MARGIE MILAM: Alright. Welcome, everyone. My name is Margie Milam, and I'm very pleased to welcome you to this first meeting of the Review Team on Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS. It's been a very long time in forming this group, and we certainly apologize for the long time that it took to get the team started. But we're here, and we're really eager to get started on this very long agenda that we have for today's call.

Next slide, please. Beautiful.

Okay, so we're going to get started by just walking through the agenda for today. This particular call is a little different, because as staff we sort of help get the group started. But hopefully, as we get through the agenda, we'll talk about deeper [stuff] and have a Chair for this group so that future calls will be handled by the leadership of the team. That'll be something we talk about later in the agenda. Without going into the details on this agenda, I just wanted to ask if there's anyone who would like to suggest an additional topic for today's call.

If so, for those of you who are new to the Adobe Connect room, there's a little man at the top and you can raise your hand and let us know that you're in a queue and would like to make a suggestion. So before we move on to the next part of the agenda, I just wanted to confirm that there wasn't anything else we'd like to add for today's call.

Alright, well, hearing none, then we'll proceed with this agenda. And before we get started, I just wanted to let you also know that we do have observers on the call. Under the new Bylaws, there's an allowance for observers to observe Review Team calls. They're not on this Adobe

Connect room. They're on a separate room, but we do already have some on this call. So, welcome, observers.

And then because it's been a while since you've applied to become a member of this team, I believe all of you recall that there was a Statement of Interests as part of the application. I would just like to ask if anyone would like to update their Statement of Interest, since it's been quite a while since it was submitted. And if so, please raise your hand.

Alright, well, thank you. We'll move on to the next part. I'd like to start with the introduction for all of you and the staff that will be supporting this team. I'm Vice President at ICANN and I'm responsible for the oversight of the specific reviews at ICANN. And on the slide, you can see the team that we have here to support you. There's a lot of interesting work that'll be conducted and coordinated for this review, so we have different members with different types of backgrounds from ICANN staff who are here to help you. And without going into all the details, you can see the names on the slide.

Karen Mulberry in particular she's essentially the project manager for this team. She's a Director of the Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives Department. We'll have Jennifer Bryce working as a Senior Coordinator for you.

Bernie Turcotte is a contractor who will be also helping us with this. He's got a very, particularly in the cc area, the ccNSO-type issues.

We also have Charla Shambley, Yvette and Pamela, all of whom will be providing secretariat, administrative, and program support.

And then in addition to the logistics, we also have subject matter experts from ICANN staff who will be helping out, helping you understand the issues that you'll be addressing.

We have Steve Conte from the office of the CTO who's a Programs Director and a subject matter expert who will be also helping this team.

We're all very excited to work with you, and with that, we'll do some introductions of the team itself, so I'll hand it off to Karen Mulberry, my colleague who's going to introduce you all and get us started. Karen?

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, thank you very much, Margie. And actually, before we get started, there are a number of people who are showing up as just phone numbers in the Adobe room. We actually need you to identify yourselves so we can capture that for attendees.

There is a 202 number that ends in 0874, there is a 301 number that ends in 895, a 562 number –

DAVID CONRAD: The 301 is mine, David Conrad.

KAREN MULBERRY: Good morning, David, and welcome.

DAVID CONRAD: Good morning.

EN

KAREN MULBERRY:	Would you like to say a few words to our Review Team?
DAVID CONRAD:	No, you're doing fine.
KAREN MULBERRY:	Okay, thank you.
DAVID CONRAD:	You're doing fine. I don't think there's anything.
KAREN MULBERRY:	Alright. And then, let's see, there's a 650 number, it ends in 597. A 703 number that ends in 200, and then I've got two users who appear as PGI user, and PGI user 2. Can folks identify themselves if those are your numbers?
JOHN CRAIN:	This is John Crain. I didn't hear my number called, so I might be one of those PGI things. 562 is the [inaudible] number.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	This is Eric Osterweil, I'm the 703 200 number.

EN

KAREN MULBERRY: Who was that again, please?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

KAREN MULBERRY: Eric. Okay, very good, thank you. We just want to make sure that we have a good record of who is on the call.

Alright, well, the PTI users and the person who's 202 and then 874, if you can identify yourself, that would be great.

Anyway, back to the slide decks from the commercial break that we've just had. Here are the Review Team members so you can get familiar with each other and the names, the SO and AC affiliation and the region that you identified that you're coming from. We also have a Board-appointed liaison, so right now the Review Team stands at 16 members.

