
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay, I think we'll get started. Welcome everybody. We have the agenda for those of you who are in the Adobe room. We have the agenda on the right-hand side. We're going to update the statements of interest, note any apologies, absence. And then I think the three substantive points, really, are to continue our discussions on scope, really get stuck into discussing the Madrid agenda and what we want to achieve at that point, the Johannesburg meeting, review open action items and the to-do list. So with that, does anybody have any updates to their statements of interest?

[AUDIO BREAK] Okay, I don't see anybody asking for the microphone, so that is noted. I have received apologies from James and from Don. I don't think anybody else has communicated apologies at this stage. Welcome to those who are just joining the meeting.

So, with that, let us continue our discussions on the Term of Reference. Just to re-cap, you know, there are actually relatively few areas where we're not fully in contention. We have emailed to the list, Version 2, the draft Terms of Reference and we had a good discussion on there that's published on the Wiki. Eric has an open action item to incorporate what's from the team onto the Version 3 draft, and before that happens, we have another moment now where we can continue our discussion.

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.

We had quite a long session on the issue of, to what extent the domain abuse should or shouldn't be included and I think we've come to a wobbly agreement that it should, to the extent that it fits within ICANN's limited mission and that not allow ourselves to get drawn into a wide consideration of domain abuse this large. My recollection from the last meeting is that there are probably three or four points where we have yet to come to consensus. That is, on the post-transition IANA, to what extent is that in or out. It was noted that there has been a transition, that the status has changed, also that certain reviews are envisioned for the post-transition IANA, so the question is, to what extent, if any, are we expected to consider that the post-transition IANA is part of our work.

The second point, I think, that is open is, are we looking literally at the present and the past or do we have any future orientation at all. The third is whether or not we need to define unique identifiers and what that means to the scope of our work. And finally, I think something that we haven't really discussed but is inherently a choice for us is, the extent to which we decide that we will do the optional May items in the Terms of Reference.

So, with that brief instruction, can I ask are there any other open issues that we've missed, I also note that Kerry-Ann had raised something on the list and had promised to clarify her thoughts. So, Kerry, if you would like to use the time now to clarify your points, we'd be very grateful. Okay, so I will open the floor. Okay, I don't see anybody wanting to make—oh, Kerry, thank you, please go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me?

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: The clarification I wanted to provide was...

EMILY TAYLOR: Kerry, your voice is very faint. I know it's very late, but if you could speak up that would help us all.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me now?

EMILY TAYLOR: A little bit better.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm just speaking (inaudible). So, the clarification I wanted to provide was, I agreed with all the outlying (inaudible). The Security and Stability team that exists as is, they still have a mandate in terms of post-transition, in terms of work that they do. And the SSR review team can take some lead on understanding and scope on their work into what we're actually reviewing (inaudible) and some of the clarifications (inaudible) as well, especially if it is about the definition of what is security and stability.

Because (inaudible) kind of reach out, especially in the clarification of the definition of what is security, what is stability, what is the scope of our review in that regard. Well, just the situation in which (inaudible) David Conrad or (inaudible) just speaking, of who we should probably try to see in Madrid. If any of those persons will be available from the SSR team and so on within ICANN and the work that they do, come and help us to decide a little bit more on some of these goals that we're trying to do.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you. Let me just check that I've got that. You're saying that, inevitably, the post-transition IANA falls into part of the work of the Security and Stability team within ICANN and therefore might well be included from that point of view. You're also noting that we could reach either to ICANN General Council or to David Conrad and his team for their guidance and their thoughts on this. You have also highlighted, thank you for this, that there was some comments on the different definitions of security and stability and resiliency in the Terms of Reference, so we should close those issues (inaudible), so thank you for that. Have I missed anything, Kerry? Anybody else want to make any comments? Geoff, thank you, please go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Thanks, and it being four o'clock in the afternoon, I'm wide awake for a change and...

DENISE MICHEL: I think you're the only one.

GEOFF HUSTON: I know. It's a very welcome change.

DENISE MICHEL: Don't say we never make an effort for you.

