BRENDA BREWER:	Good day everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 Plenary Call #73 on the 6th of June 2019, at 1400 UTC. Members joining the call today are Denise, Norm, Russ, Jabhera, and I have a phone number that just joined ending in 610, could you identify yourself please?
ALAIN PATRICK AINA:	This is Alain, can you hear me?
BRENDA BREWER:	Yes, we can, thank you very much.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	Naveed is here.
BRENDA BREWER:	I'm sorry, repeat your name.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	Naveed.
BRENDA BREWER:	Naveed, thank you very much. Naveed and Alain have joined. We have observer Stephen Deerhake, from ICANN Organization, Jennifer, Negar, Larisa, Steve, Charla, and Brenda. We do have apologies from Danko, Laurin, Eric, and Kerry-Ann. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please

RUSS HOUSELY: The first thing on the call is the status of where we are with the technical writer.

LARISA GURNICK: Hello everybody, this is Larisa Gurnick. As we communicated to the leadership team, I can give you a quick update which is the same status update. Since the relationship between the technical writer and ICANN has ended, we will find another resource that is available and well suited to do the work. We will keep the leadership team informed of the progress and are targeting to have a candidate profile to share as soon as possible. We understand the critical nature of the next several weeks, and continue to work very diligently to resolve the situation. Thank you.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Hello, this is Alain, can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSELY: Yes, we hear you.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Okay, good. I want to ask question about the technical writer. Do we really know the motivation? I think he said something politically correct

but do we know the motivation or had to withdraw so that we cannot take anything from that when we are recruiting a new technical writer?

LARISA GURNICK: Russ, this is Larisa, do you want me to respond to that?

RUSS HOUSELY: Yes, please.

LARISA GURNICK: So, the technical writer had worked on the assignment for approximately two weeks and the termination was based on mutual agreement, because she stated that this assignment would not work for her under the current terms and wanted to renegotiate the terms of the agreement.   That was the reason for the mutual agreement to terminate.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, this is Denise, could you put me in the queue, please?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: So, Denise follow me, can I do a followup?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Okay, so that means she is still unavailable for discussion? Maybe it's just a matter of agreeing on new term, term of the contract. She is still available or we are just closing that and opening a totally new chapter?

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you for the question, this is Larisa. Again, I am not able to discuss the details of this, as I'm sure you understand this is a contracting, a personnel matter. But we no longer have the option of opening that discussion. We will not do that and we're looking for a new resource.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Okay, thank you.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is Naveed, can I say something?

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, Denise is next.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Please let me know when I can speak because I am on phone, I cannot see anything, I cannot access Zoom.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I'm also on the phone. Can you hear me okay?

RUSS HOUSELY: Yes, go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. I think a little bit more background would be useful for team members.   The technical writer that we selected was unilaterally dismissed by Staff without discussing with the leadership team. We're playing catch up and gathering all the facts. We've asked that the technical writer be reinstated. The technical writer has provided us with all the background information, indicating that she is ready and willing, and her schedule is still clear to support us. We've asked that she be reinstated and that's where we are. We're incredibly concerned that Staff has dismissed a writer that the review team has chosen, and I think was working well with the team.

And of even more importance was that we've got the work plan that we're now behind on and a draft report that is going to be really difficult for the team to deliver in the Marrakech timeframe. The substantial amount of work that the writer was doing and is teed up for the writer to do is not being handled by anyone. It took about three months for Staff to get this writer on board. I've been doing this for over two years, volunteering my time. I don't know that with yet more extensive delays I can continue to set aside a substantial amount of my personal time to continue to volunteer on a team that does not really have the support that it needs. I'll stop there.

RUSS HOUSELY: Go ahead, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, this is Naveed. How is everybody? My concern is I think the dismissal put us at least two months behind schedule because the three days we spent in Brussels and she was on board with what we were doing, understanding the process, discussing all the recommendations, the draft one, I don't think we can have it unless we have another face-to-face with that new technical writer, and that is not possible as I see before Marrakech. In Marrakech we have to be one step ahead, like Denise mentioned. So there has to be very solid grounds to have it done, because it puts us well, well behind schedule. So this is my concern. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSELY: Larisa, go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Russ. Just to clarify, this was not a unilateral dismissal. Angie had worked on the assignment for approximately two weeks from 15th of the May to the 31st of May, and we're not even sure the number of hours, which we're hoping that she will submit her invoice, but it was a two week period, approximately. And again, we did not terminate Angie from this assignment, it was not a unilateral dismissal. Rather, she stated that the assignment would not work for her under the current terms.

