

**Accountability and Transparency Review – Third Conference Call**  
**MAY 27, 2010 – 19:00 UTC**  
**Transcript**

---

Coordinator: Excuse me I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Brian Cute: Okay this is Brian Cute. We're beginning the May 27 meeting of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. Could I have a roll call with each member calling out there name as present?

(Peter) (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr present.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Peter Dengate Thrush? We'll come back, (Manal).

Manal Ismail: Present.

Brian Cute: (Larry).

Larry Strickling: Here.

Brian Cute: (Warren).

Warren Adelman: Present.

Brian Cute: (Becky).

Becky Burr: Here.

Brian Cute: (Fabio).

Fabio Colasanti: Yes.

Brian Cute: (Willy).

Willy Currie: Here.

Brian Cute: Erick. Erick Iriarte.

Fabio Colasanti: He just put in the chat that he has been disconnected, that he's asking if it was possible to call him back.

Alice Jansen: Yes.

Brian Cute: Operator could you take care of that? Okay. In the meantime (Louie). (Louie)? Okay. (Olivier).

Olivier Muron: Yes I'm here.

Louis Lee: (Louie)'s here. I'm sorry I think my mute was on.

Brian Cute: Thank you (Louie). (Xiang).

Coordinator: Erick has rejoined.

Brian Cute: Erick?

Erick Iriarte: Thanks. Yes I was disconnected by the system but I am back on.

Brian Cute: Okay (Xiang).

Xinsheng Zhang: I'm here.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Okay. The roll call's complete on the assumption that Peter is listening in on his mobile phone. Let's begin.

The first order of business has everyone received the proposed agenda for the meeting? Has anyone not received it? Okay. Does anyone have any additions, modifications, deletions to the agenda to propose?

Louis Lee: Brian if I may ask?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Louis Lee: This is (Louie). Could you ask to see who are the observers that are on the phone call as well?

Brian Cute: Certainly. If there are any observers on the call could you please identify yourselves now?

James Bladel: James Bladel from Go Daddy.

Brian Cute: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: And Olof Nordling from (Microsoft).

Guo Feng: (Guo) and Mr. (Zhang Xinsheng).

Brian Cute: Thank you (Guo).

(Fiona Alexander): (Fiona Alexander) from NTIA.

Brian Cate: Thank you (Fiona). Anyone else?

Alice Jansen: Alice Jansen, ICANN staff.

Brian Cate: Thank you Alice. Anyone else? Okay. To the question at hand any suggested changes to the agenda?

Okay. Hearing none the first order of business is to discuss and solidify the Brussels meeting schedule. There were a number of proposed meetings and I'd like to first just have confirmations from the people who were assigned to set up the meetings, get confirmations of times for the respective meetings we had, the meeting with the board...

Peter Dengate Thrush:Hi. Peter coming back.

Brian Cate: I'm sorry?

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Just Peter coming back in.

Peter Dengate Thrush:Sorry, just Peter rejoining the call. I'm actually in traffic guys so I may not be able to stay on all of the call.

Brian Cate: Understood Peter. Thank you. For Brussels we had proposed meeting with the board, proposed meeting with the GAC, proposed meeting with the board and GAC joint working group, proposed meeting with the, all the ACs and SOs organizations. I'd like a report in from the folks who have responsibility for setting those up if we have confirmed times and dates?

Becky Burr: This is (Becky).

Brian Cute: Peter since, oh sorry (Becky). I was going to grab Peter while he's on. Peter if you could just comment and confirm time and date of meeting with the board (unintelligible) was yours?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sorry Brian, I'm back with you. Yes the board time is confirmed for the afternoon that we scheduled, I'm sorry I haven't got the thing in front of me but it's the one that we set up.

Brian Cute: I believe that was Sunday, right?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yep.

Brian Cute: Okay. And do we have a time whether Peter or somebody else could confirm the time?

Becky Burr: I believe that I have seen a time for the, I've seen a variety of different times, there are three, there's the GAC meeting, the joint, the GAC board working group meeting and then the board meeting.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: And the ALAC meeting.

Becky Burr: And the ALAC meeting but the ALAC meeting until we you know, lock down the board and the GAC...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Becky Burr: ...it's I mean those have been moving targets so we really need to do that because Sunday is definitely the day for ALAC.

Brian Cute: Okay. Well sticking with the board, does anybody have confirmation of time, yay or nay? If not...

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sorry, Brian sorry, it's Peter again. It's the one that went around. (Diane Shroeder) asked if you were okay with a particular time and then you came back and said yes. So the time that (Diane) used (unintelligible) is the one that we're going with.

Brian Cute: Okay. Well I'll gather that and then report it in as we move forward here.

The GAC times as I understand (Manal) if you could confirm, that was I think we had 12:00 to 12:30 for the GAC board (unintelligible) group?

Manal Ismail: Yeah.

Brian Cute: And then 4:00 to 6:00 for the meeting with the GAC, correct?

Manal Ismail: Yeah. Correct.

Brian Cute: Okay. Who's just joined the call? Did somebody just join the call? Okay. So those are the GAC times confirmed.

Larry Strickling: Brian could you confirm those are both on Sunday, is that right, or is one of them on Saturday?

Brian Cute: My understanding is those are both to be on Sunday.

Manal Ismail: Both Sunday, yeah.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Becky Burr: Yeah and the board too.

Brian Cute: And, yeah now I'm looking at the e-mail from (Diane Shroeder) which has the meeting with the board from 2:00 to 3:30 on Sunday. So the line up I have right now is GAC board joint working group on Sunday from 12:30, 12:00 noon till 12:30, meeting with the board from 2:00 to 3:30, meeting with the GAC from 4:00 to 6:00.

Becky Burr: And then what does that do for ALAC?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well the ALAC has had the lunch time slot and we've gone so far as to actually organize the luncheon. So it should be end to end on Sunday, and I thought all these times were confirmed once we had the board immediately asked what was in the ALAC that moved the GAC out a little bit later and it left us the 30 minutes with the GAC and board work group to start the day.

Becky Burr: So that, but that...

Brian Cute: So Cheryl are you saying that ALAC is, is ALAC 12:30 to 2:00?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm saying I thought all of this was confirmed and everything was put to bed.

Brian Cute: We're trying to, no we're trying to confirm it now Cheryl and Alice what I'd like you to do on the heels of this conversation Alice is if you could pull together a draft schedule of all these meetings and distribute it to the members of the RT once we get off the call, that'd be very helpful, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, Cheryl here, we also have the Tuesday as well now.

Brian Cute: No I understand.

Becky Burr: Right.

Brian Cute: We're working through this one at a time folks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Brian Cute: So we now have those three meetings on Sunday. Cheryl are you telling me that the ALAC meeting is confirmed for 12:30 to 2:00?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely confirmed and meetings have even organized lunches.

Brian Cute: Okay. So ALAC is 12:30 to 2:00, obviously there's going to be a little bit of time there...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's 15 minutes shorter than that but yeah.

Brian Cute: ...as we move from location to location. Yeah. And we'll be moving from location to location but let's go with that slot. Okay we've got those four meetings now locked in. (Becky) can you report in on progress with the other SO and ACs?

Becky Burr: I am, I'm in contact with everybody. We have one cross constituency meeting but the notion would be that on Tuesday morning we would essentially move through all of the SOs and ACs that are interested. The ccNSO is not sure that they need a meeting other than the public meeting but basically it's Tuesday morning.

