
JENNIFER BRYCE: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to day three of the SSR2 Face-to-Face Meeting in Los Angeles. Today is the 27th of January 2019. My name is Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Organization. We'll go around the table, if everybody could please state their name for the record. Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

BOBAN KRSIC: Boban Krsic.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Scott McCormick.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Matogoro Jabhera.

ALAIN AINA: Alain Aina.

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.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everybody. At the moment, we have no remote participants. Brenda Brewer from ICANN Organization is on the line. Just remember, please, to state your name before speaking. Speak clearly into the microphone as much as you can for the transcript. With that, I'll pass it over to Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, the first thing we need to do this morning is take a look at what we did two days ago. I asked Jennifer to put together the table of the seven topics that are in the ICANN SSR. What I'd like to do is get names of people who are going to take the information and start writing it down. What we came up with was questions. What we need is people who are going to write the text when we get the answers.

So, if we could go through these seven, I guess the first thing to do is who wants to volunteer? Can we get all seven on the screen? Okay. So,

welcome, Ram. We'll start with who wants to volunteer? We will go around the room.

MATOGORO JABHERA: For the information security, on the first part, I volunteer.

BOBAN KRSIC: I take number two.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I'll take number four.

ALAIN AINA: Russ, can I ask a question? So, why can't we just ... If we had a small group of people to work on, so why can't we just give priority to those who have—

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, what we had was three people assigned to each of these little groups and no one assigned to the risk management one because we did that as a whole group. Plus, I want to provide an opportunity once our names are here to let the people who could not join us today add their names. So, it's a matter of being inclusive.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I will take number three.

ALAIN AINA: Jennifer, put me on one and two.

NORM RITCHIE: I can work on six.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, we'd like to get the other ... At least a name on the other two rows, please, to make sure that we're getting these done. Thank you.

I was not in the group for five, so I didn't know. I don't remember. Okay, put my name on five.

Okay. So, we already have a list of questions. When the answers come in, we at least have a lead to make sure that we pen the report. Jennifer, would you please send that out and offer the opportunity for the people who are not in the room to add their names?

ALAIN AINA: Sorry, Russ, those are the questions you are referring to?

RUSS HOUSLEY: From Friday, we composed a list of questions and Jennifer has not yet sent them, but they will be sent to staff and when the answers come in, you should then have everything you need to write those sections. Jennifer, you disagree with what I said? Okay, good. Because I know you've been in here enough, therefore haven't had the time to write the

questions up. Alright, thank you. Boban, did you come up with anything else we need to revisit from Friday? No, okay. Alright, thank you.

Yesterday we had kind of a marathon day, learned we're bad at culling. But we ended up with a list of topics. Then the homework for the people that we did collect names at the end of the day for is to come up with the list of questions that you need to write that section. So, write the questions out, then we'll ask staff. Then when those answers come in, then we'll be able to either ask follow-up questions or write, depending what we get.

So, yesterday we have a list of topics and names, and again Jennifer, would you send that out so that the people who are not here can add their names to the places where they want to participate? Yeah. I don't know if it's possible, but it would be great for Thursday if we could have those questions to go over as a group. I realize we're here and there's a travel day, but the sooner we ask, the sooner we'll get the answers. Scott?

SCOTT MCCORMICK:

For one through at least five, probably, it's a pretty simple question. What ICANN policies, procedures, or processes are related to exactly those bolded items?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

No. So, we already have questions for this table. It's the table we built yesterday from the brainstorming with Eric that we don't have the questions.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Gotcha. Sorry, I still haven't had the rest of my cup of coffee this morning.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's a whole urn over there.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I know. I'm halfway through. Which Google Doc is this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, we're good. For the ICANN SSR, we already have the questions. Now we have people to write when the answers come in, and for next Thursday, hopefully we will have questions for the DNS SSR, so that we can get them to staff, so we can get going on getting the answers.

My hope is that a bunch of them will be very simple. Please send pointer to blah, as Scott was about to say. Those I think we can answer quickly, and hopefully there won't be things that we have that require interviews and that kind of thing. I don't know if you're all just too tired. Okay.

So, in terms of wrapping up the SSR1 part, she decided to pull all the recommendations out of that section and put them all together in one place. Laurin agreed to make the pass, change the intro, to say that that's what it is because what it says now is if there was a simple,

directly related recommendation it appeared here; otherwise it appeared elsewhere. So, he's going to make that match what we did yesterday.

At the end, we had a little section of green of why this was hard. So, he's going to turn that into an intro paragraph for the whole section. So, we won't be talking about that again. If that plan matches with your expectation or doesn't match your expectation, please say something now. Thank you, Laurin. Did you capture that action? Now he's going to fix the introduction to the SSR1 section. So, I have encouraged him to, once he has that one paragraph from the green bullets at the end, to just send that out in e-mail for comment as opposed to the Google Doc and all of us trying to find the one paragraph that was changed. Alright, good.

I think that's a summary and the actions from the last two days. Did I miss any? Great. Alright.

So, the next step is to look at the futures workstream. We tagged a couple of things yesterday, made them yellow in the brainstorm session. [That is,] consider them when we get to futures.

We had a brainstorming session before the pause, so I've asked Jennifer to pull those two lists together so we can look at it and do a similar brainstorm to decide which ones we actually want to write about. Jennifer, I'm going to turn it over to you to walk us through that.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

So, I just put up on the screen here the workstream topics document which was the initial brainstorm that was done back in I think May last year and then, at the very end of that, I just pasted in the bullets that were highlighted in yellow yesterday from the DNS SSR discussion. I have lost track at this point of which year.

So, in the topics for consideration section, these are the items that I think Kerry-Ann had been the rapporteur of this workstream. I can't remember off the top of my head who else was in that workstream initially but I don't know if you want to do an exercise like you did yesterday of going through them all.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yeah. I think we need to decide which ones we want to further explore. There's just those five, plus the yellow ones. Okay, so there's more here than, from my perspective, we can do ... Is there a way we can get the list on the screen? Okay, could you post the link in the Adobe chat?

So, Eric, you put a comment in here that I don't understand. How should we prepare for a plan for software changes to root zone? Is that just a clarification of that highlighted yellow text or ...?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I'm sort of trying to remember this from a long time ago. I have the vague recollection that I didn't understand what this was talking about. In the discussion we talked about, it was basically the root zone software is going to change because software changes. What is it we're going to consider a future item here? It's going to change. I was trying

to make it an actionable element and I think I was saying knowing it's going to change, are there any guardrails or plans we can put in place? We're trying to construct what would be recommendations. How would we prepare for the fact that it's going to change? [Progression] testing? I think that's what I was trying to do is help the objective turn into a recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. So, some of these are really huge topics and some of them are quite manageable. It's, of course, what makes these things hard to talk about. So, I guess the first question is: is there anything that we need to add to this list before we try and decide is this something that at least two people, following what we did yesterday, want to explore?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

There were some items from the DNS SSR that we were going to punt over here. They're gone? Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Hearing no additions, let's go through them. It looks like this has been done once because there's things that are already crossed out. So, the first one is root zone management software change. Is this something that people want to explore?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I think it's worthwhile.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're lower down. The work item/areas of focus. Right there. So, one person so far, Eric said, that root zone management software change is something we should explore.

NORM RITCHIE: Elaborate just a little bit on that, because I don't understand.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: My comment on the right? Isn't that [illuminating?] I don't remember where this came from. I had the vague recollection that it was in there and we talked about it, me and I don't remember who else I was speaking to. But the gist of it was the root zone is managed by software and someone thought that was important and I think the idea here was just shouldn't there be some consideration for the fact that this is a critical working piece and we should consider software bugs and progression testing, something that needs to be [inaudible]. So, I'm not hard and fast on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Who cares enough to put their name against this? Okay. I'm seeing thumbs down. Or I'm seeing no thumbs up, let's put it that way. Alright, moving to the next one.

