EN

KOBE – SSR2 Review Team Face-to-Face Meeting Day 3
Thursday, March 14, 2019 – 09:00 to 13:15 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

JENNIFER BRYCE: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to day three of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting at ICANN 64 in Kobe. Appreciate you all being here, because I know it's been a long week. My name is Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Organization. I'll go around the table. To my right, please, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org.

ZARKO KECIC: Zarko Kecic.

BOBAN KRSIC: Boban Krsic.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Kerry Ann Barrett.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

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.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric Osterweil.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger.

RAMKRISHNA PARIYAR: Ramkrishna.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Scott McCormick.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Naveed Bin Rais.

DENISE MICHEL: Denise Michel.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. And Steve Conte is joining us online in the Adobe Connect room. We have no other observers or attendees in the room at the moment. We have apologies from KC. Please

remember to state your name into the microphone before speaking and remember that the session is being recorded. And with that, I'll hand it over to you, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The first thing on the agenda is the welcome. We're done with that. The next thing is planning for the report writing. There's a couple things I want to do regarding that. One is to share an idea for organization, and the second is to walk through the table that we have with the three open Work Streams and each of the topics, we have a leader there, and find out where we are, what we need and what has already been done. Please, Danko, please join us. We just went around the room and introduced ourselves. So, would you please add our alternate board liaison to the list of people who are attending today?

So if you could please put up the slide with the five pillars of the strategic plan. There we go. So, one of the things that I took away from the session we had with the board caucus was the recommendations need to clearly tie to ICANN's objectives. And if you look at these, the number one objective is completely SSR-related. So I think that basically helps us organize the way we present our recommendations. I don't think it changes the recommendation itself. But tying it to effectively achieving the

goals that ICANN has already set for itself seems like a good way to organize the report.

I wonder how you feel about that and what other takeaways from the caucus session you want to share.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Russ, I agree with you. I'd probably make one recommendation in terms of how we structure the report to tie it back to that. At the end, what I'll probably recommend is that however we do the structure of the recommendation and the report, at the end, we could have a table that actually does the mapping where you'd have all the recommendations in order, and then we'll have a column that says "Correlates with strategic objective one, two, three" so anyone who looks at it would have a key. I don't think we should necessarily restructure to align under each [top subheading,] but at least have a key that ties it back.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That just seems to be a writing mechanism to do exactly what I was thinking. Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. First, to agree with you, I think it makes a lot of sense to align this to the strategic plan. The other thing I think is important is to

make very clear recommendations, essentially provide a quick explanation in the recommendation what we want to do, as in, in accordance with strategic objective whatever, and due to X or because of X, we recommend ... so it's very clear what we want and why.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Sorry, Laurin, can you explain that last part? The what you have and why. Can you just restate it?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, to just have two things. We essentially say, "Why is it aligned to the plan, and also why is it important?" For example, what is the end the recommendation is supposed to achieve, and/or why do we give that recommendation. So, something like we want to increase the security of the domain name system, then we have an issue, so we name the issue. We give a recommendation and we say what we think that recommendation should achieve. Does that make sense? Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, what I think you said using different words is, have the recommendation include the desired outcome.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Let me just pull up a recommendation. I'm opening the draft document, give me a second. Something that's short. Okay, so for example, ICANN should provide support [for] development of a suite for DNS regression testing, including configurations. That's what we currently have.

What I think we should do is say, "What's the issue this is supposed to address? What is the outcome that that recommendation should have?" So for example the issue is that we don't know what the behavior is that is the problem and that might impact on the security of the domain name system or its stability. And the outcome would be that you can test these things and therefore you're helping pillar number one of the strategic objectives.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Any other takeaways from the board caucus session? Go ahead, Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: On these strategic objectives, could you either share the link to that document or scroll down? Because it looks like there's more detail. Can't talk today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What it does next is it walks through each of those five, and there's a slide explaining it.

NORM RITCHIE: Some more detail?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, could you post the link then for that?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I just unsynced it so you should be able to scroll down. I'll certainly share these slides with the list.

NORM RITCHIE: Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Going once. Going twice. Okay. Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: Hi. One thing is that we have to decide how much cost is referenced or how much cost we need to implement the recommendation. And I'm not sure if we are able to do that, so I have concerns to say, "Okay, we need resources, we have to define a number" or what else, and what then the way is to decide at the ICANN board side what to implement or what not to implement. And these are my concerns from yesterday's outcome, because we have no information about it, I have no idea how to … I can say only minor or major cost, and that's it. Nothing else. But it's not quantitative, it's only qualitative result, and that's it. And I'm not sure if it's enough at the end when we have there, I don't know, 50 recommendations, or let's say when we have only 30 recommendations, and 20 of them are major costs and only 10 are minor, that means at the end that we only with implement the 10? Or the 10 with the most appropriate risk to the organization? Because there is no risk-based approach in cherry picking these recommendations, and these are my concerns.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I had a thought about that, and then Denise. I think that where there's dependencies among the recommendations, we need to be clear that if you implement this one, don't do it without

implementing that one. Either that, or merge them into a single recommendation so that regardless of the cost, we don't end up with silly implementation. Denise, then Laurin.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I think where we left this with Cherine and the board is it's the board's responsibility, I think, to go away and do some serious thinking about how all of this gets integrated. Until a recommendation is made and staff directs the staff to come back to them with an implementation plan and proposed budget, only then will you know really how much the recommendation will cost. And even then, we don't have the full responsibility and visibility into everything the ICANN board oversees and the ICANN Org pays for. If they want to give us responsibility for saying, "We prioritize this over all of these other things in ICANN," but that's not our job, it's their job to do it in consultation with the community.

So I think in my personal view, it's our job to come up with what we think are the most important and impactful recommendations, and it's the board and community's job to cost those out and factor that into their ongoing budget and strategic planning. So, can we help around the margins? I think we should always be mindful of, is there a less costly way of having impact in a particular area? I think we should be aware of

that and have those conversations perhaps, but if we feel strongly that something should be done, I don't think the expense of it should cause hesitancy on our part, I think, is where I ended up after that conversation. But I'm interested to hear other people's views as well.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is something I already mentioned to some of you in private. Essentially, I think what we need to do is create kind of different mappings of the recommendations. One of the things I was thinking about would be like a mind map style where we essentially say, "Look, this recommendation that is part of the DNS SSR Work Stream is linked to a recommendation we have in the ICANN SSR Work Stream, so it is very apparent right away how these things belong together."