Brian Cute: Tuesday morning to meet with all of the respective SOs and ACs.



Becky Burr: Yes. Although we're going to meet with the cross-constituency which ISPs and the business people. The IP people appear to want to meet with us separately.

Brian Cate: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: May I ask Brian, Cheryl here again and I'm trying to get into the habit of identifying names because it makes the transcript and the listening to recordings so much easier. (Becky) on the Tuesday it's the full morning blocked out end to end, is that from a breakfast time on or what (unintelligible).

Becky Burr: It's after breakfast because I believe that there are already breakfast scheduled.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Okay.

Becky Burr: So I did not schedule any breakfast.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So we're looking from the 9:00 through till what 1:00?

Becky Burr: 1:00 when the, that break is. And I'm still kind of juggling around the different constituencies to see which works best.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure. Are we likely to go into other parts of the week as well or is that going to be the two blocks, the Sunday and the Tuesday A.M.?

Becky Burr: My hope was to confine it to those two blocks of time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Becky Burr:: My effort was to get everybody on Tuesday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. That's fine, it's just, you know, some of us obviously you know have to block ourselves out of our other commitments so I can just make sure that that works. Terrific. Thank you.

Becky Burr: And I have told the people that I'm talking with that it's not, that we probably will not have the full committee, for example I suspect Peter may not be available for some or all of those meetings.

Brian Cute: So can we just have a listing of the respective entities that we intend to meet with on Tuesday, if you can just tick them off (Becky) so we have the list and then we'll create that list on the schedule and start slotting times they become confirmed?

Becky Burr: Registry, registrar, ISP and business together, IP, non-commercial and have I missed anybody else?

Brian Cute: So the registry, registrar, the contracting party housed together, the ISP and business together, the intellectual property on its own...

Becky Burr: Well yeah, we're still working on that.

Brian Cute: Non-commercial on its own.

Becky Burr: Non-commercial on its own.

Brian Cute: We've got ALAC covered on Sunday.

Becky Burr: Right.

Brian Cute: Are we meeting with the ASO, the regional registries, is that planned?

Becky Burr: Actually you know I hadn't really planned on doing that, I guess we could but that seems to me like I don't know why I hadn't planned on it but I'll put in a call to them and ask if that makes, if they want to do that.

Brian Cute: Okay. And the ccNSO?

Becky Burr: I have talked to (Chris) and (Chris) is not sure that there's a need to meet separately from the public forum so we're still working that out.

Erick Iriarte: Hi. I have suggestion.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Erick Iriarte: Yes, not all the ccTLDs are (unintelligible) with the ccNSO but more quantity of ccTLDs are immobile with their (unintelligible) organization of ccTLDs like center, (unintelligible), AFTLD and (unintelligible). Maybe it could be interesting to share opinions or have the opportunity to have a meeting with them too.

Becky Burr: So would you like, Erick does it make sense to, I mean the CC meetings presumably are open whether you're a member or not. We could do that or we could just set up a separate one.

Erick Iriarte: Yes. I understand that but at this moment in ccNSO it's only 410 members but if you ask all the members of the (unintelligible) organization it's around 200. So maybe could be another opportunity to include (unintelligible) people that not necessary both with the ccNSO right now.

Becky Burr: Right. And where do they go on constituency day?

Erick Iriarte: They, the (unintelligible) organization will be in Brussels week of meetings there so (unintelligible) try to have some time to talk with the four regional managers.

Becky Burr: Okay.

Erick Iriarte: (Unintelligible) talking to everybody and include the people that are not with ccNSO.

Becky Burr: Okay. And maybe we could just invite CC members if they, who are not in, presumably that would take care of the CCs right?

Erick Iriarte: Yes. And normally the members of the (unintelligible) organization not participate in the ICANN meetings because they're so small so they don't follow a lot of, they don't represent us, they represent (unintelligible) this regional organization.

Becky Burr: Okay. Well maybe you can, you and I can talk afterwards and I can get in touch with them.

Erick Iriarte: Yep. Okay.

Becky Burr: And see if we can set something up.

Erick Iriarte: Okay. I will try to have, make a slot of time after the meeting.

Brian Cute: Okay. (Becky) thank you for the update. The other outstanding question for me is should we be scheduling a meeting with the GNSO council. I know we're meeting with the various SOs from the GNSO but it seemed to be that

since the council is the body charged with developing policy it would be odd for us to not at least extend an invitation.

Becky Burr: I'll extend an invitation, I confess that I was not focused on the council itself but they have a full day, or they have a half day of meetings so it would be, you know, easy to see if they want to put something in there.

And I will leave it to you Brian because you're going to be closer to this to know whether that's going to ruffle feathers or not to have a separate meeting with the council.

Brian Cute: Well I can talk to Chuck certainly informally and get his view on it from a council perspective with regard to the SOs I think that we'd have to hear from them on a one off basis informally.

Becky Burr: Okay.

Brian Cute: It just struck me as kind of a gaping hole if you will.

Warren Adelman: Brian this is (Warren), I agree and I actually don't, you know I think there'll be no problem setting that up.

Brian Cute: Well I'll talk to Chuck and get that rolling. Okay. I think we've got the outline of who we're meeting with. Now the last one is the open session for public comment correct?

Manal Ismail: Brian this is (Manal).

Brian Cute: Yes (Manal). Yes?

Manal Ismail: Can we also specify the slot on the public forum day?

Brian Cute: That, yeah that was my next and last question I think.

Manal Ismail: Oh okay, I'm sorry.

Brian Cute: Is the public forum, do we have a specific time and place, or day and time, pardon me.

Do we have an owner of that work item?

Manal Ismail: I think Janis was looking into this, I'm trying to check my e-mail right now whether he came back with a specific slot or.

Alice Jansen: Brian this is Alice.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, Peter here. I, there is a slot I just tell you what it is so you can (unintelligible) I just can't tell you exactly what the time is. I can get that to you when I'm next in front of my laptop.

Becky Burr: Is it Monday or Wednesday?

Alice Jansen: Here, this is Alice here. We have a meeting on Monday for affirmation reviews so the Selectors are going to present the forthcoming reviews and part of the meeting will be dedicated to the (AT) review team. So I will have to interact with the committee in that moment and that's on Monday from 2:00 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.

Becky Burr: And is that the entire, that's the time for the entire meeting or the portion of the meeting that's for the review team?

Alice Jansen: That's for the entire meeting but I think 60 minutes will be allocated to the (AMT) review team.

Brian Cute: What was the time frame again Alice?

Alice Jansen: 2:00 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.

Brian Cute: 2:00 to 3:30 on Monday.

Alice Jansen: Yes.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian, Peter again. Can I just ask what's intended to be used, what's the use of the first half hour, I missed that?

Alice Jansen: For the forthcoming reviews the security and stability of the DNS and the WHOIS policy.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Okay I think, we're going to have a talk about this (unintelligible) time within that 90 minutes. The priority I think is pretty clear that the, this review team gets most of their time at the meeting (unintelligible) face to face with the community. There could be some time for announcements (unintelligible) forthcoming reviews. But so, but this you got to (unintelligible) Brian there's the time and there's the slot.

Brian Cute: Very good. Okay. I think that covers all of (unintelligible) we have with constituencies or organs of ICANN and the community. We have the meetings between the RT itself on the Friday and Saturday. (Fabio) raised the question about whether we would need more time. I want to broach that question, (Fabio) would you mind if we do it a little later in the agenda?

