ICANN78 | AGM – Second IANA Naming Function Review Team
Monday, October 23, 2023 – 4:30 to 5:30 HAM

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hello, and welcome to the second IANA Naming Function Review Team working session. This session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. I'll read questions and comments aloud when prompted by our moderator, Jennifer Bryce. If you would like to ask a question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand, state your name for the record, or just pop your question in the chat. This session includes automated real-time transcription, which is neither official or authoritative. To view it, please click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. Please also sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name for transparency purposes. And with that, I'll hand the floor over to Jennifer, please begin.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Nathalie, and thank you, everybody, for joining us here today, either in the room or on Zoom. My name is Jennifer Bryce, I'm a project manager for the Office of the CTO, so I will be project managing this review. Today is our first meeting of the second IANA naming function review, so affectionately known from this point forward as IFR2. The purpose of today's meeting is really just a chance to get to know a little bit about each other and the next steps for the review to get the review work started. So we'll do, if you could just progress to the next slide, please, Nathalie.

We have a few agenda points here, first of all, the welcome and introductions, and I'll ask that we do just a tour de table when we get to that stage, and everybody, if you could please state your name and your affiliation, and then perhaps provide a little bit of information about if you have participated in reviews at ICANN before. I think that would be helpful for us to get an understanding of the level of knowledge that we have here in the group of routine members. I think we have review team members as well as observers and liaisons in the room, so it's a good mix of people. I will provide a process overview of what to expect from the review at very high level, and of course answer any questions that anybody might have, and then we'll look at the roadmap for the initial meetings in the coming weeks.

I think it would be a good idea to understand what the review team particularly wants to focus on in terms of getting briefings and background research information available to you and what we might expect from the meetings in the coming weeks and months. We'll hopefully agree to a meeting rotation and cadence and time permitting from the review team members themselves. We can dive into the terms of reference, but that may be a little ambitious. We'll see how we go, and then we'll wrap up and confirm next steps in any other business. I did want to say that I will start the meeting, but we have happily co-chairs, Peter here and Ashley, who will also help with some of the agenda items as well.

If we could just go to the next slide, please. Introductions, thank you, and the next slide. Just very quickly, in terms of support staff, as I said, my name is Jennifer. I'll be the project manager. I wanted you all to be aware that I'm based in the UK, so my time zone is UTC. My contact information is there. I will be supported in a coordinator capacity by my colleague, Jonathan, who unfortunately isn't here today. He's based in California. We also have Secretariat support from, some of you may know already, the wonderful Brenda Brewer, who we have Nathalie today, but in a normal circumstance, it will be Brenda.

We also have a technical writer who will be supporting the review from January. She will be available to us from January, and I think that will be a very helpful resource for this team to have in terms of developing the content of the report itself. We have SMEs from the ICANN org available to the review team as well at any time who can provide input pertaining to the issues of the scope. Speaking of SMEs, and before I hand over to do the turd of tablet, Kim, do you want to say any opening remarks from your perspective? Thank you.

KIM DAVIES: Sure, thank you. For those that don't know me, my name is Kim Davies. I'm the president of PTI. Ultimately, my team is that's delivering the IANA naming functions, and it's my team that you're here to review our performance of those functions. I was a member of the first IFR as the representative of PTI. I found that the process was quite rewarding to go through all the work that we do and have a frank and candid dialogue with community representatives about how we do our work and why, and to really have a comprehensive assessment of the work that we did. We caught some legitimate things that needed some attention. We found some areas for improvement. It was a good process and it came up with some good results. I'm looking forward to this time around, the second review.

This time around, I won't be PTI's representative. It will be my colleague here, Marilia Hirano, to represent us. I really do thank you in advance for contributing your time and your energy to this work. I think it is valuable and I'm looking forward to helping out, I think, wearing an SME hat this time around. Thank you very much.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you, Kim. Do you want to say something, John? Thank you.

