
COPENHAGEN – Security, Stability and Resiliency 2 Review Team Face to Face Meeting
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 08:30 to 16:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

KAREN MULBERRY:

Okay. We're about ready to start. It's a little after 11.

I thought we'd use this couple of minutes to do an agenda reset, to see where we are and what you wanted to do next at this point in time. I've got some slides put together based on a suggestion on the list, on the review team expansion and the scope of the review team. We can move into the brainstorming session if you want to, or we can postpone the brainstorming session.

There is very little that I can move around at this point, because of some hard starts and stops I have with the speakers that have been scheduled. So, I'm happy to rearrange things that I can rearrange, and just note that there are some things that I have very little flexibility on.

Kathy.

KATHY:

I realize we just all got done snacking and a bit. I was going to ask a question about lunch. If, because I think it actually effects the agenda and where we go, if we're going to break for lunch,

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

because it's hard to get people all back in, and that... Or, if you guys, if it's a working lunch, or what it is. Just curiosity.

KAREN MULBERRY:

Lunch will be provided. It will be at the same table as where we had our break. It will be from 12:15 to 1:15. If you want to work through it, you can. If you want to take a break, you can. There again, you know, it's up to the review team to determine how it wants to do all of this and when it wants to have things arranged.

So, happy to take your advice on how you want to do this.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Karen, after we discuss the review team expansion, I think is what you got up teed up right now, is it possible to have any briefings now, or are we locked into the time that you previously put on the draft agenda?

KAREN MULBERRY:

Those briefing sessions that I have from the two vendors and from John Crane, a lot because of their schedules. I have no flexibility to move them at all.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

So, I think you answered your question.

KAREN MULBERRY: I did try, but they're committed to other things, so...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Karen, can I just say? You know, certainly I really appreciate that it's very difficult position for staff to be in to be constructing the agenda and doing all of this, and you have done a great job in putting it all together. Inevitably, it's going to be, you know, confusing and difficult because we haven't all met, and don't know what we want.

So, it's much appreciated what you're doing. So, you know, we're in your hands.

KAREN MULBERRY: Well, I also want to make sure that what we do actually, you know, provides you the basic information to get the team together and get started. That was the intention of the way that the agenda was constructed. But there again, we're flexible and can move what we can around, knowing that there are schedules that I just cannot shift.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Back to lunch. [Laughter] A girl has got to have her priorities. Now, I'm thinking is, since we're not going, we don't have to go

someplace and we do have a lot of work to do, that maybe we take a half hour for lunch, and come back.

PATRICK [DODSON]:

Real quick. Patrick [Dodson]. The one that will be helping on the brainstorm and facilitating that. And one suggestion I would have would be, and I know that expansion of the review and scope is obviously a big point, that's one of the two topics we want to tackle in the brainstorm.

And the intent of the brainstorm is to surface as much information as we can in as fast fashion as we can, so we can, if not literally proverbially put all of the points of discussion on the table. And I think that that might actually help structure the conversation that you then want to have, so that you're not identifying new things along the way, but you kind of bubble everything up, organize it, and then that helps you see where you want to take the conversation next.

So, that's the intent of it. And if that works for everybody, we can try one of the exercises that we wanted to do, and see if that's useful and fruitful exercise. And if so, then we can shift into the second one, and that really does provide a lot of information for the conversation, which I would venture a guess right now, you're not going to close on a lot of things, but you're going to at least have a framework for carrying the conversation

further for the rest of this day, the meeting, and then subsequent calls and meetings that you'll have.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think that sounds, to me, personally, that sounds like a good idea and a good place to start, with the understanding that this is a first brainstorming session, but hopefully not our last.

KAREN MULBERRY: Kathy, you have...? You don't. Thank you. Any other points? So, it sounds like the proposal was to have a short lunch and then start up again sooner rather than later, knowing that we have to break then at 1:15 for Xavier, who is going to come in and talk about the fact sheet, and some of the budget details that were asked.

So, that is hard start point, so I can't rearrange his schedule at this point, other than that. Do, do we want to proceed with just a quick overview of the details on the review team expansion? And then go through the mission and scope, because what I have is going to actually the ICANN bylaws and the new mission and scope as it's captured there.

So, that will help frame, you know, this construct that ICANN needs to stay within.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Karen, could you cover the possible review team expansion before we go into the bylaws? I think [CROSSTALK]...

KAREN MULBERRY: That was up next, and we need to go to slide 49, please.

Okay, and I have been reminded too then that we need to ask everyone to introduce themselves on the mic for the recording, so people know who is speaking when they come back in and listen to this session. And our sessions will be recorded and archived both on the Wiki page and probably other places.

I don't think this will be on the ICANN meeting page, but it might very well because it was in the ICANN meeting schedule. So, it will be shown in two places.

Okay, Karen Mulberry. And we'll start with the possible review team expansion. And there were some questions asked on the list. Should the review team be expanded for more diversity and expertise? And are there any gaps among the review team members that should be addressed?

Now, the consultants ask, actually will be covered when you get into the budget, because it's specified in the bylaws of the review team, can hire expertise and consultants to support their

work. You probably want to think about that as you go through your scope of work and your terms of reference, in terms of what your gaps are and how you might want to do that.

But also, you need to determine what kind of outside research and data you might need as well, so that it will all fall into actually how much budget we have to spend for all of this. So, those were the questions. I don't know what kind of dialogue you want to have on that. I do know, according to the bylaws, that it's the SO and AC chairs that have to approve expansion to the membership of the review team itself, the consultants are something under the control or the instruction of the review team.

Denise?

DENISE MICHELLE:

Thank you. Denise Michelle. Can you give us some more context for this SO AC chair ask? I think part of where the confusion comes in is that the bylaws give the SOs and ACs the single responsibility of appointing members to this team. So, considering that the team itself doesn't have any authority to expand itself, can you give us more context of what they are actually saying, and what you think the action item is here? Thanks.

KAREN MULBERRY:

I can attempt to summarize the conversation. It came from one chair. And supported by another chair in the conversation to actually confirm the review team. Because one of the issues that we raised was having sufficient diversity on the review team, both gender and geographic. And there were concerns that we didn't have sufficient geographic identification.

And in particular, at that point, we didn't realize that Carry Anne was representing the LAC region and there was a gap. And so, we were notified that Carry Anne would actually represent the LAC region. And so, in essence, the comment was if the review team thought that the diversity wasn't sufficient, they could take a look at it. Now, I don't know if that was a specific ask to the review team to do that, or if it was an off the cuff comment by one of the chairs to defer addressing any further diversity issues.

So, I am not in a position to read minds of the chairs and what their intention was. It was just the comment that was made. They also reinforced the fact that the review team could hire consultants and technical experts. So, maybe considering diversity when you look at that, and your needs, knowing full well that to hire a consultant, or technical expert, we have to go through the ICANN procurement process.

So, that could be very well part of the requirements that you would know for whatever expert that gets hired. Carry Anne.

CARRY ANNE:

Carry Anne. Karen, [inaudible] when the review team was selected, it was through a process of expression of interest, and the selection was done based on various backgrounds, I assume, and the nominations from the supporting organizations that would have recommended or supported the expression of interest if each of us were on the table.

Was there some balancing done in this selection then? Because there are a few technical persons, there are some legal persons. To mean, there seems to be a decent mix of expertise, technical policy, and legal. Is there an assumption that we aren't complete? Just wondered if that came up in the discussion.

KAREN MULBERRY:

Obviously, I can't speak to the full selection process. It happened at the SOs and ACs. We issued the call for volunteers, collected the applications, and submitted them to the chairs to vet within their communities, and then for the chairs to get together and determine from those nominations from their individual SOs and ACs, who they were going to finally confirm as the review team.

We just followed the, you know, waiting for the end result.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, to the first point, I want to say, there was a process which was followed. Actually as part of the process to SO and ACs, that kind of diversity wasn't mentioned, because that was part of the RSAC team when we did a selection for RSAC. And that was not part of recommendations that, the RSAC leadership got. And I also observed.

Other than that, we have a team. It's formed. We have no control over, we had no control over selection. But we are here, we have a complete team. I think this is not for us to review, if SOs ACs have issue, SO AC leaders have any issues, they have to follow either an existing process or talk to the Board or something like that, because we have no control over that.

KAREN MULBERRY: Kathy then Carry Anne please.

KATHY: Kathy [inaudible]. My suggestion was going to be as the team, we're in agreement that we feel that we have diversity and expertise. Send it back to the SO ACs and say, you know, we've agreed that we're fine where we are. If you have, you know, any

specifics, then they have to tell us more, they want us to consider. You know, so that would be my suggestion is to take it back to them.

DENISE MICHELLE: Denise Michelle. I would agree with our last two speakers and team members. It seems that I would also support that we should move on to our business.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If I may add, in support of what Kathy said. Yes and no, because I think we should agree internally, but I don't think we need to communicate that, because I don't think we need to communicate that back to SO AC leaders or other people, because we don't need to prove ourselves to them. There has been a selection process. It is what it is.

So, if they think it's not diverse, I don't think we even have to assess that for them. They can do their assessment and deal with it.

KATHY: Kathy [inaudible]. It's not about proving ourselves, it's just a step that says we've looked, you know, we seem to be diverse, and it was an ask, and I think it's... I honestly think it's

appropriate, since there are the ones that did the endorsement and everything, to send it back. Not asking, you know, any more than say, we believe we've met diversity requirements, and you know, we're not planning on doing anything.

If you have any other comments, you need to be more specific to us.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you. I'm not going to make it a back and forth, but the core of what you're saying, if it's a meeting, we're diverse, but we didn't select ourselves, correct? There is a process, and basically they selected us. So, they nominated us and we got selected here. So, if we say [inaudible]... I mean, we have no control over that.

So, we can just ask that something you did, we think is good, so why are you...? That would be the core of that kind of letter. That's the reason I'm a little bit... I don't think it's a big deal anyways. [Inaudible] but I just wanted to raise.

KATHY:

Kathy [inaudible]. Maybe that brings a bigger question is, as a review team, is it necessary for us to respond to the SO and ACs, when they ask a question?

DENISE MICHELLE: This is Denise Michelle. They didn't put this in writing. Personally, I don't think our responsibility is to respond, but if staff could take this, I would suggest that staff take this conversation back to the SO and AC chairs, clarify the misunderstanding about Latin America, and ask that if they have any additional input or asks of the team, that they put that in writing.

Would that be acceptable to everyone?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, happy to do that, and happy to work with anyone who would like to assist in drafting that communique. So, just let me...

However you want to capture the conversation back to the SO and AC leadership. So, please let me know, and we can take that as an action item to do that.

Okay, and then moving on...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Just as a point of clarification, just everyone knows regarding the designation as my representation as LAC, it's because on the website it had it as North America. So, the

clarification wasn't a selection based on LAC, but more that as a representative of the OES, I best represent LAC rather than North America.

So, just for the record, just for clarification.

KAREN MULBERRY

And the SO and AC leadership were informed that there was an error, and that we did have someone from the LAC region. Yes, yes. So, there was some confusion on our part, regarding your application. So, that was corrected, they were informed of that.

All right. If no more discussion on this, can we move on then to **the mission and scope?**

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Sorry. The second point we didn't discuss, and if you go back to the... Yes, because there were two... So, are there any gaps among review team members that should be addressed? I think that would be an internal discussion, but we cannot do anything on that unless we find a formal model so we can see what expertise we need and what expertise we have.

So, I think it's a very important question, and we have to address it at some point, soon. So, it's good to keep an eye on that and save it [inaudible].

KAREN MULBERRY: All right, we will make note of that. I'm sure that will come up as you start to look at the information and data you need as to what gaps and understanding you might have. Elaine... Oops. Emily please, and then Elaine.

EMILY TAYLOR: It's Emily Taylor. Yeah, I think that's right. We will only really understand the gaps, and you know, the needs that we have for further support when we've started to really dig into our workplan and our scope of our work. And I think then, gaps in our knowledge, collectively, will become apparent.

So, it's really useful to have this sort of just planted in our brain at this stage, that when we're stuck, that there is that ability to ask for additional support.

KAREN MULBERRY: Would you like us to capture this as an action item then? So, it can be reflected on the action item table or not? Okay. All right. Just wanted to make sure we were clear.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Sorry. And then one way of capturing a gap, is to do an assessment of the capacity that we have here. And I think, at

SSAC, we used to have a form every year, where all members are asked to fill a form. Then you choose your area of expertise. Maybe we could do that, and then it would give us an idea, just fill a form where you select your area of expertise, then it gives us an idea of what we have.

DENISE MICHELLE: It's Denise Michelle. I think that's a good idea.

ZARKO KECIC Jacques [inaudible]. I think that this talk should, we should repeat this talk after we have scope of work, and strategic plan, because right now, we don't know what expertise we will need, what we have in place, and what we are going to request. So, I think just if, just now and we'll talk again later on.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, we'll make note of that and make sure that we keep that as a pending agenda item for the future, and work with the leadership when you have them, to make sure it comes back up again.

All right? Let's move on then to the mission and scope. And this is actually the text from article one of the new bylaws. It goes for, I think, three slides that captures the limited scope. You

probably hear about lots of people talk about the limited scope of ICANN. This is what we operate within.

So, I thought it would be useful for you to see that to help frame how you might want to look at the scope of SSR. Do you want to go to the next slide please?

And in particular, you've got two and three, really do focus on the DNS root name server system, so the unique identifiers. Next slide, please. And in particular, item B, we shall not act outside our mission. Those are, at least the parameters for ICANN. So, I don't know if you want to discuss that. I thought that would be just a good foundation to let you know that this is the scope that we can operate under. Denise.

DENISE MICHELLE:

Steve, has your staff provided or developed a specific definition of what security, stability, and resiliency actually means?

STEVE CONTE:

That's a great question. Steve Conte. I have to double check the framework. If we do have a definition, I suspect it would be in the framework. We've been, I think, traditionally going off the running definition as described either in the strategic plan of ICANN, or within the bylaws, if there is anything. I honestly don't know.

You're making faces at me, so please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I don't think the strategic plan or bylaws actually define what those three terms mean. But I was wondering if some sort of follow-up work over the last couple of years, it strikes me that at some point, staff... So, I think that would be worth looking into. Yeah, thanks.

STEVE CONTE: I'll take that as a follow-up, and I'll go to John Crane and see if we can get an answer for you on that.

PATRICK [DODSON]: This is Patrick. There might be some reference that you can leverage off of SS1, if they went through and defined terms. They didn't? Then you can't.

JABHERA MATOGORO: [Inaudible], just for the record. I was going through the recommendation, I think, number one, which required the, I think, there is a document I think which is written here, and I found some definition, especially on ICANN remit, and ICANN [inaudible] remitting security, stability, and the resiliency of the internet unique identifier.

And there is some [inaudible] on the document, that really a point on those security, stability, and resilience. So, I think, [inaudible] for the review team, I think we need to be guided, which is the correct document to refer, when defining security, stability, and resilience as per ICANN missions.

I think it's very important, and that will also give us a point to come up with this specific scope for the team. Thank you.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:

This is Alain. Steve, in the SSR framework document, for physical year 2015 and 2016, [inaudible] definition for the 10 security, stability, and resiliency.

And it says that it was first introduced in fiscal year 2012, so apparently, there is a definition.

STEVE CONTE

I'll make sure, John is joining us this afternoon. I'll make sure that we'll have that information to the team, to the review team today, either before John gets here, or John can address it directly when he does arrive.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Steve, I don't know when, probably John comes, you can ask him, as a part of the definitions for the SSR1 report, security,

stability and advisory committee described what the functions are. You know, you can define something by reference, not necessarily by specifics. So, a part of it says that they should advise on security and integrity of the internet name and address allocation system, and this includes operational and gives example.

And it goes on, administrative matters, and it gives examples again in terms of giving us a reference point, supposedly when he speaks he could clarify where the references... When he comes later, we can ask him about it.

STEVE CONTE:

That's actually a great comment on that, because we've had internal shifting since that recommendation has been made, and there was a deliberate division between SSR group, which is external facing, and then we now have an infrastructure security team which is internal facing. In the past, that was kind of meshed together, and that's changed.

So, that would be a really good point to discuss this afternoon with John.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Yeah, I think this is really useful discussion, and I think we should try and get to grips to what these terms mean, and whether

there is any difference in the three words. Another one which came through in the public discussion that we had earlier this week was, what exactly was the unique identifiers meaning? Is it confined to the DNS? Is it wider, you know, to include the unique identifiers within ICANN's mission? Is it based on now?

Is it now and the future looking? So now, I think there is a little bit of unpacking in that term as well. So, just to highlight that at this stage. I'm sure that we will revisit it, no doubt, in our brainstorming and in our defining, what we're going to be looking at.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I just want to warn about this possible pitfall, looking for definitions, because I'm sure SSAC has definition of SSR and I'm sure John will bring some. One of the things that this team has to do, I think, is to all rethink how far one wants to go within the ICANN mission, with each of these terms.

For example, SSAC has a strong a view that, and in many of their publications they repeat that, that visual similarity of the names is a threat to the stability, or sorry, to the security in that case. So, if names are visually similar, that's confusing, and that's a threat to end user security.

I don't know if this committee wants to take that approach or not, but I think this is one of the things which we might recommend, as a recommendation, that we don't see that, or we see that, both cases are fine, but we shouldn't say, oh, SSAC thinks visual similarities are a threat, so we should already operate on that basis and say, okay, in this case, ICANN didn't look at that visual similarity, so ICANN is not doing a good job or something like that.

So, how deep we go to in each of these, and we have to form our own view on how we take this.

KAREN MULBERRY: Steve, please.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. For some reason, my MAC is having extreme issues rendering PDF. So, Dan pointed out, and Elaine you mentioned it too, that the framework, the SSR was defined within the latest SSR framework, that's on the length that, Denise, you supplied in the chat, [inaudible] on page seven. One note though to keep in mind on this is that, SSR groups definition, which might slightly differ from the corporate definition, the organizational definition because it's specific to the mission of the SSR team.

The SSR review is broader than just looking at the SSR team, parts of what takes place within... We're looking at SSR, how it's defined within the organization, and some of those pieces are outside the scope of John Crane's SSR group. So, we can certainly look and talk about the definitions that the SSR group looks at and operates under, but we should keep in mind that it might not be authoritative to the work that this review team is doing, that we should be looking at it from maybe a higher altitude.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Kerry-Ann. Just out of a note, I think, for everyone on the ICANN about glossary. What was fascinating, it actually only defines stability. It says stability, and it says in ICANN, security, stability, and resilience framework, stability means the capacity, and it gives just a definition for stability, which is interesting because it refers to the SSR framework, and only defines one aspect of it.

So, it's just for us to know when this discussion comes back up again.

KAREN MULBERRY: Should we take an action item then, to try and collect definitions for you around SSR? And then we can provide that to you to see

if that is sufficient? And provide the references where they exist.
Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yes, please. And could we also try to do the same on unique identifiers as well?

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay, add unique identifiers to it. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes, so I think culling together a list of definitions for SSR, sounds like it would be useful, but I think to [inaudible] point, I think it's going to necessarily fall to this team to decide what we think SSR is, and whether we base that on what we see around us, or a combination of things that people have said.

I think it's going to be necessarily part of what we do, to identify what's important, and then we can use that to define what's secure, what's stable, what's resilient. So, I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page. I think this is a starting point. It's not like there is an easy answer over there, and we're going to import it, probably.

AMIN HASBINI:

I would like to... [Inaudible], I would like to agree with Eric, and add that the ICANN have chosen us, and the diversity that they have, like, chosen within us, is based on that we are exactly supposed to define the scope, and define what needs to be done, and what we think is better for the community or for the internet.

And based on that, I do believe that we should probably start discussing action items more than definitions. There will always be like variations of definitions, like domain names, or security, etc., but maybe the focus should go towards action items, or action plans. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL

Denise Michel. I think that's also a good point. I don't think these things are mutually exclusive. I think, if the staff could gather together all of the various definitions that staff is using, or has used for SSR, as well as unique identifiers, then we can factor that into our work. It might even help us identify something in the work plan that we haven't thought of, that staff is working on, or considers within the sort of scope, if you will, of our work. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY:

Okay. Well, the action item will be noted. I don't know if you want to discuss anything more about ICANN's mission, and how it might relate to the scope of the work that you have in front of you, it's just more of a foundational, this is what the mission is that we have to stay within.

