

---

**BRENDA BREWER:** Good day everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR2 Plenary #84 on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September 2019 at 14:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Alain, Danko, Eric, Norm, Russ, KC, Denise, and Laurin. We have apologies from Kaveh. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Negar, Steve, and Brenda. Technical Writer Heather has joined. I have no observers at this time. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And Russ, I will turn the call over to you.

**RUSS HOUSLEY:** Okay, the first thing on the Agenda is the Work Plan. The Agenda that Jennifer sent out includes a link to the updated Work Plan. Basically, what we did here is we looked at having the recommendations done in the next couple weeks, and then being basically prepared to present those recommendations at the meeting in Montreal, gather feedback from the Community from hallway discussions and engagement sessions, and then at the face-to-face meeting in January, finish the report based on what we learned from that. And then that will lead us to the public comment period, which will then... We have to incorporate those comments and then deliver the report after doing that.

So that is the basic structure that the Leadership used in putting together this update to the Work Plan. We wanted to share this with you and make sure that we didn't miss something that one of you could spot. And if there's any concerns with any of it, let's talk about it and my hope is that we can approve a Work Plan today so that it can be posted for the whole Community. So, has anyone had time to take a look at this and able to raise any mistakes we made in putting this together?

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, this is Jennifer. If I could just relay a comment on behalf of Kerry-Ann because I don't see her on the call. I just wanted to note that she'd made a comment in the Work Plan document on Row 76 Column D, which is pre-approve the draft recommendations for the draft report. Her comment says we should start sensitizing how we will obtain consensus on the final text. For example, by non-objection after a period of open review. Currently the team's rules of operation is by consensus, so in order to meet the deadlines, we could discuss this at the next face-to-face or whenever we have majority attendance on a call. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. My understanding is that the agreement before the pause was the consensus meant more than half. If that's not the case or if that's not what people want to do, we should talk about this at the next face-to-face.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey Russ, this is Denise. I'm sorry I'm only on the phone. I'm in transit. That is the case, though I think more importantly, after the pause and as part of our discussions and agreement on how the team was going to work we, again, this group agreed that [inaudible] where we're using the GNSO's approach to consensus and it was majority. So, that's actually in our work document as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was my memory, yes. So, okay. Are there any hands raised that I can't see?

JENNIFER BRYCE: No hands raised.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, then I think without objection, this is approved and if you guys could post this for the Community, that would be great. I'm just juggling my windows around and now I have to find it. Okay, so the next thing on the Agenda is to talk through the recommendations that have been added to the Google doc. The recommendations document has a link in the Agenda. This is the one with the red letters at the top of the front page.

There's updates that have been made here. The first set of updates are more than a week old and those are the ones that Eric made, and he sent a note out about that. I'll try to pull up the numbers. The first one was Number 3 that he made an update to. Does anyone have any concerns with the current text in Recommendation 3? Okay. Hearing none, we'll move on to the next one.

The next one was 24, 25, and 26, so those three are all blocked together. Have I given enough time for everybody to refresh their memory? Okay, hearing no objections to those. Then the Compliance Team has added findings...

KC CLAFFY: Russ? It's KC. I sent in some comments to the mailing list on my concerns with these recommendations and Eric responded. But I don't think we've got resolution on those. [inaudible] I don't know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know. Eric?

---

KC CLAFFY: I don't think these recommendations are...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, did you update that? I remember seeing a note from you and seeing a response from Eric, and I thought he was proposing text.

KC CLAFFY: And I never saw Recommendation 3 so I'm going to have to go look at the document on my computer but there was no Recommendation 3 in the document when I looked.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is Eric. So, there was a bunch of comments, so I don't remember them all of the top of my head. I only remember some of them, so if I missed some that are important to you, KC, then maybe it would be worth refreshing my memory. But there's text in here that evolved from the team, so I don't feel like it's my place to sort of add in or take out some of these things, like putting in the strategic goals and stuff like that was part of team discussions, etcetera. It happened after the pen left my hand and then it reappeared, then it appeared in the text. So, I don't think it's my place to add it or take it out at this point, so it really has to be a consensus call on the team, in my opinion. And I don't know what the thinking is on that.

And another one that I remember that you voiced was that there was a coalescence of measurements that made the suggestions more diffuse, and in fact that's why I had broken them out in the first place, but I got the impression that when the pen left my hand the team's preference was to coalesce trackable measurements into general categories.

