
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks for joining everyone. Can we go to the next slide? So, this is Denise Michel. It's my turn at that, so I'll be chairing today's call. Our agenda has six items on the screen. And if someone doesn't have Adobe Connect access and is only on the phone, please let me know so we can make sure we describe what we're looking at in case it's needed. Are there any updated statements of interest that we need to cover at the beginning of our call? Any team members have updated SOIs?

Okay, Yvette, are there apologies? Absences to note?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: There are two apologies I currently have, one is Bobin, one is Carey Ann. I have noticed, I don't believe Emily has joined us as of yet. I want to try to work on contacting her to make sure everything is okay and she doesn't need assistance getting into the room. Those are the two apologies I have noted though. Bobin and Carey Ann.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you very much. So, we have three key things to address on today's call. And we also have an item for other business, should be there other matters people would like to raise, but the three items we want to focus on today are continuing our discussion on the scope, the

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.

draft terms of reference that we have been trading emails on on the list, and that we discussed at our last conference call.

So, we're going to continue the discussion on that and also get input people have about next steps and in particular a timeline. Co-Chairs would like to help the team set sort of a deadline to work towards as we finish up the draft terms of reference. The other item is the Madrid meeting, which is coming up quickly, we're going to have a brief discussion about our objectives, get any input people may have on the agenda, review any outstanding logistical or other matters. And the Co-Chairs will be sending out a draft agenda for the team to consider in the next couple of days that we'll need to get out shortly.

And then, finally there are some developments regarding the Johannesburg meeting, which has been on the team's agenda, so we'll touch on that today as well. Are there any other agenda items people would like to add to the list, before we start? Okay.

EMILY TAYLOR:

Denise, it's Emily. Just to say I'm trying to join through the Adobe room and having difficulties connecting, but I've go audio but I can't see the screen, I'm going to try and keep trying to get the screen, so bear with me, but I'm the call.

DENISE MICHEL:

Great, thank you. So, going back to the second agenda item. We're continuing our discussion of the draft terms of reference, specifically

the section on the scope. The proposed scope of our team's work. That starts on page three of the current draft that's circulating on the list. Is anyone having challenges finding that draft? Okay. Great.

So, the floor is open for additional discussions about the scope. I'm taking a cue. James? I see your hand up? And if you're speaking, we can't hear you. Nope. Why don't we go to Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Hey, yeah, so I've been a little more quiet on this, but I've been watching and reading the comments and jumping in a couple of times, and so, I propose that one of the things, actually what I'd like to do is I'd like to ask what people's perspective is on potentially taking starting point that we have, we have a few sets of bullet points and some references that motivated the bullet points, and then a handful of them have comments from you, Denise, from James, from Kaveh, etcetera.

And I propose that we sort of take that and factor it into next text that I'd be happy to do the first draft of and pass up the list. I've been iterating a little bit, trying to do that, but I wonder if people would sort of have a positive or negative reaction to trying to take this and put it into a list of this is how we'll decide what to do? This is how we'll decide what to look at, and this is how we'll decide, we produce meaningful results from what we do? And then, Denise, one of the things you said, I think was on our last call, was keeping the sense this is a living document, it necessarily needs to evolve as our understanding and direction is attenuated.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, thank you, Eric. James, I see you have your hand up, and others, please feel free to speak up or raise your hands and we'll continue this discussion. James?

JAMES GANNON: Okay, second time lucky. Can people hear me this time?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

JAMES GANNON: Excellent, sorry I was using the wrong mike. And yes, so something that I realized we discussed at our face to face in Copenhagen but we never really came back round to was the issue of whether PTI [inaudible] and its security framework and everything else is in scope or out of scope. It was something that we brought up, we had various discussions on, but we never finalized on what our positions were on that. And do we plan to come back to that? It's not mentioned explicitly in terms of reference, is that something that we think we should put into the terms of reference? Is it something that we still need to have a discussion on? Have we decided one way or the other on what's people thoughts on it? It's something I'd like to bring up with regards to scope.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you James. Thanks for raising that. Are there thoughts on the issues raised by Eric and or James? I see that Kaveh. Sure.