The next item on the agenda then was the brainstorming session. Do you want to move into that? If so, I will turn it over to Patrick to guide us through this discussion of all of the elements that have been laid out for what the review team is to be framed to do, and hopefully we'll end up with some good thinking, so you can move on to your terms of reference and other work.

PATRICK [DODSON]:

There we go. Is this mic on? Hi everybody. This is Patrick [Dodson] for the record. And I'll be your facilitator, instigator, whatever that needs to be for the next exercise. We're going to tackle these exercises one at a time. If you can go to the next slide? What we want to do, in talking with Karen, and knowing where this group is, the idea here is to facilitate an exercise that will help us quickly surface what we want to explore, what we think as a group we need to explore, as it relates to the scope, and the areas, the [inaudible] in the maze.

And then also, for this group as it comes together as a team, what does it look like to work together? What are the frameworks for this group's engagement. So, we wanted to do that in a couple of different exercises, and I'll walk through the framework. Next slide, please.

So, the idea here in this diagram is a visual depiction of what we refer to as the process for group decision making, which is what this group has to do, right? You have to figure out how do we come together and align on the terms of reference, on the scope of work, on how we're going to work together. The model that you'll see here is really three parts, right?

It's the first part opening, which you're going to find we do most here in the next 15, 30 minutes. And we're going to start to do the exploring. We won't get all the way through this process, just because of the sheer volume of discussion that's going to need to happen. And we don't want to shorten this, especially the middle area is the area where you actually learn the most, and so you want to give yourself time to go through that process. Next slide, please.

So, for these exercises, to set expectations and to let you guys know up front, that where we end, at least on the exercise, is going to feel somewhat unnatural because we're going to end before we actually close anything, right? And it's really just to

get a lot of information surfaced up, have some discussion to start the framing of the discussions that you need to have in order to get alignment on the decisions you need to make.

That will eventually culminate into the terms of reference documentation, and scope of work documentation, which will help frame the governance and remit for this group. Next slide, please. All right. So these are my ground rules. I don't have a lot, because this is really yours, but there are a few things that I think will help this group move fast and productively.

One is, we're going to use Post-It notes and Sharpie pens. So, they are around the tables. Steve and Denise know what I mean when I say we're going to use Sharpie and Post-It notes, but the idea is, for the exercise of the scope, and you'll see five stations around the wall here, and I have reference materials for everybody that can't read that far, doesn't want to [inaudible] their head around.

We want to figure out, within the framework of the scope elements, what are the questions that this group needs to answer as it relates to these categories. So, for example, one of the questions that is already being brought up is, what do we mean by SSR? Right? We want to capture those. We want to capture those on Post-It notes so we can post them up, and we can start to see where a lot of activity and energy is.

Do we have a lot of duplication of the same questions? That's a good indicator that that's a primary question that we really need to tackle. It might be one of the bigger things we address first. This is going to give you guys some guidance on that, for the rest of your discussions. Please print clearly. I will be capturing all of the information here and putting it into documentation for you to carry forward, and so, the ability to read one's handwriting, or one other's handwriting is going to be helpful.

What I mean by the, more than three people per station, what we're going to do in this first exercise, is you're going to sit at the desk chair, and you're going to write down as many questions as you can think of. I'm going to give you about 10 or 12 minutes to do that, against any of the five categories.

Once you've exhausted your questions, you'll put them up, and then I'm going to ask you to congregate near the one aspect of the five framework that you either have the most interest in, or the most experience with. Your choice, but we want to start to see what that clustering looks like, because that's where we're going to start to have a discussion.

And then, we're going to, as time allows, have discussion for eight, 10 minutes, and then we're going to rotate to a different section. We won't get through all five, but it will at least start to see how the conversations are starting to formulate. It will also

help us look at that. So in order to have a good conversation, we don't want to have one or two people at each of the stations for the SSR team, right?

So, we want to have at least three people at a station, and we'll get through all of them eventually. You will get through all of them eventually, but time is just a constraint that we have. Because of the time constraint, and because we're not closing on anything, make sure that you're staying in the discussion zone and not in the debate place, and trying to land on a decision, because we're not there as a group yet.

This is really about framing what are the biggest pieces and what are the things we need to sequence in conversation, so that we can get through the work that we need to get through for the terms of reference and the scope of work. Any questions? Does that make sense at this point? Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, I have a question, maybe not directed to you, but to... So, I was expecting us to have a discussion on how do we interpret the [inaudible] in what we are supposed to do? Because we have two [inaudible] review, and three may. Okay, so I don't know if we will have time to discuss, how do we interpret the [inaudible]? How do we interpret the may?

And this may have an impact on how we approach this discussion.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Good question. Does anybody want to offer at least a working definition for the purposes of the exercise? Denise.

DENISE MICHELLE: Denise Michelle. I can offer my own interpretation. I interpret the may as something that, based on our own deliberation and opinions, consensus we come to, we have the ability to address those in our review, if we so choose. And the shall, is something that we have to deliver on. It's our responsibility to address. That's just my personal interpretation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think that's already a decision. So, my suggestion was to make a more light-weight decision, is if you remove that bigger than three per station, then let us have the stickies, put them on and we might all end up with these two, and then automatically we say, okay, there is not that much interest in that, or so, I think...

PATRICK [DODSON]: No fewer than three, but if you all congregate and have a group discussion, that's fine. That's the one within the constraints of

the room. One thing about that on the room, there are remote participants and we have not left you out. Please, if you are a remote participant, I will make the note that as we go through this exercise, we will share with you the same frame of reference that are on the walls that you guys cannot see.

If you have questions that you want to put up as part of the group, please do that in the chat. And we will transpose those chat notes, please do note which section. If it's one of the shalls or the mays that your question refers to, but we will transpose those into Post-Its, and put them up for the good of the group, so that your comments and input are also captured.

It will obviously be limited in the ability to have the discussions, but the discussions don't resolve anything as much as they explore, we will be bringing those back into a framework that everybody can address in the Adobe Connect room, either later this afternoon or in subsequent calls.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just a very quick point of information for members of the team, who don't have bionic vision, and haven't yet committed to memory all of the mandate wording, there is, it's on the Wiki page. Oh, thank you very much, Patrick. I was wondering how to do this. Thank you very much.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Yeah, we have multi-media, we have paper as well. I'm actually going to ask you to share a few, because I'm going to run out of copies. But we do have reference materials for everybody. And they are on the walls, yes, but no, bionic vision has been accounted for, or non-bionic vision has been accounted for.

And we'll have that too. Go ahead, Karen.

KAREN MULBERRY: Just one note that we have plenty of observers that are online, but it's actually, this is an exercise for the review team members themselves. There isn't a process to capture information from observers just yet. So, we have one review team member that is remote, so it will be looking for comments from Don, should he want to post them in this.

And I apologize to the observers, once there is a process determined by the review team, then you'll be able to participate according to that process, but for now, you just observe the discussion and dialogue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Plenty of observers. Do you have a number?

KAREN MULBERRY: I haven't been counting, I've been too busy.

PATRICK [DODSON]: We'll get those stats to everybody. So, with that, I'm going to start the clock where 10 minutes until noon, and I'm going to give everybody 10 minutes and we'll see where we are, if everybody is up and standing around, we know that we're ready to go to the next phase, but we want to exhaust as many questions as we can.

And then as we get grouped together in these posters, then we can start to see where we might have some overlaps and pull together similar ideas and questions. Denise.

DENISE MICHELLE: I'm sorry. What's the grouping posters? How is that divided?

PATRICK [DODSON]: There are the three may's and the two shall's, so that's where the questions that we need to address, or we think we might need to address, will nest into those categories. And the clock starts now, 10 minutes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. What are the action items from the meeting?

PATRICK [DODSON]: From the perspective of these different five categories, what questions do you think this review team needs to answer as a part of the review? So, in one area, for example, that was brought up earlier, what do we mean by secure, stable, and resilient? Might be a question that we think as a group.

So, this is just, what are the different things that you personally think need to be addressed in the review? And this will allow everybody to see what everybody's opinions are for the discussion.

Yeah, thank you. As you guys have completed your Post-Its, put them up and post them in no particular order, but at least into the right categories of the questions to the areas of the review.

We have a quick time check, about three more minutes or so.

Great, just a couple of more minutes here to wrap-up the questions, get them posted, and then... There is my alarm.

There we go. We're in the factory now. And then please just stay near the station that you would like to participate in as far as the first rotation of conversation. We'll have just a couple, I think, before we break for food, and then we can continue it as we want.

Okay, a couple of you are still wrapping up, which is fine. For those of you that have already grouped around some stations, the next step in this exercise is to read through the Post-It notes, and see if you can consolidate, or group them. Hopefully there is some overlap in people having the same questions. So, we want to group those together and even take one Post-It to rewrite those questions, so we can start to see what the themes are.

So, feel free to use that. That's why we did the Post-Its, you can move them around. Please do that. We'll hopefully get that done in the next five or so minutes. That then helps simplify, what are the areas that you want to start to have a conversation around.

Great, good. So, we have a couple of different groups. I don't want to interrupt anybody, but as you can start to group together the questions, then we can start to see the discussions and what the question topic categories might be.

Okay. I want to... They've got food out there.

You may sit down. But let's wait. Before everybody just sits down, because you might be getting back up to grab food, let's do a quick check. It is 12:15. As all of these exercises, they take on a path of their own, which is great because I think you guys have gotten a lot of stuff surfaced, which was the intent.

We have an hour, and we also want to make sure that everybody gets fed. So, I would make the suggestion at this point, because we have some groupings of things, but we haven't obviously rotated at all, to take 15 or 20 minutes right now to grab food. Allow me to organize this a little bit more, and what we might then do is ask folks that did stand at these different stations, to just maybe do a quick readout to the group, of what's on the page for discussion.

And then, that's going to take up the rest of our time, I think, as we go through the lunch hour. And then, we'll work during the afternoon, as you guys are having other presenters coming in, capturing this for a document that can be easily projected, and we all have a similar view of what this information is, for further discussion. If not today, then subsequent calls that you can have.

I will make the note that there was a second exercise. We will not get to that second exercise until the very last 15 minutes, and it's going to be just the first step of what you did here, of just putting Post-Its up on particular categories, and I'll walk everybody through that at 1:00. But that way, we'll get that up and we'll get that captured for further discussion as well.

And then from talking with Karen, the very last portion of the day, there aren't locked-in speakers. So, we can revisit if we

want to dive into any of these other topics a little bit further while we're still here as a plenary. Okay?

So, let's take 15 or 20 minutes to try and eat, and not eat too quickly, but start that out, and then I'll ask for volunteers as we organize some of these stations here for some, just some readouts so that people can start to have a little bit of a dialogue around them.

Yeah, 12:40 is when we'll start doing conversation about it. And there is food here, and you can eat out there, or you can bring it back in here. Thank you, guys.

All right, everybody. Apologies for interrupting some of the lunchtime conversations, but want to bring it back so we at least do a quick readout of what has been produced so far. So, I'm going to ask for volunteers. The first element here on the left, I've put all five against this wall, but I'm hoping somebody can give an overview as a part of the group that was the first shall, which is the biggest one. It had the most, I think, conversation around it.

So, if anybody wants to volunteer to come up and just obviously read out every Post-It note, but give the group a sense of what were the themes in that category, and then I'll subsequently ask volunteers for the other sheets as well. I know that there was more heat on a couple than others. So, in the next 20 minutes

here, we'll take maybe five minutes per, three minutes per poster, just to have that conversation and see what immediate questions or comments come out of that.

It looks like I already have a volunteer, is that right there Mohamed? Here, I'll give you the microphone here, okay?

MOHAMED:

All right, thanks. So, at the shall, we have three main groups of questions, or maybe needs that we think are relevant to the group. The first is organizational, around how does the SSR2 communicate or integrate inside the ICANN? And what are like the measures that could be enhanced within how the team is managed, or how the team manages the work itself?

I can probably read a few of the questions. What are the key performance indicators? How to interact within or with outside organizations? So, I think these are the high level questions that are probably more relevant than others.

The second group is around the measurements of evaluation, measurements and evaluation of security efforts. So, this is about the current measures that are currently in place inside ICANN, and the current capabilities around fighting DNS abuse or similar behavior. And what could be done to enhance this

further in terms of performance, in terms of efficiency, speed of blocking DNS abuse, etc.

And the third group of tips or questions we have, future challenges. So, it is more about identifying future threats or somehow trying to figure out what is coming next. As an example, we can take like increase in malware, increase in DDOS, these are all probably part of the future that we see.

Maybe some research could be done here in order to put in some expected level to prepare for. So, these are the main groups. We do have secondary questions, right? So, I'm not exactly sure how to explain them. Maybe I should read them.

PATRICK [DODSON]:

I think reading them might be okay. This one did not have as much content around it, and it didn't get grouped, so there wasn't a discussion there, which is fine. But if you want to read through some of the questions, and then we'll see if we can get another volunteer to come up and help us with Section 1A.

MOHAMED:

All right, thank you. So, review... What? My writing is not good, too. So, review guide importance and where it is implemented. Something like that. How do we get an understanding of what SSR1 requirements have recommendations have been

implemented? So, there were also some questions around like the efficiency of the SSR1 implementations, and the impact they have done inside ICANN.

Or, towards the community. What are the indications the SSR2 would want to use to measure success of security efforts? Again, in the same area. Are these measures in place, SSR1 work? To which extent were SSR1 recommendations implemented? For like input on how ICANN should improve on SSR? How can we...?

I think it's all around the similar, a similar theme, which is the evaluation of the SSR2 work and impact. Thanks, Patrick.

PATRICK [DODSON]:

Thank you, Mohamed. This is Patrick. Anybody want to cover the group here? You guys, yeah, there you go. Consensus was they're both going to go up and speak, because they were the two that were guilty for the grouping and the headers.

JAMES:

Great. We're going to do this collaboratively. By the way, I'm James. Sorry for being so very, very late. So, we had kind of three and maybe a fourth kind of category. So, the first thing that really jumped out of us was that there is a huge amount of

questions around the definitions of what the actual scope of work is, and maybe even some of the sub-items within that.

So, there is a lot of questions around, well, within the scope of our work, what is stability, security, and resiliency? What is the impact on what we should actually be looking at inside that? You know, are we purely limited in our scope to look at the internal ICANN staff processes?

Or are we also going to look at some of the impacts of that outside of the ICANN organization itself, and measure somehow the impact of the choices that are being made internally, on the actual operational stability of the internet identifiers themselves? So, that's a pretty big scoping question, I think, for the group. And maybe something that we should try and frontload, so that we are not going to get halfway through our work and realize, wait, no, we should have actually really been looking at this as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I wanted to touch on scope. So, in terms of the definitions, a lot of it was surrounded about unique identifiers, etc. But when we come across the scope, what we realized was persons trying to decide what our requirement has security in this? And one of the things we wanted to highlight was, the physical is so much distinct from network. They're like two very wide areas.

So, in terms of scope and we have to kind of decide if we do touch on this, we have to decide, are we more focused on the physical? Do we have the capacity to do the physical through the staff, for example? Or, are we going into network, which will probably need the wider community to actually assist in the network aspect of it.

The miscellaneous, and I'll probably pass it back to him for the procedures. The miscellaneous, we didn't know where to fit them, because they were really different questions. Like some of them were, is the assessment limited to those organizations ICANN has policy input into? We weren't sure what that meant.

And if the person who asks this could clarify, it says explore DNS analysis, opportunities, physical security. Should we consider KSK signing physical security? ICANN HQ? How can we ensure the secure and reliable unique identifier? How do outside organizations policies effect assessment? So, these were kind of just general guiding questions that came up.

JAMES:

So then, our final category was procedures, and I suppose a number of these questions in my mind relate to ICANN's internal SSR procedures internally, and how effective are they, and are they touching on the points that they want to touch on? And

you know, is that group of policies and procedures internally, meeting the expectations of the community?

And is it actually doing what is actually needed? And I know for me, myself, I have some very specific questions on that, where I think we have gaps that we should be looking at, and maybe that's something that can then be integrated into our overall work product.

PATRICK [DODSON:

Great, thank you. I'm going to pick on Denise here, because she helped with the groupings on the last couple here for the headers. There is always one person that doesn't stay with the whole group, so I usually pick on them and make them read out. So, Denise is my... She's a former client of mine, so I get to turn the tables a little bit here.

DENISE MICHELLE:

Thank you, Patrick. Okay. These are... You want me to do these two? These are two may categories. And so, members posted a number of how questions, surrounding how we would assess the components of the appropriate security contingency planning framework for the internet's system of unique identifiers.

So, this includes both definitions and how we would actually carry this out. And then, this is how a group of questions around

contingency planning, you know, again, into you know, what's covered in contingency planning, and a lot of related issues to contingency planning. Up here, there were two questions that related to the IANA transition. In this category. And then, I think a few odds and ends relating to whether or not the review looks only internally at ICANN processes.

What is ICANN doing to cover interoperability, interoperable security STDs to monitor? And how end users feel about, you know, the SSR, the DNS, and who is responsible for maintenance upkeep of the something, that I can't actually read. What does that look like to you?

A mystery, to be solved. And so the other may, may assess maintain clearance and globally interoperable security processes for these portions of the unique identifiers. There is a group up here, again, and you'll see a thread here, what do we mean by? So, a number of these questions involve definitions of terms that are being used in this section.

Another large group of questions team members posted, that could broadly be grouped under abuse, both in the G and ccTLD space, questions about compliance, obvious mitigation, key issues under SSR that relate to any gTLDs, things like that.

One down here on emerging tech and trends, what emerging technologies and trends should this team be considering? And a

couple here that, I don't know if they fit into a category, how DNS works with secure, reliable, and stable manners? And then root server stability and security.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Great, thank you. Any general comments, observations, questions on these? Otherwise, we can move to the next half exercise.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Maybe one point to note, I think we should have in mind during the public expectation, there was the concern from engaging youth on what we're doing. So, that should also be in our mind. Thank you.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Great, good comment.

Yes, sorry Jeff.

JEFF HOUSTON: No, you're fine. Jeff Houston. I'm struck with what I heard against what I understand ICANN does and does not do. And I understand that this is a security and stability review of what ICANN does, not what I do, or my company, or your company, or

anyone else. ICANN. They don't run the root. They don't run the DNS. They don't run the numbers. They don't run the protocols.

You know, they don't do an awful lot. They actually do very, very, very little. As I understand it, there is a policy forum that determines some of the operating behaviors of some of the labels that are in the root zone of the DNS. And they have some degree of control over a policy process that from time to time, enlist U labels into the root zone of the DNS.

Doesn't do anything else. And so, in terms of security and stability, if you take that very limited role, overseeing a policy process, what is really at the heart of this? Because all of this stuff about, the DNS is horrible. Yes, it's horrible, but it's not ICANN's fault. You know?

All of this stuff, you know? These DDOS attacks every second. It's not ICANN's fault. So, when we try and sort of understand what we can and can't do in this review, it will be good to put a filter on about what ICANN is actually all about. Because it's fine to create a report that says, you know, the internet is a horrible place.

But it's not obvious that ICANN can fix it. And it's not even helpful to say that ICANN is going to fix it, because it's not. It doesn't have the remit. So, you know, when I contrast what we've said and thought, against what ICANN is here to do, I think

that should be a very begetting function about now, when you've got all of these great ideas about making the internet a better place.

And now you've got to understand, to what extent is ICANN able to actually play a role, within its defined remit? That was all. Thanks.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Great, thank you. I took down a note, and I know we'll capture that for the conversation. There is some follow-up as well, so [inaudible] and then James.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I just wanted to fully support what Jeff said. I think we really have to look at what ICANN does. There might be a bit more, if you look at the operations, but it's easy to explore. For example, DNSSEC key signing for example. Running that whole ceremony. I don't know if it should include that or not?