GEOFF HUSTON: I was reading through the Terms of Reference Version 2.0. I don't when that was, it was 14th of April, about a week ago. And I do notice there in the definition section that security, stability, resiliency, and indeed, unique identifiers, are all defined inside that document, together with a number of other terms that are left as, "to be defined." Quite frankly, I think it's good enough to work from. You know, security: the capacity to protect misuse of internet unique identifiers. Fine. Stability: it operates as expected and users have confidence that it's operating as expected. Seem to me to be perfectly reasonable definitions and I'm not sure we need to spend much more time on it.

The issue of the PTI is more substantive and I recall last week's discussion on this, and I must admit, my view personally is very much the same that, the PTI should be responsible for its own review, in terms of security and stability.

Now, I think we should say that as part of the review, that the bylaws of the PTI do not make it clear. James, certainly, was of the view that the bylaws of the PTI did not make that responsibility clear and I think we

should point that out, and point out that the PTI should indeed take on that particular role. In other words, we should delegate that job to other folk, and let's not try and do everything all at once inside one committee, but let's make sure that the various elements, including the PTI, are fully cognizant and able to discharge their part of this role under their own, you know, resources and within their own set and sphere of judgments.

And so, I think at best, we should just simply be able to observe that they should be doing this and that we will encourage that, and indeed, we will expect it. And maybe that's as much as we need to do. So, I put that forward to kind of a straw man to get over this sort of issue that some of us strongly have the opinion that PTI is out of scope, while others I notice, have quite the opposite view. And maybe this is one we can finesse through. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much and thank you for that helpful summary, Geoff. I have Kerry-Ann on the list. I also note and would ask the Co-Chairs, James Gannon couldn't make today's call but did actually write a brief summary on how his thinking's developed on that point. So, if Denise or Eric could pick that out and share that with the rest of the team, that would be great. Kerry, you have your hand raised? Please go ahead.

KERRY-ANNE BARRETT:

(inaudible), but I wanted to suggest what the (inaudible) as they're written. It's pretty clear that the PTI was set up, although a separate entity, directly reports to ICANN not separately from ICANN, in the

sense that the functions that it was created was in response I think to the independent (inaudible) for the IANA transition. And while we don't want to go on any (inaudible) or go into the extraneous areas.

The Board (inaudible) PTI based on their bylaws, it's not as clear as what is required on the ICANN and PTI while a separate entity. If you look at the bylaws of the PTI itself it still is reporting to ICANN, and then off the contract that it has with ICANN when the PTI was incorporated in August and performs its IANA functions on behalf of ICANN. So it doesn't exclude the accountability aspect of this in terms of the review team.

What it accounts for in terms of (inaudible) limits, the levels of details, if you go into what the PTI is performing, but I don't think it should be included in the event of looking at what are the reporting functions to ICANN and not restricted in the ICANN Board because the (inaudible) restricted to ICANN Board, it's in ICANN. And if you look on the work done on PTI it says, PTI was incorporated as an affiliate of ICANN and through contracts and subcontracts with ICANN, began performing the IANA functions on behalf of ICANN.

So, while the functions are being delegated to the PTI, the functions are still that of ICANN, and being done on behalf of ICANN. So in that regard, I think instead of excluding you could probably consider including within certain parameters, and be very clear and articulate that on review of the functions, the IANA functions in the sense of what PTI did on behalf of ICANN, we can look at a different (inaudible) structure, the accountability structure, but at the end of the day, ICANN Board still maintains the responsibility as (inaudible) accountability, and

being measured in that regard, while not regulating those responsible to account for who is managing that process. So, I just wanted to put out there that I think we should consider but limit articulating what they say, in terms of which we're actually including in the review.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you, Kerry. So, just to summarize because the line is quite faint so for people who are struggling to hear. Your view, based on a reading of the bylaws, is that the PTI is not being spun off completely as an independent entity but is classed as an affiliate. That there is still operational links, if you will, between ICANN and PTI and so you would support a limited review of the PTI functions within the scope of the SSR2. I note also that, as well as Kaveh and Alain, we have Ram Krishna who's also fully supporting Geoff's position and it would be really helpful if any of those three could ask for the mic to just say a few words about why you take the position that you do. Meanwhile I'll go to Denise, please, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks, Emily. As you requested, I'm going to share some contributions from James that he asked us to convey since he wasn't able to be on the call this evening. He indicated that he has spoken to some of the PTI directors offline and that they agreed that as they currently stand the IFR review, the review that's required of the IANA function entity does not include SSR in its scope and that they're open and supportive of our team including, in a narrow way, the PTI within our scope of work and that they also agreed that it's important to have an SSR review of the

PTI. He also had an opportunity to speak to some of the drafters of the IFR review and the drafters of the current bylaw language on the SSR review and both of those groups agreed that the intent was that PTI was to remain in scope of the SSR2 review.