EMILY TAYLOR: Can I raise my hand and get me whenever is in the scope?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, go ahead Emily and then after Emily we have Geoff and then perhaps Kaveh, looking for hands. Go ahead, Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: Just a very quick one, to say yes, thanks James I noticed that you raised that on the list just before the call. And you're right to keep that open. I recall that Carey Ann made some interesting points on this issue at the last call. And based on quite a close reading of the bylaws, I know that Carey Ann's not able to make this call today. But I think the gist of what she was saying, if I understood it well, the PTI being a wholly unsubsiary, James this is something that you also mentioned. It has actually no policy purview that is simply an operational subsidiary of ICANN. The policy is set and the supervision is done through ICANN, that's my understanding. So, I just thought I'd thrown that into the discussions, and thanks, James, for raising that again.

DENISE MICHEL: Geoff and then Kaveh and Eric, go ahead, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you, looking through the requirements or the scope here, and the bullet points and I see a rather troubling entry called DNS abuse, study

the DNS abuse last cycle and evaluate DNS abuse through mitigation measures. To say the [mystic? 00:09:10] would be laughably naive. That is simply an impossible task. And as it's written, I find it very difficult to understand its relationship to ICANN and its bylaws. Quite frankly, that's not going to work, the way that's written.

I see there are some comments around has ICANN effectively fulfilled its limited role in threat mitigation and I suspect that a somewhat better approach, the larger topic is simply impossible and that the focus that whether ICANN is aware of and within the terms and scope of its mission is sufficiently reactive to what it is aware, would strike me as a more realistic assessment. As it's written, that's just simply not going to happen. DNS abuse doesn't work in ways that it readily categorized, summarized, or even studied in finite time. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff, we have Kaveh and then Eric, then James, then I put myself in the queue. Go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, so Geoff, quick answer to what you mentioned, you're right and we discussed that in detail on the last call. If I remember correctly we basically agree to stay with that wording, which mentions limited, the scope that relates to ICANN. But I haven't seen a final version yet. On the comments from James, I think IANA should not be included in our scope, so it's good that it's not mentioned in the document, for multiple reasons.

The concept of the PTI basically, this PTI is at the end a contract for ICANN. So, if we want to look at what ICANN and PTI to do from policy and all of that, that's something the team might be interested in. I'm not, I think that can be some how related, 'cause what PTI does they're linear contractors, we should also look at them if we want to extend the scope that big. I think the best way to approach that is to look into what would happen to ICANN if PTI fails, and then from there, see if we want to even look into PTI or at level, or IANA function from today's relates to ICANN and maybe decide if we want to look into that or not. But I suggest

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you Kaveh. Eric and then James, and then me and then anyone else.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so I think this is one of the things I think I brought up on the last call as well, just sort of bring it all back up to speed. I think that there's a difference between what we look into, and what we consider as important to understand and what we're like, for example

recommending at the end. So, we're very concerned about ICANN's remit and where we should or shouldn't make an authoritative statement, and I get that, I think that's definitely something that we need to keep in mind, but that's not the same thing as understanding an issue, that relates to the SSR issues of things that are within ICANN's remit. So for example, elements of the root name space might become important when look at effects being felt farther down the food chain or in different ecosystems, and so we can't recommend somebody do something to a webpage to one of the points that came up last time.

One the other hands, things that are happening non webpages could have implications on things that are within ICANN's remit. So, I think it might be important, and this is my two cents and certainly open to discussion for us to consider broadly the things that affect the elements that we will make recommendations about and those things that affect them might be outside of ICANN's remit but we don't want to do early optimization to not consider them, if they do have a very relevant perspective on things that matter to us. That would be my two cents.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Eric. James?