---

And so again, I don't know that it's my position or my ability to go and just put back the text I had before. So, I'm not sure exactly what to do with that. I wasn't really proposing text. I was sort of highlighting that this seemed to be the consensus of the team, but that was done on the email list so if anybody has opinions it'd be a good time to bring some history into this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, my memory was that in Brussels we felt we were getting too many recommendations and so it was better to talk about those even if it had, you know, bullets of the kinds of measurements. So, I found KC's note and Eric says he's confused about what's confusing regarding needed parameters.

KC CLAFFY: I found the recommendations very not amendable to operationalization by ICANN. And I found them difficult for SSR3 to figure out has it been implemented and was it effective, because it's not even clear in the recommendation what is the goal that we're trying to achieve or the harm that we're trying to prevent. So, I think these are way too vague to be useful for ICANN and to be helpful for SSR3. And maybe the combining a bunch of recommendations into one isn't helping because it ends up looking even more vague and diffuse and not clear what objective we're trying to achieve with the recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, can I get Eric and KC to, in the next week, talk this through and propose some text for the team for next week? You two are the measurement people.

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, KC and I probably should talk. This week is a big deadline week for people in my world and next week I won't be able to join the call so if we push it out a week beyond that, it would make more sense. I mean I'd have more availability to be prepared to have a discussion if KC and I could find time to connect.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I have the same problem.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't really understand a lot of the objections, so it would probably be worth either now or on a separate call or something helping me understand some of the objections. I mean, also I'm not, there was a handful of things in the email so I'm not sure if we're broadly speaking about all of them or there was some of your particular comments that I should be looking at because I've got the email up as well.

KC CLAFFY: Let's go through them one on one. I don't have the email in front of me, but you guys can read it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so why don't you guys connect?

KC CLAFFY: Again, when you said parameters, I don't know what parameters you're talking about. It doesn't say in the recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: IANA Parameter is what it says.

KC CLAFFY: You mean...

RUSS HOUSLEY: It says...

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Which recommendation are we looking at just so I can keep up?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was in 24. There's three kinds of IANA Registries. One of them is Protocol Parameters, I think that's what he's talking about.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, so we should... Can you read the recommendation? I can't see it. Oh, here I see it. Was it 24?

RUSS HOUSLEY: 24, yes.

KC CLAFFY: And so, what is he asking about the...

---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: What we were asking was basically since ICANN, specifically PTI as it's IANA Function maintains Registries that are necessary, that those Registries basically have to be available and that that should be subject to measurement and quantification.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But the part of Recommendation 24 that that is about says, "The IANA Registries include many needed parameters that are specified by RFCs in the IETF. Their availability and integrity is paramount and needs to be clearly illustrated to the Community." So, I think he's setting the groundwork there for what do we need to do to measure the availability and integrity of the Protocol Parameter Registries.

KC CLAFFY: The Registries? It says the parameters.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, parameters are what are registered.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The Registries are sets of parameters.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, and it says there are many of them as specified in RFCs?



---

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: We have to go see which RFCs we're talking about and I think we should just list the parameters if there's only three.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's all of them. No, there's hundreds and hundreds of them.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. We should... And you mean each protocol?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, each protocol has a Registry.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so when you compose a Linux distro and for, among other things, you're creating XE Services. XE Services specifies which services run on which ports. That all comes from RFCs that are maintained by IANA. Which means that at some point somebody's pulling that authoritative information from a resource that is run by IANA under ICANN and that means that that has to be available online whenever somebody's creating a new Linux distro and an old Linux distro. Which means the ability for people to get that information securely and with high availability is critical but it's not being tracked anywhere.

And like Russ said, there's just squillions of these things. There's tons and tons of Registries. You can create a new Registry with a new protocol tomorrow and

---

it would be added to the corpus, the ever-growing corpus. You can also add new parameters to existing Registries with a new RFC. So, it's like this is an evolving set of important data that has to be available. It's not queried maybe as often as DNS Registries are that are used for transactions but that's, I think, how it's kind of been forgotten about. But it's a critical resource managed by IANA and we don't have any performance idea about how it works or how well it's working.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. And I guess I missed the conversation where we actually, do we have evidence that there's a problem that it hasn't been available when it's been needed?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We have no evidence of either, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. So, we don't know whether it's been unavailable or available. Nobody really does.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if you go [iana.org](http://iana.org), you'll see there's three panes to that. Domain Names is on the left, Number Resources in the middle, which is IP addresses and AS numbers, and then Protocol Assignments on the righthand side, and that's what Eric's talking about in this bullet is all of the links that are behind that righthand pane.