RUSS HOUSELY:

So, Larisa, I have to respond that. We're hearing different things from Angie that are contradictory and so somebody is not being honest with us here, and it puts us in a really tough spot.

LARISA GURNICK:

I appreciate that Russ, this is Larisa. I appreciate the difficult situation because we are not involved in the conversations that you are hearing from Angie and then those discussions. I continue to not be able to comment on any of that. The information that I'm sharing with you is all I can say, given that this is a personnel and HR matter.

DENISE MICHEL:

This is Denise. So, what is not a personnel matter is that this is supposed to be an independent community review team. Review team through its leadership selected the technical writer, oriented her, and the team started working with her. We use the unilateral because Staff did not have any discussion with the leadership team before you initial capped her hours in working with the review team, and then dismissed her. There was no discussion before those actions occurred.

In addition to the team not having a technical writer at a very critical time in building this report and presumably we have to wait another three months to get a new one on board, and we've asked for our technical writer that we selected to be reengaged. There is an important process issue here, as well. Without any consultation with

the team, you've taken away our right to select the consultant we work with and to work with that consultant.

Taking actions without any discussion with the leadership team is what we call unilateral action. So there's an important process issue that's a problem, not only for this team, but if you're doing it for other teams, I think it's a problem for them, as well. I don't know that there's much else to discuss here, but other team members may have questions.

LARISA GURNICK: If I may, I'd like to respond to Denise and just respond to several things that you said, Denise. You mentioned that we capped her hours, that is not accurate, and as I mentioned to the review team leadership, there was a total number of hours that was agreed to and when we had an understanding of the hours that were necessary, more hours up front, perhaps less hours later, we asked Angie if she was prepared to be flexible, and she was not. So we did not cap her hours.

Also, you mentioned that there would be a three month wait to engage another technical writer, and we never said that there would be a three month wait. All I said is that we're working very diligently and urgently to get a replacement as soon as possible. And finally, you said that it's a process issue that we took away your right to select a technical writer, and we did not take away your right to select a independent writer, because once we have suitable profiles available we will once again come back to you for you to review the profile and make your selection, just like you did in the case of Angie. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so I don't know that there's much to be gained by continuing this, but we have all the emails from the technical writer, so the facts that she has provided us are documented. Some of the problems apparently, and disconnects you apparently had with the writer and with the review team probably could have been resolved if you had talked to the leadership about the parameters and hours of the technical writer before dismissing her and since the last engagement the technical writer took three months to actually get her working with the team, I can only base my estimate on what has actually occurred.

With Staff telling us that they were working as quickly as they could to get a technical writer, it took about three months, so that's why we're, based on those facts, concerned it's going to take that long because that's the facts we have to base this on. And again, the leadership team has asked that Angie be reinstated, and this is for the rest of the team to know, that's where we stand right now with the support that we need to finish the draft report. Thanks.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Hello.

RUSS HOUSELY: Go ahead.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes, this is Matogoro speaking. I have sent out my view through the chat and I will request that it will be taken as my contribution on the

issue that we are currently discussing.   Thank you.   [AUDIO BREAK 00:16:25]

RUSS HOUSELY: Is there anyone else who wants to speak who is on the phone? I don't see any hands.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is Naveed, I just want to know if the leadership has discussed about any delay in the work that this may cause eventually to the work that we are doing, how to deal with the situation now?   So, what we are planning for?

RUSS HOUSELY: Well, we've had this information less than a week and frankly we spent most of the time trying to understand what's going on. We heard Larisa say earlier in the call that they felt they can find someone quickly, but they have not offered a date.   It's really for hard for me to figure out what to do other than to keep going, so that while we do have a technical writer they have both the recommendations and finding text to process. But I don't think we would be in a position to make any kind of presentations until we have the technical writer on board for several weeks.

Okay, we've used 20 minutes of our time, I'd like to see if we can move on to the recommendations at this point. We do have about half the team on the call. So, sorry, Kerry-Ann just posted something in chat. Yeah, I think what Kerry-Ann posted in chat is similar to what I just said.

So, Jennifer, would you put into chat the Google doc that is, there's a link in the agenda. Thank you. So, since we have about half of the team, I'd like to know whether people have concerns with any of the words that have been put into the Google doc, and obviously some of this was just added overnight, so we'll have to go through this kind of step by step.

