RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So first, are there any updated Statements of Interest from anyone? Okay, are there any apologies that have been noted? Okay, Kerry-Ann and Boban. Well thank you very much. That's from the chat room by the way. Okay, so the agenda for today's call is to talk about the Johannesburg agenda, go over it and make sure we're all on the same page. And potentially this would be the best opportunity for any kind of course corrections that we need to make before we head there. To go through the sub topics groups, talk about progress or any other issues that we really need to start with and I think there's a handful things we could get into there.

So hopefully everyone will feel free to speak your mind on that one. And to go over the call rotation and attendance for the various meeting times. I think we have the right people on the call to hit that nail on the head hopefully. And then we'll go through the open action items and the to-do list, and stuff, before we get to any other business. So before I jump into that, does anybody have any comments, questions, agenda bashing or anything else that they'd like to raise right now? Alrighty, cool.

So, real quick before I ask to put up the agenda for the Johannesburg meeting. One, has anybody not gotten that over the email list? Has anybody not seen the Johannesburg proposed agenda? And while I wait to see if any hands raise for that, basically the outline of this, we've got

two days blocked off. So, Sunday, June 25th from 9-5, we have a room reserved in the Convention Center and we've got a number of things outlined in the agenda that was sent out. On the second day we'll be moving to a nearby hotel instead to accommodate the teams. And we have a number of items that will probably entail breaking out a little bit and what not on day two.

And so I think that we do not have this embedded. So, is it possible for somebody to throw up the proposed agenda so people can look at it? Great, thank you very much. So, you can see on Sunday there's an initial welcome and what not and then a Sub Topics Scoping Discussion. And there's one missing here or the other, but for the most part, I think this is to continue to try and get us on the same page.

And I saw there was some consternation on the list about what to do with the SSR1 Review and whether or not we should break from the SSR1 Review into hearing about the DNS Abuse Study or we should continue with that. So rather than try and channel the list I wonder if we could just have a brief discussion about where people's heads are with that because the Co-Chairs and various staff members have been working to try and make sure that availability, both of room and personnel, have lined up well. At the same time we want to make sure that we're meeting what teams need. So does anyone feel like speaking to any concerns about the agenda?

DENISE MICHEL: Eric, this is Denise, and I'm sorry, I'm unable to get into the Adobe room, but could you put me in the queue, please?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, absolutely. In fact, you can go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, great. So, it's been challenging getting information about the various availability of presenters and details on what will be ready by June. So it turns out that they will not have all of their analysis completed on the DNS Abuse Study that I know several team members were interested in. And we've confirmed that the consultants who are doing that work will be available through July and likely August as well. Since we'll be able to put that on one of our conference calls later, I would suggest switching that out for either work time or another presentation. Similarly, it's not clear that all the entities involved in the Registry Operators Security Threats will be available, so just want to flag that, whether or not we're able to put that into the agenda is just a little bit up in the air at this point.

And then finally, overall, just want to underscore in case people missed this on the list, our objective for this meeting is to develop, if not largely complete our both work plan and timeline, and in particular have good road maps for the team and any sub topic work we're going to advance through smaller groups. It will be four months about, until the team is face to face again and so we want to maximize our face to face time by making this a working session as the priority, better than the team listening to briefings.

So those of you that are headed to Johannesburg, please do so with the expectation of rolling up your sleeves and actively working. And of

course, as we can fit relevant briefings into the schedule we'll do so. We've also asked staff to provide us with availability of the outstanding SSR1 items, not only in Johannesburg but over the next month. So if we're not able to close out the SSR1 outstanding briefings in Johannesburg we can do so soon after as part of our weekly conference calls. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Denise. I have Cathy next in the queue.

CATHY HANDLEY: Good morning to everybody, or afternoon, or evening, whatever our choice may be. I just responded this morning to the agenda that Denise had sent out earlier and just want to say I think it's really important that we come out with something concrete that we can say, you know, with the SSR1 Review. I don't mean to offend anyone, we've kind of bounced around and talked about a lot of different things.

