
DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Staff, do you have everyone you need in terms of recording the participation of people? Yvette, are you doing that?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hi, Denise. Yes, I am. I usually would just take it from the participant role. I'll get that from the Adobe Room.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Thanks, everyone, for joining. We have a packed agenda today. Due to the availability of staff, we're going to start our agenda with a brief staff presentation on the ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement Team outreach efforts to SSR Technical Community groups. This is a follow up request from our Madrid meeting and is also relevant to some of the obligations ICANN has stemming from the SSR1 Review recommendation.

After that, we'll move into a review and discussion of the follow-up work that we agreed on regarding our subtopic groups. And Zarko and Boban in particular have been great in providing us draft plans and additional work to consider. So we have a draft work plan for subtopic entitled ICANN Security that has been e-mailed to the list as an attachment and also shared on Google Docs.

We also have follow-up work on consolidating and reviewing the subtopic group list and then we want to make sure that we capture any final volunteers from the group that we have for the particular subtopics that we've identified, and to discuss what our next steps will

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.

be regarding these subtopic groups. We also need to do a bit of help keeping on Johannesburg meeting and review, if we have time, our open action items list and of course Any Other Business that people might have.

I see we've got Patrick. We have Adiel as well on the line.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX: Hello. I don't see Adiel on the line right now. We're trying to find out where he is.

DENISE MICHEL: Patrick, would you like to introduce yourself and start? We have a fairly tight agenda today. And there is a big echo on the line, if people could mute their phones and speakers if they are not speaking please and contact the operator if you're having trouble with your line or message staff if you would like additional help. Patrick, I'll turn it over to you. Thank you.

PATRICK JONES: Hi, Denise, thank you. Can you hear me without an echo?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Thank you.

PATRICK JONES: Great. Thanks for inviting me to come back and talk with the Review Team. I have provided a written summary of engagement on security stability and resilience issues. I don't know if that was sent to your mailing list and if it wasn't, I can talk to the points.

DENISE MICHEL: Karen, is that on our list? Is that on the e-mail thread for the team?

KAREN MULBERRY: No, it has not been shared. We can send it out right now if you'd like.

DENISE MICHEL: That would be great, thank you.

PATRICK JONES: You can certainly go ahead and send it and I will talk to the points and then if there are follow-up questions or areas where you want more detail, we can cover that. And then by that point, maybe Adiel will also be on the call.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thanks.

PATRICK JONES: Okay. So as covered in the Madrid session, you're probably aware that there are several departments within ICANN organization that do Outreach and Engagement with different stakeholder groups on security

stability and resiliency topics. So this includes the Office of the CTO. The department that I am part of is Global Stakeholder Engagement. Our colleagues in the Government Engagement Team as well as staff in DNS Engineering, Public Technical Identifiers, the IANA Staff and some of the Global Domains Division that deal with the technical topics around registry and registrar operations.

Global Stakeholder Engagement, our team helps support the work of these different groups. We will typically represent ICANN at technical community events. And these cover a range from events such as IDS and DNSR which was also occurring in Madrid to the RIR meetings, Regional TLD Organization meetings and various DNS forums that ICANN conducts in various regions with the partners. And we also do a variety of facilitating DNSSEC Training, training on DNS abuse and misuse with public safety entities, individual training with the ccTLD operators, giving talks at regional and national IGFs and also cyber security conferences and other technical events.

We do quite a bit of work and there are established processes with the DNS Engineering team to help support the distribution of new L-Root instances around the world. So in the written material that will be sent to your list, I've included a hyperlink to the process that we follow when requests coming from ISPs, infrastructure operators and others about hosting and L-Root instance.

The process was developed with the DNS Engineering team and includes very specific coordination elements between Global Stakeholder Engagement and the DNS Engineering team. And we typically will fill a lot of questions directly from those that are interested in hosting an L-

Root instance and then connect them with the process. And we may act as a facilitator or just hand them off to the DNS Engineering team for them to follow up and complete the process.

We also have various partnership agreements and Memorandum of Understanding with regional partners, the Regional Internet Registries and others on the distribution of L-Root instances. And some of these agreements even include specific collaboration elements around DNS security and stability. Maybe I'll pause there and see if Adiel would now join.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. And Patrick, did you have –

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, Patrick.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, Adiel. Thanks for joining. Patrick, is there any slides that people should be looking at? That's fine.

