| | |
|---|---|
| RECORDED VOICE: | This meeting is now being recorded. |
| DENISE MICHEL: | This meeting is being recorded. We have a proposed agenda for today, of the following: After apologies and updated statements of interest, we have a recap and review of action items from the Johannesburg meeting, updates from our sub-topic teams. We have an SSR1 implementation briefing on the agenda, relating to the compliance recommendation from SSR1. And finally, James, if he's able to join us, will be taking us through a brief Trello demonstration. This is the shared workspace effort that he volunteered to spearhead for us. And then all other business. |

Are there any suggested additions or changes to the agenda? And before I take any input, I'd like to remind people to mute their speakers if they're not speaking. Any changes to the agenda?

Since we have the staff already on the line, from the compliance department to address that recommendation, I'd like to suggest that we take that item first and let the staff address that topic, respond to any questions, and then staff can drop off, and we can address the rest of our agenda.

But first, let's do a call for any update to statements of interest and any additional apologies or absences, beyond what staff's already noted. Anyone? Okay. Seeing none, then we're going to go to the SSR1

implementation briefing by compliance staff.  If Jennifer or Yvette could jump forward to that slide.  And Maguy, I'll turn the floor over to you.

MAGUY SERAD:  Good afternoon, everyone.  Thank you, Denise.  This is Maguy Serad from ICANN contractual compliance.  I have joined this call to provide you a brief update on the SSR1 recommendation 10, as it relates to contractual compliance.  As the subtopic review team already knows, and is aware of, all recommendations have been fully implemented.  So what I'd like to do is take just a few minutes to share with you a summary of the implementation.  And if it's okay, Denise, maybe open it up for any further questions you guys might have for me, or thoughts and ideas.

DENISE MICHEL:  Sure.

MAGUY SERAD:  Thank you.  I'm now on slide three.  This slide really summarizes the other slides that follow.  I just found it hard to believe when I was pulling up the summary in preparation for today.  Wow, in 2012, it seems like just yesterday when this whole effort began.  But the final report was issued in June of 2012 where recommendation 10 clearly suggested that ICANN as an organization should continue its effort to step up compliance enforcement and provide adequate resources.

I don't know how many of the participants on the call remember the status of contractual compliance in 2012.  I joined in April of 2011.  I was

tasked with pulling forward this effort, and I really had an amazing journey doing so. After completing a full assessment of the status, state of the compliance department, I had put forward a three year strategic plan. I had socialized the plan across the entire community of stakeholders to make sure I am capturing their thoughts and inputs, of course within the scope of the contractual compliance department. And we began our journey to implement it. And soon after this the recommendation came which was totally in support and totally aligned with the efforts we were working on.

So since then, in the second sentence here of the recommendation—I mean, you guys can—I'm not sure how many of you were on the SSR1 team—but the second sentence truly hits hard to the core of the effort we've completed -- is: implement a structured process, monitoring activities and enforcement. So back in the early days, we had several fragmented systems, as you guys were made aware of that, thus the recommendation.

So we have really centralized all these fragmented tools. We have established a structured approach. And why do we do that? I mean the core of all these activities, it's true, to enforce the contract, but compliance manages, on average, 4,000 to 6,000 complaints a month. So it's really important to have the right experience when we're going through that. Whether somebody's coming from the external world or internally bringing forward compliance issues.

So by having one compliance approach and process, a consolidated system that's been migrated to ICANN.org, where people can have access to it from the main landing page. We've also built in a lot of

Learn More. Learn More, think of those, and Frequently Asked Questions on common topics, at a minimum, we provide this in six languages.

In some of the areas we've even gone to eight languages. We've also at the closure of any complaint, every complaint received, we've implemented a post survey. We have been in the past reporting on the post survey only at the ICANN meetings. But today, we are working towards finalizing the post survey and bringing it forward in a more structured format and reporting to add to the data that we currently report on.

A big effort we focused on is improving and increased community outreach. When we say community, it's everybody in the community, not just registrants or constituencies, or ICANN meetings, it's contracted parties. It's any topic that we see that is relevant to increasing awareness and knowledge and compliance, we try to do that. We did that through different ways, whether it's the visual, the infographic, again and the learn more. We have defined and implemented a very robust compliance metrics and reporting system.