Top identifier system attacks. There are a couple of bullets, some of which have been crossed out. Coalescence of registry backend

operators for multiple TLDs. Identifier, hacking via social engineering are the two that seem to still be here.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I do thumbs up on coalescence.

RUSS HOUSLEY: On just the sub-bullet, not the social engineering one?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think that's a separate one. I'm only talking about the coalescence one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Anyone joining Eric on thumbs up for the coalescence?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. [inaudible] of bullets under that seem to be not quite ... I don't think that's the case. So, I don't recall the details of the discussion about the coalescence, but there was – the group had some discussion around there are some trends emerging in terms of backend registry operators and ownership of TLDs and what are the implications for that. They raise some potential issues to be explored. Multitudes of victims for one high-level compromised outage, I don't recall was one of them. I think that's a separate future topic. I mean, there's some correlation, but completely separate from who's a backend registry operator is I think there's questions about future attack threat factors and trends.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Why don't we move that to the left, so that it's a separate topic and we'll talk about it next? So, does anyone want to join Eric on working on coalescence of the registry and backend ops? It takes two thumbs up to keep it. Okay, so – thank you. That's it. Thank you, Jennifer. You missed Boban. Using your peripheral vision over there. Okay. Now we're going to move down to—

DENISE MICHEL: The multitudes of victims and the identifier hijacking, it strikes me that these are elements of future – of abuse trends and future challenges in this area. Am I remembering correctly? It seemed like we need detailed types of attack. But rather we want to consider whether ICANN is appropriately aware of, informed about, well-positioned to deal with or is thinking about in the future the trends in the major abuse area.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. How many people want a thumbs up on this topic?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm happy to rewrite this a bit to take it up to a higher level and also work on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we have one. We have one. Don't do the rewriting unless you get a second.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think the social engineering stuff might be relevant.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But that's a second one. We're on the multitudes of [inaudible] for one high—

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm sorry. I thought the first two belong together.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm sorry, again trying to understand this. Are we saying that because of coalescing of registry and registrar services, a compromise then is a bigger prize because you have access to more accounts?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. We broke the coalescence in the multitudes, into two independent topics.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I can speak to that a little bit. Like Denise said, there's an intersection between the two, but they're distinct and the intersection of coalescence was that if you had a lot of services that were operated by a single entity and that entity were compromised, then there would be a lot of services that would be vulnerable as a result. So, the extent to which the name space is coalescing around increasingly few providers,

high-value target goes up. And that's why the multitudes is related, but to Denise's point, the multitude ones should break out separately because it also implies a bunch of other stuff as well.

NORM RITCHIE: But that's a current concern, not a future.

DENISE MICHEL: I would suggest that we take the multitudes bullet and the identifier hijacking bullet and we take those away or make them simple. It's under a bullet about future trends, future abuse threats, and then work together to decide what level and what detail we address that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can you edit this Google Doc and show us what you're talking about?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I need to have permission to edit.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I just did, so I'm surprised.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Boban asked why is it not in the DNS section? It's a current threat. And I think Norm had said something similar a second ago. I'm going to channel some conversations I kind of mostly recall, but this is my recollection. This, again, is sort of like what we were talking about

yesterday with something in name space versus root zone. It's like the flavor here is if a trend continues and you do get a lot of congregation, things like backend registry operators hosting a lot of services, if you were to plot that out so that there was just the big three, whoever they are, and they hosted all of the DNS even though the name space is really diverse, you don't really have ... You don't have diversity in the same way you might think you do.

So, it's really just like if this is a trend that's going to happen, what would we worry about there? Not, hey, the fraction is blah, so is that a big deal or not? It's more like, if there is a trend, should we put some caution in about that? "Signposts in Cyberspace" is a work by the National Academies from I think 2005 and it talked about things like if you were to have the root zone change in the following ways, these things would be bad, and when the new round of gTLDs came out, it was a real interesting read because they had sort of given some guard rails around something that was very imaginary based on some trends that were coming through. So, I think that's the spirit of it.

I'm just explaining. I'm not trying to do a hard advocate, so feel free to push back on it.

NORM RITCHIE:

So, if you had a NIN access to top the registrars, you'll basically have access to over 90% of the domains?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's the registrars, yeah, and then there's registries as well. So, if there was a registry with a systemic vulnerability in its software and it was hosting 90% of the TLDs, that would be a scary thing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Boban, go ahead.

BOBAN KRSIC: Thanks, Eric, but what about the current threat we had today? Registry operator and they're hosting around about 250, I don't know, 300 TLDs? It's not 90%, it's 15%, yeah, but what about them? Should we address that in DNS SSR or should we – okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, or ICANN SSR. [inaudible] either way. They're contractually [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, it's very possible, just listening to the – try and channel the room a little bit – that this is a thing that should come up in multiple places that has different facets to it. I think ICANN SSR in a sort of compliance aspect, also just kind of a systemic measurement of what's going on [inaudible] DNS, and then if there's a trend and it looks maybe we'll worry about something getting worse, it's just three different ways to look at a problem [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yes. I'm really kind of thinking about state-sponsored attacks and [posturing among] this one because it would be possible to actually control a significant portion of the Internet in a few clicks. So, I guess that is important. I'm just kind of debating whether it's a future or a current.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I feel like I'm advocating for it. I just keep trying to [couch that.] If, for example, we don't like it here, I'm totally okay with that, but I'm just trying to make sure the view I have is clear. And that's that the threat today, if you were to say it looks like it's going to be ten times worse in five years, would be what you talked about here. So, the flipside is if it's not going to be ten times worse, it probably doesn't belong here.

NORM RITCHIE: Putting it in the futures, something along the lines of the escalation of state-sponsored attacks which is still escalating.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think as a general note, I think we'll find a lot of stuff where we already see the signs of this becoming an issue, so probably the sub-topic is more emerging and future challenges, I think that would probably be the more appropriate and then we can deal with the fact that this is both something current, but that we believe will increase. So, I think if we frame it like that, we have less issues going forward.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I don't think we should get too caught up about duplication or connecting on some of these areas. I think as we finish our initial work, we'll then want to go back and look at the best way to organize this to make it understandable and approachable and we may want, for example, in the broad gTLD abuse area to talk about operational, current-day issues, and in the same place say, "And, in addition, you should have access to this research and information and be prepared to deal with being forward-thinking on abuse trends," blah-blah-blah. So, we could just instead of having a completely separate area of the report about future, we can pull the future into the rest of the document. We may end up doing that, so I wouldn't get too caught up about duplication at this point.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's a really good idea.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Not with your shoe yet, right? Alright. So, Norm's suggesting it's criminal abuse and state-sponsored attacks. That was to change the name of the whole workstream was to future and emerging or emerging and future.

Okay. So, I hear [Laurin,] and Norm, and Denise. Is that right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Boy, I hope they're not all this hard.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Me, too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm put up Scott's hand. So, Scott, Norm tried to raise your hand. Are you accepting?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: [inaudible]? Sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Criminal abuse and state-sponsored attacks.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Although, I haven't seen a state actually sponsoring activity because they never admit to it, so ...