KC CLAFFY:                Okay, I think I understand enough now to go have a conversation with Eric about how to make it more specific.

RUSS HOUSLEY:        Cool.

KC CLAFFY:                Yeah, so on that one let's pass it to Eric and me for next week. I have the same deadline Eric does or at the same time of the deadline so we can do it.

RUSS HOUSLEY:        Okay, so let's make the deadline two weeks to make sure that we get what we need. Okay, then I would like to shift to the compliance information that was added to the document. It starts on page 17 and there's a whole bunch of findings that were basically in a separate Google doc and were just copied here, followed by the recommendations. And this was sent out earlier. Denise sent a note to the team that this was added. And so, let's see. Where do the recommendations part begin? There they are. Recommendations, all caps, underlined, on... How do I make this tell me again what page it is? I don't know why it did before and it's not now. I have no idea. There we are, page 31. Okay.

So, there's a group of recommendations that were added here based on the Compliance and Abuse Sub-team. I do not know whether people have had a chance to read this since the note went to the team. Can somebody let me know whether we need more time on this? What I guess I'd like to do is have everybody take a look at this over the next week and make sure that we're

---

ready to get close to final text by the call next week. So, I know the Sub-team has been over and over this. It's time to get the rest of the team looking at it. Does that make sense?

So, if everyone would take an action to read this chunk of the text and send comments to the list so that we can find out how close to consensus we are on these recommendations. The recommendations end on page 39 with the stuff parked below being the end of the recommendations. Okay? I'm not getting much feedback from you guys so I'm not sure whether we're on the same page or not. Alright, so a week from today we will have all of your comments from everyone on the Sub-team, or not just the Sub-team, the whole team.

KC CLAFFY:

So, Russ, again, I went through, and I spent several hours on this sub-document. I still think it needs work. I mean, I think a lot of what's there is great and terrific, but it needs work that I'm definitely not going to be able to do in the next couple weeks, probably not before Montreal, just to clean things up. So, I don't know if others on the Sub-team would be able to commit the time, but I just want to highlight that there's a lot of consolidation and kind of also making things more specific and I think that's need to be done.

And it would be great to have like a researcher and maybe some of this Heather can take on because some of it's like finding citations and removing redundancies from the document, maybe organizing it a bit. So, it would be good to have some external help with this is my view. Maybe the other folks disagree because I haven't talked with them about it.

---

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is Heather. Yeah, some of what you're describing is definitely on my list to do, to go through and basically do a good edit on it to make sure we're clear and consistent and if references are needed that we have them, and if we don't have them, I hunt people down to find them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great.

KC CLAFFY: That would be great. And I think the Sub-team probably would say it's okay to start that now but maybe they've already told you. Great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Awesome. Okay, so Heather, please bring to the SSR2 List anything where you find problems and need help. Alright. The next thing on the Agenda is to let everyone know that the Implementation Plan for the CCT Recommendations is out. Basically, what the Board has done here is there was three clumps of recommendations.

Those that they were going to proceed forward with and figure out what the cost and so on was, and this Implementation Report deals only with that roughly third of the recommendations. The second category was recommendations that they said were not for the Board but were for others and the Implementation Plan does not do anything about those. And the third category was the recommendations that they put on pause and this report doesn't say anything about those. It doesn't even tell us what the criteria are for unpausing those. So, the question is do we want, as a team, to deal with providing some public comments or do we want to just deal with this as individuals?

---

DENISE MICHEL: Russ, this is Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think that it would be useful and appropriate for this Review Team if we have a critical mask on to provide some comments on this as well. It goes directly to how the Board and Staff are treating Community Reviews and of course how they potentially will treat our review. And virtually all of the issues that we discussed with the Board at the previous ICANN meeting, I think we were in Japan when they parked rather than approved most of the CCT Review Recommendations, I think virtually all of those issues that we discussed with the Board have not really been addressed. So, I think it would be worthwhile for given where our team is in our work to also offer some public comments on this.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Hello?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hello?

