
DENISE MICHEL:

Hi, everyone. Let's go with the first slide, the agenda slide, please. On the agenda today, we have SSR1 implementation briefing on Recommendations 11 and 12. Okay, from subtopic teams, SSR1 implementation, ICANN SSR, DNS SSR, future challenges and IANA transition if we have members of those subtopics on the call. We also need to touch base on our upcoming meetings at Abu Dhabi and a quick note about a meeting in Brussels in January and of course Any Other Business.

Does anyone have any questions or additions to the agenda? All right. Seeing none. Any updated Statements of Interest, any additional apologies, or actions that haven't been listed?

Okay, we will start then with the SSR1 implementation briefings on Recommendation 11 and 12. Who's first up on that?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Negar Farzinnia, ICANN staff. Thank you for your time today. We are presenting the last of these SSR1 briefings to you today on this call and will be concentrating on Recommendations 11 and 12. Steve Conte is on the call with us today – he is on every call – to help walk us through what we've done to implement these two recommendations. Steve, I've forwarded the slides to Recommendation 11 and I hand it over to you to continue this conversation, please.

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.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks Negar. Just as a housekeeping, I am on hotel bed so there is a chance my Adobe Connect will drop. But I'm on telephone so if it does, I will keep talking and ask MSSl to advance slides as pertinent but right now we're doing good, so it's just as an FYI.

Recommendation 11 states that ICANN should finalize and implement measures [to] success for the new gTLD and IDN Fast Track that is closely related to the SSR-related program objectives including measurement to the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse.

So there was a challenge on this, and we had a paper contracted to analyze this recommendation and to provide some results from this and the paper is located within – I believe it's within the [inaudible] material of that SSR2 that's within the SSR2 wiki, so I invite you to take a look at the report and –

DENISE MICHEL: Steve, apologies for the interruption, just to make sure everyone is on the same pages that perhaps the staff could drop a direct link to that report into the Adobe Connect room. It's not clear to me which report that is. The [inaudible] circulated security stability risen to the DNS Review Team, Recommendation 11 implementation report, is that that report or something different?

STEVE CONTE: Negar, you have your hand up, is that to address this question?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, thanks. Yes, the link to the report that Steve is referencing is included in this slide deck for the implementation of the recommendation. It is also included in this briefing recommendation that you're looking at now on the very last page, and I'm happy to copy and paste the link into the chat room momentarily.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. If you can put that in the chat room, that would make it accessible to everyone since we can't click on the Adobe link slide and I don't think everyone has them up. Go ahead Steve.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks. I will continue on if that's okay while the link is being pasted in and then you guys could [inaudible] any questions you have afterward. One of the –

DENISE MICHEL: Steve, I'm sorry. Before you go on, so when did staff have a consulting report on how to implement Recommendation 11? When was that done?

STEVE CONTE: I believe it was finalized early of this calendar year. Karen, if you're available to give more information on that, I'm happy to pass that over to you.

KAREN MULBERRY: Apologize, I was on mute. Yes, it was done in April of this year. That's [when we close] Action Item 18 on the tracking list and that was [on received] the paper from the consultant.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thank you.

STEVE CONTE: And just to clarify that, once the paper was received, it did go through office of the CTO for review. David was the one who reviewed though I'm not sure if he gave input back or if he acknowledged that the details of the paper was accurate though it was then since published.

So one item of note before we get into the discussion a little bit, Recommendation 11 and actually of all recommendations was that at the time of the SSR1 briefing, there reflects the period of time that ICANN Strategic Plan 2012 to 2015 was taking place. Which dealt with some of the new gTLDs and the idea in Fast Track Process as well as the SSR framework fiscal year 2012, the first SSR framework that we had, which also makes reference to the New gTLD Program and the IDN Fast Track.