On a monthly basis we publish what we call Operating Metrics and SLAs that we report on to the community. We also have currently, a rolling 13-month metrics that we have built these reports on. What we've learned and keep hearing from the community recently is that the metrics now they want us to take it to the next level of granularity. For those of you who are familiar with the CCT review team, and if you read the report, there is now a need to take the level of data to the next level of granularity. And the team is working on that.

**EN**

A critical element to compliance is a strong defined audit program, which we completed and launched our first round toward the end of 2012. The other program has become a structured approach and almost a predictable function for compliance where we try to conduct at least two audits a year for registrars and two for registries. Of course the scope may run into the next year, it depends on the complexity and scope of the audit.

A big area that was in high demand at the time in 2012 is the bulk complaint submission, which consists of allowing the ability to find multiple Whois Inaccuracy complaints within one submission, because the complete system today only accepts one complaint at a time. And the need for that was to focus effort on Whois Inaccuracy. So that system was put in place and is still in place and available.

An effort that we tried to launch is how can we sustain that once a Whois inaccuracy is identified and corrected, how can we come back and check that it's still valid? We built what we call a Whois inaccuracy quality review which allowed us the ability to come back after the fact and sample some of those Whois Inaccuracy complaints to see if they've changed patterns. If they're no longer suspended, or if something's changed. We go back to the registrar and say show us what happened, and why is this now not suspended? It depends on the case we're trying to review.

As far as a structured approach to enforcement and proactive monitoring, it ties to the first bullet that we have on the top of the slide. Having a structured approach to contractual compliance not only brings predictability and a common understanding within the ICANN

community, but also allows us the ability to report consistently and provide updates to the community on that. The proactive monitoring aspect of that is also an area where we focus a lot of time on. And it varies from system real time proactive monitoring to what we call just human proactive monitoring based on blogs or articles or abuse reports or different things that is available through social media.

The main state we are in now, I want to share with the team is that we are now focused on what we call continuous improvement. Because the foundation has been established, so now it's: What do we hear from the community? What are the opportunities to improve in the process? In the reporting? In the communication? In the activities? And that's what we work on as we go.

The bullet I don't have in here that I also want to bring to your attention is we are very actively involved in the policy efforts and working group. The policy team works very closely with us on the initiation of ideas, and they come to us soliciting for data and input, and we do a full circle with them. After a policy has been implemented they come back to measure that policy based on the issues they were trying to address. And we work similarly with the working groups.

The next few slides, I just provide you with links to the different areas. So when we talk about the Learn Mores, if you link to this place here, complaints, it will give you the landing page—I'm afraid to link from Adobe, I don't know if that's going to mess up the Adobe room or not— but from that page you will see the Learn More. And again, we try to provide as much information in English, and in multiple languages, not contract languages, but in simplified English language while tying it to

the contract in an effort to enhance the awareness and increase the knowledge of the team or whoever's coming to this website.

The bulk Whois inaccuracy, again, this slide here also provides a link to share with you where is it. It is, as I mentioned earlier, it's granted by request only. Because it is a much more focused effort where we require authentication, specific testing, and what we call a QA -- a test environment before access is given for to submit to the production platform. Because we want to ensure the data is coming through properly and interface is working, and the user has been authenticated and is working within the realm of the scope of the compliance contract.

The Whois quality review, I spoke to it earlier also. It's an effort where we sample, and we report to it in our monthly updates if activities are taking place. And we talk to it much more intensely at ICANN meetings when we have facetime with the community.

The audit program, again. This is a page that contains a lot of information. For example, on this page, we keep augmenting the information we put in there based on information we receive, or questions we receive from the community, and being part of the BC community stakeholders.

For example, when the BC asked specific questions about the audit methodology and timeline, I went immediately and updated the page with my team to make sure that, by providing you the answer, also we have been transparent in providing it to the entire community. So any question that comes our way or idea, we try to step back and see what

is the benefit of that to the community?  Because if one stakeholder has a question about it, I'm sure many others might have some questions or thoughts about it.  So we try to be proactive in taking and hearing what's being asked of us, and try to do it.

Metrics and outreach can be found here.  We have a special page where we publish all the enforcement notices, and we keep it up to date.  But we also have the metrics supporting.  As I said in the beginning, the metrics and reporting we have this semester, we are very focused on how do we bring the granularity to the data.  And we will be providing updates in our quarterly newsletter about the changes that are coming.  And so hopefully that's going to fit the need of the community based on the different requests and the working groups.  This here speaks to the compliance process, the enforcement update, and some of the proactive monitoring examples that exist today for compliance.