So, looking at the first suggestion, that is not new, that was exactly as it was last week. Same for Recommendation 4 and 5. Recommendation 7 has been edited, so if people would take a look at that, let me know if there is any concerns.

KC CLAFFY: This is KC, sorry, I came a little late. I'll have to go read the transcript for the part that I missed about the tech writer, because I'm confused with all that. But anyway, Recommendation 7 and it kind points to a larger problem I'm having with the text as it's currently written as it references Recommendation 22, and as someone who had to struggle to go figure out where the old recs were yesterday, and I suspect is going to be kind of long, I'm wondering if we're really going to have this reference Recommendation 22 and not explain what it is. That's part of my concern.

My related concern is that we've got this whole document, the review of the original recommendation SSR1 that extensively reviews what has and hasn't been implemented and our take on it, and then provides recommendations or claims that a recommendation is still relevant if we think it is. Some I'm wondering about how to streamline this,

EN

because I feel like we already say in the SSR1 they should go do this, that we don't think was implemented or had its intended effect, and now we're kind of saying it again here as Recommendation 7. Is that on purpose, or how is that going to get streamlined later? What's the plan?

RUSS HOUSELY: If you look at the CCT report there is a section up front that gives all the recommendations and they go into the findings, their reasoning, and then present each of the recommendations a second time. What we're doing here is just trying to collect the recommendations. Because once we see the recommendations, we believe that clustering them, you know, the ones that go together, and then from that we will be able to make the rest of the report flow. So, yes, you're right, right now it's two places, and I think again it will be in the summary but only once when you're explaining the whole process of our findings and what recommendation those findings led to.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, my related question is that if you do go to Recommendation 22 in the SSR1 document, it says, it immediately references Recommendation 20 and 21, which is also related to, I guess, budget transparency, but maybe not in the SSR, maybe not in the gTLD context, I can't even remember at this point. But my question is, is that going to get streamlined later? And there is a suggestion down below in this document about combining 20, 21, and 22, but I think that's ironically a different 20, 21, and 22, I think that's the new 20, 21, and 22, but my

concern is that the old 20, 21, and 22 are also perhaps being combined for the purposes of Recommendation 7, because I don't understand why we would have a gTLD specific recommendation about SSR-related issues and budgeting and transparency when we say the same thing about SSR in the larger context.

Now we might need to go back into the old doc to understand what I'm talking about. Anyway, my concern may be a purely issue or tech writer, and so it would be good if we had a tech writer, I know I'm not going to bring up that can of worms again, but I just feel like there's stuff going on that a single person who is responsible for bringing coherence to the document could handle, and we wouldn't have to waste time on the call.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, to make sure we don't use your thought, I just added a comment, should Recommendations 20, 21, and 22 be referenced here, just to make sure we don't lose it. And I completely agree with the sentiment, that is exactly to make it all flow, like I said, finding parts that belong together and cluster them.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, that's my only comment right now for this one.

RUSS HOUSELY: Alright, thank you for being thorough. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands, are there people on the phone that want to comment on

recommendation 7? Okay, hearing none, let's look at 9. I think this was added since last week.

Okay, I'm nor hearing anything or seeing any hands. Let's move to 10. That's the one that calls for a C-sweep position.

KC CLAFFY: Can we go back to #9 a little bit? I'm a little confused. My understanding is that we sort of have this exchange with ICANN on #9 about what they are to be transparent about, and I'm concerned that we're convolving two issues about threat intelligence, which is a pretty broad scope phrase and the issue of registrars that are engaged or seem to be harboring a lot of domains that are used for malicious activities.

But I think we need to be more precise in what we mean about role in distributing threat intelligence, and I think we also would need to be cognizant of that we already had the conversation with them and they've expressed their reasons for not being able to be more transparent about at least the registrar blacklist issue that has to do with proprietary data feeds. Otherwise, I suspect this recommendation will die in the sea of, we've already had that conversation kind of sentiment.

RUSS HOUSELY: There were a bunch of people in Brussels who said yes, but we want to get whatever is possible to get out of that and maybe there are other sources with some of this information that don't have restrictions, and they'd like that explored.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, maybe the recommendation should be more explicit about that, because if I put myself in ICANN's shoes, I don't know what is wanted here. How do I know this one is done?