JEFF HOUSTON: IANA.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

JEFF HOUSTON:

It's IANA's function. It's not ICANN's function. I didn't put it in.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, and you're right. So, exactly. But I think this [inaudible] very limited to what ICANN does. I fully support that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

So, I was about to agree wholly with Jeff, but I think given the exercise we just went through with the CCWG, and not only now, is IANA not just a department within ICANN? We've also moved it outside in its own, you know, affiliate. We need to be very careful on deciding what our scoping exercise is first.

And that's why I think we need to be doing a scoping exercise first before we start running head long into anything. And I think that's reinforced by the number of questions we had even around, well, what are the definitions of the terms that we're actually using here?

So, I think you know, given the months and years almost of talking about ICANN's limited remit that we've entered into the CCWG, we need to convey that understanding to the scope of the work for the SSR team as well. And I do think we possibly need

to have a discussion as well about whether PTI is within that remit or not.

Some would say it is, and some would say it's not, but I think we need to have that discussion around the table first before we decide, because that's a pretty big additional chunk to put on the review. So, that's a big part of our scoping as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I won't add much to that, because I was going to say something very similar. I think if we don't start off by looking more generally at the problems that we think are in the general area, then potentially pruning back to something that matters within the remit of ICANN, then I think we wind up defining something too narrowly, or we wind up being too myopic in the work that we're doing.

So, we can certainly start off with a broader threats and broader concerns, and trace the systemic problems to what we actually want to write about. And I think, actually I heard some comments from our public session, that we kind of, some people thought maybe we were a little too broad in what we were talking about, but I think it's certainly better to start off wide, and then pulling that in, as long as you do pull that in.

CARRY ANNE:

Hi. Carry Anne. Kind of to follow-up on what Eric is saying. Jeff, you'd probably be able to guide me on this a bit better, but in terms of the definitions and the scoping that we have to do, I think in doing that and matching it against what our current mandates and frameworks are within our bylaws, I think that is how we'll end up giving final recommendations, but I still think it's important to look widely, to actually see what it is and the challenges that we're facing as a community, because if we are saying that it's a community governed process that we're in now, and a community is managing all of this, I think even if our recommendations are for ICANN, we could at least make recommendations that a community, or observations that the community could consider if not specific recommendations in our scoping, in our assessment.

We can document it somewhere for the community to read, even if it's not a specific recommendation coming from our group. But I'll be guided by the [inaudible] documented anywhere.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Just to, okay. You want to go first?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

You know, the problem about security and stability of the internet is probably a bigger problem than climate change. And

I say that seriously. That's not a vague allegory. This is enormous. And you could spend not only your lifetime, but the lifetime of the next five generations, watching this get worse. You never, ever going to be able to categorize and understand this broader ecosystem.

It is just an impossible problem in terms of its massive scope, and the huge numbers of vectors out there. What you can do in the time available from volunteers and this organization, is assist this organization to do its job. And part of the things we all bring to the table is the context from the broader world.

But, you know, it's not my job, if you will, to bring everyone up to what I know, and it's not yours to bring everyone up to what you know. That's not it. You're bringing what you are and have into this discussion. But the discussion is a discussion about ICANN. Honestly, it is a discussion about ICANN. And as far as I understand right now, maybe it's something that we should talk about.

It's not even a discussion about the PTA. It's a discussion about ICANN, in my view.

JEFF:

Jeff [inaudible]. And it's strange because in some other venues, we don't take it as much, but here...

PATRICK [DODSON]: Okay, so I want to get the agreement on the record. Okay, perfect. Any other last comments here before we go through the next quick exercise? Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry if this is just repeating what others have said around the table, but I think that Jeff's warning is really well-taken. We can end up trying to boil the ocean. And as Eric said, you know, a sort of reaction to that would be to essentially do a clerical exercise, which is like inside baseball times about a billion of how all of the different acronyms and different internal processes are functioning.

Which would suggest would be too narrow. Absolutely, you know, how to fix the broader world of all internet security is far too broad. I think that at this early exploratory phase, we should be encouraging ourselves and each other to come out with the sort of slightly blue sky. We can always eliminate things, but if we don't actually have an environment where we can do things, like you know, suggest things, it will come back to haunt us later in our scope, because it will come out as bubbling out tensions and disagreements about our direction.

So, I think that this reinforces the note that we had at the beginning of this session today, which is great if we manage, you know, within the next five minutes to agree our scope and workplan, terrific. If we need more time, I think we should take it, because we really feel the benefit as we go forward.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Go ahead, [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. This is [inaudible] for the record. The discussion has triggered me to go back up to the initial [inaudible], and I realize that I think the call were made before the actual transition of the IANA thing, and maybe it's high time for the team to go through and see how we can review, because it's better we have forecasts while we're here, and then you can take further discussion. Thank you.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Okay, great. Any other comments on this section? And one thing I'll just bring up, if you remember the visual diagram that was up here earlier about group participatory decision making, that will happen throughout the thing. It's very easy to look at that and say, at the end of this is our recommendation from the review.

It may well be that you have an interim two-ended kind of diagram that just gets down to what is scope. Right. And figuring that out before you dive into everything else that can go further, and that allows you for the exploration that you need to have to just align around the fact that these are the things that we need to address and go through that. So, that's good.

I'm going to shift this real quick to the last exercise. We have about 10 minutes. It's exactly the same as the first exercise, as far as Post-Its. And this one isn't about questions. This one is about comments or ideas or observations or thoughts people have. The framing of it is around how we're going to work together as a review team.

So, you'll see here in a second, I'm going to hand these out. I'm hoping you can just take one and pass them around for me. And two that way, thank you. There are a handful of buckets of categories that the staff has identified from previous reviews, experience, as far as topics to tackle under the larger umbrella of, what are the aspects of how we'll work together? How we'll work with the community? How we'll work with the Board?

Those types of efforts and activities. You'll see some of the stations up. I have one on... We have one on approach to the work. And there are some framing questions. They're not exhaustive, and they're hopefully not too directive, but they

hopefully give a sense of the kinds of information that we're hoping to solicit from folks here.

So, under the category of approach to the work, for example, how should this group organize to tackle the different aspects of the review? And just thoughts and ideas that people have on that. If we could get those surfaced and posted up, then we can capture that, bring it back to this group to frame more of those discussions. Transparency and communications is another category, as far as how to make sure that the work is done in an open and transparent fashion, and what are the communication vehicles to keep the community apprised of activities.

And then role of outside experts. I know the topic of consultants has come up already. At the risk of being overly dramatic, I needed the wall space. So, we have the other sections here. Team structure. You know, is it a single chair? Are there co-chairs? Are you going to use subgroups and rapporteurs?

These are all different vehicles and mechanisms that have been used in sort of getting thoughts about that. The role of staff. What should staff do? What should staff not do? And then my last dramatic reveal. And then also bringing in lights. So, that helps with the metaphor here of exposure. Reporting metrics. How do we reflect progress? What should we be measuring?

What does that look like as far as how we want to convey our activity milestones, progress, lack of progress? Whatever that needs to look like to the community, or the other specific stakeholder groups, OEC, and the Board, etc. And then the decision-making format. Consensus. Which flavor of consensus we're talking about? How do we want to make decisions?

How do we deal with dissenting opinions? Or, if we run into an impasse? So these are the different topics. I'll ask everybody to just take the next eight minutes or so until our 1:15 shows up, and do the same exercise, Post-Its, of anything that you think we should or shouldn't consider, post them in the appropriate places.

We will not get to discuss them right away, but I know that there is a little bit of open time in the afternoon where there is some flexibility after we have the speakers that have made time on the agenda, that if we want to come back and discuss these we can. And we'll do our very best to capture this information in a way that's easy for everybody to read out, if not at the end of the day, shortly thereafter. Thank you.

One last final note. These are also not exhaustive categories. So, if there is something that you think you want to bring up for the discussion to the group, that isn't captured under one of these themes, please do that and then just post them on the

door, and we'll capture those as the parking lot of new topics as well.

MARGIE:

All right. Thank you everyone.

The next topic we wanted to cover with you while, and we have Xavier here from ICANN finance, just to talk a little bit about the budget process and information about how we report out to the community on the financial spend and other aspects related to the review team. So, let's introduce the team.

So, we have our CFO, Xavier, and we also have [Charla] who will talk about the fact sheet, and I'll give you all a little bit of information as well.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Margie. Hello everyone. Thank you for taking the time to allow us to speak. We wanted to be able to offer for you our understanding, a number of thoughts, ideas, and practices that apply either to projects generally, or more specifically to reviews. And that would help you in the management, in quotes, of the review.

Can I have the next slide please? As a preamble to going a little bit deeper into this slide, I think with the empowered

community, the post-transitions, I would nearly argue reviews are even more so important than they were in the past. They are an extremely critical element of how ICANN as an overall organization with its community, demonstrates its effectiveness.

And therefore, these reviews are key in the sense that they need to happen, one, and second, they need to be effective. So, that they can produce recommendations that demonstrate that the ICANN organization as a whole is accountable to the public. So, the effectiveness of those reviews is a critical element. They need to be successful, these reviews, they're important for everyone.

Because if we would have reviews that are not effective, it's like we don't have reviews. So, one of the many elements that help with the effectiveness of the reviews is, a certain amount of guidelines to help going through the work, and among those guidelines there is, to establish a project plan, so that you define what is the scope of the review on the basis of that scope, what are the objectives that we want to achieve with the review team, relative to that scope?

And with the objectives, you then define how do you achieve those objectives, and that leads, gives you a project plan. So, defining your project plan is obviously something very key at the beginning of the review, so that then you can plan for the work,

and therefore also plan for the resources that the review will require.

Once that plan is established, the resources are defined and the budget is established, then that's your plan. Then you carry out the work. And then you monitor how you are doing against your plan. You wanted to have milestone number one done by a certain time, you check where you are in, if you're not exactly completing milestone one, where you were planning but you revise your plan.

So, this is a guideline for your effectiveness and for your success. Managing the cost is just an element of that overall project plan monitoring you. You will monitor the milestones, your progress in terms of deliverables, as well as in terms of the costs that will be involved. And another element is, of course, that management of the project that this review constitutes, we will need to be able to track it and report on it.

To be able to inform many different parties during, and of course, at the end of the review, on progresses, on findings, on maybe we want to share preliminary results at some points with various parties of the community, with maybe the Board. So, the tracking and monitoring of the activity of the reviews throughout its life, and at its conclusion is obviously the natural element of having planned the review, and we'll also help

demonstrate the accountability of this review team to the community.

Because you are taking on a responsibility on behalf of the community, to carry out this review for ICANN, to be able to establish, what are the recommendations that will make ICANN better as a whole relative to, in this case, SSR? So, and SSR is one of the five strategic objectives of ICANN in its mission. There is no more important than one of those strategic objectives.

It's very important that you can demonstrate the accountability of ICANN through this review, and your work will be visible by the entire community. So, you're taking on a responsibility, and these guidelines help you demonstrate that you're doing a good job in that responsibility, and that you're accountable to the community in carry out the review.

So, the transparency, of course, on the project that the review constitutes and on the progress of the review, is of course, an element of accountability, but I don't need to explain that to you. I'm sure you know it better than I do. Next slide. Or, maybe I should... Let me step back for a second.

Are there any questions? Can I have the previous slide? Are there any questions, or any comments, at this stage? Not yet. Okay, next slide. So, we are ahead of that project plan that I discussed a little bit earlier. We don't yet know the structure and

the extent of the work. So, right now, everything is a little bit placeholder, it's a little bit envelope. So, simply on the basis of past experience, not on the basis of what you're project plan will be. We have placeholder budgets of funds put away to be able to start the work.

But again, these are placeholders until we have the visibility of the resource requirements associated with the project plan that you will put together. And again, the amounts that you see here are based upon historical experience, except for those travel and face to face meeting expenses that have already been incurred, or committed to between this meeting and the Madrid meeting that I think is scheduled to happen in May.

Like for any expenses, or every and any expenses that ICANN incurs, expenditures need to be documented, with a rationale and an approval and [inaudible]. There is staff here will be my witness that at ICANN, you can't spend a dollar without the approval of the, right Steve? Without the approval of at least a department manager, and an officer, and me, if I'm not that officer.

So, but of course, it's a process. There is a standard process of requesting an expense to be incurred, whether it's for a trip, whether it's for hiring a consultant, or for any other purpose, and that's a very standard process.

But of course, the expenses for the reviews go through that process as well. And so, on the basis of preliminary envelopes, as you know, until the review has established its project plan, the budgets are usually preliminary, but we use those preliminary envelopes to insert, to be inserted in the budget that is offered to the Board for approval. So, of course, those reviews, there is a review that's starting two months from now, but that would carry out work in FY 18.

We have put a placeholder in the budget draft that's just been published for public comment, because we don't yet know the precise numbers associated with that specific review that would start two months from now. So, in the budget, until we have more precise numbers resulting from the project plan, then we put the placeholders in them.

So, that's what the Board would approve. And if therefore, the specific work of the review would lead that envelope to be exceeded because the project plan suggests that it would, or involves resources that then would lead to more spend than the envelope, then we would need to go back to the Board for approval, which is normal and standard process, in quotes, but requires a request, and of course, the natural, logical documentation of expenses.

Let me stop there to see if there are comments, questions, clarifications. Yes. I have... I don't know in which order, Denise, and Carry Anne, and James. So, Denise, James, and Carry Anne.

DENISE MICHELLE:

Thanks, Xavier. And I was multi-tasking so apologies if I missed this, but I just wanted to confirm that ICANN still operates on a user lose budget by fiscal year, and that your fiscal year ends at the end of June. And if that's the case, can you note, is this the proposal for the next fiscal year in July? Or is this currently? And if it's currently, can you note what the amounts are for the next fiscal year? Thanks.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

So, it's, we are changing that. So, since you were involved, we have changed the approach of use or lose, because it's a nightmare for everyone. So, what Denise is referring to is the fact that we plan on a fiscal year basis, right? So, we plan for activities between two dates, which are July 1st and June 30th of the following year, that's 12 months.

But of course, the reviews, like many other projects, they don't fit within a specific fiscal year. One, they can take more than a fiscal year, more than 12 months. And second, they may simply not fit. They don't start, this is beyond July 1st and don't finish

necessarily on June 30th. So, we have been confronted in the past with the challenge of scheduling or thinking that a review is going to start at a certain date, budgeting accordingly, and then the review started a different date, and then the budget that was put into the period of 12 months, would actually need to be used maybe six months later, and into a different fiscal year.

So, it's been a complication to manage the budget and expenses of the review, simply because what was budgeted was actually happening at a different timing. So, what we are now trying to do is simply to look at the envelope associated with the review, in quotes, irrespective of when it happens.

So, the amounts that are here are for the review. They are not for a fiscal year. Now, of course, there is a presumed duration of the review that is assumed in those numbers, but not when it happens. Simply how long it happens. Of course, if a review last two years instead of one year, but there is likelihood that it will cost more. But that's a different topic.

This is the duration, presumed duration of the review. So, no, we're not on a use or lose basis anymore, and I think that will help a lot, everyone to manage the budgets.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi Xavier. Me and Xavier are good friends at this stage. And so I have a couple of questions, all the slides are gone, but up on the slides, there was a 350K for travel and meetings. Can I ask, does that include personal costs? Or is that T&E only?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes, it's just the travel yes. Travel and lodging and [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I ask then, where our 0.1 that was in the FY 18 budget has now become 350 already? So, that's a tripling based on what was in the FY 18 budget.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sorry, I missed what you were asking.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, in the FY 18 budget, it was marked 0.1 K, sorry 0.1, so 100,000 for T&E for the SSR2, we have a note here of 350 is already budgeted, that's a...

XAVIER CALVEZ: So, this is part of the challenge that... If you look at the FY 18 budget, you're only looking at one slide of the overall review allocation, because the review has been, has started, you guys

are here now, and you have started work in FY 17. So, what we will need to do is reconcile together the total allocation of the review, irrespective of the fiscal years.

And we then parse that out to be able to say, well we think something is going to happen in FY 18, or in FY 17. What we are telling you, and the answer to Denise’s question, is that the envelopes that you see there, will be allocated to the review irrespective of when the work happens. And then we will need to do a bit of a reconciling exercise, to match numbers of the budgets of the fiscal years.

Just so that you know, we’ve been trying to develop with the Board a mechanism where we extract the reviews, like other multi-year projects, we extract them from the annual budget, and we track them and fund them separately as multi-year projects, so that we don’t have that problem. It’s been in the works, we’ve been discussing it with the Board, and they didn’t get implemented in the FY 18 budget, but I’m stubborn, and I will continue to try to convince the Board that this is the right way to look at it, because it shouldn’t matter when we do the work.

What should matter is that, when it happens, it’s funded, it’s predictable, visible for you in the community, that a review is happening, is funded, and if it’s happy earlier or later, it should not matter.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So yeah, that feeds perfectly into my next question. So, I'm going to raise a concern straight away is that, I believe the SSR review team is probably one of the most complex reviews that is going to take place, yet it is the lowest funded if you look between FY 17 and FY 18, it is the lowest funded of all of the review teams.

So, I'm going to put up a hand right now and say, there may be a point that we reach, maybe six, nine months from now, where we may need to go back to the Board to extend that envelope, due to the complexity of the work that I think is going to come down the path.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Absolutely. And that speaks to what we were saying earlier is that, it is worthwhile that you spend time to define the scope of the review, simply because the better the scope is defined, I don't mean broader or narrower, I just mean the better it is defined, the more chances you have that changes in scope will be limited in the future, and that if you have defined well the scope at the outset, the resource requirement associated with it will be more clear.

So then, you can very upfront, develop the workplan, the resource requirement, and therefore the budget envelope that you think you will need for that review. And then you can engage very early on with the Board. Set expectations, which will, you know... If you go ask for money on the basis of, these are the objectives, this is what we need to do it, and this is the resources that it takes, it's a very compelling argument, right?

Because if you ask for money now and say, well, we think it's going to last a long time. Well, okay, but to do what? You know, so I think that logical framework or framing of the work of the review, and therefore, the plan of the review, is very helpful to you to make sure that you get the resources that you need.

And that you can demonstrate not only to the Board, by the way, but to the community. We are spending X amount of dollars to do this, and that's very important. You need to do that. You need to be able to do that. Your taking on a responsibility that you need to be able to demonstrate how you are delivering on it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The question was in relation to... If there was a need at some point, we've been speaking about consultants. We've been speaking about consultants and experts, and if it is at some point, we needed to procure those services, it's not within the community are available to us, and we have to procure, the

question is two-fold. One, as the TOR is developed, and the whole procurement process is done through the staff?

And the second question, is if the persons quote exceeds our available budget, and then we have to go then through the whole process of the Board to get additional budget. It's something that could come back to the team, so we could actually determine whether or not we want to go ahead with the procurement, and that would leave us with less money in the kit, at the end of the day, or is it something that once the process starts, it has to end?

So, whatever is available to be used up for that consultant.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, that's very interesting and good question. So, I'll speak about theoretically at this stage, because we don't yet know how much and what. We have a, for any expenses that the organization incurs, there is a procurement process. That procurement process has different thresholds. We apply of thresholds of \$150,000 for a RFP.

Having, sorry, a request for proposal, a competitive bid, basically. Formally, asked defining work to be done, and asking for vendors, for companies to bid on doing this work for a certain amount of money. So, we do that for every expenses at

\$150,000 or above. But we also do that sometimes for projects that are less than that, where the project is either sensitive, visible, or there is sometimes a lot of available resources to do it.

So, as an example for the audit of the financial statements of ICANN, we've done a RFP, even though the spend would be more in the \$100,000, but we felt it was important to demonstrate that we had very competitive bidding for such an independent type of audit.

So, it's a governance matter. We felt it was useful to do it. It cost money to do a RFP, right? It costs resources. It takes time. But it helps us an organization, demonstrate our accountability, managing adequately the funds of ICANN. So, we have a process for RFPs, and we would obviously need that you, formally the request, and the work, right?