So, congratulations to everyone. Now, John, I'm going to ask you if you'd like to make any comments.

JOHN CRAIN: I think you're doing good there, but I just wanted to let everybody know that me and my team are available if they need them throughout this effort, and quite happy to get out of the way if they don't.

KAREN MULBERRY: Alright. Thanks very much, John. I'm sure that we will be interacting with you and your team quite a bit as the Review Team itself goes into framing its work and starts investigating, researching and addressing some of the things that they uncover. So thank you very much.

Okay, moving on, one of the most important things that we need to do is determine the leadership of the Review Team. Now, the Review Team or the team members determine their own leadership. Now, you can determine if you want to have a single Chair and Vice Chairs, do you want to have Co-Chairs, and so all of that is going to be up to you in terms of how you would like to structure the Review Team.

This is just some scope and responsibilities [actually] that came out of the CCT Review Team and how they framed what they wanted to have as defining moments for their leadership. So, this is just to give you some context, and there are also some references in the Bylaws for how the Review Team will approach consensus and how things need to be documented. That's the citation that's listed there

Now, in terms of looking at the proposed role of the Chair, the Vice Chair, the Co-Chairs, this kind of frames some of the additional responsibilities for that role or roles, and it's provided more for you to think about in terms of interest in that role or how would you like your leadership to lead the team.

Now, in terms of the SSR2 leadership process, I have some questions here for you to maybe help think through so that you can form and determine what you want your leadership ought to be. I mean, what process do you want to undertake to select the leaders? In essence, do

you want it to be a Chair, a Co-Chair, Chair and Vice Chairs? How do you want that structure to be for the review team itself?

And then moving on, how do you want to open up the call for leadership? How should expressions of interest in having a role in the leadership team be noted? Can we do those by e-mail where people will indicate that they're interested in a particular role once the Review Team itself has defined the structure it would like to have?

Then, how long should this process take? Should it be open for a week? Is it something you can conclude by e-mail before Copenhagen? Do you want to do it in Copenhagen? And then finally, you want to select a Chair, Co-Chair, or someone – if we haven't solidified the leadership for the team at this point – to be responsible for running the public consultation meeting on the 12th of March.

Now, I see we had a couple of hands up. Don, I see you, then Emily, and then Denise. Please. Okay, Don's mic is not working. Let's move to Emily, and hopefully we can correct Don's microphone. If not, Don, maybe you can type in what you want to say in the chat and then we can read it. Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. Can you hear me, Karen?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, I can.

EMILY TAYLOR: Hello. Oh, good, because I never managed to get my mic to work before, so that's a huge victory. Thank you very much for you and to Margie for setting up this meeting and the team, and getting us started. I just wanted to try and pitch in to give some answers or some responses rather to the questions that you've [raised].

Having been through a Review Team at the WHOIS review the last time around, is that this is a substantial piece of work, and looking at the more recent work with the IANA transition, it seemed that Co-Chairs has been a system that's worked very well. And I see that there's already some chat along the same lines, so it would just really to be to pitch into that.

Perhaps people can have a think about it, and it might be a bit soon for people to rush forward [inaudible] and offer to take on this sort of responsibility, but perhaps it could be something that we can pick up on the e-mail list. I'm not sure whether we can get it sorted in time for the Copenhagen meeting. I think a lot depends on the expressions of interest from the team, but that's just my two cents. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Emily. And I should also note too that there are several Review Team members who were unable to make this time slot. I know the call was set up rather quickly. We thought it would be useful to get everyone together – or at least as many people as we could get together – to have a chat before we meet in Copenhagen. So, there may be others who have input or an interest who are not on this call, so we need to be aware of that as well.

Don, do you have your mic fixed at this point? Alright, let's move on to Denise, please.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Karen?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes.

DON BLUMENTHAL: [inaudible]

KAREN MULBERRY: Oh, Don's [here,] alright. Sorry, Denise, we'll pick you up later. [inaudible] Please, Don.

DON BLUMENTHAL: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question. Hello?

KAREN MULBERRY: Hello.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Have I got the noise cleared up yet?

KAREN MULBERRY: I can hear you fairly well, Don. There's a little bit of background noise.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Okay. I couldn't hear what you said there.

KAREN MULBERRY: Oh, I was just going to say if your microphone is working, please go ahead and speak, and then we'll move on to Denise [inaudible] and Mohama.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Oh, okay. Thanks. No, I pretty much put what I thought in [inaudible] This project has a very broad scope – which is an understatement – and it's got a comparatively short timeline. So, [inaudible] Co-Chair route is going to be the way to go.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. Thank you, Don. Denise? Denise, are you muted?