JABHERA MATOGORO: Yes, this is Matogoro and I support that we deliver public comment as a team so that... I understand that if we [inaudible] as a team, we shall have some time going through the documents and leave a consensus comment for the same. So, thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:        Anyone else?

ALAIN AINA:            Yes, I had my hand on. I don't know, maybe.

RUSS HOUSLEY:        Sorry, I'm dialed in only so I can't tell that.

ALAIN AINA:            Maybe Brenda should be watching. So, okay, anyway. So, this is Alain and I hope you can all hear me. So, I wanted to... Okay, Russ, you asked question about do we submit comment as a team or as individual and I'll personally go for individual and I'll avoid as a team trying to approach this thing, especially that we are still working on this. The way people will interpret any comment from the group may be problematic.

But I want to raise something else and I think this, for me, seems to be also very important is we should look at how the Board approach the implementation of the recommendation from the CCT because one thing we discussed, and we keep discussing is the measurability of the recommendations. So, I think something we will want to learn from it, how are the recommendations of CCT drafted and are the recommendations easy, accepted, and implementable, and then do we take anything from it for our recommendations we are going to present in Montreal.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: That makes sense and I do think that everybody should be look at the history here to see how this might affect the way we word things. Hopefully we will also have our Research Consultant on board to help with that as well.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, Kerry-Ann is in the que.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi everybody. Apologies to be late. I had just sent an apology, too. GAC just had a webinar, just want to let you guys know why I'm late, on Expedited Policy Development Process they're doing for the gTLD Registration Data. So, it clashed, and I had to just listen to that just in case we needed any information from it so apologies.

I just want to input that I do agree with Alain but one thing we just have to consider is waiting to see how they respond to one group can't be a complete indication of how they'll respond to our report. I think the added value that we can do is just to ensure that we have our core recommendations and where there is synergies with the other reports that have just come out or will proceed ours, that we have a section that actually notes reports that came out during the preparation, and not to necessarily mix our link but at least to be able to have clear, defined things coming out from us and where possible, acknowledge where there's synergies with the other reports.



---

And I think if we present it in that way, it will be more palatable to the Community. But, a kind of wait and see may not be beneficial to us because the Community will already be reacting to that and the later we came in with our recommendations, it may get overlooked. So, I think as soon as we can giving credit to what has come out would be useful to us. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Kerry-Ann, Alain said two things and you said I agree with Alain, and I wondered which part, the first, the second, or both? Alain said he thinks that we should comment as individuals and he thinks we need to read the report, both the CCT Report and the Implementation Plan, to help guide the way we write our report. Which of those are you agreeing with or both?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Individual contribution is needed now, but when we present it holistically to Montreal, I think it's not that it's going to be seamed into our recommendations, like as CCT this, as CCT has said we should do this, the SSR2 Team agrees. Like I don't think that's how we should be writing it. Reviewing it and noting it as like a section that we actually acknowledge it and each of us giving our views on it, I think it's needed because I think at this stage, all the team members need to know, have ownership and looking at it and giving the input now and end, at least with the new reports that have come out.

But pulling it together, I think, how we present it is where it's going to be critical. I don't know if that makes more sense. But I agree with each of us giving individual look at it, but at the end we need to make sure how we present it it's not us just talking about someone else's report. But to make sure that our report stands on its own. If that's clearer.

**RUSS HOUSLEY:** I understand your suggestion but that means that the work we were just looking at from the Sub-team needs to be updated to align with that idea because that's not what we currently have.

**KERRY-ANN BARRETT:** It depends on how we do it because what I was thinking is having a section that refers to them, not necessarily changing our Sub-team work. Because our findings is based on our findings. The conclusions that the other reports have made have been based on their findings. We may have found stuff that they may or may not have considered or we considered it differently based on the skillsets we have on our team. So, I think noting what they have as a separate section in our report is good because they would have predated us, but not necessarily changing our text to constantly refer to what they have, if that makes it clearer.

**ALAIN AINA:** But Russ, this is Alain. I think I've not said we should align with the CCT style of the recommendations. What I said is that at the beginning, when we looked at the SSR1 Recommendations and Implementations, there were complaints about some of the recommendations being very vague, not implementable, etcetera, and then I said that we should make sure that our recommendations are measurable, are well-phrased, etcetera.