PATRICK JONES: No. There are no slides from me. What I was hoping to do is talk to these points, have a dialog and be able to respond any questions that may come up.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you. Just wanted to clarify that.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Thank you, Patrick. I will just add one or two things and then we go – we're happy to take any questions, clarifications from there. One particular aspect of technical engagement related to SSR as well, building relationship and trying to maintain them and nurture them with the [inaudible] admission as you know. The security and stability of... [inaudible] notify system it's not something that I can only [jog] off but it will whiff other organizations.

So within what we do as well is to be able to maintain those relationships, being able to proactively engage with them on issue that pertains to the stability and security and resiliency of the attribute particularly the [inaudible] system. And through that, we also participate in many events, co-organize the I-star group. We also have joined collaboration platform with some of them to exchange information to also coordinate participation in different activities and this is an important aspect of SSR as well because of the interrelated nature of different activities.

The OCTO team research, which is a new element to the overall technical engagement is also very actively doing work right now to start gathering data and information about (1) overall what we are doing, (2) about things that are important to know while the committee is working on policy to be able to anticipate and be ready to mitigate any risk that the policy will repose with efficient stability or being able to inform the community on the technical aspect of [methodology].

So I will stop there as well and I would be happy to take any questions or clarifications. There is one question –

DENISE MICHEL: I'm happy to take the queue. Alain, you have your hand up. We will go to Alain and then Geoff.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: There is one question on the chat room as well. Thank you very much.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, we will take Alain and then Geoff and then we will take that.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: I hope you can all hear me.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, we can.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Okay. So I want to just seek clarification in terms of – because we hear that the Global Engagement Team supports the work done by the Office of CTO also. I just want to get more clarification of what do we really

mean by have support, okay? And also seek the relationship between this engagement and the IANA function. Can you try to explain a little bit? Let me say it again, in terms of relationship, what do we really mean by Global Engagement support the work done by the CTO Office? That is one aspect of the question. The second question is I want to see also how the Global Engagement, CTO also affects or impacts the IANA function.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

I can quickly say a few things about the support aspect because, as you know, I've been part of the GSE for a while and now fully moved to the OCTO team. So I cannot have a global view of how the two team works. In fact, you have to take this as the GSE team is the team that is on the ground. That is a group of people that interacts on a daily basis with the community. And one, no, [they need] but two is regularly called to explain and talk about things that we do. So the GSE team, when needed, will go out there and present work that the OCTO team is doing related to SSR or any other aspect of the unique identifier system that we have managed as soon as they have the information. And they promote the work that the OCTO team does.

On the other hand, when they have request or there is an opportunity for us ICANN to represent what we do technically in forum, in events and so on, the GSE team are the ones who are first informed. And that they provide that information to the OCTO team to be able to go present and explain. And we have seen these very actively in action for the KSK Roll where most of the presentation done by the OCTO for instance, many of them have been made or requested by the GSE team.

So their support is in terms of raising awareness about what the OCTO team is doing and making sure that the message and the activity of the OCTO are well known by the community. And also have to get the feedback from the community so that we can align what we are doing – the needs from the community. So that’s from a relationship between OCTO or the support from GSE to the OCTO team.

When it comes now to the IANA function, it will be the same. What we do has some relationship with the IANA function as well. The KSK Roll is one very recent example of how the work or the responsibility within the IANA function and PTI is supported by both the OCTO and the GSE team because a lot of work for the role of the key is being done by the CTO office team, but the GSE team helping spread the word as well to get ISP in the portal ready for the key roll.

So it’s even dynamic relationship and as Patrick had mentioned originally, the engagement happen at different levels and what we tried to do is to coordinate that and make sure about the very dynamic way we provide supports to those different engagement activities, when and where they are needed.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Geoff, you’re next.

GEOFF HUSTON: I’m looking at three questions and quite frankly, if you can’t answer them in 30 seconds, just write down the question and send the response on e-mail because I don’t want to take time.

First question, Patrick, a lot of your presentation was about sending the message out. This is how we engage. But your [inaudible] appears to be the description of how you tell an audience what you're doing. How does the engagement work in the other direction? What are your efforts to make sure that you're getting and accepting messages coming the other way? You seem to sort of point to some passive mechanisms where stuff is put on the web and you solicit comments. I'm interested to understand any active elements you have while seeking input, particularly on security and stability related matters.