DENISE MICHEL: Can you hear me?

KAREN MULBERRY: Oh, now I can hear you, yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Alright. I also agree that a Co-Chair approach would be useful, although I would also be supportive of a Chair and Vice Chair. I think it would be useful to continue this on e-mail. As you noted, there are several members who weren't able to be on this call.

I think it would be useful if Staff gave us a brief outline of ideas of what past reviews and other working groups, how the responsibilities have been divided, or the responsibilities of Chairs, Co-Chairs and Vice Chairs, to make sure people who may not have been involved in the past understand broadly what the responsibilities may be. That will also give Review Team members an opportunity to add any additional responsibility, suggesting additional responsibilities they'd like Vice Chairs or Chairs or Co-Chairs to have.

I would also suggest that we use the e-mail list to allow people to volunteer for positions if they're interested, and then use our face-to-face meeting to resolve that and select the appropriate people for the appropriate positions. So, I would suggest all of that be handled via e-mail and that volunteers note why they're interested, and any relevant experience they would like the team to note. I'm sort of running down your list on the slide.

So, I would suggest that we start now with this activity, have staff send some background info on what they feel that broadly the positions entail, and have any discussions that is necessary about that, and then encourage people who are interested to volunteer on the list.

I would suggest that we have a goal of resolving this at our face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen. I realize that would leave the March 12

consultation without an official Chair, Co-Chair or Vice Chair. But again, I think we can handle that with volunteers, rapporteurs, and I'm happy to help in that vein. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Denise. We'll make note of those, and based on the direction, I had hoped to send out an e-mail to everyone with these questions. Mohama, your comments, please.

MOHAMA AMIN HASBINI: Okay. You can call me Amin. Can you hear me well?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, I can.

MOHAMA AMIN HASBINI: Alright. So, well, I do agree with Denise. I think we should meet up in Copenhagen to introduce ourselves to each other and know more about each other. And then maybe proceed on e-mail or maybe have some type of vote, I don't know. But it would be a good start for us to just start getting in touch and knowing each other face to face. And we can continue with the rest, and of course, the people who are not able to attend through e-mail, etc. That's all from my side. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you very much. Alright, we have an action item, and make sure that this gets out to the e-mail list. The questions and the ask, and

hopefully you can have a great discussion on the list. When we come together in Copenhagen, I will make sure this is on the agenda, and hopefully you can have it resolved at that point so someone will take over.

ALAIN AINA: [inaudible]

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes,

ALAIN AINA: Hello.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, I just want to make sure that someone is monitoring the chat room, because we have been responding in the chat room as well. So, just to make sure that you're also following what is going on in the chat.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, I am, and I have noted the interest to move forward with this discussion in Copenhagen. And there seems to be some preference for Co-Chairs as the leadership. So, I will capture all of that in a summary note that goes out to everyone so that the Review Team members who

weren't able to participate have some context as to what the ask is and some of the dialog that occurred with the members who were on the call today. Any other comments?

Okay, next portion is just administrative information, things that will be helpful to you as the Review Team comes together and you start thinking about your work. I see a hand was raised.

ALAIN AINA: Excuse me.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, please.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, on the action item, can we set the timeline so when we are on the call… Can we put some timeline when are we on call on the list and when are we closing it? Can we add something on the timeline?

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. What is the Review Team's preference? When would you like to open the call for expressions of interest for the leadership, and when would you like to have it closed?

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise.

EN

KAREN MULBERRY:	Go ahead, Denise. [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL:	So, I'll throw a suggestion out there. I would suggest that if today, staff can send out to the e-mail list a brief outline of the traditional responsibilities of Chair, Co-Chairs, Vice Chairs so a lot of people could discuss that. But I would also suggest – unless there's objection – that we acting members to – that as we consider these, our responsibilities that we also open the sort of self-nomination or nomination period for these positions with an eye towards making a decision at our face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen.

And if it seems like we're not ready at Copenhagen, we can I think decide then when to close this consideration. That would be my suggestion.