And in terms of process, I think we have to, probably in Brussels, take each recommendation, look at it and see how we can best combine different issues, or in some cases, we might have to pull things apart and actually make one recommendation into two recommendations.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Boban, I had the same concern. I think where I got to when I left the meeting is I think as a team, we look at the issues, as you said,

from a risk-based approach, prioritize them based on the risk that we've identified, some of them may not be possible for cost, and I think to be attached even when we're completed with our recommendations, because many of them could involve the community. That may be a cause for the community, not necessarily for ICANN Org.

So I think it's necessary that we not – like I have decided whenever we go back to this that I will not be thinking about it in terms of cost factor. I'll be thinking in terms of risk. And having done that, I think the six-month hiatus that they'll have once they've submitted the report, that's the time that if they want to look at the risk, match it against the cost and see what risk is tolerable for them as ICANN Org, and what risks are intolerable and what cost needs to be attached to it immediately. I think it's a board decision, it's not a decision for the team to make.

I think with any board that we advise, all of us in our technical capacities for our different organizations, it's the same approach.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I think this is what I mentioned yesterday meeting as well. I think the reason for putting the recommendations at pending state is not only the cost, and this is what we need to analyze, what caused that to be pending. Because even as I mentioned yesterday, the recommendations that they accept are also

subject to cost and implementation feasibility. So, maybe there are some other factors that we are missing that resulted in making those other recommendations pending. So I just want the review team to consider whether we need to analyze those factors and plan our activity accordingly, because we are just thinking on the cost perspective, but I don't think the cost was the only reason why they put all that to pending, because I repeat, what they accept is also subject to the cost analysis. That's what they have written in their resolution.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry, I forgot to mention the stuff on risk. So, Kerry Ann, Boban and myself had a long discussion about that. I think why it's also important to kind of really push this approach is because risks, threats, whatever might change, and then the financials are important. So if, say, we give free recommendations and one of them actually becomes more and more pertinent due to developments in the future, it would be appropriate to spend more money on that and less on the other two. But that only works if this risk-based approach is being used. And then it also allows ICANN Org or whoever is doing that recommendation to say, "Look, we did an analysis, this actually increase and this is why we spent money on this one more than on that one." So I think it's also good for that, actually.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, that's main point, Laurin, that we have to do analysis of risk and impact of each recommendation. So our findings are the most important information for board and community, what we have done and why that recommendation is important to be implemented. And after that, they'll be able to prioritize all recommendations and decide, go or no go after that. Cost, we can estimate time and resources that should be required for implementing each recommendation, but I wouldn't go that way.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Zarko, I'm not sure if we misunderstood each other. I was just trying to say, not that we necessarily do this, but if we recommend ICANN uses this risk-based approach, and then because there will be time between us saying, "Do this, this and that," and what will happen, but it's more that they can change priorities after we're done if the situation changes based on a risk-based approach. That was the only thing I wanted to say, not that we necessarily do that analysis for them right now.

ZARKO KECIC: I'm sorry, Laurin, but if we want to recommend something, we need to do analysis, or our recommendations will be just, "Oh, we think that's the risk." So we have to do analysis, and we have to write that down clearly so community and board know what and why we are doing that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, Zarko, completely agree. I just was referring to activities after that happened. Obviously, we need to do this at this point in time, but we don't know how the situation might have changed in two years' time. So the only thing I'm saying is if ICANN was using this risk-based approach, they could make appropriate adjustments. I'm not saying we're not doing that. I think we should. This is just in the future, not for us.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Zarko, I think what Lauren is not saying, what he's not explaining is we've done the analysis, but there's a specific recommendation we drafted yesterday that asks them, in addition to what we've done, to continue doing this using a risk-based approach. I think that's why [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but Kerry Ann and Laurin, we are talking about our recommendations and our part. So, our part has to be clear and

it has to have findings in that. What will happen after that, that's out of our reach. And I agree that it should be continuing process and they will implement some things immediately and some things for implementation later. And maybe it will not be important at that point of time. That's out of our reach, so how they will approach, that's another thing. But we have to have our clear findings, our approach, why we are doing that, and what are outcomes.

DENISE MICHEL: Zarko, I agree with you, and I would note that the CCT review did a good job of exactly that and provide a very good model for this team to follow, notwithstanding the board's response to their recommendations. They have very clear recommendations, they have very clear findings, they have substantial analysis backed up by research, and much input, and they actually provide, I think, a good template for us to consider following.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but that's that part that I would like to see in our report, written or just we do internally and implement that based on analysis that we did. We can do high-level assessment of how much resources and how much work will be needed to implement each recommendation.

So based on that and based on expected impact, we can decide, are we going to put that recommendation into writing or just mention that as something that may be done, but it is not that important or will require a lot of resources and findings.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So yes, just to say, Zarko, I completely agree with you. I think we just had a misunderstanding. We definitely need to do that, and that's completely fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin? Okay. Are we ready for the next topic? Okay. Jennifer, would you please put up the table? So what I would like to do is walk through each of the Work Stream tables. We have a bold name of the people working on that one, and answer two questions. Where are we in completing that topic, and what else needs to happen for us to be ready in Brussels to put that to paper?

So, the first one, Noorul has the lead on. Actually, all three of them are not here. Is there anyone who can talk to this one? If not, I think it falls to Boban as the Work Stream leader. Go ahead, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just as a note, we actually discussed this part of yesterday's discussions, and there is a draft recommendation on this already.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I see we have one outstanding question as well, so I'm sure we need that response to be finished. Go ahead, Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: Hi. Not really. I think also with this recommendation that we drafted yesterday, we touched this whole topic, [inaudible] related to number one. And hopefully, we will get the answer to this question, but if not, we will assume that it's not implemented and that's it. So that's the way how we would like to proceed.