So, what I'm saying is that now that there's been this review, and we went to the Board and they had the Implementation Plan on some of the recommendations, just to see if there's anything in there we may write the

---

recommendations. So, if they are ready to [inaudible] or both, on some of the recommendations, maybe there is something that we can take away on how we can produce or own, is what I was saying in a different way just to make sure that I got the message through.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Russ, may I be in the que? This is Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: So, when I was thinking about SSR2 submitting comments, I was thinking about the utility of commenting more on the process and approach the Board has taken more so than just substance. I wasn't actually suggesting that the Review Team take a position on the substance of the CCT Recommendations, although I'm certainly open to that.

I see this as an inflection point for the Review Team to, again, reiterate many of the process and operational points that we made with the Board about how they approach and work with the Community Review Teams and develop decisions on what they do with the recommendations, how they treat them, and development of the Implementation Plans. So, my thinking is more on the process side where I think we, certainly at the ICANN Meeting, seemed to have

---

very broad agreement across those who were there in our conversations with the Board about how to and how not to work with a Community Review Team and handle the recommendations.

I think that's a futile area for the Review Team to contribute on these comments. I'm also open to addressing more substantive aspects of a proposed Implementation Plan where they intersect with recommendations that the Review Team has agreed on, but I'm particularly interested in, I think, the team using this to reiterate the process and operational questions that we've already addressed with the Board. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so, what I think I've heard is Denise recommending that the team say something about process but leave comments on the actual Implementation Plan and how it related to the CCT Recommendations to us as individuals if we want to say anything.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, KC is in the que.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Just a point of clarification. I'm open to addressing the substance as well if we have a majority of members who are interested and agreed upon that. Just to clarify, I'm really open to what other members want to do on that area.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. We've already had two speak against that. That's why I'm saying this is where I'm feeling we're going. Okay, KC, you're turn.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That was KC, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so Jennifer, who has their hand up?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, it's KC. I'm fighting my stupid phone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, okay.

KC CLAFFY: Or maybe the phone's smart and I'm stupid. Okay, let's see. A few things I've heard. I'm not sure I totally agree with Kerry-Ann. I think there is value in highlighting just how much we are, how do I say this, maybe literally cutting and pasting recommendations from other Review Teams and saying we totally agree with this or we agree with this with maybe the follow modification or specification.

And the reason I'm sort of thinking about it with that Accountability and Transparency Review Team hat on a little bit, which is I think the more Stakeholders or constituencies or whatever, that the same recommendation

---

comes from or something almost the same or the refinements are the same, the more times it's said, the higher priority it's going to have. And we've seen, in fact, the biggest problem we've been told the review process has right now is lack of prioritization of the reviews that are being handed to the Board.

The Board now has hundreds of recommendations. It cannot possibly implement them all even if it spent all of ICANN's capital doing it with the number of recommendations that it had. And in fact, apparently [inaudible] reviews that was passed in June, and I'm still not clear and I would like somebody from ICANN to help me understand, does it apply to us midstream in this review or is that for like the next round of reviews which may never even happen at the rate we're going. But back to the original [inaudible] I think we shouldn't [inaudible] CCT Report. Some of that [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, KC, you're cutting out.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible] that are still in process are in line with the ones that are in draft, the SSR2 Reports. I mean, I don't know how much we want to say about our recommendations, but I think that my point is the more voices that are saying the same thing, the more ICANN is going to be able to say, "Okay, those need to rise to the top."

And then to Denise's point about substance versus content, I think that I'm also open to SSR2 making a comment about content, sorry, process versus content. I'm not sure I understand exactly the two voices that were opposed. I guess that Alain and Kerry-Ann said we should all just respond to the public comment as

---

individuals on the CCT Implementation doc. I don't think most of the CCT, I think there were only five or six recommendations that CCT actually is, that the Board is actually moving forward with an Implementation Plan for, and I don't remember them having to do with security. Maybe I need to go back and read them. Does anybody remember? Like what would we say about the substance of those five recommendations in an SSR context?

ALAIN AINA: There is something there about DNS Abuse, abuse [inaudible], blah, blah, blah.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, that was accepted? Alright, I need to go back and read that report. Can anybody actually give a sentence of that report that is about that recommendation? Because I even looked for that and I didn't see it.

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise. I can send you the link on the Implementation document. There's a recommendation that our team is proposing again that be recommended that's included in the CCT Review which is more detailed information on complaints to ICANN be publicly available in the Compliance Report.