And we've done things internally to get ourselves going but I really think given that I saw something earlier that the staff can give some information on, at least get through some of the recommendations of the SSR1 and do it and finish it, not do it half way and then we're going to come back. Just kind of put a stake in the ground. I don't care about what time or what part of the agenda but if we're going to do it I think we need to allow enough time to get it done. That's it. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Cathy. James, you're next.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Eric. I think I was the main instigator on the feedback in my usual role and, Denise, it sounds like the stars have aligned and that through pure coincidence my feedback has been (inaudible - 00:09:02) by fate. So I think that if we can extend out the SSR1 piece on the first day into the slot that the DNS Abuse was going to be in, we can make serious progress on that.

And then I have a question on the second day then. I really like the idea of breaking up into the sub groups to do some break out work and, you know, get that work done face to face while we can. On just logistics, do we have room in the second hotel to be able to break out like that? If we have 15 people trying to break out into teams in one room I think that could be a bit challenging, so do we have the facilities to be able to do that? And then come back together in a plenary after lunch or what way can we do that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, thanks, James. So, yes, the Chairs and staff members have been talking about this a lot. Oh, I think Karen will probably jump in on that. So yeah, Karen, please, if you're going to speak to that, please jump in.

KAREN MULBERRY: Thank you very much, Eric. Yes, I was. Based on some of the discussion with the Co-Chairs and the potential seeking the opportunities to break out in this sub group, right now there isn't another room available for us at the hotel, so we're looking at what kind of public areas might be

conducive for groups to break off into two or three to sit and chat about things. So that's the best we can do. We have more opportunity actually on the 25th in the Convention Center to have rooms available for our breakout sessions and we do have the hotel on the 26th. That's all I have right now. Still working with the hotel to try and identify if there are anything possible that we might be able to use, but have no conclusive feedback at this point.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Karen. Yeah, so we've had a number of conversations about this and so I think we'll continue to try and find what works best and hesitant to say that we can make things work in different ways, but we'll certainly try. So, best we can do I think. Okay, so I see no other hands raised so I'll just continue. So I think that was most of what it is that we were going to talk about with the agenda. I think the main part of the second day is really the sub teams and trying to move forward with that and try to get our overall work plan together, and from that, our hope is to start to build a notion of a timeline and then literally build an exact timeline after that.

We have a briefing at the end. I think Denise mentioned a few seconds ago or minutes ago, a briefing on the Framework for Registry Operators to Respond to Security Threats. It sounds like while that's lined up, if people have a strong objection to that we can figure something out. But I note, if people aren't following the chat room, that the researchers from DNS Abuse Study will likely have the results it sounds like in July and that it seems they're willing to be flexible about briefings and pre-

briefings and post-briefings of the dissemination of those results. Oh, James, your hand's up, go ahead please.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Eric. Just super briefly on the Registry Operators Framework for Security Threats. I think it's good to get a quick briefing on it. You know, I think we have an hour allocated to it there. I think that's probably a little ambitious because it has just been drafted and it is currently out for public comment and my understanding is there's going to be significant public comment going to be going back into it. And so if we do want to get a briefing on that I think it's probably good but let's keep it short and sweet and to the point.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I agree and actually one of the things I was like, maybe dovetailing and taking my Chair hat off for a second, is that I think, and again, this is with my Chair hat off, I think one of the things that we should hopefully try and focus on is when we get these briefings, which I think are very good for us to be getting, hopefully we can continue to sort of, my sense is our perspective should be, listening to the good work being done by folks for various reasons and trying for ourselves as a team to map that to what the SSR issues from that are.

So for example, if someone were to give us a briefing on something that was potentially far afield from what we're working on, not at all implying that those presentations we've just spoken about are far afield, our job would be to say, how is this related to an SSR issue that we should be talking about? So yes, back to your point, James, I think

hearing these briefings, whether they're brief or they're in depth, it should be governed by how much of it do we think we're going to take from it and actually turn into part of our work product. That would be my two cents.

Okay, so not seeing any hands in the queue, perhaps we can go back to the college and the deck please? Great. Okay, so I think this slide we've covered. So, progress updates from sub teams. So at this point, I don't believe all the sub teams have met. So can I see people maybe volunteer to give descriptions of the sub teams that they've been on by raising your hand, then we can just go down the list? Because, like I know, I haven't been able to get all the members of the other team together for a call, our schedules just haven't aligned. So maybe not all the teams have actually had a chance yet. But anybody want to volunteer before I start calling? Great, thank you, Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: Hello, can you hear me?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes.