KAREN MULBERRY:	Kerry, you have your hand up.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Hi, I just had a typo [inaudible] I think I agree with Denise, but I'd probably do one variation. I think if we do circulate the responsibilities under quorum under the Chair and Co-Chair, we could either have on the floor self-nominations during the meeting and then give a window of maybe a week [after] for persons to submit it for the self-nomination or nomination [inaudible] and then we could within a two-day window I think everyone be required to do an online poll or just submit their

preference as to who the Chair and Co-Chair should be. But I think a week after Copenhagen should be [inaudible]

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. Any other comments? Denise, I see your hand's back up again.

DENISE MICHEL: No, I just didn't take it down.

KAREN MULBERRY: Oh, old hand. Sorry. Well, I think we have a lot of food for thought. What I'm hearing is that staff should send out a note. I'll make sure we get this done this afternoon. We'll outline the positions, we'll outline some of the discussions, ensure that the questions that are in the presentation are also noted for the full Review Team to consider.

I'm assuming then that the expressions of interest in the leadership position would be open then with that note going out to the team? And we'll leave the closure of that for your discussion in Copenhagen. Does that sound like a sufficient plan?

DENISE MICHEL: I'll then modify my suggestion and agree with the other comments that – particularly since I see in the window that there are members who haven't [inaudible] for Copenhagen and we may not have a full complement of team members there, that we set an expectation to have this open for, say, a week after Copenhagen as well to make sure

that we accommodate everyone's schedules and everyone has as chance to participate.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. And that's why I left it a little open ended, because not all Review Team members may be able to participate in the face-to-face meeting. We are working to enable that wherever possible, but we cannot guarantee that. So, we can have a discussion then as to what your next steps might be based on the pool that have expressed interest, and how you want to approach it in Copenhagen. And it may be determined that the best approach is to do online polling at the meeting or to keep it open for another week and we can reconvene on another call to finalize the selection and the leadership criteria.

Emily, I believe you have your hand up.

EMILY TAYLOR: Sorry, I just didn't put it down. I was trying to do something else.

KAREN MULBERRY: Alright, not a problem. Anyway, what I have in front of you is just some administrative information. We have a dedicated wiki page for the SSR2 Review Team, and RT stands for Review Team. Here's your e-mail list, and only the Review Team members are subscribed to that. Now, note that the e-mail will be archived, and this is the archived list should you need to go back and research something.

[You're going the] wrong direction.

I want to give you a little context in terms of the role of observers for this Review Team. It's captured in the Bylaws that Review Teams will include an open number of observers, so as a result of that, all of the applicants that applied for the SSR2 Review Team who were not selected were offered an opportunity to subscribe to the observer list.

Many indicated that they were interested and would like to be on that list, so we do have a separate list for them where they have been subscribed. We have a separate wiki page for the SSR2 Observers, and that's the link to that page.

Now, some decisions that the Review Team members will need to make, and again, these are questions to think about, not necessarily something that needs to be answered right now. How would you want to work with the observers? Do you want to give them an open thought on every agenda so they have an opportunity to speak? Because right now, the observers are in a separate Adobe room where they can listen to the discussion of the Review Team but they don't interact with the Review Team members.

Now, if they raise questions in their chat, how do you want to consider that written input from them? And should there be specific sessions of the Review Team where you're going to want to close everything off and not have observers? So just something to think about in terms of organizing the group and how you would want to address those points.

There's also a specific e-mail address out there for the community to provide feedback to the SSR2 Review Team, and there's the e-mail list or the address for that list so that we can receive input from everybody

and then it can be presented to the Review Team to consider to manage in whatever shape you think is the most appropriate to undertake.

Kerry, you've got your hand up.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I was just wondering, did they include the agenda to publicly address this question? Because I think during the face to face, at least we could [inaudible] a little bit, because if the work of the team has a specific timeline, we have to say whether or not we have the observers submit their comments just for consideration, and then it's considered during a review period where we will take public comments and observer comments at the same time.

Because it would be a little bit tricky, maybe based on the types of comments we receive, [inaudible] probably have a face to face with the observers, at least get their input or feedback. But I think during the Copenhagen meeting itself, [inaudible] we could at least [inaudible] link up a little bit more those who aren't able to attend on the team, we could then probably try again to have an online meeting and share with them the output on the face to face on this topic in particular.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. Cathy, I see that you have your hand up.

CATHY HANDLEY: Thank you, Karen. Just a quick question is, how were observers handled in some of the past working groups when this has taken place?

KAREN MULBERRY: Their comments have been collected from the observers' room and [right into] the meeting of the Review Team so that they could be considered and discussed. There are observers who will participate in face to face meetings, and as agendas, there has been time allotted for the observers to speak. Or in some cases, observers have been granted access to speak along with the Review Team members on topics.