The work that needs to be done by that resource, which should let us, at the beginning of the process on the basis of the description of that work, we should be able to engage a bit how much it would cost. Maybe not precisely, but at least we should have an idea. And I think that on the basis of that idea, we can check whether or not it fits within the envelopes or not.

So, that's why I'm talking a little bit theoretically. But so, that would be how we would figure out at the onsite whether there is a risk or a chance that it fits within the [inaudible].

MARGIE:

And I can speak to how it works on the review teams, because we've had this come up with the CCT review, for example. And so, you're going to hear from the DNS abuse study. At the time when we did the RFP, I think we were at the envelope, so we went back and asked for funds to be able to solicit bids for that study.

And then, we worked with the review team to get the criteria for the RFP. So, that's how, you know, because obviously, you want to make sure that the vendor selected is meeting the kinds of criteria and scope of the project. So, that's where the review team comes in, is to provide that kind of input. And then after the procurement is done, certain things like, for example, the price of the contract, but that's confidential, obviously, but the whole process along the way, there is involvement with the review team so that you have at least the scope of work and the qualifications that are being looked at.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Just to add to that, thank you, Margie. The most important input from the review team is, what type of work needs to be done, the output, right? What does the vendor need to provide? Which is, of course, the reason why you need those vendors, and the criteria for selection is where, as a next step, you have also

input because how the work needs to be provided, the level of quality, the level of qualification, if you know it, that you think that the vendors need to satisfy, these are all going into the RFP that's published.

So that vendors know this is what the output is, this is the criteria that you will be evaluated upon if you bid. So, the input from the entire team on the criteria is very important so that we define well the question, and therefore you get good answers. Whether we meet or we don't meet the requirements.

But the better the questions that have been answered, asked, the better quality the answer will be as well. So, criteria will be very important. We have Alan and [inaudible], you're good? Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Very quick question. The professional services budget and discretionary, thank you very... First of all, thank you very much for coming to the meeting, and for giving us this overview, because it's really useful on the onset to have this sense of like, this is our budget and something we have to work within. That's really, really helpful.

One of the options that I think personally works very well with a group of volunteers, is that a lot of work is progressed during

face to face meetings, and that we sometimes see, with the review teams, that intersessional meetings take place and clearly there is a cost attached. Is that something that would come out of that sort of professional services pot? And be reallocated into an additional travel spend?

Or, how would it be...? First of all, is the option available to us to call intersessional face to face meetings, if necessary? And two, where would the money come from? Would it be a go ask the Board? Or, will it come from the existing funds?

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you. Very good question as well. So, the travel, as we said, the travel budget that's laid out here, again, is a placeholder, not yet knowing what the plan is. But on the basis of your working plan, and the number of face to face meetings versus virtual and [inaudible], there will be a sense of whether this is sufficient or not, which is why, I think, your workplan is very important.

Once that's established, fast forwarding, you've provided a plan that may be exceeded the envelope that's here. You've gone to the Board, there is approval from the Board, off we go, working. I think within that plan then, depending upon the adjustments that you want to do to that working plan along the way, because you'll see more progress, less progress, or some things that you

thought would be easier to deal with face to face, or taking too long during the face to face, anyway.

Whatever adjustment you think you need to make, if it can first be done within the envelope, by maybe saying, we don't see a need for as much professional services funds as we thought we needed, but we see a need for more face to face meeting, if you can, you know, work out the plan with the help of the staff to reallocate the resources within the overall envelope, I think that's the first thing to try to do. And then it [inaudible] doesn't, right?

And if it doesn't, then we get back to the process of formulating a workplan and going to the Board for approval.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Let me also let you know that that number, we've done an assumption based on past reviews, and so that estimates six meetings. So, you know, if you end up needing more, then we go through the process, but that's a rough estimate for six.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I've heard you many times say, well, we've defined the scope for the travel, get a sense of what it costs. But I want to put it this way. Are you expecting us to provide a budget, and to provide a budget as part of this group to work on the budget,

after we have defined the scope, etc.? And you know if the envelope, and we lose, we went to [inaudible] based on our budget, then probably you have an idea of what it costs, and if you expect some extra money, etc.

This is the first question. The second question is, I saw something set there for this meeting in Madrid. It looked like someone already made a decision for Madrid. Is it you? No.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I actually don't know about the, who made the decision for Madrid.

DENISE MICHELLE: This is Denise Michelle. I think it was a sort of, just, yeah, suggestions of how... Like an example of a work plan and schedule might unfold. I think staff provided just as an initial stepping off point for us to think about, and to give you a heads up that a bunch of things are happening in Madrid around that time. But I think it's completely up to us how we want to meet.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So, on your first question, hopefully I've understood it correctly. I think that once you've established the work plan, and in parallel, by establishing the work plan, the support staff will also

start quantifying with you, right? So, if we're saying well, we want 25 face to face meeting over one year, this is going to be a problem, right?

So, not only because of the cost but also because of the time it takes from you, but therefore, everything that you will design in the work plan, quickly the staff can help associate amounts to it, so that as you design, you can have the feedback of the money at the same time and say, well, maybe we want to do a bit more of this and a bit less of that, to try to fit within the budget.

So, the staff will help you get costs that are obviously estimated, but on the basis of a certain amount of experience. It's not rocket science. We have a good guess, you know? And then once the plan is established, then it's easier to refine.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Do we have to have a budget to be approved? Because are you saying, we have a sense, but this may not go as we expect. If we do not have some, let's say, the budget approved where we all know exactly what we can do. Because here we have some money set, 500 K, maybe we need the double of this.

So, maybe we have to start from a budget to be approved.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes. The budget does not have to be precise. What I mean by that, you don't know exactly how much the flight ticket is going to cost in six months from now, right? So, the budget is an estimate to begin with. Right. So, it doesn't have to be precise, but it follows the work plan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My main thing, that we need to get this budget approved by the ICANN Board or somebody, so I think this might mean...

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Right. So, what you know already is that the budget that we are showing up here, is already, in quotes, approved by the Board, or it's FY 18, fraction will be approved by the Board as part of the standard process. But again, this is a placeholder without yet knowing the workplan.

So once the workplan has been established, you will then have a view of what the total amount is, and then we can compare to that, and see if there is a need to go back to the Board.

We have [inaudible] and then James. And I think that's it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. James, mine is related to budget, so thanks. I just wanted to point out that because SSR2 is a special, in a way,

because it's community review of security and stability of the services that ICANN org provides. And because of that, actually I think we have to be extra careful with budgeting, and we need to document that properly from the very beginning.

So, as soon as we have a workplan, I think we need to at least come up with the estimate of trips and everything. The reason being, it can easily put us in a strange position with Board, because of the nature of this review, if for example, we want another half a million, and Board for their own reasons, they cannot allocate that, this can be seen, wrongly, as Board trying to block a review of organization.

So, I think we really need to be from [inaudible] basically, have proper budgeting as soon as it's possible, and keep updating the estimates and all of that. So, we need small stream, working stream, during our review, to make sure the budgeting is clear.

JAMES:

I think that actually feeds very well into my question. So Xavier, I assume that the moment the concept is that either Margie or Carole will be the budget owner for this. Do you foresee the possibility of moving to the way that we end up with CCWG? I know that was at a different scale, but where there is a co-ownership of the budget, and a co-ownership of managing that allocation, you know, between the review team and ICANN staff.

Or, is that something that you've thought about?

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

I think we need to look at what the needs are, right? I mean, so far, the reviews, the work of the reviews has not required to put in place such an infrastructure, in quotes. Having said that, there is, there has been for a long time, and we are offering as well, mechanisms that look like what has been done for the CCWG accountability, like WS2, like the facts sheet that [inaudible] will go over that presents all of the elements of the review, its projects, the milestones, the progress, the costs.

And that fact sheet will be published. So, that's a mechanism that mirrors, you know, the CCWG accountability process. The very specific ownership of the cost that's been designed into the WS2, was specific to the, how innovative, in quotes, the work of WS1 and 2 has been, and that we didn't really know where it was going to go, and the conversations that happen in the subgroups, feed then a need that needs to be established.

So, locating the management of the resources to be able to progress within the ownership of each of the subgroups, or at the CCWG level, was helping the community drive a work that is defining itself as it goes. The review is a little bit different is that there is an objective already defined. Now, the scope, of course, needs to be defined as well.

But, it doesn't feel yet that there is a need for that. Now, it's an infrastructure to put in place, and it always can be considered, I would argue, let's do it only if we think it's necessary. You want to add something?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We do something, right now, with the CCT. It's just a little different, it's not quite what you're familiar with. But, as part of the leadership discussions, we identify someone on the team to be the, you know, kind of the budget owner in the sense that they work with us, and so, in the example of a RFP, that person might know what the actual cost the RFP is, versus you might not.

You know? Just so that can help kind of keep the costs down, and understand...

JAMES: Yeah, and that's exactly the scenario...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But it's not something, it's not exactly the same as what you're used to, but [CROSSTALK]...

JAMES: ...version of.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We're also, we're running out of time on this topic, so just if you can wrap up, and then we'll have [inaudible] go really quickly on the fact sheet.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I'm done if there are no more questions. There is a question right here.

KATHY: Yes, Kathy [inaudible]. I have a really quick one, and I don't know who it is for. So, whoever wants to answer it. Did I miss...? Is there an assumption that we will be meeting, always meeting at ICANN meetings? And intersessional meetings we may have? I mean, is the budget figured that there will be in Johannesburg and Abud Dhabi having meetings?

I just, I don't know. This is my first team.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We generally assume that the teams want to meet, because there is a lot of consultation that goes on with the community, but it's not a given if it turns out that you feel that one meeting isn't necessary, or you'd rather meet outside of the ICANN meetings. You know, it's up to you.

KATHY: Yeah, just a question. If the budget was figured, because it's clearly cheaper to meet at an ICANN meeting then it is at an intercessional. It was kind of figured based that we probably meet. That was the only question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just a few minutes. We have our guests on the next... I'm sorry. James, are you done with your...? Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, next slide. So, [inaudible], I work for the MSSI team with Margie and Karen. So, I know this is really hard to read on the screen, but the fact sheet, as Xavier mentioned in his discussion, will be posted quarterly. Right now, it's very skeletal because you guys have some work to do on it. And once I start getting feedback from you guys, I can start populating this document.

There is a section for naming the chair, once that's determined. If there are subgroups that wind up being formed, that information will be put up there. Over on the top right, you can see the review status section. That was the dates, estimated dates of the review, and there is a bar chart that will show...

Thank you for the little laser. Look at that. I don't know if I'm good with these.

All right, let's see how I do. So, this section up here, review status. It shows that right now, we're estimating that the review will take about 12 months. Obviously, that could change depending on your workplan. And the bar charts there on the complete... Right there. Complete based on duration. That will track through the workplan, depending on what month it is.

The section below that is the budget spent. And how much has been committed. So, for example, if you wind up having a meeting in Madrid, you know, that's going to cost X amount of dollars. That will actually show up in that bar chart. Over to the left on the section, it's broken down in sections. Section people.

Right now, I have attendance from your first call in March 2nd in here, and I also have your attendance from the session over the weekend. And so right now, we show 16 review team members. And so, there is various tracking mechanisms that we have on a different sheet that's feeding into this, but these numbers will continue to change after every call.

So, then over to the right, we have the financial section. And you'll see that's completely blank right now as we continue to determine what the budget is, and this will get populated with actual figures and committed services. So then, down at the

bottom, once you guys determine your workplan, you'll have some milestones that come out of that, and this was an example.

There is headings here for project management, research and studies, draft report and final report. So, we have main buckets for the work. Once you determine your workplan, we'll start populating the milestones in here, and then you can start seeing the progress towards completion on each of those, and then that feeds over to the right on a full completion of the project.

So, this will be published on a quarterly basis. But it will be, I'll be updating it constantly, along with a few others on the team. So, this will be posted on the Wiki. Questions? Denise?

DENISE MICHELLE:

Denise Michelle. Just a quick comment. Since we're half an hour behind, perhaps you can send a link to the email list of the members, linking to this, and then also giving us the sort of due dates of when you're going to be posting the exact dates and when we need to get it to you. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, Xavier. Okay. So, I think we're done on this topic. We have a photographer here to take your picture. So, we have a picture for everyone.

So, the next phase of the agenda is, we've invited the vendors from the DNS abuse study, that is being conducted for the CCT review. We thought it would be helpful for you to hear their methodology and what they're actually working on, because that might help you understand what else you might want to, you know, try to commission as you do your work.

Brian, do you want to introduce our guests?

BRIAN:

I'll introduce myself as well. My name is Brian [inaudible]. I'm from ICANN staff. I haven't met, I don't think, anyone from the review team yet, so just a little bit about my background, and where in ICANN I fit, I'm on the operations and policy research department, which falls under domain name services industry engagement, which falls under the global domains division.

We have been working on the CCT review team, as Margie mentions. My background, as relevant to this review team, is actually in research methods and design. So, as you go through your research projects that you are thinking of commissioning, if you want to commission primary research, I'm happy to assist with the design and methods for any questions you may want to answer in a more rigorous and sort of structured way.

Can we go to the next slide please? Oh-oh, that's not us.

[Speaker off microphone]

Okay, great. Right. We have with me, from [inaudible] Labs, is Martin [inaudible], and [inaudible] from the [inaudible] University of Technology. And they're the research consortium that we've contracted to conduct this study. So, I'll go a little bit over the background, then turn it over to them to talk on the methodology and plan research, which hopefully, should be of relevance to this team.

So, next slide please. So, go back to 2009, before the new gTLD program. It's when it was being considered. There was a memo that came out on some mitigating malicious conduct, and it was presented to the cybersecurity community, to put it very generally, on how malicious conduct could be mitigated in the new gTLD program.

The community came up with the four questions you see on your left. And on your right, you see the recommendations that came out of that work. They're nine there. The ninth one always seems to get the most questions, but it was one that didn't actually pan out, so you have seen these recommendations integrated into various parts of the registry agreement, different areas.

So, you're probably familiar with a lot of these thick WHOIS, centralized zone file access. All of this kind of started with this

discussion back in 2009. Next slide, please. Fast forward to 2016, we have the new gTLD program safeguards against DNS abuse. This revised report, and this was an aide to the CCT review team. And it was tasked with the fundamental question of how to measure the effectiveness of those safeguards you just saw.

And we have here, and this was included in that report, a very base research model, looking at the expansion of the DNS at a very high level, as an explanatory variable, with the response variable being a DNS abuse rate, however you measured it. And you can see there is a number of proxy measures for that, and this has evolved quite a bit as you will see.

And we're only in sort of a very narrow segment of this research model right now, but that's the sort of general idea. And within that sort of cause effect chain there, we see safeguards as a kind of intervening variable that would presumably have an effect on a DNS abuse rate, which is what we're testing right now.

Next slide. I believe, right. Okay. So, this is just a bit about the CCT review team. They kicked this off. What they really wanted was to establish a baseline measure of abuse rates in new compared to legacy gTLDs, in order to gauge safeguard effectiveness.

They also saw this as a proxy for trust, which was one of their main review areas. Such that, in that changes in the abuse rate would hypothetically effect a change in trust. And the review team also recommends, in the draft report, ongoing DNS abuse measurement. You can see the timeline on your bottom left.

We're trying to get a final report out by June 2017. And we are looking for more data, that's one of our big tasks here at ICANN 58. So, we've got some good leads on that, so expect more on this in the coming months. And with that, I will turn it over to our researchers, who will talk more about the methodology and what we're doing.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Okay, thank you Brian. Next slide, please. Next. Okay, as Brian has already mentioned, [inaudible] to [inaudible] formed a consortium for this study. The study was issued and request by the consumer choice trust and competition review team. Next slide, please. So, the goal of this study is to come up with a statistical comparison of the abuse rates in new and the legacy gTLDs. And to do that, we'll be looking at spam, phishing, malware, botnet, command and control incidents.

Also, we'll be trying to do a statistical analysis of potential relationships with abuse drivers, one of such could be DNSSEC

and implementation. And other drivers, which may not be identified by future review teams. Next slide.

Thank you. All right, so the motivation for this study is, of course, that ICANN, with its new gTLD program enabled the adding of hundreds of new gTLDs to the root, which also included safeguards intended to mitigate rates of abuse, abusive, malicious, and criminal activity in these new gTLDs.

Next slide, please. So, in order to do that, we need data, of course. So, we're using different types of data. For instance, to look at malicious domain names that have been registered, or have been compromised. We're using domain name blacklists. We're using some well-known, reputable blacklists such as anti-phishing working group, which contains phishing URLs, [inaudible] which contain malware URLs, and also secure domain foundation, which contains malware URLs, phishing URLs, and other suspicious or bad faith domains. Next slide, please.

We also use WHOIS data in order to be able to link up a domain name which is reported in a black list with a registrar or registrant. We're using data from WHOIS XML API, which has been contracted by ICANN to provide this data. This data contains all of the WHOIS information about the new gTLDs for the last three years.

It also contains a subset of the older legacy gTLDs, such as com, net, and org. There are some limitations, data I will come back to that. And also, we're using domain name data, of course, and for that we use zone files. We have zone files for each gTLD. One zone file per day over a three year period. Next slide, please. Yeah, sure.

DENISE MICHELLE:

This is Denise Michelle. So, I found that the central zone file data portal, that is supposed to contain, you know, the contractually obligated daily zone file data from every new gTLD, in fact, doesn't contain the zones files. Are you experiencing the same thing?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

So, yeah. For this study, we got all zone files from ICANN, but to answer your question, from my experience, because we are in the centralized zone file program, it's quite difficult to get all zones all of the time. We probably will need to monitor it every single day. Yeah, so that's the answer to your question, but for the purpose of this study, we are getting the data from ICANN directly.

DENISE MICHELLE: And are you confident that ICANN itself is getting these every day? And is ICANN compliance able to assist in getting the registries to respond that aren't?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think that's a different question. Can you repeat it and put it...? Can you repeat the question?

DENISE MICHELLE: I know we're behind, so why don't I just follow-up with you by email?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, sure.

MARTIN: To get back on that issue, that we did check briefly to see if we get, had every zone file for each day for each TLD, and it seemed to be that it was there. There were some small gaps, mainly due to operational issues, I guess, like one or two days missing for particular gTLDs, which for our study, really isn't a big issue.

And yeah. So, basically we didn't use the centralized zone file access program, we just used a different way to synchronize our data with ICANN data. Okay, let's, oh yeah. So, for the purpose of this study, we divided the gTLDs into two groups, and we

have, you have the legacy gTLDs, such as com, net, org, and the new gTLDs, part of the new gTLD program, and the study contains several components.

And depending on the type of data used by components, we are able to use different numbers of legacy gTLDs. For instance, when we look at TLD level aggregations, discounting the abuse across TLDs, we can use the zone files. And we have 17 legacy gTLDs in our zone files, but when we try to differentiate between maliciously registered and compromised domains, or aggregate across registrars, we need to use the WHOIS data.

And the WHOIS data only contains information about nine legacy gTLDs. So, there is a slight limitation there. Next slide, please. One other limitation regarding the WHOIS data is that we have to, feeling that the vendor for the WHOIS data is, creates a snapshot of every domain name in existence, at a certain point, and then starts scanning all of the domains in that set.

And in that period, when the provider is scanning, there might be new domain names that get registered, domain names get dropped. So, we might be missing some short-lived domains in the scanning period, which might affect the study. Next slide, please.

And this is important, really important for us that we already have some really nice data feeds, and during this week, we had some really interesting talks with potential new data feeds, but we're still also really interested in more phishing information, malware information, or bot net and spam information.

And also, if possible, information about up times, which up time is like the time between the, when a domain name is included in a malware or a blacklist, and a time when the domain name has been dropped by the registrar or cleaned up by the host.

So, if any of you have any ideas on how to get more of this data, please come and talk to us. Next slide. I'll turn it over to my colleague.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thanks, Martin. So now, I'll discuss a little bit more about the methodology that we developed for the purpose of this study. So, to study the concentration or distribution of malicious content, across different intermediaries such as registrars or TLDs, we propose three occurrence metrics that we developed for the purpose of our previous study, [inaudible] TLD, also together with SIDN.