So the paper that we received reflects that and reflects the time of period in which the SSR1 Team conducting the review and recommendations were made around that period in time. So one of the challenges of the recommendation was that the Review Team... I'm sorry, the GNSO and the ccNSO for IDN did not have any specific relevant metrics in relation to the SSR of the DNS. And there was no

community-defined definition of success in which we could base corresponding metrics to. So ICANN didn't have anything specific to point, which is one of the reasons why we contracted this out to help identify how ICANN could address this recommendation.

In the report, there are a list of inventory of activities that ICANN does conduct or has conducted that ICANN feels that it pertains to spirit of new gTLDs and IDNs in relation to consumer trust on that too. So the CCT Review Team is so currently underway and their inventory of material is evolving as well.

So if someone could post in the link to find the CCT material for future reference that would be helpful as well. We do have operation supporting the SSR objectives in the new gTLD process and again, bearing in mind the new gTLD process was as of five years ago.

The [TBE] had service level agreements and monitoring through the [TBE] Technical Team to ensure the technical requirements of new gTLDs were included and that includes, I believe, DNSSEC and one of the items that was in the report was that the inclusion or the recommendation to have DNSSEC more commonplace was in that report and in the purview of the group.

As of today – let me paste to you a link so I'm not just making stats up. I'm reading stats. As of today, through [stat] research like icann.org, which showed that there's 1547 TLDs in the root zone, of which 1406 of those TLDs are signed. So we are having a continued expansion of DNSSEC throughout the root zone. I don't have the stat of what it was in

2012, but I would make the assumption that it was significantly less at that period of time.

Jumping back to the slides, we also have Emergency Back-end Registry Operators and data escrows or EBEROs and data escrows in place, which addresses some of the stability and resiliency of the DNS namespace. I just mentioned the DNSSEC related activities, which includes the adoption, the promotion and the training of DNSSEC. And then as Maggie had spoken a few weeks ago, there are also compliance department activities that contribute to the ongoing SSR of the DNS namespace.

The bulk of this recommendation or the bulk of the dialogue within this recommendation is really in the report that was posted in the chat room and is linked in the materials, action for SSR2. So before I move to Recommendation 12, I'm just going to pause and see if there is any comments or questions regarding Recommendation 11.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes, Steve. I have a foundational question. So the recommendation is for ICANN to finalize and implement measures of success in new gTLDs and the IDN Fast Track that relate to the SSR programming objectives at that time. Can you give us some background as to why five years later? What was happening in those five years between when this recommendation was approved by the Board and just a couple of months ago when an address consultant report was posted about here are some things that could be relevant and that you could do? Can you give us a little more background on that?

STEVE CONTE: I would be happy to take that back if we could capture the question and answer in writing on the relevance of that question and the answer to that question.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, because this really goes to the fundamental implementation of Recommendation 11 and the facts that were checked that has been fully implemented. So over five years ago, the Board passed this recommendation that says, "Finalize and implement SSR-related measures for new gTLDs and the IDN Fast Track," which was ongoing at that time. And then for five years later, there is a draft consultant report with basically some ideas in it. So I am struggling to understand how that is considered full implementation of this recommendation. Is that something that you could shed some light on?

STEVEN CONTE: It is something that I can capture and head back. I think the questions are valid and we'll have to go back and get the parties involved. I suspect that as mentioned that a lot of these recommendations spans more than one department. So I think we'll need to discuss with multiple departments that were involved with the New gTLD Program, the IDN Fast Track and find answers that will satisfy your questions.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. I guess [part of] my questions that I will turn out to Geoff who also has a question. Because on the status and deliverables, it says that

you have implemented measures of success for new gTLD. But we haven't seen how you've actually implemented the measures of success for new gTLDs and IDN. That's the first we've completed this check mark in the final report. But what we've been provided with is a draft consultant report that [shares] some ideas of what you could do until [we target] – it's difficult to square the idea draft paper with implemented measures of success for this. I'll let Geoff ask his question and can come back to me. Thanks.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Yeah, thanks Steve. I am looking at and reviewing the material in the report and I must admit as part of the first question – and I've got two that cross my mind – is do you think it is ICANN's staff's responsibility to gather, analyze, and publish this data? Or do you feel that it is ICANN's responsibility to facilitate effort to perform that?