EMILY TAYLOR: We did actually attempt a call on the ICANN Security Sub Team and as everyone will know from the list, there's been quite a lot of work done by Boban and Žarko to just narrow the issues and get a schedule up and running. We did schedule a call and I think members of the team—by

five past the hour that it was supposed to start we had significantly less than five participants so we didn't go any further on that at that time. But the spirit was there and hopefully we'll be able to move forward in a slightly more substantive manner very soon. But I think that the Johannesburg meeting will provide a great impetus to renew those efforts and get those conversations started. So that's it from me. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Emily. Yeah, and thanks to Boban and Žarko on all the hard work on putting the primary materials for that group together. James, go ahead please.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Eric. So for the IANA Transition Sub Group, I'm just finishing up a work plan. I've broken it down into two phases I suppose, information gathering and a list of things that we need to investigate and to get information on that can be done over email lists and emails to staff. And then I'm preparing a list of either teleconference interviews or one-on-one interviews probably in Abu Dhabi and with some key staff around the IANA Transition, both sides, ICANN and PTI. Once I've finalized that list I will turn that into a schedule and then we'll send that out hopefully before we fly to Johannesburg so that we can start working on that in Johannesburg, hopefully.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Great, thank you very much. So I think it's probably the case that the other teams have not met yet. Is that correct? It doesn't say anything on the list. I suppose that this is probably a good segue to start the discussion on how we're going to get the DNS Security, Future Threats, and I'll leave the other jokes off the table for now, so the DNS Security and Future Threats group. So those are the larger of the groups. Okay, go ahead, James.

JAMES GANNON: I was going to wait for you to finish, but my suggestion and piece of feedback to the Chairs is for those groups, I really think we need to get a rapporteur to start coalescing people together because that's a key part of that role, is to start doing exactly what you're asking. I think when you have the seven, eight, nine, people on the team it's going to be very hard to coalesce around getting work started without somebody there to schedule the calls, to start the work plan, etcetera.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's a very good point, thanks, James. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks, Eric. And you guys might have already thought of this, covered it on the last Chair's call, and I apologize if you did and I'm just repeating stuff. But looking at these names in red and thinking about the review teams want to have break outs to these groups, I see a significant amount of overlap of people in these sub groups, and just wanted to

raise it that it could be difficult to have break outs if you, for instance, need to be in five groups, six groups, at once.

And trying to find that out and also if there's someone on the review team who is in a different sub group that's not gathering and they're not in any other sub groups that are gathering, you know, what do those individuals do at that point too? So I just wanted to raise it, to think about, before we get there and realize that it might be an actuality. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that has not escaped my attention so thanks a lot for bringing that up, Steve. Emily, go ahead.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah, thank you very much, Steve, for bringing that up. Yes, it has not escaped the attention of the Co-Chairs, as you rightly guessed. There's also a few people, including myself, who are unable to make the Johannesburg meeting for various reasons. I guess we can sort that out on the ground. It is one of the issues that we have as a small team, breaking into six groups. However, I think that just looking at the -- there are three, really, major work items and where we also have significant numbers of people who will be in attendance and they're not all the same people. So hopefully we can work that out on the ground but also be aware of it.

And I also just wanted to support James's intervention about the need to get rapporteurs sorted out for the small groups, and I would

anticipate that that's something that hopefully could be done rather quickly when we sit down face to face. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you very much, Emily. So I actually would like to pile onto that but I have a proposal. So I propose that between now and when we show up in Johannesburg, which is at this point within a week, I'd like to make a call to the group to have volunteers to be rapporteurs for the outstanding groups. And what I would like is that by the time that we meet on that day to break out, which will be Monday, I'd like at that point if no one has volunteered for a particular sub group that we allow the Chairs to designate someone, including the Chairs potentially designating themselves.

In other words, it would be nice to point and nominate somebody but at the very least a Chair who's in a group can say, fine, since no one will do it, I'll do it, or since no one will do it, so-and-so will do it. And hopefully that will be preceded by copious amounts of drinks the night before being bought for said volunteer. Nevertheless, I would like to put a deadline on the table so that we can move this forward, so by the time these sub groups break out -- and I note that we may not have all the sub groups fully able to meet. For example, Future Threats, it looks like I will be the only one on the Future Threats team that will be in Johannesburg, so my guess is it would be better for that one not to meet. Nevertheless we could probably ask people to volunteer. So that's my proposal.