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Denise. So just coming back to the PTI topic, it's very important to understand the corporate governance around PTI. So, PTI is not just a contractor of ICANN, there is a functions contract between ICANN and PTI. However, ICANN fully owns PTI and is the sole member of PTI forma corporate governance point of view. Based on what Carey Ann said and

on our last meeting, I spoke to one of our corporate governance lawyers in California, and if we look at the way for example, if we take something as an analogy for the financial statements for a wholly subsidiary and its parent company, it would be considered fully under scope for any set of auditing or any when you go in and do reviews and you go down through the corporate governance structure, you would go and also review those wholly subsidiaries of the parent corporations.

And just from a practical point of view, if we want to look at comparing SSO1 and its scope and then comparing that to what we need to do now, it would be a huge change for us to consider IANA out of scope and just because it has become an external party that is now fully owned and is fully integrated in all the financial planning, in an operational way, that it is made up of former ICANN staff, which are now sitting in the same building as ICANN, I think it would be a big mistake for us to just discount and say, "Oh well, it is now just a contractor" this is a critical part of the unique identifier system. And particularly of the security piece because a lot of the DNS sec stuff sits within PTI now, for example. The only persons that I know that stayed on the ICANN side is Rick Lamb.

And so I really hope that we have a really strong discussion around this, before discounting PTI as being in scope.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, James. I've put myself in the queue, I invite others to raise their hands or speak up on the number of issues that have already been raised and additional ones that are in the draft scope. So, to go back to

Eric's first comment, I think it's a reasonable path forward to use the structure of the initial draft, take the edits, comments and discussions we've had so far about the elements of the scope, and come up with a new, more robust draft of the scope part of the terms of reference, to bring back to the team for another round of discussions. I think that's a good practical way of getting us closer to our end point.

Regarding the DNS abuse comments, again, I think Geoff wasn't able to join our last call, but there was general agreement to use more of the approach that I articulated in a comment, there. I think it still needs a little bit more work, but it would be great to get your specific input on the next version of that language, so we can appropriately bound the DNS abuse related elements of our scope.

And then, finally on PTI, I generally agree with James we will be in part addressing IANA, because it is our job to assess the implementation and effectiveness of the SSR1, the first review team's recommendations they did touch on in part touch on IANA. Additionally, I didn't read the bylaw language as precluding or taking PTI out of our mandate, and I also think Eric makes a good point that at this stage, I don't think it's appropriate to limit ourselves too much. We want to make sure that we understand the critical environments and issues that the team identifies. Clearly understand ICANN's responsibility and role in that, and then, move onto our recommendations.

Additionally keeping in mind, that as we move through our work, and start developing recommendations we don't want to be duplicative of other efforts that may be related that are occurring within ICANN. So, if we choose to look at PTI or elements of PTI and how they affect ICANN,

I think we also need to be mindful of the review requirements that PTI also carries with it, and make sure that we're not duplicating efforts.

Who else would like speak?

EMILY TAYLOR:

Denise, could I just come in for a second on if there's anyone else in the queue please go ahead. But thanks for those comments and this discussion. I think we are in agreement with the majority on this. Also note that to Geoff's comment about DNS abuse there's quite a long discussion on that on the last call. And I think we are pretty much all on the same page we don't want to boil the ocean. But as with PTI, we don't want to exclude ourselves from things that are part of our job. So, at the end of your comment you mentioned not duplicating effort, again, I think this may be repeating things that were discussed at the last call. But I also think it's very important that we coordinate and consider what other review teams are going to be looking at and in particular the consumer trust review, which is far advance, the WHOIS which is going to be kicking off any time soon.

We'll cover quite similar areas and we should be mindful that we're not duplicating effort or going over areas that are better covered by other reviews. And I think that that will be the way that we can limit our scope. For example, I think on the issue of DNS abuse, to echo comments by other team members, issues relating to content are already being considered by the consumer trust crowd. So, I thought I'd just throw that into the pot, while we're having this fairly wide ranging discussion. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Emily. Are there other comments regarding any of these points raised? Cathy, your hand up? And Cathy, you'll need to come off mute, I think.