RUSS HOUSELY: There was also an aspect of this and I can't remember who had the action, where some information could be released, but not right away, and I think that's why the periodic release was put in there.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, the first sentence needs some editing because it says, "periodic release of needs." I don't think that's what we mean there. I guess it's periodic release of information, but I think we need to be clear about what we think is actionable there. Is it just that we want the names of registrars that have a lot of abuse reports or that are listed in the blacklist? One of my concerns with the blacklist is nobody has validated the integrity of the blacklist, so if ICANN were to release a set of bad registrars based on proprietary blacklists that it can't share the methodology for, who is going to take what action and how is it going to hold up in court?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Hello, yes, I was the one who worked on Recommendation 9 and what I noted is that from the previous draft is showed that the recommendation, there are more extra information that need to be provided to guide the law enforcement agencies, as well as policy

methods. So I think the way the way the report being released, there are still a lot of information need to be improved.

So I think I also support the KC input that we need to find out the actionable items that we need to include so it is clearly indicated the activities what need to be done by ICANN to improve the recommendation. Otherwise what I spoke from the previous draft, the way that report is being categorized, it is not enough to guide the policy enforcement organizations and other stakeholders. So that needs to be improved, and maybe we can try to rephrase so that we capture that input. Thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Russ, to try to move this forward, do you want me to take assignment to write something here?

RUSS HOUSELY: Sorry, Steve Conte has his hand up, let's see what he has to say, then I'd love to give you that.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks Russ. Just to address KC's earlier point in the beginning of the discussion about Staff not having exactly about direction to take for implementation. As some of you know, I went through a first pass informally and provided suggestions and comments and stuff to the document, and I hesitate to do that every time there's an edit. So I'm looking and this is as an individual, not necessarily as the organization and I'll get back to that point in a second. I'll look at it and would try to

make suggestions on how to get it to a point where when there is a time for Staff review prior to releasing it, then we might be in a better place.

So, I'll do that periodically to the document cycle, but I think what I'd like to suggest if it's not already in the plan, is once the recommendations are pretty well baked, then we should give those who will be implementing an opportunity to look at these recommendations, because right now the visibility on these recommendations are small, and limited to a few number of staff and getting too many involved too quickly could further delay the process.

So I think you guys, from my perspective, are on the right track in trying to tighten it up, but before the draft is released to the wild, or almost ready to be turned into a final, then having that opportunity for those who will be implementing to be able to question and hopefully further refine the recommendation so it is implementable, it is measurable, and we can move forward in a positive state there.

RUSS HOUSELY: Steve, do you think that should be done before you release them to the community or simultaneously?

STEVE CONTE: I think simultaneous would be fine too, especially in the question of timeliness and everything else, I think that would be fine. I guess the main point is before it's a final and submitted to the Board and all that, the staff who will be responsible for implementation should had an opportunity to look at the relevant recommendation that they're

responsible for, and make sure that any questions have been answered that they might have as far as the implementation goes.

RUSS HOUSELY: So, Steve, in the original plan that could have happened twice. I'm not sure now. Once as just the summary of the recommendations and then once again when we have a draft report for the comment.

STEVE CONTE: Okay, so I guess I leave it to the team to determine when would be a good time to pull in the relevant, when these recommendations are considered baked enough, when to pull in the relevant ICANN Staff members to take a look at them so we don't get into an ambiguity that we hit on some of the recommendations from the first SSR.

RUSS HOUSELY: We all want to avoid that, yes.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSELY: Not seeing any other hands, so KC, if you'll take a whack at this one, that would be great.

EN

KC CLAFFY: Let me just ask Steve, since, I mean, I know he wouldn't be on point for this, but, am I worrying too much about this Recommendation #9 text specifically in the context of what you just said?

STEVE CONTE: No, I think the points that you raised are valid and you're right, I'm not on point for the implementation on this, and I know because it's still my team that will be on point for this, and I know that there has been some discussions about like specifically registrar data and stuff. I know that it's an ongoing process, but I don't have personally the words to suggest how to strengthen that recommendation to hit the reality of what's taking place through the evolution.

And so I want someone like John Crain, or someone from his team to look at it, because they're the ones who are actively working on it and in order to better guide the language on that recommendation that sort of aligns in this case, you know in some cases it might be different, but in this case align it with the work that's actually already being done to pull in some registrar data.