JOHN CRAIN: Just five seconds because I actually need to move to another meeting. This is where I say I'm here to support you and then leave, which sounds very ironic. But this is very important work. Thank you for doing it. We will give you whatever resources you need to get the job done. Let Jennifer or Marilia know if you need things. I'm the CTO and an SVP at ICANN and this falls under my responsibility. If you need things, go through Jennifer and we will get you whatever resources you need. I recognize a lot of faces here so I've got a lot of confidence that this will be a really good outcome. Thank you very much.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, John. All right, thank you. Nathalie, if you could just go to the next slide, please. So on the screen, you will see the full cohort of IFR2 team members, some of whom are here. Others are unable to join, unfortunately, this first meeting, but I'm sure we'll all get to know each other quite well. And at this point, I'm going to hand over to my right, Ashley, if you wanted to start and just introduce yourself. And like I said, I think it would be helpful if you could let us know if you've participated in any reviews before. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. Yes, my name is Ashley Heineman. I work for GoDaddy. I represent the registrar stakeholder group. I'm also the chair of the registrar stakeholder group. I have never participated in an ICANN review. As a registrar, I have no engagement with the domain name function. So you have an interesting co-chair choice. But with that, I actually have a lot of background in the domain name function for my previous employer, where I was very intimately involved in the process. I do have some subject matter experience, but I'm going to be here more as a facilitator in my co-chair function. So that's me.

PETER KOCH: So good afternoon. My name is Peter Koch. I work for DENIC. That is the ccTLD registry for this country, Germany. I have participated in the first IFR that Kim just mentioned. And to that extent, I can only echo what you said. It was the first time we had to like pave the way in a certain way, following the bylaws, actually, because they already structure the review quite well. We had some findings that probably resulted from this being the initial review and also things that were envisioned during the transition. And then implemented in the bylaws turned out to be formulated in one way or another. This has recently been resolved by amending the bylaws. And I think that is still in progress or in the approval action status.

Other than that, I have not participated in any further reviews. But just for information, I'm also. So first of all, I should say I'm one of the ccNSO, the ccNSO-appointed co-chair. And I'm also appointed by the ccNSO to some other committees that have to do with the IANA function, which is the RZERC, the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee, and also the RSSGWG, which is the Root Service System Governance Working Group.

So I do have a technical background, but have been shifted into policy a bit. And that reflects what I've been doing at ICANN more recently. And I can also say I see a number of familiar faces. I'm also happy to see some non-familiar faces and look forward to working with all of you and to meet or re-meet colleagues I have been working with. And look especially forward to working with people that I've not met yet. Let's use this as an opportunity to familiarize ourselves with the environment. Thank you.

MARILIA HIRANO: Hi, I'm Marilia Hirano. I think I know a few of you. I've been with IANA for nine years now. Even though a lot of you have said that you've never seen me before. But my role started as a continuous improvement manager in IANA. So I was behind the scenes looking at our processes and customer feedback and evaluating all the input that we received. And then my role grew more into strategic planning, budget, risk, management, audits. And continuous improvement continues to be my main focus.

So with that, my role is very broad and cross-functional within IANA. I work with everyone on the team, so I'm pretty familiar with what we do and our internal processes that would be helpful for the team when you have questions.

So that's me as far as reviews. I've been the ICANN staff liaison to SSR2. That's the review that I'm more familiar with. I was not part of IFR, the first IFR. So that sums it up. So pass it over to Kim Davies.

KIM DAVIES: I think I've already introduced myself sufficiently, so I'll pass it on.

RAJIV PRASAD: Hi, I'm Rajiv Prasad. I work for Google. I manage the corporate domain name portfolio there. And it's interesting to be doing something that I was doing in the late 90s. So this is my first IFR. So please bear with me. I have a lot to learn. Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Good morning. My name is Carlton Samuels. I am pleased to be a member of this team. I have done several review teams. I've been on the CCT, I've been on the WIS, I've also been on the EWG. So I have a lot of experience with research review teams in ICANN. I come to this from the end user perspective, from the ALAC. I represent the ALAC on this team. Most of my association with ICANN Names and Numbers Policy was with At-Large Constituency. I spent a term on the GNSO, but I would say that my expertise is looking at all of this from the end user perspective. It's good to be here. I'm hoping great things to come from this review team. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Carlton. Also, I am aware there's remote participants. So we will continue around the room here. So Lyman, if you want to go ahead.

LYMAN CHAPIN: Lyman Chapin. I'm here as a representative of SSAC. I have a consulting company called Interisle. And I go a ways back, which is how I got the white beard. I was chair of the IAB, the Internet Architecture Board, when the IANA was John Postel. And since then, I've conducted as a consultant, not as a volunteer. I've conducted a number of the organizational reviews of different parts of ICANN, but have not been involved in an IANA review. So I'm looking forward to hearing what people think about how things work. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Rick Wilhelm, Registry Stakeholder Group representative. I was on the previous IANA function review that happened a few years ago. And so I've got experience working on that team. Jonathan Robinson, the other representative from the Registry Stakeholder Group, is not able to make it and sends his apologies for this meeting. Thank you.