CATHY HANDLEY: Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: I know on different groups, there isn't anything real different between and observer or a participant unless it comes down to final decision making, and then the observers are not part of that. Kerry-Ann, I see you've got your hand up. And your hand went down. Okay.

This is not something that needs to be decided right now, but it's something that the Review Team itself as it frames what its processes and its working methods needs to be will need to consider the role of the observers and what you're trying to accomplish. And I see a hand up. Margie, and then – I'm probably going to butcher your name, so I apologize for that – [inaudible]. Sorry, I have a very fat, Midwestern U.S. tongue. Margie, please.

EN

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, to answer the question about how observers have been involved in the past, I just wanted to highlight that there's actually a shift in thinking on observers as a result of the new Bylaws that were adopted after the transition. That was a pretty heavily negotiated part of the transition with I think the intended purpose of giving the observers a bigger presence and participation than has been in the past.

That's not to say that the observers would have all the rights a Review Team member has, that's actually not the case. But I think it's something that you may want to keep in mind as we come up with the best way to include them in the process.

And to give you an example of what's happening for example the Review Team on Competition, Consumer Choice and Trust, what they typically do is in their face-to-face meeting, they'll actually set aside time in the agenda, perhaps at the end of the segment to have an open mic kind of thing where they solicit input from the observers in the room or the observers who are remote.

So, that might be something to think about as you consider what their role might be. I just wanted to share that information with you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. And the next person whose name I apologize that I butchered terribly. I'm afraid I can't hear you.

JABHERA MATOGORO: This is Matogoro.

KAREN MULBERRY: Matogoro. Thank you so much for that.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes, I just wanted to say that I think for the observer and [inaudible] Hello? Can you hear me?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, I can. I'm sorry, we can no longer hear you. Maybe you can type your comment in the chat so everyone can see it, but this is just something else that the Review Team itself needs to consider, and we'll add that to the agenda then for the face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen.

Okay, and the question was he wanted a [guide] in how observers were treated in past Review Teams. I think maybe we can collect some of that and share that information with you to help in your decision-making as to how you would want to set up the process for observers to engage and work in this Review Team.

I'd like to turn this over to Steve Conte to tell you a little bit about the background materials. Steve?

STEVE CONTE: Thanks, Karen. Karen, before I speak more, I just want to confirm, is this slide deck available to everyone on this call? Otherwise, I will madly start pasting URLs into the chat room.

KAREN MULBERRY: It will be posted on the wiki page as soon as we're done.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, thank you. So as we all know, this is just a preliminary call with the Review Team and a welcome and all that, so this is maybe just a high level discussion on the pointers on where the existing material will be for both background and SSR1.

As you know, we did our first SSR1 review a number of years ago, and the final report is the first link there. That'll cover the outcome and the findings of the first Review Team. That report then was submitted to the Board, and the Board decided to take action I think on all the items. I'm not sure, I wasn't there for that review process.

The second link we see here, the SSR1 Quarterly Implementation Reports was a reporting scheme from staff to show where we stood on all those. I invite you all to take a look at that. I understand that part of this process for SSR2 is to look at the SSR1 recommendations and A, I guess so we don't reinvent to wheel, and that we make sure that the implementations that were asked to take action on from the Board were actually implemented.

And then finally, the last link is probably the most dynamic link. This is a bucket of various background documents that we have either uploaded or will be uploading more. These are documents that we think would be of interest to the Review Team. As we come across more or create more, we will be posting them there.

Something to think about between now and Copenhagen is please look through this, and if there's something that you feel should be included in there that we can either find or maybe create by Copenhagen, please let us know, either myself or Karen, and we'll see if we can find the right documentation to put there.

So again, the last link will probably be the most dynamic, that's [where] we'll be putting publicly accessible documentation. If we get to the point where we have closed sessions, we will discuss where that documentation can lie as well then. Thank you. Karen?

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you very much, Steve. I see a hand up. Mr. Matogoro, do you have a comment, or is that an old hand? Alright. Alain, your comment, please.

ALAIN AINA: Can you hear me?

KAREN MULBERRY: Now I can hear you, yes.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, can you hear me? Okay, Steve, I have a question for you. It looks like the first review was on DNS, and this review is more brought up, most talked about are the unique identifier. Is it right?