I think, you know, certainly interested in hearing anybody's thoughts on the call, but additionally, conversations on the list about this, you know, we have those few days. Just looking at the chat room, remote participation for the sub groups. Mr. Matogoro brings up a good point, so while we do have remote participation I believe set up for the meeting, I'm not sure what we've thought about for the sub group, so I think potentially if we're in the mode of breaking out and there's one group that has a remote participant, that one group can certainly nominate the connectivity stuff. We'll have to work on that.

So can I make that as an action item for the staff and the Co-Chairs to work together on making sure whatever accommodations we can make for remote participation in the breakout sessions, we do. Okay, cool. I see a handful of comments and a hand in agreement. Mr. Matagoro, please go ahead.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yeah, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Thank you, Eric, for leading the meeting. And as I was just routing on the possibility of me participating to the sub group, and I think the idea that you have brought is a good idea, that if we can have the pre-arrangement before arriving to Joburg and then that will be a good option. But the idea that I was having, for example, the two groups, DNS Security and Future Threats, you know, for me for example, we may need to have rapporteur volunteer for this group and then can lead on making the work going so that before arriving in Joburg at least we can have an initial work plan draft that can guide the team in the ground.

So, I really support that. Maybe the Co-Chair should lead us on the best option. And the best option that I see is that the Co-Chair can chair the meeting for DNS Security and the Future Threats, because you know, we can wait for a rapporteur to volunteer forever, but if we meet and discuss the work that's ahead us and within the discussion, then we can have someone who is telling to this sub group. But we have seen that while keeping waiting then it's like throwing down coming up with the concrete plan before arriving to Joburg.

So I would propose that the Co-Chair take care of parenting a schedule or a meeting for DNS Sec and for the Future Threats. As we might be aware that the SSR2 is a small group, a small team in number, so I'm aware also that the capacity and technical skills distributed among us quite different. Some of the members are used to ICANN and some of them are aware of the real intention and the plan that ICANN is working within as we might be (inaudible) remit within ICANN.

So when we are in the discussion during the meeting then we can have someone leading the team but we can start with the (inaudible) before arriving to Joburg. But if we wait until we are ready, of course we still have five days, I'm not sure how we can do it, but I think it's something that I thought I should mention. Rather than waiting for the team to have the rapporteur, then let the Co-Chair arrange a meeting for the team members within these two groups, especially the DNS Security and the Future Threats. And out of that meeting then we can have the rapporteurs selected from that meeting. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so those are a bunch of very interesting comments Mr. Matogoro, thank you very much. So I want to make sure I got what you're saying clearly. So I think what I was understanding, and anyone feel free to correct me if I'm wrong, that if we wait until we show up on the scene in order to nominate a rapporteur for any or several of the sub groups that that means there may not be enough time to put together a cogent schedule for that break out session. Is that one of the things that you were saying, Mr, Matogoro?

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yeah, what I was saying that, of course as you can see, the Joburg meeting is approaching, we see how fast days ahead, and the idea of mentioning is that, because you know, we formed these groups since the Madrid meeting and what I see is that as we are waiting for someone to lead the groups it is taking time. So I was having an option that rather than waiting for someone to organize like what the ICANN Security did, where Žarko and Eric came up with the somewhat draft where people are starting discussing, is the Co-Chair can take a role of organizing an all-round meeting among the sub group team members so that within that they can get something worked before the meeting. That's what I was thinking.

Because you can see the two groups are good enough review team members but we have not even met and come up with something that can initiate the discussion. So I was thinking that's the way it would be, the Co-Chair organize an all round meeting among the team members, the sub group team members, and out of that and then we can have someone to lead the sub group. And if it is something that can be done

within the remaining five days before the trip, it's well and done. But if it's not yet done so the thing can be started within Joburg, that the team can meet, but we should also have a way for people who are not within the face to face meeting, so they can also get their idea included within the sub group. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, great. Thank you very much. Yeah, we'll probably have to cycle on that a little bit. But that's a good point of input, Mr. Matogoro, thank you.