KC CLAFFY: But hold on. Was that in one of the five?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

---

KC CLAFFY: Was that in one of the five that they have just issued an Implementation? Oh, it is. Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, I'll go read it again. Well, then I do think we should comment as a group on that one, if there's something. I mean, anyway, I don't think we should decide today. [inaudible] I think we should all go read it and consider it.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, and then Recommendation 22 regarding security measures, also relevant to our team for sure. Then they have a data collection on gTLD Recommendation regarding that which also has relevancy, of course, to some of the things we're recommending. Well, two recommendations on data collection that are part of the five. So, I'll send you this link. You can take a look at it.

KC CLAFFY: Thanks. And then could ICANN comment on the new Operating Standards because first of all, I can't find them which makes me nervous. I find a draft of them in public comment, but I don't actually find the final standards. And second of all, reading in the ATRT documents that it's effective June and I don't think I was told so I want to know what are the standards we're operating under.



NEGAR FARZINNIA: Hi KC. This is Negar. The Operating Standards were adopted I believe back in March and Jennifer can confirm that. The documents are open. We've suggested for any Review Team in progress who's interested to take them on as their Operating Standards, so this is more of a question for this Review Team to discuss and determine if you want as a group to operate under Operating Standards. ATRT3 chose to do that, but again, it's something for your Review Team to discuss as a whole. And we're happy to share, thank you Jennifer just put a comment in the chat saying it was adopted in June, thanks for clarification Jennifer. We are happy to share the link to the documents so you can see the adopted version for reference.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Could you send that link to the mail list please?

KC CLAFFY: The only two Review Teams that it would be a question for would be the remaining ones that aren't finished, which is ATRT and SSR2?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Correct. The other two Reviews have now submitted their final report. So, they're no longer conducting reviews.

KC CLAFFY: And so, this team never discussed it?

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: It wasn't final when we figured out how we were going to work.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, because we had the meeting in DC when we were unpaused to figure out how we were going to do our work and we could only look at the draft at that time.

KC CLAFFY: So, the reason I'm asking is that there's a sentence in there apparently, because I only saw it quoted, I haven't read it, about that the Review Teams are now obligated to include prioritization of the recommendations and ensure cost-effectiveness of the recommendations, which is a phrase that I totally balked at because I don't understand how Review Teams could ensure such a thing and I don't understand how ATRT3 could accept such a responsibility. But I wouldn't. Maybe I'm wrong and it's not in the Operating Standards so I need to go read it and I've been gone for a couple months as you know, so I'm totally maybe talking out of turn here, but that needs a public comment and apparently it had a public comment that I totally missed.

But again, back to the CCT public comment issue and do we have a comment on that, that the real issue here is ICANN's overwhelmed with recommendations, that I totally agree with. It doesn't know how to prioritize them. That was somehow left out, in the hub bub of the transition, left out of the, "Oh, how do we actually execute these reviews and make sure that they're reasonably implemented as much as ICANN can do?" And now we're in the throws of the

---

problem. So, I don't know if that's something we want to add to our comment in CCT public comment or just leave it separate, but obviously we're going to need to say in our report which Operating Standards we're operating under and why. Okay, I'm done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it seems to me that the CCT Report was put together before those as well. They started even before the update to the Bylaws, right? So, I don't think we can say, "Hey, you didn't align with this." as part of a comment.

KC CLAFFY: No, no, no. That's not my point. My point is the whole process has a problem.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, yeah.

KC CLAFFY: The fact that the Operating Standards have been changed in the middle of the process because there's a problem with the process. And if we're going to comment on the fact that well, all of these other reviews that relate to SSR2 have been ignored, or the ones that are now heading toward implementation, we don't think are being implemented properly, I assume a response will be, "Well, we've already handled this problem with the new Operating Standards. We're overwhelmed with recommendations." So, I think we should be careful to issue a public comment without understanding that ICANN has already tried to address some of the issues that it's suffering from right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I now understand your point. Yes, I think we need to pay attention to that in writing our report as well.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Hi, this is Negar. If I may, I just wanted to add a couple of clarifying points here. KC, the Operating Standards were not changed in the middle of the process. They were being developed as they were a requirement under the new Bylaws. And the development of the Operating Standards went through quite a few rounds of reviews and engagement by the Community and involvement and discussions about what various sections of the operating standard should include. And, again, it was with explicit involvement of the Community and multiple rounds of public comment and discussions and presentations and webinars, that the Operating Standards came to be the way they are today.