Because in some ways, this report references what other people do and sometimes doing it yourself, where is the onus here? Is it an ICANN responsibility to implement these measures or is it an ICANN responsibility to see that these measures are implemented, which is a [slightly] different objective.

STEVE CONTE:

That's a great question and I do acknowledge the difference on that. And I think the point that speaks to your question at least at some level is that ICANN as an organization looks to community to define what success is especially in a program like that like the New gTLD Program and the IDN Fast Track program from the ccNSO. I don't believe ICANN

imposes measures of success on those groups. And I think it's a community effort in which we look for guidance from the community on what those measures are. And then depending on what the result is, it would determine whether or not ICANN is the implementer of those measures of success or the shepherd of those measures. One of the challenges that we faced specifically around this recommendation and around those programs was that we didn't have any community definition of success or those measures, so we couldn't have any baseline in which to conduct measurements off those.

GEOFF HUSTON:

So, my follow up, which is equally one of the challenges here, in a commercialized world of DNS service provision where data is considered to be a corporate asset rather than a public commodity, do you feel that these are ICANN or the community at large necessarily have access to meaningful metrics? And for example, I site the incredible barriers to finding out what's happening on root servers and the fact that none of that data or at least a remarkably small fraction is available publicly. And all the rest of that data about queries and behaviors of the roots is considered to be commercial. I'm like, is this a variant to the entire objective that access to this data is certainly externally appears to be challenging, do you face that challenges in access to this data?

STEVE CONTE:

Are you asking if I face or the office of the CTO faces these challenges or you ask if ICANN org –

GEOFF HUSTON:

Well, I suppose [inaudible] office of the CTO but it is a more broader sort of question about, this is recommendation about measures of success and part of that is of course technical measurement. In your judgment, do you think that the operators of this infrastructure provide that data to allow such measurement and as a general rule or is it a struggle to get the right data?

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks for clarifying that. So speaking as myself and as a member of the office of the CTO, I feel that it has gotten much better so back as – Geoff, as you know, back in 2012 through 2015 or so, I ran along with John Crain L-root server. And the root operators held their cards much closer than they do now. And the concept of sharing data even between root server operators was you would get laughed out of the room or thrown on which room you were in.

Along came DNS-OARC, which was a giant leap as far as sharing of information that could be considered sensitive data. I think DNS-OARC has come a long way and has contributed to a more open table in which operators, be them root or TLD or other interested partners can come together and discuss data that could be considered sensitive. I think there's still a way to go.

I know, speaking from an office of the CTO perspective, we do have research efforts going specifically around root server operators. We do have some agreements with various root server operators in which we have the ability to collect some of the raw data under various contract or agreement provisions, which we can analyze and look at that data.

Now, the trick or the crux in that is depending on what kind of agreements we have with these root server operators is we're trying to figure out how we can present this data to the broader community without exposing risks to the critical infrastructure of the root system or exposing risk to the operators themselves. So we're still working on how to publish and produce meaningful results from this, but we are taking that next step in looking and working in a collaborative function with the other root server operators and that's not just L-root because that's the low fruit but other operators in the community as well.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Thanks Steve. Certainly, my comment is based to the broader SSR2 committee is calls to measure, calls to access data, not necessarily calls to get instant response from the sort of larger community, that when you ask for these things, sometimes actually access to meaningful data might be particularly challenging and might require much work. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks and actually, that's a great point and I ask the Review Team to consider that if there are either perceived or [wheeled] barriers for data collection from a community data perspective, I ask the Review Team to look at this either in the offices of the SSR ICANN Subteam or the DNS SSR Subteam and see if there's something – a recommendation that could come out that would benefit the community and help us as the community better reflect data metrics.

