'd like to close this item up. Are there any last comments?
Okay. Well, thank you. Yes Peter?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sorry, we don't have...

Brian Cute: Peter?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Hello?

Brian Cute: Yes. Peter, was that you?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes it is. We don't have an agenda yet and we need one reasonably soon for the actual team meeting on the Friday.

Brian Cute: Yes indeed. We'll develop that. Manal and I will develop that and circulate that right away. Thank you for that point of order.

Peter Dengate Thrush: If I can just close by offering the comment that I don't actually have the time at an ICANN meeting and might be able to attend after the end of our Friday sessions. I'll do what I can to (unintelligible).

Brian Cute: And it's understood that members of the team will have other commitments and may not be able to attend every minute of every session. That is an understood point given everyone's activities in the community. No question.

One last point before we do close up the schedule - first of all, thank you to everyone who did the work of putting these things together and especially to Becky because you carried quite a bit of water there in putting all those things together. But thank you to everyone.

There is one other item. I did receive an email from Stewart Lawley from ICM registry who asked me if the ATRT would be interested in meeting with him. His statement was that since he is I guess to his knowledge the only entity that has availed itself of all of the review mechanisms within ICANN, he felt it would be constructive for the team to have a meeting with him.

I have not responded to his email yet. I wanted to bring it to the team's attention and have a discussion on it. My own view at this time is that there is an open process that we are running that Stewart could avail himself of our public comments and respond to the public comments in writing and take advantage of our open session.

But I'd like to hear thoughts from the review team members as to whether a separate meeting with Stewart Lawley is something we agree to in order. Open table.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, Cheryl here.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm of the view that our opportunity in the ICANN meeting is to interact with the mainstay identifiable constituent parts of ICANN and to that end I would suggest that availing oneself with what is a particular set of experiences any more general community member has is more appropriate at the public interaction on the Monday or in the formal or if needs be I guess inter-sessional informal approaches with the ATRT.

We are very short of time and I'm particularly keen for us to be seen to be very, very equally approachable and transparent in how we offer ourselves to the core sets of the ICANN community at this meeting, which is our only one to really get early information in a timely manner for our reporting process.

Brian Cute: Thank you Cheryl. Any other thoughts?

Willie Currie: Willie here.

Brian Cute: Yes Willie.

Willie Currie: I'm not sure about that. I think that it could well be useful to meet with Stewart Lawley. I'm not sure that given what he has been doing through his input into the open forum would be minimal.

And picking up on what Becky was saying about the problem of only having 60 minutes for that, it could be seen that we are circumscribing the possibility of input from a party that has experienced the review mechanism process. So I would tend to think that it may well be useful to make some time even if the whole team can't be part of that meeting.

Brian Cute: Thank you Willie. Any other thoughts?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You've got two views. Are you going to poll?

Brian Cute: Well, I suppose I could poll. So the question would be should we have a separate meeting with Stewart Lawley under standard rules of the ATRT?

Or should we direct him to the open public process that we are running currently? Those are the questions before us and I take a poll of the group. A would be a meeting with Stewart, B would be avail himself of the public process. Can I hear...?

Becky Burr: Brian, this is Becky.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Becky Burr: I think Willie may have suggested a middle course, which was for those people who are interested in meeting with Stewart, permitting that to go on and making everybody aware of it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Becky, Cheryl here. I guess I find myself a little betwixt and 'tween here because I know Stewart has written to certainly me as chair of the at large advisory committee and offered to come and speak to our community separately on this particular matter during the meeting.

So a number of communities are availing themselves or looking at availing themselves to having that opportunity. I think if the ATRT does something it should be done formally with however many of us can be in the room at the time. And under the standard ATRT meeting

rules I'm wondering if we're looking at finding it difficult to allow for frank and fearless discussion in the time of the 60 minutes from the whole of community including Stewart.

Whether or not we should look at a well publicized but nevertheless available time in our Friday or Saturday meeting rather than bite into what is a very small amount of time for the public interaction on the Monday.

Becky Burr: That sounds like a very sensible solution Cheryl.

Brian Cute: I would be inclined to either have a meeting with the ATRT or direct Stewart to the public process that is in place as opposed to inviting him to meet with separate members. I'm not sure how it would logistically engage that. But can I have a quick poll of the table with response to this question? A would be to indicate to Stewart that we would have a meeting with him as a team or B, that he should avail himself of the public process. Can we go around the table?

Lawrence Strickling: Do you want us to speak up? This is Larry.

Brian Cute: Yes. Thanks Larry.

Lawrence Strickling: I think I would very much like to get his input into the process. I think he can do that by submitting a written comment. I think he can do that by appearing with other members of the public at the appropriate time during our sessions. I do not favor a separate meeting with him.

Brian Cute: Okay. Willie.

Willie Currie: Well, with my point, I would go for A.

Brian Cute: Okay. Olivier.

Olivier Muron: I would go for Larry's position, B (that would be).

Brian Cute: Okay. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was coming down on B to begin with and if it stays with B then it opens up opportunities for my community separately.

Brian Cute: Okay. Becky.

Becky Burr: I'm very confused about which is A and which is B now.

Brian Cute: A is meet with him, B is avail yourself of the public process.

Becky Burr: I think the public process would be a perfectly appropriate thing. I wish we had more time.

Brian Cute: Okay. Louie.

Louie Lee: Can you hear me okay?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Louie Lee: Okay. B for the reasons that Larry has so eloquently stated.

Brian Cute: Okay. Zhang. Zhang, can you hear us?