So, first, we propose to analyze the occurrence or the number of unique domains. Although this is the most commonly used, and

most intuitive metric, it also has its limitations. Because it does not give an indication of the amount of badness coming from a single domain.

Next slide, please. So, for that purpose, we propose a second complimentary occurrence, security metric, which is the number of fully qualified domain names. For example, [inaudible] and bot nets, they extensively use domain generation algorithms. I imagine a bot master reduced during single unique second level domain name, and then he's automatically generating large number of subdomains, and a subset of those is used in, as a rendezvous point for compromised end users and malicious [inaudible] and control server.

But this metric also has its own limitations. And again, it does not give an indication of how much badness is associated with single qualified domain name. Next slide, please. So, for that reason, we propose also to count the number, or to analyze the number of unique URLs.

Quite often, [inaudible] occurs, used a compromised websites to distribute malicious content, using URLs, or using distinctive patterns. So, this study also stems from our ongoing work with the Dutch national police, where we analyze URLs used to distribute child abuse material, and we see that one fully qualified domain name can be used to distribute just one photo.

Another one can be used extensively to distribute a lot of photos using distinctive [inaudible]. And also what we did, we cross-check with the other types of abuse, such as malware, phishing and so on. So, this trend is indeed persistent. Next slide, please.

So, there are quite a lot of reports out there, that discuss distributions of different type of abuse compromised machines, compromised end users, malicious domain names and so on and so on. And very often, those guys with the highest concentrations are called the worst. And the questions like, is that always correct? Not necessarily, because repetition metrics, they really should account for a trend that the big market players experience larger, or march larger, concentrations of abuse. Next slide, please.

Or in other words, size matters here. So, our repetition metrics, our free occurrence metrics that we proposed, account also for size. Next slide, please. So, the size of a TLD can be used as an explanatory factor for concentrations of abused domains. And in fact, it can be interpreted as the attack surface size for cyber criminals. I will discuss this point later a bit more.

So, how do we estimate the size of TLDs? We use zone files, and we count the number of second level domains registered in each gTLD. There are at least alternative methods, one would be to check monthly ICANN reports on active domains, but the

problem with this approach is that there also those numbers also include domains that were registered by registrants. But they never associate... But for example, they never associated the domain with NS server, so they're not in the zone.

But at the same time, they're not exposed to the attacks. So, in this case, using zone files to estimate the size of gTLDs, is the right approach. It also, it of course, has some limitations. There is a large portion of domains in new gTLDs, with NS records that do not resolve yet. And according to some previous research, on average, it's 16%. So, this is large number.

And our solution there, we are going to make some active measurements to determine domains that are active, or in use by gTLDs. Next slide, please. To determine, so our study is, of course, mainly about gTLDs, but then also about registrars.

To determine the size of registrars, we use WHOIS data, and we count the number of second level domains registered in each registrar. And it's even more challenging than before. Single entity can have, of course, multiple different names. Just as an example, we found the registrar using 52 distinct name variations.

Probably you can guess which one I'm talking about. And the solution here, is we performed an additional entity resolution step to try to group together different names of single registrars.

So, what we did, simply, we changed the registrar names to lowercase, we removed the information, additional information between parenthesis.

We removed some keywords like LLC or dot corp, indicating the business type of registrar, and so on. Few were other things, and then we reduced the number of registrars by 58%. There is a question? Please.

DENISE MICHELLE:

Yes, Denise Michelle. So, we've noticed that there is a small number of new gTLDs with a high percentage of abuse rate. We've also noticed, in correlation between registries and registrars, that have, that significantly reduce fees or offer free domains, and the amount of spam. Are you doing any data collection or research around that issue? Which also enables, you know, abusers who register and drop names fairly quickly.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yes. So, in our study, we try to, first of all, verify the absolute number of abusive domains per gTLDs, then normalized them. Or, even without normalizing, try to find the driving factors for those. It could be potentially pricing. It can be potentially because there are a lot of domains in registry, so the attack surface for attackers is higher, and we try to take all potential

driving factors, and try to explain the variance between different gTLDs.

If they're really worse than the others, and what are worst? Or, what are potential driving factors there? So, of course, we see the outliers, let's say, but then, for example, if we normalize this by the size of a gTLD, we see and compare with other, with for example, very small prices of the registration.

Then we see that they're not necessarily doing that bad. So, yeah, but we are definitely considering those questions that you asked.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yeah, thanks for the question, Denise. That's something we talked about a lot in the CCT review, is the relationship between pricing and abuse, and it's something, it's sort of this hypothesis that's circulating in the community so much that it's sort of almost accepted as fact, which I think anecdotally, we all kind of see that as true, but what we're trying to do is sort of imperially test that.

In this part of the study, we haven't really got to pricing yet, and it's hard to collect the historical data for that. If you notice, if you go back and look at the very, one of the very first slides I presented, one of the first intervening variables I presented was,

in fact, pricing, so we're trying to think of creative ways to kind of track that, and perhaps that could be an element of what you test, up to you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. And I expect it would be easier for you if the GDD staff didn't negotiate away the even limited pricing data that they're requesting from new gTLD registries. But I think that's a conversation for another day.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Question about the pricing issue and the correlation between low price and high levels of abuse. It might be interesting for you also to speak to some of the ccTLDs that have experimented with free all over price models. I'm thinking of CN NIC and dot CN, who have had numerous, for China, who have numerous changes of policy based on responses that they saw, so the zone was massive about 10 years ago, and then they went, because they were doing a giveaway policy, and oh my goodness, were the spam center of the world, changed, sorry, that's too glib a way of putting it.

But they noticed that there were issues relating to abuse. They change their policies. They have relaxed their policies again, and it would probably be very interesting for you to have a

qualitative type of conversation with them to see whether there is anything that you can learn.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you for this comment, yeah. And of course here, coming back to sizes of registrars, the big limitation here is also the missing WHOIS data. I mean, okay. Next slide, please. Now, so far, we were just discussing abuse, we were discussing blacklisted domains. I think we should now be a little bit more precise. So, we distinguish three types, for the purpose of this study, three types of maliciousness.

First, maliciously registered domains, and those are domains registered by cybercriminal for malicious purposes. Second group is compromised domain. It's a domain registered most probably by legitimate user, and hacked by a cybercriminal. How? For example, by exploiting vulnerable content management systems such as WordPress, or it's vulnerable [inaudible].

What is also very important is that we distinguish the third group of domains that we refer to as third-party domains, and those are domains of legitimate services that are extensively misused by the attackers. And this is also exploring our previous study. And we maintain a list of around 11,000 of those domains, that

represent file sharing services, block bot services, [inaudible] services such as [inaudible] and so on and so on.

And we show that they are constantly misused also by the attackers. So now, I promised, before, I promised that I would come back to the TLD size, and I will elaborate a little bit more. So, for compromised domains, as I mentioned before, the TLD size could be interpreted as the attack surface size for cybercriminals. In other words, the more domains in hosting provider are in registry, the bigger chance of getting compromised.

As I was saying, the bigger attack surface. For malicious registries... Please.

DENISE MICHELLE: Denise Michelle. I don't understand what you're saying. Could you elaborate on the [inaudible] theory?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure. So, if there is an attacker, he has the list of domains, and he tries to exploit it. And if he doesn't care if it's dot com, if those domains are dot com, dot NL, under which registry, which hosting provider. They just go and if there is some vulnerability that possibly could be exploited, they do exploit it.

So now, if we have a really huge provider, the chance that some of those domains are listed, and therefore exploited, is much higher. Right? So really huge hosting providers, they will experience a lot more abuse. Yeah.

And for malicious registrations, the TLD size could serve as a proxy for the popularity of the TLD. What makes it popular, it's just a hypothesis. Again, it makes, the same reasons, or very often the same, that they are very popular and more cybercriminals for the same reasons as for regular users.

And of course, I was saying, it can be pricing, but maybe within the study, maybe not. We would like to verify this hypothesis. Yeah, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yeah, so to follow up the attack service question. So, it's an interesting, essentially a way to look at it, but one of the things I think I see, even just in the slide, is you're conflating a lot of things. I think you're actually conflating two like diametrically opposite phenomena. Just so I see, a maliciously registered domain, will have a harder time finding purchase in a registry with a lot of names in it, because there is less availability, right?

On the other hand, a compromised domain, a domain or maybe even like a third-party domain, maybe because there is a lot of

registered domains already, it's easier to imagine some of them following victim to a criminal.

So, just sort of, I encourage you to look a little more deeply into the different things, because I think those are [inaudible] differently, and it even goes to the pricing model as well. I think you need to start looking deeper into these, before you start drawing broader conclusions, because I think you say a big registry has more attack surface, and then you say, but there is always different ways I can attack it in some of those of ways are actually harder to attack a large registry, than just sort of...

It undermines sort of some of the things, I think. Because there is some interesting insight to what you're doing, I just think it will help to be a little more specific.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Sure. I mean, I know maybe also I can give you some examples we would like to do. So, we go very deeply into this problem. So, I just try to make it [inaudible] intuitive, but the thing is, for example, I'll give you two examples. How we would like to, how we did that in the past, and how we're going to do this for the purpose of this project.

First of all, we distinguish between compromise and maliciously registered domains. This is critical point. And now, as we were

discussing pricing. Of course, pricing, we could consider pricing as a driving factor for maliciously registered domains more, right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Maybe. I mean, you could look it up. So, you could go... Instead of looking at pricing forever, you could go and find a low pricing campaign, and go, if you spike some registrations, and it doesn't prove everything...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Absolutely. Let's concentrate on the spike then. Or, lack of spike, actually. Imagine that there is, in a registrar, there is, they start offering registrations. And interestingly enough, we do not see the increased abuse, or the increased number...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, but...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, no, it's okay. But we do not see the spike there. And we go much deeper, and then we check that the promotion is actually for the actual users, the current users of the, let's say, registrar. So, what we need to take into account, to drive more meaningful conclusions, not only the pricing, but also, for example, registration restrictions. Right?

So, and if we take, for example, compromised domains into account, here let's imagine that we would like to test specific security practices. Let's say if there are hardware, if there is hardware patching, if there is software patching. If, for example, hosting providers, they insist on patching vulnerable content management systems, and so on, and so on.

And we can list them, and we actually do it for the purpose of other studies. But what is very important here, to really draw us some more meaningful conclusions, we need to take much more and much more information, like for example, structural variables of those guys, because and then, a number of, for example, domains operated by such hosting provider.

And so on and so on. And then we can have a bigger picture. And then we can have run [inaudible]... So just, I hope...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I definitely don't want to use up all of the oxygen in the room. So, maybe we'll take it offline, but I think, you know, I think you're sort of hinting on, you know, being very specific in what you're saying, even more specific than just maliciously registered. Like say, you find different behaviors in phishing, and spamming, domains...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Absolutely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But again, maybe we'll talk offline. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But also, just to comment on this one. Last one. For that reason, we really try to collect and get as much diverse data as possible, because we expect different behaviors. For example, in phishing, different or slightly different in malware, potentially. That's only hypothesis. And not even mentioning that the number of maliciously registered domains can be potentially much higher, if we take DGA blacklist in comparison to phishing.

Let's say it's just...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, it's certainly different behavior is worth considering separately.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I don't know if...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, it looks like James has a question. Sounds like we have five, 10 minutes left for this presentation we've been given, so we'll start wrapping it up, thanks.

JAMES: Just very quickly. As somebody who is involved in the security researcher side, I feel like there is a lot of, particularly on the compromised domains and the third-party domains, there is almost an attempt to ascribe human choice into this. If you go off and talk to the actual malicious actor community, this is all automated.

There is no human interaction in this process, to discover these domains. So, I feel like it's almost a given if you look at the way that these actors actually work, that of course, the larger the TLD, the larger the attack service, because it's automatically scanning. You know, there is no human element of choosing, I am going to find a dot com domain to do this.

You know, these guys, their tools are scanning and they're doing it automatically. And to a lesser extent, particularly in the last, say, 12 to 18 months, that is also happening for the malicious registration as well. So, I feel there is almost an attempt to humanize something which is largely automated these days.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I might take this. Yeah, I absolutely agree. That's why, for example, if we consider registrars, which are the worst in the way that they have large concentrations of abuse, then probably the driving factors, or potential driving factors that we would like to verify, would be if there is an API for registrations. If there is a limit for domains that can be registered.

If, for example, the payment method, is not only by bank transfer, but for example, by Bitcoin. So those are types of driving factors that we're trying to distinguish, measure, and try to put in our regression...

JAMES:

Yeah, and I think in the current state, as far as I know it, that those are probably more consistently driving factors than issues like cost, because if you look at cost, these maliciously registered domains are not being paid for by the attacker's credit card. You know? There may be some correlation that it's

easier, that you know, that larger registrars that are able to drive down their prices may have more open APIs, but the ability to automated it, and the ability to automate the payment of it using stolen credentials, is probably more relevant than the raw cost.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, to be perfectly honest, I think that it depends on the attacker, depends on his costs, on his abilities. So, one will choose the automation over pricing, another take, will go with those that potentially have lower pricing.

So, I wouldn't say that it's... It's just the cost for the attackers, and he needs to decide what he prefers.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do we have time?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, sorry. [Inaudible]. My question is the following. What is the size of the data that you analyzed?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You mean abuse data?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, but and like, yes the number, the sources, you mentioned them. And there are many that I haven't seen them in the list, and a lot of them are free APIs, or free feeds.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I assume you're referring to the abuse data feeds. So, one of the problems we've encountered is getting the historical data. There is a lot of perfectly great data feeds out there, on different feeds. But our sense is that there is really not a financial incentive to keep historical abuse data. It's a lot of data, and they have to pay to store it, and I don't think they get many requests for it. That's our sense of things.

So, it has been a challenge to find that historical data for the 2014, 2016 observation period. That being said, when we presented this yesterday to the community, we did get quite a few hits. So, we're hoping to incorporate quite a few more substantive data feeds into this in the next few months. So, ongoing.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, thank you for this report and update. And so, I like the work. And I just wanted to point out to [inaudible], that for any type of discuss policies, slash technical research, you have to take it with a grain of salt. I think, especially at our level. And I will give you two examples for this report. It's... I don't know any other way of doing this kind of research, so it's not to discredit this type of work, but it's just to show some of the shortcomings.

For example, you use a lot of words like malicious content, cybercriminals, things like that. But when we are looking at a global definition, because we have to act globally. We are reviewing ICANN organization. Malicious content, even within jurisdictions, there are sometimes problems. Like inside Netherlands, the national police thinks Pirate Bay are criminals, the judicial system thinks they don't, and police tried a lot, they didn't get it.

But the police assume they are criminals, and think about like between the borders. There are many countries and millions and millions of people living in countries, who are not part of WTO or any kind of internet intellectual property [inaudible] and all of that.

And they don't see content which we call stolen as stolen. And we have to respect that as well, because we are operating globally. We cannot say, yes, because Motion Picture

Association of America says this is stolen, they local law doesn't. So, that's another thing.

On a second level, I'm systematically against using analyzing any type of content, other than zone files or DNS level, to get conclusions about domains, because domains are a low level utility type of thing in the whole internet ecosystem. So, I think I can argue, and I think I will win, that domains in this case are no different than [inaudible] that these people use to, for example, do phishing.

It can be a long argument, but we can do that. I'm just saying that we have to look into all of this, and we have to consider all of these reports, but by no means, they can be definitive and say, oh, because this report or those reports say, this is bad, we have to make this decision.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

And I encourage you to look at the DNS abuse section of the CCT review. It's really just a placeholder section right now, but that point was brought up explicitly. That there are jurisdictional differences in definition. That's one of the reasons we kind of gravitated toward the spam, phishing, bot net, malware. It's generally accepted that these are kind of bad things.

So, we've chosen to focus on that. That and it's more measurable. But when we did put out the report I referenced, the 2016 safeguards report, we did get a lot of requests to look at more trademark types of abuse, and that's, that gets into a whole different can of worms, if you want to call it that.

But yeah, so we're fairly limited in scope in that respect, and definitely agree with your point that this is not, in any way, the final report. If anything, this is the beginning. And we have a model that we're building. The nice thing about it is, it's kind of modular in that you can sort of add explanatory variables to it, pricing for example.

So, there may be ways to expand this study, refine it, as you see fit. We hope it's useful in some way to you, but we're trying to approach this in a scientifically rigorous way, that obviously, we'll have caveats. I don't know of any perfect research or perfect data out there that doesn't have it.

So, I think with that, what we'll have to end, just given time constraints, but please reach out to me with any questions, or Margie, or Karen, can put you in touch with me. And in touch with our researchers. And look out for our preliminary report, hopefully within the next couple of months.

We're aiming for June for a final report. We might be able to get out of a preliminary report, depending on data and sort of

workload. But thanks very much for your attention. Another question?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Really short question. Who commissioned this study?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This was requested by the CCT review team.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Could you, in addition to sending your slides, make sure we have your names and email addresses as well on the team list? Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, we have an option in front of you. We can take a brief break right now before we move on to the next set of briefing things, or we can keep on going. From

the looks around the room, it seems like maybe you would like a few minutes of a break. But I will leave it up to you to decide.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I will just say that if you wait too long with your break, there will be nothing left out there. People are starting to scavenge already from your cookies.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can everyone come back at 3:15 or before? 3:15. We have the root zone vendor coming in, and to talk about the root zone study that's going on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, there is a question about how we want to spend the next two hours, right? We have two hours left. We've got the guest talking to us about C-DAR. What else do we have, Karen, on the agenda?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

KAREN MULBERRY: For the next things in front of group, so just plan ahead, we'll compress the root zone overview. John Crane is up after that presentation to talk about the security department, the framework, and whatever other questions you might have, that

you want to have more information on. He's the person that would help field all of that and collect that. And then we can arrange for more deeper dives on things, depending on how that comes about. That should leave about the last hour, give or take, to kind of go over your calendar, the next steps, how you want to approach all of the other things that are on the list that, you know, the review team has to determine to actually become a full review team.

You need your leadership. You need to figure out the role of the observers. You need to figure out when you're going to schedule a deep dive into how do you want to develop the terms of reference. What your timeline with major milestones might be. So, all of that needs to happen, and you need to figure out schedules and times to do all of that.

So, it may take a while. So, I'd like to reserve the last hour for that. And just know that you can follow-up with questions to the previous presentation as well as these folks here, should something come up for, in their discussion that you want to have an exchange with them, or we can arrange a very particular call to follow-up if there is more that you want to know about, either the E-root zone study, or the DNS abuse study.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, just perhaps to get clarity, because I know there is other concerns about having time to really start our discussion about the workplan and scope. Karen, you wanted half an hour to talk about face to face meeting and scheduling? Is that still correct?

KAREN MULBERRY: I sent out a draft timeline. We don't have hard and fast times, as you know. Things have gotten rearranged in the agenda. I would like to at least spend a half an hour, longer if possible, to go all over all of... How do you want to approach that? And then, what's the next call? I mean, on the call of the second of March, you all indicated that you wanted to have an expression of interest for leadership open through this meeting.

And then meet a week afterwards to kind of talk through the leadership construct for the review team, which in my mind, is the most important thing we need to have resolved, so that you can build your structure out from underneath that.

Then we need the calendar for the terms of reference discussion. How you're going to focus the work? How do you want to capture timelines and other things around that? And it may take a while to go through all of those things. We do not have... I mean, it could take even a full day to go through all of those things, to kind of get to a comfortable place for the review team members. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Karen, that's really helpful. So, I just want to note that we're scheduled to end at 5:00, that gives us... What time is it? Yeah, an hour and 45 minutes for two reports, a discussion of the workplan, and then discussions of the calendars, and schedules, and face to face meetings. So, with that in mind, do we want to just have an overview of...?

How do people want to use their time? I mean, in terms of the team getting underway, it would seem that our next call and our meetings and a discussion of the workplan would be a priority. But do other people feel differently? And do we feel like we could get a more high level summary from CDAR and John, with their email addresses and follow-up on email?