Thanks. Denise, I think your hand is back up.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, since I already asked a question, is there anyone else on the team that has a question? I'm happy to let them go first. Feel free to speak up or raise your hand in the chat room. Okay.

So the SSR1 Review Team specifically called out a number of activities that were operational and within the staff purview and contained in the SSR framework and called for implementation of measurement sent metrics in more specific goals and impact assessment. Was that work done? Is that captured anywhere or separate?

STEVE CONTE: Sorry, can you clarify?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. So as part of the SSR1 report relating to Recommendation 11, they noted ICANN's administration of the New gTLD Program, the ICANN program, significant SSR-related issues that are addressed in the SSR framework relevant to both new gTLDs and IDN and that be called for more specific goals and measurements and impact assessment. Was that work done and is it captured somewhere else?

STEVE CONTE: I believe that was not in the deliverables on this recommendation. I don't actually know if that was captured elsewhere. That's another question we can capture and take back to the organization.

DENISE MICHEL: And then just what we note within this area of Recommendation 11, 12 activities for which ICANN can be a facilitator/convener but [inaudible] primary [inaudible] of data or activity. Is there more information on how on the [stuff] that ICANN took over the last five years just to facilitate activities that involve other entities that had primary ownership or responsibility on related activities?

STEVE CONTE: So these are the questions and these go beyond just one department so we will need to capture all these questions and discuss who the person to answer your question should be and good answers back to you in writing. That question from George Sadowsky who is in the observer room as the SSAC weighed in on any of the material that came out of the Recommendation 11 and if so, what did they say? George, I'm going to make –

Geoff, your hand is up.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks, George. And as far as the quick answer is particularly addressing Recommendation 11, no. But as, if you will, a side effect of Recommendation 11, yes. The IDN Fast Track issues affected root of a potential new IDN name in root zone that raise some issues over confusability and user confusion and prompted a significant discussion that's still ongoing relating to whether community is so [inaudible]

outweighs the underlying technical constraints of the IDN system and in particular, the IDNA rules.

So some of the side effects we are living through right now were the results of these programs are causing SSAC some degree of [grief]. As I look thoroughly at Recommendation 11 for today, [inaudible] as far as I am aware as a generic question. Thanks.

STEVE CONTE:

Thanks, Geoff. I think that was going to reflect – I don't see Don Hollander on [inaudible] to see if you wanted to chime in. I think much of what I was going to say to you is I don't think specific, to my knowledge, effect was specifically looking at Recommendation 11. But if we look at the report when we look at the activities in which ICANN feels are related to the spirit of Recommendation 11, I believe there is a lot of places for overlaps where SSAC has looked at those various pieces.

Oh, Don is on. Don, do you want to add anything to that?

DON HOLLANDER:

Hi. I'm on but I do [inaudible] my grandson get to Adobe room to work so –

STEVE CONTE:

Okay. No problem. We had Geoff Huston also from SSAC who is giving his input as well.

DENISE MICHEL: Heard an echo on the line. If you [could mute] their phones?

DON HOLLANDER: I'll catch up later.

DENISE MICHEL: So before we move on to 12, are there any other questions on Recommendation 11? So Steve, in looking at the dashboard for Recommendation 11 and all the check marks of items that are defined and measured success related to SSR, it's hard to see how the basic [spirit] and whether of this recommendation was actually implemented with – certainly not with an idea paper a couple of months ago from a consultant, which certainly provides a lot of good food for thought for SSR2 going forward in the future and I suspect that [if] a team review but in terms of the last five years and what staff did to implement this, I think a lot of detailed information is lacking.

So hopefully you can gather more information and provide more clarity and facts on the implementation here particularly for those programs that the staff has done operating for the last several years relating to this recommendation. And I'm sure this team will have additional question as we get into this further.

Thanks for, I guess, the beginning of the discussion on this recommendation. If there are no further questions on 11 at this point in time, we'll move on to Recommendation 12.