Erick Iriarte: Did you say Erick? I am with B. You said my name but (I didn't listen to you).

Brian Cute: Okay. Zhang?

Xinsheng Zhang: This is Zhang speaking. I'd like to choose.

Brian Cute: The question is should the ATRT have a meeting with Stewart Lawley of ICM registry as he has requested or should we direct him to the public process and tell him to participate in the public process?

Feng Guo: Hello, this is (Feng).

Woman: Yes (Feng).

(Fengl): I think Mr. Zhang would choose Choice B that directs Stewart to the public session.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Woman: Thank you (Feng).

Brian Cute: Peter. Thank you very much. Peter.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, I think I'll abstain if you don't mind unless just because the process that Lawley is involved in is still alive and the board is still involved in that process. I think I'll just abstain from this question if you don't mind.

Brian Cute: Fair enough. Is there anyone I have missed?

Manal Ismail: This is Manal. Sorry.

Brian Cute: Manal. Manal. I'm sorry (my dear).

Manal Ismail: It's okay. No, it's okay. I'll go for B also for the same reasons mentioned by Larry and Becky. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay. And my vote is B as well. I think we have our answer. I will respond to Stewart and suggest that he avail himself of the public process that is available to all.

Okay. Moving on and we have about 45 minutes left. I'm going to do my best to better manage the agenda than I did on the last call. So let's get to the next item. And the next item I believe is the management assessment RFP, preparation for presentations, methodology for evaluating candidates. The first order of business, the RFP has been posted.

We have two requests outstanding or responses with questions outstanding from potential candidates and we have a deadline of tomorrow without a specified time for that deadline. So starting with those items, we have two requests from potential candidates that have hit the email asking for responses to particular questions. Has everyone seen those emails?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Becky Burr: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'm trying to pull them up as we speak. Let's see. So I'm sorry. Let me get...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Could Alice put them into a note and bring them up so we can look at them?

Brian Cute: That would be best. Could you do that, Alice? In the meantime one of the questions was what time is the deadline tomorrow? The question I have for the group...

Manal Ismail: Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes Manal.

Manal Ismail: I have them in front of me if you would like me to go through them one by one.

Brian Cute: Certainly. Let me first ask the group I know that some members of the team, Larry and I think others, may have candidates to whom they sent the RFP. Do we have any other responses other than the two emails that we're hunting for right now from potential candidates? Larry?

Becky Burr: I thought it was like three.

Lawrence Strickling: I'm aware of the one from PRTM and then the one from One World Trust. Those are the only two I'm aware of.

Becky Burr: I thought there was one later this afternoon.

Brian Cute: Was there? Manal?

Lawrence Strickling: Do you know who it was from, Becky?

Becky Burr: IRT or something like that.

Manal Ismail: I think there is a - sorry Becky. Go ahead.

Becky Burr: No, it was just like ISLIP something or another, IRP.

Manal Ismail: (Interstyle).

Brian Cute: Okay. Manal, do you have them in front of you?

Manal Ismail: Yes I do.

Brian Cute: Why don't you read through them for us, the questions, and identify the entity that responded please.

Manal Ismail: So the questions from PRCM, first question regarding confidentiality and the question says will the proposal including our approach, qualifications, professional fees, references and financial information be subject to release by ICANN or will it be held confidential?

Is it possible for us to put in place a mutual non-disclosure agreement if this is the case? So would you like me to read everything or we'll get responses one by one?

Brian Cute: Yes, please read everything if you would and identify them.

Manal Ismail: Okay. References - would it be acceptable to provide references separately from our proposal? We generally try to clear the release of any client information with our clients and have not had the chance to do so. Would it be acceptable to submit references once ICANN has completed its initial review and selection.

And question C on budget, is there a specific budget allocated for this project? If so, what is the amount? Does it include expenses as well? Fourth question on the deadline - can you clarify the specific deadline, time and time zone on June 11, 2010 for the submission of proposals? And last question on submission, can proposals be submitted by email or do you require a hard copy submission as well? So this was from PRCM.

Brian Cute: Okay. Is it possible to post these up to the board if I just get in here?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alice just sent them around.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why are we using tools if we don't use them effectively is my question.

Brian Cute: Cheryl, I just spoke to them. Do you see them?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Becky Burr: You might be far more competent than the rest of us Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not a matter of confidence or competence. It's a matter of if we have tools people who are presenting or hosting ought to know how to use them. And (that's not your say), Becky.

Brian Cute: I'm sorry. Does everyone see the five questions? I just posted them and see them on my screen.

Becky Burr: I see them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay. There they are. So let's work through these because these are responses we need to get back. Confidentiality of these proposals will be held confidential. Is there any objection to that? I think we have already addressed that issue.

Lawrence Strickling: Again, this is Larry. My view on this is that to keep the process pure they ought to be kept confidential at least through the presentations by these groups, those that are invited to present to us.

Frankly, I don't know what else in here is truly confidential if people want to do this work and I see no reason to provide people any promise of confidentiality other than to preserve the process.

Brian Cute: Okay. Any other comments?

Becky Burr: I think the only question is whether it means that we won't get as many proposals as we might like. But generally I agree with Larry. I mean there are going to be certain things that are proprietary - pricing certainly in the initial round. But the approaches will be instructive and interesting to the entire community I would think.

Brian Cute: Okay. So presentations and RFP responses confidential through the process of presentations in Brussels but then otherwise made available as we discussed earlier.

Becky Burr: I think we should say subject to redactions for clearly proprietary material.