I'm just sort of raising a real practical question that we're going to have to make some hard choices here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I think we have to do what you're saying. I think we have to sort of focus on what the team infrastructure looks like and what our objectives are.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, how long is the presentation usually when you give it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think I got about 14 slides, but the go part is on slide 5 is the conclusion, actually. [Laughter]

Maybe another question. I see some people in the room who are already aware of the contents of the [inaudible], are they not in? I saw Jeff Houston in the room, I don't know whether he is in the team or not, but there are quite well aware, actually, of the contents. The thing is, we just published final report, and these kinds are more or less aware of what's in there.

I could give you a, say, five minute overview of stuff. And then...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That would be great, if you don't mind.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. So, then let me start. So, the C DAP project is the project where we cooperated with the SIDN [inaudible]. I'm personally from, representing [inaudible], as well as my colleague, Daniel here. And Daniel [inaudible] in the floor here for [inaudible]. Could you give me next slide please?

So, what's the C DAP 30 about? The C DAP study has been commissioned by GDD, in order to figure out whether or not this increase of the root zone, due to new gTLD program, has any

effect on the degradation of the stability and security of the root DNS system. And actually, we're, we've been focused on technical impact of the new gTLD program.

So, that was the primary question. The secondary question would be, could we expect any degradation in the near future? So, what we did, if you could give me next slide, please. Is we analyzed a large amount of data sets, includes RSSAC 002, which provides us with aggregate query rates, for example, to each of the root letters. We've analyzed digital data sets from 2012 until most recent digital data sets, which are two-day data collections of any of the queries arriving at the root server operators.

And we've analyzed RIPE NCC ATLAS measurements, which provides us means to get more feel for the response times, and the actual queries and responses towards all of the root letters. And additionally, we've used several other sources of data.

Actually, all kinds of data sources that were available for us in order to find out whether there is a degradation of the stability and security in the root DNS system. We've taken those opportunities to analyze those. And then we, what we did is we divided those datasets in order to figure out whether or not the root security and stability would be harmed, in terms of this tree map, which is shown here, of metrics.

We distinguished between the operational stability of the root DNS system, and the DNS data consistency, whereas the operational stability was further distinguished between the query rates towards the root letters and the query responsibility. And for each of those individual metrics, we provided analytical data, which provides a measure to which extent do the new gTLDs degrade the security or stability. Next sheet, please.

Now, here is our primary finding. So, there wasn't any degradation of the security and stability on the root DNS system, as a result of the introduction of new gTLDs? And the answer is, no. Based on the investigated data, we didn't see any degradation of the stability and security. As I mentioned, the complete findings are now published, since last week, I think, and the final C DAP report.

In following sheets, I have much more individual findings based on which this conclusion has been drawn, and you can find more details on why we came up with this conclusion. But this is more or less the outline of the C DAP project. Would it be helpful for you? Or, do you have any more specific questions? I guess this is the point in time.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's really, really helpful. Thank you. I think many of us have seen your report, and at least, you know, skimmed through it,

but to have you here to present it, I know it's frustrating to do it so quickly, but it's really helpful. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Could we have both the report and your email address on our team list? It would be great to be able to [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...in the report, the emails, contact details, are all there. If not, I guess [inaudible] can assist you here. Right.

So, if no further questions, I think we'll leave you at it. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much, and thank you for giving us some time back. Okay. John, over to you.

JOHN [CRANE]: You're too kind. So, quick introduction. My name is John [Crane]. I am the chief security stability and resiliency officer at ICANN. I made up that title, it is an acronym for [inaudible]. Go look him up, he didn't do too well. So, I run a small group that's been around for, I think, about three years now, maybe two. Time flies.

Inside ICANN, and it's... People refer to it sometimes as the security group, but we're not your traditional security group that looks at the organization's infrastructure, etc. We have different people that do that. We look outwards. So, what we're interested in is the security, stability, and resiliency of the identifier systems. And what we look at is, are there things, just like pretty much sounds like what you guys are doing, right?

It's very much in the same sort of realm. Are there things that will adversely affect the DNS, or routing? We look mainly at DNS, just like the rest of ICANN does. And that we can affect and make a change in? Can we give good input to the policy process? Because, you know, the tools that we have, as an organization, or policy and contracts.

So, we try to have an informed discussion by bringing in data. And that's the crux of what we do. We also have some other more operational, semi-operational roles. So, we look at the idea of, you know, doing studies, etc. So research into what's affecting things, but we also look at the counter side, which is awareness. Can we influence the SSR of the system through things like training programs?

An obvious idea is, if you think that registries do not have a particular skillset, and we look across the board, by the way. We don't just look at the contracted parties, but we also work with

ccTLDs on a regular basis. Can we influence the SSR by improving their skillsets? So, we've given trainings on everything before this group existed, going as far back as about 2004, on everything from how do you install bind, to how do you monitor your network for security threats, to disaster preparedness.

So, anything that will improve the SSR. And our training programs are what we call demand driven. So, we don't go out saying, hey, we're a training school. We're going to go and train the world. If somebody comes to us and they highlight a problem, we ask ourselves the question, well, is this something we can do to affect that?

And often, awareness is the big issue. So, we do a lot of training. And those are sort of the two big sides of what we do. We also do some operational help. We also consider a form of training and outreach. So, if you've heard of things like Avalanche, [inaudible], some of these larger bot nets that have been, what we consider, abusing the system, or using the system to make abuse...

What we would generally do in those situations is, we will work with the public safety community to ensure that they understand how the ecosystem works. So, you know, we're not investigators. We're not doing investigations for them, or

anything like that. But when they come to us and they say, well, here is a problem, and we think we should just go and take down all of these names.

And our general sort of response would be, what are you actually trying to achieve? And how do you best achieve that? And have you talked to people at the registries? Which it normally doesn't even occur to them that, you know, the registries are not the nefarious people here, they're actually the people being abused, right? The registries, registrars, you know, the echo system itself is getting abused.

So, we try and do a lot of these introductions. And we see ourselves sort of as trusted introducers and knowledge based, for anybody who is going to be affecting the ecosystem or is running parts of the system, so we do both sides of that, and that keeps us very busy. Shockingly.

And I think there was an earlier question about what is SSR. Are there definitions for security, stability, and resiliency? And the answer is yes, there are many. So, Steve is going to help me by reading out the ones that we are actually using and that we've documented.

And you can disagree with that, that's fine, but these just happen to be the ones that we put out in the public and said, this is what we are using as SSR.

STEVE: Yeah, John, you can disagree with this too because you've actually seen this slide before, so...

JOHN CRANE: I trust you.

STEVE: The question was asked earlier, you know, what is the definition of SSR? So, I did a quick scrape of our website, you can't read this, so it was intentionally, but no. Actually, it's slightly out of order, and given any further thought, I should have ordered it different. If you go to the second part there, second bullet, it says SSR framework FY 15, 16, which is the latest framework document that we've discussed earlier today.

It has the three definitions of security, stability, and resiliency. This was inherited, I believe, from the framework from before the 12. And so, a much easier read is page seven of that framework document, unless you guys want me to read it out. Interestingly enough, I went to the glossary then, and looked up security, stability, resiliency, and it's almost word for word the same. There is mostly just typographical differences on it, just the way it's presented.

So, those are the two main definitions that I say on the ICANN site. I did look also at the strategic plan, the most current ICANN strategic plan from 2016 to 2020. There is references, specifically page 11, which covers strategic plan item two. There is many references to security, mostly security, but security and stability and resiliency, but there is no specific definition call out within that document. Likewise, with the ICANN five-year operating plan, FY 16 through 20, there are references, but no specific call out to definition.

And finally, I went to the new bylaws, there are 33 references to determine security, there are actually more, but some of them were social security, and I figured that didn't fall under the remit of this group. But again, no specific call out of definition of security, stability, or resiliency within the bylaws themselves. So, the most, you know, the most accepted definition, and this is, again, a general scrape, a quick scrape based on discussions today.

It's probably not a complete one. I don't know if there is any call out on this, maybe you can talk to or not. If there is a call out or definition of security, stability, or resiliency with any of our contracts and are contracted parties in relation to registries, registrars. I don't have that information, so this is... I consider this an incomplete data set at this point.

If you go to the next slide, with respect and apologies to Jeff and John, if I get this wrong. I wanted to throw this up because this is a community advisory committee, and this was on their website in, to the best I can find, their definition of security and stability. So, it's similar to the ICANN, air quotes here, official definition, but it does differ. So, I only brought this to light because it is a community driven definition.

It is slightly different. I don't think that necessarily any review team needs to fall, you know, word for word within the ICANN definition, I think what we're really looking for, in my opinion, is trying to, you know, fit the remit that, you know, security, stability, resiliency, as it relates to the functions of ICANN.

So, I'm going to leave that you to correct me, but that's what I kind of found today.

JOHN [CRANE]:

No, I think that's a good summation. And to be clear, the ones from the framework, are the ones that I direct my staff to use, for one very simple reason. Those are the ones that we publish to the community, and those are the ones, as far as I'm concerned, that the community therefore didn't disagree with. Different from agree with, but didn't disagree with.

So, those are the ones that we use. And yes, there are some, occasional odd rewordings in various places, but I've got better things to do than change the webmaster. So, with that, the other thing that I want to say, specifically to committee, is that we are a resource for you, but we're going to be very, very careful not to be a resource that drives too much.

We're happy to answer any questions that you have. If you need data, we will find it for you, but we're going to be very, very careful not to try to be an influencer, because we actually need you to do a neutral job, because I'm hoping at the end of it, just like last time, you'll tell all of my executives, the Board, and the community, why they pay me my salary, and you will actually give us things to do.

You know, we don't do the things we do just because we thought it was a good idea. We actually look at the various reviews and what comes from the community, because you know, we work for the community. So, I'm hoping that this committee will come out with things that would enable us to do a better job, and enable us to actually justify our existence.

And with that, I guess if anybody has questions for me, we can start with that, apart from Kathy.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Thank you for a good briefing, and we appreciate for Steve that came through the slide. The presentation has prompted me to go to recommendation six, which said, ICANN should publish a document [inaudible] of training and responsibilities for both SSAC and RSSAC, in order to clearly [define] the activities of the two groups.

So, if I go to the action on the implementation, I note that there are some overlapping, especially on the key responsibilities. So, how do you differentiate these two? Thank you.

PAUL [CRANE]: Okay, so, change my hat. Which hat am I going to wear here? Because I'm also a member of both of those communities. So, this is why I keep busy. So, I think, as you think about this, going into the acronym soup and find something called [R-ZERK?], that also has some, I won't say overlapping, but some similar issues.

So, the root server operators, I think... I'm going to get this wrong. I think it's RSSAC 000 that talks about this. So, RSSAC is made up of those involved... The main committee is made up of those involved in publishing the root zone.

So, that's root server operators, it's the root zone maintainer, it's the IANA, etc. And they really focus on issues pertaining to that publication system. So, you know, if there are threats against

the root servers, than obviously, that's a threat against the publication system. SSAC has a much broader remit.

They really look at the more, the whole identifier system, so they are open to look at things that RSSAC would never look at. It doesn't say that they wouldn't look at things related to the root servers, because there is nothing that says they can't do that.

But it does... And both committees have liaisons. So there is a liaison to RSSAC from SSAC, and to, and the other way around. And what you'll also find if you go into a little bit of investigation, and I don't know if this is a good or a bad thing, is that the membership also has a lot of overlap.

So, what we try to do is to make sure that the root server issues, the root zone publication issues, etc. get dealt with in the RSSAC, and that all the other stuff generally gets dealt with in the SSAC. So, you won't necessarily, well you probably will never see anything come out of RSSAC related to things lower in the tree, if you like, unless it's going to specifically affect the root zone publication system. Does that help?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It helped. This is [inaudible] for the record. Because if you read, for example, it says to report periodically to the Board, and the same thing is happening for both, and to make

recommendation. I hope that's a recommendation that [inaudible] RSSAC, and those related to RSSAC. So, maybe after this recommendation, how do you differentiate these from the previous way that RSSAC and SSAC used to work, before this recommendation?

Because I just want to know, is there a clear-cut differences between these two groups? Or... Thank you.

JOHN [CRANE]:

Yeah, I think the [inaudible] is really the scope. So, you know, RSSAC really is limited to those root zone publication issues, and SSAC is the other stuff. And there is a process whenever... They're both advisory committees. They give advice to the Board and the community, not jus the Board.

And then the whole advice thing goes into some system into ICANN, which I can't even remember what the acronym is or the name of it, and it's a tracking system for all of those kinds of [inaudible]... So, there is a whole process about how the recommendations from these committees actually get handled.

And I'm not the right person to talk to that process, because I don't manage that process. We can find out if people are interested.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you for the answer. To compliment your answer, yes. And there is a bit of legacy with all of this. So, RSSAC is comprised mainly of root server [inaudible], and that means for example, RSSAC 0002 is a very good example. RSSAC 0002 mandates, or not mandates, recommends, to the root server operators to publish a set of statistics.

It doesn't mean that root server operators have to do that, because RSSAC is just an advisory committee to the Board, but because members are actually the root server operators, when they agree to write down and publish a document, basically they also agree to implement it.

So, RSSAC came up with RSSAC 0002, and all of root server operators implemented that. They didn't have to, but as I said, there is also this sublime difference between RSSAC and SSAC, where in RSSAC, basically the operators, all of the operators, who have the power to make the change, are on the committee.

So, if a decision is approved by all of them, it's almost sure that it will be implemented.

KATHY: You were ignoring me. I have a really easy question, or not. It may be you... You were pretty specific about not wanting your team to influence decisions that come out of here. Is there

something that we can do in the way we make our requests, we ask our questions, that will help both sides? That we don't put you in a spot.

Sir.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, ma'am. Kathy and I go back a long, long way. So, I'm an engineer, so I prefer things to be data driven, so if you're asking us for facts and data, that's great. If you ask us for opinions, that's harder. So, if you ask for an opinion, we're going to go and try to find the data and show you, this is the data.

So, try and... Try not to ask me things like what color is the sky? You know, because we're going to go into an argumentation about light refraction and weird things like that. So yeah, data, facts, resources. If you need introductions to people with particular skillsets. Obviously, we're staff. So, we work with this.

Steve knows everything. Try and stay fact... Ask us for facts rather than opinions.

KATHY:

And you'll also be a good... We may not be able to give you names that we're looking for, but...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, we'll help you find them. If you give us a problem, we will try and help you find the solution, but we're probably not going to try and solve it ourselves for you, because we're staff so it puts us in a little bit of an awkward position, because I have opinions on pretty much everything you're going to discuss.

KATHY: Yeah, I'm pretty much aware of that part.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, exactly. And you don't want to hear them, because I'm [CROSSTALK]...

KATHY: They haven't probably changed over time. The other question is, we're getting ready to look at timelines, and this is kind of putting you on the spot, but given that your team is really a lot of the meat for support of this group, what kind of turnarounds should we expect? Or... We don't want to put you under, because you actually have a day job too.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, there is a gentleman that works on our team called Steve Conte, and he can turn things around like this, so if you're asking

for Steve, I'd go for very short timelines to make you [inaudible]. But seriously, this is a high priority for us, so we will endeavor to be days not weeks in turnarounds.

Now, obviously, if you ask for something that's hard, it's going to take longer. Right? If you ask for some really hard dataset, we have a research department, so yeah. I can't give you specifics, because I don't know what you're going to ask, but we will endeavor to be as fast as we can, and make it a priority.

There are certain staff members that are helping to run this committee, they've been known to ask regularly, and I won't say DDOS, but they will be...

So, it behooves us to answer quickly, because the pain for not doing so is not worth it. So, we're on your side here, we're going to help you as quickly and as factually as we can.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: John, a question on a process for engaging you for data or for fact. So, shall we directly contact you? Or we come to you through the [inaudible] office? So, how do we...?

JOHN [CRANE]: No, you go through the staff that are supporting the committee. I mean, me and you... You can come to my house and we can

have a drink and discuss, or I would rather come to yours, but for all of the function of the committee, I believe there is a process for that. That way it's documented, and you know, we're getting you the right things.

So, I would prefer that things come through the committee staff. Obviously, if something is an emergency, most of you have my home phone number, but I'd rather you not use it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Sorry. I think it's actually a softball, because it's kind of a question for the future. But when you were talking about the stuff that you do, your day job, it sort of prompted that in the future, we may actually benefit from hearing if you could, just some of the detail, yeah, some of the details of the requests that you've gotten from the community, look into this, and what your sort of resolution to them was.

Like, how you don't really want that, you want this. Like, if there was like a summary at some point, I would suspect that it would be helpful for us in trying to trace down systemic dependencies.

JOHN [CRANE]:

Okay. I think the answer is, ask and you shall receive. Be a little bit more explicit about what you want. I know you can't be too explicit, but we can... That was pretty close. Work with the

staff, and we'll get somebody to put that together in... There are going to be some situations where we can't talk about detail.

We operate in something called trust groups. Yeah, I know Eric, stop [inaudible]. So, some of the data we get, and as a highly transparent organization, this can occasionally be interesting, we're not allowed to share. If you're familiar, and I expect most of you are, with how trust communities in the security world operate, sometimes you get something called TLP red, or traffic light protocol red.

If we've got stuff like that, we don't even share that internally. We can be generalist around those kind of things, and we can talk about the kind of things, but we're not necessarily going to get into the detail, because we have to, you know, we cannot compromise our trust with the community. And you know, it's one of our most important tools. But yeah, we will definitely put something together. Get the staff to formulate the question and send it to us, and I will put somebody on that as quickly as possible.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That sounds great. We won't ask you about fight club.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just on timeframes, probably to help us adjust ours, if we do send a request and you do a quick assessment, and you realize it might take longer, can you send back to us the possible timeframe?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Absolutely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The second thing, are you opposed to natural conclusions. Like, if we do have an analysis based on certain datasets you have, and rather than us skimming through all of the data we could ask you for natural conclusion, that's obvious on the face of it. Not necessarily opinionated, are you opposed to that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If it's a natural conclusion, you shouldn't need to ask me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, as the whole of the dataset. We may not... Instead of us skimming through the entire dataset. So, for example, there is a specific question that will require analysis of over a week, actually conclude [CROSSTALK] give us the results rather...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: On a case... I don't know what questions you're asking yet, but generally speaking, I think so, but we're going to... So, what I tell people is, if you're asking for an opinion on something, we're going to have to have the data to back it up. So, if the data backs up, you know, if we have 20 objects and they're all blue, and you ask us what color of the objects, we'll be quite happy to say, they're all blue.

But life is never that simple. So, we will absolutely strive to give you anything you ask for. But I don't know, because you know, you've had a couple of presentations about people dealing with data, and you see how complex it gets, and I really don't like comments like, therefore it is our opinion, or we suspect, things like that, unless there is...

I prefer things like the data leads us to conclude, and that's how we work. So yes, we will do that, but sometimes we... If the data doesn't conclude anything, but that's probably what we'll tell you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just wanted to follow-up on Kathy's question. And first of all, thank you for expectations setting. I do, yeah.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

When a question comes to the organization from this committee, I would prefer, or this team, I would prefer that we talk about it with all of the support staff here involved through MSSI as well, because as mentioned, some of the questions might not be directly related to the functionality of the SSR department, and I want to make sure that it's routed to the proper group, so that we can give you a timely answer, and set expectations that way.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If I may, just to come in on that pay. It's also on the record then, if it goes through the appropriate channels, which I think we would all want.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And please don't hesitate to tell us that that's not really the question we want answered. That this is really more the question, because we may... Simply having done this when you're explaining people to things in training sessions, one of the things that we've had to do in the past, is explain, you can ask that question, but your frustrations will continue because you will get a response to that question, and it's not going to be for what you're looking for.