STEVE CONTE: Sure. I would like to send in a link into the chat room right now. This is a link to the CCT review and I do invite the Review Team to go look at the draft recommendations that the CCT got up for discussion right now to see if there's any portion as this Review Team moves forward with our drafting recommendations, if there's any portion of the items, let's say the items in the report are being addressed by CCT. So we're not having overlap between two different Review Teams.

And, finally, as part of your questions Denise, what I would recommend is that we ask MSSSI to take a look and capture the list of questions that you have and we reflect that back to you for the Review Team to ensure that we captured your questions correctly so we're on the same page when we go and look for those answers. Are you open for that?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm happy to clarify it if anything I said is confusing or not clear, sure.

STEVE CONTE: There were a lot of questions I want to make sure we capture them correctly and getting what would be the intention of your questions so that we're not going to go back and forth.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks. I appreciate that.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Sure. Thank you. All right, Recommendation 12.

STEVE CONTE: Recommendation 12, “ICANN should work with the Community to identify SSR-related best practices and support the implementation of such practices through contracts, agreements, MoUs and other mechanisms.”

Much of what we were going to talk about in the next slide or two, we had in our face-to-face in Madrid, we had the Office of the CTO and many individuals from OCTO there including David Conrad, Dave Piscitello, John Crain, myself, former – was in OCTO at the time but former member of Patrick Jones. Much of the work that we’ll be talking about on the bullets here we discussed while in the face-to-face, so I suspect that this recommendation will go very quickly. I’m happy to talk about this.

But part of what this is it was to identify and establish best practices and integrate those when I emphasize SSR responsibilities and best practices, and regional engagement strategies, and that’s a key thing because in regions, the concerns of SSR varied depending on the region. So, as the Global Stakeholder Engagement VP is from those regions [inaudible] their own strategies, they’re taking input from their community as to what’s important. So, in some regions, the focus is on things like DNSSEC. In other regions, the focus is on maybe some public safety or law enforcement and DNS abuse issue. So, we work with the GSE VPs who in turn worked with their community to determine what

part of SSR, if any, is important to them while they create their annual strategies.

We work with the Anti-Phishing Working Group. We have two members of OCTO staff who are heavily engaged in the APWG and that's Dave Piscitello, who I believe is a Board member of the APWG right now. And Carlos Alvarez who's also an active and engaged member of APWG, and they've worked with and through the APWG to create seminars and I think collaborated on some papers with the APWG as well to increase security awareness especially through the work of the other members of the APWG. And then, we maintain a resource locator page, which we've also pointed to you before.

I'm going to pause because I've seen Mr. Matogoro is typing. While he's typing, I'll talk about this one paper, which we looked at and spoke at about in Madrid that's the identifier system attack mitigation methodology paper. As a community-driven activity, this paper is offered by Dave Piscitello. It talks about different types of mitigation methodologies, prioritize sets of attacks, etc.

There's a link here, which Denise noted you can't click on. However, I believe this paper is also within the resource documents on the wiki and if not, it's also in the OCTO SSR portion of the ICANN website, and if you want any clickable link, we're happy to have someone put it into the chat room as we speak.

Going to Mr. Matogoro's – thank you, Negar. Prime Minister Matogoro's question: "What has changed after the implementation of Recommendation 12 compared to the past?"

Let me jump back up to 12. I think Recommendation 12 has really driven ICANN's SSR Team – at the time, it was ICANN's SSR Team and now it's ICANN's OCTO SSR Team – to really continue to build their engagement both on a person-to-person networking typing engagement, getting the right people, knowing the right people and getting that network built. But also engaging heavily with ICANN's GSE Department (Global Stakeholder Engagement Department). We've always worked with them since this recommendation and it's because of the recommendation or because of evolution or a combination of the two. ICANN's OCTO Team works very closely with Global Stakeholder Engagement Team in order to help facilitate, help to find – not to find because that's community-driven – help facilitate and clarify some of the needs of the GSE regional strategies as they're being built. So we do have more visibility to the strategies in draft form in order to help – a lot of it is to help OCTO and make sure we have the right resources and budget in order to support some of the activities that the regional VPs want to facilitate within the region.