CATHY HANDLEY Okay, sorry you're not going to be able to hear me very well, my allergies are killing me. But just to comment on back on PTI, I have been on the school that doesn't think it's in our remit, but that's fine. But I think it's important if it's a decision of the team, to get into PTI that we only get into there's a very limited part of PTI that ICANN really do anything about. As far as looking at things, when it comes to addressing and I just think that if we do end up going there, we need to keep in mind what can actually be effective. Hope you got that, you could hear it.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I could hear that. Thank you, Cathy. I see James' hand up and Don Blumenthal and also Erin Oldberry. Karen, did you need to make an announcement, or did you have a?

KAREN MULBERRY Denise, I was just going to point out that early on in the review team, when you started discussing this, after Copenhagen I did share with you the bylaws and article 18, that actually addressed PTI, you might want to look at the way that that's constructed, because it's actually set up to have a separate review of PTI?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, thank you Karen. And if you could resend that, there I see, you dropped it in the chat, if you could resend that to the email list, so people have that at the top of their box, that would be great.

EMILY TAYLOR: Denise, sorry, it's Emily. Sorry, could I just come in very quickly on Karen's point. Yeah, sure, do you want to go ahead James? I'm very frustrated, I can't get into the Abode room, it's just breaking my computer.

JAMES GANNON: No, you go ahead, Emily. I think we're going to make the same point.

EMILY TAYLOR: So I looked quite carefully and thank you, Karen for raising this point. As far as I could see, the bylaws instruct various reviews of the PTI, but there didn't seem to be anything that was looking at security and stability, now if I've missed that, then please do highlight that when you forward it to the list, but I would be reluctant to take those bylaws reviews as a okay stand down for us, because there doesn't seem to be anything that instructs reviews of the PTI to look at the security and stability. So, thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you Emily. Bernie did you have an interjection before we move on to Don Blumenthal?

BERNARD TURCOTTE I just wanted to make clear I'm trying to capture the action items.

DENISE MICHEL: We'll cover that, yeah. We'll cover that when this agenda item is done, thanks, Bernie. Okay, we have Don Blumenthal and then Geoff and then James. Go ahead, Don.

DON BLUMENTHAL Hi, this is a little bit self evident but if you decide to limit the scope of our examination, our inclusion of PTI, then we have to be really [inaudible] about why we included some and not others. So, just looking at the interaction time, I would like to note that.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Don. Geoff and then James?

GEOFF HUSTON: I'd like to chime and agree largely with what Cathy has said here, that the PTI has its own periodic review structures, at some point if you try and say, "Well, we need to look behind that, you're actually evaluating the statements of work, that at in effect defined by interactions between PTI and folk who are reliant on PTI's outcomes and actions, which I think is then getting way beyond where this particular review team has a legitimate remit. So, on the grounds that I think that it does

have its own in effect governance structure and review structure, I would actually see this as being an extremely limited, if indeed at all relevant to SSR2's work, and my personal view is we should not be going there. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff. James?

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. So, I wear a number of different hats at ICANN, so I'm going to take my SSR hat off and put on my customer standing committee and somebody who was very involved in writing these sections that we're talking about right now. So, the IFOR review in Article 18 is in analogy or in parallel to this review at all. That is a very specific review to do with the IANA naming functions contracts the statement of work between ICANN and PTI.

So that is largely going to be based around the ability of PTI to meet the SLEs which were defined in CCWG, and I sit on the committee, called the customer standing committee, which oversees IANA's or sorry PTI's day to day [recorded voice 00:27:30]. Thank you. That oversees the day to day expectations around those SLEs, so I can definitely say to that if we are looking at Article 18 as our reason for not including PTI we are misreading the bylaws, that is not the intent of the IFOR or the periodic IFOR nor the ISIFOR, which are for an entirely different purpose. I just want to point that out, and make that very clear.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, James. Geoff, is that a new hand?

GEOFF HUSTON: No, it's an old one.