Brian Cute: Certainly. Two, references. Would it be acceptable to provide references separately from our proposal? Well, I assume we have a schedule where we receive presentations, we'll take them in and analyze them and make a decision.

I certainly would assume that references that come in after their proposal and giving us ample time to review those references would be acceptable. But what's the original? Does anyone have the original schedule that we had for making a selection? What deadline did we give ourselves?

Lawrence Strickling: This is Larry. I think the RFP envisioned that again, this was tentative. I don't think as a group we agreed upon this. But the RFP said there would be a proposal conference in Brussels.

I actually would hope that we schedule the presentations perhaps Friday afternoon so that we have time Saturday as a group to talk about them face to face and make a tentative selection with the idea of then getting the contract wrapped up within a week of leaving Brussels. That's what we had proposed. I do not believe we have talked about that and reached agreement as a team though on that schedule. And so in the schedule we put in the RFP we made it very clear that was a tentative schedule.

Manal Ismail: Brian, this is Manal. Do you mean the proposed work schedule you suggested before?

Brian Cute: I meant what we set for selecting a candidate.

Manal Ismail: I have in front of me June 18 and 19 RC meetings in Brussels, presentations from RFP management assessment candidates, July 2 selection of management assessment candidates, RC reviews input from ICANN and other things and July 9 management assessment begins.

Brian Cute: So July 2 did you say we make a selection?

Manal Ismail: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay. So we effectively have two weeks' time from the presentations to the selection. The question here the candidate is asking, indicating that they need some time to get clearance from clients to release any client information in terms of references.

I think an adequate response would be that certainly they could provide references later or after the presentation date of the 18th but we should I think indicate a deadline for the submission of references because we have such a short timetable ourselves to make a decision. Does that seem reasonable, a no later than date?

Lawrence Strickling: This is Larry. I think as a practical matter, assuming they are invited to come to Brussels, if they bring the references to Brussels I think that does not impede our process.

Having said that, I for the life of me can't understand why they can't do this in the timeframe. It's not tomorrow.

Brian Cute: I'm having the same thought Larry.

Lawrence Strickling: I do not have a lot of direct contact with this organization but I know it. I have been on their Web site. They have references on their Web site. I don't understand why this is a problem for them. But I don't think it impedes us if they bring them with them next week although well, I'll just leave it at that.

Brian Cute: Okay. And then any other thoughts on this item before we move on? Okay. Let's move on to the budget. Is there a specified budget allocated for this process? If so, what is the amount? Does it include expenses as well?

We have not established a specific budget. We don't have an amount. We haven't scoped that out. My assumption as to question three is that it would include expenses as most of these contracts would. The one simple response is that we are looking for the best price and best value. Do we need to get into a budget? Have we discussed budget? Larry, do you have a sense of budget?

Lawrence Strickling: I think my sense of this is we want people to scope this according to what they think the work ought to be done. And I don't think it's necessary for us to help them out by giving them a number.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Cheryl here. I agree with Larry. I think the benefit to answering these questions should be limited to yes, we would assume it would include expenses unless you want to give a budget that has a different response to that. But yeah, we want to find out what the best value deal is, not get people to come within \$3 of what we suggest.

Brian Cute: Agreed.

Peter DengateThrush: Brian, when you finish this comment, can I come back to the meta topic of budget for the ATRT?

Brian Cute: Certainly Peter. Thank you. So for a deadline, we did not specify a time and time zone for the deadline. I guess my overarching question here is we have heard from three potential candidates.

Is tomorrow's deadline something we should stick with? Is anyone concerned that we are not going to get sufficient responses? I think three is a fair number. Larry, have you heard from - you had mentioned I think Booz Allen and maybe another firm. Have you heard from them?

Lawrence Strickling: I believe I have not directly. I know that both Deloitte and Booz are working on something although I have not talked to them. I think our view of it was that once the RFP went up it was not appropriate for us to talk to anybody about anything specific to this.

In that to preserve the process we would just not respond to inquiries. But I understand that both of them are working on this. I don't know whether either or both of them will submit. I would expect them both to but I don't know that.

I do think though that this one is an important question and we need the answer and we need to post something on the Web site tomorrow morning in terms of how late in the day according to which time zone we'll accept submissions because people do need to know that and we ought to be clear on that. And it's complicated by the fact that we are basically dealing with every time zone not just time zones in one country.

Becky Burr: How about anywhere, tomorrow at any time in the world?

Erick Iriarte: I agree with that. I think it's a good option because it's 11 in different parts of the world. So it could be nice on our side. And one more thing - this question was made two days ago. And we just answered it today, the same day that they asked. So the idea of anytime of 11 in any part of the world is fine for me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I just point out that it's already the 11th in some parts of the world?

Erick Iriarte: Yeah.

Brian Cute: So perhaps we ought to think about a UTC time on Saturday? I don't know. I don't think that between Friday or Saturday it makes a lot of difference. I do think we need to post something so that everybody has a clear understanding of what time they need to submit by.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree. Between Friday and Saturday it's not that big a deal. And the most important thing is to get a time out there so that nobody is disadvantaged.

Woman: 23:59 UTC on the 11th.

Brian Cute: What would 24 hours from now be because we have just struck midnight US Eastern?

Becky Burr: Yeah. No. About 24 hours from now would be the 12th in many parts of the world.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. You're already 4:00 am UTC. So if you're going to use UTC time you need to set it at 23:59, which is one minute to midnight, UTC on the 11th. So you stick with your 11 dates, which you have assumed, time stamp finish.