Okay, so I note the time check from Bernie, thank you very much. So I believe Mr. Matogoro's hand is still up from before. Okay, thank you. So, no other hands raised, I'm prepared to move on. I think we have a couple directions we can go. Certainly as a volunteer driven review team, if somebody feels like jumping in and grabbing something at any time, you don't have to wait for decorum, but as the Chairs we have set a couple of deadlines, so if nothing else happens we'll prod it along based on it looks like a little bit of rough consensus we got in the chat room. Okay, Bernie, go ahead, please. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just to be clear, it was in the chat, but we have no tech support for the 26th and that means that we'll just have a speaker phone set up in the main room. And I don't see how we could arrange any kind of remote participation for the break out groups. So just trying to set the baseline so everyone's on the same page here.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Bernie. Yeah, so I suppose just to follow it up with a question, in the event that there was only one sub group that actually had a remote participant, that sub group could probably squat on the speaker phone while the other sub groups broke out. Correct?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Correct.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, cool. Yeah, I think we kind of understood that but thanks for the clarification so everyone's on the same page. Okay, so this is going to be one of our big ticket items so I don't want to linger on it any longer than we have to, but I certainly don't want to run past this sub group sub topic team discussion before everyone's had their say. I don't see any hands up but does anybody else have any comments or questions before we go forward with the semi-ratified plan of doing our best? Alright, cool.

So, Call Rotation and Attendance. So there is a particular time block that is a little bit difficult for a number of the people and I can't remember what the UTC time is but I know it's 2:00 AM my time. So I don't know if we actually gathered attendance statistics, maybe somebody part of the support team can remind me if we have statistics on participation? But I think without statistics, I'm sort of a data guy, so it's hard for me to go forward with just the (inaudible) but I think it's a little bit of a (inaudible) time for a lot of people and we've got three

EN

times in rotation. So I think what we're talking about is whether we need all three times. Emily, go ahead, please.

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah, Eric, just to give a little background on this agenda item. It was raised under Any Other Business at the end of our last call. Our last call did take place in that 06h00 time slot. And there was quite a lot of, you know, strong feelings expressed by members of the team on the call. Thank you very much to staff for gathering those participation figures. You can see that we started off with a fairly strong attendance at the 06h00 time slot and it's pretty much flipped. In contrast, the attendance at the 14h00 and 21h00 UTC has actually maintained consistency or even grown.

Our North American colleagues in the team do find that time slot at 06h00 extremely challenging. However, there are others who find it very suitable. So one proposal we could have, looking at the call attendance figures for the other slots, would just be to drop that 06h00 slot and renew our call for strong participation from our volunteer team members. However, I'm aware that many of our colleagues, that 06h00 UTC is a great slot for them. So it would be really good to hear, for example, from Noorul Ameen, from Ram Krishna. Also from Geoff Huston, Kaveh. I think that that 06h00 is quite a nice slot for you guys. So would you have any objection to what I'm proposing? Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thanks, Emily. I also put my hand in a queue for one comment which is I just want to note that the first and the second derivative of

participation is negative for the 06h00 UTC slot, whereas the first is positive for the other two slots and the second is flat. So that basically means that we're losing people from the 06h00 UTC slot and we're losing them faster and faster, versus we're gaining at a constant rate in the other ones. Just throwing that out there as a number thing. Okay.

So, Ram Krishna, thank you very much for commenting in the chat room. So yeah, I think maybe what we'll do is, maybe we should take this to the list just to fully codify it but it sounds like nobody has a strong objection to refactoring our schedule down to two meeting slots. Currently we're looking at maybe just enshrining the 14h00 and the 21h00, but certainly I don't think we want to make a rushed decision before people have a chance to weigh in. Nevertheless, I do think we want to converge on this.

So how about, can I make a straw man proposal that we settle this by the time we meet in Joburg? In other words, if there's no commentary on the list beyond what we're talking about right now -- Okay, so there's a couple of comments on the list. Any time zone is fine except for 21h00, which is one of the time slots we have. Okay, so Emily, your comment in the chat room is what I was aiming at. I don't think we can come to a consensus right now, not everyone's on the call. But certainly, we could never terminate on this.

So maybe this will be another thing we can put on our action items for Johannesburg list, which is that we'll settle this by the time we leave Johannesburg with a lead up of discussion on the list. In other words, we've got several days of time where we could discuss this on the list and maybe one of the face to face items that we can finish off with at

EN

the end is, are we going to keep the same meeting schedule or go ahead and abbreviate one of the slots.