And it's the same people...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I will not hesitate to have a dialogue about the question. I do hesitate to feed you a question that you might want to be asking, because that's us trying to, could be viewed as us trying to steer the group. So, I'd rather have, say, I don't hesitate to have a dialogue and question the question that you're asking, and then maybe come to a resolution from that. Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So to follow-up, are there any more questions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, I'm sorry that Jeff is no longer in the room. Jeff brought some issue up during the discussion we had in the morning. And I want you to clarify. The root KSK key rollover, is it an ICANN activity, or IANA activity? First. Second question is, the ICANN SSR framework covered the IANA and the PTI operation or not.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, the first one. So, PTI slash IANA is involved in this, and also the [inaudible] team, which [inaudible] part of. It's pretty hard to be anything that, something that PTI is doing and not also be an ICANN thing, because of the way the structure works. So, the technical resources that are running the rollover, for the most

part, because I believe Kim Davis is also involved, but you'd have to ask him, are [inaudible] staff, I believe.

Because that's where the skillset sits. And there are also community people who provide it, so I know that's not a super clear answer, but I think it's both. I don't think there are these two separate things. Does it fit within the framework? Yes, I mean, it does. We... So, one of my staff is a gentleman you may know called Rick Lamb.

So, he's also on that team. You know, many of you met him through DNSSEC trainings. We're one organization. So, everything that ICANN does, if it affects the identifiers, as obviously the KSK rollover does, fits within my group's area.

We look at those things, you know, one of the other things we look at is emerging technologies and say, you know, what are the SSR implications of an emerging technology? There are other parts of the organization that all look at business, etc. So, I don't actually think trying to put a [inaudible] about where it's IANA, PTI, ICANN, ICANN [inaudible], GDD, whatever area it is, is particularly useful because we are one organization, and we use the resources, etc., as needed.

And you know, if somebody from the legal staff, or from the finance staff, notice there was some issue, that would also be particularly fine for them to raise it. And typically, what happens

inside the organization is if there is a security question, rather than an incident, incidents are handled differently, what we generally do is form a cross organizational meeting and we discuss it.

So, it's... Life is not that straightforward. There are not these, and we don't want these clear lines. I hope that answers it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you, but I don't think it answered for me because it wasn't about SSR team in ICANN, but it's about SSR review we're going to do, correct? And SSR review, we are reading the bylaws, and basically what the mechanism is in place, so the community can review what ICANN organization is doing, and then to assess if you're doing right or wrong, correct?

So, the question came up in the context, that for example, I had the example, the key signing ceremonies, if ICANN is running them, then they are clearly, they won't clearly fall into our scope. But if IANA is running them, that's basically the question. If IANA is running them... If I read the bylaws, I don't see we have to look into them, but I think that will be a discussion for the group.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, yeah. So, my answer to that would be that I'm not on the committee that's going to have to decide that. Because last time we did this, they had the same kind of questions, and if you... You can look to what the output, and we were frankly surprised by some of the things they found interesting, but it was all good feedback.

So, I think the people who really get to decide that is this committee, and I would only suggest that you don't try and take every single issue that's out there, because there is a multitude and you've got to figure out which ones are priority for your time. That's the only advice I would give.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I agree, but mechanically, the question is basically, mechanically, who is doing the key signing ceremony? Who is running the key signing ceremonies? Is it PTI slash IANA or is it ICANN org?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't know what you mean by mechanically, because...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Who pays for it? Who pays for it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You'd have to ask finance that. I believe the people who pay my salary is probably the same bank account that that money comes from. That's a really good question, probably, for Xavier. And I suspect that you could get that question from staff by asking.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Two comments and a question. So, I can actually answer that. At the moment, it's both. It's split between the two. And this is part of the reason [inaudible] my second comment of why I've personally, I'll put my opinion out here already. We cannot complete this review without having PTI in scope. It's a wholly owned affiliate of ICANN Corporation, and it is key, you know, it is incredibly key to the SSR of the unique identifier system.

That's my opinion. I'm sure we'll have a great discussions over it, that's my peace. John, do you know who owns, or owns the contract for the KMX, the [inaudible] facilities? Is that still with ICANN or did that transition to PTI?

JOHN [DODSON]: I believe, I'd like to come back on that. If we could put that, that's another one to put into writing. I believe it did transition, but I can't guarantee it. So, let's do that in writing [inaudible]

committee. I suspect there are people more qualified to answer that than myself.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, and I would like to suggest if you have questions like that, send them out to the list and then I can make sure that they get directed to John and everybody, and then that way others might see the question and might trigger some additional things that they would like to add to it, so we can have a very comprehensive response for everyone.

Do we have any more questions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...discussion a while ago, and you could see the direction where the directions have been floating around. Is it then that recommendations coming out of this committee, if on one side some persons may believe that it's just for ICANN strictly. Just in your opinion, is it that the other entities, IANA, etc. would actually look at these recommendations and consider them any at all?

Or is it strictly for the application and accountability of ICANN?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I see everything as sort of one organization.... I know there are legal constructs, etc. And I... Yeah, honestly, I think you need to probably go ask ICANN Legal about that. Whatever comes out of this recommendation, out of this committee as recommendations, will be viewed by the whole organization. And therefore, I assume, acting, I'm assuming, they can be acted on, right?

So, that's the only thing that I would ask of this committee to try and influence you. Is please, when you get to the end, let's have a discussion about whether or not the recommendations actually are implementable recommendations, what you expect specifically my staff, because I have to look after my crew, to do.

Some of them you won't be able to, you know... When I look at the previous implementations, the way I look at these things, land for many of the recommendations you come out with, I have a sneaking suspicion that I'm going to be the person on the plate for those, I look at them in three buckets.

Things that we can directly do something about. That stuff we can do. Stuff that we can influence. So, if something has to be through contracts, etc., that stuff we can... That's sort of in the middle, we can do it in the contract, but we have to influence, but there is also stuff that we can influence through training programs, things like that.

And then there is just stuff. If it's just stuff, then you know, it's probably not going to be a useful recommendation. Most, I think, all of the recommendations that came out of the last one, because we had a good conversation about it, and I think that all of the ones that you come out with are probably going to be in all three categories, there is going to be bits in them of each, and that's fine, but let's think about whatever recommendations come out of the committee, driving towards hopefully an outcome.

And I recommend that to every committee, it's not specifically this one.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Any last minute questions for John? Then we can move on to a discussion on planning an approach and some of the open items that have been noted so far.

All right. Thank you, John.

JOHN [CRANE]: Thank you. I'm going to stick around and listen for a while, if I may.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: All right. So, the next item up is basically a discussion and planning for your development of work. How do you want to approach it? What's on the plate? And how you would like to arrange it. Next slide, please.

So, the scope of the review, and this is there again, a summary of the exercise you went through this morning and what's in the bylaws, for what this review is about. So, this is just kind of put you back on the page of, this is the scope of the review. You can take that and develop your own scope and approach. But this is what the bylaws kind of provide the broader framework for the work that you're going to be conducting. Next slide, please.

There was a proposal on the list that you should talk about outreach, engagement and information gathering, much like you had the two vendors here that are doing studies for the other review team. That's just an example of some of the things that you might think about, as you go into your work plan.

Go back to the gap analysis you had this morning, how do you want to fill the gap? What do you think is the best approach to do that as you lay out what you want to do? There are also, for example, other key briefings. If there are other areas, pieces of information that you are interested in, send it to the list, and then we as staff can make arrangements to make that happen.

And we'll work with you as to what is the best timing to make that happen. But we were trying to do was just trying to get you a flavor of some of the things out there, at your first meeting, so that you can drill down to specifics and we can make arrangements to do that.

And there was also mention of key groups that you might want to meet with. It could be SSAC, it could be RSSAC, it could be others out there that are relevant that you would like to have an opportunity to have a dialogue. And you know, that would be good to know, and then we can work doing that in ICANN meetings, so should you choose to meet again face to face at an ICANN meeting, or arrange a conference bridge or discussion for you.

So, those are just some of the examples of things to think about, as you go into your workplan development. Next slide, please. These are the list of the things that we kind of summarized from your public consultation. So, that gives you some of the, you know, the concepts that were discussed.

It's still in draft form. Happy to amend it as you think of things that came up that we weren't able to capture. I think there is another slide on that too. Yeah, there are two slides. So, that's the list of information, and I did send it out to the list, so you have that as well to think about, as input from the community,

and what they were thinking about, what they would like to see, and some other elements that maybe you hadn't thought about that you would want to consider as you flesh out your workplan. Next slide, please.

And then, in terms of the terms of reference, that goes to the action item from the Board. This is kind of the outline of the terms of reference that the CCT review team developed, to give you some idea of framing for how you want to consider things.

I know, as you can see in item number three, their framework, they actually definitions, that they used in their work. So, when they said something, this is what it meant. So, that could be where you would want to think further on the definitions that Steve provided, and what other definitions might be out there.

So, this is just an example, there again, you can develop what you think would be the appropriate construct for your terms of reference. And when that is finalized and adopted, can be shared with the Board. You also note that the terms of reference, at least for CCT, included a timeline. And you know, that goes to Mohamed's point about key milestones.

This is not the actual every step you're going to take in the process, but what do you think are your possible key milestones. You know, at some point in time, you might want to request data. At some point in time, you might want to analyze data.

Yet, towards the end, we're going to want a public consultation on your draft and presentation to the Board. So, all of those are elements that you can consider when you think about major milestones in the process.

Next slide, please. Now, if you want more examples, these are the groups that I could find that have terms of reference, and these are the previous review teams. I also sent that out in the email a couple of days ago to you, so you can click on the links, you can go specifically to the terms of reference to see how they've been captured.

I think in looking at it myself, it seems that each review team has enhanced what they're putting in their terms of reference. So, just some background for you to take a look at. Next slide, please. So, those are all things that need to happen.

The critical point then is, the only meeting that's scheduled is this one. Yeah, so, next slide please. So, first of all, and you know, to separate it into two buckets, need to schedule conference calls. And with all of the things that you have in front of you, the questions that you have, I think to really establish your foundation, you need at least weekly conference calls to get started.

Now, there are two examples that I've provided for you. The CCT review team has a set time and a set date. So, you can block

your time, and that's it. And everyone knows that that's when you're going to meet. Now, an alternative example, since you're from all across the globe, and many different time zones, is the, well, work stream two rotates calls amongst three set times.

Just so that they don't infringe upon everyone's, or small components while everyone else is enjoying the daylight. I know Jeff is not here. He's from Australia. He had to go off to another meeting. So, those are two examples to use, I mean, you need to at least establish your next call, if you can't go beyond that and are unable to make any decisions about that right now, but I think the next call, and look at your calendars as to what would be the most acceptable for all of you, and then make a determination, whether you're going to rotate time zones, or have a set time and date.

Next slide, please. Now, for face to face meetings, this is what I have on the plans. We've got the meeting at ICANN 58 confirmed. We have confirmed the meeting with the DNS Symposium, and that's where you will have the opportunity to meet a lot of DNS experts and security experts in Madrid to talk to them.

And thought that would be a beneficial source of information for you, as you start to build out what you're doing. After that, we have planned meetings at ICANN meetings. But we can confirm

them, if you would like to do that, we can confirm alternatives, should you think you need, you know, a different schedule and more time. Yes, sir.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I want to note on the Madrid meeting, I have to disagree that we will see a lot of DNSSEC persons at that meeting. There will be DNS experts, but first of all, it conflicts with another event, which has a DNS, very specific DNS thing there, and from my point of view, and I know some might disagree, but the DNS Symposium, we will see a lot of industry players, but not necessarily technical or...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If I can respond to that. Is the conflict at the RIPE NCC meeting that you're talking about?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, it's the RIPE meeting, but the other meeting is because this DNS Symposium is next to the GDD, correct? [CROSSTALK] ...more of an industry...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I believe we planned for the DNS Symposium, to start the day after the RIPE ends. So, you know, we have a day to get to

Barcelona to Madrid. But with that said, we're also doing the DNS work meeting directly after, so there will be industry professionals and not just market professionals there.

KAREN MULBERRY: This is Karen again. For calendaring, that's kind of what the schedule looks like, or could look like. Next slide, please. Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Before you leave there, how many days for us to meet? I don't remember. My calendar has got all sorts of crap on it. Were we looking at in Madrid.

KAREN MULBERRY: I think we've got three days. One day to go to the Symposium, and then two days for the review team to meet afterwards.

Yes, it's May 12th through the 16th. Starting on the 12th, you'll meet on the 13th... Starting on the 12th, 13th, 14th... Is it the...? Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just as an easy reference, ICANN dot org slash IDS will give you details on the Symposium.

KAREN MULBERRY: And the Symposium is on the 13th.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, it says right there in big letters. Thank you.

KAREN MULBERRY: So, you travel on the 12th, the meeting is on the 13th. Then the review team will meet on the 14th and 15th, and you travel on the 16th.

So, you need to think about, do you want to meet at ICANN meetings after this? Do you want to meet for one day or two days? I mean, this is a good time if you want to cross over with RSSAC, or SSAC, or some of the other community groups, to have some joint discussions with them. Emily. And then Eric, sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is quick. Are we going to have the audio setup so that in the event that we need remote participation, it will be more streamlined, so people can talk and forth remotely? I know, it's not optimal but sometimes it might not happen.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. When you say... That was an oversight at this one, and Don dropped off at the beginning, and I haven't seen him come back

on, so I've been trying to keep an eye as to whether he is putting something in the chat or not. But yes, all of the meetings going forward will have audio capability so you can participate remotely if you can't be there in person.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What was the website again?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ICANN dot org slash IDS.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, thank you. Just a quick comment. This probably anticipates your next point, but I did notice that there was sort of a heart felt plea from staff to us, to now that we've been sitting here, we've deferred everything that we've been asked to decide on, and I think it would be really great that if in the next 50 minutes, we could just bring ourselves to just some small decisions to help us move forward.

And I think we probably can go for some, don't you think?

DENISE MICHELLE: This is Denise Michelle. I agree, too. Could staff...? Could we take a look at what our answers were to the approach to work? Transparency, communications, it includes several other things

we were supposed to make decisions on as well, and we haven't looked at the results, right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. And I know Patrick was going to summarize those out, so we could send them out to you. I don't know where he's at right now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Has anyone...? So, no one has summarized them yet?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And can you go to the next slide too?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Okay, and maybe this will help you a little bit in terms of the open items that I've noted so far. That I think decisions need to be reached, or times scheduled to talk about them.

Do we have a microphone?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There is a team structure thing here. Role of staff, and I think is probably flows from that. Looking at the team structure, and just a really quick whip through, this isn't moving forward too fast for everyone, there seems to be quite a few... There is one here, which says single chair and group leaders. One that says, chair, vice-chair, and group leaders, should be kept chair and co-chairs, so there is a sort of, you know, that sort of hierarchy.

There is a lot here that says co-chairs, co-chairs, co-chairs, co-chairs...

Lots of stuff sort of around sub-teams forming around groups. Co-chairs again, and stuff. So, if I'm not over egging this, I think there seems to be some sort of weight of opinion towards co-chairs. That might help us to reach something.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: On mic please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just want to point out that decision making may have to come first, because like, I'm just kidding. I see full agreement up there, yeah, full consensus, so that one could be tricky. I'm kind of kidding actually.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Was there anything about scheduling calls?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think the last one is probably the most relevant for what we're doing right now. Approach to work, we organize around sub-groups. How often should we meet? In-person or virtually? There are four postings in support of sub-groups, for sure. There are suggestions for biweekly meetings for an hour. Monthly virtual meetings, and meeting in person every quarter.

Virtual meetings are first choice face to face for decisions, and we'll take more than one day. A plea to work online every week. Meet every three months, conference calls at least every two weeks. I think those are relevant in terms of our meeting schedule.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, doesn't that mean we should change our weekly calls to biweekly at least? Because all I heard was...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There was one sticky note, I think, perhaps used this as a stepping off point. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Carry or Emily, put your flag up first, but...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I kind of don't know, as we progress with those two summaries, based on the co-chair and the approach to work, maybe just a suggestion to the team that the last five minutes, persons who may be interested in expressing interest on the floor today, we reserve the last five minutes to give persons an opportunity to do that if they want to, and at least in the last call, I don't know if many of you recall that we had said we would give a week after today to kind of give persons an opportunity to send their round robin to the mailing list, and then person, I don't know if it would be a Doodle.

I think we need to decide that as well, if it would be a Doodle vote. Like a Doodle poll to actually say who persons select, rather than a lot of emails bombarding Karen. I want this person, I want like, probably just those who expressed interest who do a Doodle poll, that is circulated to the team, and then at least it would make your life a little bit easier for selection.

So, I'm just very procedural in terms of things [inaudible] to kind of get going. I think that would actually help to push the work stream...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks. So, I'm actually going to take Eric's point then a serious point, because before we go and decide our chairs and co-chairs, we need to decide our decision making. So, I think, to be honest, I think decision making format is our first topic, and then everything else flows from there, because you know how we are planning to make decisions.

PATRICK [DODSON]: No, I can do it. Decision making. Decision making, we're going to make a decision. No, I'm kidding. Hi everybody, Patrick [Dodson] for the record. And I just, I'm in the middle of capturing all of this, so this is pretty fresh. A lot of conversation in here about consensus, full consensus, keep going until you have consensus, mechanisms for dissenting opinions is the very standard, note those in the minutes if you need to, when you get to the final reports.

Some voting mechanisms, majority vote with tie-breaker mechanism is one point. A two-thirds majority decision. General consensus. Consensus by co-chairs and sub-groups. Consensus being defined as a decision that can be lived with.

There is just a comment up here, I like this one. I just says whenever possible. So, solid work there. Need to clearly define roles and responsibilities, consensus whenever possible, dissenting opinions, statements only when absolutely

necessary. So, generally speaking, full consensus, general broad consensus is [CROSSTALK]...

ERIC: ...what we could do is we could adopt one whereby you need like rough consensus where a tie is broken by the chairs, and that way, we can't do the chairs until we have the consensus, but if we could deadlock then we have to wait for the chairs to show up to break it. No?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Eric, I don't think you have two-thirds vote on that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, my experience in working with a number of teams and working groups, is that there is often just a couple, a few people willing to be, you know, chairs or vice-chairs, or leading sub-groups, and these things can often just be handled with a consensus, or a lack of anyone else volunteering to do it.

And then, if we need to do, you know, just a quick vote, I think a couple of teams have done that as well. So, just to give you a little more context on how I think these things are often taken care of.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, so I actually just put some specific texts into the Adobe. So, basically, we just came through the CCWG accountability exercise, and you know, there is text in there on, you know, members act by consensus and the polling will only be used in rare instances. The recognition of such does not constitute voting.

That did us well through that entire exercise, which was a very contentious one with opposing viewpoints at times. And I would suggest that, you know, we could almost just take that verbatim. Say that you know, our working method is to act by consensus. And that potentially if we encounter a really, really contentious issue, we may take some straw polls to, you know, work out minority viewpoints, but that our basic working method is by consensus.

And like, we're a small group. We're going to get to know each other over the next year in a bit, likely. You know, I would think that we would have enough respect around the room that if I come up with an opposing viewpoint, that I don't feel is being captured by the majority, that I might write a minority statement that, you know, the group will be able to incorporate into our final work product, and the same for anybody else.

So, I would strongly suggest that we go with a default of consensus, and if we need to move away from that, then we have that decision at that point.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I sense that everyone agrees with James’s proposal. So, we can capture that in the record as a decision reached of the group.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

I was trying to be very cautious and not use that word until we’ve agreed that consensus is the way we’re going to operate.

Okay. One decision down. So, what would be the next decision? I mean, we’ve got Patrick here, so he can walk you through some of those things, from the exercise.

PATRICK [DODSON]: Which one is next? Which one is next?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And there was a proposal from Carry Anne as well, in terms of the, how you might want to approach your leadership decision, to allow towards the end, in which we will probably be in 20 minutes or so, for those who are interested in expressing interest

to have the opportunity to introduce themselves, to talk a little bit.

And then, when you get to calendaring, you need to set a date for when you want to have that conversation amongst yourselves, to select your leadership.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Quick one, while we're talking about these other things. Could staff give us a sort of a list of what the couple of times that work globally for this whole team? In terms of where everyone is distributed.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, because it's never going to fit Australia, for one thing. Well, yeah...

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

It will fit Australia, yes. So, do we have a sweet spot amongst all of us? Not necessarily. So, James.