DENISE MICHEL: Does anyone else have comments to share? Okay. Well, thank you all for I think a very fruitful discussion. Coming back to the suggestion that Eric raised, earlier on in this discussion. So, Eric suggested that he hold the pen I believe, Eric, and please correct me if I'm misinterpreting your comments. That he take a shot at taking this discussion and the comments and edit that have arisen and provide a new copy of the scope section of terms of reference document for the team to consider. Did I capture that correctly, Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I'm more than happy to give that a shot.

DENISE MICHEL: Is there-- is everyone comfortable with that approach as our next step? Anyone not comfortable with that? Okay. So that's our action item, and then, I think as and thank you so much, Eric, for volunteering to do that.
[AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello everyone, if you're not watching the chat, it seems we've lost Denise's audio. We'll be trying to get her back shortly. Thank you. If it's

going to take more than a minute, hopefully we'll get one of our other Co-Chairs to step in in the meantime. [AUDIO BREAK].

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, this is Denise, can you guys hear me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Not sure what happened there. What was the last thing I said?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You were thanking Eric for taking on the task of drafting the next version of the scope and terms of reference.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, okay, so when Eric does anyone have any objection to that as the next step? If not, when Eric provides the next draft for the team, the Co-Chairs will also provide a proposed timeline for the deadline in which we hope to wrap this work up. It'll be a proposal, but I don't know about you, but timelines and deadlines tend to help me focus attention. So, we'll provide that as well, for your consideration along with the next draft of scope. Is that acceptable to everyone? Anyone have a problem with that? Okay.

Great. With that, then, we'll move onto the next agenda item. And I think Yvette has freed the scroll so that you're all welcome to peruse through the slides if you need to. Right now, we're on agenda item three, the Madrid meeting? You can see on the screen, if you have Adobe Connect, yeah, I think Emily's in, great. We have an optional DNS symposium reception on Friday the 12 May, Saturday May 13 the review team is to attend the – did anyone else just lose their slides?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi, Denise. This is Yvette, I was just going ahead and putting in the Madrid meeting details, so these are different slides on the screen.

DENISE MICHEL: All right, so Saturday all review team members should plan to be at the DNS symposium all day, I think we have a proposed review team dinner Saturday night, the 13th. And then, our meeting will be a two-day meeting, all day Sunday and all day Monday. And is there any, let me just pause there. Does anyone have any questions about this schedule as it stands?

No? Okay. Not seeing any, we wanted to raise the issue of how to best use our face to face time, that is on Monday and excuse, rather Sunday and Monday. The Co-Chairs will develop a draft proposed agenda for both days, more detailed agenda for the team to consider. I wanted to give people an opportunity to raise any issues or share any ideas they have, right now. And one thing I would note, is that a significant number of the asset technical and SSI related staff will be in Madrid, and we hope available on Sunday and again, this is my personal opinion or suggestion.

Since an assessment of SSR1 implementation of SSR1 recommendations is a mandate for our team, that we could use part of our Sunday agenda to do a deep dive, into understanding how ICANN implemented SSR1 recommendations, or at least a significant number of them, and be in our consideration of the effectiveness of that implementation. So, that's an idea that I want to throw out there and I invite anyone else, who has thoughts on the best use of our Madrid meeting to share them on our list, or raise them now. Can you guys hear me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, your sound is very good.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, all right, if there are no-- I see hands. Steve Conti, Emily Taylor. Steve do you want to go first?

STEVE CONTI Sure, thanks, it's just a clarification of where OCULUS as our standpoint.

DENISE MICHEL: Excuse me, could you remind people especially those who aren't involved in ICANN what OCTO means and is?

STEVE CONTI Absolutely, sorry. As you all know, ICANN is very acronym heavy. OCTO is the acronym for Office of the CTO, the OCT SSR team, which is CRIMS formally known as the SSR was developed into the Office of the CTO about a year, a year and a half ago. And the OCTO SSR team is John Crane and his group, who used to have a different reporting structure and are now reporting through David. So, when I refer to OCTO SSR I'm referring to the specific team and not the SSROs of the unique identifiers, as per ICANN's limited role, blah, blah, blah.