As I said at the outset, if the answer is too long, just take it on notice and write it down and send it back. That's the first question. You want me to press on?

PATRICK JONES: Geoff, press on and why don't we come back to you with the explanation on that.

GEOFF HUSTON: That sounds perfectly reasonable, Patrick. Thank you. My second question, you appear to be saying in your engagement, anyone who puts their hand up to host an L-Root, you put one there. I'm interested to understand the planning process, the passive response on placement of L-Roots. Is there a master plan from the folks who operate these roots in terms of any cost? And how is that overall plan implemented? Your presentation, I might be in the comment Adiel made. You almost appear to be passive but I'm not sure that's the case. So I'd like you to elaborate.

PATRICK JONES: Adiel, can I take that?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay, go ahead.

PATRICK JONES: I think this is a question that's best aimed at Terry Manderson who's the head of the team. I'm certain that they have an overall approach to what they want and how they want to administer, but I would direct that question to –

GEOFF HUSTON: And I'm sure that's the case too but what I heard was a little different. Certainly.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Maybe just to say something although we got Terry into the loop in on this. I think the policy or the approach that the Engineering team has on this is two way. One is that anyone can host an L-Root. Anyone can request it and that's also one aspect where GSE come into the loop because of their engagement at the regional and local level allow them to know who want or who is interested to host an L-Root instances. And as soon as that request is picked, then it gets to the process where the first assessments are done and all the requirement are done. The objective actually –

GEOFF HUSTON: Thank you, Adiel. I'll move on with my third question because I appreciate time is of the essence.

My third question, you appear to give the impression from Global Stakeholder Engagement, that you inform the policy debate after the event. You analyze the outcomes and provide feedback. What efforts do you do, if any, to inform the policy debate as it is taking place to provide input on what are the potential effects.

Again, I'm not really interested in a long answer here. Time is of the essence. If you want to write it down and send it back to the group, that would be fine too. Thank you.

PATRICK JONES: I know I can provide a written explanation that will cover the response to that question, so why don't we take that up.

GEOFF HUSTON: All right. Terrific. Thank you. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Geoff, and thank you, Adiel and Patrick. We have a question in the chat from Matogoro. How does GSE work, specifically with the ccTLD community on SSR?

PATRICK JONES: I think we can also provide a written response to that question as well. Adiel, do you think?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah. Also let's think of managing time, we can provide that. They work [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Great. Thank you. Are there other questions from team members? Feel free to speak up on the phone or raise your hand and the Adobe Connect while we wait for any additional –

PATRICK JONES: Just to clarify, Matogoro's question was specific to how we work with the ccTLD community, if you can make that in the notes.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: In the context of SSR, yeah. That's it.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, great. I have one question. I'm sorry. There is someone else on the line. Go ahead.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, I was about to say I have one question for the group as well but go ahead first.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. Similar to Geoff's question and I'd appreciate an elaboration in writing when you have the chance. I'm interested in how your work is coordinated and support the OCTO and SSR teams' commitment to engage and seek input from the broader, particularly the SSR related community that's not necessarily active day-to-day in ICANN, their obligation to get input and interaction from them on their SSR framework and strategic priorities, how you're involved in that and how the coordination on that occurs. I'm happy to get an answer on that online as well.

Who else had a question? Identify yourself please.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

No, it was just to get a little bit of... I mean the context of this and probably [inaudible] from you guys how you see these engagements in support to the SSR review. Because the scope of the technical engagement and SSR widely from the ICANN organization's viewpoint can be a little bit blur but how you are seeing this in the work that we are currently doing can be something useful and interesting practically for me personally to hear. If any, if there are notes, I'm fine as well at this stage. I'm fine as well.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Adiel. Geoff, did you have a response to Adiel or another issue?

GEOFF HUSTON: It was more generic issue. Now it's a new hand and it's a generic issue.