MATOGORO JABHERA: Can you also add me on that criminal abuse and state-sponsored attack?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Alright. There's a lot interested in this topic. Okay, are we ready to move to the next one?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Could you grab the list of initials and pull it to the top bullet? Okay, I think the next one is the new crypto and DNSSEC. This comes up at least twice. It's in yellow later. I think this is an interesting one. Do others?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I agree.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It also has [PQ] in it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Closed quantum. Okay. So, Eric and I want to work on this. Anyone else? Ram would like to help. You need ... If a large-scale quantum computer comes to pass, RSA and elliptic curve both fall. So, what do you do to keep DNSSEC working? That's the question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Besides making multi-terabit keys.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But, that's the question. Okay. Thanks, Eric. Okay, the next topic is new uses for DNS which include IOT and can DNS evolve as new systems use it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that's important.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin agrees.

RUSS HOUSLEY: She will have an opportunity to add herself. So, Boban did you want on this list or not?

BOBAN KRSIC: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No? Okay.

BOBAN KRSIC: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're welcome. Okay, the next one is alternate naming. Interactions, conflicts, etc. Namecoin. Does anyone want to work on that? I have no idea what namecoin is.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Namecoin and ENS are two blockchain-based alternatives for DNS. I think it's important. I keep putting my name in things. I'm so going to be mad at myself.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I agree with Eric, here. It's not that we have to do anything in-depth, but it's definitely something we have to mention at some point.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I mean, namecoin is just one example. I think there's a lot of things. More than even that, I think there's other systems that are proposing new transport and stuff like that that don't [even use] DNS at all, so it's worth considering.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so I'm hearing Eric, and Norm, and Laurin. Is that right? No? You can say you like it and not do it. But if you like it enough, do it.

DENISE MICHEL: You put in namecoin. It should be blockchain. Jennifer, can you do blockchain and take out namecoin?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, we have the elliptic curve crypto next. We just dealt with that, so we'll delete it from down here. Then, root server system protection, threat scape of top threats. Yeah, she the one who said don't delete them, keep them yellow. So, I think we can put Kerry-Ann here, if there's someone to support her. So, Kerry-Ann is one thumb is the way I take it. I'm not hearing a second.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'll be the second because it's hard to imagine we have a future threat section where we're not outlining what the threat scape in the future threat section is. I mean, it's like ...

DENISE MICHEL: I think there's two levels of which we want to think about this section. One is from a structural and operational level. Does ICANN have the resources and priority and planning in place that it is appropriately aware of and tracking future challenges and trends and actively thinking

about how that rolls into its strategic plans and operations. So, that aspect of it. Then, there's the in here in particular are key future challenges, specifically, that ICANN should be looking at for the following reasons and looking at in the following ways. So, I think you've got two ways of approaching the future, saying one is as an entity, is ICANN appropriately resourced and structured to be looking at and aware of –I'm repeating myself now. And the other is, "And in particular we've got some particular areas of future challenges that we think you should address as part of that process," is the way I'm thinking about this. Are you thinking about it in that fashion?

NORM RITCHIE:

Yeah. I think there is a group under OCTO that looks at technology trends and reports to the board on them on a regular basis. Yes. It's like the [star chamber]. I went to one of their sessions. It's just a bunch of technical thought leadership people. They kind of put their views. But I don't know if they look at it from a threat perspective.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think that would be a great question. We should ask what they're doing right now, what staff is aware of [it's] working on, what they bring to the attention of the board. Are there the right voices at the table? So many different layers to this because you're technically aware of things that are evolving. It doesn't necessarily mean you're aware of the evolving threats in different sectors, for example.

So, if we could just make sure, Jennifer, we don't lose the question. We need to add the question table.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Got it.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, we got two people interested in working on that. The next one is KPI for SSR measurements. So, Scott just raised Norm's hand. Is Norm going to accept that? Alright. I'm not hearing you object. Okay.

So, moving back to KPI for SSR measurements. I think we have Kerry-Ann wanting to do this, but I'm not seeing any support. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, this brings the sub-bullet or the second line here brings up something I was going to ask at some point. It's right here. I'll ask it. This is asking to commission analysis. So, I don't know if we have any thinking or perspective on whether we're going to be asking for studies to be done or analysis to be performed, not to do ourselves but request it. So, it's right here, so I just want to draw people's attention. But I add that more general question as we go through this. Are we going to get the points where it's like this really needs to be done, we're obviously not going to do it ourselves, we're going to make – are we of a mind to say commission studies is one of our recommendations at times?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's how I read this bullet was we ask that the recommendation would be commission analysis for key performance indicators for the root and possibly [others]. I'm not seeing any support, so we're going to strike that one.

And DNS over TLS.

NORM RITCHIE: Should that be more broad and put down as something along the lines of privacy?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I actually think that even in addition to privacy, but separate from privacy, this one also implies things like cyclic dependencies for verification. So, if you have DNS over TLS, then your connection is bootstrapped by WebPKI. If you're then using DNSSEC on top of that to verify something else, then you basically are inheriting WebPKI's verification that you got the DNSSEC data. And if you then go to something like DANE or whatever, you have cyclic dependencies, but certainly you're beholden to the web PKI for bootstrapping of everything.

RUSS HOUSLEY: His point is DNSSEC can depend on ... DANE could depend on the WebPKI [if you use a] TLSA record and all that depends on what the parent does and so on.

NORM RITCHIE: It has also impact on [inaudible] [abuse].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think this is a bigger topic and we have to potentially reframe stuff like name resolution now going through browsers. There's so much stuff being floated right now.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Is this more than one topic? I'm trying to think how we would throw all this together and I wonder if we just need to bifurcate it.

NORM RITCHIE It's just that as a futures section, the driver for all this is privacy. So, I'm thinking that that might be the better way of just pumping a bunch of different issues. What does the impact to increase, generally increase privacy across the globe have on SSR and DNS?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I agree with that. I think that is a broad category and it touches a lot of stuff and DNS or TLS sort of can channel a lot of that, but the cyclic dependencies also are not privacy concerns, but they're also touched [on] by the DNS over TLS. That's why I was wondering if we bifurcate it. But maybe ... Yeah, I'm just [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So now that we know what it is, who wants to work on it? I guess we should put Kerry-Ann. Yesterday she argued make it yellow. So, these

future ones somehow feel different and the DNS SSR stuff we did yesterday and it's not clear to me that there are questions we need to ask for everyone. Does it make sense to go through these now and formulate the questions for these for the ones we've agreed to do work on? Is that a good use of the time?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Hi, Kerry-Ann.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, let's go to the top of this list and see what questions, if any, are needed in order to do the writing. So, the first one was coalescence. Eric, Denise, Norm, and Boban wanted to work on this. Are there any questions you need answered in order to start writing?

DENISE MICHEL: A comprehensive list of backend operators, both the Cs and the Gs. It's not like [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. What about the escrow providers and ...?

DENISE MICHEL: That's a good question. I think a first step there is to get a complete list of backend operators for all registries and a confirmation of current escrow – yeah, escrow providers.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'd ask if there is any measurement or data about [smoke] testing. Like, how long does it take? Have they done any tests on how long it takes to do an escrow, etc.? I mean, if the answer is, no, they don't have it, that's fine. It's not like we should ask them to do it. But if they've done some tests or something like that, it would be good to know how that turned out.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, measurements analysis and testing I think is what he just said.

NORM RITCHIE: Are we going to extend that to registrars as well? Because we're talking about TLDs and EBEROs and stuff. Are we going to down a level to the registrars because they're also coalescing together?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry-Ann can't hear you. Boban, Kerry-Ann can't hear you.

BOBAN KRSIC: It was only [inaudible]. Off the record.

DENISE MICHEL: So, we need a formal question to ICANN to get the list, although you can off of ICANN's platform in different ways find out these. But obviously,

our work should step off from the authoritative point, which should be ICANN staff.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. That's exactly right, because if this was important analysis, we'd probably need it to be in sort of a formal function in case nTLDStats goes sideways.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Two questions for this. Anything else?