Fabio Colasanti: No. Brian here, so my suspicion was that we would probably need less than a day and a half but let's see what we have on the agenda and we can discuss that later.

Brian Cute: Yes. My sense is that that's all going to be volume of work driven and so if we can work through the agenda a bit and get a better sense of how much we have to wrestle to the ground as it were in terms of work then we can, we'll have a better sense of how much time we'll need on the front end.

Fabio Colasanti: Yeah.

Brian Cute: Okay. Alice if you would again pull together a schedule, I know that there's still some of those meetings are to be determined and scheduled, but at least pull the outline of a schedule together for us. And even if there are holes send it around, so we can at least get a sense of what days, what time slots we're going to be meeting with folks and then (Becky) obviously you can come back and fill in those dates, those times and I'll reach out to Chuck about the GNSO and we'll get that on the calendar.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Brian Cute: Anything else, go ahead please? (Becky)?

Becky Burr: Nope.

Brian Cute: Anything else on the schedule before we move on for Brussels? Okay item number three is the management assessment RFP. Thanks both to (Larry) and to (Fabio) for putting together the draft and circulating it to the team. I guess what we need to do is finalize the RFP if it's not already been reviewed and edited by everyone on the team and then talk about how we publish this in



order to get the widest possible notice out to candidates and in order to notify them that we'd be expecting them to make presentations in Brussels.

(Larry) and (Fabio) in turn do you want to just address the item itself and then talk about finalization?

Larry Strickling: Right. Well our philosophy was to keep it as short as we can and to try to just refer people to already existing documents rather than to try to summarize them and characterize them ourselves. And so we've just pretty much flagged the recent history of efforts in this area.

The key points we were trying to make in the draft was the focus on this being a more of a qualitative review than a quantitative review. And again, I think we've just tried to keep the focus as narrow as we can to give these firms a chance to react and respond and the mountain of information that's already available to try to make sense of it in a way that allows us to really test the expertise and the experience level of these groups that might want to come in and do this.

In terms of who we would circulate this to we're absolutely open to suggestions. I think we have a handle on firms that are global firms but that are based in the U.S. like the Deloitte and Booz Allen and firms like that that would probably be interested in doing this. We certainly will want to notify the one world trust of this opportunity since they've already done some work in this area, but we're absolutely open to other suggestions.

I assume this would be also be posted on the ICANN on our Web page for the group, so that would be another way to get this information out into the community but any other suggestions are quite welcome. But maybe before we get to that we should focus on whether people are okay with our fairly, you know, terse approach to laying out what the issue is for folks and making sure

people are comfortable with keeping the language as brief as we have suggested it be.

Brian Cute: Certainly. Thank you (Larry). (Fabio), any remarks on the document before we open it up to the group?

Fabio Colasanti: Not on the document, I'll have a remark about the procedure, the technicalities and the contract, but let's first see if anyone as (Larry) has asked, has questions or suggestions about the document itself.

Brian Cute: Okay. Open table.

Becky Burr: I have one, which is the very last paragraph, the proposal conference, I think you mean June 11 not July 11.

Fabio Colasanti: Yeah.

Larry Strickling: Oh, thank you.

Brian Cute: And that was (Becky). Anyone else?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yeah (unintelligible) like to have some comments.

Brian Cute: Yes (Zhang).

Xinsheng Zhang: Yeah. So I think maybe this document is pretty much what I think so first I noticed there is some simple mistake in the document for example for year of the sign of AOC shouldn't be 2009.

Larry Strickling: Thank you.

Xinsheng Zhang: (Unintelligible) not clear about the purpose of (unintelligible) to access the quality of (unintelligible) and the quality was many of quality and I'm not sure here but any of your (unintelligible) confirm (unintelligible) but I'm not (unintelligible) to make a comprehensive consideration so I suggest (unintelligible) discussion and spending more time to refine document before approve on it.

It gets more approve to (unintelligible) the agenda of the next conference call or face to face meeting for the further discussion is my idea and comments.  
Thank you.

Brian Cute: (Larry) any response or any response from the group?

Larry Strickling: I guess I mean absolutely we want everybody comfortable with this and we want to be able to have a shared vision of what we're trying to accomplish here. I know we have been and had some separate correspondence on this issue and we're happy to continue to do that.

I'm nervous about not actually agreeing to this document until Brussels because that takes three weeks off of this work schedule which we think is already quite compressed and we were, you know, hopeful of trying to reach agreement on the language today so that we could get this out, you know by June 1 so that we would have an opportunity then to actually talk to the organizations that might come to Brussels and make their pitch.

I think at that point in time, even if people are still a little uneasy about what some of the terms mean having actual firms there to kind of give us their perspective of how they would tackle this assignment I think would be a better use of our time than for all of us to try to haggle over this word or that word.

I mean what we're trying to put out there is there's a problem, or not a problem, there's an issue we would like firms to think about how they could deal with and provide expert help. And then listening to each firm and how they might approach would seem to me to be the best way for all of us to reach an ultimate shared understanding of what we want to have done and how we want to do it as opposed to debating the language in the abstract.

So I would like to be in a position to respond to any concerns any of our members have to any of the language, but I really would urge us to try to lock in as best we can on a document to get the benefit of the discussion with the actual expert firms in Brussels, which I think would be the most important piece of the discussion anyway.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian, Cheryl here.

Brian Cote: Yes Cheryl please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Just picking up on both the points that have been made, I popped my hand up because I was concerned about our opportunity as a review team to ensure that in our Brussels meeting space.

And here I mean the Friday and Saturday morning, not the ICANN interactive meeting part of Brussels, that we did have the opportunity to meet face to face and to tweak and to perhaps grow our own clear definitions of exactly how we want to give the specific requirements to whomever gets this contract if we decide we go ahead with it.

So I think I'm sort of picking up from where (Larry) just left off to say I believe that with the right planning and timing providing we get this document out we get responses and we get people in on our probably preferably Friday afternoon where we could have an in camera session to do this.

We can spend a little bit of time ourselves in the morning making sure we all know where we're all coming from and doing some of the definitional work perhaps. But to be able to interact and look at what the expertise is being offered to us and mechanisms and modalities they are proposing is a very important thing.

Then we need to give a very firm and controlled requirement if we're going to go ahead with it so that's what I thought we would be doing and I was just very concerned when I heard we may not need a day and a half in our meeting coming up later. I think we're going to be pushing it to get this body of work done in just what I fear is a mere half a day in Brussels. Thank you.

Brian Cote: Anybody else.

Fabio Colasanti: (Fabio) here. I share Cheryl's comments. Clearly we shall be doing the final substantive tweaking when we see face to face the firms, but it's important that we send the document out now.

And at the same time we should be getting in touch with the staff of ICANN because should we finally decide that yes, there is an interesting proposal from the firm and we want to go ahead we must have all the technicalities in place for the signature of the contract essentially right away.

Willy Currie: (Willy) here.

Becky Burr: This is (Becky). Oh, go ahead (Willy), I'm sorry.