DENISE MICHEL: A new hand, okay. Adiel, I think that was both a statement and a question but to that extent, it was a question. My own perspective is that the SSR Review Team is certainly in a fact-finding mode. There are several elements of our mandate that have some connection either directly or indirectly to the GSE Outreach SSR activities. And so from my perspective, we want to make sure we understand what you're currently doing, what your plans are and understand how that connects with the SSR responsibilities and activities that it's our job to review. With that, I will turn it over to Geoff for one final question and then we'll need to move on to the other items on our agenda, Geoff.

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, again, this is a generic question. More than happy for the written response and no need to react immediately. I gather the impression that there is a strong amount in the current program of explanation, almost teaching and familiarization with what ICANN does and what it doesn't do. In other words, to various audiences, your role in staying of things and how you do it and so on, which has a limited lifetime.

At some point, it becomes an interaction between equals. When you taught them, they don't need to hear it again. You need to listen and interact. When do you think in terms of global stakeholder again? The focus will shift to more of an interaction between if you will focus to understand the conversation and the elements? When do you think your initial familiarization task will be largely achieved and you can

move on to a more substantive engagement gathering input rather than just telling folk what you do? Thanks.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

If I can use a quick shot on that one. I think overall, the Engagement firm also explain what we do, I will take that the [inaudible] to say that it will end until we are sure that we can seek all the [inaudible] of multistakeholders bottom-up process is effective and we have all people interested who participates into our processes. The engagement of inputs will be [from] obvious when participation and policy development and specifically those who are linked to SSR gets a variety of when we see the multistakeholder model hopefully visible in the way the inputs are done.

I think the GSE team is one of the most [inaudible] group to be able to achieve that to make sure that they get those inputs or organize a way for the community at the regional level, from the different activities perspective, different group perspective inputs into the policy. So we will [go back] to that. [inaudible].

Now when – the when is a very big question that I'm not sure we can have a direct answer to – but the goal actually is to make sure that we broaden the scope of the multistakeholder approach, both in terms of geography, in terms of professional that can participate in terms of interest, as such. That's not the firm answer but it gives you a perspective.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Adiel. We really appreciate Adiel and Patrick – we appreciate you jumping on this call on short notice and providing us with more information. And we appreciate your commitment to provide some additional information in writing. I'd ask our team members to review the discussion notes you see on the right side of the screen. And make sure that your questions and requests for additional information are appropriately captured there. And then Staff, Adiel and Patrick can use that to follow up online.

Of course, if you think of additional questions as we move on to other agenda items, feel free to post in the chat room and we can also send additional follow up e-mails to staff after this meeting.

Great. With that, we'll move on. Adiel and Patrick, you can drop off now and thank you again very much for joining and addressing these issues with us.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you very much.

PATRICK JONES:

I will follow up with more information as I want to note that we're just now scratching the surface of a variety of issues that are at work where different participants within the ICANN organization are involved in the process. So what I've given you is only the start at a high level, the types of interaction on SSR, to follow up and provide more information but I sense that this may open up more questions and we can take that as we go.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, thank you so much. We really appreciate that. Bye-bye.

PATRICK JONES: Bye.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, since we need to address this at the top of the hour due to Patrick's and Adiel's availability, let me jump back and just ask if any team members have any updated Statements of Interest and if there are any additional apologies or absences that the team needs to be aware of.

Hearing none, we'll move on to our next agenda item and that's the follow-up work on our subtopic groups.

So Boban, would you like to start our discussion on the draft work plan for the ICANN security subtopic? I'll remind everyone that one of our work items that came out of Madrid was the additional work that Boban and Zarko volunteered to help spearhead in developing a draft work plan for one of the subtopic groups. We were thinking that not only would this give us an opportunity to provide some structure and a more detailed plan and how we are going to attack this particular subgroup topic but would also help inform the work plans that we apply to the other subtopics as well. With that, I'll turn it over to you Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: Sure, can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

BOBAN KRSIC: Okay. Perfect because I have [inaudible] tuned in, yeah. Okay, I'll start.

I sent yesterday first draft of the work plan for [inaudible] ICANN security. As mentioned in Madrid, I think or I propose that appropriate way would be or should be to perform a gap analysis on two industry standards. The one is ISO 27001 Information Security Management System. The other one is 22301 Business Continuity Management System. I think that with the use of these both standards, we should be able to address all the relevant items that we identified in Madrid.