NORM RITCHIE: Sorry. Button is not working. A question [getting] information. Are the registry and registrar reports still public? Don't they do them on a monthly basis or something?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I wouldn't know. I thought you would.

NORM RITCHIE: I just haven't looked in a long time.

DENISE MICHEL: Reports on what?

NORM RITCHIE: On number of domains under management, so you actually see who are the big players and what constitutes 90% of all domains.

DENISE MICHEL: Well, ICANN gets revenue on a per-domain basis, so they do have the data on domains by registrar and registry because that's their revenue source. Whether that's published ... Yeah. I'm not sure.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, Verisign publishes a quarterly domain name industry briefing that I think has some of the stats in there. So, whether that's authoritative or not, I'm not sure whether we would use it, but it might have citations that allow us – whatever. But, yeah, it's a perfectly good question.

DENISE MICHEL: And again, I think appropriate since we're looking at this to make sure that we have an authoritative data source in ICANN, although you can get a lot of information outside.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, there's a third question. Would you type it in?

BOBAN KRSIC: Maybe a question: has ICANN identified this threat in the risk management? And what controls are designed to mitigate it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I tried to channel you, Norm. If I didn't get it right, feel free to correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I think we captured the question. Does three cover it? Are we done with this one and moving to the next one? Okay, hearing nothing else, the access to data on important abuse and attack records, we have Laurin and Norm and Denise and Eric and Scott and Matogoro working on this one. So, what are the questions?

DENISE MICHEL: So, I think we just need to make sure we understand the [inaudible] to what extent staff is looking at this and reporting on it, at least internally. So, I think that's just our starting point question. Then, we'll look at a lot of information sources outside of ICANN and come back with some additional questions or suggestion of how this might be folded into ICANN work. Does that sound like a plan, Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: Some of the questions we have there will probably not be for ICANN, so [I'd like to get an] authoritative source to say this is what's happening for state-sponsored things. So, do we still want to list that as a question? Of course, there's only ICANN questions.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think these are probably ... Yeah. But, there's no reason we couldn't ask a question in here [inaudible] we don't have that data and that doesn't stop us from saying, well, we have other sources, too, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, certainly, you want to go do your own research, but what questions do we need staff to answer that are blocking us from doing the writing? That's really the question here.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes. I'm just trying to look up that group. I was trying to think of what it was before. There is a technical expert ... It's called the Technical Experts Group and they actually [... so it's] forward-looking technical and technological issues. That's what they do and they report that to the board. So, the question is do they cover—

RUSS HOUSLEY: I actually know what they do [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Well, no, we need to ask that, right? We should ask them if they cover future threats and consider and do analysis on future threats and report those to the board.

DENISE MICHEL: They don't. So, I think the more general question is do you have any standing structures and processes, resources in place that does this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Where did you write that?

NORM RITCHIE: So, I just posted the link to the Technical Expert Group resource page in the Adobe Connect.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there any other question? Boban is still making up questions on the previous topic. Well, I read it to see if it was just put in the wrong spot. Okay, I'm not hearing anything else. New group though. I can't think of any questions that staff could help us answer on that one. Does anyone else have thoughts?

DENISE MICHEL: Again, I think just the baseline question of, is anyone responsible for keeping track of emerging, and how do you track this, how do you make appropriate entities inside ICANN aware of it? How do you factor it into your strategic planning as appropriate? I think that same baseline question applies here.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And what analysis or studies have been done. Would you mind sending that question again so I can put it in the [doc?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: You said what processes.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Yeah. I think just [currently, not envisioned,] but what resources and processes, if any, are in place to track, stay abreast of these issues and, as appropriate, make the board aware of them, make people internally aware of them, factor them into strategic planning.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anything else?

NORM RITCHIE: I know this kind of centers around quantum computing. Are there any other trends or developments that are also considered a threat that are not quantum? Just like massive compute power.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's what quantum is, but there's always a threat of a brilliant mathematician coming up with a new cryptanalytic attack. But how do you plan for Newton? All you can do is react when the event happens, and it's –

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] incident response, basically.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, basically.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think in that regard, it falls in the risk management stuff we already have. Okay. New uses of DNS. What questions do we need to ask?

NORM RITCHIE: Sorry, I keep asking questions here. Is this ... the thought process behind this one the scalability of DNS, or is it that there's some new use of it for [a text record] or something, or is it both?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: My personal opinion is more the former. So if you're going to start using it for all these other things, then it could affect your position on things like hyper local root, whatever.

JENNIFER BRYCE Kerry Ann has typed into the chat integration of AI or ML into DNS management. Is this something that ICANN is exploring?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can you type it in the Google doc?

DENISE MICHEL: Kerry Ann, can you expand on that just a little bit more? Let me make sure I understand what that –

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Are you able to hear me? Because the [app] hasn't been working for me. [Brenda] and I tried to figure it out, but it doesn't work. Are you able to hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, we hear you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Oh, okay. That's a first. Forgive the noise in the background, I have the baby in the car with me. So, more and more, actually, from the cybersecurity perspective, we've seen the use of machine learning tools and AI tools to actually auto manage a lot of services that were traditionally actually managed by like us, just to kind of have an eye on it. [I don't know if there's plans that] ICANN to integrate any machine learning into the registry or the DNS management processes that they already have. I don't know if they're talking about it, thinking about it, but in terms of looking at what they plan to do to make the DNS management processes more efficient, and even from a security perspective to see if it's something that they're going to automate. I think that's something that we should at least ask the question and see if it's something we need to [inaudible] for future.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm trying to see how that's a threat, and the one just dawned on me, the one area that is a threat is the use of machine learning techniques to social engineer. So it's actually a chatbot talking to a human.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, doesn't that go back up in topic two, as maybe a sub-bullet to the identifier hijacking and social engineering part?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, Kerry Ann, [we're trying to see about is a threat.] It's a trend, certainly, but I'm trying to understand how it's a threat.

DENISE MICHEL: Kerry Ann, would other activities, such as the bulk registering of random domain names in large quantities from a particular registrar or registry that are then used for phishing attacks, that [inaudible] automated bulk registering. Actually, the CCT review called that out as a source for a growing level of abuse in the new gTLD space. But is that [inaudible] example?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I'm not sure if she's still there or not. One thing we should do – I'm thinking about this, and certainly, the machine learning is definitely a trend that's increasing rapidly and will continue, and AI is kind of

there. At the very least, we could look at it and say we don't see a threat from it at this point in time, just to give it a nod, [or not.] Yeah, so I'm advocating that we put in something on machine learning, because if we don't, then people are going to ask what about machine learning, so might as well put it in.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I typed something up there in the identifier hijacking via social engineering. I said, "Machine learning to aid the attacker. Are you talking to a robot?" Does that capture your point?

NORM RITCHIE: And machine learning can be used for abusive registrations.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [I jumped back] while we were talking, because I was dialed out, and put a question under new uses just as a sort of strawman to pass up the chain.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So now there's going to be a trademark infringement. Okay, we're getting close to the 10:30 break. I'd like to finish up the new uses for DNS questions and take that break. I've put it in the second topic, because it seemed to fit that social engineering part. You can move it anywhere else you want. It's a Google Doc.

Okay, we have two questions. I'm sure the answer to question two is no. Under new uses for DNS, there are two questions. Are there any group reports, or is there any work being done to track new uses of DNS? And the second one is, has ICANN identified any scenarios where the current DNS infrastructure would fail? Okay, I'm not hearing any further ones, so let's – wait, Laurin's come up with one.

Okay, let's take that break and be back in 15 minutes, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE

Okay. Welcome back from the morning break, everybody. The session is being recorded, and I'll hand it over to Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Do we have anybody remote right now?