So we'll put that as a deadline, by the time we leave Johannesburg, this will be a settled issue, we'll either have all three or we'll have knocked off the 6:00 AM based on a consensus? Sorry, I'm trying to draw lines in the sand so that we can make the measurable progress. So I'm going to leave this hanging. It looks like there's a little bit of agreement on the list. That's fine. And I certainly don't mind if we want to take longer to figure it out. I just think we need to draw a line in the sand at some point. Okay cool. (inaudible) anything else, but the time we finish Johannesburg we'll have given the list a chance to comment and reach consensus, then we'll move forward. Thank you very much.

So, if I could get back to the slide deck please? Great, thank you very much. So an email went out to the list about having another face to face meeting scheduled like way far in advance.

Oh okay, so before I go forward I'll make sure I don't leave anyone behind. So I see a couple of hands raised. So I'll come back to that. Emily, go ahead please.

EMILY TAYLOR: A very quick admin point, should we just capture the action item to reflect what we've just decided to do, i.e., we're proposing to drop the 6:00 AM time slot. We want to hear objection if, and try to get it sorted before the end of the Johannesburg meeting. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt your flow.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, excellent point, thank you very much, Emily.   Definitely want to capture that. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Hey, Eric, after you are done giving the intro for me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. So we had this proposal to, while we're way ahead of this, down the road, put some time on the calendar and make sure everyone's available for face to face writing. So the hope that we would be at the stage to do, you know, some writing and some editing of a draft report at the very beginning of 2018 in January. And now seemed like a good time to start getting people lined up. Staff sent out a Doodle poll to the list, thank you very much for helping us all with that, and wanted to encourage everybody to please participate with that Doodle poll.

So far, last time I looked which was I think yesterday, it looked like those that had participated did not seem to have any problems with the dates, but certainly if we start to run into problems, the sooner we find it the better. We're, I believe, closing that Doodle poll down on Friday so please participate. Okay, so go ahead, James.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Eric. So, I can make both sets of those dates, however, I have a query. How come we're doing Monday through Wednesday rather than

EN

over a weekend? Just for those of us who have to take paid time off of work? Over a weekend will be extremely preferable.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Interesting point. I don't think we discussed that specifically.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise, if I may just, I'm sorry, again, I'm not in Adobe. I think part of that issue is that our face to face meetings require a not insignificant amount of staff support, technical and otherwise. So I think it's very preferable to not have staff work on weekends if we can help it. If there's a strong sentiment on the team that we need to have a weekend instead of a workday, we can certainly explore that. Part of the reason for raising this issue now is to try and get a critical mass around a couple dates so we can start to make arrangements. And the members should also speak up if they're finding workdays more challenging and they need weekend slots. Thanks.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, thank you very much, Denise. But I think that there's an interesting perspective here. So, I note the Doodle poll didn't have an option for the lukewarm response you sometimes get in Doodle polls, where you can say yes, no, or prefer not, or something like that, or available if need be. But certainly if we had that sort of tertiary option in the list, and Doodle poll, we probably could pick a weekend and throw it in there, and see if people were lukewarm on a weekend but possible and we got better overlap that way or whatnot.

EN

So maybe the Chairs can take an action to go and cycle on that and see if we can pull something together, because I think it's a fair thing to put in front of the group and see what we can do. Certainly some of us are meeting this coming weekend, so point taken. James, I assume your had is still just up vestigially, so I'll jump to Kaveh, unless there was something else you wanted to add to that?

JAMES GANNON: Yeah, I actually just have a really quick follow up. Yeah, so if I can turn that into a formal request then, because you know, I've given up enough time to ICANN for free without costing a couple of thousand dollars worth of paid time off. So if there is the option to meet over the weekend I'd look at that as (inaudible - 00:43:33) I would formally request that, please.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, roger that, understood. So I think the Chairs and support staff, we should just have a conversation to try and enable that update to the Doodle poll quickly. Otherwise we'll have to launch it again. But yeah, point taken. Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I want to point out that, at least in my personal opinion, this group has spent a lot of time on just logistics, including this call, which I would say at least 30 minutes of the past 45 minutes we were speaking about just timing. And I didn't (inaudible) and people have to commit. If people commit (inaudible) and it's just our professional responsibility to