Also with topic number two, ICANN's business continuity management, we also started drafting a recommendation yesterday. All 18 questions are still outstanding, so I hope that we will get the answer until the end of March. If not, then we will go through this question and recommend regarding to these questions two or three recommendations, how to implement it. That's the way how we would like to do it, to have it ready in Brussels, [to say, okay, they are the final recommendations] regarding information security management, business continuity management, and at the end, also risk management, but Laurin will say something about it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My memory is the latest date on questions that we have is 31 March, but we just send some questions this week which we don't have dates for yet. Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: I just wanted to add that I was part of the team which was working on ICANN SSR, and I don't see my name anywhere. I was working on business continuity and risk management methodology, so I'd ask who is adding names.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jennifer, would you add his name there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin, number three, please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Number three, yes, so this is essentially an outcome of the same meeting Kerry Ann, Boban and I had yesterday, and it is actually an integrated recommendation with number one at this point in time. There are seven answers outstanding. Well, hopefully, we'll have them all by the end of this month, which will inform further writing, but right now, we have started drafting.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Scott, number four.

NORM RITCHIE: I have not gotten a chance to start on this yet. Surprise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, this isn't the mid-October thing, is it?

NORM RITCHIE: No. This is [finding time.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Good. Alright, so could you please – I realize there's nine outstanding questions, but if we can get started on the parts that are not related to those and start putting them into Google docs, that would be helpful so that we can, coming out of Brussels, really have something.

NORM RITCHIE: Got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Number five, just the other day, we added Naveed to this, and I know that this is the one that I have not had time to

work on yet. Kerry Ann, have you done anything on this one? Okay, so this is one that we have not yet begun writing. We do have two outstanding questions, and they are pretty fundamental questions, actually. So work to be done on this one as well.

Number six, Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. I [started on] this one and broke it into two parts. One is the new gTLD delegations, the other is transition, which is post-delegation. On the post side, we have to wait for responses before we can really write anything further about it. I think they are supposed to be done, or the responses are supposed to be on March 31st.

On the delegation portion, we have some recommendations, and probably some to give to other groups that don't really belong in this category. For instance, [inaudible], I think are probably better put towards security management than registry operations.

I have a question on this though. The prologue to this could be astronomically long, which no one wants. So, I need some sense for the correct amount of discussion and prologue before we get into the actual recommendations, because as you know, the application process, the typical application was 3-400 pages. The

guidebook, I think, was comparable size. And then there's all the other procedures that are around this. So there's an amount of paper and documentation around this, and we don't want to just regurgitate it all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Pointers are your friend. Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So that brings up a good point that I think is spread around a lot of this, which is that in a lot of cases, recommendations kind of need a preamble to make any sense, so that was some of the text I was drafting when I did recommendations. It just didn't make sense to launch into [inaudible] must do the following without setting up something.

So right now, I think we're in a tough spot because we're not writing the report, we've sort of separated the recommendations into a recommendations document, and my guess is we'll probably either put those back into the main document with some preamble text or leave them there as copies from the main document, but the main document, we haven't even started fleshing out yet. So my suggestion would be we do short preambles in front of each recommendation now just to set context where, like you said, Russ, pointers are your friend, but

just so you can understand what comes next, this is kind of what we're talking about, and knowing full well that when we start writing this report, there's probably going to be a lot of stage setting, a lot of background, and we're just not doing that right now, unless we decide we want to back up and do something different, would be my two cents.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if you look at the CCT report, what they did is they started with the list of the recommendations and they just set that aside and then they dig into the meat where they go through the logic that got them there. And I'm sure we will end up doing the same. Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think one of the things that I'm doing for example with the SLA document is to have, similar to what Norm was speaking of, the source information in terms of where I've been sourcing the information, and then writing the logic. And I think while it might not be a document that's in the Google share right now, I think it's something that each of us, when we write a recommendation, should ensure there is that explanatory paragraph, the source for all the research that we've done. A lot of it, I think, will be referenced in the Google docs with all the answers and questions we've asked for each Work Stream as well.

So I think that organization will come probably at the end, but it's just to ensure that whoever writes the recommendation that you have that background information ready to kind of slap in in a logical way at the end. And then whichever editor we have will do the language clearing. I don't know if that makes sense, Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so what I'm hearing is don't worry about it for now, just collect all the information or the pointers to the information, we'll sort that out later.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But more specifically, write it in a way that you can just cut and paste it in, because what I'm doing, I'm doing an introduction as to what's the issue, what's the sources, that kind of analysis of the data that I found. I'm doing footnotes with all the URL links to where I found the data, and then carry the recommendation over but have that background information. So when we do the report, we need to stick it in, it's there in the document that I have. It would make sense to put that one in the Google share right now.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: And just to express my perspective – and I'm happy to defer to the group – I do think there's merit in putting – at the risk of being terse – just a short preamble before the recommendations now. I

do totally accept what you were just saying, there needs to be proper discussion about everything that we need to say. I just feel like we do need to set a little context before recommendations just so that when we go back and start homogenizing this into a central document, at some point, we're going to be confused, "Why do we say that?" So that's just my two cents.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I just wanted to say I approve of this.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Agree with you totally, Eric. I think the example we have is how we did the SSR1 recommendations, because before each of them or after each of them, we have a short sentence as to the logic. So I agree.

NAVEED BIN RAISE: If you read many of the previous recommendation document and other recommendations that are [inaudible] generally, the prologue or this pretext before the recommendation is necessary to understand why we come up with that recommendation. So it has to come up with what was available, what brings us to that, and by no means I think we should think that each recommendation will have a pretext. It is possible that two or three recommendations which are similar might have a common

text at the end, which brings the logic of one, two, three, okay, this is what brings us to that sort of.

So we might have a pretext of each of these groups that we are making, but each of these groups might have two to three recommendations or one recommendation in that context. So it can be as long as it requires. I don't think there is a rule that we can make, but one page might be sufficient to describe why the recommendation was made. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So on number seven, none of those names are bolded. Was that a mistake? Did we pick someone? Go ahead, Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It's called shared responsibility. But no, I don't think we picked anyone. Denise and I spoke briefly yesterday just to see when we could probably meet on it. We're trying to reach out to someone from the PSWG to see if we could have had just a quick, short chat, just to see some of the concerns that they've had on the topic. That wasn't very successful yesterday. So I think Zarko, Denise and I will probably send an e-mail and try and see if we could get together soon, coming weeks. Denise, I don't know if we have any comments.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, we have a lot of information on this, I think, to process. So we should decide our next few steps. And there's still a fair amount of outstanding questions that we don't have answered, some of which I think are maybe gating questions to move forward with this. So we definitely need to circle back and give you guys a clear update.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, could you guys flip a coin and tell me which name we're going to bold?