STEVE CONTE: Yes, the first review, actually my understanding was that it spanned beyond just DNS. There was certainly DNS in it, and recommendations were made around the DNS, but I believe there were also some aspects that wouldn't be on DNS, wouldn't be on the SSR teams, John Crain's team's scope of work within the organization too. So it was a more broader scope of recommendations.

KAREN MULBERRY: Alain, you have your hand up. Okay, your hand's down. Denise, I see your hand up.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Just to follow up on the question that was asked, the SSR1 Review Team conducted a review under the Affirmation of Commitments on the Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS. I think it would be helpful if staff could include a link in the background materials, or just take that original AoC language and drop it in the background materials so people have that point of reference in terms of what the SSR, the guiding Bylaw language for the SSR review. I think might be helpful. And of course, the language is a bit different in the current Bylaws that guide our review.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, Denise, and actually, that is something that we will cover as we get more into some of the work items itself. Because the language in the Bylaws [frames] what the review should be about.

Okay, any other questions or comments? Okay, moving along.

Now, here is a very rough estimate of what the roadmap for SSR2 looks like. So, knowing that we need to be flexible with plans and align, work with what the community workload is, your workload, and then work within it.

So I've tried to look at what might be a reasonable schedule of when you might want to have face-to-face meetings, and knowing that you can have conference calls and other activities in between these options. So this is just a guide, and as you start thinking about your schedule and how you want to work, something to think about.

And then the most important thing is to look at future meetings. We've got the face-to-face meeting planned in Copenhagen on the 15th. We've got a public consultation session on the 12th. So, how do you want to schedule teleconferences? Do you want to do something weekly? Do you want to rotate time zones?

Because we have members on the Review Team from across the globe, so we'll need to be very aware of different time zones so that we don't disenfranchise one group that always has to get up at 3:00 in the morning and not share the pain amongst all of us in this process.

So, something to think about. And I did want to go into an opportunity that has come up, and I have made arrangements for the next face-to-face meeting in May in Madrid, and that's the 12th through the 16th. And you may ask, "Why?" Well, I will turn this over to Steve Conte to explain. I see Don and Denise both have their hands up. So, Denise, please, and then Don.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Karen. I would like to suggest that we address these issues at our face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen. Can people hear me? There's a lot of static on the line. Hello. Can people hear me?

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, now I can hear you.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. I would suggest that we address these details at our face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen in terms of the frequency of calls, the timing irritation and all of that. Since you've brought up Copenhagen, could you give us a little more background on sort of staff thinking of holding a public consultation prior to our face-to-face meeting and what were some of the thinking behind that?

It seems a little counterintuitive to have our first public session before we have our first private face-to-face session. So, it would be useful just to hear your thinking about that. Thanks.

KAREN MULBERRY: I can. If you give me a couple of slides, because the next item up is the sessions at ICANN 58, so I can give you a little background on why this came about the way it did and what the session – at least what I was envisioning the session to be.

Don, you have your hand up. I believe you're muted, Don.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Yes. I had to unmute. I see a lot of what we're talking about here is really best addressed at a face-to-face meeting and e-mails. My first thought though is so we can get started, I would suggest [inaudible] meetings just until we get the process going and see what works out best. [inaudible]

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, and frankly, my intent was to just point out things that the Review Team members need to think about, and then when you get together, you can have a discussion about how you want to schedule meetings and what approaches you want to take.

                         Emily, you have your hand up.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yes, thank you. Just partly to say, I think I'm agreeing with a lot of the comments that have been made, that it's really useful to just have your questions here so that we can all reflect on them before we have our first meeting.

                         And two, just on to Denise's point – and sorry if this is going to be covered in what you're just about to say, Karen, but – I don't really see a problem with having a public session before our first face-to-face if it's a kind of listening mode. And that's an opportunity for members of the ICANN community to speak out about what they feel this Review Team ought to be covering and some of the challenges that they perceive. And that will be I think potentially very useful for us as we sit down to our first meeting together to have those thoughts in our mind as well as

the more administrative things that we'll need to cover under our scope as well, of course.

So I just thought I'd throw that in there. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you very much. Cathy, you have your hand up.

CATHY HANDLEY: Yes, just kind of a little bit onto what Emily said. It's an interesting opportunity to hear what the public has to say before we've made our minds up about what we think they're going to have to say. You don't get that opportunity that often, so I think it's a nice use of the time if it's available. We had a late start for any number of reasons, and I think versus skipping the opportunity, we should take advantage of it.

That's all. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Denise, you have your hand up.