I've also added this last slide because I'm sure somebody mi6ght have some idea or thought.  If you want to reach out to compliance or you have some questions or follow ups or ideas, please email it to compliance@icann.org with the subject "briefing session", and that email will be forwarded to me, so we can follow up with you if it's a question or an idea.  With this, Denise, I'd like to turn it back to you if there are specific questions on recommendation 10, I'm free to address.

DENISE MICHEL:          Thank you, Maguy.  We'll take a queue.  I'll start off the questions.  The security review team attended the DNS symposium in Madrid in March, I believe it was.  April.  And one of the presentations was on service

level agreements.  And in particular, they noted that 32 out of the 37 RSPs had failures.  Could you speak to compliance's role in auditing and ensuring compliance with that aspect of the registry contracts?

MAGUY SERAD:       Sure.  So if I may restate the question?  The question here is relating to the RSP failures that were reported in the presentation at the DNS symposium in Madrid.  I went back to slide nine.  The last bullet on slide nine speaks to real-time automated monitoring system.  This is a system that has been put in place by technical services at ICANN.  And, sorry Denise, I don't know the technology behind this, but I can speak to the handshake.  This goes beyond my technical skills in this aspect.

But part of the real time automated monitoring system is a system that monitors the DNS infrastructure.  And when there is a noted SLA failure, based on the SLA requirement and that specification, it may or may not -- it depends if it's reached the threshold—it will trigger a interface or a notification to the compliance ticketing system.  And based on that notification, we have compliance efforts that kind of start.

The first focus is to let them know, hey, we are aware of this.  But the first and most important focus is to allow the RSPs or the registries to get the issue addressed.  That's the first focus, is making sure that everything is back on track and operating.  Then we follow up with technical services because they are in contact with the RSP and the registry operator.  We obtain the additional data, whatever the reason is or the reports.

And we work directly with the registry operator to ask them, for example, a question might be: We acknowledge that based on the SLA or this outage, is back to normal.  What was the issue?  What have you done to correct it?  And it could be, based on the issue, what have you done to ensure it does not repeat itself?  So it's on a case by case but we do have that touchpoint.  The first focus in that is really with the technical services and getting everything on track.  And then we jump in and work with them and diffuse it.  Does that answer your question?

DENISE MICHEL:          I think you certainly, in part.  It's good to know about the process.  I think 32 out of 37 failures was certainly much, much higher than I expected, and the GDD staff in the room also indicated that that was not a figure that they were anticipating either.  Can you speak to whether there's been subsequently a change in that failure level?  Or have you identified some systemic problem that's at the root of these failures? Or provide any additional insight into this issue?  And feel free to provide us with [CROSSTALK].

MAGUY SERAD:          Yeah, I don't have the information memorized.

DENISE MICHEL:          Sure.

MAGUY SERAD:          But I can tell you we have not breached for this failure.  So that's usually an indication that it's got resolved or addressed.  But, if I may, if it's all right with you, can I take that question and get back to you for more specificity on what type of failure it was, or was that provided to you at the session?  I was not there in person --

DENISE MICHEL:        No.

MAGUY SERAD:          -- so I do not recall that presentation.  I was not made aware of that presentation.

DENISE MICHEL:        It was a very jam-packed agenda.

MAGUY SERAD:          Okay.

DENISE MICHEL:        So that you know, there wasn't a great deal of time for discussion.  But, and please, I should have started with this: Please feel free to follow up on email with any answers to any questions that people raise, or any additional information that you want to provide the team.  So, please don't feel like we're putting you on the spot.

**EN**

MAGUY SERAD:        Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:      Throwing questions over the wall.

MAGUY SERAD:        Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:      So feel free to follow up later as well.  And it would be good to get some more additional information about the subsequent performance on the RSPs and the nature of the almost whole failures that were reported. Yeah, I think that would be useful for the team.

MAGUY SERAD:        Do you have reference of the time frame, or who presented this data, or is that something you can share with me so I can take that and review where it's referring to?

DENISE MICHEL:      It's on the ICANN website under the DNS symposium webpage.  All of the presentations and presenters are posted there.