So, we're having earlier visibility to the regional strategies. We're having more input from an earlier stage on that and that way, that gives us a chance to be more responsive and proactive on the ground in supporting the GSE Team in the region but also getting on the ground and giving the most bang for a buck.

Although OCTO SSR is completely request-driven, we used to be completely ad hoc request-driven, which means that a request would come in, we would go and satisfy that. We do training, we do a talk, and then reply back, and that was cost-prohibitive and really inefficient.

So now, because we're more deliberate in our actions especially traveling and being physically in the region, we work with the GSEs prior to any travel. We facilitate, we finalize any actual formalized training that we do but we also try to fill the person who's traveling their time with meetings and presentations that are relevant that would be efficient to have them out there.

So, we set up meetings with key delegates in the region or we might be doing a training on DNSSEC but at the same time, while we're out in that region, we might also meet with local law enforcement or the regional Interpol or places like that. So we're being more deliberate in our actions as we move forward and especially now.

I hope that answered your question, Denise. I do see a hand up for you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. Thanks, Steve. And, just to note, we're running out of time, so I'll just note these and would appreciate a follow-up answer to the team. So, under identifying or [inaudible] best practices and integrating those into agreement into which ICANN enter, it [inaudible] to that really good, [inaudible] factor paper that raises a whole host of issues and addresses proposed [inaudible] activities. But it's unclear how that then relates to integrating those into agreements into which ICANN has entered over the last five years.

So, more specific information on how the best practices are reflected in agreement that ICANN [inaudible] into would be useful. Similarly, addressing SSR practices in MoUs links to a page that holds all of the MoUs but if we could have some information on how and some

quantification that SSR-related practices in MoUs and more information on which one to contain SSR-related practices, which practices they contain and how that [factor] the implementation is assessed would be really useful.

Similarly, if there's any quantification or more detailed information on what the working relationship would APWG has yielded, it would be helpful to get some specific information on that as well and which sections of the revised New gTLD Registry Agreement the OCTO staff feel advanced SSR best practices is not immediately obvious simply looking at the Registry Agreement. So, it would be useful for OCTO staff to point out which ones they feel advance the SSR objective. I'll stop there.

Are there any other questions? In the course we can do follow-up questions on e-mail as well, but before we close this up, are there any other questions related to Recommendation 12?

Thank you, Steve, for running through these documents for us. We appreciate your time [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Likely add to the many questions that we've raised today on this call.

Okay. So, we've got 15 minutes left. If we could have any new updates from the subtopic teams with the rapporteurs on the call or other

members? [Inaudible] anything they'd like to bring to the [whole] team's attention at this point? SSR1, any new activities there? Boban, I see you have your hand up.

BOBAN KRCIC: Not for SSR1 but for ICANN [inaudible] 2.

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

BOBAN KRCIC: So, is there someone to say something to SSR1, please?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I don't think there's been any new activities since the last sharing on SSR1. So we'll [inaudible] up on the list I think with Alain and other team members on any additional activities there. So, go ahead on the ICANN SSR.

BOBAN KRCIC: Okay. Thank you. So, we had yesterday our first group conference call and with three key members and discussed how to move forward in the subgroup and what the [site] was following. As you maybe know, Zarko and I will meet or we have a face-to-face meeting next week in Serbia to discuss some ccTLD stuff and to the local work some hours on the ICANN SSR2 staff. And, we'll circulate in detail the work plan and the

work items, and propose some next steps up to the meeting next week to the mailing list.