I don't recall if there's any specific reference to prioritization and budgeting of the recommendations in the Operating Standards. I believe that's more recent discussion that has been started between the Board and the Community and others to start looking at better ways to manage all the recommendations since as you know, that there's so many of them, not just from reviews but from other work that are coming through, and if there needs to be a feasible of trying to manage how they get implemented and how they get budgeted, etcetera. So, please, we will share the link to the Operating Standards.

Please do read the document and we're happy to answer any questions that you may have on the document and various parts of it if you find useful or relevant when formulating your report, I think that'll be great. But again, this is something the Review Team should agree upon in terms of how every part of

---

the work is managed, of course. But we will send the document out so please take a look at it when you have a chance.

DENISE MICHEL: Negar, this is Denise. In addition to simply sending the document out since we really don't have enough time to even deal with our own report, could you please look at the document and pull out the citations that referred to prioritization and classic effectiveness, so it makes it easier for us to find those? Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: We'll make a reference to each section, Denise, so everyone can look it up.

DENISE MICHEL: If you can just pull the words out, put it in an email, here's what the operating plan says about prioritization, here's what the operating plan says about cost effectiveness. I think those are probably two important things we want to make sure we see right away. Thanks.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: To address Russ's request, he wanted the whole document sent out so we will send that out.

DENISE MICHEL: If you could do both, that would be great.

---

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Again, I don't think sections are all discreet but happy to pull out what maybe helpful and send it out to everyone.

DENISE MICHEL: Great, thank you.

KC CLAFFY: Was it the case, this is KC, was it the case that SSR2 was asked about these Operating Standards ever or I mean, presumably they were allowed to public comment, but I apparently didn't know this was going on way back in March or before, and was it the case that when they were completed that somebody asked SSR2 do you want to operate under these, and I missed it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. We have not formally been asked to do that. My understanding is they were adopted with Review Teams starting after this approval will operate under them.

DENISE MICHEL: For a little more history, this is Denise, the SSR2 Team when we formed, we actually asked for the Operating Standards and there were none. The Bylaws do require the Staff to actually to create the Operating Standards before the Community Reviews move forward, instead of having Operating Standards before the Review Teams started, the Operating Standards, they were done a couple of years later.

---

KC CLAFFY:                   Okay, that helps. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL:            But I take your point. We can certainly be aware of what's in that but it's pretty ridiculous to think that two years or so into a review we're going to retroactively go back and try and adopt Operating Standards.

KC CLAFFY:                   It's obviously ICANN's not expecting that. Okay. Nonetheless, there's the reality there of ICANN being overwhelmed so that one we can just take into consideration. I'll have to deal with the Operating Standards over on the ATRT side. Alright, I'm done.

RUSS HOUSLEY:            Okay, so we only have five minutes left, so I think where we ended up is that we may want to make some process comments as a team. I encourage people to take a look at this, figure out what they might want to comment about, and send some stuff to the list so we can start that going. We have like three weeks before the comments would be due. So, if we're going to do anything, we need to do it fairly quickly.

We have one last Agenda Item. At this point, with only four minutes left, I think all's I can do at this point is point that the GAC issued a statement on DNS Abuse. It seems to be highly aligned with some of the things that we plan to recommend, and it seems to be highly aligned with some of the things that CCT did recommend, so I encourage people to take a look at that. It's certainly something that we're going to need to add to the site's going in. So, is there any

---

other business people want to raise at this point? Okay. Then, over to Jennifer for the confirmed Action Items.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks Russ. So, Action Items. Eric and KC are going to work together on the recommendations that KC got in an email, a proposed text for the 9<sup>th</sup> of October Call. Team members to read the text from the Compliance Sub-team which is in the recommendations document for next week's 2<sup>nd</sup> of October call. And Staff to pull out the prioritization and cost-effectiveness sections of the Operating Standards and send to the Review Team along with the full Operating Standards document.

Decisions reached, the updated Work Plan was approved, and Staff will publish that to the Wiki Page. And the Review Team agreed they should start a public comment on the process related items of the CCT Implementation Plan, so team members please share comments on the list to get that going. Let me know if I missed anything. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so I think that's it. With one minute to spare, we can wrap up and have a good week.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks Russ.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Bye everyone.



KC CLAFFY:            Thanks everyone. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**