MAGUY SERAD:        Okay.  Thank you.  I will follow up on that one, Denise.  But if I may address the RSP providers briefly: One of the audit efforts we did last year is what I call a low-hanging fruit.  We know the environment has

become more dependent on RSP providers.  So we obtained a list of the RSP providers in our environment and we launched two rounds of audits where we selected TLDs that were being serviced by the RSPs on the list.  And our goal there is if we can ensure by testing through the different test cases and audit review, if they are in compliance, by default we are much more confident that that RSP has applied and is working though what we call the contractual obligations to provide those services.

So we did complete all RSP reviews via the different TLDs.  And they were done very well and completed successfully.  But I will follow up.  I will look up on the icann.org the presentation and confirm and answer your questions regarding why 32 out of 37, and what's happened since.

DENISE MICHEL:              Great, thank you.  Do other members have questions for Maguy?  Or requests for additional information relating to recommendation 10?  I have an additional question.  And you mentioned the updated bulk reporting.  Do you have stats available on the abuse of that since it was established?

MAGUY SERAD:               I'm sorry, you cut off, Denise.  Do I have stats on what?

DENISE MICHEL:              The use of bulk submissions.  You mentioned the new bulk list inaccuracy submissions.  Do you have statistics available on the use of that?

MAGUY SERAD:          And when you say the use of that, you mean like how many users have access?

DENISE MICHEL:        Has anyone used it?

MAGUY SERAD:          Yes.

DENISE MICHEL:        Basic usage statistics.

MAGUY SERAD:          Yes, we have that.  I can answer you here and I'll also look.  We've provided some information on that in the past.  I can also send that information to you via email if you'd like.  But to answer you on the phone here, we have about eight or ten users.  And the submission varies. It's up to them.

But on the monthly dashboard that we publish, if that has been used by the Whois bulk submitters, we provide that data in the dashboard.  So I was looking at our reports for this month, we're getting ready to publish it.  I think we already had some bulk submissions come through.  We do publish the use, and the number of tickets we receive via that.

DENISE MICHEL:      Great.  Great.  So, when you have a chance, if you could just send the number since it was—I think it was created in 2013.  That would be great.  And then we have some questions posted in the chat.  Mr. Matogoro asked: To what extent ccTLDs are bound with contractual compliance, and is there any specific KPI relating to that?

MAGUY SERAD:       And Anna answered it properly.  Sorry Mr. Matogoro.  The ICANN contractual compliance scope is only focused on the gTLDs.  ccTLDs are not in scope for us.

DENISE MICHEL:      And then, Maguy, to the extent that some have memorandums of understanding.  Are those types of agreements with ICANN, is there any monitoring or assessment of compliance both by the ccTLD and by ICANN to those agreements?

MAGUY SERAD:       So I think your question, Denise, is larger than compliance.  I can only speak to contractual compliance, and we do not have anything in there. But ICANN as an organization, I think maybe Yvette or Negar can follow up and turn it in to provide you, to follow up with the ICANN organization if we have any other scope in there.

DENISE MICHEL:      Okay.  Thanks.  And then of course Mr. Matogoro should feel free to email additional questions or need for information on that as well.  Are

there any other questions by members?   If not, I have one final question, and thank you for providing these slides as well.   We'll be going over them in greater detail in our sub-topic groups, and I think we may have some additional follow up questions.   Recently there was, I think an article in the press, regarding the, again, failure levels in audits conducted by compliance.   I'm sure this isn't' the first question you've received from that.   Would you like to address that issue?

MAGUY SERAD:          Yes.  Thank you.  Thank you.  I think, Denise, I have that on my mind as your first question to me.   So, you are referring to the article by Kevin Mercy?   And this is in relation to the registrar audit round that just concluded I think last month.

And I encourage the SSR Team to please review the audit report that's already published.   What Kevin did, he focused on one area only.   The audit methodology has several milestones.   The first milestone, I'm not talking about the phases, I'm talking the milestones, is when we do our initial review, when compliance reviews the responses, the documentation provided and everything else, we pull together what we think is initial findings.   Initial findings could be as simple as an abuse contact or is not published or visible when we were testing their website posting obligations.