So I'm just using this as an example of how we can work together, because we're part of the community too, and so we want to make sure that whatever recommendations come out are, well, implementable, I guess is the key word, I know we said that before. But align with the direction that's going and where the budget already exists for moving forward with this.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, I see Denise's comment too, I'll go read that, take that into account, and maybe have a phone call with John or Dave and write this one by next week, or try to rewrite this one by next week, Russ. So you can add it to my homework.

RUSS HOUSELY: Thank you. I'll be sure Jennifer captures that. Alright. Steve, is that a new hand?

STEVE CONTE: No, thanks, sorry about that.

RUSS HOUSELY: So, moving to Recommendation 10. There's Kerry-Ann in chat, she copied some stuff, so we probably should wait until next time to look at that text.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, Russ, it's Kerry. Yeah, I've been trying to accept the changes in the Google doc but every time I do it it's not changing, so I'm not the best with, I don't know if I need to take suggestion off or anything, but it's capturing and taking across all the checks. So I've tried again to copy and I'm given the same result. I don't know if anyone else could have, I could read it.

RUSS HOUSELY: The way it was set up, so the idea was you do an edit, anyway that was probably some detail [inaudible] I'm not sure what the right answer.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just so you know, the text is, I edited and made the recommendation specific to having an officer at that level to coordinate security and security risk, so I just made the text a little tighter. So whoever can carry across with the edits accepted, I think they could and footnotes with reference to a document that I think we could include in the final report as a reference.

RUSS HOUSELY: I understand, okay. We'll have to have a discussion on how best to address the editing issue. I thought we had a plan and it was assumed that Angie would be there to do the editorial part. Okay, 13 was added since the last call, as well. I'm not seeing any hands on that one.

I don't remember whether 28 was here last time or not, so let's take a look at it. Okay, I'm not hearing any concerns on that one. 36 was intended to gather a whole bunch of different things together from different previous recommendations, so this is one of the ones that merge a bunch of parts together. Take a look at that one.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Russ, it's Kerry again, it's a similar issue, some of the text came apart but in the other Google doc the recommendation has been reordered in terms of the sequence of the list of specific requests that we would want them to do, and so I'm hoping that when it goes across it will be a

little bit clearer once we get it copied over. But I've restructured the order of the list.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, I'm not seeing anybody having concerns with what's there. And then down below the suggestion, there are some more recommendations. We talked about 39 last week, and there's a merge of 15 and 29 after that. So let's take a look at that. Okay, I see a hand, Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm okay with the text but the only thing that I was wondering is the second sentence starts off, "These best practices." I'm just wondering, when, I mean, if we're going to work with Staff to develop, then is there like a specific, when we reference a report, reports that have come up that we consider that our best practices? Who will be the determinant of what we are thinking about best practices.

RUSS HOUSELY: So, the discussion in Brussels...

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Where are we asking them for reference?

RUSS HOUSELY: Sorry, I lost the tail end of what you said. Well, I can say that the discussion in Brussels was that L-Root should be the flagship one

demonstrating how to use the provider root service and be there to take the capacity if any of the others were to fall short. In fact, I think we went so far as to say if all of the others were to fall short.

KC CLAFFY: We need to be explicit about that, because when it says should ensure that L-Root is capable of handling all root traffic, [AUDIO BREAK] I can't hear Kerry at all. [AUDIO BREAK]

RUSS HOUSELY: Kerry, we cannot understand you at all. Okay, KC, maybe Kerry-Ann can type what she was saying...

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I mean, I'll just type it in the document right now. I think if you really meant if all the other roots go down, L-root can handle all the traffic to all the hundreds of NCAS servers around the world, which is a high threshold, but if that's really what you meant, we need to say so explicitly.

RUSS HOUSELY: That is the discussion that took place in Brussels.

KC CLAFFY: I'm not sure it's reasonable expectation. If every other root is disabled, we're in a world of hurt, and I don't think ICANN is going to be able to save us, quite frankly.

RUSS HOUSELY: So what do you think?

KC CLAFFY: Well, that's a good question. I guess I'm not convinced we should apply rules to ICANN that we're not applying to the rest of the root server community.

RUSS HOUSELY: Yes, but I'm not sure we have a mechanism to recommend to the rest of the root server community. I don't disagree with you, let me start with that.