BRETT CARR: Thank you. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Brett Carr. I'm the chair of the CSC, and I'm a ccNSO representative in the CSC. But strangely, I no longer work for a ccTLD. I did work for a ccTLD.UK for 12, 13 years. So I've got plenty of experience from the customer's perspective of IANA. So hopefully, that will help in this review. Currently, I work for Amazon

Web Services. So my perspective has changed somewhat, but maybe that'll help as well. In respect of other reviews, as part of the CSC, I've been involved in the CSC effectiveness review. But I was not involved in the original IFR. But I'm very keen to be involved and see what happens as this goes on.

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello. My name is Olga Cavalli. I'm from Argentina. I am appointed by the ccNSO. I participate in this meeting as an academic. And I don't have experience in review teams, but I did participate in the IANA transition very actively at the time in representation of the government of Argentina as a member of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I'm a technical. I have a background in engineering. So I have installed several internet networks in different parts of my country and other countries in Latin America. And I also work in public policy for several years so far. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: My name is Lars-Johan Liman. I work for a company called NetNode in Stockholm, Sweden. And we operate one of the root name servers for the DNS. And I've been doing that for far too long. So I date back to the live in shaping years dealing with IANA when his name was John Postel. And I was also part of the entire system that set up ICANN many years ago. So I did attend ICANN number one. And since then, I've been a member of the root service system advisory committee. And I served as its chair for a while. And I've also been the liaison to the customer standing committee and served as its chair for a while. And I have participated in review teams so far that I have contributed to their work, but not as a member of these actual teams. I am here as the root service system advisory committee representative. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. And I'm just going to start calling on our participants in the Zoom room. So if you're able to unmute yourself and introduce yourself, that would be nice. So first on my list, I see Alan Barrett. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT: Yes, I'm Alan Barrett. I'm a board member appointed by the ASO. And I'm the board liaison to this review team. I have not previously participated in a review team. But I do serve on the board's OEC, the Organizational Effective Committee, which pays attention to all reviews. And I've been on the other side of reviews, but not on the review team. Thanks.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Edowaye?

EDOWAYE MAKANJOULA: Hi, I'm Edowaye Makanjoula. I'm representing the GAC. I haven't served on the review team before now, but I'm willing to lend and add valuable contribution as well.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Hello, everyone from Tokyo. My name is Rafik Dammak. I'm representing the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, which is a stakeholder group in the GNSO. I work for NTT and data center and co-location service. So it has nothing really to do with the IANA functions. I mostly participate in ICANN and PDP working groups or some cross-community working group. But I never participated in any review. So it will be a first time for me and looking to work with all of you. Thanks.

SAMI ALI: Thanks, Rafik. Next, I see Sami. Hi, my name is Sami Ali. Can you hear me?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes, thank you.

SAMI ALI: So I've been appointed from CCNSO from the Asia-Pacific region. I represent the ccTLD .bh for Bahrain. And I haven't been part of any review committees in ICANN, but I have done some work for policy review in APTLD, Asia-Pacific Top Level Domain Name. And that's about it. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. Steve?

STEVE CONTE: Thanks, Jen. I'm Steve Conti. I'm the ICANN liaison to the IFR2. I've been lurking in ICANN for a whole lot of years, not quite as long as Lehman and Lyman. But it's good to see a bunch of people. And it's good to see some continuity and people coming back to the IFR. So I'm really appreciative of that. I have been involved with all sorts of aspects with ICANN over the years. Came in as a technical resource, ran IMRS, formerly known back then as L-root. Headed the IT department, headed our security. Worked at IANA for a while, while Michele was on leave. Currently holding the role of operations senior director for John Crane's group in OCTO.

I have run the AV at all the meetings way back in the old days when it was just a couple of us. And so, old man, getting that gray beard there, Lyman. And I look forward to this. And I expect with looking at the quality of the people here, I expect this to go as smoothly as the first IFR2. I've also been supporting various reviews. I have SME for SSR2, SME for RDS WHOIS, SME for I think ATRT2. It was maybe a different one. And then the first IFR, I was also the ICANN liaison. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Steve. Did I miss anyone? I think I got you all, but please do speak up if I missed someone. And I recognize that Jonathan is not able to join us today. Nathalie, if you wouldn't mind, please moving to the next slide.