DENISE MICHEL: I'll do it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you. Naveed, then Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: A quick question. KC and I have a call outstanding with PSWG. Do you want me to rope you two into that, or would you prefer an extra call?

DENISE MICHEL: What's it about?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: A few topics, but one or two of them should be pretty close to what we're talking about here. It's essentially their position on various matters, SSR, that KC and I started discussing with them, but then we ran out of time. So if you want, I can try to kind of just get everyone together. Or would you just do your own depending on what you prefer?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. I think we can include everything.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Moving to the DNS SSR table. We know that on the first one, the data sharing one, KC started some writing. We haven't seen it yet. Laurin, then Boban.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just a quick note, KC is not here, but some of that has been discussed while I was present, so this is underway as Russ said, and I think there are various links to other recommendations that we have already been writing, so I think it's mainly an ICANN integration game for that part right now.

BOBAN KRSIC: I would only suggest before we move to two that we get back to one and take a look at the comment to see there is an outstanding

comment from Laurin, I think. So if it's open or done or that we only delete it. This one over there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I had assumed that those things were raised in the discussion. Is that not correct, Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This was just me saying we have a lot of stuff outstanding for one of them. That was that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Number two, Zarko, on the business continuity and disaster recovery.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. I tried to use this conference to get more information, but that wasn't successful. So I'll write a few questions that we are going to send. There's not much information about business continuity and disaster recovery when talking about root server management and root zone management stuff. So we'll have to ask a couple of questions about that.

BOBAN KRSIC: You have a bucket of 18 questions as an example in the ICANN Org part, so you can only choose [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: What do you mean?

BOBAN KRSIC: When you go to the ICANN SSR stuff, there is a business continuity management bucket.

ZARKO KECIC: You mean to use your questions and resend them? All 18?

BOBAN KRSIC: No, not all 18, only a part of – only an excerpt of them. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Denise, name collisions.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Haven't done anything on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Denise, I'm happy to work with you on that one.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Would you please add Eric to that list? Thank you. Okay, root zone change management. Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Essentially, this involves three topics. I think I just do them [all one, right?] Okay. So Boban and I met, we discussed root zone change management, TLD label management, and whatever the third one – [inaudible] yes, there we go.

Essentially, we asked two follow-up questions because we asked questions about the general system, and ICANN Org replied about how they managed their own domains. So these questions have been clarified and resent.

Nevertheless, we have started drafting, particularly with the root zone management, we did some factfinding, some demo of how it works thanks to Zarko, and yeah, we have drafted some recommendations out of that.

ZARKO KECIC: If you don't mind, I would add my name to three, root zone change management, TLD, and nameserver DS record management. Especially the last one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Naveed, I know that your name isn't bolded here, but do you know where we are on the best practices and system hardening for L-root?

ZARKO KECIC: No, I just added my name this week on this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Fair enough. Okay, so please reach out with Alain and figure out a way forward. The comments on RSSAC document. KC has the lead. I don't know where we are on that. Do you know, Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric, the accountability and transparency part. Alternate root.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Are we playing buzzword bingo and changing names? I'm having trouble keeping up. I'm trying to remember if we drafted that. And while I look, does anybody else remember? Yes, I did. I drafted it out on the plane on the way out here. So I have a draft. It's been shuttled around, it's in multiple documents now. So that one, barring any feedback from y'all, is done, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great. Thank you. The next one is the SSR measurements, Kerry Ann, on the SLA compliance.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: There was a question that was sent to me on clarification as to what it was about. I don't think the clarification had helped. So I just wanted to check on that first. And then I know there was – privacy, yeah. Well, the SLA, what I've been doing, I've been looking at the registrar agreements, especially specification four and specification ten, that actually speaks to some of the requirements that would actually help SSR. And I should be able to draft that before the end of next week, and I'll put it in the document and share it with everyone. But just for heads up as to where it's going, I think it's more towards analysis that the agreements with the registrars, etc., it pretty much has the conditions and terms that it needs, it's just a matter that we need

to enforce them for compliance. So it's probably going to link to the compliance section.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric, propagation and delay on the measurements section.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: One second. Drafted, in multiple documents, subject to team approval.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great. Thank you. Scott, IANA registry availability?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: I have not started drafting on this yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you. And KPIs for SSR measurements. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I broke this into three recommendations. They're, again, in a bunch of our documents and ready to be looked at by the team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Norm, namespace abuse.

NORM RITCHIE: I haven't written anything up on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. And reactive versus proactive? Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. We've been sharing some data and information about that. Had a preliminary discussion and need to continue and come to some general agreement on our recommendations. We discussed several options yesterday, so work proceeds.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Cool. You want to talk about [big stick too?]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, exactly the same thing as well. We also had a meeting on that yesterday, discussed findings, potential recommendations, and need to continue with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: Correfct me if I'm wrong, but those two recommendations should be connected, and I would join them.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. We had the same thoughts. Same people are doing it. We are. Thank you for that. Yeah, we're thinking of it, I think, as one. Does anyone object to simply merging those two? No? Okay, good. We'll do that. Thanks. If we can just tick those two boxes about compliance and …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I'm not sure what wording I would use. Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. On that, we tried multiple times to get together on this topic during this meeting, and I think it kept getting bumped for whatever reason. [Just wondering if we should] arrange a conference call before the next …

DENISE MICHEL: I'll do that. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. The next one, Laurin and I got together on the IDN, visually indistinctive ones. Zarko joined us since he actually runs a domain with IDNs. So please add his name. And we drafted some text, and we have two outstanding questions. We know which paragraphs will be altered depending on how they're answered. So we're just waiting on those.