And so, from those conversations, James offers three options for the team's consideration. One, is that we include a narrow part of PTI in our scope. He notes, namely the security framework and the DNSSEC operation piece and that we communicate this to both boards and to Elise, as President of PTI, and agree that task forward with them. Option two would be that we do not include PTI in our scope and we communicate to the Board of ICANN that the IFR scope needs to be updated to specifically include SSR. This requires a huge workload and a fundamental bylaw change trigger which would trigger an empowerment community forum, which is quite an involved process.

And then option three, he posits, would be that we do neither and leave PTI out of scope, but this leaves us with the risk that we do not fulfill our "shall review" mandate from the bylaws. So, those are the three options that James wanted to convey and that he wanted to discuss with the team on this call. Thanks.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much, Denise. Would it be possible for you to just snip that input from James and circulate it to the review team list so that people can take a look at it. Geoff, you have your hand raised, please go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Thank you, and thank you for that summary, Denise, and I couldn't help thinking that there is indeed a fourth option, as ever. And the one that kind of strikes me as being appropriate in this case is, by mutual agreement with the Board of the PTI to delegate this SSR review to the Board of the PTI and say, "Can you please undertake this on our behalf?" And actually incorporate their findings and review back in what we're doing.

So, in other words, respect to some extent the arguments that I hear being made that we have a responsibility here, but at the same time pay some obvious and overt attention to the intended independence of the PTI by effectively trying to say, well, "Could you please do that and do it in a manner that is appropriate to the PTI and we will incorporate your findings in our report, and you will be our delegated agent in this behalf." And so, while we're considering options I certainly feel that that is certainly also a viable option here. Thanks.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much for that suggestion, Geoff. And I think it's right that, you know, I'm seeing on the chat that several people, Boban is the latest to agree with this. There is clearly, within the group, a feeling like, well, transition's taken place, you don't want to behave as if it's never happened, we don't want to overreach ourselves and end up meddling in something that has deliberately been taken out of the ICANN scope.

And at the same time there is also, it's almost, if I could put it, lawyers versus techies, which has never happened before, as, you know, those

who are going to the bylaws and saying, well hang on, we've got some reservations about taking such a kind of clear view that it's not included for the following reasons and you can see James's text there. Eric, you have your hand raised. Please go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay, so if I'm not clear, it's because it's 2:30AM. But, you know, I just want to sort of reiterate something I think that I touched on last meeting or meeting before. I think there's a difference between planning to sort of produce recommendations that may sort of be directed towards PTI and potentially artificially limiting our ability to sort of see issues that may have systemic relations to things that fall into other purviews. In other words, we may need to sort of look at the whole picture, understand how things are interrelated, including some of the things that someone might claim fall under the purview of PTI.

We may then want to limit the sorts of recommendations we make to those that are achievable by different organizations. But I'm just a little bit worried that if we're too concerned about what's in and out of scope to even start considering what the issues are then we may wind up with such a limited set of things that we're looking at that we'll have kind of a myopic review.

So, in other words, I think it might make more sense to start considering the sorts of security, stability and resiliency issues that we need to for identified systems in general that relate to ICANN. And then start to have this conversation little more directly when we start talking about

what our recommendations are going to be or where these systemic dependencies lead. Thanks.

EMILY TAYLOR:

So, if I can try and summarize what you're suggesting, Eric, is that you're saying that actually look at our task which is, you know, considering security, stability, resiliency issues relating to unique identifiers. Then we find out what those issues are, obviously, you know, limited by ICANN's scope, so we're not sort of ranging over the whole world's problems. But we say, well, within ICANN's scope, these are the issues.