show up on the calls. And if we have issues we have to bring it back (inaudible) this is just taking a lot of time for all of us. We're not doing actual work. So I just wanted to point this out for the record.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, that's a very good point, Kaveh. And to that end I think that's why I'm starting to put some deadlines and lines in the sand. Because you're absolutely right, we've done a lot of administrivia so far and we really have a lot of work to do. And so I think one of the reasons that the Co-Chairs and support staff have put together the Doodle poll and put a meeting way far out is so that we basically are now in the process of trying to be deadline driven because I think we have not necessarily made as much progress as we potentially could have and I think we're trying to rectify it. So I think your point is very well taken, I think that's a lot of the rationale for some of the deadlines we've thrown out on the call. So hopefully that jives with what your feelings are.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Eric. Just one thing, Eric, just a quick reply. Thank you for acknowledging. I think it's also important that under the Chairs, the Co-Chairs also have power, so if you see that people do not participate, I think we can write to their (inaudible - 00:45:41) opportunities that they have selected. Because we need the work to be done and yes, I expect, especially the Co-Chairs, to show sounder results, basically, and yes I'm (inaudible).

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, those are all good comments, Kaveh, and honestly, I mean, the identification of the sub teams and the fact that they're roughly half of our entire agenda at the Johannesburg meeting. It's there because we are ready to make the forward progress we need to make and a lot of the set up of getting to the point of identifying the sub teams, what the topics would be, who's going to be on, I mean, a lot of that's been necessary administrivia up front.

Nevertheless, your point is taken that we do need to make palpable progress. And I think that's what the Co-Chairs and the ICANN staff have been working really hard to enshrine in a lot of the deadlines in the schedule. So hopefully that puts you and others at ease about that but certainly, the proof will be in the pudding when we actually start doing it. So yeah, I think stay tuned in the next week and I think you'll see a marked change. Emily, go ahead.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thanks for raising the issue, Kaveh, and without wanting to get into the irony of then further taking time to discuss it, I think you raise an important point, which is the level of participation. I note that we do have I think 12 team members on this. There's been active participation by many, both in the chat room and verbally. We also, as far as the Chairs taking the sort of action that I think you have in mind, Kaveh, we also have to balance that with the fact that we are working as a volunteer group.

Both the Co-Chairs are volunteers and of course all of the team members are as well. And as part of that we do understand that

EN

people, you know, James is just saying on the mic in terms of balancing his professional responsibilities with those of the team. We all have to make those accommodations too. So your point is well taken, it is noted, and looking forward to getting some substantive work done in Johannesburg. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, Emily. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. Just very briefly now, me and Kaveh, we're usually on the same page 99% of the time, but I want to echo what Emily's just said. Our professional responsibilities to our day jobs. You know, 90% of the team are here purely as volunteers and we are taking time out of our professional responsibilities. You know, we are all willing to put in the work but the flexibility needs to be there with regards to, particularly long term scheduling, you know. I'm very happy that we're looking at these things as far out. But I do want the recognition that our professional responsibility isn't necessarily to this volunteer activity. You know, certainly in my case there is no professional relationship with this review team and that's a very important distinction.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's a very good point, very good point. Okay, I'm going to move forward because we are within ten. We're also almost at the end of the deck so I think that's fine. But now we have the most fun part of the thing, the Action Items Review. So which of these things do we really

need to talk about? So we posted a number of questions to various organizations.   For example, the ICANN DNS Engineering team responded back with a recursive framing exercise for questions and scope. And my understanding is that we're still in the iteration process with the ICANN DNS Engineering team about what form of question they'll accept from us.   I leave it to the group to decide how we feel about that response to questions we've issued.

Then let's see. So we had the SSR1 sub topic discussion on this call already, so I think we probably want to reiterate on that. I think we understand what people's thoughts are.

Then skipping around, let's see, review team work plan with key dates to circulate. That I'm going to jump past.

So actually, as we wind down here I'm not sure that I have a whole lot that I want to cover on these in the last moments of the call. I'm not sure it'll be effective to jump into a whole lot of them.