JENNIFER BRYCE

Kerry Ann is online.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Welcome back, Kerry Ann. Okay. The last thing we did was put together two questions related to new uses of the DNS. And the next topic is alternate naming systems. And somebody already put one question in there. So, it says, "Does ICANN track these developments? What are the findings and how are they fed into the ICANN operations and policy? What other questions do we have? Hearing nothing. Okay. I take it Laurin typed that, since he's happy.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think this is really more for like research-type project rather than ICANN [staff]-related.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Moving to the next topic, root server system protection, assess the threatscape. What questions do we have here? Well, I think we need to turn that last bullet into a question somehow. Somehow, [it's got to] assess the threatscape part.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: But we already have a section on risk management, so it's got to be doing that. So here, it's about future threats, right? As you put it earlier, emerging and future threats.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, exactly. I'm not sure who wrote this. What is meant by "just technologies or threats to?"

RUSS HOUSLEY: At the time, it said, "What briefings do they get?" Right? We knew they got briefings on emerging technology, so the question is, are they

talking about emerging threats? Any other questions to add in this section? Alright.

One more, privacy protections. What questions do we need?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I feel this is another more research looking around [phase one,] so I just kind asked the question from [similar one above] essentially on what is ICANN currently doing looking into these things.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Somehow though, the circular dependencies thing, that's a technology one and probably won't happen at ICANN, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Use the mic.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry. Are you asking what will be formulated as a question, or what will we do with it as an item in this group [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think he was asking, okay, ICANN's not the place to ask. Where will we find out?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I'm not sure that all these things necessarily have to have a question to ICANN so much for us to investigate. So, I'm not sure whether we have a question to ask.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Alright. I think this is the bottom of the list. Are there any we need to go back to? I'm sure there's great enthusiasm to packing up. Please make a quick pass and see if we've gotten all of it so that we can ask Jennifer to type those up and review them on Thursday and make sure they're ready to go to staff.

JENNIFER BRYCE Thanks. And I just added a question in there from Kerry Ann that she has typed into the chat. Yeah, the bottom.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so talking about GDPR here. Okay, I think we're done with this. Jennifer, would you take the action to turn these into questions for final review on Thursday?

JENNIFER BRYCE Okay, got it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

The next thing we need to do is figure out when we're getting together again. Brenda put together a chart, so, could you project that for us, Jennifer?

Okay, this is really small, but my concern with this is that we get the most green at the far right, which is way too close to the next ICANN meeting, so it's too late to actually get anything done. It's less than three weeks before the meeting after Kobe. Marrakech, is that right?

So we need to kind of be in the middle somewhere in order to actually get anything done after the meeting. And the further left of this is all red. So, people aren't available.

But where we're in the middle is when the meeting's happening in Bangkok. How many people are going to be there already? Two. Yeah. That's a long way to go if you weren't already planning to go.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. I'll send around a link. It's a confluence of ICANN meetings that are all being held in one week, right? So GGD operations, the DNS forum, OARC, and RIPE.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL:

Maybe? No. And probably something else.

JENNIFER BRYCE

There's a registration operation workshop.

DENISE MICHEL:

I think we went to the DNS forum in conjunction with our meeting in Spain. We had a lot of really useful information on that. I understand we won't be in the information gathering stage by then, but I'm just throwing that out there as it might affect other parts of your –

RUSS HOUSLEY:

That must have been Madrid, not Barcelona.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. Thanks. [I keep getting those mixed up.] I probably will be there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY:

But it's a really long way to go if you weren't going for those other things.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Fair enough. From Washington, it's 14 to Tokyo and seven more to Bangkok. It flies over the top so it's about the same.

DENISE MICHEL: In any event, I know there are a number of considerations and preferences that go into when and where we meet, but I just would flag that some of us, I think will be there during that time. So if we could avoid a conflict with that, if we don't meet there, that would be [a great idea.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: But obviously, if we're not going to do it in Bangkok, we need to avoid the 4th through the 13th. Absolutely.

NORM RITCHIE: And if it was done there, you would also have a great wealth of knowledge and people readily available, should you need to ask them anything.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hopefully, we're not at the information gathering stage at that point. Right? Okay. If we're at all close to the work plan, which is the next thing we're going to review, we should be in the finalizing stages, not in the information gathering stages. So, while I'm looking at that chart and the amount of green at the right is encouraging, it's just too close to Marrakech, and there's hardly any green at the left of that chart. So, one of the things we could do is ask about dates that are even further to

the left to see if that fixes it, gives us ability to get enough people in the room to make it worth it.

I hate to redoodle, I really would like to find a way to come to an actionable plan here so we can get ICANN Org finding us a place to meet and so on.

That's what I'm thinking. Jennifer, what information do we have about the ... what date is the ... there's two meetings in March that I think affect groups here or people here, and that's the ICANN meeting in Kobe is at the beginning of March and the IETF's at the end of March. I think that's why we started where we did, but maybe early April's possible.

So, can we extend the Doodle starting in the middle of April and see what we can learn? Can people fill that out right now while we're here and see what we get?

JENNIFER BRYCE

Yeah, I think I'd have to create a new Doodle. I can do that, starting the mid-April and then ... do you want the same dates, or do you want it to end sooner than it's in this one?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Well, what we need to understand is whether middle of April to 4th of May, right? Boban, why are you shaking your head?

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, Easter. I think we're looking for two, two and a half days. Yeah. And if it's in Bangkok, that puts two days either side of it for travel depending where you're coming from.

JENNIFER BRYCE So the reason that wasn't on there was because of ICANN support. It's challenging for support, that two weeks, but we can include it if that's the way – we'll find a way.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Please do. We've got to figure this out. So, when you say ICANN support, means you can't be there, or it means ...

JENNIFER BRYCE Right, so between myself and Negar, we have conflicts, but we can find a way to support the meeting.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But you're the Wiki index.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Let us please add those dates into the ... so, a week after Easter, I guess, is when we started it before. Is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, maybe the 25th of April, which is half a week instead of a week. And if it turns out that solves it, that'd be good. Otherwise, we're going to end up flying to Bangkok, guys.

MATOGORO JABHERA: For me, May is quite good compared to the rest. Yeah, otherwise, if it's [April or so, I will also not be able to attend.] I'll also not be able to attend in Kobe. So, in May, standing a better chance of being there. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Let's give Jennifer a minute to put together this Doodle, and then we're all going to fill it out right here.

DENISE MICHEL: So, where in the world during these dates? Makes a difference in terms of travel time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Of course it does. But if we do it the 4th to the 13th of May, it'd have to be in Bangkok, right? In that window when at least two of you are already going to be there.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. I think some of the challenges are if I just have to fly eight hours to go to a two-and-a-half-day meeting on certain dates, I can do it, but if I have to fly 20 hours, it depends on ... that affects everyone's calendars. So, I think the where is important on this Doodle poll. Do you want to talk a little bit about [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. It would have to be in Bangkok, in that middle. The last two meetings of this group had been in North America, so I was kind of assuming it would be in Europe. That's just in terms of sharing the pain. You can do it on eastern now.

DENISE MICHEL: Are there other suggestions around the table of general locations to meet on? Russ has noted two North American meetings, and European might be on the table. Other people around the table have other comments about a Europe meeting or want to suggest another venue? This would be a good time to drill that out.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And the ICANN office is in Belgium.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think it would be good to have the new date overview, because it might depend on when it is when certain people would be able to go somewhere. So, for example, if you have a two-day travel versus a one-day makes a difference. So, I think if we could get the dates first and then have a look.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, basically, Bangkok will be the appropriate place for us, because very near from my country, and I think some of the colleague also. Yeah, [inaudible] as well. And I do not have problem for any of these part, but we need some time to get visa processing, especially in the euro, that will take a long time. That is the problem.