Ah, okay, this one is a bit more of an IANA-ish type of thing. Or it may not even occur. But what you're warning us against is an over-rigid exclusion of issues at this stage which may well end up just limiting us into, if you like, a very quick bureaucratic review which would possibly, you know, fail to be useful, if you like. Have I got that about right? Okay, thank you. Eric has just put, yes, in the chat room, thank you. Geoff, please go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, thanks. Look, I hear what Eric's saying but I go back and look at definitions and I'm still a little bit concerned about this. If the house was burning down and there were obvious fires, maybe there is some justification here. But we are looking at a well tended environment where security and stability has been considered, resourced and heeded for many years. And so, to some extent, what you might describe, Emily, as a quick bureaucratic exercise, I might describe as something

entirely befitting and appropriate considering that, if you will, this is not a subject that's been unattended. It's been well attended subject.

My concern about pulling the PTI into this starts to sort of getting us intruding into places where I think we have a dubious ability. The one that sticks out right in my head is the definition of unique identifiers includes the protocol parameter registries as directed by the IETF. Now, that's a relationship between the IETF and the PTI, where ICANN's involvement is, at best, peripheral. And it strikes me as being somewhat intrusive of the SSR if it was wondering into an arrangement when neither the PTI or the IETF have any particular negative view on what's happening.

Indeed, as I understand it, both parties are quite comfortable with the directions, the level of participation and the dual attention to security and stability already being paid. You kind of think that if this is between the PTI and the IEFT and has nothing to do with ICANN per se, then what business is it of ours?

So, you know, I'm, I suppose, much more in favor of small achievable set of bounds of this review that focus on ICANN and what ICANN does, and in particular, a heavy attention, if you will, on the naming space which is the core purview of ICANN as it relates to the DNS. And essentially acknowledge that other parties who are basically disconnected from ICANN, undertake various roles in accordance with the PTI, that aren't really core business for this SSR review. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thanks, Geoff. I've got Eric and then Kerry-Anne, and just noting that we're coming up to halfway through our meeting. Thank you. I've also got Matogoro on the list and then I'll just ask if anybody else wants to take the floor, please do so now because then we're going to close this issue. Eric, please go ahead.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, so just to sort of respond a little bit to some of the comments just made. I mean, some of your points are well made, Geoff. I think on the other hand, you know, there's a difficulty in understanding some of the larger concerns that sort of stem from things outside of a very narrow scope. So if you look at something like name collisions, name collisions still winds up being a really big deal. So it's really hard to look at just a narrow scope and see what's causing a name collision or how bad it is actually affecting someone.

Nevertheless, if you take a broader scope to say, how are names being used and why are they being used, and then you trace that back to, you know, registry issues or something that, you know, that stems from an issue in the root. You never would have thought of that, you never would have seen that very real problem, very measurable, very explainable problem if you hadn't started with a broad analysis. I of course agree that you can't boil the ocean, and you don't want to boil the ocean, and once you start to lock in on some issues you do need to be specific and you do need to address them within the purview of, you know, our scope.

But I think they necessarily sometimes start outside of what we would consider a scope before we've learned about them, before we get briefed on them from external groups like SSAC, RSSAC, or, you know, APWG, MAC or whoever. So, you know, I definitely hear your point, Geoff, but I'm just a little concerned, you know, we have a couple straw man (inaudible) collisions that really are important and really would be easy to overlook if we started looking too narrowly. Thanks.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you. Kerry? Kerry, I'm not hearing you. Are you on mute?

KERRY-ANNE BARRETT:

Yes I was. I agree with Eric's point just now and I think what I feel very, like, the part that I feel is that the (inaudible) overall, I think, Geoff, that's the concerns I have is for me it's not a (inaudible) an area that does not concern us but that's the language that I think that worries me a little bit when we think about our scope. As I said, I'm taking it strictly from the language of everything post-transition, not even pre-transition, everything post-transition (inaudible) the agreement entered into by PTI and ICANN in September, the new bylaws that were formed in August.

All of those things contemplate that the PTI is performing these functions on behalf of ICANN. You take that strict legal interpretation, while indeed operational aspect, being that they are operating independently and ensuring the management of the IANA functions are done.