And, yeah, we hope that the staff group will provide [key stakeholders] because, yeah, we need [inaudible] how to move forward and [what else] to discuss, what's the possibility to organize the additional face-to-face workshop with people from ICANN because we had a lot of staff there and we need not only document. We think it's good or good choice to talk also to people and to discuss some different topics in the subgroup. And the idea was maybe the next following four to six weeks in [two-day] workshop.

Definitely prior to the next ICANN Abu Dhabi meeting and what we will do is allow client request with specific [inaudible] etc. to add the right people at ICANN and yeah, to look at if it's possible or not yet to organize it. And yeah, that's what's the outcome of the SSR calls. And did I forgot something, Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: That sounds good.

BOBAN KRCIC: That is all.

DENISE MICHEL: [Inaudible] thank you.

BOBAN KRCIC: Thanks. Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Boban.

BOBAN KRCIC: Yeah. [Inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks for that summary. Geoff, is there anything that you'd like to share with the team for our DNSSEC [inaudible]?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes. Thank you. Yes, thanks. We had an extraordinarily productive phone call. I'm not sure it's related to the... It's relatively small attendance but we did cover a fair deal. We've gone through the initial draft of the areas of that in further detail and a lot of the discussion I think resulted in an undertaking that I would edit that document for next week's call fleshing out with examples and sort of rationale as to why these things are being listed there, citing particular instances or other material to justify why this is an area of interest.

Highlight those areas where answers or information is the source. For example, off the top of my head, I'm trying to think about questions about I.root-servers.net, the rationale for its placement to highlight some of these instances about where information might be and where

information sort of isn't there at the moment and who could help with providing it.

And thirdly, to start looking forward as to where we might consider making recommendations and what those recommendations might approximately look like. We'll be on weekly meetings teleconference for the next few weeks to make some solid progress and at the end of August evaluate where we are to make sure that by the time with the Abu Dhabi meeting in October, we have a decently formed set of materials at the broader group and then look at and figure out where to go.

I note, for example, from today's meeting the topic or question of access to data and metrics [of] DNS will probably be included there somehow or in some way in response to the conversation that we had with Steve this morning.

So, yes, we are certainly moving forward with the teleconferences to keep it moving. Obviously, if you're interested, please join us on – when was it – Mondays at 21:00 UTC. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Geoff. Any questions?

Thank you, Geoff. Is there anyone from the Future Challenges Group or IANA Transition Group on the call that would love to provide an update?

All right, let us move on to the next item on our agenda. Given the date of October 27th of the date before the official start of the Abu Dhabi meeting for our working session for our Review Team, I think that they

have standing question and staff, now is the time to jump in if you have any additional information and clarification on whether there are additional short periods of time in which the team could meet or the groups could gather together during the ICANN meeting.

In terms of [inaudible] meetings, we're told by the Meetings Team that on the October 27th and the day after the ICANN meeting are the days that the meetings can accommodate.

Staff, was there any additional information? And also, can you clarify whether you're talking about actual meeting rooms or are they talking about IT staff to support recordings or both in terms of the restrictions in Abu Dhabi?

KAREN MULBERRY: Denise, this is Karen. If I can respond and provide an update for you.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Thanks.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. There are two days that the Meetings Team and IT can support the SSR2 meeting. They're either on October 27th or November 3rd, so it's the beginning or the day before the ICANN meeting starts or the day after the ICANN meeting concludes. And this [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, before that starts. [Inaudible] clarify it is that [space]?

KAREN MULBERRY: That is a [room] and it is IT support, and everything for the Review Team to conduct their meeting.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, the [inaudible]

KAREN MULBERRY: There isn't space for a Review Team meeting.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. [Inaudible] I wanted to know if we have a space because I think we can accommodate in some [fashion] meeting if we have space and not IT recordings if there's no space at the Abu Dhabi venue to meet as a whole team outside of October 27th or the Friday after the ICANN meeting ends, correct?

KAREN MULBERRY: That is correct.