[inaudible] and some of them, this is not [in the Nepal,] then it takes a long time. The process is quite long, at least one month ago. And it depends. Especially Europe, getting visa in the Europe is quite difficult, because we don't have any embassy in Nepal, we have to travel India and go back. It's not like we cannot send document online. We'll have to physically present [in India.] That's why it's difficult.

MATOGORO JABHERA: For Bangkok, I used to go to Bangkok, but anytime I go to Bangkok, I have to travel to Dakar. So I prearrange, and I have to travel to Dakar to submit. So, I either continue my trip from Dakar or come back. So, that's always been a challenge for me, yeah, going to Bangkok. But this is how

it worked in the past, go to Dakar, continue, come back to Dakar, and then go.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, is Europe a problem for you as well then?

MATOGORO JABHERA: No, Europe is not a problem for me. Europe, US. Canada is a bit difficult, I have to go to [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I get an extra day in the week that I could potentially join if we do it after May 15th. I know that that runs afoul of your perspective on moving it forward, not backward, Russ, but I teach on Tuesdays.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are we looking at another three-day, or ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Two and a half is what I'm guessing. But it's very hard to project how we will be based on how quickly we went through text yesterday. I'm just guessing that that's kind of the amount of time we'll need. The more review done online, the less face-to-face, but we tend to be way more productive when we're face-to-face.

So, Jennifer, is the Doodle ready?

JENNIFER BRYCE

I have it ready. Do you want me to send it?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Please send it.

DENISE MICHEL:

Also doesn't have to be an ICANN office. Boban was mentioning he could host it at DENIC, Facebook has international offices. So, particularly if it improves the opportunity for members to join us, we can look at that too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Something that was brought up on council the other day was that due to Brexit issues, London probably wouldn't be the smartest. I don't know what the dates are around London, Brexit, but it's effecting people actually buying travel right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, alright, the Doodle's in your mailbox. Please fill it out.

Right now, we're doing availability. What I thought we were doing is if you were on that day, knowing that the 4th through the 13th if we met, it had to be in Bangkok, could you join the meeting on that day? In Bangkok if it's the 4th through the 13th, somewhere else, other days.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: What he's saying is that the Doodle poll is location agnostic except for during the GDD summit, and if you said you're available, you are implying you're available to go to Bangkok.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Scott, Denise, have you made your updates?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, looking at the whole table, the most we can get on any day is eight, and we have a row of eight, eight, seven if we go the 17th, 18th and 19th, which means Europe. It's not in the window that we said it would be Bangkok.

I think this is the best we're going to get. I think if we send out that those are the days, maybe people –

DENISE MICHEL: [Hold the date.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, hold the date. So, Jennifer, could you send a "hold the date" message?

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: 17, 18, 19.

DENISE MICHEL: Could we also then ask the group to flag if they have preferences for countries to meet in in terms of visa challenges to see if we've got some room to accommodate?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would be good.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Absolutely. Yeah, so hold the date, and what countries are most easy for you to get to in Europe from a visa perspective. Right. Make sense?

JENNIFER BRYCE Yeah, so have you basically decided that it's going to be in Europe? Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: But not necessarily at the ICANN offices in Brussels.

JENNIFER BRYCE I understand.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Europe or Jamaica.

Okay, Jennifer, when you're done with the hold the date message, I'd like to turn to the workplan.

Jennifer, can you let me back into the Adobe Connect?

Can you put a link to the Google Excel or whatever they call it?

Okay, so let's see if we can do this by workstream. Yesterday, we finished the SSR1 workstream. That should all be marked 100%. Well, okay, the last one's not, but all the rest of them are. The last one is cross-check draft recommendations with scope and bylaws. So, we didn't do that yet because we pushed the recommendations to another section. But there will be some cross-check. But everything except row 29 should be done at this point as of yesterday.

Does that make sense? Are you editing it while you're going, or what are we doing?

JENNIFER BRYCE [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. I see.

JENNIFER BRYCE [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Finish that, please. Save the day, it's really important. Okay, so now on that last row, when do we think we will have a recommendations section? Since it's probably not February 15th at this point. Just seems really unlikely. My guess is that we're probably talking right before Kobe at the earliest.

So, my guess is that we should do that something like the 1st of March. Does that make sense? I see no one objecting, so let's do that. Go ahead.

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. What I'm thinking is that we can start pulling together the recommendation section, and so we will at least have those to look at, and as each other piece finishes, we'll add them to that recommendations section. So yes, you're right, we won't have the

whole recommendation section, but I think we will have those, because I was going to give myself an action item to start that Google doc.

No, Jennifer, I was thinking the start date was 1 March. Call it two weeks for people to just do it. Yeah, good. Alright. Boban, you're way closer to this than I am. Can you give us some guesses on the percentages here? Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that last one, we should stagger a week out, so push it to begin on the 19th of May.

BOBAN KRSIC: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Okay, Eric, your turn for the [inaudible] section.

DENISE MICHEL: Can I just note? So each workstream has additional questions that they've sent in to staff. Would it be helpful to just add that line into each workstream, additional questions asked of staff on X date? And then have a projected goal date of when we could get them back? And I think the chairs talked about some things we can do to raise this, getting answers to the questions, raise it higher on the priority list and put some specific delivery dates around it. It might help if we worked

that into each workstream as well to call that out. Or what do you think?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So in this case, it's actually a sub-bullet on conduct relevant interviews, right?

DENISE MICHEL: I changed that to, "ask staff questions and conduct interviews as appropriate."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [Yes, but the bullet before, I was hung up on that. Before, it was] review, analyze and summarize relevant documentation and touch based on the current status, etc. I thought that was where we were going to be getting documentation stuff back as our question.

I don't care where we put it, but in my mind, for the Work Stream 3, wherever that is, that item can't be 100%, right? Because we have outstanding questions. Yeah, so we should have to pick where that's going to be.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So, I think we should add a row that basically says follow-up questions, because in every case, they're not the first time we're talking about it or investigating it, and the difference is that column E is going

to be ICANN Org who's responsible, right? And that's why I wanted it a different row. I didn't know how else to capture that.

JENNIFER BRYCE

So, should I put "provide answers to follow-up questions?"

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yeah, "answer follow-up questions" is even better. So, we're going to have those questions on Thursday. That's the plan, right? So, let's say we'll get them out to them on Friday, assuming there'd be some minor edits to what we're presented on the call, and give them two weeks. Does that make sense? Okay.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah, and I think asking for a specific and close in turnaround date, if there is a question that they don't understand, I think our work has also suffered from hearing on some questions after, say, ten months, that they don't quite understand the questions. So, I think we need to be really explicit about we would like to hear back. And also [gets back] the option of perhaps getting on the phone and talking through a whole number of issues if that would help speed things up.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Makes complete sense to me. Okay. Eric, now it's the [inaudible] stuff.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I'm just pulling up the document we did yesterday, trying to find the link real quick.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And I had a similar [inaudible].

I love the future when it's got negative days.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I'm just looking through what relevant documents we outlined in there, and trying to get a gut check on whether we feel like we've reviewed them all.

Okay. So, my personal opinion is that – and subject to the group's perspective – “review, analyze and summarize relevant document, touch base with current status of workstream,” we should probably put that about 90%, because there was SAC 74 that came up a bunch of times, and Scott found a NIST SP 800 document that I don't think we'd all sort of looked at. And I don't think we probably have to do a lot of heavy lifting there, but I'd say a review of that is probably worthy. So, like 90%, and I think we can probably give ourselves a week to do that as a deadline.