At the end of the day I think we should just more look at what aspects that Eric even highlighted, some of the specific aspects that should be included, even if it's more management procedural review, not necessarily getting into the nitty gritty details of how the PTI manages itself, but more in the sense of how it is accountable to ICANN, it's not separate from ICANN but it's their popup content framework to ICANN that would actually allow the people to be accountable instead of just the contract, though the contract is pretty basic. The agreement that the (inaudible) it doesn't have a lot of details in terms of standards and accountability.

So, it's something that we should not exclude, and I still encourage us, if we are that confused, probably sit with (inaudible) on the next conference call. And put a specific question to them which is what we're trying to answer. Does post-transition affect the review team's ability to examine the operations of PTI in relation to its accountability to ICANN? It's not a Board to Board issue, it's function to function, more than Board to Board. That's it, thanks.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thanks very much for that, Kerry. Matogoro?

JABHERA MATOGORO:

Yes, I just want to comment that the business -- because we are doing this review of--

EMILY TAYLOR: Matagoro, could you speak a little louder or closer to your microphone. We've got a very good line from you this time, but it's just a little difficult to hear.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yeah, it was over the idea about the PTI saying it's something that we need to include within the discussion because as we can see that we need to see the scope of the security, stability and the resiliency after the (inaudible). So I think it's something that we need to include although as Denise has mentioned has made some kind of opening discussion (inaudible). I think it's something that we can take into consideration in another way actually to see the aspects or the scope of the security and resiliency within the new bylaws. I think that is something that was of the idea that we should also (inaudible) with and rather than ignoring and not mentioning something about it. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. Denise, you have your hand raised. Please go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. I agree with the comments of Terry-Anne and Eric and James as well, at least his first option. I think that the PTI is appropriate and within the SSR review team's scope, particularly reviewing the security framework and DNSSEC operations of the PTI. At this point, in my view, this scope is sort of a collection of issues we'll be drilling into. We may well not have time to fully address everything within our scope that we

initially include in this scoping document. It may be that we get to a point and we determine that our recommendation will be, we don't have the time to explore issue X as much as we think it merits.

And so our recommendation will be for the Board, or the staff, or PTI, or another entity involved in the issue, you know, follow up with additional research and reporting to the community. There could be a whole variety of action items, simply because we acknowledge that something should be within the review team scope does not necessarily mean that we'll come out with a very specific or directed recommendation.

There's a whole variety of ways that we could go. But from my perspective, at the outset, I think it behoves us to be a bit more extensive and try and include all of those items and areas that we feel in some way should be explored and perhaps addressed by the team and then just move on to organize our work. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you. So, just to sum up where we are, because we now really do need to move onto the other agenda items. We're pretty evenly split in terms of the numbers for those who strongly believe that the PTI should not be included and those who strongly believe that it should be included in some way. Some threads of where I do think that we agree with each other, one another. And by the way, I think this is an extremely foreseeable area for us to try to get to the bottom of and to have different opinions on.

So, it is not in any way a failure on our part that we are divided on this because there's been a change in the landscape and therefore we do

need to understand how to respond and how that affects our work. What does seem to be coming through is that whatever we decide, which could either be now or could be a little bit down the road once we've got started. You know, we can flag this as an area where there is disagreement. It's an area where we should go carefully. But above all, we should either communicate what we have decided if we can make a decision, or if we can't make a decision.

And I think this takes one of Kerry-Anne's suggestions, we should ask for help. You know, James has gone and taken some informal findings from various people. Can we ask some of those people to come and join one of our calls and explain how it looks from their point of view? We don't want to fail to do something that is expected of us. And equally, we don't want to range beyond the bounds of what is expected of us. So, my proposal would be for us perhaps to send an invitation to somebody who can speak with authority on behalf of the PTI, and speak with authority on behalf of the bylaws drafters, and help to pitch in for our next call and inform us about what the intention was. Would that be a way forward?