Do either of the other Co-Chairs have -- am I doing disservice to any of these open action items that we ought to review? I apologize for the phoning it in here but I don't think there was a lot for us to cover here. I think the biggest one that I would want to point out is the one I just mentioned, the DNS Engineering team. Unless somebody wants to have a brief discussion about how we ought to respond to their lack of response? I note we have about five minutes left so there may not be a lot of time to jump on that.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Eric, this is Denise on the phone. I'd appreciate, I guess, some more information as to why they feel they can't answer the question or is it that they -- yeah, I'm just confused at their response. I would expect if they aren't able to answer the question that they come back and ask us for more detailed questions or more context. Is it that they ultimately did not apply an ISO standard to their work but apply to a variety of other standards? Is there anyone on the call that can shed some light on that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I see Steve's hand is raised, and Steve, just give me one second real quick to just riff off of what Denise said. I think we want to be really careful about inviting or accepting situations in which we as the review team have asked for something that we think was important for us to do our job and we are dismissed out of hand.

Not because we're necessarily in a position to demand things, but at the same time, we certainly need to highlight if we're to do a review team's job and we're not given material to review that there's a fundamental problem there. So yeah, our understanding I think is critical for this and any other adjacent issues in which we've asked for items and they've kind of gotten the hang fire on them. So Steve, yeah, if you have any comments or anything, that would be really helpful, thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Yeah, thank you, Eric. Let me refocus the (inaudible) going on. The latency was on my part last week, I was away at a team retreat and wasn't able to follow the email and some of the conversations as much

EN

as I would like to. With that said, I did put in the chat, and I just reiterate since I recognize that Denise is not on the chat either, that they have come back with a proposed reframing of Geoff's question. I will send that to the team today. And my understanding is, also to address Denise's question, is that the question wasn't around any kind of ISO or anything like that.

For whatever reasons, they felt the original question was out of scope and they were asking for a reframing. Emily had asked that they propose a reframe and that was where that was. It had mostly about trying to fit within ICANN's role and remit and not about lack of, or (inaudible) talk about any kind of ISO or any other type of certification, it was not a certification question, it was a question about L-root deployment and methodologies and stuff like that. So again, the latency was on my part because due to a team retreat, and the proposed reframe will be posted soon after this call. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you very much, Steve. Emily, go ahead.

EMILY TAYLOR: -- say that the response of asking the Engineering team to rephrase the question in a way that they found palatable, that doesn't have to stand, that was my off the cuff response to a rather surprising response to our question, if that's not too circular to say. So I'm very happy, you know, we're now in a slightly more (inaudible) group, if we want to revisit how we react to that, as a practical issue perhaps we can await the notice to

the group that we could just reflect on it as a team and its implications, and I would be extremely open to that. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you, Emily. So yeah, I threw my hand in the queue as well. And with my Chair hat off, very squarely with my Chair hat off, I think Emily's response was great. I think instead of saying, hey, you know, give us a question that you're willing to answer with the answer, was a really good first step. But I have to be quite honest, depending on how the question is reframed, we may not be done with this, because I think the question was incredibly fairly put. I mean, certainly one of our sub topic areas is DNS Security, and as Mr. Matogoro's pointed out, part of that's DNS Sec.

But to be quite frank, DNS Security is broader than just DNS Sec as well. It has to do with operational hygiene, it has to do with deployment, it has to do with traffic characteristics, capacity, responses to attacks, etcetera. And I think it absolutely is within our remit to consider the SSR effects of operational acumen interaction. And so if the question is reframed into one that is exceptionally narrow, for example, then I think we may actually have an issue where as a review team, you know, everyone on this call knows very well, we've spent a lot of time discussing what our purview and our remit is.

And I don't know that it's as easy for an external group to impute that to us. We've spent a huge amount of consternation trying to figure it out ourselves. So I think what Emily did was a really good thing. She said, then you tell us what you think, and if they come back with a

question that is very well scoped and that meets our needs, that's great. Then that was a really good approach.

On the other hand, if they come back and they say, go away because we want to talk, this may not be the only time that happens and I think it might be important for us as a review team to ensure that we have the support from our affiliates that we need in order to conduct our review. So I'm just framing that for everyone on the call because I suspect this will unfold in the next day or next weeks.

Okay, I don't see any other hands up. And we are at the end of this call and Any Other Business. So unless any other calls, questions, anything? Alright, then I return to everybody negative time, apologies for running a little bit over but thank you everyone for sticking with us. And I guess we'll see a lot and talk to even more of you in Johannesburg.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you, Eric. Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]