And then “conduct investigation of identified object,” in regards to the stuff that we were outlining just yesterday, I'm not sure that we're in the same boat as the ICANN on SSR and SSR1 where we put them at 100%. So, I feel like we're probably most of the way there. I think a lot of us have a lot of time in the system on this one. So, do we feel like we're mostly there with just a little bit of leftover work to do, high

percentage number, or do we feel like we've got a ways to go? Anyone have any thoughts?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, my concern there is that we won't even have the questions form this until Thursday, and that's when people do their work, so I don't see how we could be more than 75.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, that's fine. I'm happy to put 75 there. But sort of part and parcel of that is it might be hard to estimate a reasonable completion date until we get those questions [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's where I was going, but so let's guess that we're going to be somewhere around 1 April. Just guessing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sounds good. I don't think we've outlined any interviews to have at this time, which doesn't mean we won't have any, but I think in the event that we come up with interviews, subject to the availability of the interviewee, [what we can do is] we just say hopefully we'll do it by the end of Kobe. If we can't track them down before then, we may find them there, so maybe we can put that – I think that would be a 0%, right? Done no interviews?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, sure, but it's already at 30. I wouldn't want to back that up.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So just leave it at 30, but push it to the end of Kobe.

So, I think the same dates should be for the follow-up questions, except that we're not going to see any until Thursday, so somehow, I feel we maybe add a week. So, whatever the blue numbers were, plus a week on both ends.

Okay, so now we're just doing dates on the 0%^s at the bottom, right? When do you think we'll actually start doing that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We're probably not going to start drafting summaries until after we conducted all our interviews, so I'd put the start date after Kobe, which is the completion date of interviews. And I don't know what do you think is a reasonable objective for duration.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right now, it's a month there, so if we were to start row 51 at, say, 1 April and end at 15 April.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Which takes us right up to the would-be meeting that we would have that we just scheduled, which is a drafting meeting. So maybe just put it at the end of that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Since we may be drafting it in situ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

JENNIFER BRYCE So, for row 49, did you skip dates for that one?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, that's the one we're talking about now, so that one, we figured the start date would be after Kobe, and we just talked about the end date being after the meeting we just talked about scheduling.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, the 19th of May. But I would hope that the approved findings part could happen before that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sure. I think approved findings should probably happen by the beginning of the drafting, so it should be done by 16 March, and it probably starts after we get the follow-up questions, so start 22 Feb and 16 March.

Add one week to the draft summary note, so basically, we draft the summary note on the 19th. I think we get a week to turn it into draft recommendation. So, starts on the 19th and ends on the 26th.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Starts on the 26th and ends two weeks later, or a week later? I guess we gave a week last time. Okay, moving to the future challenges. We just got a good start on that today, really. So, yeah, so I was about to say that, please add the row for the questions.

We did the questions today. I think we should plan on them going out next Thursday after the team has seen them written up. And they're pretty straightforward questions. Either they have the documents or they don't, so it's kind of a, "Yes, here's the link," or, "No."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. So, let's just give them two weeks for that. Alright. So, given that, I actually think the dates down from there – we'll go back in a minute – need to line up with the ones Eric just gave for the last three

bullets, because they're coming in within a few days of each other in terms of the answers to the question. So, let's just copy those dates.

Does anyone think for [futures] we have any interviews to conduct? I think based on what we did today, we can say that that's complete today at 100%. I think the row above that, conduct investigation, there we still have more to do. It's probably 75% complete. But let's see if we can get that done in time for the – and let's make that the end of Kobe.

The square you have highlighted, end of Kobe, right? Yeah. And for row 59, let's make that the same, end of Kobe. No, you did the wrong one. Put that back to today. Go up two rows. So, row 57 should be "end of Kobe." Yeah, that works. Okay, does that make sense to everyone?

Okay, is there anything at the bottom of this after the IANA, which we're not going forward?

JENNIFER BRYCE

Russ, there's row 61, the summary note key findings.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I see. Sorry. Let's make that 19 May. So, 16 March through 19 May. That makes it line up, coming in after the 15 March. Right.

So, I'm really not sure how to update the administrative duties part of the draft report part, which is row 75.

Look at row 78, we don't have the workstream outputs that we need to do that. So, our assumption is we will have those coming out of Kobe. And I think that drives the rest of this table.

I think we just add from that, right? it looks like everything's dependent on the row above it. From that point, it's a waterfall model. So, I don't think we need to sit here and figure it out. I think Jennifer and I can just sit down and do those without the rest of the group, and we'll do that.

NORM RITCHIE: What days are we meeting in Kobe?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was my next topic. Thanks for the setup. So, I think what we're doing in Kobe changed based on this meeting. Our hope was that we would spend some time before drafting the reports and presentations, but we already picked dates, so I can pull those out if you give me a second.

JENNIFER BRYCE It's the 8th and 9th and the 14th, I believe.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The 8th, the 9th. We thought we were putting together outreach briefings on our recommendations, and then the 15th, we were going to take the results of what we learned and put them into a report. So, those are the days we have, and I'm wondering if it makes sense, given

where we actually will be, whether we should get a little bit of time in the middle there to actually work. Does that make sense to people?

Right now, we have the 8th, the 9th and the 15th all day, the 15th half a day.

JENNIFER BRYCE The 14th.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I [wrote] it on the 15th. You're right, it's the 14th.

So, I guess the request is, are there days that are already booked on your schedules, or are there times when we can try and get another time to work on the actual document? During Kobe.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not sure yet, council's schedule for the meeting [yet.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, is that morning or afternoon? Do you know?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jennifer, it'd be good if you could find out whether we could get just even a couple hours on the 12th and a couple hours on the 13th to just get together and make progress on the report.

I sense that everyone's exhausted.

Yeah, so I think we have to offer to do outreach, but I think we're at a place where we're not going to be hearing much. We're going to just say, "Hey, we slipped. We hoped we'd have a draft report coming into this meeting. Sorry, we're going to have a draft report in a couple months."

I'm not sure there's much else to say, but we can't not say that.

DENISE MICHEL: So, I think it'd be appropriate for us to work on a blog post in advance of Kobe, giving people an update on the status of our work, focus of our workstream, invitation to reach out through our public e-mail address to set up meetings or consultations in Kobe and that we will have several working sessions there, I think would probably be a good way to approach it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That makes sense. Jennifer, can I ask you to write the first cut at that?

JENNIFER BRYCE

Sure. I can do that. And then just for your information, we have put in a request for the engagement session, because we always do [inaudible] request in. It's the usual kind of hour-long thing that nobody [comes to.]

However, we [inaudible] and then we can [inaudible] and whether or not you want to keep it.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Well, if nothing else, we can talk about the five bullets at the end of the SSR1 section about why this was so hard, and at a minimum, that's reasonable stuff to share, get people talking about so they can figure out how to make it easier.

Okay, Norm, what other questions do you have? So we're supposed to have lunch in ten minutes, so I think that's the thing. We have, I believe, two other agenda items. They are the go over the action items and Any Other Business. If we can finish those in ten minutes, we can adjourn right after lunch. Or we can reconvene and do those two right after lunch. Up to you guys.

Okay, so we'll break now for lunch and reconvene in, say, 45 minutes.

So, before we get started, I just wanted to point out that during the lunch break, Jennifer and I sat down together and did the white part of the plan at the bottom. If you see something that we did that's wrong, please highlight it to us.

My plan is that we'll have an agenda item on the call on Thursday to go over the workplan and get just the consensus that that's a reasonable approach, and then publish it to the Wiki. So, I think it makes sense, at

the time we send that blog that Denise recommended earlier, that we point to the updated work plan. So, please make sure that we did it in a sane way. Thank you.