Brian Cute: Okay. And just to help me, how many hours from now is that?

Alice Jansen: It's 20 hours.

Becky Burr: Yeah. 20 hours away from now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I think Larry's point is well taken. We might consider staying 23:59 UTC on the 12th since we are only going to be answering this question when it is already the 11th.

Brian Cute: That sounds sensible.

Becky Burr: Okay. So we just - 20 or 40 is fine but it needs to be at 23:59 UTC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So I'm going to move 23:59 on the 12th.

Becky Burr: I'm happy with that.

Brian Cute: 23:59 UTC on the 12th. Agreed?

Becky Burr: Yeah. I'm happy with that.

Brian Cute: Alice, you got it?

Alice Jansen: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay. Let's make that change and adjustment to the Web site announcement tomorrow.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Becky Burr: It already is tomorrow for Alice.

Brian Cute: Now who is going to be checking the time stamps of the emails and making sure they were filed in a timely fashion? Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alice.

Alice Jansen: I think Cheryl is a good choice.

Brian Cute: Okay. I think we have worked through this. I will take the points of the discussion and fashion a response to this email with Alice for this candidate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You have not answered the question on email. Can it be submitted via email and do we require hard copies?

Lawrence Strickling: Can I suggest - I guess I don't want to prejudge this application but I think that's a silly question.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Becky Burr: Yeah.

Lawrence Strickling: I mean we gave them an email address to submit to. It's like hello.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Read the details boys and girls. Yeah. A response to (Interstyle) is also if we're going to bother responding to some we should respond to all questions. And the matter of whether or not we were construing that it was an individual versus a small group or team, again, that's sort of back in their ballpark as far as I'm concerned.

Becky Burr: I agree.

Brian Cute: Yes. Okay. We will...

Lawrence Strickling: This is Larry. Is it implicit in this that we will post these questions and answers so that everybody gets the benefit of them? I think we have to do that.

Becky Burr: I think we should.

Brian Cute: We have to do that, yes. So we'll develop some responses to these questions and circulate them, get them blessed and get them up on the Web site.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They don't have to be identified who has asked them but we can say the following questions have been asked, here are the answers.

Brian Cute: That's correct.

Becky Burr: I think we should pass on the blessing and just (post them) Brian.

Brian Cute: Very good. Done. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll let you know if you make a mistake. That works.

Brian Cute: I know you will. Okay. Moving on.

Becky Burr: Taking their life in your hands.

Brian Cute: Moving on, let's come back to Peter. He wanted to speak to the budget topic. Peter, are you there?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I am Brian. Thank you. We had a conversation with (unintelligible) where he indicated what the budget for this work was. At some point I think it would be useful for you and Manal if not others to work out how you're going to live within that budget.

And if there is any problem with that come back to board and staff or I guess go back to that. At the moment I think there is sort of a sense that we don't actually have a team budget for this and we're talking about meetings and serious things to say. I'd like to have an (idea around) at some stage.

Brian Cute: Well, I guess Manal and I should then set up a call with (Doug) and start working through that. And you're talking about budget not just for the management consultant but for the entire team's exercise if I'm hearing you correctly.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Correct. That's what (Doug) has given you an indication of what the current provisioning for this team's work is. I think you should ideally the team should put together a budget and if there is a difficulty with doing that, (there should become a budget).

Brian Cute: Very good. We'll take that on as an action item Peter.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thank you.

Brian Cute: Finishing up Item Number 3, preparation for presentations and methodology for evaluating candidates - in terms of meeting with the candidates and their presentations in Brussels, anything that we need to prepare? Anything by way of...

Manal Ismail: Brian, sorry.

Brian Cute: Yes Manal.

Manal Ismail: Sorry to interrupt you. This is Manal. But I think we had a couple of more questions from other candidates. Are we going to go through them also?

Brian Cute: Yes. Certainly. Let's do that.

Manal Ismail: Because there is one in the process of putting together a proposal for ATRT review tender, which needs to be in tomorrow and was wondering if you could clarify for me what quotes, "financial information on the party," end of quotes - I should include in the proposal. Also, is there a specific time by which the proposal needs to be submitted, which we already answered.

Brian Cute: Yes. I just posted that to the site. Financial information of the party.

Manal Ismail: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Larry, I don't have the RFP right in front of me.

Lawrence Strickling: I do. I mean I think what was expected here was just your usual boilerplate of in effect the something that - if it's not a group we know about something that demonstrates that they have a certain gravitas or a certain financial standing.

I mean it was listed in there with resumes, references and financial information. I think what it was intended to do was elicit from the potential consultant some information about the size

of the organization, their annual turnover, that sort of thing. I don't see this as a very big issue. And certainly in the case of some of these companies it's not going to be an issue at all

We're much more concerned about I would think the specific people who will be working on the project, not the financial standing of the firm as a whole. But I think that for firms that we don't know well it was just to get some sense that the firm is of sufficient standing that we think they have the ability to carry through on the project. That's what's intended by the request but I don't view it as a very big hurdle for people.

Brian Cute: Okay. Very good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So the answer is information that demonstrates your ability to carry through on the task.

Brian Cute: Very well put.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Exactly right. Got it. Okay. Manal, we have a third, right?

Manal Ismail: Yes. The third submitted two questions. First one on the deadline - so this has already been taken care of. And the second one, the RFP could be construed to imply but does not directly state that ICANN is looking for responses that name a specific individual as opposed to an organization or a team.