DENISE MICHEL: That seems to have spurred some discussion. My question about the order certainly was not to suggest at all that we shouldn't have public consultations, and I'm really glad we're able to take advantage and get input.

I think the normal course of Review Teams is to have an initial sort of face-to-face discussion and key up, make sure that people are on the same page in terms of understanding the background, the objectives of the review, start to tease out some very broad areas they want to learn more about, as well as then open it up for any questions and contributions from the community.

I'm really glad we're able to take advantage of Copenhagen. I think the order of our face-to-face meeting and the public consultation though will necessitate members I think reading more of the background information, using the e-mail list a little bit more before our March 12th session to help everyone get up to speed to make sure that it's I think the most productive session it could be.

And Karen, if there's additional background – it sounds like you have some more background on that – it would also be good to hear. Thanks.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, and we need to move a little quicker if we can, because we're running out of time. Anyway, I'd like Steve Conte to explain the DNS Symposium, and hopefully you can get this on your calendars now. I thought this would be a value for the Review Team. Because it's on the DNS, it's going to be focused on security. And Steve, explain what the symposium is all about, and therefore I could go into the Review Team meeting afterwards.

STEEVE CONTE: Absolutely. We're still working on a draft agenda, so if you go to that link at the bottom there, you'll only see the expression at a high level of what the symposium will be. Now, I will tease the draft agenda in a second. We will have probably an official public agenda by the time we get into Copenhagen, but we did want to put this on the roadmap, and Karen had suggested doing a face to face while [inaudible] we were all there.

We will be covering different aspects. This will be a program that's put on by Ops and CTO, and we're going to have a couple of different programs in the research, the DNS operations, IANA, SSR and GDD Technical Services areas. Research will be including talks on ISO 3166 alpha-2 codes as seen by the roots, various reports on garbage that hits the root servers. Roy Arends will be doing something on that.

We'll get an update on the technology health indicators that Alain Durand has been working on, and we'll be doing some other parts within research, introduction to – we have a middlebox lab looking at consumer grade products that are utilizing DNS and how they interact, so we'll have an update on that.

We'll have some talks about DNS operations, including the o-root ecosystem and some other ones that we're still working on finalizing. IANA will be giving us an IANA PTI update. Kim Davies will be there, and Punky [Durro] will be doing a root KSK protection and key ceremonies talk. As many of you – if not all of you – know, we're in the process of changing the key signing keys, the KSKs at the root. We've been doing a lot of talks around various meetings around the world [inaudible] updates on where we are in the KSK rollover.

And then we will also have Dave Piscitello from John Crain's SSR group talking about DNS abuse, so we'll have a talk on that.

We will have Gustavo – and I don't have his last name in front of me, I apologize – from GDD Technical Services talking about ICANN's SLA monitoring system.

And again, this is just a draft agenda for the day. We're still looking at finalizing, so your mileage may vary with this and subject to change, but I'm hoping to have a publicly available agenda by the time we see each other face to face.

The other [inaudible] on this is that we're going to have plenty of staff from our office of the CTO there, so this will be also – if we can secure time – a good opportunity to have them available if we do have a face to face or if we have questions, if you have questions about specific items as we move into the actual review of the SSR.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, thanks, Steve.

STEEVE CONTE: Karen.

KAREN MULBERRY: We're starting to run out of time, so I'm going to go through the rest of this rather quickly and ask for questions at the end if that's alright with everyone, just so I can get all the information in front of you to start

thinking about everything. And moving on is the sessions in Copenhagen. Denise raised a point about the scope of the review.

According to the new Bylaws – and this is just a summary – this is what SSR2 is to look at: operational stability, reliability, resiliency, security, global interoperability, systems, processes, internal, external that affect the Internet's unique identifiers. So we can go into more of that discussion in Copenhagen as to how you see what you want to accomplish within what the Bylaws have stated is the focus of the review. Here is just a summary of the sessions in ICANN 58 that have been scheduled.

In terms of the public consultation – and frankly, due to the nature of when we are going to actually get [inaudible] review team and the timing of everything, it seemed appropriate at least to hold a public consultation to gather input from the community as to what they see are the issues. And initially, I was thinking more that this would be an open mic session.

If we had a Review Team, you could facilitate some of the equations and discussion. If not, it would be – I wasn't sure who is going to be doing that.

Anyway, this is the session description I have, and then questions in terms of do you want Review Team members to lead the sessions? Do you want to make an open statement? Do you want this to be an open mic session?

Alain, I see your hand up. Comments?