Another initial finding could be while reviewing a registration agreement we noticed there's one provision missing in the agreement.   So we note those as initial findings.   What we have learned is once an initial finding report, it's like a preliminary report giving to the

contracted party they get back to us and they either tell us, "Well yeah, it's published at this link, at this link, or something," or it could be, "Yes, this is definitely a deficiency and we will work on it." Or it could be something more serious; for example for renewals, they're not sending renewal notices to the base on the policy and they may have to launch or update their system to put it to the frequency base on the policy.

So an initial finding while it is a non-compliance, it is not truly yet in the breach aspect because the audit is done to avoid future issues. So we proactively identify those issues and give them the opportunity, the contracted party the opportunity to correct them or to clarify if we missed something, where it is or misunderstood something. So really the end result should be in the final statistics, the final report. It is not abnormal to have 100% initial findings.

The environment also is changing so much. We've noticed some of our initial findings are due to maybe the consolidations of different contracted party. It causes some opportunities for improvement. The failure level as reported in Kevin's article, there is a lot of dissatisfaction, it depends what side you're coming at it. It was done very factually and if you continue reading the report, many of those initial findings were corrected before even the closure of the audit phase.

We do end up though sometimes where some of the findings are noncompliant and will require a remediation plan that may be a week or sometimes three months term. So compliance requests usually, if there is remediation, will request a full remediation plan with clear milestones of deliverables and we put that on hold and we follow the remediation

plan.  When a contracted party completes the remediation of these issues we retest them to make sure that it has been addressed.

We have breached and terminated some registrars, but most of terminations and breaches happen at the beginning for the lack of collaboration or completion to provide the information requested.  So I hope that adds clarity but please review the audit report and let me know if you any more questions on that specific area.

DENISE MICHEL:          Great, thank you, Maguy.  If you could send a link to that report, that would be helpful, we'd appreciate that.

MAGUY SERAD:          Sure, absolutely.

DENISE MICHEL:          Are there additional questions by other members?  I want to make sure I'm not missing any hands.  I think a couple of other areas that would useful for particularly our sub-topic group to have more information on, Maguy, would be your enforcement of the obligations of registries to provide daily data for the central zones file, CZ -- I forget the acronym there.  That's an important source especially for security researchers. Having used it myself, I know there have been several registries that have not met their obligations to deposit data there.  So I'd be interested in the compliance department's actions on that.

There's been a fair amount of discussion on some of the venues we've been involved in, in a few new gTLD registries in particular that have a very high percentage of abusive domain registrations, so we'd also like information on what actions compliance or plans to take when it comes to these more holistic problems we're in seeing in just a few new gTLD registries.  I'll follow up on email since unfortunately we're out of time on our call.  We really appreciate you taking the time to talk to us today.

MAGUY SERAD:            Thank you for the opportunity.  And I'm going to hang up, but I look forward to your email, Denise.  In the meantime, I can address the first two things you asked of me, but I look forward to your email with the additional questions so we can respond properly.

DENISE MICHEL:          Great, thanks again, Maguy.

MAGUY SERAD:            Bye bye.  Thank you, everybody.

DENISE MICHEL:          Okay, thanks.  Bye bye.  Okay.  Jumping back to our agenda then.  Johannesburg meeting recap and review of action items.  Staff, was there a slide on this?  Would one of the staff like to take us through?

The action items I think recently closed and those that are expecting a close in the next couple of weeks, and noting any other action items for

JENNIFER BRYCE:
Hi, it's Jennifer. I can definitely talk you through those. On this slide at the moment are the open action items. And apologies, my computer is having a bit of a freak-out, so I can see everything right now but just to give you a heads up. The first action item is from Boban actually and he doesn't look like he's made the call, I know he was running a little late. He circulated a reorganization of the work items for the ICANN SSR Sub-group to the list and he's requesting if everybody could take a look at that and please share their inputs by the end of this week, that would be great. And them perhaps he'll like to revisit that on your next week call.

The next item is post meeting blog on ICANN.org; so we've been working with Alain to draft a blog for that as we do with all the SSR meetings. Again, that's 19th of July that it should be published.

The next couple of items are questions that came out of the session on the Board's response to Terms of Reference; so we're working to get responses to those for the end of this week.

The support requirements and availability for SSR2 Sub-Group; so you'll have seen an email that I sent on earlier today regarding this. So each sub-group now has an Adobe Connect Room as well as an email list. So please go ahead and start using those, and just to let you know as well, we've put some times there that we can support sub-group calls. I think the best way to do that is if you guys get together within your groups

and then the rapporteur can let us know which times he'd like to have a call and we can help you set that up. I know you may want to discuss that a little but more, so 11th of July was really the action item for me to get that information to you all.