The schedule and the nature of the work involved would suggest a small team, between brackets two to three researchers, in order to conduct the necessary interviews, reviews and analysis. Can you give any guidance on this point?

Lawrence Strickling: This is Larry. I'll speak to that, which is it's fine whether the RFP is responded to by a firm as opposed to individuals.

But I think we do want to know precisely who would be doing this work inside the firm and we want to understand their qualifications for performing the project. But we are not in any way suggesting that only individuals can apply and firms can't. But if it's a firm we want to know who in the firm is going to be doing the work.

Brian Cute: Got it. Any other points?

Manal Ismail: No, that's it.

Brian Cute: Okay. Got that. Okay. And those are the three that we have heard from.

Lawrence Strickling: So can I speak to the rest of the agenda point on number three to try to speed this up a little bit? This is Larry speaking.

Brian Cute: Sure.

Lawrence Strickling: We had envisioned that anybody who presents a responsible proposal to us tomorrow or Saturday could be invited but we didn't want to just assume that every proposal we got we would assume justified having people come to Brussels and spend time with us.

But I do think there is a question as to doing a quick review of these responses and making some selection of the ones we want to have come in. I don't think it needs to be a very high bar but on the other hand I don't see any benefit to wasting our time or the time of firms that don't clearly show experience in doing the kinds of governance projects that we want to have done here.

So the question would be before the group is whether that is an exercise everybody wants to participate in, which we really have to do over the weekend or if people would be comfortable naming a smaller sub-group to that, which might be able to make a proposal by the end of the weekend as to who to invite, which would certainly be subject to discussion if people want to evaluate or respond to that type of suggestion.

But in this case I think speed is of the essence. And I do think that we all ought to have a clear understanding in terms of what the recommendation would be and what it would be based on if somebody is not going to be invited to come to Brussels next week.

But I do think that it's worthwhile taking a little bit of time and I certainly would volunteer my time to participate in that over the weekend to try to whittle down the group if we have a

lot of applications, because as a practical matter we have got to zero in on the three or four firms that are most likely able to do this and move forward pretty quickly.

Brian Cute: That sounds like a common sense suggestion. Anybody have any objections to formation of a smaller team to take on the task of initial vetting of all the candidates and recommendation of candidates to be invited to Brussels? Thank you. Thought has won the day Larry and you are the charter member of that group. Anybody like to volunteer to work with Larry on that? I have a feeling Fabio would but I certainly wouldn't suggest him without him being on the call.

Olivier Muron: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps that could be taken as a cautionary tale to not turning up to calls.

Brian Cute: Exactly. Three is always a good number in case someone is unavailable or I'm happy to raise my hand for the job as well. Larry, why don't I join you on that and we'll ping Fabio and see if he wants to join us.

Lawrence Strickling: I think that'd be great. And then all we'd need is to make sure Alice emails us the responses as she gets them since they won't be publicly available immediately.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Brian Cute: Okay. So any other points? Yes. Go ahead Larry.

Lawrence Strickling: What I would propose then is with this new deadline of the end of the day Saturday UTC that we would come back I think with a recommendation to the group and really thinking it probably needs to be by the end of the day in the US on Sunday. I don't know Brian what your schedule is like.

But I think we have got to go fast on this so that people can make travel plans if they are going to come with an idea that we give everybody else a chance to see that and react to it

before we notify people Monday morning as to whether they are invited to come or not. Is that too ambitious a schedule?

Brian Cute: No. I think you're right that we can't afford more time than that for the candidates' sake.

Lawrence Strickling: And I guess I would also just propose for the team that whatever - if we do make a recommendation not to invite everybody who applies, we will certainly provide a rationale for that.

In my own mind I would say that what I'm going to be looking for is prior experience doing this kind of work very specifically. And if we don't see that I'm less inclined to invite people to come over if we don't see that they have done this kind of work before. Make sense?

Brian Cute: Manal please.

Manal Ismail: Brian, this is Manal, yes. I was just looking into the email Alice sent compiling all the questions from the bidders and I found the fourth question, it's again on the deadline.

But it seems to me that it's from a different email address. So I'm just wondering is this a fourth candidate? So do we have four companies now?

Brian Cute: I don't know.

Manal Ismail: Do we have Alice on the call maybe?

Brian Cute: Alice, are you there? Alice?

Manal Ismail: Because the email is coming from someone at BAH.com and it's without a signature.

Brian Cute: That would be Booz Allen.

Lawrence Strickling: Booz Allen.

Brian Cute: Yeah.

Manal Ismail: Okay. Okay. So that means that we have four candidates, right?

Brian Cute: It sounds like it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Manal, Cheryl here. Regardless of how many candidates we have now providing the answers to these questions are posted out and we send to each of the questioners please look here to this URL for answers to various questions we have received, hopefully it'll mean we'll get at least half a dozen or so in the new deadline or the confirmed deadline.

Manal Ismail: Yeah. Sure. Okay. I just wanted to point this out. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Okay. This is very good and I'll be working on the answers to the questions right after this call and getting them right out. Okay. I think we can - let's go to the list. Obviously we're going to have to come up with a methodology.

Lawrence Strickling: I'm sorry Brian. One other thing that we need to get established is what time? When do we want these people in Brussels? I had suggested Friday afternoon so that we have time to react and respond to it on Saturday.

But we also have a lot of other stuff we need to accomplish. But we are going to need to know that by Monday morning when we talk to people in terms of when we want them over there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, Cheryl here. I think Friday afternoon is ideal for a number of reasons, not the least of which it's possible to fly in, deal with us and get out on a Friday afternoon when you have got accommodation issues that you won't have to deal with.