Alright. Software interop. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Laurin and I met with Paul Hoffman and we had a reasonably detailed discussion, and I have a bunch of notes. So there's a placeholder text in there, number two, high priority in the draft section. So I have a long flight and I have a laptop, and I'm going to knock that one out.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, just want to go back to the IDN ones. For the people that weren't at the tech day, there was ass great presentation done on the analysis of IDN domain names, so I think that presentation's available. It might help you.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. Okay, we've been at it for about an hour. Why don't we take a ten-minute break? And we'll do the future challenges Work Stream when we get back. Thank you.
	Could we get our seats and et started, please?
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Thank you. The recording is unpaused. Welcome back to the second morning session of the SSR2 face-to-face meeting. Russ, over to you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. So, we're going to continue going through the tables. I think this is important to know where we are and what needs done between now and the may face-to-face. So, the next Work Stream is the future challenges, and the first one is the coalescence. Eric, you have the lead here. First row, futures table.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	It's been a long week. I have not done that one.
DENISE MICHEL:	We'll be withholding your pay.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	That's right, homework for the flight home.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: As long as you pay me in Bitcoin, it's fine. I see we have six outstanding questions.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You do.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Cool. That's why.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Access to data information. Laurin, you have the lead here.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. So, essentially, this is also one that kind of was discussed in multiple sessions. It relates to the topic KC is doing on her own, is responsible for on her own. And I think, again, as with the last one, this is something that kind of needs integration and discussion how we can address it. But essentially, it is underway.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. The next one is new crypto systems. We divided that into two chunks, elliptic curve and post-quantum. The post-quantum, I took the lead for, and it's done. And the elliptic curve one, Alain has the lead, and I haven't seen anything yet. So I sent him a

reminder. So I know that AFRINIC has a conference that collided and overlapped with this week, so hopefully when that's behind him, he'll be able to do it. Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Since you mentioned quantum, I had to mention that the – it's a Russian scientist, they've said that they reversed time in an experiment. That was announced last night.

RUSS HOUSLEY: They reversed time?

NORM RITCHIE: Very small amount. I forgot the law. It's supposed to go random over time, but actually reversed and went back to its original state.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Could you send a pointer? Interesting. How cool is that? I bet it actually was very cold. Alright. New uses for DNS, including IoT. Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We haven't met any at all on this. I don't know if any discussion took place last week when I wasn't here. So I will get on it and try to organize them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Alternate naming systems, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Laurin and I had a couple of conversations, and I have some ideas on how to [inaudible] that. There's one outstanding question. Cool. I think we can probably make some progress even though there's an outstanding question though. I look forward to hearing whatever the answer is to whatever we asked.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Noorul has the lead on the next one, which is the root server system protection, but there's other people here in the room. Did anything happen? Okay. I'll ping him. And then privacy protections. We had an answer come back that says we didn't understand the question, and a clarification was provided, I believe. Is that right?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think so.

DENISE MICHEL: Remind me what that's about.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I believe that was like DNS over TLS and DNS over new transports.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Eric, was the clarification also the one that you sent in the e-mail to me? You had a question about what I meant about the GDPR and following up with decisions related to it, and I had provided that clarification. Was it the same clarification? Was it helpful?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We passed it on to staff. We haven't even heard yet.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, and I think what we realized was there's a conflation of question, so the reason it was helpful to have your clarification was that that question they answered, they were confused and about to bridge the question into a different direction, I think.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but I believe we have cryptography in DNSSEC, so does it [conflate?] Actually, we are doubling that question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, we eliminated the other one.

ZARKO KECIC: It is up there still.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. No, that one's the one we did. There was one back in DNS SSR, and we combined them and left it here.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. But I saw that. Can you go up, please? I saw in previous session. You remove now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We've removed it then. We talked about combining them, and then we updated the table afterwards.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. And I would add that we had a couple of sessions during this ICANN meeting and a number of warnings from ICANN about domain hijacking, so I would add that topic as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. To futures, or DNS?

ZARKO KECIC: That's nothing new, b ut it is important.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm hearing DNS. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think that's a really good point. We were even briefed on it here, and I think we had a number of conversations with resounding support for discussions that – one of the derivative results was talking about registry lock and stuff. So I think as existing mechanisms and with existing threats, we should probably go into DNS SSR as a recommendation around … how would you say that?

ZARKO KECIC: DNS SSR is good place to put that. And I have one question for the team, because there is SSAC recommendation how to do that, but

that's written, I don't know, in 2008, 2009, a long time ago. So, can we recommend to SSAC to do something or to ICANN?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I believe any such recommendation like that would get the exact same treatment. [inaudible] the board would simply forward it. So we can do that, but that will be the implementation we get, is they will forward it to SSAC and say, "It's been suggested you do this." Eric, and then Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: So the short answer is yes. I think one of the points that I've raised is that before the IANA transition when a recommendation from a review team was the implementation was responsibility of another entity within ICANN, previously, the board accepted the recommendation, explicitly asked the involved party, like SSAC, to address the recommendation, directed staff to support that particular activity, and asked for regular reports on progress and reports back. So that's distinction between doing that in a very engaged and supportive way and simply saying, "Here you go." But yes, we can recommend that SSAC address this again. But I think that would be a really useful discussion for us to have in terms of what our findings are and what we think would be most impactful in terms of the action to recommend. Is it SSAC saying it's been a long time since we've done this? Here are our refreshed

recommendations. But I think first, for me, it begs the question, well, why weren't those old recommendations about two-factor authentication and registry lock and some of those other things ever implemented in a meaningful way or supported and propagated throughout the system? I think it's a good conversation for this group to have.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, there are two ways of doing that. ICANN can impose some security requirements to its contractual agreement with registries and registrars. But we have next step, those are resellers and we go further and further from main database, it is very difficult to control all of that. So we need one thing to ask ICANN to impose that and there is not much cost except writing security requirements.

Another thing is to ask SSAC to write recommendations for entire community and ccTLD community because that cannot be imposed to ccTLDs.

DENISE MICHEL: I think there's probably a separate conversation we should have about brainstorming, but ICANN board could also incentivize the adoption of these by offering a fee reduction for example. It could do a number of programs to support and help ccTLDs in adoption if there are some that need it. I think it's a really good conversation to have, and I appreciate you starting that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think we'll come to this, but let's go find the spot in the DNS workstream to add protections against domain hijacking. That's what you were going to say, huh?