JAMES: There is a tool that is used by some of your SSI people, that I'm sure we can plug everything into. No, there is a specific like cool spreadsheet thing that the CCT people that, you know,

everybody is time zone is put in, that gives you a color coded graph that works for everybody.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, meeting planner will do that. We'll just pick out the time zones for everybody. I can tell you, having to plot some things out for work stream two, there is very little commonality. So, someone is going to be getting up in the middle of the night.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Could I just ask a question? Jeff...

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

You can see the two options there on the board, and unless I'm wrong, I think that it's really you who would be most adversely affected by a single time on a single day. That might be an over...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: At 15:00 UTC, I wouldn't join your calls. I work at GMT +10 and, GMT, UTC +10, +11, so you're basically asking for 1 AM, 2 AM. I don't want to do that. You don't want to hear me at that hour. It ain't going to happen.

I get up quite early. I get up normally at around 5, and I can do, I do calls for SSAC at five in the morning. So, typically what we try

and do is put the night across from Europe to Australia. However, that inconveniences India, because if you're trying to slot the night across that thing, someone has got to do the 2 AM.

Now, the issue is, if you put the night across the Pacific, the Pacific is only five hours wide. So, I'm up late and someone in the west coast is up really, really early, because it's only five hours long. So, as I said, typically what we've tried to do for SSAC, is move it so it's my morning, European evening, America through the day, but and Nepal loses.

But at 15:00, I know for a fact, that I've done it a few times, I'm never going to do it again. Sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Emily.

EMILY: I think I was just about to put my thing down, but you know, since I've got the microphone, you know, we're not really... So, there is also a sort of a majority inconvenience thing, that's really helpful, Jeff. There is also like if half the team are getting up in the middle of the night, because many people are in similar time zone. We've got a similar sort of problem.

Personally, you know, a three-slot thing could personally work for me, but hoping all over the map in terms of [inaudible] could be a complete nightmare, because people would just forget, and end up missing the call. And I think many people have very busy schedules, and so some sort of stability...

Even if we could just rotate, but there is some measure of stability that would really help me, as a personal plea.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yeah, I would agree. I would agree with Emily on that. It would be ideal if we could find two times to rotate and block them in our calendars, and be consistent to help us all remember when we're supposed to hop on the phone. But I'd also like to make a plea to everyone to, if we can really try and also get work done via the email.

I know that's a little more challenging, that would be great as well. Does it make sense just from a practical standpoint to do a Doodle poll and agree to talk next week, and then set our rotating schedule?

KATHY:

Kathy [inaudible]. A personal plea is for something that's pretty solid put down, because the chances are, I'm not in the States when anything happens, and I'm all over the world in different

time zones, and I'm old, and I will forget when I'm supposed to be on a call. To Denise's point, I really think it's important, before we have a conference call, we have an agenda, we have specific items, and please, if we don't have specific items, if we're not ready to talk about it, skip the damn call that day.

Don't have a call just because it's on the schedule.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Sorry. Maybe one of the things we should talk about is, which might help this, is the duration of the calls. Now, usually groups that meet for one hour, have a tendency to meet every week, but if you want to stretch that to every two weeks, you can look at a two-hour call, but you know, that depends. I see Denise being very unhappy with that.

DENISE MICHELLE:

This is Denise. I don't know if there are others, yeah. A two-hour block is really challenging in terms of business schedule. I certainly appreciate the intent though, and that's just me, and I'm happy to bow to the majority will.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I'll plus one that. The two-hour block is really difficult for me. One hour I could do, just generally, if it winds up being a work

day, I guess middle of the night is different. Also, back to Kathy's point, I mean I think if we have a meeting and we can meet our agenda in less than an hour, that we should, it would be great if we could be onboard with like not talking about the bicycle shed.

CARRIE:

...email to the group, time converted is really good, because you can add all the time zones. I just sent it to everyone, because I think this issue will also come up in this subgroups, if we do agree to subgroups because I think, as it relates to two-hour meetings... This is Carrie by the way.

The two-hour meetings may be more applicable and a subgroup has a specific deliverable to the wider group, so they may need to put in more time and that way they would still have to find a good time zone that works for everyone. So, in short, [inaudible] the time convert, I think it's pretty good because if we at least, I know that there are several suggestions as to how to do the meetings, but at least if you could agree to a certain meeting per month, at least, at a minimum, have that as standard.

Wherever you are, wherever you are, across the world, whatever you're doing, that time try and make yourself available, especially if we have decisions to be made. I think it would be a

good commitment for the team to commit to. It's important, that's why we volunteered.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If I may interject, you may need something more than just once a month, in particular. And I can tell you, for example, with the work stream two, they're one hour calls, they meet once a week, and they rotate between those three time zones, because there again, they have people from Australia, and elsewhere. And so, it's to accommodate the majority as best we can with those time zones.

And it does work to focus the work in one hour. Sometimes, they can talk fast and it's less than an hour. It just depends on there again, the topic, the agenda, and what you're seeking to accomplish. So, I mean, that's why I put it up there as an example.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Another consideration for the review team is that, we're talking about as if we're going to do everything in the plenary, this group. We may... One of the options that has been discussed is there will be subgroups, and those subgroups will be meeting, and depending on the approach you decide to take, most of the

heavy lifting may be done in the subgroups, and this plenary may meet less often to allow the subgroups to do the work.

So, that's also a consideration.

PATRICK [DODSON]:

Just to add to that, this is Patrick. There is just going through, I've done the capture on the team structure piece, significant momentum towards the subgroup approach, based upon whatever topic this group decides to break that down to, but that oftentimes can alleviate some of the time zone issues globally.

The other one is just on that topic of team structure, co-chairs versus a single chair, but then as the subgroups, it's either you call them rapporteurs or some group leads, that typically, harkening back to work stream two, they're the ones that get into the responsibility of making sure that they're finding good times within the options, communicating that out, setting an agenda with feedback and input so that you're not getting on the call just to have the call.

And so there are some ways to compartmentalize that responsibilities, so not everything is a plenary conversation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, we have Don on the chat and he was saying, “My experience has been that folks lose focus on calls after about an hour and a half, at the most.” That’s what he was also saying. And you were also asking about the time converter, we will send that out with every invite. That’s an automatic. Okay.

Okay, Don, I hope you heard that. They all support you. You’re right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, do we have consensus that you will schedule calls for one hour and they will all be focused? [Laughter]

Since you just agreed to operate by consensus? And I can use the word now?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. I’d like 24 hours advanced notice of a cancellation. I so often wake up early and the call is off. I would just like the consensus to be, you know, if there is nothing there, cancel it. But please, make the decision 24 hours before the call.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I do think that that would be an ideal to live by, just because everyone is so busy, and to give you back your time for other things. Carrie Anne?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In the interest of moving on, how are people feeling about the calls? So, we have an hour... I think, do we want to talk next week? Maybe that will help narrow this down. So, if we want to talk next week, do we need to do a Doodle poll to identify a time? And then, perhaps from that Doodle poll, we could select two times that we can rotate and lock into our calendars?

Does that...? Just throwing out an operational potential path forward.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi. I'm looking at the time zones as we play out here. There is one area that gets punished, so obviously, we're going to need at least two time zones. One could be 21:00 UTC, so that's currently 17:00 in New York, that will make it 10 PM in Europe, that will make it 8 AM in Melbourne, and Dubai will get hit with the 1 AM in sort of that timeslot. I'm not sure what that gives you for Katmandu.

So, that could be one of the them, and then we could go the other way and have someone else, but at least that will give us one meeting where we could...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm serious when I say this, but while we're picking times and dates and all of that, could I also throw in if we try and stay away from Mondays and Fridays when we make calls for many reasons?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. Another one could be... As an option until we figure something else out, the second time could be 13:00 UTC. Which would be 9 AM New York, 6 AM California, midnight Melbourne, sorry Jeff, I know, and... I know. We get used to them, right? And 5 PM Dubai.

So, we could just start with that, and then we can figure our way out. Not saying this could be forever.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, thank you very much. Can I offer...? I don't want to get into the weeds, because we're all going to have... Suddenly everyone is talking. Could we move the 21:00, I don't know whether it's forward, like 19:00 because then we're, then it's like 11 PM for you, and it would be a sort of 6 AM start, which Jeff said already he doesn't mind, which is brilliant.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. Getting tired. 19:00 UTC is 15:00 New York, noon California, 6 AM Melbourne, and 11 PM Dubai. We have a winner for that one?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: How can [inaudible] how we stick on the previous time that we used? The previous meeting? What if we stick on that timeframe?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That was 8 AM, which was...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Because in that time, my time was 7 PM when my location is. So, it could be affordable.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I believe that was 15:00 UTC. Yeah?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Doodle. Let's get back to Doodle.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: As one of the two options, 19:00 seems to be workable, and then we would swing to the other end.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: May I just suggest, perhaps...? If people are available also in California, it would be Thursday 19:00 UTC. If we can lock in next week's meeting, and then perhaps people want to give some more thought as to what two time zones, times we lock in. I'm quite open, but in the interest of time, since we have maybe 20 minutes left, and I think several people have other meetings to attend, if we could lock in just next week's meeting, and then thrash this out on email.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thursday would be 23 March, 19:00 UTC, for one hour. Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: All right, and Don is online and currently looking at his schedule too. Wednesday 22nd? Wednesday 22nd, 19:00.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What if we make 15:00?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: With the understanding that if we do 19:00 on the 22nd, the next one will not be at that time. We'll confirm our schedules on that call. One of the items for that call will be the time of calls. Right? We'll be circulating some options on that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, and we'll prepare a schematic of everyone's time zone so you can actually look at that, and then see where the crossover points might be the best for the majority, or however you want to make your decision to figure out your times that you want to support.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, Wednesday, 22nd, 19:00. Now, for the next call. 19:00 UTC, let's lock that in. And one of the agenda items on that call, we'll be the time of calls.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, but I think we need to take into consideration the diversity based on the regions, and sometimes, for example, for me, there is a way to make a call is to use my office network, because I don't have broadband in my home. So, in most of cases, in that way I'll be missing meetings because I have to use the office broadband connection.

I'm thinking on this, maybe this next week, I'd be missing this.
Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Anyone that has... As we prepare the great meeting table, if you have restrictions specific, like Jeff has informed us of his, I've noted those, so I'm good. But if you have particular time restrictions where you really cannot have, we've noted Kathy's not Monday not Fridays, we'll try to include all of that in.

But if you have them, please send them into staff as we build up this table for everyone to look at and consider, so we can achieve a working timeframe. If you don't have any, then that's fine. But if you do, could you send them in by the end of the week so we can build up the table, please?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And also, as you think about this, since you may not have a broadband connection, we do have the capability of calling out to you so you can have an audio participate. So, whatever number you would like to be called out to, we can arrange that. You may not be able to see what's on the screen, but we should circulate all of the documents beforehand, so at least you'll be able to participate in the discussion if that works for you.

So, if any of the review team members needs us to call you, you just need to let us know that you do, and at what number we should reach you at, and we can arrange those call outs. And we understand that sometimes, wherever you are in the world,

there are challenges, and so we will work to accommodate as best as we can.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. He was worried about the broadband issue, that's why he requested, but I think that could be solved. So, 19:00 UTC is quite a good option, I think, for everyone.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's so good to accomplish things. In that vein, could we perhaps get as a group, confirmation that staff has suggested Madrid for specific dates is... But I don't think we actually discussed and confirmed that as a group. It would be good before we leave to... If you are going to meet them, to lock that in, or if there is an issue for some members, or some people have other suggestions, I think it would be a good time to make that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And just so you know, those are locked in. We already have a contract with the hotel, because on the last call, we thought that was the agreement. So, I hope it's okay, because we're going to have a cost either way.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Excuse me, which dates?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We just had that wonderful mind meld on that one. You would travel on the 12th, the DNS Symposium is on the 13th, the review team will meet on the 14th and 15th, and then you'll travel on the 16th. Unless you want to travel after the meeting ends on the 15th. Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think I'll communicate. [Inaudible] my schedule [inaudible], have a last meetings planned straight through until June. So, I think I may not be able to attend all the days in Madrid. I'll be able to attend the Saturday and the Sunday, but I wouldn't be able to attend the Monday, so far. So, just to put that on the record, so anything I can follow remotely, if it's possible for, if we end up having to participate remotely for the entire time, I probably will opt for that rather than travel to Madrid for two days. But I'll be in touch.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We will have remote participation. So, we want to accommodate your ability to participate in the dialogue, whether you can physically be in a face to face meeting, or have other restrictions, much like Don is not able to travel to the

meeting this time, come up with some means so you can contribute to the dialogue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I think, [inaudible] for the record. For me, I might not be able to attend all the meetings, because in my country, there is a number of meetings that you can, number of trips that you can outside the country as a public officer, so I might not be able to attend all of the meetings.

I think the maximum is three times outside of the country [inaudible]. Thank you.

YVETTE: Okay, we'll get... This is Yvette. We'll go ahead and get Don in here. He's okay with the 22nd of March, Wednesday 19:00 UTC. He also wanted to remind folks, it's probably just affects the United States more than anybody else, that the UTC difference will change in a month. So, I think we've already made ramifications, I think we're good on that.

Yeah. So, that's, yeah. So, I think he's good on that, because [inaudible] ago.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's the first date. Other dates, and schedules, and how you want to manage it, can be accomplished on that call, and we will do some background gathering for you to help you make your decision on that, see what comes up with the most [inaudible] times for all of you.

All right...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: As the, for example, I've mentioned the ICANN DNS Forum, I think we also, in July, we went to the African DNS Forum in my country, and I thought maybe if there is something that can be done that can help the review team, because it's going to be done in my country for the entire Africa, for Africa DNS Forum. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is that some information you could share to the list? So, everyone can have that, and you can have a discussion on it?

I can personally say I have been to an African DNS Forum, and they're wonderful.

Okay, so back to the initial discussion on timing. We're at the kind of less than 10 minute mark, and our cut-off at 5 PM. And back to Carrie's suggestion to maybe leave the last two, your

leadership discussion and expressions of interest, and note that the call on the 22nd will be you will make your decision then on the leadership that you would like to have.

So, turn the floor over to you.

DENISE MICHELLE: This is Denise. Despite my last comment, I would volunteer to be a chair or a co-chair. Actually, I would only want to be a chair if there was someone, or a couple of other people, who would be willing to share the work as co-chairs.

ERIC: I'm Eric [inaudible], I'd be happy to be a co-chair.

EMILY TAYLOR: I'd be happy to be a co-chair... Emily Taylor. I'm not going to, you know, fight anyone for it, if you like. If people are willing. It's a huge responsibility, and I work for a very small organization, so I'd be really willing to do a co-chair thing. I don't think it's really doable as a one person thing, but if there are people who want to co-chair it, I'm very happy for that to happen as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is [inaudible], just for the record. Maybe for diversity within the team, the [inaudible] should be distributed across the region, for having two members coming from the same region. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do we have any other expressions of interest? All right. Well, we've got three candidates then.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can we have three co-chairs?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mean, it's up to the group. I can tell you that the work stream two has three co-chairs. Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We have one from Don. Don also said co-chair or vice-chair, okay for me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So then we have four people interested in position. I notice in your team structure discussion, as you went through that, it seems to be a preponderance of the group supports a co-chair role. So, we've got the candidates and that gives you all

something to think about. And then on the call on the 22nd of March, you can make your determination as to the leadership structure of your group, and go through your time zone calendaring, and all of the details to kind of gel the group and start working on your next steps.

EMILY TAYLOR:

It's Emily. Just to say one thing about that. To have, in a group like this, to have four people stepping forward and willing to take on that responsibility is really quite remarkable, and so whatever happens, I think we've got a pool of people who can well serve as, you know, the [inaudible] in subgroups and stuff like that.

So, I don't think there is any reason for anyone to come out of this upset.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I agree. There will be more than enough to share.

DENISE MICHELLE:

This is Denise. Wait, I think we have a commitment to work this out on our email list, and then I also wanted to just throw a couple of things out for people to think about, and that is, an early... I'd like to consider an early outreach to those

individuals who volunteered to serve on this review team, but were not selected.

I think they're a built-in source of interested and potentially engaged people in this topic area, and I think it would be great if even just a personal email to them, inviting them to offer their input and guidance would be a good thing to do.

And then I think it would be good for us to set aside some time to talk specifically about key groups to meet with or do some outreach to early on in our process.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

If I can respond to that, Denise, all of the applicants that were not selected for the review team have been contacted, and those who were interested in following the work of the review team, which were the vast majority of them, are on your observers' list. So, they already exist. There were quite a number of them, I think there were 11 or 12 of them that participated on the March 2nd call.

I haven't paid attention to who is in any of the Adobe rooms that we have going right now, but future meetings, we do have the observers' room so that they can follow along with what the review team is doing. The decision point is, how do you want to

interact with them? How do you want them to contribute with what you're doing? So, you just need to figure that out.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think another key group would be the first security and stability review team. Like, we're getting a sense of how staff feels. It was implemented, but I think that's a really key group to hear from directly, about whether they feel their work was appropriately implemented, and some of the why behind what they did.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. So, because I have to leave, but I have a quick question, just to wrap-up for myself. We decided that... So, we have four candidates, and in the next call we will, they will send their statements of interest, or their interest to the list, correct? To the mailing list or not? And then, are we going to decide on the next call? Yes.

For that, may I ask, because based on experience, the best is if we can run it anonymously. So, and I know ICANN uses [Big Polls?] or other, so it would be... I would really appreciate if we can cast our votes anonymously.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

I know, but...

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Okay, so even for selection, we are not...? Okay.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. And Don has his hand up. So, Yvette?

YVETTE: Don, please feel free to type, any moment. Now would be good. Yeah, I think he put his hand up, and... He's typing. This is exciting. He's typing. Hold on. Typing.

Typing. Anybody know a joke or something? Okay. She can go ahead because Don is still typing.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It was just a quick follow-up to Denise's point about the observers. Just for something for the team to consider when we get to the stage of subgroups. I think it would be a good resource to actually reach out to supplement the subgroups to actually do the work of sending deliverables. I've done it in a previous, not ICANN setting, but reach out to like that wider

group to assist, and I think it is something that will be useful for us, for the subgroups to get the work to advance.

So, just to think about food for thought.

YVETTE:

Don had typed, he had said, “I think whoever the person who was prior, that spoke prior to Carrie,” he said, “The last person’s mic wasn’t working and he didn’t hear them.” So, he’s asking for a repeat of whatever that was. Do we remember who that was?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

So, it was [inaudible] who had said that if we are going to vote, then he’d like an anonymous voting system, and then James said, oh, we’ve decided, actually it was quite ambiguous, James, whether you were referring to this group or the CCWG. True, as to whether we’re going to vote or not.

But somehow you started off saying, we decided not to vote. That’s how we do it in the CCWG. And I’m very confused about whether we have decided something, or you were just reporting.

JAMES:

This is James for the record. For the record, I’m extremely tired. I’m just off of planes this morning. So, the we I was referring to was actually this group here. So yeah, like, I would like that we

try and stick to that piece of consensus rather than immediately going to vote just after we've decided that we're not going to go to voting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Maybe before the... Okay.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just really quick, I don't think this group has decided whether or not it's going to vote. I didn't think. I think what we talked about, if anything, it was anonymous. That we had agreed on. I didn't know we had agreed we weren't going to vote. And if I missed it, I'm sorry.

JAMES: Yeah, we recorded it as a decision. Yeah.

ERIC: This is Eric. I recall, and I don't have a preference, I recall that we decided that we would have consensus, and that the reason why we decided that was so that we could establish our leadership, and then when the vote was called, I think there was a question whether voting is [inaudible] or in opposition to consensus.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mean, again, it's up to the group as to how you want to approach selecting your leadership and confirming it. I tell you what, you can think about it, and exchange your thoughts on the list, and we can set it up whatever way you would like to do it on the 22nd.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, can we use consensus to decide if we will vote?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I will let you debate the consensus using consensus. I'm sorry, but we have to depart the room, so we've run out of time. I would like to thank you all very much for the wonderful contributions today and the terrific dialogue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you to staff.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And thank you for helping us organize everything and keeping us on track, and doing all of the hard work.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much to staff.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]