And the next slide again, please. Thank you. So recognizing that this may be very familiar to some of you and less familiar to others, I did just want to take some minutes to talk about what to expect from the process as a whole over the coming 12 to 18 months, depending on how we go. We can talk about timeline at a later point. But where we are is very early in this process. So the board convened the review just in September.

It's actually written into the bylaws that the IFR review should happen every five years from the point of the kickoff of the first review. So I know some of you may feel like the IFR1 just finished because IFR1 indeed published their final report in 2021. So one thing that this team should talk about is what the IFR2 review period might look like. And I would propose looking at the timeframe from when the final report from the first IFR was published. So really, it's a couple of years. And you might want to think about the review cadence as well when you get into your research.

The selection process. So community groups appointed the members according to their own selection process. And as I said, then we're very happy that we have our leadership appointments here already. And the IFR2 team was announced just after the board passed the resolution there in September. And again, this is our kickoff meeting. ICANN org's role in that. That selection process is really just a facilitation effort. We are in the process as well of collecting the statements of interest and the acknowledgement of the conflict of interest policy. So thanks to you who have already completed that. And for those who it's outstanding, please note that as an action item, these agreements get posted publicly on the wiki.

And it's just to make sure that the review team members participate. It's an independent process. And the inputs are really for the best of the internet as a whole. So that's the purpose of those documents. We're now kicking off the stage to identify the objectives and plan your approach to work. Luckily, this is one of the reviews where the scope is pretty well defined in the bylaws. I would point you to bylaws article 18, I think section three or thereabouts. There's a very clear direction as to what this review team should look at. So one of the things in the coming meetings is to take a look at how you want to divide that scope up amongst yourselves, whether it's subgroups or dividing up the contract, the IANA naming functions contract and taking individual assignments and reporting back to the group.

That's all up to the review team. ICANN org is not going to get too involved in that. It's something that we're here to help facilitate. So once you've determined what exactly you should look at, and again, the inputs to the review are very clearly outlined in the bylaws, you will begin the data collection and analysis phase. So that might be, well, very obviously a review of the contract and the inputs and outputs from that. You might want to interview subject matter experts, either within the org or customers. The customer standing committee is probably a good group for you to talk to or have a briefing from Brett. And then there is actually also an option for the review team to take a site visit to the facility in Los Angeles. So again, that's something that the review team will determine.

There's lots of other inputs as well, monthly performance reports from PTI and from the customer standing committee, customer surveys, that kind of thing. So that process will probably take several months. And actually, I should also mention something that is for this review that the first review didn't look at for obvious reasons, implementation of the recommendations from the first review. Once you've done the data collection and analysis phase, it's on to formulating findings and recommendations based on what you have found and checking against the scope. So that's why it's important to have the terms of reference document at the start of review and clearly outline what exactly you expect to be looking at so that when you get to formulating your findings and recommendations, you can go back and check against the scope and make sure that everything you're recommending is within your scope.

There's also, I wanted to point out quite a lot of guidance in the bylaws about recommendations and also some suggestions in the operating standards for reviews as well about what good recommendations should look like. For example, and this is from the bylaws, recommendations should identify improvements that are supported by data and associated analysis about existing deficiencies and how they could be addressed. Recommendations could include proposed remedial procedures and describe how the procedures are expected to address such issues. And there's additional guidance about providing suggested timelines and prioritization as well. So again, once we get to that point, we'll make sure to go back and check against the bylaws and the scope.

There is a step here that says consult with community and SMEs on the initial findings and recommendations so that includes a public comment. The public comment is capital P, capital C through the ICANN process that I'm sure we're all familiar with. But even though it's a step here in the timeline, it's something that will happen throughout the review. So I expect that this team would meet maybe ICANN meetings in the future to have public consultation on your work. And of course, as I think I've mentioned already at this time, throughout the process, you can talk to various groups and get feedback along the way. So while it is an important step for the formal public comment, I think it's throughout the process as well.

You would update your findings and recommendations based on the public consultation and then the final step is publish the final report for board consideration. So that would be the output of this review that we're all working towards. It's a final report delivered to the board. Once that's step is complete, you will be pleased to know that this review team can disband. And so then we would that it's up to the board to take a look at the report and recommendations there.