With that said, so as Denise mentioned, we are going to be having our DNS symposium, which is sponsored and run by the Office of the CTO, we will be heavy with staff there. It was produced and scheduled prior to the SSR2 review team consideration. Their consideration of going out to their SO, immediately following the DNS symposium is the DNSO work, which is a technical meeting for TLDs and other parties related to DNS.

One of the things we certainly want OCTO and OCTO SSR to have some face time with the review team, Sunday, Monday. I'm currently working to try to get David and John's schedule to see where and if they're needed in DNSO work and we need to work around that, so I'm chasing that right now and I'm hoping to get an answer as soon as I can. We are committed to having them with you in the room at some point. And in

relation to that, we've also mentioned last call, we've been looking at grouping, and I think that was sent to you, too.

Grouping out the SSR1 recommendation implementations and one of the things that would make the review most effective and efficient is if the OCTO team went first. And so we're hoping to be able to provide you with some face time on the implementation review, with a deep dive into the security framework, because I think that's got a lot of references throughout the entire implementation and recommendations dialogue. So that's loosely where we're working at right now, and I'm hoping to from available schedules with John and David as soon as I can.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you, Steve. Emily?

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much, and thanks Steve for that information. Yeah, I strongly support the idea of using the time in Madrid for us to get really stuck into the review of the first security and stability review team's work and how implementation is going. It's always difficult in these interactions with staff because a short presentation only gives you so much. I, personally found it really useful to have John, Steve and other members of the staff there, throughout the meetings in Copenhagen. I know that's a big demand on staff time, but it's really useful to be able to check points and to really to help us get into a deeper dive because at the moment, we very much have been in the topsoil of these issues of

course. But this is now an opportunity for us to go a little deeper and to understand where we need to know more.

I think probably realistically, there may be things to finish off with our scope and work plan. It may not be necessary, but we should probably have a contingency of time available to just finally put that to bed, if you like. There were also some open actions from the brainstorming, which we could potentially revisit and I don't know whether they'll have passed though, after we've put the scope of work and terms of reference and so on to bed. So that's just my thoughts on the Madrid agenda, thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Emily. Are there other comments, regarding the Madrid meeting? Okay. So, the Co-Chairs will work with staff to get clarity on availability of key OCTO SSR staff in Madrid and will develop a proposed agenda for the SSR team's face to face meetings. And we'll get that out on the list, give you all an opportunity to provide input on it. Okay, we'll move onto the next agenda item. Yvette, could you put the main slides back up? We're on slide five. So, the next item is the Johannesburg meeting. So, as you know that has been on again, we're on slide five.

As you know, that's been a meeting on the team's meeting schedule for a while now, staff has recently informed us that the meeting is a and it's June 26 through June 29, by the way. That is a policy meeting. Last year ICANN changed the structure of its international meetings. Different meetings have different focuses and purposes and they've changed the rules around those meetings, and so the meeting in Johannesburg in

late June, is has restrictions on additional sessions. And a general rule that meetings can't be scheduled outside of those meeting dates without the prior approval of the Chairs of the supporting organizations and advisory committees at ICANN.

And so, an option we've asked staff to explore, and that depending on their answer, we wanted to raise for the team's consideration is meeting right before the ICANN Johannesburg meeting, Karen do you have additional information for us on that?

KAREN MULBERRY

I'm sorry, the kids are coming home from the school and the dog starts to bark. So, have to leave it on mute. Anyway, I think Margie has a little more information for you, but there just isn't anything that I can provide with an update right now. There's a lot of discussion going on, and to see what can they do with the new meeting strategy, and how our request might be addressed.

Now, I think what the review team might be able to do, is actually think about what you want to do in Johannesburg in that meeting, and if you can document that you want to meet and you want to spend a day or two days, or what you want to focus on, it would be very beneficial for us to then share that as part of the discussion, whether they will reach some determination and we're hoping that a decision is made and some guidance provided by next week.

DENISE MICHEL: Karen, so what the Co-Chairs asked staff to do, was to determine the feasibility of having the SSR team meeting on June 24 and 25 in Johannesburg but separate from the ICANN meeting, so that was the action item that staff has. Has there been any work on that?