The 0600 Plenary call slot attendance; I know that the co-chairs have that on their agenda to discuss, that needs a little more thought put into it. I'm sure you will get an update soon on that one. I don't know, Denise, please jump in at any point if you want to interrupt me.

DENISE MICHEL: You're doing great, thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, the Tracking Tool; so the next item was Charla and Larisa presented this to the Review Team on Monday in Johannesburg. So the link there just replaces the action items page that used to record all the plenary action items. It still does that; it just gets a little bit more information on kind of like a back story to how we reach the conclusion of the action items. The link is there again and please take a look and let us know if you have any inputs or edits to anything that's on there. The idea is to not only capture action items, but also any requests that may not necessarily come out of the plenary calls.

The next item is another sub-topic work item that was requested by the Future Challenges Group; so there is a Google document that's going around and I'll post the link in the chat as well after this. The request

was to share your concerns with Future Challenges and I think that will help the sub-team to build out their scope of work.

Follow-up Questions from the SSR1 Briefings; so I think we can close that action item, the 7th of July has past.  Thank you all for sharing your questions, this came out of the SSR1 Briefings that were presented in Johannesburg.  We have a cohesive list of questions which we'll consider and get back to you once we have the appropriate people.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey Jennifer, if I may just interject.  I know that I needed more time and I have a couple of additional questions, and I think there's at least one other team member that did as well.  I would suggest we refer to this as sort of our first round of questions.  Not comprehensive and of course any SSR Team member can raise any questions about the material within our scope at anytime, but just to flag that I think as we delve into this deeper, we will have more questions on the material covered in the briefing.  Just to set expectations there, thanks.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure and thanks for the clarifications.  I mean, it's still a Google document, so it can be a living document.  We can get started on the responses to the first questions that are on there.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE:     Sure.  So the next item, Complete SSR1 Implementation Briefings.  There are a few outstanding briefings, so the Risk Management Briefing is scheduled for not next week but the week after that, which I believe is the 25th of July, and then the GDD Briefing will be scheduled for the 1st of August.    Then the briefings will be complete in terms of presentations.

Moving on to the next slide.  Again, this is probably similar to the piece we just talked about in terms of questions.  This was something that came up on the first day of the meeting in Johannesburg, the team began to build a list of questions to be sent to the CIO of ICANN, Ashwin, in preparation for holding a briefing with the Review Team, so again there's a Google document on the Wiki that's been circulated via email as well.  Please feel free to add any more questions there and then maybe we'll work with the co-chairs to kind of suggest a couple of times slots when the Review Team would like to have a briefing.

The SSR Review Team Work Plan with key dates; so this is our work plan for the entire review team, not the sub-topic ones and we've got Denise, James and Boban who all volunteered to help with that.  Denise, feel free to jump in, but I suspect that this might be something that takes some time in the coming weeks.  The sub-topic groups, we kind of go through the de-duplication and prioritization of tasks.

The next item, the SSR -- sorry, did you have something to add?


DENISE MICHEL:     Nope, go right ahead.

**EN**

JENNIFER BRUCE:	Okay.  The SSR1 Implementation; this was an item that we discussed, I think, in Madrid about reaching out to the SSR1 Review Team.  That's an action item for Denise.  Again, I think that one might come a little bit further down the line.

Review Non-Disclosure Form with ICANN legal and report back to the review team on any updates or edits; so I know that James and Emily and Kerry-Ann have been working with ICANN Legal as well as some of the MSSI Support Teams.  We have that scheduled for an update on the next plenary call, the 18th of July, paired the discussion that we had in Johannesburg.

Draft a Statement of Work for a Specialist Technical Writer; that's in development and I'm sure that James and Kathy and Denise will share a draft with the Review Team shortly, leave that blank for the due date currently is at the 25th of July.

And the next one is the Trello research collaborative tools that the review team may use that can be publicly archived; again, we scheduled that one for this call, but I don't see James on here, so it seems like he's delayed, so we'll have to reconsider when you want to have the Trello demonstration.  Does anyone have any questions that I can answer?