I'm going to go to the next slide, but please do jump in if you have any questions. I'm just taking a quick look at the zoom room. I don't see any hands. Ways of working. I think this is my second to final slide before I hand over to the co-chairs. I just wanted to take a minute to let you know that all of the IFR2 meetings are open to the public. So we have recordings of all of our meetings. We will take a record of the action items and decisions reached. We'll take record of the attendance and that kind of thing and publish everything onto the wiki to the fullest extent possible. Obviously, anything that is deemed confidential, we have a process for a non-disclosure as well, but I expect that most of the discussions will be open to the public. Please, I see a question.

LYMAN CHAPIN: Lyman Chapin. I suppose that also pertains to the mailing list that I assume that we will be using. The follow-up question is that that is certainly archived, I suppose, and the archive will be public, but will it also be possible for people other than the group to subscribe to the mailing list to receive direct messages? Just asking for clarity.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you for that. I did have it on here, but I took it off in my various edits. So, yes, thank you for bringing that up. The mailing list is active. IFR2-team, IFR2-team, I cannot organ it. As you said, publicly archived mailing lists, so be aware of that when you're corresponding. Not that I expect anybody to not be nice to each other or disclose anything inappropriate, but just be aware of that. So yes, observers. Observers are welcome to follow the mailing list and observe team meetings. We've got some happy faces of observers in the room today, so they can also join any of the meetings. If you are interested in following the mailing list, then just drop myself or Brenda or Jonathan, for that matter, a note using the email list, the email that I shared up here earlier, and we'd be happy to subscribe observers to that list.

In terms of observer input to the mailing list, I think at the minute, it's open to observers to share comments. I have to double check on how we set that up, but maybe that's something we can discuss as a group and see how much traffic comes through and what we want to do with those. But observers are certainly welcome to share input with the team throughout the process. Did I answer your questions? Great, thank you. I already alluded to this a little bit earlier, but just to restate that how this review team determines to work is entirely up to yourselves. So just some possible approaches, and I think Peter and Rick, maybe, who were involved in the first review, have some suggestions or ideas for how to move forward.

But sub teams is often a good approach to work as a group as big as this, or just assign individual volunteers based on your interests or expertise or skill sets and report back to the group. But any subgroup work or any would be reported back, and the idea is, again, to keep those discussions open and transparent as well. And with that, just a very quick look at the timeline.

Nathalie, if you wouldn't mind moving forward. So this is a proposed high-level timeline that I put together, and really this is just a general idea that has the final report published in March 2025. This is all just a proposal and based on previous, the first IFR review and other review experience that I have and that my colleagues have. So please take this with a grain of salt, but I did want everybody to walk away from here with an understanding that hopefully by March 2025 at the latest, the final report can be published.

But again, it's just an idea, and so I put the milestones in there so you can see kind of how I worked backwards. And I considered the ICANN meetings in there as well in terms of when might be good to have the discussions with the community. All right, so let's move on then. Oh, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks. So not that I would think we would need more time, but just for the sake of clarity, it needs to be done by March 2025. So we can do it earlier, but we can't go past that.

JENNIFER BRYCE: You can go past that. This is a date that it's not written in the bylaws anywhere, put it that way. thanks for bringing that up because I should make that really clear that this is just a proposed timeline. You can go past and you can do it before then too. Any other questions there?

LYMAN CHAPIN: Oh, Lyman here again, maybe a bit premature, but I expect from the work going forward, a good number of telephone conferences and working between and also meetings at the ICANN meetings. Do you know if the previous IFRT also had workshops where they actually met physically? So should I mentally prepare for that?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I see Peter is keen to speak to this.

PETER KOCH: So this is Peter for the record. Thanks Lyman for that question. We discussed that in the preparation as well. So the first IFR had the privilege of working most of the time in the pandemic, so that more or less prohibited these workshops. From the top of my head, I recall we had, I think, a cadence of two-week meetings, but other than that, no dedicated workshops that would have taken longer time, even virtually. I do remember we had meetings at the virtual ICANN meetings then, but we might take advantage now that we are back to physical to schedule that and Jennifer and the other staff will remind us that there are interesting deadlines for asking for those time slots. So we need to schedule that earlier than later in the game. That's it. But Rick or Kim might chime in here.