For the beginning, I draft standards work plan which contains the main [action] steps, the description of the [inaudible] and expected outcome and methodology [inaudible] form. And other three sheets, a detailed checklist on what to or what questions are hard to identify the level of maturity of consults which I implemented to meet the requirements of the standard. And it could be [way] how we can organize our work in the second subteam or to how we get the information about the status of implementing security in ICANN.

So I would like to hear from you what do you think about the way, is it an appropriate way or should we change something in the methodology and of course how to move forward with the item.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Boban. I'll take a queue for questions and discussions, Emily? Please go ahead. Emily, if you're speaking, we can't hear, you're maybe on mute. We'll do Emily and then Kerry-Ann.

EMILY TAYLOR: Is that better?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, it's a little bit faint but we can hear you.

EMILY TAYLOR: All right. Thank you very much, Boban for this stuff. It's really great to have something to react to, very much appreciate your work on this [inaudible]. It's really a question to you. I've not being through this little gap analysis [inaudible] I suppose which doesn't [inaudible] on one. It's just a question to say you signed in practice to get some to the scheme of what you're trying audit. Because these things can either be a useful framework that gets this going or they can turn into checkmarks and exercise. So I'm just interested in hearing from your experience when you find it valuable and when you find it really getting into the level of [inaudible] you need.

Apologies if anybody can't hear me. Did that question come through? I can repeat [inaudible]. Let see if I can do anything about the volume. So thank you very much, Boban, basically, thanks a lot. This is great. In your experience operating under this framework, do you find it useful or can

you advise us of any shortcomings that you've experienced in using this framework?

BOBAN KRSIC:

Well, I thank you [inaudible] because I use it since 2005, yeah, the last 12 years and I'm also in different standard organizations, and I have the [inaudible] standards. And, it helps you to identify, you get with your head if you have them – I mean, if you [inaudible] approach, you have to – how to measure or how to identify any gaps in the security management and then an approach, which is [rightful]. Yeah, and for me, it's a full-scope approach and I've got different domains in the information security management and business continuity management. And yes, it's time to [elevate] it but I think at the end, the output is a great [inaudible] which you had when you perform and you can write it down, you can measure it, you have controls in place. I think it's a great point to start and to say, "Okay, how we can reach a good standards and implementations, and implement in the information security management in a global approach."

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you. Emily, did you have a follow-up question on that before we move to the next question?

Okay. Kerry-Ann, did you have a question? I thought I saw your hand up earlier.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

[Inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: We're having trouble hearing you, Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [Inaudible] in terms of – can you hear me now?

DENISE MICHEL: No, not really. It's very, very faint.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you now? No?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, it's very faint. [Still clicking] to get the operators to boost the mobile. Steph, if you could help Kerry-Ann to see if the operator can help boost the sound level in her line.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Are you able to hear me now?

DENISE MICHEL: There you go. Yes, that works well. [Inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, the problem [inaudible] where I put the mic.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, [inaudible] connectivity. [inaudible].

I wanted to first tell you thanks for what you did. I think it's a good start for us to focus. The only thing I probably asked the team to consider when we review it for this subteam and other subteam is that we've probably tweaked some of the language in terms of the specific products. For example, [inaudible] and audit, I don't know how the community or [inaudible]. I appreciate that audit [inaudible] are reviewed. And since from other terminologies, the [inaudible] –

DENISE MICHEL: I think we lost Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [Inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Are you there? Well, let's see if we can get Kerry-Ann back. Meanwhile, Geoff, you have a question and then Alain. Geoff, go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, thank you. And thanks for this work, Boban. I have asked by this one question here. When on [inaudible] –

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Have very strict – I know.

DENISE MICHEL: Kerry-Ann is back. Hey, Kerry-Ann, we lost you for a while. And if you continue talking, we didn't hear you. Could you repeat your last part? You had a concern about the use of the term audit versus review, then we lost you after that. Are you there? Okay. Geoff, go ahead. Sorry about that.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay, I'll be a lot faster. Normally, when I see this kind of work, my first reaction is engage in external firm, an audit firm to conduct this kind of work under our instructions and then review the outcomes. Do you think that this plan [inaudible] could be undertaken by the Review Team as a set of volunteers or do you think necessarily that to do it to the level of detail and standard that you're describing here, we would engage external consultant to do this for us. Thank you.