EN

ALAIN AINA: Yes. What we have on the slide, on slide 19 then cover what I just expressed a few moments ago. I'm reading DNS, I'm reading DNS SSR2, and talking about DNS, then I'm confused. Are we going to look at DNS or unique identifier? I'm still confused.

KAREN MULBERRY: Well, you can look at that in more depth, but the Bylaws do mention DNS. It's the security and stability and resiliency of the DNS Review. That is the title of what it is. So, how much you want to touch on DNS or unique identifiers or anything else, I'll leave to further discussion. David, you have your hand up.

DAVID CONRAD: Yes, so part of this is a little complicated because of historical – what I personally consider a mistake. The NTIA in the footnote in the Affirmation of Commitments declared the term DNS to mean what – I don't want to say normal people – technical people would call the domain name system, in addition to addressing and protocol parameters.

If you look at the original AoC footnote 1 [sort] of makes the term used within the AoC DNS to be much more comprehensive. In general, in my view, you should probably think of the security, stability, resiliency of the Internet system of unique identifiers that are within ICANN's remit as sort of the area that you have scope within. That way, if you feel it's

appropriate and that there are SSR issues related to things outside of the domain name system, it would be considered within the scope.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you, David. Anyway, this is how I framed the session. I thought it would be good just to have an open mic discussion and get input from the community that might help the Review Team as they move forward. So that was my intention for setting up this session.

And I certainly hope that Review Team members who are in Copenhagen can participate in the session, be part of the dialog, and I will put something out on the list to see if there are Review Team members who want to volunteer to be the facilitators for the session.

This is kind of a list of topics for the face-to-face meeting. I will add the other items that we've raised today in terms of the leadership selection, discussing the role of observers, but this is kind of a rough outline of what I thought would be useful for the Review Team to follow at the face-to-face meeting.

Now, I've also arranged briefing sessions in the afternoon. I've noted there are a lot of similarities for what's going on in the CCT Review that might be of use for this Review Team, so the vendors that are doing the DNS Abuse Study, the part two study for the CCT Review will be available and are planning on participating in the afternoon to provide an update on the research and what they're doing in that program so that you can be made aware of that.

I also have the vendor that's doing the continuous data-driven analysis of root server system stability available, and they will be coming and provide an update on their research and what they are looking at. And then John Crain will be providing a little more of an overview of their department, what they work on and what might be available for you.

Now, my ask there is to think about new topics that might be of interest that you'd like briefing session on. David, you have a new hand up or an old hand?

DAVID CONRAD: Old hand, sorry.

KAREN MULBERRY: Old hand, okay. So anyway, that's kind of what I've got laid out. We can add more briefing sessions to other calls and meetings that we have based on the topics that you think you need more information on, and proceed from there.

One thing that you need to all think about, that the ICANN Board resolution on the 3rd of February, they named their liaison to the Review Team and they also have an ask, that they request the team to develop and deliver to the Board their approved terms of reference and work plan by the end of March.

So we need to start thinking about what that all will be, and we can set aside some time in Copenhagen to actually go in depth in terms of how you'd want to approach that. I do have some examples from other Review Teams.

This is kind of from the CCT Review Team, the most recent one, so what they [inaudible] in terms of reference, and I will have their actual term of reference circulated so you can think about that for how you'd want to draft something for SSR2, discuss it and then proceed with that.

Then in terms of a work plan, this is kind of the element that you'd want to identify in your work plan so you have some sense of the path that you want to take for this review.

So that was rather quick, but Any Other Business from anyone? Any other questions? Okay, Denise, your hand is up.

DENISE MICHEL: Can you hear me?

KAREN MULBERRY: I can.

DENISE MICHEL: Can you hear me? Oh, great. Just quickly, thanks so much for this very useful material and discussion. When you send the slides to the list, could you also highlight in bullets the action items and outstanding issues that we have? So that I think may help people address them on the e-mail list before we get to Copenhagen. Thanks.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. I don't think I will circulate the slides. They will be posted on the wiki page and I'll provide the link.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Alright, any other questions? Comments? I know there's a lot to think about as everyone prepares for the first face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen. I'm actually looking forward to meeting everyone in person, and in particular learning how to pronounce your names if I butchered it, so you can give me some lessons on that. I would appreciate it.

I think we've got a great group of people, and this is going to be – at least for me – a lot of fun. So, thank you very much for volunteering and working through all of these things as we get stated. Thank you all, and if you have any questions, please feel free to ask folks on the list or contact any of the staff support.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]