RICK WILHELM: You're exactly right. We had this meeting in Montreal and then the roof came in, is what I recall. We had this meeting in a much smaller room and then everything went to heck. And then we went virtual and then it was like every other week that we did our meetings and stuff like that. The good news is that we didn't delay anything because we were waiting for a physical meeting. The bad news is that we couldn't get together face to face because sometimes when you get together face to face, it goes faster. You could argue one way or another if it made a difference. I don't know.

In the last IFR, I don't recall the group disagreeing about anything. It was much more a matter of us just needing to get together to do the work. And a lot of it was helping to understand the scope and limiting our scope because the scope of the review and when we actually get into this, it actually is what does the contract say IANA is supposed to do? Not what you think IANA is supposed to do, not what you think IANA thinks IANA is supposed to do, not what IANA is doing.

But what does the contract say IANA is supposed to do? It's a contractual compliance, which Lyman knows. But it's a contractual compliance review. You're almost acting as an auditor. That's the hardest thing for the IFR1 to do was to pull in our thinking around like, no, we are looking at the contract. And are they doing what is in the contract and actually narrowing our thinking? That's my recollection of it.

But as far as face-to-face goes, it wasn't like sometimes you've got to get together and negotiate and argue about something. We were not at that sort of a thing. It's my recollection. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Rafik, you have a question?

RAFIK DAMMAK: It's more a comment and question. So I understand that this high-level timeline milestone are using as reference what was done before, while as you shared previously, we will have kind of additional task which is to review the previous recommendation and their implementation. It's hard to say if or to comment about the timeline because I'm not aware about or know about the volume of work expected. So we have that list of tasks and what we can do, but no kind of real estimation how much it will take for each. So it's hard for us to say. And it also depends on the kind of frequency or how regular meeting we have. So how much time we spend like per week or per month to work on this.

But when maybe last question or comment here, I can see there is kind of some gap between when we will put the report for public comment. I assume it will be maybe for 45 days. And when we will update the draft report as needed between August and December, that seems kind of maybe four months. It's little bit quite long, but just wondering why. And after when we will publish the report. So I see like that period seems quite long compared like the other where we have much more work between interview, findings and review. So some clarification about that. Thanks.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Rafik. And I can speak to this. And then if coaches want to chime in, please do. But very good comments about the timeline and not having mapped the workout yet. It is difficult to say. In terms of the gap between the draft report being published. So yes, there is a public comment period, which I think is 45 days, something around there. So if we publish in August, that would bring us to September, mid to end September, if we start early August. And then it just depends on the amount of comments that come in from the community on how long it might take to update the draft report. It might be a very easy process because the idea is when you publish the draft report for public comment is that it's pretty in good shape, right?

You're just looking for an input on it there. So you're right. There is a big gap there potentially, but there also may be a lot of comments, hopefully not, because hopefully you've done engagement along the way. But I hope that helps. And do you have any to add?

PETER KOCH: Let me maybe just add to that directly. And then we'll hand over to Kim or to Ashley, if you want. That's a very valid observation, of course, on the timeline. I wanted to add that we are now in the advantageous situation that we are not the first anymore. That consumes some time to get our heads around it. Like Rick said, for example, get our heads around what the mission is. And we can benefit from that. And of course, we need to start with some timeline. But obviously, if we feel or recognize that the timeline goes a bit out of shape, then we can readjust. But I believe nobody of us would like to make this a lifetime assignment. So there is the desire for speed, but we also need to be careful in what we do. And this will not just be a copy of the first review. But again, thanks for that observation. And Kim is next then.

KIM DAVIES: Thank you. I just wanted to make a comment in response to Rick had mentioned that predominantly the job here is to review IANA's performance against its contractual obligations. And I think that is correct. If you look at the bylaws, that's predominantly what this group is charged with doing. But I will note that the group is also charged with making recommendations on changes they want to see in terms of the scope of work, transparency obligations and the like.