Willy Currie: Okay. Just trying to look at the (Xiang)'s point about the language of quality. It may be that in the, in that section on purpose where there's an assessment of the quality of decision-making perhaps that could just read an assessment of

the decision-making and somewhere else in the document we could make it clear that this is a qualitative assessment, if that is a way forward. Because I lack the brevity, the briefness of the document and I think if we could fine tune it now and get it out that would be best.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. If I can just come in behind that as a proposal I think we have the, the words of our accountability and transparency and in the, I think we need to go back to the whole naming of what this review team is all about in the (AIC) of course, not just the truncated accountability and transparency.

If we use the language that includes the marker that says in the interests of Internet end users and community then using that language will take the qualitative/quantitative gray area away. Any time I hear a desire to measure quality of something I want to know what the benchmark is first off.

And I fear that type of language because it's quality compared to what and for who's measure and we do need to work on that. So perhaps that proposal of a tweak now and an approval of the document that would be the very best way forward from my perspective anyway, and I suspect the community at large lower case at large.

Brian Cute: This is Brian can I.

Becky Burr: This is (Becky). Go ahead.

Brian Cute: Go ahead (Becky).

Becky Burr: I actually I like the brevity of the document, I agree we need to get it out. I have one substantive change that I would like to suggest but I think it's minor.

There's a paragraph in here that says, starts with -- given the unique nature of ICANN's role and structure it does not have a readily identifiable set of individuals to whom it owes fiduciary duty.

I am uncomfortable with the sort of it looks like fiduciary duty is a placeholder for accountability in this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And there's more than that, yeah. I agree (Becky).

Becky Burr: And there's some language in the methodology which we haven't approved but talks about the unique nature, you know what ICANN is effects the parties to whom it is accountable in any given situation and the manner in which it should be accountable in any given circumstance. And I would just urge consideration of that kind of a construction rather than the reference to fiduciary duty.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or the near reference to fiduciary duty I think is, I'm a little uncomfortable.

Brian Cate: This is Brian, if I can ask for a point of clarification Cheryl are you suggesting that we should work into the document with respect to qualitative review...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well let me quote from...

Brian Cate: ...suggested measurements. Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...quote from what, if I may Brian the regional...

Brian Cate: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...mandate somewhere in my memory banks, and forgive me but I'm sure Alice can find the reference because it'll be in various documents, said something along the lines of ensure, this review team was all about ensuring accountability, transparency and the interests of global Internet users.

Now if that last part is attached onto the words accountability and transparency and we ask professional reviewers to look at it from that perspective, which would include the fiduciary, which doesn't have my benchmark problems on what is a quality decision and how do we measure that and to who's best interest is this quality measured, some sort of language like that, then we haven't increased the documents length but we've removed some of the discomfort points and I would be very uncomfortable if all we did was look at have we done it in a fiduciary basis.

Larry Strickling: So in response to that I have no problem, this is (Larry). I have no problem with that. I think if you go back to the purpose paragraph if you take out the words the quality of I think we do capture the other three points, accountability, transparency, and reflecting the interests of global users right there in that first paragraph. And I'm certainly fine with taking out the word quality there if that, if that moves the process along.

Similarly I have no problem with removing fiduciary duty on Page 2. Now, this is me talking, we probably should check with the co-author (Fabio), make sure he's okay with both of these.

Fabio Colasanti: I also agree. I also agree.

Brian Cute: And quick point of order, this is Brian, is anybody tracking these proposed edits? (Larry) are you catching all of these?



Larry Strickling: I think we are, but I would ask that when we get to the end of the discussion I would just suggest that anybody who made a suggestion just ping us again, certainly if not by the end of today or by the end of the day tomorrow just so we could get this out on Tuesday assuming we reach agreement on the document?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Minor point of order Brian if I may, Cheryl here. Just a message, and it might be something within Alice's skill set, in the way we're running this meeting with these sorts of edit discussions whoever's got control of the pods in the Adobe connect room you could get rid of the white board because only Alice and Brian have the capability of writing on the white board. Now as exciting as that might be for them the rest of us it doesn't help.

If you replace that with a notes section then we could be typing and capturing these points and that would make the wrap up from this meeting far easier. If it can't be done, no problem we'll get it done next time but it would be capturing these points if we can all actually share a writeable space. Thanks Brian.

Brian Cute: Point well taken. Alice can you arrange for that in future Adobe's?

Alice Jansen: Yes.

Brian Cute: Okay. Any other substantive edits to be suggested for the RFP?

Larry Strickling: So I don't know if it's substantive, this is (Larry) again but we'd left a big gaping hole on actually who would be the ones to receive the proposals. We have to settle that obviously.

Brian Cute: Yeah, well that publication notification correct? Yeah. Okay. I think before we move onto that there was a question raised about the timing, whether this

document goes out as is or it becomes more further developed in a detailed manner.

I'm sensing the consensus is we go with the document, we issue it as quickly as we can given the fact that there's only three weeks until the Brussels meeting, and we want to give candidates ample opportunity to receive it, review it and prepare to present to us in Brussels and I think we should proceed on that basis.

So (Larry) if you've captured the edits I hear no more edits, move on to the question of publication and notification. Do we have recommendations as to how we approach that exercise?

Larry Strickling: I guess I would want to make sure, yes we can capture that, we can get it out, I would like to just circle back to our Chinese member to ask if by removing the word quality he's comfortable with our proceeding the way we've said. Because he was the one I think who had asked that we postpone deciding this today, but we may have addressed his primary concern by removing the word quality, which I think was the one that was giving him, raising the most questions with him.

Brian Cote: Thank you. Mr. Zhang?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes. But I like to do a more detailed part with exact of quality of the (unintelligible) meaning. So I think maybe (unintelligible) little bit explanation if (unintelligible) and it's better. So if possible I think that maybe before we set meeting, face-to-face meeting could I have some (unintelligible) conference call again to discuss this document (unintelligible) for my personal opinion. Okay. Thank you.

Brian Cote: Well we certainly have time for another call before Brussels, we can schedule one and we'll be discussing how to schedule our upcoming calls before this, at the end of this agenda.

I guess the only other question I have if we issue this document in the next couple of days and got it notified out to prospective candidates, does it make sense to try to develop a bit further some criteria that we might want those candidates to speak to and circulate it to the candidates who have identified that they intend to be in Brussels? Is it a common practice within RFPs to do so, does it make sense or is it biting off more than we can chew, any thoughts there?

Larry Strickling: Well this is (Larry). Let me give you our, my perspective and I'm not speaking for (Fabio) I'm just speaking for myself, which is that what we're asking to do here is kind of a one of a kind study for all the reasons we've talked about.

I think the firm that's going to emerge, assuming we want to go ahead and do this, as the best candidate is going to be the one who can take these different issues and absorb what's happened in the past and try to put, bring more sense to this in their presentation to us. And when I - one benefit of keeping this brief and terse is that it'll put a premium on the firm that's best able to understand our situation and present it back to us.

In other words, if we spent too much time trying to come up with more specific criteria for the review now as opposed to in response to what we hear from the various proposals it I think dilutes our ability to spot a really excellent proposal by having standardized them a little too much.

So I'm a big believer that in this type of engagement where we're all a little unsure of how this review would be conducted that leaving it open, leaving it,

leaving the firm a lot of leeway to come back and propose to us will end up working to our benefit in the long run.

Now having said that, I absolutely would agree that upon our review of the proposals and in drafting up an engagement letter I think that would be the appropriate time to get more specific about scope of work as we actually contract with the firm. But I think in terms of soliciting proposals I'd like to keep it fairly broad.