DENISE MICHEL:	Alain? Go ahead, Alain.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     Yes, this action item on the SSR1 [inaudible] Denise played, is it still valid?  Because now we have a sub-team, we have a group, we have a rapporteur, so this action item, is it still a valid one or we should close it?

DENISE MICHEL:     Alain, are you referring to draft note and summary of SSR1 Implementation?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     Because now with the sub-teams on SSR1 are taking the task to work on SSR1 recommendations, so that's why I'm trying to figure out what is this really about?

DENISE MICHEL:     I see, yes.  So the normal practice of review teams, second round review teams is to contact the first review team, the report of which we're assessing and invite the former SSR1 review team members to share any input they may have, testaments or observations they may have of the implementation of their review.

That was just a co-chair to do item, to get a brief note out to the former SSR1 review team members, letting them know that the SSR2 was underway, we're assessing the implementation of the SSR1 report and inviting them to share any input they may have.  Initially, we were going to wait until all the briefings were done, since they're running on quite awhile, I think we may just get it out this month.

That's what that is, more of a housekeeping item but an important one to make sure that if SSR1 team members have any input they'd like to share, that they're aware of our activities and have an opportunity to send in an email or talk to the sub-topic team if they want to have a dialog.

ALAIN PARTICK AINA:    Okay, fine.

DENISE MICHEL:    Does that make sense?  Okay.  Jennifer, are we at the end of the action item list?

JENNIFER BRYCE:    Yes, unless anyone else has any questions, that's all the updates for that.

DENISE MICHEL:    Great, are there any questions, any additional questions on this?  I don't see any hands.  I would note just for your own information, there are two briefings that we've noted for future agendas.   One is -- and I believe someone recently shared it on the list; one briefing will be on the proposed security framework for new gTLD registries.  That framework is currently posted for public comment so we have it on our list of future briefings to have a briefing on that and discussion by the review team.  The second outstanding briefing is on the DNS abuse study.  The work has been completed and the researchers are due to complete their final

analysis this month.  When their work is wrapped up, we'll be putting that on the review team's agenda for a briefing as well.

If there are no further questions or discussions regarding the action item list, we'll move on to our next, which might be our final agenda item and that is an opportunity by the sub-topic rapporteurs to provide any updates or other information to the team regarding the sub-topic work. Alain, you seem to be first on the list, is there any information on SSR1 implementation sub-topic that you'd like to share with the group?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     No, but I assume everybody saw the email I sent, I think it was yesterday or this morning.  So trying to get the team to complete the work plan, the methodology so I'm preparing to send it to the team, then we'll have a call to finalize the work items and the methodologies, because I think we need to agree on how we are going to approach the review of the implementations.  I think from that call we should be able now to really start on the work of the SSR1 implementation, so this is what I can say for now.

DENISE MICHEL:     Great, thank you for that update, Alain.  Do we have Boban on the call? I think he was delayed, I don't see him on the call.

JENNIFER BRYCE:     It's Jennifer, if I could just jump in.  Yeah, Boban said he may be delayed and it looks like he is, so the only update that he shared with me earlier

**EN**

to give to you guys was I mentioned that earlier that he written on the list to share your thoughts for the SSR sub-group work plan.

DENISE MICHEL:          Great, thank you, Jennifer.  We don't have Jeff on today's call regarding the broader DNS SSR issues.  Is there anyone else on the team that has anything they'd like to share with the group?

ALAIN PARTRICK AINA:    Yes, this is Alain, if I may.

DENISE MICHEL:          Yes, please do.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:     Yes, I think in Johannesburg I think the DNS Security Team I think we made a great, great progress, a week that [inaudible] sent to the team.  I think we have a document where we mostly agree on the main area of focus, so I think what is needed now is that team members to review that document and maybe comment and then finalize the document. We have a good document we can [inaudible] for the DNS security [inaudible], but I also said many times [inaudible] DNS security should be DNS SSR, not DNS Security because[inaudible] I think we are still carrying the name DNS Security.

DENISE MICHEL:          Yes, thank you.  I was thinking the same thing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is Eric, I'm sorry, I'm not able to join the Adobe Connect because I'm at a venue and my laptop is dead, but I want to insert myself into the queue.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, hi Eric, welcome. Alain, I just want to make sure that we didn't cut you off? Are you done? Okay, great, thank you. Eric. No?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I've reviewed that document and I've been sort of waiting to hear when the DNS, whatever we're gonna call it, security, SSR, or whatever sub-committee is going to meet again because I've a rather serious set of comments and questions and things I'd like to address in that. I wasn't so sure that that was necessarily a thought for the group call. I'm happy to go through some of them now but in general I think that team has met the one time in Johannesburg when unfortunately I wasn't able to make it, so I'm looking forward to the sub-team meeting again. I wish Jeff were here.