DENISE MICHEL: And if any subtopic groups want to get together – these are very small groups, most of them are – do they have birds of a feather or rooms that can be reserved on an ongoing basis during the meeting? I know they do that in some ICANN meetings. Are they going to have that for this?

KAREN MULBERRY: Meeting I would assume they will but those rooms won't be released until – right up to the start of the meeting. So, we will not know what's available and where they might be and the size of the rooms until that point.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Since we're running out of time on this call, I'd like to have everyone follow-up, check the e-mail list. We'll need to come to closure this week on our travel dates and our meeting dates for Abu Dhabi, if there's anyone who thinks we should [inaudible] the ICANN meeting with a meeting not only on the 27th but on the 3rd or whatever that date is after the ICANN meeting. And, please send an e-mail to the list.

[Per se] I'm not inclined after a weeklong ICANN meeting to have a [tack] on an additional meeting at the end but we definitely... Eric and I definitely want to hear if there's anyone on the team who feel strongly that the team should gather after the ICANN meeting ends as well.

And then, separate from that, we'll continue our discussion about opportunities for groups to meet during the ICANN meeting but we'd really like to get our travel date locked in by the end of this week. So, the Meetings Team can make travel arrangements for people.

And then, [inaudible] discuss the part of our meeting in Abu Dhabi. We'll be reaching out to the various ICANN groups to extend an opportunity to meet with them about our progress and solicit any discussions or input that they may have. So, we may have meetings

during the week at the ICANN meeting if groups such as SSAC or At-Large or some of the other groups would like to meet with the SSR Team for a discussion and update. In addition, I think there's discussion of having just a general update for the community on SSR Team.

Progress – I think the issue that's being discussed there is to whether they have an open session that [will follow] the review, all their ongoing reviews together or whether they're done separately.

Any questions about this item? So the action item here is depending on things, we should add an additional full-day meeting after the ICANN meeting ends in Abu Dhabi. We'd like you to please post an e-mail to the list now. Otherwise, we're going to lock in our travel dates for Abu Dhabi and then keep working on opportunities for working sessions in addition to the full day that we've already locked in for October 27th.

Karen, is that an old hand or a new one?

KAREN MULBERRY: That's a new hand, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Go ahead.

KAREN MULBERRY: I was wondering if the Review Team would like us to send a note out to the full list because there are several Review Team members who were

not participating in this part of the discussion so that they can weigh in as well the [differences].

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I'll certainly do that but if you would like to, that would be great.

KAREN MULBERRY: Okay. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Any other questions or comments before I move on from Abu Dhabi? Do we have the next slide, please?

So, we gave people another week to identify whether there are any changes to that original Doodle poll on when we should have our January drafting session. And, Brussels will be the location and the winning dates were Monday the 22nd of January to Wednesday the 24th. So, we're going to lock in those days, so the Meetings Team can make arrangements.

What Eric and I would like to continue to discuss on the list is whether there are individuals on the team who are on the [continent] or in the vicinity or have the ability to come perhaps the day before. I think it would be good to track our subtopic group activity and determine whether there are some individuals who can't come on Monday, Wednesday that might be available Sunday to get together for our subtopic working session that in any event, we finalize the location and

the date for January, so staff will be sending out a calendar invite. You can block those dates.

Any questions regarding that? [Matogoro] had a question about Brussels as the point. This was [inaudible] with identifying the best meeting locations based on the number of criteria including acceptability for team members, travel cost meeting, hotel and meeting cost, and availability of hotels and meeting venues, so Brussels won.

Any other questions about this? Karen, do you have a new hand or an old hand?

KAREN MULBERRY:

I'm sorry. It's an old hand. That's about [Inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL:

Do we have anything else on our agenda that we need to cover? And of course, we'll certainly continue our discussion on the e-mail list.

Any Other Business that people would like to raise before we close to a conclusion? I'm happy to accommodate additional points.

Okay. Thank you, everyone, for joining the call. Thank you again to our speakers and thank you, staff, for your support. Goodbye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]