KC CLAFFY: Right, I mean, the other issue is, this goes back to another recommendation, what actually is that level of traffic? And who tracks it? You know, this whole thing is in play now with the whole hyper local root stuff, so this recommendation might get overtaken by events and I think we should be cognizant of that. ICANN has already taken on the work in discussing hyper local root as a specific way to mitigate this risks of the roots being DDos'ed out of service. So I think for us to ignore that and just put in this recommendation, they have to be capable of withstanding all DDoS attacks, it's not reasonable. It makes us look out of touch with other possible solutions and reality.

EN

NORM RITCHIE:	Yeah, this is Norm. Sorry to just barge in here. The discussion was not only concerned about DDoS attacks, it was also the fact that there is no contractual agreements with any of the root operators.
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah. I'm not sure how to, it's a complex space that I don't think we're capturing with this current working, I guess. I mean, handling all root traffic in the case of a DDoS attack against the roots, it's infinite, right? There's no way to invest your way out of being attacked by DDoS, there's just more machines than there are Necasts, there are more machines in the world than there are Necast servers. So if we want to say that ICANN needs to invest to ensure the resiliency of the root systems in the case of attacks on institutions with whom it doesn't have contractual SOA obligations with, we need to all for there to be other solutions than just that there is infinite bandwidth and capacity on L-Root.
RUSS HOUSELY:	You're right. Would you like to put a comment in the document, please?
KC CLAFFY:	Me?
RUSS HOUSELY:	Yes, a comment.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, okay, will do, right now.

RUSS HOUSELY: There's a difference.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, so move on, I'll do this as we talk.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, there's only one more to talk about and that's the one below it, Combining Recommendation 20, 21, 22 and 23, and yes, those are not the SSR1 recommendations, they were our earlier recommendations. Please take a look at that. Okay, I'm not hearing any concerns here.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, no, no, no, you're on 20, 21, 22 and 23, now? I think the memo I sent last week from SSR2 when you guys asked me has SSR2 put any time into defining of use, I sent back a memo, a link to a GNSO document from 2010 which went extensively into this community-ish derived process for defining abuse, and it's not consistent with the wording in this set of paragraphs right now. Specifically, I don't think there is any agreed definition of abusive naming or abusable naming, and in particular, GNSO document goes out of its way to say the registration of a name is not an abuse, it's the use of it that's an abuse, or some use of it that's an abuse.

So I don't know what abusive naming means or abusable naming, and if we're going to introduce those terms, we need to define them and probably cite some other definition, I can write it in the document too, Russ. No, I think this one is far from ready, because we have to be really precise about what it is we want stopped, and presumably cite somebody else that's' come up with it, if there is some other source of a definition or say that this needs to have a definition, because it still doesn't have one, which I'm not sure we can do that, but in any event, this one needs more discussion.

So, I see we've sort of defined it here, sorry to speak too fast, "including but not limited to," but I think that we probably need to at least say again, in the context of ICANN being able to know when they've implemented this, we need an exhaustive list of everything we know about. My comment earlier which seems to have disappeared on "visually indistinguishable" is who is going to decide that they're "visually indistinguishable?" We've got that phrase in quotes, which means we should define what we mean by it.

RUSS HOUSELY: I think that's a situation where the findings text is going to help a lot, but I do think you're right about having to align with other documentation on abuse, and you're right, the registration of something that is "visually indistinguishable" isn't the problem until someone uses it for phishing or something.

EN

KC CLAFFY: Well, again, I might push back on that. We might decide as a group that that is not acceptable.   Even the registration of a visually indistinguishable name by some definition of what that is, it could be considered something we need to stop. We need to recommend that ICANN prevent, probably SSAC might agree, I don't know where they are on that topic. But in any event, we have to acknowledge that as an issue, that, you know, this has not been declared abusive and we think it needs to be declared abusive and it needs to be prevented.

RUSS HOUSELY: Right, I think that's where this is going. We don't all know the answer here, and you're right, what's "visually indistinguishable" may actually be cultural. But there are some that are exact same, so yes, more work is needed here.

                     We are one minute from the end, so I think we're going to stop here. Please finish the rest of the recommendations, the work of the team doesn't stop while we sort out what we discussed at the top of the call. I'll turn to Jennifer for the Summary of Actions.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you Russ, this is Jennifer. So, KC took an action to provide a suggested rewrite for Recommendation 9 by next week. The review team members are all to continue finishing and editing the draft recommendations and then I noted an action for Staff to copy the Google document into the SSR2 team drive and find a solution to the editing access at the moment. Thanks.

EN

RUSS HOUSELY: Thank you for that last one, especially. Thank you. Alright, I think we're done.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]