Okay. So, Scott's not coming back, and KC's not coming back, and Laurin has his hand up. Oh, KC has her hand up. Okay. But I think we're all back from lunch. Can we go ahead and get started?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE Thanks, everyone. Welcome back to after-lunch session of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, the 27th of January. The recording has now been unpaused, and over to you, Russ. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We have two things to do, Any Other Business and going through the action items and decisions we made. So, I guess we'll do the Any Other Business in case it leads to additional action items. So, we'll do that first.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a question for Jennifer, probably Jennifer. The attendance statistic you send, you remember last time. So, does it include absence with apologies, or it just include absence, nonparticipation to call and meeting? Does it include apologies, or not?

JENNIFER BRYCE

So, if you did not attend anything, then that is not counted towards participation. So, I believe in that one sheet that was shared, there were no apologies [inaudible]. So, an apology would be the same as a nonattendance.

We also do circulate or we do publish fact sheets on a quarterly basis for the review team, and those include data on apologies that have been provided, and those are posted to the Wiki publicly. But that particular attendance data did not.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Anything else?

MATOGORO JABHERA:

Okay, yeah. A question to Russ. We have some activities that will be done in groups [or based on the number of] review team working together to accomplish a certain objective, and with the reference of the history went through until the pause, I suspect that doing these activities in groups sometimes also read to the [inaudible] where we reached.

So, I think we need to say that each activity that we are doing is also representing the direction that the group or as the review teams, we need to go to avoid any inconveniences as we went through. I think it's kind of an observation. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, of course, I didn't experience that. I was put on the team after the resumption, but I totally appreciate your point. We very much need to bring the work back to the whole group to make sure that there's consensus for it.

I hope that goes a little more smoothly than it did for the SSR1 where we broke it up into people one, or sometimes as many as five, to work on a particular recommendation, and then bring it back to the whole group.

There can, of course, be disagreement when that comes back, and we'll have to work to resolve it, but I think that for the most part, there won't be, based on the previous experience. But once the information is collected and discussed once, my experience from the SSR1 is we don't want to keep revisiting it and revisiting it. Rather, surface issues, have a discussion of the issue, and then capture it and see if that is sufficient to reach agreement. And if not, we can of course always have a minority opinion written up.

I think that's all explained in the preamble text that we have agreed to, and the reason for agreeing that before we did the work was to make sure that everyone knew what the process was going to be. Does that make sense, or did I miss something in your point?

I did not pick a lead for each of the work items that had more than one person. I'm hoping that that can be sorted out within that group. If one is needed, they can either divide it further or work together in an ad hoc way, or however they want. And I think that applying too much structure sometimes causes problems, but at the same time, there

needs to be enough structure so you know what part of the work is yours.

Okay, Alain.

ALAIN AINA:

So, now that we have work assigned to people [inaudible] won't it be good that we try to revise our weekly call? Do we always need to have the group weekly call or sometime allow the subgroup to meet, have call? [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I don't think we know the answer to that yet. I think that we may certainly have topics like that. I just gave Jennifer a list of things that we need to cover Thursday, and they mostly have to do with getting the questions collected for the DNS SSR, getting the group consensus on the work plan, those kinds of things. So, we definitely will need the whole group on Thursday, and then we'll have to figure out by the leadership team reaching out to the ICANN management how quickly we're going to get some answers, because I think they need to know that at that point, they are a blocking factor, they need to help us, not delay.

Anyway, that's my near-term thoughts. I hadn't thought beyond that yet, but it certainly makes sense that if there's a hot topic and the group needs to have [it discussed,] to give some or all of the call to that.

Any other Any Other Business? Okay, Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE

Actually just put that action item from today, it says LA meeting action item, so it's really just today's action items up there on the screen. I'll run through them quickly, and please, as always, feel free to make any edits or additions. So, first of all, the SSR1 Work Stream line is [going to fix the initial today report] and recirculate the report to the list for a final review.

On the ICANN SSR on Future Challenges Work Stream, staff will pull out the list of questions that you all developed over the past few days. We'll recirculate those to the list, and then on the call on Thursday, any other edits or additions to those questions will be received with [inaudible] that we will get those to ICANN Org after Thursday's call for the SMEs.

On the DNS SSR Work Stream, team members who volunteered for each topic to think about developing questions, and I believe that will be an item on Thursday's agenda call. We will circulate the table of volunteers for each workstream to the list, and please feel free to add your name to any workstreams that you're not already on.

Regarding Kobe, we'll try and identify a couple hours on the 13th for you all to get together and work on the report.

Next face-to-face meeting, so I already did this, sent the Save the Date for 17th to 19th of May. The exact location in Europe is to be determined. And there's an action for team members to share any preferences for countries in Europe that are easy based on your visa requirements, and then obviously, the decision there was agreed to meet on those particular dates.

Other action items, we'll draft a blog post coming out of this meeting to highlight the team's progress, status of work, and invite SOs and ACs to reach out to the team should they wish to have a meeting or set up a consultation in Kobe.

Also, we'll circulate the updated work plan that we discussed today to the list, with the intention that you can all take a look at that ahead of Thursday's meeting, and then there'll be a call, a final call for approval on Thursday for that to be posted to the Wiki.

I would suggest that in the past, we've included our link to the work plan to the blog, so that would fall under the blog, and that would be circulated to the SOs and ACs and stakeholder groups.

And with that, please let me know if there's anything else that you wish to add or if I didn't capture something correctly. Happy to adjust. Thank you.

BOBAN KRSIC:

Thanks, Jennifer. Can we maybe add an action item to create a page that referenced all relevant Google documents? Because I have a lot of open documents here, and I think it would be easier when we know which document is the last version.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

That is what you said, right? You want a Google doc full of links to other Google docs?

Okay. I totally get that there was ... every discussion had at least five tabs open, so you're right.

ALAIN AINA:

We seem to be laughing, but I think this thing is serious, because we will need this document to be part of the report anyway. So, we have to. At some point, we will need –

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Right. They are referenced in the Wiki, but finding the right one at the right time is not easy.

MATOGORO JABHERA:

I remember in previous, we shared a number of questions to ICANN, and it got delayed answers. I'm not sure for the team leadership how are we prepared in case we share these questions that we have today and they get delays of a month, two month, three month, how are we prepared to make sure that the work plan will also be updated according?

Because I remember that was one of the frustrating, that [I really didn't have] [inaudible] of what happened, and we suffered because of that. So, I think it's better for the leadership team to also be aware on what action or how are we prepared to make sure if that happen, then the work plan will be fulfilled within the timeframe that we are thinking of. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're absolutely right. Vice chairs had that discussion at lunch yesterday, and so we should probably add [that] the action item was for the leadership team to reach out to ICANN management and make sure that they're aware of the impact on the work plan if they are not prompt in responding to the questions.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, a very good point, and we also discussed having requested deadlines for ... short deadlines if they don't understand the question, so it doesn't take them many months to come back and then only to come back and say, "What is it you want here?" And then a proposed deadline for actually receiving the answers. Yeah, it's a really important gating factor, and thanks for raising that again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Need to figure out who is the best place to deliver that message, but the answer may be up and down the management tree. But we'll figure that out.

Okay. So you added that.

JENNIFER BRYCE So we added a line to the work plan.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

No, the leadership team to reach out to ICANN Org management to make sure we're aware of the importance of prompt answers or we'll slip even further. That's all.

Okay, any other questions? Then I think we're done. Thank you. We got a lot done in two and a half days. It's kind of mindboggling, but thank you very much, and we really appreciate your efforts and your focus during this time here. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL:

And thank you, Jennifer, for sticking with us this whole time and helping.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]