KAREN MULBERRY Yes, that's all part of the bigger discussion. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM Yes, can I step in? This is Margie Milam. We've explored it, we don't have an answer yet right now on that. Unfortunately, as you can imagine, there's this, because it is a new strategy having this policy forum, it's very difficult at the moment to get an answer on whether we can even have a meeting right before, or right after, but so what we've asked to do in our department is to identify what the team would like. So, in other words, it's just setting aside the meeting strategy for a moment.

What is your ideal state? Would you like to be there? Would you not like to be there? Are you available to attend? Would you mind if it was meeting during it? And at least we can go back to them and say, "This is what the review team would like." Again, I can't make any promises, I have no idea whether it'll be granted, because it's a really it's got a political slash logistical issues at the moment, but I have to be able to go back to the meetings team and at least articulate what in an ideal world what the review team would like.

And then, they promised us once we submit that information to them, that they'll give us an answer quickly, because obviously, prior planning on both sides, so the review team at first and also on their side to find space, it's just if they're able to. And so that's unfortunately the situation we're in right now.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Margie. So just speaking personally at this point, and I'd like to take a view and encourage other members to share their thoughts. I think because from the very creation, the very beginning of the review team, staff has had Johannesburg and these dates on people's schedules. And the team formally sort of validated that we would have a face to face meeting in Johannesburg. And I think there are certainly team members that have already made plans to be there. I think in addition, there's review team members who will be in Johannesburg at the ICANN meeting in any event. I think all of these are important considerations that go into this.

Additionally, I think there are certainly members of the review team, who have not been particularly involved in ICANN I think it's also an important learning opportunity for especially those team members to be at an ICANN meeting and attend some of the relevant sessions that will impact our team's work. And then, finally, something for the team to discuss is the need to at least solicit initial input to make from key groups, such as the SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the Public Safety Working Group, and there are others, certainly that are interested in and have been active in SSR related issues, that we

give those specific groups an opportunity to provide input on what they would like to see the SSR review team focus on.

So, in my mind, those are a number of factors that go into this. I think setting aside the particular policies that have been created around this particular meeting, I think if it is indeed a fact that most team members are planning on being in Johannesburg, and the fact that it's in late June makes it still makes it relevant and an ideal place for the review team to meet. I would consider then, that meeting, if people are available can be considered completely separate from the ICANN meeting, with its own little rules, the review team meeting can be in a separate place in Johannesburg, not shown on the ICANN schedule. I don't think the rules of the policy forum then would apply to the SSR team meetings. So, with that, I'll stop and let James, your hand's up?

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Denise and you literally read my mind (laughs). So, that's almost identical to what CCT did, it's not the first time that we've had a review team coincide with the policy forum, and Margie and Karen will probably know specific dates and things better than I would, but the CCT team met I believe it was the week before the policy forum in an independent two-day face to face and then they held engagement sessions. I know they had a specific cross-committee session, which is part of the policy forum meeting with the GAC and I believe they attended some of the gNSO cross-community sessions and briefed gNSO and I believe one or two of the other groups as well.

So, there is precedence for exactly what you've just suggested there, of an independent two-day face to face prior to a policy forum. And then, holding engagement sessions as requested or we can certainly approach our respective constituencies to raise that.

On the point of getting approval for these things, if this is the case of internal ICANN staff policies, that's fine. But I would suggest that if staff are finding that you need to get approval from SLAC Chairs, that needs to come back to the review team, so that we can approach our SO and AC chairs and get that approval for you, as staff, so I'm happy to approach James, or I'm sure some people here know our ccTLD community people, ccNSO, if that is the bottleneck then that needs to come back to us as community members to bring to our SO/AC chairs.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, James. Are there other comments or input here? And Margie, did you have anything else you wanted to add?