I know accommodations aren't terribly easy over a weekend in Brussels. So to do it Saturday is probably more of an impost than it is to do it on a Friday afternoon.

Brian Cute: I agree. I think the Friday afternoon suggestion makes a lot of sense. We have a full day on Friday. We'd have the first half of the day to tend to other business. We could meet with candidates on Friday afternoon and as Larry said, have the ability to react on the Saturday if need be or follow up if need be with any of the candidates.

That sounds common sensical to me. Any other thoughts on that? Then let's target Friday afternoon for slotting candidates for presentations.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are we looking at three to four?

Brian Cute: Candidates? Well, I guess it depends on the number of candidates who we select. And I think we'd want to afford each of the candidates - wouldn't you think it at least a half an hour?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 30-45 minutes each?

Brian Cute: Yeah I would think.

Lawrence Strickling: That sounds right to me.

Brian Cute: We can be flexible. It's the afternoon. Let's see how many qualified potential candidates we get and we'll schedule from there. Okay. Closing up number three, I think what I had methodology for evaluating candidates I meant evaluating and selecting the winner, not selecting the group that is going to come to Brussels.

Why don't we put that off the list or take that onto the list and have a discussion and anyone who has suggestions as to a specific methodology we should follow if ICANN has methodologies of its own in its RFP selection process we certainly could look at those as a point of reference. Larry, at the Department of Commerce I assume you have some that might be a good guide.

Lawrence Strickling: I'll look into that. I'm not sure.

Brian Cute: If you do, I'd say let's take that to the list and people make suggestions on the list and we'll work it out there for now. Anything else on item three before we move on? Okay. We have got about ten minutes left. I'm going to move expeditiously through these.

Number four, I had made a request and suggestion a while back that we establish issues-based working teams that looking at Paragraph 9 of the affirmation 9.1 that there are certain buckets if you will of review and certainly the opportunity to establish sub-committees or sub-working teams of two or three people to focus specifically on those items.

I haven't heard a lot from folks on the team. I'd encourage you again if there is a specific area that you would like to focus on as we work towards our recommendations, please raise your hands for that. Warren Adelman on the list had made a suggestion of how we might consolidate a few of the elements. I'll re-circulate that email but I would like some reaction and some hands raised if possible.

I think this will help make the work a bit more efficient. One other note there, my suggestion in no way would limit the ability of any review team member to work or contribute on any issue whatsoever at any time. This is just an ability to get some focus and some efficiencies on the work. So that's a request from the chair if you would respond on the list.

Willie Currie: Willie here.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Willie Currie: Just before we leave that could we put this issue on the agenda for our meeting in Brussels? I think it's to the question of how we see the next six months unfolding and the interaction between these kinds of two-based teams and the management consultants and I think it's a slightly complex discussion and one that I think is better dealt with face to face, not just by people raising their hands in the meantime.

Brian Cute: Sure. Consider it done. On the agenda for our discussions in Brussels. Any other thoughts there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Brian Cute: Item Number 5, document management and administrative support - it's become clear to me certainly moving into the phase where we're going to begin taking in a significant amount of data from management consultant firms, from the community, the documents that we have already begun to receive from ICANN staff.

My sense is that the management of documents on the one hand in addition to the increased requirements of administrative support as we begin interacting with both the community and the management consultants are going to be significant. And my sense right now is that we

will require additional support, potentially third party support for this task. I'd like to open up to the table for discussion/suggestions.

Becky Burr: This is Becky. I agree that just getting all of our documents posted and collecting all of the other documents is not an insignificant task. And given the time that we are looking at, I think we ought to be realistic about whether we need to look outside for some support.

I have talked to some law schools who have students who might be interested in providing low cost support. I think that there is a fairly significant task of just gathering all of the body of information that already exists within the ICANN history about this question and making sure that we are taking into account all of that history, which strikes me as a profoundly and fundamentally important task.

Brian Cute: Thank you Becky. Any other thoughts, suggestions? Since there are budgetary concerns and Peter is quite right, we need to work up a budget for the group and this support could have a cost to it as well or perhaps not or perhaps a low cost if we were to get a law student who has document management skills.

Anyone who has suggestions Becky or beyond for resources that we could use and I think this is something we need to do in the short term quickly because we are about to start taking on board documentation and my own meager management skills have not been up to the task on list that we're managing as is. So please provide your suggestions quickly on this point.

Becky Burr: Just it seems to me that could be in terms of development of a budget proposal, that should be part of the - that should be in the mix.

Brian Cute: Absolutely agreed. Any other points before we move on? Item Number 6 on the proposed work schedule, I am going to suggest that we put that on the agenda for Brussels and pick that up next week.

Item Number 7 - any objections? Item Number 7, propose meeting schedule. The dual poll with regard to the Asia meeting, we have put out three now. It looks as though the best time is, the best date is actually going to be the one that was originally proposed, which was beginning on August 30 and going to September 5.

I think Louie, you were the only person in that poll who wasn't able to attend in person. Are you going to be able to attend telephonically if those are the dates that we pick? And if so, are there any days in that week that are - well, let me refer back to the poll before I say that. Are you available telephonically?

Louie Lee: Yes I am.

Brian Cute: You are. Okay.

Louie Lee: Yes.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much. I'm going to come back to the group and we'll establish the dates on that week that worked for everyone else on the team. And Louie, we apologize but you'll have to join us by phone from wherever you are and we'll manage it that way.