NORM RITCHIE: Mine was the same point as well. I actually have some stuff In my writeup. I didn't know where to put it and that's where it belongs.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Eric, why don't you tell us where to put it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can you scroll up, please? Root zone management zones. No, that's not right. root server systems doesn't sound right either. Not measurements, not name space. Is there anything below namespace abuse? Software [inaudible]. No. I think we would basically, need a new category for whatever these categories are

or are not worth in the long term that talks about SSR label management policies or something like that, or SSR delegation.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. I think in some cases, you're going to work on recommendations that affect everything. So it'd be like ICANN registries, registrars, DNS providers, because they're all part of [inaudible] infrastructure collectively. So they get actually, let's say, that endpoint protection for example. they could all get that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I propose calling it ecosystem.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So basically a new section. Okay, Eric, we're looking for some words here for the topic, and then we're going to want names for the middle column, and then I don't think we'll have any questions. I think everything we got this week is adequate, so let's put a zero there.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'll do the names, and that'll help us do the first column. I think the names should be Zarko, Denise, Norm, myself, and I propose Zarko lead it, which would allow Zarko to say what we should call it.

ZARKO KECIC: I would just put domain name hijacking protection, and we'll work on it.

BOBAN KRSIC: Jennifer, please add also my name there in the section.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Having finished the tables, are there any other additions that we need to make?

DENISE MICHEL: One thing we've discussed in the past, and just to mention it here as a placeholder, is some brief discussion and potentially guidance from this team on how to more efficiently and effectively run community reviews, or at least a community review on security. So just want to put that back out there. This is something that obviously with the suspension and different things that have happened, not only to us but to other reviews, there's been discussions here and there over the last years about ideas that would make this a better process, for both ICANN and volunteers. So I'd be willing to work with someone to put something on paper for that for future consideration.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I'm happy Denise brought it up. It's something that I raised with a few persons yesterday, that I think – and the team can tell me, as frank and honest as possible to this suggestion – we would have our recommendations with our background information, research, etc., but I think complementing that, we should probably write a statement that supports what Denise just said, captures what Denise has said.

I think all of us have had, at different points, various emotions towards the entire process we've gone through, including how the pause was handled, including just how members were put on the board, the NDA experience, I think, should be stated categorically in that statement. I think in terms of how calls are done, them being very specific in the calls what their expectations are in the calls, so when persons sign up, things aren't thrown on them after.

I think there are several things that have happened throughout this post-bylaw review that we could actually say to the community and to the board – the reason I suggested it being a statement is because that way, it's not subject to board review and approval, it's really us to the community and the board, which I don't think can be fettered. I'll try not to use any other

word, but I don't think it can be – it's our statement, freedom of speech. So I was just thinking that it's a suggestion I'm putting out there, and how I would go about it would be that we'd just all start thinking about different things that we've noticed, but that subject, a topic ahead of whatever the thoughts are so that way when we sit together, we can look where the topics may align and then pull the thoughts together. I'm willing to actually support that statement, and whenever we get there, assist in writing it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: When we did the SSR1 review, I noted that it was difficult to find things that happened four, five years ago. The way the website – like public comments just scroll off and there is no archive of them. So I wrote a recommendation about that. So I think we need to break it into two parts, what things are we recommending to help future review teams, and our statement to the community. Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I would state that I would probably object to a recommendation about process being included in the SSR2 recommendations as a recommendation, only because I think if we keep it clean to what we're charged to do, it can't be challenged or be caught up. The recommendations wouldn't be caught up with persons commenting on that. It may be objectionable whatever we state,

I don't know, but I'm just saying I think keeping it separate would make it cleaner. That would just be my gut feeling. Just make it cleaner so anything related to the process should be the process however we state that in a cover letter then, which from the co-chairs and chairs [would] be stronger than a statement for that part of it. But I wouldn't tie it as part of our recommendations. It doesn't fall under any other buckets that we have.

DENISE MICHEL: That's a good point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: However we organize it, it doesn't matter to me, but I think it's very important we put it there, and also, it is actually relevant to SSR3 and any other follow-up review too, because if you're supposed to assess what has been done and you're not able to find that information, you cannot do it, which means there's no accountability and [that'll have an] impact on SSR. So it kind of is related.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: What do you think about it when we talk to the other review teams that [pass] the process and give a statement from all of them together? Not only specific from us. So consult them, talk to them, and try to make it better as a lessons learned.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that coordination is something we can try, but no one else has been through a pause, so I think we may end up having to make our statement.

BOBAN KRSIC: But I'm pretty sure they had another experience. So it's our part to contribute the policy part and the CCT will contribute something else.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Indeed. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so I was going to say something very similar, but I was going to be more tactical. I think obviously, we'll get input from them and we want to incorporate feedback, but I think not because of any specific reason, but I think we should just take the lead and I would recommend we put together a draft deck of slides that we

will intend to turn into writing so that it's easy to share. And once we have our thinking straight, a rough outline of the things we want to say, the topics that we want to say, it'll be easier to go to the other review teams, past and present, and say this is something we're putting together, then they can help us evolve it, and once we have something that looks homogenous across us, then start writing on it. That way, it's easy to approach our colleagues and we can all do it together, but I do think we should take the lead and put the first version out just so we have a talking point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, does this rise to the level of a pseudo-workstream where we want to put someone in charge of making this happen? Zarko, then Laurin.

ZARKO KECIC: That would be nice to give feedback of our experience during this work from the beginning, having to produce terms of reference and the scope of work. We struggled a little bit with that, and that's one of the points where board were not happy with that. But I wouldn't put that into final report.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I lost that sign again. Whatever. I think it's an exercise worth considering. I'm not sure if we should start with this and assign someone to it right now or if we would want to wait a little bit to kind of do this when we have a better overview of the whole process, i.e. after brussels.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm happy to take this topic area as a work item and when the team feels it's appropriate, I'm happy to start collecting ideas and input, interfacing with the other review teams and then coming back to this team at the appropriate time with some narrative for you all to discuss. Does that sound like it would be something useful? Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And I think everyone has to start jotting down your thoughts, because I think by the time we get to the point of writing, the thoughts may be a bit muddled. So as we go along, just start jotting it down and when Denise does that call for submission, we're all kind of ready.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright. Can you put the agenda back up? So I don't want to go through the workplan in detail. Kerry Ann, is that an old flag?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. But what I do want to do is just discuss what changes we see happening to the workplan, and then when we get together in May, then we'll do a real update to the workplan. That way, it will reflect hopefully all the work that's going to happen, gathering this information that we just talked about, and put that together coming out of the meeting in May. Does that make sense to people?