So don't feel constrained in the sense that all you can do is say whether we did the job right or not, but looking forward with the evolution of community expectations, et cetera. Or if there's new things coming that should belong in the scope of the IANA naming functions, or indeed things that no longer should be in the scope of the IANA naming functions, there is a role for this group to make that assessment as well. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Kim. Carlton, go ahead, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, ma'am. I want to echo what was just said a while ago. It's very important for us to remember that while we're looking against, historically against the performance against contract and so on, we want to look over the horizon. And as participant in several review teams, I really want to put a plug in for workshops, how important they are to gather useful information about where we're going and where we should go. It has been my experience from review teams from the EWG to the CCT, the workshops have enabled us to provide a better product outcome. And it is important for us to gather as much information from the community. And the workshop, workshopping the problem always seems to work very well. So I'm making a great plug for having workshops. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Carlton. Let's move on, if we could, to the next slide. So there's a couple of things that we need to still do when I want to make sure we get the chance to look at the call rotation schedule. But if you could here, I'm going to hand over to Peter and Ashley, I think for this, but I just proposed a couple of suggestions for the next couple of meetings. I think maybe a quick discussion on any learning sessions or briefings that you can immediately identify, either here in this session or maybe in the coming weeks or so. But I'll hand over to both of you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I know you have views on this, Peter, so you can chime in with your thoughts. So I think it's pretty self-explanatory based on what's up on the screen. But there is a number of things that we need to do. And that's to develop and adopt our terms of reference. That's been circulated. So you all should have it. So I encourage you all to please read it. So I would suspect that one of our next things that we need to do is identify if there's any questions, comments associated with that.

So then we can adopt that. So that's a pretty big, important milestone. Develop and agree a practical and equitable path forward, timelines and milestones, which we've already started to dig into a bit.

I know Peter has some ideas with respect in particular to identifying learning sessions and briefings. Not all of us, like the registries from the GNSO side, have a regular relationship with IANA already. So it might be helpful for us to better understand how these functions work and then et cetera. So I'm going to turn it over to Peter, because I know you had a number of ideas. So why don't you go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Thanks a lot, Ashley. And just to echo that. So we will have some formalities to serve actually that are important to shape the work. We'll do that. But also this is important work in a field that might be new or complex to some of the team members, old or new or returning or fresh. So we'd like to suggest that we gather information or invite SMEs, like subject matter experts, not small medium enterprises. These acronyms too can be confusing as well.

And because we've mentioned a couple of times, for example, the CSC and many of IANA for a variety of things that IANA does, but what exactly is in the contract. So of course everybody's encouraged to have a look at the contract. Also everybody's encouraged to have a look at the report of the previous IFR if you haven't already done so. And maybe develop questions from that.

But what the exact role of these different players is important to know too, and that supports a bit in what Rick already said, is important to know to understand what we are supposed to look at and what we are supposed to, well, maybe look at, but what we are not supposed to change. So we're not going to deal with individual consumer complaint cases in quotes. But we're looking at patterns and that is important that we understand or everybody in the team understands what the CSC's role is in this. But also getting back to what was just suggested recently, looking over the horizon is important.

So any evolvement or development of what the naming function is comprised of, or things that are in the contract, and that was something that the previous team was concerned with, things that showed up in the contract and were just duplicates of one each other, or that things that didn't work or hadn't actually happened in practice and then can be removed from the contract of course. And then the question is how can the contract be changed like at the meta level that some things we should go into.

Anyway, so on this topic of what would you want to learn? Now we've heard that there are so many familiar faces and everybody has been, almost everybody has been involved here and there. If you've not been involved, please don't be shy if you want that information. If we want, for example, and I warned Brad so I'm not going to put him on the spot. If you want to have a briefing session about what the CSC is and how the CSC works in relation to the contract, please ask for that. And I know that Brad will be happy to deliver that.

The same is, and we've just gotten the offer from both Kim and John Crane. If you feel that you want some explanation about IANA itself or any of these relations, please ask for it. If you don't want to do that right now, then approach Jennifer or us to co-chairs that you want this. So don't be shy. It's important that we get to speed or excuse me, it's important that we get to a similar level of expectations and knowledge about what the functions are. And again, just encourage everybody to ask that we start filling the gaps that you might feel. And just go there. Rick, you had a remark.

RICK WILHELM: I would see your offer and I would actually raise it as we would say in Monte Carlo and say that we should actually have the leadership team book those and have them not be optional. And even though Brett and I are, Brett's the chair and I'm on the CSC and I was on the previous one, that we should, everybody on the team should be attending the review of what the IANA function does.

Everybody should attend the CSC thing, whether Brett gives it or I give it or we both give it, so that everybody has a level set. Everybody hears the same thing that should go into the record that gets recorded. Because what I would not want as a member of the team is that someone later comes back and hears that the IFR2 happened and not everyone heard what the CSC did. Not everyone heard Kim's briefing about what IANA does.