Okay. So, I'm seeing some agreement on that. We'll try and get an action item out of that somehow. So, basically we want the PTI and the bylaws drafters to come and advise us because we're stuck. And I think it's completely rational for us to be stuck. And I would suggest that we continue our discussions on the open items on the Terms of Reference in our next call. We still need to do a little bit more on definitions. I think that my suggestion to the group and my request to the group would be, if you've got substantive points to make on definitions, to

make on future or present, and the optional (inaudible), please, please, please, go back to the list.

You can see how much we use our time so quickly in doing what we should do on these calls which is exploring areas that we disagree and trying to actually get our points across. Please go back to the list, and particularly an of those who have not yet commented on the Terms of Reference, let us have your opinions there and then we can reduce the time that we're spending on areas that we agree. Okay, with that, I would like to also suggest, Eric, that we perhaps, I don't know what you think but maybe just delay the factoring into Version 3, or do you think we're ready to go now?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, we can delay. It looks like there's kind of a huge amount of agreement that we should get reached. I've got a little bit of something drafted that I can certainly sit on until we get on the same page.

EMILY TAYLOR:

That's great. Okay. Alright, thank you, let's do that and just get our briefing halted. Thank you.

Okay, Madrid. We've got a really good program taking shape in Madrid. Starting on the Friday day evening, welcome and reception. I actually think at these early stages of our group work those social events are really useful to get to know each other as individuals. I know that some of us will actually be in Madrid but not at the meetings because of diary clashes with the, is it the OARC? But we have the DNS Symposium. We

have a dinner on the Saturday, very important. And then we have two days of face-to-face meetings, so the question is, what do we do?

At the moment, just to let you know, the Co-Chairs are starting to work very closely with staff to ensure that we have the right people in the room to give us briefings from the SSR team. But this would be a very good opportunity now to hear from anyone on the team about how you think we should use that time. We've got two days together, we can really make a lot of progress. So, the floor is open. Would anybody like to make any comments or suggestions for the draft agenda? I'm seeing no activity at all. Nobody asking for a microphone. Are people reasonably happy with it? Denise, thank you, please take the floor.

DENISE MICHEL:

I was on mute. So, were you referring to the overall Madrid meeting agenda or also input on how we spend our face-to-face time on Sunday and Monday?

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you, Denise. Yes, I was really asking about the bit of the agenda which I would view as in our control, which is our precious face-to-face time on Sunday and Monday.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thanks. And so since the bulk of the staff that has done the SSR1 implementation, and is responsible for the ICANN SSR related work, will be in Madrid and I think available Sunday, I think their proposal was to let the team know that the Chairs are working with staff on, would have

us address, essentially do a deep dive with the staff on the details of how they implemented a number of the SSR1 recommendations and have a wholesome discussion of many of those issues, at least for part of Sunday. Since assessing both the implementation and the impact of the SSR recommendations is one of our mandated duties.

What we are thinking is that, and with all of us in the same place, it would be good to get a start on that work in addition to some other ideas that we have for the agenda. So I just wanted to throw that out and the Co-Chairs, our thinking here is that we provide a draft agenda to the list and give team members an opportunity to add any additional thoughts to it before finalizing it in advance of Madrid. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much. Yes, and you know, there are some areas on the Terms of Reference where we're having difficulty coming to agreement but there are many areas where we're not. And one which seems to be completely uncontroversial is the requirement that we review the implementation of the recommendations from the first of these reviews. And so, Denise says it's a great opportunity while we have the staff there in Madrid, to really get stuck into the details and to get a much deeper view than we've had so far. So that is one of the areas that we're working on.

And just to let you know, the Co-Chairs are working in the background and discussing and we'll have a draft agenda as soon as we can to share with you for your comments for those Sunday and Monday days. Does anybody want to make any other comments? I do see on the chat room

Matogoro has recommended that remote participation be worked out early for those who are unable to join.

I know from speaking in some of the one-to-one calls with other team members that some are having difficulties arranging visas for Madrid so again, I would encourage anybody who's having difficulties with visas to inform staff and ask for help. The staff are very, very happy to help and willing to help on those issues, so please do do that. Any other comments on this item? I can see some typing going on in the chat so I'm just going to let that run its course. Matogoro, please go ahead.