Okay. Are there any adjustments that people think we'd need to make sooner? Hearing none, we'll plan to update the workplan document in Brussels. I think we have just done number four by going through the table, identified everyone who has something to do, who has the lead for it, and that the goal is to have it done in time for Brussels. Anything else? Alexander wants to say something. Go ahead, Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. I would like that those who are engaged in certain areas look around and to see, is there any parallel work on the same topics? I was surprised, a couple days ago, I was at RSSAC meeting, and I saw that they are doing some measurement planning. So maybe our proposal will overlap with their work.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I'm aware of a lot of it. Probably not all of it, but I think the recommendations aim to sort of – if this thing is already happening, then it's an easy checkbox. I don't think we're trying to propose a gap so much as it's not here right now, and if it's in process, then that's great. So I do agree we should be fully aware of ongoing work and efforts and whatnot, but I don't think it necessarily removes the benefit of making a recommendation that sort of supports ongoing initiatives. Does that make sense to you?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but in that case, we'll just have to think about less recommendations to worry less when board reviews and accepts that. I believe that RSSAC has power to enforce those measurements, and that's much easier for them than for us to ask

just ICANN so that they'll pass that to RSSAC or any other group which is involved in such measurements.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. That all makes sense. My two cents just personally with no hat on is that right now at this stage, outlining the things that we think are important and what they should look like is like the first step, and that we're going to do all these passes where we homogenize things and we pitch things out and so on and so forth. Early optimization is the root of all evil. I'd hate to kick it out now on the off chance that we want to say something about it later. So I agree, when we get to the point of issuing recommendations, if something is basically overtaken by events, then we may not want to put it in.

ZARKO KECIC: I didn't say that we stop working on some things, but just to get informed what's going on and to see if that's suitable in our review or just leave behind us.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Fair point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. One thing in this next steps section, I wanted to observe that Eric, Denise and Zarko took an action to make a pass through the SSR1 and coalesce things together and look at the recommendations and see if that can be sorted out, and basically do some quality assurance and fact checking as well. Go ahead. I'm sorry.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: A little correction, [it was me, not you.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Sorry, Laurin, Denise and Zarko. Thank you. So I just wanted everyone to be aware that that was going on.

Alright. Is there Any Other Business we need to do today? Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I just wanted to put two things to the floor just for consideration. I know we just spoke about making sure that when we write recommendations, we have the background information. I just had a question. Is it that the technical writer would be the one who'll go through to harmonize references, etc.?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Assuming that we have one in time, yes.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay, so the goal would be just to ensure that we document sources, etc. The second thing I wanted to put on the floor, just in terms of supporting our recommendations at the end, is I had a brief discussion with Jennifer off air, and I'll probably ask her to just clarify as well. What I asked is that all the questions and answers that we've received so far be collated into one document, excluding the SSR1, because we know that story. But everything recently. Right now, there's a Google doc that's called the LA meeting, but that document was actually tracking the responses. So I've asked her to just clean it and just to clarify that all the questions we've asked, including from [Alain] previously unrelated to SSR1 is in one Google doc so everyone could find it. And I think we need to consider, would this be one that's cleaned up? Will this be an annex to our report, or will it just be saved in the archives for reference for the community to check, should they wonder where some of our rationale come from? Because I think our rationale will include research and references, but not necessarily the questions and answers. And some of the recommendations we make may be as a result of an answer and not necessarily open source information. So I just wanted to clarify now as we write, how will we capture that as a source of information?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not sure that we … everything that we investigate may not lead to a finding or a recommendation, so some of these will just fall on the editing floor. Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Totally different point regarding the technical writer. How will we select them, when will this go down? Just so we're all on the same page. Negar's already reaching for the microphone.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: In terms of timing, we've started the internal process. They are looking at the candidates that have put in their names so far, and they're researching other candidates as well. What will happen is that the requirements that you guys have identified in your job description for the technical writer will be matched against the candidates received so far and the ones that do meet the requirements. We are trying to get a couple of options in front of you guys to make sure the review team is in agreement with the candidates that we have identified, and hopefully, there'll be more than one candidate that you guys can pick from, and we'll get the contracting process started right after.

DENISE MICHEL: How long will that take?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I don't have an exact time frame, but our goal is to meet the timeline Russ has put in place to have the individual contracted before May time frame.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there any other other business? Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just back on the technical writer, I had raised it, and this may be something that's obvious, but sorry for stating maybe the obvious. Whenever the technical writer comes in, the person may or may not understand our complete thought process, so I just wanted to make a recommendation, which I did to Laurin yesterday, is that whenever we do write and we start to collate the document, just to make sure it has the flow that we're thinking of, because I've seen too many times you bring in a technical writer and they shift stuff around and move it around a lot, and it loses the entire thought process.

So I just wanted to see what everybody's expectation that this person's really coming in to make sure that the language is aligned and focus on grammar and referencing and etc., not necessarily trying to interpret what we wanted to say. So just to

kind of make sure [inaudible]. Sorry for stating the obvious, but just want to make sure everyone [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: My thoughts on that are that we're going to lay the outline out, no the technical writer, so that it has a flow that the team wants, and then if they have suggestions as they're dealing with the actual writing, they can bring them to us. But it needs to be our report. They're helping us compile it. Anyone else? Scott?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Just for simple's sake, I'm going through the SSR2 work topics, I'm just adding a link to – because a Google link will work – to each section so that you don't have to go out and try to find crap in a folder library.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I think we're done.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I'm going to run quickly through the action items. Just before I do that, just to Kerry Ann's point about the questions. The document that you all have that is currently named the LA questions and answers, I renamed it because I understand that the name was confusing. But just to be clear, it does have all the

questions and all answers in it that have been asked at that meeting and forward. So you shouldn't have to go into e-mails and find information in your inbox.

The only questions and answers that are not in it are questions that were asked before the pause, and so obviously, there's the SSR1 questions which has its own separate document. I'm not going to touch that. And there was a number of questions regarding the ICANN SSR work. So I can add all of those questions into that one document, but those are the only ones that are not currently in it. So I'll take an action item to do that. That's my first action item.