Fabio Colasanti: (Fabio) here. I totally support this. I think we are in a situation where we have a sort of general, vague idea of what could be done. And we need professionals to take this and transform it into a real world program into real more, to more precise description of what could be done. And if we will try now to lay down precise criteria we might even be going in the wrong direction.

Brian Cute: Okay. I am persuaded. Are there anybody, any other thoughts on this before we talk about publication.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Brian. I put my great big green kick up because I was agreeing totally on (Larry)'s and (Fabio)'s approach here. I think we give them a bare minimum and we see who's got the experience and skill set to hit the ground running in a way that resonates with us, and the real then dotting of Is, crossing of Ts and discussions that we're going to have to have is that, in that if we take it to the next level how we frame the engagement document.

And that's going to be the most the most important part I see that we will grow and gain a great deal of benefit. It's a bit of a fishing exercise actually, from what will be presented to us.

Brian Cute: Okay. Very good. Then can I suggest that we recognize the name of the firms that (Larry) identified and then any other member of the review team who has a candidate organization who should receive the RFP please identify that organization to the group, to the list. We can build our own list of potential candidates and make sure that they are notified.

Posting it to the ICANN Web site obviously, and Alice I assume that you can help us make that happen in the short term? Is there any other vehicle that we need to use to get this publicized or notified to potential candidates?

Willy Currie: (Willy) here. We could put a notice in the (economist).

Inaudible: Hey that's an excellent idea.

Fabio Colasanti: I think it would take a lot of time and it would be horrendously expensive.

Brian Cute: Is there someone who could make a quick inquiry to identify as (Fabio) says, is it feasible from a question of time and expense.

Becky Burr: Well won't we, this is (Becky), won't we have a sense in Brussels about that, I mean I expect that almost anything is feasible from a time standpoint what they'll come to Brussels is essentially tell us what they can do in the time period that's available and it may be that informs a narrowing or a focus on this. And with respect to the cost obviously we'll know more about that in Brussels as well.

Brian Cute: Well I think we're looking at Brussels as a unique opportunity for presentations to be made to the group. We're not going to have another face to face as a group until the September time frame, which would be far too late so I believe there's a premium on getting publication and notification out to any

viable, potential candidate and I think that's really the priority here unless I'm missing the point.

Fabio Colasanti: Yeah but the, there are two considerations if you want, this is (Fabio). One is making sure that we get at least two or three good proposals so that we can choose between interesting proposals. The other one is a fairness of, in offering this possibility to various firms.

I think that what we need to do is to publish the text as soon as we have agreed and I would say within the 36 hours, to publish the text on the Web site, and then also send it to the 6, 7, 8 organizations that we think might have an interest. That's probably all we can do from a practical point of view because the deadline, the time frame between say the beginning of next week and the meeting in Brussels is very, very short indeed.

Brian Cote: This is true. We have three weeks from tomorrow effectively for these organizations to be making presentations to us.

Is there, in terms of getting this wrapped up for publication on the ICANN Web site, (Larry), (Fabio) are the authors, any reason we couldn't get this in final form within the next 24 to 48 hours?

Larry Strickling: We could do it on our end but I guess what that would, what I'd urge is does anybody who has word edits, you probably need to get them to us within several hours of the end of this call that's all, that's so we know we heard from everybody and then we can send another draft around tomorrow morning you know, East Coast time.

Brian Cote: If everyone on the team would please do that, send in any suggested edits you had to (Larry) and (Fabio) quickly after this meeting, if we could get this thing

finalized sometime tomorrow that would afford us at least a three-week period give or take a day for notification and publication.

Larry Strickling: Related to that could we suggest that we put Alice's name and information in as to where these ought to be sent?

Becky Burr: Fine with me.

Brian Cute: Yeah that seems appropriate.

Inaudible: Okay.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Xinsheng Zhang: So Mr. Brian it's (Xiang) speaking.

Brian Cute: Yes Mr. (Xiang), yes.

Xinsheng Zhang: (Unintelligible) China for the early morning for around 4:00 Mr. (Larry) said just (unintelligible) hours maybe for (unintelligible). So I think maybe at least one or two days is better for us.

Brian Cute: That's fine, I mean I don't think we envision this document being really in final form until at the earliest close of business tomorrow if you'd agree (Larry), so I think affording into Saturday is no problem whatsoever assuming we can get it circulating by Sunday or Monday the 31st at the latest, does that sound sensible?

Larry Strickling: That would be fine, I mean as a practical matter even if we make the edits by tomorrow say by noon tomorrow that gives everybody roughly what 18 hours, 20 hours to send us something. So I think everybody should assume you've

got 20 hours to send us stuff. If you make that we'll get it out tomorrow, if people still need more time just tell us and we'll wait a day.

Brian Cute: Mr. (Xiang) are you comfortable with that approach?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He may be on mute.

Brian Cute: Could be. Mr. (Xiang) can intervene at any point in time. We're going to move forward on that basis and if there's no more comment on this item we can move to Item Number 4. Any last comments on the RFP?

Okay. Item Number 4.

Xinsheng Zhang: Oh yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mr. Zhang?

Brian Cute: Yes. Yes Mr. Zhang.

Xinsheng Zhang: Mr. (Larry) suggestion for 20 hour or 18 hour for the (unintelligible) hour time.

Olivier Muron: So I didn't catch the point about the address people are supposed to answer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One question that (unintelligible), Mr. Zhang was asking 24 hours is going to still be very early in China time. You know we're talking 4:00 a.m. in China time, if it could be extended as (Larry) said around the mid day tomorrow from his perspective that would be some 24, 28 or 30 hours from now.

Inaudible: Yeah okay.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll just make the record reflect that, is that okay Mr. (Xiang)?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I'll so note it. And to answer seeing as I've got the microphone the proposal was that Alice Jansen as staff for us was designated as the contact point in the document so proposals and interaction and information would be going to and from her e-mail and/or postal address.

Brian Cute: To be clear here, if anyone has edits for the draft RFP please send them directly to (Larry) and to (Fabio). When the RFP is complete and finalized and ready for publication if I understand correctly, Alice Jansen will be the point of contact for the candidate companies to respond to. Do I understand correctly (Larry) and (Fabio).

Fabio Colasanti: Yeah.

Larry Strickling: So frankly people could send edits just to the list unless you want to keep them off the list.

Brian Cute: Oh that's, you're right just send them to the list, you're right.

Larry Strickling: That way everybody sees what edits are being proposed.

Brian Cute: Correct. Edits go to the list, Alice will be designated as the point of contact on the published RFP.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Brian Cute: Any other items on the RFP? Hearing none let's move to Item Number 4. Questions and preparation for meetings in Brussels. And some of these bleed into the assignments that we're going to go over, the assignments from Marina del Rey.

We have right now draft questions to the GAC that were just circulated by (Becky). We need draft questions to the board, which is mine and Erick's responsibility. We will get something...

Becky Burr: Well I have, oh sorry.

Brian Cute: We will get something circulated within the next 24 to 48 hours on that to the list for review and edit. We then have the board and GAC joint working group and the ACs and SOs as well could the people responsible for drafting questions for the joint working group and ACs and SOs please report in?

(Becky)?

Becky Burr: Pardon me. I am drafting those. I don't think that they're very different from the ones that we put out for public comment.

Inaudible: Yeah.

Becky Burr: So I would basically it was my assumption that we were going to essentially use those and let the groups focus on what they're interested in.

Fabio Colasanti: (Fabio) here I support that.