BOBAN KRSIC: Great question, Geoff, thank you very much for this one. And, I think it's where do you're geared into to hire a consultant and to perform to get [inaudible]. And I think we can – we called the [inaudible] related resources and I think I'm [inaudible] and to the 301, and if somebody assist from [inaudible], it could be possible but I think it's better to hire an [external] firm to provide the [gap analysis] and to provide a [inaudible], and to move on forward.

GEOFF HUSTON: Thanks. That's it. And I agree with that. That's my reaction as well. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Alain, next.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Yes. My question is also around what Geoff just asked. But me, I [definitely] think that this Review Team shouldn't really tie to do this kind of work directly or getting the [inaudible] team to do this. I think our focus should be, first, let's see what ICANN have in place in terms of [certification], how they manage the security and get the outcome of previous audit and everything. If we didn't think we need to go further, maybe get some expertise to evaluate some of the outcomes of the document we have in hand yet. But I don't think it is in our scope to even try to say we are going to audit the system. We should be making sure the mechanics in place are being followed and then the recommendations are being implemented. And if we see any gap, then we try to analyze the gap and see what [inaudible] trying to do the audit. I think this is [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Alain. I see some agreements noted in the chat window as well.

BOBAN KRSIC: [Inaudible], could I?

DENISE MICHEL: Yup.

BOBAN KRSIC: Just to Alain. I talked to Steve in Madrid and if ICANN has some certification in some place or [didn't] certify in any standard and he said, "No." Yeah, they're working on it or they're working to be confined to the standard but I think we should or we could provide [inaudible] to see where they are. I think it's a good way to have an idea what we have to do to have a full-scope approach and maybe a good way on how to implement security in overall. Yeah. It could also be to review audits, which are performed in the past. But I think it's [inaudible] a good way also to provide one [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Alain. Is Kerry-Ann back on the phone? I see a comment in the chat room. If so, you're free to go for it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can you hear me now?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Just [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, I missed what has happened before but I was trying to reconnect everything. But what I was saying was not just the use of the term, I think more – seeing exactly what was the applicable to the area that we wanted to review for ICANN. Well then, you would probably know better than I would in terms of what we could actually extract and do like a short version of probably using the ISO standard that you recommend.

I don't know how the community was [inaudible] even, if it is that we attempt to do it without going into the full [press] of applying all the different line items that [inaudible] included in the checklist for us to check it and if each of us would have the ability to be able to verify whether or not if we use the term audit, that actually means that audit is [standard].

So my recommendation which I see that given that we have this big template now to work or modify is good start and we just now – we get to ensure it's something about – can actually meet the standard to apply and to deliver [comments] in a review as to whether or not the standards are met based on what we selected is applicable.

DENISE MICHEL: Boban, would you like to reply?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, not a [reply].

BOBAN KRSIC: Sorry, [Inaudible] standard because I also [inaudible] was hard to follow it. And, yeah, I would like to move forward and maybe Kerry-Ann and I can phone at the end of the conference.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Good. Thank you. Steve Conte.

Again, if people could mute their phones when they're not speaking, there's a bit of an echo on the line. I have Steve Conte next and then Alain, I'm not sure if your hand is old or new. But Steve, the floor is yours at this –

STEVE CONTE: Thanks, Denise. I just wanted to clarify myself at the transition that I have with Boban during a break once about this. What I was trying to indicate is that the ICANN [inaudible] are diverse since [spread out] and managed through various portions of the ICANN including IT DNS engineering, which involve some of the root servers and then some of the root staff.

But it's managed through IT where VIP [and] IT for PTI and what the various levels depending on different things such as the community

outreach or community visibility or the level of importance such as holding the KSK or the Key Signing Key probing the root zone itself. There'll be different places that just have different structures set up that could be and probably have some measure of stratification either in place while working.

I didn't say or I can't say with a [new] certainty what those levels measures are and I'm requesting to Review Team to consider the magnitude of the [stuff] that they currently [stand]. And if the Review Team wants to get down [inaudible] and tend to get down [inaudible] that we take a look at maybe specific items or functions that have impact on the SSR like in what [inaudible] not that and not necessarily... Personally speaking, I don't necessarily think that this is the place for an ICANN IP audit. But looking at it from the portions that affect the SSR of unique identifiers, the SSR of the DNS that the Review Team has been asked from the [inaudible]. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you, Steve. Are there any follow-up comments or questions on that or other items to discuss relating to this draft work plan? Okay.