The second one is for the second one is to update the workplan in Brussels, then review team members to continue to work on the topics that were in the table in time for the Brussels meeting. Review team members to think about lessons learned that can be shared from the review and to have a work topic on this area, which will happen in the future, but at the moment, just to keep thinking about that. And then Denise, Laurin and Zarko will look through the teams, the SSR1 recommendations work for quality assurance and report back to the team.

I didn't take any other action items down, so if I missed something, let me know, but other than that, I think we can finish the meeting. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: Before we finish, have we talked about the next ICANN meeting and our face-to-face meeting at the ICANN meeting, and if it's possible to block days? Because my schedule is so full for June, July, and I'm not pretty sure if I have time to attend the meeting. So I would really appreciate if we could as a team agree on one, two dates to say, okay, that's the time, and then depending on if resources are available to block it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That makes a lot of sense. I was kind of hoping we would have that discussion in Brussels just because we would know whether we actually achieved the goal we just discussed today. So I think we will have to revisit it if we have it now, but assuming we are successful in having basically the list of recommendations coming out in Brussels, I would expect that we would be briefing the community on this is the direction that we are going and we are in the process of compiling the report.

Our current workplan, we will have the draft report ready of the community in August, so if we're in July telling them basically

here's the foreshadowing of what you're about to see, that's what the current milestones say. Go ahead, Boban, and then Jennifer.

BOBAN KRSIC: Very optimistic, but my experience in the past shows me that it maybe will be a good idea to say only it's an informal block, so if we are in Brussels and we will not be at this part of the project, I think it's at the moment a good time to choose one or two days so that it's only informal, block them, not confirm them but block them to say, okay, I have it in my schedule and I know it could be something in June, and then [kind of let's] prioritize it [on my own.] So I would really appreciate it to say, "Okay, here we are," and if we don't need them, we can skip them. But if we have them, it makes it easier to schedule something around that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Makes sense. Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. So, the meeting in Marrakech is a B meeting, so all requests for face-to-face meetings need to be approved by the SO and AC leadership. We actually had a discussion with the leadership of the review team just a couple of weeks ago about this. So we have put in that request for a couple of days, the 22nd and 23rd of June which is before the meeting and then a half-day

at the end of the meeting so it would be much the same format as you all had here.

Obviously, once the request is approved, then you can use that time or choose not to use that time, but if you like, we can send a hold for people's calendars at least so that they have a date.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So let me explain the rationale for the leadership's thinking there, is that if we at the end of Brussels know roughly what the recommendations are going to be, we won't have a slide deck yet, and the idea was to use that time to put together the briefings to tell the community what our big findings and recommendations are, and then the half day at the end is to incorporate the feedback we heard from those discussions with the community. That was the general flow we had come up with.

Welcome to hear feedback on that, just based on that. Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Regarding the scheduling, can we for this meeting ask for sessions with the various stakeholder groups to update them and gather some feedback from them? Also in advance, as in in the coming weeks or so.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I would argue that if we get a bunch of 15-minute slots, that's going to be really hard to present recommendations. So it would be better to have those little 15-minute slots that say, "Just make sure you know we're walking through all our recommendations [in one] Tuesday" or however that works. But if we were to get a bunch of 15-minute slots, I don't think we could do our recommendation set justice. Go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think it's just a question of what can be organized. If we are going to different communities, we should definitely have more than 15 minutes, because to present recommendations and get feedback, we definitely need more time. Maybe with can try to combine it to like one long outreach session like we tried here, and hopefully there will be more feedback if we actually just show them, "Look, these are the recommendations, tell us what you think."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hopefully, it won't just be staff in the room. Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Considering that no one showed up for the engagement session here, except ICANN staff, I would suggest that instead, we ask each constituency and advisory group directly and specifically,

"May we have time on your agenda in Marrakech? We want to review our draft recommendations and get your input." I think that's probably a better way to go, don't you think?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Zarko, then Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Because you know I'll be brief. Presenting recommendations to the various organizations would [inaudible] understand when you present the recommendations pertinent to them, or all of them?

DENISE MICHEL: To all.

NORM RITCHIE: Everybody gets all?

RUSS HOUSLEY: My fear would be that if we tried to tailor it too much, they would go, "Well, you didn't do a very comprehensive job." But let them comment on the ones that are relevant to them. Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: We always can send them in advance so they can look at that. I just wanted to ask Jennifer to share again that contact list with Skype handles and e-mails of the team to the group. And I would really ask team members to do writing before Brussels meeting, not to do writing over there, and t o look at all recommendations and bring questions and concerns and whatever is correct for that. So we discuss not final but draft recommendations in Brussels, not losing time in writing that on face-to-face meeting.

So groups can work offline, on Skype, on private e-mails, and bring out recommendations during this period until Brussels.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I completely agree. If we don't come in with our basic ideas already formulated, we're not going to be making the best use of the face-to-face time. Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I support Zarko's suggestion, and I just wanted to make sure that the team was aware that I would not be in Brussels, but I will be working. My boss put a freeze on me going there. I actually [inaudible] calendar and he deleted it. So yeah, he literally did that. So I will be working, as I said, to make sure that whichever team that I'm leading, I'll try and coordinate and have all the text drafted for Brussels.

Just on Zarko's suggestion about Skype, whichever team I'm a part of during Brussels, since we may not have the Adobe Connect and since Denise indicated that I have been blocked on Adobe – just joking – maybe whichever team I'm a part of just set up the Skype call, and if anybody has Skype Business, I'll participate that way. I think that'll be more efficient.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there any other Any Other Business? Okay, do we still have a review team lunch?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. It's going to be a boxed lunch situation. It's scheduled to arrive around 12:30, I think, but I can check and see if we can get it a bit earlier if that works. You're welcome to stay in this room, obviously.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was about to say, and we have these little teams who are trying to get work done, so we have an extra hour that you can take advantage of that and get some stuff done. That'd be great. And I know Alexander really wants to say something on the microphone, so why don't we have that happen now?

Focus the attention, that's what it was. Okay. Thank you so much, and please, use the time that we have left to get further progress. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]