Olivier Muron: That was the idea when we wrote the question for public comments to use them also for the meetings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Becky Burr: Yeah I, it was a surprise to me that I had a volunteer to do that Brian. I'm happy to do it but I...

Brian Cute: Okay.

Becky Burr: ...don't know why it's necessary.

Brian Cute: That's fine. I would then ask the only question is we needed to have a customized questions for the GAC, customized questions for the board. I think the, I think the GAC board joint working group wants customized questions because that working group has a specific objective unique to the relationship between the two organizations.

We use the draft public comments for each of the ACs and SOs and if we're able to set up if we're able to set up a meeting with the GNSO council do we think the public comment questions suffice for the council or do we feel there should be customized questions for the council?

Becky Burr: I think that they suffice. I think that the council is, you know that they may have a slightly different twist on how these questions focus on it, but the questions are basically you know, in line with the affirmation of commitments language and I don't think that they constrain anybody in any way.

Brian Cute: Any other thoughts? Okay.

Becky Burr: Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Becky Burr: This is (Becky). For some reason I thought it was also my assignment to do board questions and I have virtually finished them so I will send them to you guys and you can look at them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic.

Brian Cute: Okay. Very good.

Becky Burr: And the other question I have is, I mean the board GAC working group question there is really one question and a set of questions for the GAC that is particularly relevant to the (unintelligible) working group and we only have, you know, half an hour with them.

And so it's, it almost seems like it might be the best thing to do would be to focus on that particular issue and in particular I'm looking through, I mean I guess for me the heart of the matter is the input from the GAC to the board and whether that process is working and what enhancements and improvement have been produced through this working group.

Brian Cute: Well given the fact that we only have a half an hour with that group it certainly would make sense to focus on a shorter list of questions and since you have both the GAC and certain board members participating in the half hour we could narrow the focus to that one question and ask both groups the same question and iterations that follow. Any objection to that approach?

Manal Ismail: Brian this is (Manal).

Brian Cute: Yes (Manal).

Manal Ismail: No in fact I think this makes a lot of sense and we will also have the slot for the GAC where again some members of the joint working group will still be

there. So if we find some burdening questions that could still be answered during the GAC session where the members of the joint work group are going to be present also.

Brian Cute: Very good. I'm going to, any other comments on this point? I'm going to raise a question and I'm going to open Item Number 5 at the same time. I just get a sneaking concern personally that there's a typical dynamic going on as you get close to an ICANN meeting.

The community members who are very involved in their respective organizations and with their respective projects and issues, we all become very, very burdened, very, very hyper focused on the work to come in the ICANN meeting.

And my concern is are we certain that we're going to receive substantive and useful response to our outreach. I had a call with the registry supporting group or constituency on Wednesday and I reported in to that group that the RT was doing outreach, that we were looking forward to a meeting with each of the organizations and that we were looking forward to concrete, fact based inputs.

And I can tell you that the reaction from that group was this was not on their radar screen and but for my raising it directly with them and getting them to focus on what we needed it may not have hit their radar screen.

So I want to raise the concern and ask us are we doing enough, is there more that we can do by way of communications or outreach to ensure that this is a productive interaction with the community in Brussels. Open floor.

Becky Burr: Well one thing I think that we could do that would help would be to get some of these documents that are sort of in the hopper out and up so that we could say here's the timeline, here's the methodology.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Becky Burr: All of that so I think it would be very useful to move forward on getting a bunch of these other documents finalized.

Brian Cute: Any other thoughts? (Becky) when you reach out the ACs and SOs, the respective chairs of each organization are they just (unintelligible) or are they taking on board, communicating to their respective organizations, organizing a response. I know some of this will be triggered by us providing questions to their respective organizations and maybe that's one of the things we need to do across the board is provide... Yeah.

Becky Burr: Right well I think, I think what I should do is in the process of finalizing the time slots also get each of them the questions that are out there, and impress on them the timeline issues and the need for substantive input.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian it's Peter here can I make a comment?

Brian Cute: Yes Peter. Please.

Peter Dengate Thrush: I think the experience with the ICANN staff is probably helpful, and if we get the questions to people in advance and then have a session with them and then finish up with a set of questions that you know, and edit the set of questions having had the face to face, that would be a helpful way to go.

And what'll typically happen on most of these organizations, as has happened in our group, someone in that group will take responsibility if we ask them to to prepare our, and they can form a subgroup or a committee if you like to deal with it. I think that's probably the way to deal with it. At the moment

people aren't quite sure what to do, they aren't quite sure who we are, they aren't quite sure what the, you know, the questions are.

And my other thought is you, once we (unintelligible) all these questions if we can put up on our Web site all of the sets of questions we've asked all of the groups, each other group, each group can see what we're asking the other groups that they realize is this is a, you know, a serious project across the board, it's not just, we're not just coming to see them, then they'll take that in context and realize it's part of a, sort of a whole, an ICANN wide exercise.

I think that will help solidify you know, their preparation for responding.

Brian Cute: Good recommendations. Any other specific recommendations?

Willy Currie: (Willy) here. Just in terms of the non-commercial stakeholders group they're certainly aware of the questions and you know, looking forward to meeting but probably only put in their written submissions after the ICANN meeting.

Becky Burr: This is (Becky), that that's going to be true in a lot of cases.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree. I suppose the exception, Cheryl speaking, the exception, small exception to the rule there is because the at large communities already had since before we had our first meeting actually, since we were announced as a review team a commons space for rank and for our members of our community to put up issues and points and matches to discussion.

I guess they're awareness is slightly higher but we formally have tasked the regional leaders and of course the ALAC members themselves who will be in the room in our meeting with the ATRT. I won't be split in two by the way, one of my vice chairs will be managing the ALAC part of that meeting.

They've been tasked to come with specific regional at large and community comments, interests and concerns.

Brian Cuta: That's useful as well. (Becky) you're already carrying quite a bit of the burden. I hate to ask you but it sounds to me like the thing we need to do with each constituent organization we're meeting with is to provide them either directly with the public comment questions as they apply or the customized questions that we developed for the organization and do so you know, certainly within the next week at the latest.

Becky Burr: Yeah. Now I'm going to...

Brian Cuta: Yeah. And I think yep, I'm sorry (Becky) go ahead.

Becky Burr: I agree, I really do think that we're going to drive ourselves crazy and not get productive comments if we try to customize the questions for each of the groups.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes.

Brian Cuta: I think we've taken that off the table. We're going with the public comments for all the groups with the exception of the board, the GAC, and the joint working group where you have a tailored question.

The other thing I think we would want to ask each of the leaders of the respective groups is that we're looking for case study candidates. They can bring that to us verbally even if they are going to provide written responses after our face-to-face meeting in Brussels. I found that that triggered some constructive conversation with the registry constituency.



I think if it's that message as well perhaps we'll get some of the focused inputs we're looking for in Brussels.

Fabio Colasanti: (Fabio) here. Can I make a comment?

Brian Cate: Yes.

Fabio Colasanti: Clearly it is important to make sure that those whom we are asking questions know about that take that seriously, are made aware of the importance of the process.

Apart from personal contact I don't see what we can do, but perhaps what we could be doing is, and I'm just reformulating what Peter and others have already said, we should be making sure that the process is sufficiently visible on the ICANN Web site.