JABHERA MATOGORO:

Yes, I was of the idea that for the SSR1, the implementation, if we can have kind of a summary of what has been implemented and possibly the KPI for the SSR2 in, to assess, to evaluate, to the extent to which the recommendation has been implemented, that will be very helpful to the team. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much for that. And indeed, there is a summary that has been updated really in the last day or so by staff, which goes through each recommendation one at a time and provides an update from the staff's perspective of how the implementation has gone and relevant things. Okay, so, that will be circulated on the list in due course, I think. Probably quite soon. But thank you for that point. Anything else?

Okay. I'm going to go on to the Johannesburg meeting. Just a status report on planning. You'll recall from the last meeting, I think that there

was generally a feeling like, that albeit this is a policy forum and we might have to get permissions from whoever to meet, there is a will to meet, and a view that the ICANN meetings provide a very important hub convening factor that gets people into the same place at the same time.

So, typically, we asked for a doodle poll so that we could reduce our options on when to meet. And you'll see from the results that they're almost evenly spread. So, really, over to you, you know, it looks like the weekend before or the week of, are marginally more suitable for more people. And so I guess that, what would we ask staff to do? Would we ask staff to find us a meeting time and venue? So, the floor is open. Denise, did you want to speak to this point? Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Sure. I understand that staff is trying to organize a call between I think a couple of the review teams that want to meet, and the SO and AC Chairs, to discuss the schedule. So, that call may add clarity to this situation and may narrow our options. And I think availability of hotels and meeting space might also be determining factors here.

So, I think in terms of next steps, there'll be this conference call with the SO and AC Chairs about what flexibility there is in the June 26th to June 29th schedule. And then we'll also be waiting to hear from staff on our options and then the Chairs will report back to the teams. Our goal is to lock in our dates really as soon as possible and hopefully within the next week.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much for that clarification, Denise, that's really helpful. So, this is an action item that is in progress and we're hoping to have a call with the SO and AC Chairs to help us find a way forward. Okay, anything else on the Johannesburg meeting?

Okay, a very quick look at our open action items. So, the Version 3, we've just spoken about. The second item scheduled for 1st of May is a non-disclosure agreement, Conflict of Interest, a disclosure document which ICANN will be producing. I think that this follows up on comments made in the initial face-to-face meeting. We're still I think aiming to provide Terms of Reference for the Board and the other items on this slide are really kind of getting us to do that, you know, towards that goal.

Okay, so, can I ask for Any Other Business? Does anybody have any items of other business that they would like to speak or would you just like to share your general thoughts with the group? I could just update you... Matogoro, yes please, go ahead. Matogoro, I'm not hearing you, are you on mute?

JABHERA MATOGORO:

Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you. Okay, thank you, Emily. I have one idea that the Madrid meeting is part to the DNS Symposium, but I also see like it's partly of the kind of an outreach initiative. And I was of the idea that it's better, a part of the agenda, that would be presented from the meeting, but it is of the need for the team to mention some of the objectives that we need to complete while in Madrid as part of the outreach engagement. Thank you.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Thank you very much, Matogoro, and you raise a very important point about the need for outreach and continual outreach, even if we haven't got final decisions as an output to communicate. I believe that there was a draft log going around and also I think that the ICANN meetings themselves present great opportunities to do outreach to relevant communities.

I would just also highlight for the group that Matogoro has circulated details of African meetings that are going ahead, which might well be suitable for outreach. And also to ask each and every individual team member to think about the outreach that they can do within their own communities. Clearly it's easier to perform outreach when we have a clearer scope, when we have a timeline, when we feel like we are starting our tasks, however, it is important for us to bear in mind and to plan.

Okay, is there anything else? Right, well with that, I think that the follow up items, I saw that the SSR Implementation Action Items have already been circulated to the list. We are going to ask staff to arrange for briefings from those responsible for PTI and bylaws drafting to help advise us on the issue of the PTI. I would repeat the request for all team members to review the Terms of Reference. Stick with it, we are nearly there. I know that we're focusing on the areas that we disagree on but there's a lot that we do agree on. And we should be able to make solid progress on the list and on these calls.

And lastly, to thank you all for your participation and to wish you a good day. Thank you very much and I'm going to close the meeting now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]