We're swiftly coming to the end of our call. But let's quickly move on then to – Zarko, would you like to touch on your contribution?

I hear a big echo on the line.

Oh, I'm sorry. Don Blumenthal, you had a question before we move on?

DON BLUMENTHAL: Yeah. Am I coming through or are they having problems?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I can hear you.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Okay. I just noticed [inaudible] and stuff look up of items on the agenda. I've got a number of concerns of that 27001 exactly how we are looking to use it but I'll just go ahead and write something up.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. I'm sorry. I missed out a bit at the end, Don. Did you want to post to the list instead of discussing it now?

DON BLUMENTHAL: Yeah. We have only eight minutes left. Yeah. I'll just write something up.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Don.

Zarko, I want to just give you an opportunity to discuss your follow-up work as well. Do we have Zarko? Can you hear? We may have lost him.

There's also an additional draft relating to the SSR framework that's been shared in Google Docs that attempts to also break out the sort of skillset that may be required for each one. So, please follow that link from your e-mail thread. And Jennifer has kindly dropped it – a link into

the chat as well. And let's continue our discussion about this work as well on our e-mail list.

But Steph – and I think it's really important to keep up the momentum and continue our work on the e-mail thread. Johannesburg is fast approaching and to keep our work moving forward, and also to get the most we can out of our face-to-face meeting. We'll need to address many of these issues on e-mail list, as well as in person.

While Zarko adds some notes to the list, I'll just quickly move on to the next item. Just to note that we'd like to finalize the volunteer list for the subtopics that we have laid out. Is Steph able to pull? Do they have those on the slide today to be able to pull them up? Yes? No?

STEPH: Yeah, [inaudible] in it.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. And then, in addition to making sure every team member had a chance to review the subtopics, add their names to one or two that they can do a deep dive into and help advance the work on those subtopics, please make sure you take care of that in the next couple of days so we have a clear sense of how volunteer effort is shaping up with each topic.

And then, please get some thought to the great work that Zarko and Boban has done to date on these subtopics, and please share your thoughts on the e-mail list about the most productive next steps we can take on these subtopics.

Then, before we sign off, I'd like to touch Johannesburg, give people a chance to ask any questions that they may have and also again to encourage people to share any suggestions, request that they have for agenda items. Make sure you share that on the team list.

The coaches will be shortly getting out a draft agenda for our Johannesburg meeting and would appreciate any additional input any team member have on that. I'll pause there to make sure there are no questions about Johannesburg in particular.

Are there other agenda items?

Okay. We'll ask staff to send the open action item list to the e-mail list or a link to the list on the wiki. Are there any urgent, outstanding action items that you wanted to bring to the team's attention? I'm raising that question for staff or... Emily, please always feel free to jump in if you know of any either. Go ahead.

Steph, did you have any items you wanted to flag for action while we have the team members on the phone?

Okay. We'll ask people to follow-up then on the e-mail list on all of these agenda items. As Emily has reinforced in the chat, we really need everyone's engagement on the e-mail list sharing their thoughts for agenda items in Johannesburg and also in particular thoughts on moving our subtopic work forward.

Is there Any Other Business before we conclude this call from anyone? Please feel free to speak up. Raise your hand. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Yes, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Just a suggestion for everyone, we got Patrick and Adiel on the call but maybe in the future we maybe need to make sure we give our guest speakers what we want to hear for them to prepare because I feel like we got them on the call [inaudible] to something, we ask questions, we can't get answer, which we'll go and write. So, maybe we may need to see [other] approach for better outcome next time. Just a suggestion.

DENISE MICHEL:

Thank you for that excellent suggestion.

Emily, you're hand is up. Emily, we're having trouble hearing you if you're speaking.

Emily is typing. Emily had a question from an observer who is finding the interaction mode a bit clunky. Is there a way we can be more open to observer input?

I think a great question to take on board, discuss on the list and hopefully address either online or at our next meeting. And Emily is going to start a thread on that.

Okay. Great. Thanks, everyone, for volunteering your hour and for all the other work that's been done, and please continue on the e-mail thread. And everyone, have a good morning, evening, or afternoon. Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]