DENISE MICHEL: Great.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: I have a question. This is Alain. Eric, did you see the document we produced with Jeff in Johannesburg?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:          Yeah, I saw the document Jeff sent out, that's actually what I'm sort of referring to.  It's in there I found that -- it looked to me like the careful wording that we used to define the scope of the overall review team in the terms of reference was sort of redone and I also found that there was a number of things that seemed like they were over limiting and a couple of things that were surprisingly broad.

I basically, I hate to sort of say it, but I think I have some sort of fundamental questions about the direction of the sub-team and wanted to sort of like open them up in front of the sub-team when the appropriate time arose.  Does that make sense?

DENISE MICHEL:          Makes sense to me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:          Okay, just make sure I'm not on mute too.

DENISE MICHEL:          I hear you.  Alain, did you have any further comments?  Well -- go ahead.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA:          Yes, I think Eric raised some important points and what I suggest is that we [inaudible] a call maybe early next to address this because I think this is something we must agree, on the scope and to clear all of these

things. It may not be easy; in Johannesburg it was not easy to [inaudible] easy. The sooner we get started, I think the better.

DENISE MICHEL:          Thank you, Alain. [CROSSTALK].

ERIC OSTERWEIL:          Sorry Denise, I didn't mean to jump in on top of you. Alain, I totally agree with you. I think that's a great goal. I just want to point out that next week is the IETF and I don't know if Jeff will be there, he often is, and I'll be there for a part of it. I don't know if that will make it easier or harder to schedule but I just want to sort of point it out to people in the event that I think we should move quickly to meet the sub-team, but perhaps if we windup missing next week, it's probably a fair mulligan. Just context, I think, Alain, that makes perfect sense what you said.

DENISE MICHEL:          Thank you. The forth subtopic is future challenges. I'm sorry, Zarko, would you like to address the DNS SSR suptopic group? I see your hand is up.

ZARKO KECIC:          Yeah, I just wanted to ask Eric to send via email his thoughts about the DNS security and comments that he has so we don't have to wait until next week or when we are going to schedule our conference meeting for the sub-groups.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     Okay, I suppose enough suspense will have been built up between now and when I get onto a keyboard so I don't mind giving away the surprises.  Yeah, no totally, sorry, I didn't mean for it to be obscure, I just didn't want to monopolize people's times with my comments.  But yeah, that's fine, I'll summarize them in an email with the hope that we can discuss them more live as opposed to whatever, but yeah, absolutely.  That's a great point, thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:     A preview perhaps.  Okay, thank you.  Future challenges is the next sub-topic and unfortunately our appointed rapporteur is not with us today.  I'll just note that Eric and I were the only two members of that group present in Johannesburg.  We made a start at a more discrete and specific topic list for future challenges and it's on the Google docs and we're inviting team members to provide their comments, additions, edits to that document.

And then finally, the IANA transition is our final sub-topic group.  James unfortunately is delayed.  Cathy or Eric, is there any updates or additional information you'd like to provide the team?  Not necessary, but I wanted to give you an opportunity.  Hearing none.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:     I think Cathy probably would be more appropriate to comment, but I don't think there's a lot to report, so anything Cathy has to say I'd defer to the next call.

DENISE MICHEL:                 I see Cathy's hand.  Cathy, please go ahead.

CATHY HANDLEY:              Just real short, we had our first round of discussions with Elise and Kim and I've got some writing to do, to put together and that's really a summary of where we are right now.

DENISE MICHEL:                 Great, thank you, Cathy.  Alright, we'll continue our sub-topic work on the email list.  We'll defer our Trello demonstration when we have James with us, perhaps on the next call.  Is there any other business people would like to raise before we conclude this call?

Alright, seeing no hands.  Thank you everyone for spending an hour with us, giving us your time.  We look forward to continuing our work on the email list and hopefully talking to you all next week.  And thank you staff as usual for all your support.  Goodbye, everyone.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:               Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**