Willie Currie: That's fine. I put in the comments there are only the two specific dates that I cannot do telephonically.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'll check that cross reference-a-doodle and come back to the grid. With regard to place, Mr. Zhang, are there any updates on the possibility of Beijing as a host for the Asia meeting?

Xinsheng Zhang: (Unintelligible)

Brian Cute: I'm sorry. I'm having trouble hearing you. Can you speak up please?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Xinsheng Zhang: (I will speak up). Can you hear me?

Brian Cute: I can hear you, yes.

Xinsheng Zhang: I'll try to speak up. Okay. (Unintelligible).

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sorry Brian. I'm having trouble.

Xinsheng Zhang: (Unintelligible) - still in progress.

Brian Cate: You have progress on the meeting?

Xinsheng Zhang: (Unintelligible) - so I'll try to get it as soon as possible.

Brian Cate: I understand. Mr. Zhang, would it be prudent for the group to explore other sites at this moment in time? Or do you have a sense of when you may hear back from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs?

Xinsheng Zhang: (Unintelligible) - our ideas for the meeting. Is that possible?

Brian Cate: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that? I have a bad - it's very low, the volume.

Xinsheng Zhang: I said I will (need other details before producing this meeting). Is this possible? (Unintelligible).

Brian Cate: Yes.

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes. So (unintelligible).

Feng Guo: This is Feng. I will repeat the words that Mr. Zhang has said. To my understanding Mr. Zhang has said that he will try to give you back an announcement before the Brussels meeting.

He is trying to push the process as much as he can and I think that he would accept that you explore other places to hold the Asian meeting.

Brian Cate: Thank you for that and thank you Mr. Zhang. Obviously we appreciate you getting a response to us before Brussels. As a matter of prudence in the meantime we will explore other locations in the event that the event does not work out in Beijing. But thank you for the update.

Xinsheng Zhang: Thank you.

Manal Ismail: And Brian, this is Manal.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Manal Ismail: I checked the Doodle and I think the dates were on 30 and 31 August.

Brian Cute: 30 and 31 of August. Okay. If everyone would please make a note of that and we will check Louie's telephonic availability and post something to the group shortly. And the meeting - yes Peter?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I wasn't quite sure of the status of this but is the suggestion that the alternative venue for Asia might be New Zealand?

Brian Cute: That was the alternative suggestion in Marina Del Ray.

Peter Dengate Thrush: ...we don't have anything like the accommodation problems so I can probably do that on quite short notice.

Brian Cute: If you would Peter, that would be great. Yes. Please Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Can I just raise the matter of travel being organized at various expenses for the end of August and then again for anyone who is going to be trying to attend the Internet Governance Forum 14 days later.

When we first discussed having the meeting in the order during our methodology discussion in Marina Del Ray we were talking about having the August/September meeting tied more into a point that would serve to be on the way to Vilnius if we were indeed continuing on to Vilnius if it wasn't going to be at Vilnius. And now we're going to New Zealand perhaps.

Brian Cute: I understand. If the dates are the 30th and the 31st the IGF starts on the 14th. Is that the case?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 14, yeah. I don't know how many people want to do round the world tickets.

Brian Cute: Understood. All I can say is that with the dates and the Doodles that we did, Cheryl and I put out...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand the dates. It's the venue I'm interested in.

Brian Cute: Okay. Is there - well, there seemed to be a consensus about New Zealand at Marina Del Ray. Is there - you have a two-week spread between the meetings we're proposing and Vilnius.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But Peter's beginning to talk about cost to New Zealand. Perhaps we should be asking them, not me, that's the cheapest fare.

Olivier Muron: We were concerned about the cost of travel to New Zealand globally as a group I mean.

Brian Cute: I see. Well, we can explore other venues. I know that Peter, if you would do the research as you suggested because we are getting tight on time. If anybody has an alternative venue to suggest please do so because we are getting tight on time and prices are only going to go up the closer that we get to the dates of the meeting.

So if we could handle it that way on the list, please everyone proceed so we can get the location locked down as well.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, Peter here. Is there a template for hosting a team meeting? How many people, how many days, how many rooms, layouts, accommodations? Is there a template?

Brian Cute: We can put one together for you certainly. Briefly though, it's two days, it's 13 team members plus any assistants that come along, probably roughly 15 or 16 total. But we can pull together the particulars for you so you can scope that out on your end.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Great. But Cheryl is right that we had a conversation about tying this with going to Vilnius. And so I guess I have no ego or any other issue associated with coming or not coming to New Zealand.

I think probably the primary focus ought to be looking at the work plan and working out when we need a face to face meeting rather than the location. I'm not clear that we actually

need a meeting at that time yet. But I will organize one if that's what's needed and make things work. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Fair enough. Thank you Peter for those points. If you would just explore what the options are and anyone who wants to suggest alternative venues please do so on the list and we'll proceed at pace.

Manal Ismail: This is Manal. I think Fabio also had some suggestions but I don't want to speak for him. So maybe taking this on the list would be more appropriate. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you Manal. Okay. Moving on, the meeting in Cairo, Manal, the dates if you would.

Manal Ismail: I think we agreed on the 12th and 13th.

Brian Cute: Of October.

Manal Ismail: Yes, of October.

Brian Cute: And that has been notified on the list if I'm not mistaken.

Manal Ismail: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Okay. Lastly and probably most importantly from my perspective, moving on to item eight, we have circulated a suggested list of future calls. It was very difficult to get this call scheduled. I would very much like if we as a team could commit to a certain day of the week.