At the moment I suspect that there is a problem there because I have in front of me the home page of ICANN and you don't see anything about the review process. Among the list of the ICANN announcements you have that one announcement is about public comments opens today I'm reading, questions to the community on accountability and transparency within ICANN.

I think we should be asking ICANN somehow to have a window on the home page about the review process and ask them to give more prominence to the questions and to the process.

Olivier Muron: So I fully agree with (Fabio). It's very not visible and I was looking at the public comments, there are no comments in one week, no comments has been posted yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that's actually sadly normal. They'll all come in five minutes before the close time.

Brian Cate: I agree with (Fabio). I think that's a reasonable request, I think it's you know, a priority item and it should be a priority item. And the fact is we are one more announcement from rolling off the front page and I understand that comments may come in later in the process, and let's not forget we do always have the flexibility to extend the response period on comments if we feel we haven't gotten a sufficient number of responses.

So there's always a pressure valve there. But (Fabio) I think that's a very good suggestion and I'm happy to make it to ICANN directly.

Erick Iriarte: Hi. Erick. And I agree with (Fabio) with the suggestion, it could be interesting. But we need to be clear that for years when we request comments like in different process we only receive a few ones on the last minute.

So (unintelligible) the questions are customized to each community could be a difference this time. Sometime when you see a question so generally that any time an answer don't feel that this (unintelligible) for you, customized for different communities ccTLDs, ALAC, GNSO, could be a good option. I think it's important customize the questions.

Brian Cate: Any other comments? Okay I'll take that up as an action item. Okay. Moving on to Item 6 if there are no other comments on Numbers 4 and 5 and we only have 15 minutes left.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: On, it's on, sorry I'm multitasking here and I do apologize for the typing noise but my role as presenter is my priority, my role as scribe seems to be secondary, but I'm doing my best.

The status of public comments is something I did want to raise and I did put forward to Brian, (Manal) and Alice a draft set of survey style questions that I would like based on conversations that (Willy) and (Fabio). And I had in Marina del Rey using the identical set of questions that have been agreed to for public comment.

I have interacted with (Ralph McCay) at (Big Pulse) to put together a draft set for our view should we wish to look at them, of interactive and measurable survey questions which can be used to benchmark in a quantitative manner. But public opinion - and it doesn't actually even need to stay within the ICANN public comment outreach, it can in fact be set up so someone who signs the link on a Twitter feed or anything else can just login and fill out the survey.

I think we do need to remember that we need metrics here and unless we use some form of survey tool that allows us to get measurable and metrics for benchmarking it'll make our next steps very, very difficult.

Recognizing that we're running short of time now Brian, one way forward of this is if with everyone's permission I was to pass on to the people at (Big Pulse) a list of e-mail addresses and names of this committee. Then each of us could login as if we were responding as respondents and have a look at the sample survey that's been put together.

Brian Cute: Just to understand, is this to develop a new and additional list of questions that would be the focus of online...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No it is using...

Brian Cute: ...and social media surveys?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian what I did was give them the public comment questions, there are no new and additional questions, they are simply the same questions put into a system that allows quantitative information to be got from them.

So for anyone who's done surveys the how much do you agree or disagree with the following you can measure one to five, I disagree or I agree. So that gets tethered to some of the questions and you still have the opportunity for placing cert details here.

But there's a vast difference between a verbally created opinion, a written response in a formal sense to a public comment and a survey, which can literally be, you know, five minutes worth of job. And we need to capture all those possibilities, in my totally biased opinion.

Brian Cute: Does anybody object to the members being able to explore the survey tool? And it would require Cheryl you distributing the e-mail addresses of the members to (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed. It would be a list of name and e-mail address would need to go and each of you would then get an invitation link to look at the survey. Now it's a draft but when you do that and go through it what you would be doing is creating real, measurable metrics that can be run for years and years to come.

We could actually track change in opinion.

Brian Cute: Okay I've heard no objections so I think if this is an opportunity to explore a survey tool we should do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I'll make that so.

Brian Cute: Okay. Anything else on 4 or 5? Okay we have very little time here and much to get through. Let me just shorthand...

Manal Ismail: Brian?

Brian Cute: Yes (Manal).

Manal Ismail: I'm sorry because I got disconnected and been connected back. I'm not sure I'm on track but if I can quickly tell the group about the questions to the board and what happened with our call with (Denise)?

Brian Cute: Yes we're actually at that, we're at that (unintelligible). (Manal) if you would report to the group our follow-up with (Denise) which relates to our request for documents and responses that we gave to the staff in Marina del Rey. (Manal)?

Manal Ismail: Yes. Thank you Brian. I'll try to make it short. We went through the whole list of requirements of the group in addition to the additional items that were proposed by the ICANN staff to submit. And...

Peter Dengate Thrush: Brian sorry I've got to get off the call (unintelligible). So I'm going to leave with apologies for leaving fairly early. Obviously I'm around if anybody, if I can help with anything just let me know, e-mail me or text me.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much Peter.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks Brian. Bye all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Peter.

Manal Ismail: So this is (Manal) again, so basically everything was almost ready except for the existing policies concerning accountability and transparency and the affirmation of commitment, which was supposed to be ready by Monday, which was last Monday.

And also updated affirmation tracking and brainstorming document, this was also supposed to be ready by yesterday.

The rest of the things are ready except for a catalog of changes in (JPE), this one was going to be ready next week. So what I told (Denise), and I hope this represents the groups opinion was that we need to get whatever is ready and we don't necessarily need to wait for everything to be ready before we start receiving the documents.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Manal Ismail: Unfortunately I didn't follow-up early enough on what we have agreed on because I think we haven't received anything yet. I sent her an e-mail just before our conference call so I don't think we're going to hear from her before tomorrow.

A couple of issues here, she of course said that they did their best to answer the questions they are most willing to date and further elaborate if we see that any of our questions are not fully addressed.

Also she mentioned that some of the documents might be still in process to be published so but for the sake of time might be shared with the group. So those documents would be highlighted and we should not be publishing them before they are published from the ICANN itself, so and I understand it's going to be a matter of days or something, that doesn't necessarily have to be a long time.

So in principle all the documents that are going to be shared with the RC group are going to be made public but sometimes not at the exact same moment so. I think that's all.

Brian Cute: If you didn't mention it (Manal) I think that she did represent that she intended to get all of the documents to us before Brussels, however, correct?

Manal Ismail: Yeah definitely. I mean we were talking even this week.

Brian Cute: Okay.

Manal Ismail: Some of the documents were ready as early as this week and I'm not sure if this is what the group wants but I was suggesting that anything that's ready we start receiving them as they are ready and we don't necessarily need to wait for all the documents to be ready and then we received them one shot.

Brian Cute: Any questions or (Manal)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brian Cheryl here. Not a question but a huge sigh I mean having worked at the interface with this type of interaction with staff now for many years. Huge sigh again she says. (Manal) you most assuredly from my perspective need to reinforce that (a drip seed) of documentation as it is ready is more than satisfactory and I find the comments about us not publishing things at a pre-publication both condescending and rude.

We are professionals and we would like to be treated as such and I'm somewhat annoyed with the lack of forthcoming to promises made and deadlines committed to by our one interaction point with staff. And yes I know it's recorded and yes I'm happy to have that on the record.

Fabio Colasanti: Cheryl, (Fabio) here. I agree with what you said but keep in mind that they then should not be using the list. If they send us document that's not published yet they shouldn't be sending them to the list.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As far as I know they're interacting directly with (Manal).