MARGIE MILAM I believe the CCT did not meet in Helsinki, so I just wanted to clarify that.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

JAMES GANNON: Yeah, I just got the webpage up there, they met two weeks prior in Washington DC.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, I think the Co-Chairs will discuss this further with staff. I think -

MARGIE MILAM Denise, can I just, sorry, say so if I could summarize, 'cause I have to provide feedback to the meeting teams, today unfortunately. So that I can get the best situation for you guys, it sounds like your preference is to meet in Johannesburg a couple of days before, even if it's say a different location, but that that seems to be the most logical thing for you guys. Is my summary correct, so that I can relay that them? Because I do have to get that information today.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and thanks, Margie I was just about to raise that. I think the issue or question on the table is there any team member who would not, and I note Emily had a prior commitment and wasn't planning on being in Johannesburg. Is there any other member who could not make a team meeting if it was scheduled June 24th and 25th in Johannesburg? I see two hands up, Emily and then Geoff. Go ahead, Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much, and this is a very useful discussion my two cents is that it is a really good opportunity for the team to meet together face

to face and maintain momentum, while we're still in the early fact finding stages. Having said that, as you referred to, Denise, I have a prior commitment at the Chatham House annual Cyber Conference on the Monday and Tuesday of that week, and I'm quite heavily committed doing sessions for that, which I had agreed to prior to learning I was on the review team, so apologies in advance for that. If we can meet face to face in the later part of the week before, that makes sense, as you're proposing, then there's a very good possibility that I'll at least be able to participate remotely, which I would very much like to do. But I really hope that we can resolve this, and say the right words for the bureaucracy, to allow us to meet. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Emily. Geoff and then Kaveh and then Eric. And we have five minutes left on our call. Go ahead, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON:

For what it's worth, I have a clash in Madrid the DNSO meeting I will be attending the DNSO Arc meeting instead. As for a meeting prior to the ICANN Johannesburg dates, I can't do that. It's either within Monday through Friday, or you will have to accept my apologies. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Geoff. Kaveh and then Eric?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, just wanted to point out that [inaudible] is also during the week, because there is ICANN workshop, but if not, I can make it work. I really prefer during the week, but if not, I will still join that discussion.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Kaveh. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I guess I'm just piling on that for me it's a lot easier to do after than it is to do before, in that particular week, for whatever that's worth. After or at the tail end.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Thank you. So, I would propose since we're running out of time, and we need to I think first of all Margie I think the message if you need to deliver one today, is that the team needs to discuss this further. And we'll get back to you as soon as we can. And for team members, please make sure that you check the team email list, throughout the week, we may want to issue w really quick doodle poll to make we have a clear sense of numbers, regarding whether the meeting is before, potentially during, or after in Johannesburg. 'Cause we'll need to convey our preference to staff and get this locked in rather quickly. Are there any new hands in the list? I see a couple of hands, are they? James?

JAMES GANNON: Hi, Denise, I just popped it in the chat, I was just saying can we at least give Margie that we are definitely putting in an ask for a two-day face to

face? But that we need another few days to decide whether that would before or after, at least then she's able to take back a definitive yes, with a comeback for a specific when she gets the broad yes or no.

DENISE MICHEL:

Okay. Thank you, James. Yes, I think there is a strong majority for a Johannesburg meeting and we'll need to work out the details of before, during or after and so we'll that on the list, over the next couple of days.

MARGIE MILAM

Sorry, Denise, if I could just jump in, what I'll ask staff is to do a doodle poll for those three options, before during and after Johannesburg? And if you guys could respond as quickly as you can, I think it'll give us a good indication on the possible numbers, so that would be my suggestion.

DENISE MICHEL:

Okay, thanks Margie. I'll confer with the Co-Chairs and then get back to staff as soon as possible on the doodle poll and the parameters. Okay, thank you. So, we've about run out of time. I'd like to ask the staff to send an updated open action item table to the email list, so members can review that. Please feel free to add any additional information you'd like to call members attention to, regarding that action item list.

And I would then note, before we leave, that the next conference call for the team is April 25th at 06:00 UTC. Are there any other quick comments or items to raise, before we say goodbye? Thank you

everyone for joining, thank you staff for your support. We'll talk to you all next Tuesday. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]