And again with the rotation of 6-8 hours forward for each call allows everyone to have during good times, decent times and bad times, is there any objection to the schedule that has been floated? There has been some feedback about specific holidays. I think making those adjustments obviously is perfectly appropriate.

But I would like to have us locked into a set schedule if possible. Any objections?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I don't have any problem at all with the schedule but the difficulty with scheduling it for Monday is at least for Cheryl and I it's automatically Sunday and try as I might, that just minimizes my ability to participate.

Brian Cute: Fair enough.

Erick Iriarte: Brian, I only have a comment with the 22nd in November. We will have our Latin American Ministerial Meeting of Information Society. So these dates are off for me.

Brian Cute: And did you indicate that on the list Erick?

Erick Iriarte: (Month of) 22 November.

Brian Cute: If you could just send a note to the list.

Erick Iriarte: Okay. Perfect.

Manal Ismail: I think there is nothing scheduled for the 22nd.

Erick Iriarte: But it's put in the (server).

Manal Ismail: No. It was commented. There is probably a previewed IGF-related meeting so those dates were excluded from - the only conference call in November is going to be on the 8th.

Erick Iriarte: Perfect.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'm going to make a suggestion that we adjust the calendar. Manal, let's take the calendar back. As Peter mentioned, he's got a Sunday conflict and Cheryl has got Sunday conflicts. I think we're going to have to shift the day to Tuesday at a minimum.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hang on. We're a day ahead of the rest of you. If it's Monday in your world it's usually Tuesday in mine.

Brian Cute: Peter, is it Sunday in New Zealand? I know Australia and New Zealand have some differences between them.

Becky Burr: But they're still at the bottom of the world.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Only on the important issues and (Australia time mustn't be important enough).

Becky Burr: All of the deadly, poisonous things are in Australia.

Brian Cute: Now that you are ahead of us I'm going to keep it at Monday and make any specific adjustments with regard to holidays or events as Erick mentioned. Thank you all.

Manal Ismail: Unless colleagues in the US are going to have this problem I mean.

Brian Cute: Anyone who has a problem with the schedule please post it to the list and we will make whatever adjustments we can. But my intention is to have a firm schedule for calls so we can dispatch with the Doodles and the difficulties very shortly and we'll circulate it to the group.

Manal Ismail: And Brian, if I may.

Brian Cute: Yes please Manal.

Manal Ismail: There were two columns, two suggested rotations. If people also would comment on their preference so that we can fix the final schedule.

Brian Cute: Certainly. Yes, we will take a hard look at the time of the call. And if there is a way that we can calibrate it so that it is not landing at 3:00 in the morning for anybody we should do so. So if anyone has any specific help on that front, please let us know. We'll get that scheduled shortly. Yes Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, if we remain silent on it, it means that we are happy to live with whatever the outcome is, I assume.

Brian Cute: That's the way I think as well, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good.

Becky Burr: But we're happy that you articulated it.

Brian Cate: Cowards. All right. I'm moving on to item nine and closing the call. But do we have any other business? And Olivier, you did ask that we speak about extending the comment period perhaps.

Olivier Muron: Yes because I spoke with a membership organization that is thinking of preparing a response to a request for comment and I think that the time is too short because a lot of input will come from Brussels.

And they have to digest it and they have to discuss it within their organization so they would like to have a deadline of about the 14th of July. These are Frenchmen, you can tell.

Brian Cate: What is the deadline right now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The first.

Olivier Muron: The first.

Becky Burr: So we'll storm the Bastille unless they don't provide the comments.

Olivier Muron: (Plus it's too short).

Brian Cate: I don't have any particular objection. I've always viewed us as having the flexibility of extending the deadline if need be. Is there any objection to extending the deadline at this point in time? A one-time extension?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy.

Brian Cate: Any objections? Going once, going twice - okay we will extend the deadline to the 14th of July and Alice, if you'd help make that adjustment to the Web site. Do we have any other business before we close and thank you for going past the time everyone.

Louie Lee: Hi. This is Louie. I'll just confirm right now that I can do telephonic August 30-31.

Brian Cute: Fantastic. Thank you Louie. We have our dates set now. Any other business?

Olivier Muron: Olivier. I just have a comment on the Web site. I thought it was supposed to be easier to get information about your team and I don't have that feeling. I don't know about my colleagues.

Brian Cute: Yes. Let me speak to that. Denise, Michelle, we had asked for a specific box for the ATRT on the home page of ICANN's site so that we would have a constant presence.

Denise had said that that had been approved and it was in the works. I need to go back to her and see what the status of that request is. There has been - I have been concerned about how we have had somewhat muted visibility and particularly on the announcement list and things roll off.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, we do have a blue box on the left hand column of the home page if you think of us as IOC reviews.

Brian Cute: We do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah we do.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Now what it takes us to could still do with a bit of work.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yeah. I think that (too).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now that is me being polite.

Becky Burr: Yeah. It sort of requires a bit of trucking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. It's appalling.

Becky Burr: I like it when Australians are polite.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just think we're looking at a perfect case study for transparency.

Brian Cute: Okay. Let me ask the review team members to send their specific requests and critiques of the current structure to the list as soon as possible and I'll be sure to shepherd all of them with Denise and make sure that the adjustments are made. Any other business?

Becky Burr: Stop laughing Cheryl.

Brian Cute: Any other business? Going once, going twice - hearing none, the meeting is closed. Thank you all very much for your time and see you all in Brussels.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Brian.

END