Fabio Colasanti: Okay. But then how would (Manal) send the document to us.

Manal Ismail: No I mean, she. I'm sorry. No (Denise) asked for the permission to be allowed to send to the whole group so she was going to send to the RT (unintelligible) list.

Fabio Colasanti: Everything that she sends to the list is public.

Manal Ismail: Yes exactly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) pre-publication documents need to go to individual addresses that's not a big, but it does need to be pointed out.

Brian Cute: So the confidentiality issue is contemplated and understood that confidential documents cannot go to the public list.

Manal Ismail: I mean it's probably not a matter of confidentiality, but rather not having two different versions if one is still being fine tuned or something. I hope I conveyed the right message and not, I mean I hope it's not my English, which made the misunderstanding.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Manal) your points are perfectly clear to me, and being Australian I don't even speak English.

Manal Ismail: Okay.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I can't imagine that what you've said to us would be heard any differently. But I would love you to take back a response from tonight's meeting which reinforces that we are fine to have the information as it is ready it does not all need to come in one final lump, in fact it would be preferable to have it what's ready now.

Brian Cute: And that was the understanding, that was the agreement, there are a couple of deadlines that have passed, we will go back to staff and impress upon them the fact that the deadlines have passed and that we indeed would like them as they are ready and express the displeasure with the missed deadline.

We are down to five minutes, maybe less folks, so I want to do a quick wrap up here but not miss any of the points we need to address.

With regard to the Marina del Rey work assignments I circulated that document with updated statuses to the best of my knowledge. Would each of the owners of those items please in the next couple of days send updates to your work assignments?

And the most critical ones to my mind are the finalizing the documents that we presented at Marina del Rey and discussed on concepts methodology and performance indicators so we can get those up on the Web site. Finishing the RFP as discussed on today's phone call.

We also need to fill out the doodle for our September or late August, September meeting. We're still waiting, Mr. (Xiang) has indicated that he is working his process on his end so we will patiently wait for him to work his process in terms of whether Beijing can be the locus of the meeting or not.

But in the meantime we certainly can agree to the dates. So please everyone if you haven't fill out that doodle poll and the doodle poll for the October meeting I think is primarily done. If you haven't entered your preferences there please do so.

I also circulated...

Fabio Colasanti: Brian.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Fabio Colasanti: (Fabio) here. Can I ask a question because it raised this, I understand that there is a doodle for the October meeting but I don't remember having seen a doodle for the September one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nor do I.

Brian Cute: Alice I think I had sent you some suggested dates, August 29 to the 4th of September. If that hasn't been circulated could you circulate that soon after, right after this call?

Alice Jansen: Okay. Will do.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Please do. And then everyone please fill that in. We really should nail down those dates.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Brian Cute: I also circulated before the call a proposed work schedule with some dates. Let me explain what I really intended here. None of those dates were intended to be hard dates on the calendar. My focus was in looking at what I thought

was a compressed time frame for the management assessment to the auditor to do work after they'd been selected. It seemed to me to be a compressed time frame.

So all that I'm suggesting with this proposed work schedule is that perhaps we could structure it in a way where the management assessment firm conducts its work over a longer period of time, provides its final report to us at a later date, I selected October 31, it could be sometime around there, that the firm provided us with a mid-term review and that in parallel we begin to work on case studies and input taken from the community and focus on that work at our meeting in September and any mid-term review from the management assessment team.

It's a construct. It's a suggestion. I think we should take it off line if we could and have a discussion on the list as to what work schedule works best. If you're all comfortable with taking that to the list or if there are any burning points that someone wants to make on that question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps that, Brian Cheryl here, perhaps that would be a ideal thing to take to the list but to have as the lions share of our next agenda.

Brian Cute: Indeed. I will do that. I'll put that into the next call. Which leads to our next item. We've touched on the meeting schedules for September and October, now future calls.

It seemed to be a bit awkward trying to do the doodle poll mostly because I don't know how to do them well. But could we agree as a group that it would make sense to have a call every two weeks, every three weeks, and if we could to pick a time and a date that becomes a constant time and date for our call. Is there any disagreement with that suggestion?

Does a two-week time frame seem reasonable or a three-week time frame?  
I'm sure people have...

Becky Burr: This is (Becky) and I think given the amount of work we have to do probably a two-week interval if preferable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Brian Cute: Any other thoughts on that? Okay. So it would seem to me that we should be scheduling our next call for sometime on the week of June 7, which is the week before we go to Brussels. Can we, can I propose a Monday as a day where we fix a time for a call?

Fabio Colasanti: Monday the 7th of June?

Brian Cute: Yes.

Fabio Colasanti: That would be all right for me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Monday's my Tuesday.

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes 7th of June is good for me.

Warren Adelman: Yeah Brian, 7th of June works for (Warren) as well.

Brian Cute: (Warren) thank you. Mr. (Xiang) you said it is good for you?

Xinsheng Zhang: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent.

Brian Cute: Okay. I'll send out a doodle poll. Yes?

Manal Ismail: Brian I think it also depends on the time, I mean June 7.

Brian Cute: Well in principle, first of all there is a premium on having a call before we go to Brussels.

Manal Ismail: Definitely.

Brian Cute: So I would hope that people would have some flexibility. In practice we are rotating this call forward six to eight hours each time we have a call in order to spread the pain as it were. I think it's important we have a call the week before Brussels. I'll send out a doodle that has the broadest, that moves the call forward six to eight hours from this time.

If we find that we have to vary somewhat from that six to eight hour movement I suggest we do that for the next call and then get on a regular schedule or six to eight hours forward on a rotating basis. Any objection?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just to be clear Brian, the doodle will simply give us the choice between a six, a seven and an eight hour advancement from this call time to be held on Monday the 7th of June, correct?

Brian Cute: That's correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it will be in UTC time with flexibility for local time zones correct?

Brian Cute: That's correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. That's what I'll capture.

Brian Cute: Okay. We'll send that out shortly. And last item, and we are at past the hour.  
Any other business?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh sorry, yes I did have a piece. My apologies I was multitasking again.  
And I've only had one cup of coffee that's the main problem.

Now that our list is public would it not be reasonable to have Alice subscribed to the list seeing as not all of us remembered to copy Alice on things that are going to the list that she needs to know about?

Louis Lee: If I may this is (Louie)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please go ahead (Louie).

Louis Lee: The list is almost public. I'm waiting for confirmation that the e-mails that we want removed, which is simply the one with the closed meeting notes, closed meeting minutes, as soon as I have confirmation from Alice that that is done then I'll make that list completely public on our (unintelligible).

Alice Jansen: Actually (Louie) I sent you a confirmation right after the meeting started so.

Louis Lee: Oh okay. I didn't see that, I'm sorry.

Alice Jansen: Okay.

Louis Lee: Okay. Well then I will make that list public momentarily.

Brian Cute: Any objection to adding Alice to the list? Hearing none please do so. Alice if you'd get the doodle for the next call out as the first item I see you already posted the doodle for the August, September meeting, thank you. But if you get that out right away that'd be most helpful.

Alice Jansen: Yes.

Brian Cute: Any other business? Thank you all. We'll be talking to you on the 7th.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Brian.

Alice Jansen: Thank you Brian.

Olivier Muron: Thank you Brian.

Manal Ismail: Thank you.

Louis Lee: Thank you.

END