And then they say, well, how did we know that they did a good job? So I think it would undermine the credibility of this soon to be esteemed group if we didn't actually sort of make everyone show up and attend those. So I think that your idea is brilliant. And I would say that it actually ought to be mandatory that everyone hears it. And even those of us that are part of this, that we hear the same exact thing in that way that we've all heard the same words. Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Rick. Any other comments on this?

BRETT CARR: I'll just say I agree with everything Rick just said. I think a level playing field here and having this organized so that there's a series of presentations from various people to make sure that everybody knows exactly where we are would be a really good start to the whole process.

PETER KOCH: Thanks Rick and Brett. So consider yourself booked. And we probably take this up. the new language in ICANN for this is capacity building instead of education sessions. So we might have a couple of those and develop that over time. So thanks for encouraging this.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Now I would even suggest as one of our first action items is in advance of our next meeting, we can put together a list of proposed briefings and we can add onto that based on feedback. So we can get that kind of that ball rolling sooner rather than later.

BRETT CARR: That sounds like a good idea for a Wiki page that maybe everybody can contribute to.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: There is already a Wiki.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you and I'll take that as an action to work with the leadership on that. I just wanted to chime in given that we have five minutes left and I know there's for those of us here some kind of welcome reception. So I don't want to stop people from getting there. But I do want to make sure that we have a look at the call rotation and perhaps discuss that very quickly.

So thank you, Nathalie. If you could just take a look here at this slide. We're everywhere. We're all over the place, which is pretty cool, but also a little bit challenging. So if you could go to the next slide, please. I just plugged in the suggestion for a call rotation. Perhaps this might work. Perhaps people hate it. I don't know. But let's have a quick discussion about this and I'll open it up for comments. Thank you.

BRETT CARR: Well, I would say that I have a lot of experience of this in the CSC because we have exactly the same challenge of people across the entire globe. And the way we do this is to just rotate it so everybody has happiness and everybody has pain. And it feels like that's probably the same thing we need to do here. I presume that every it's going to be certainly some people are not going to make certain meetings, but I presume every meeting is recorded and people can watch or view them afterwards anyways. That seems like the obvious answer to a common problem I can, I think.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I just want to note one thing to keep in mind though. If we're catering to certain time zones and those people that the time zones are being catered to cannot make the call. There's any way that we can know that in advance so we don't all have to suffer for no reason at all.

PETER KOCH: Well, just as a very technical detail, we should remember that the northern hemisphere is going back from daylight savings to whatever other time very soon. And you might want to explain how you already folded that in maybe.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. I did consider that the time change happens pretty soon. So I put this in based on the new.

PETER KOCH: November.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Exactly. So I might propose then that I circulate maybe a doodle poll and see what days work for people. We can go off this cadence maybe. So please look up for that on the list and then we can have a first call. Next week obviously is out given people are coming back from the

ICANN meeting. So Monday at 9 a.m. No, sometime in the very near future, next couple of weeks, hopefully we can have another meeting and just keep this going. But next week definitely is out. I think we've agreed that.

PETER KOCH: This is Peter for the record. I was just going to suggest what Liman just raised that a couple of the team members might have common collisions like the ITF meeting that is coming up in November. But we can deal with that on a case by case basis and on the list. So if we aim at a meeting first half November, just to touch base and then discuss the rotation schedule. So we get the weekday sorted out, which is important. All these meetings take place on Tuesday, which might be hard. And then that we get the rotation schedule because we might want to think about like, what was it, three different or four different slots and things like that. And you all have probably experience in this kind of thing in other committees that you've been in. And don't worry if you don't. We're not assuming that. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So I think that's an action item for me to take away, circulate this poll and make sure that we at least have our next meeting in the calendar. And then we can agree as we go if you want to do 60 minutes every week or 90 minutes every other week or however you want to do that. And I also note the action item that we talked about earlier with regard to setting up the briefings. So again, I'll work with leadership on that. Any other business or final comments or questions before we call this meeting a day for now?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman, just a quickie. I saw that there was a wiki already and I saw that there was a page for background materials. Is that a complete set of things that you think we need? If it's not, would you please work on making that complete? It's very good to have that collected in one place. So thank you for the work so far.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. And thanks for the PR for the wiki. So please go and do some background reading. And yes, we will keep building on that as things become identified.

PETER KOCH: So before we close the meeting, I would like to express special thanks to the observers for coming and staying because it's important that we do this work in the open and we get people interested. And so we look forward to your further observations. Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everybody. I think we can close and enjoy the welcome reception. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]