BRENDA BREWER:	Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to SSR-2 Plenary #88 on the 23rd of October 2019 at 14:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Kaveh, Ramkrishna, Laurin, Russ, Naveed, Denise, Norm, and Kerry-Ann. Attending from ICANN Org, we have Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda. Technical writer, Heather, has joined. Today's meeting is being recorded. I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking and mute your line when not speaking and, Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	So, the goal today is to come out of this call knowing that we have the full set of recommendations that we're going to share with the community In Montreal. Jennifer, on the last call, there was a couple of recommendations that people took actions to review. Can you remind us what numbers those were? I should have pulled that up before, I'm sorry.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	No, that's okay. I, myself, have to pull up the actions as well because I don't have them. One second. Okay. So, the recommendations were 3, 24, 25, and 26.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you.

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.

JENNIFER BRYCE:	But those were the recommendations that we discussed, that KC and Eric had made edits to and you had to ask for the review team to take a look at those ones.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yes, I did. Thank you. All right, so let's start with those. The link to the Google Doc is in the agenda email that came from Jennifer and you'll recall that recommendation 3 was split into 3 and 3b, and there was for a little while 3c, but that got deleted during the last call. So, the first question is are there any remaining concerns with 3? And we'll do 3b next.
KC CLAFFY:	I'm wondering if anybody's read them. This is KC.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Hi.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	I'm wanting there to be more than consent by silence here but a comment from somebody who has read them and either think they're fine or need changes.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	I don't see any comments that were added to the Google Doc.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	And I didn't see any in the email.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Right. It could mean everybody likes them or nobody actually read them.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	That's what it means. That's exactly what it means.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	I'm trying to get an answer to that on the call. So, can someone who read them raise their hand and say they read them?

DENISE MICHEL:	I'm in transit, so I'm not on a screen and I don't have the numbers memorized. Just let me know which ones.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Sure. This is the ones that … 3 is about the metrics. It says ICANN should implement SSR recommendation 11 to address strategic objective one; and two and strategic goal 4.1, ICANN should finalize and implement measures of success for new gTLDs and IDN fast track that expressly relate to the SSR-related program objectives, including measurements for the effectiveness of mechanisms to mitigate domain name abuse.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Well, personally, I'm okay with that one.

KC CLAFFY: So, one, I still have the objection about all this stuff about the strategic objectives addressed in the recommendation. I think that should all be pulled out into a separate table where somebody maps recommendations in the column and strategic objectives in rows and it's a visual thing. I think it completely disrupts the flow of trying to read the recommendation and nobody who is reading is going to know what the hell strategic objective on is. There's no table nearby. If there were a table, it would [inaudible] to have to go consult it. I think that's a [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. I totally agree with you on that one and that applies to the entire document, not just this, right?

KC CLAFFY: And I think that should be done before we hand these out to people in Montreal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Heather, are you on the call?

HEATHER: I am and I'm happy to take care of that. I was just taking a note.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

HEATHER: And then the second thing is I think we use the word abuse and we run into this whole kerfuffle that's going on now about definition of abuse. I think we cannot use the word abuse in the document. Before, we have been very clear about what we mean by that and what we think other people mean by that. And we preemptively prevent the recent flurry of documents talking about how we need to be careful about using abuse and we need to use security threats instead of, or whatever, which might all be correct, in which case we should use security threats. But we shouldn't use the word abuse by itself here, as if we're not aware of all those documents and all that conversation that's happening around. We should incorporate that conversation as a preamble into whatever we hand people into Montreal.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm happy to provide some text to clarify that and provide some background for the team. There's been a longstanding and [inaudible] definition of abuse that's been used by the security staff at ICANN and there's also a definition of abuse and malicious abuse that has been – years ago that was approved by the GNSO and incorporated into various things at ICANN including the new gTLD application. I'm not sure why there is a sudden flurry of this idea that there needs to be one DNS

abuse definition that controls the world at ICANN and it must be created from scratch but we looked at this issue when SSR first started and decided that the functional definition that is currently in use in ICANN served the purposes, so I'm happy to circulate some language that clarifies that and in this report.

And I'm jumping back. I have no problem with taking out the references to the strategic plan that disrupts the flow of … We just referenced that [inaudible] here, that the topic is also covered in ICANN strategic plan and then I guess Heather can – footnote it and Heather can create a table in the annex or something like that. I think the only point here was it underscores that this activity needs to be done and ICANN itself notes that this activity needs to be done because it's in its own strategic plan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. That was the point to be made and I think a table is a fine way to present it instead of text in every recommendation. Just to point out that we have no recommendations that aren't highly aligned with the strategic objectives of the organization.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Denise can—

EN

KC CLAFFY: I have a couple more [inaudible], Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. Let me just wrap that comment up. Can we get text to the mail list on replacing the word abuse with whether you're going to define it a following sentence or replace it with something else. I'd like to have that this week if that's possible.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I can. Yeah, I'll get it out to the list today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay.

KC CLAFFY: So, I think a lot of that has been done, as Denise alluded to. It's later in this document. That brings me to my next concern which is it's hard for me to approve the recommendations in their current form because they're still pretty much all over the place and there's some overlaps and they're not structured in a way that Montreal people should read them. So, I'm wondering if we can get that kind of structure in place and some of that Heather may be comfortable doing herself and some of it needs to have our eyes on it, or maybe it's the kind of thing that's going to happen in the face-to-face at Montreal.

But I think that is an issue, that we should put all the things that mention metrics about abuse together, because there's a few of them,

and maybe consolidate them. Some of that has happened but not all of it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, that we have a plan for. The idea was to leave the number stable, so when somebody said recommendation 3 while we were doing this, we knew what that meant. Of course there's so many of them, that part didn't actually work out. But that was the idea is to leave them – to not be renumbering them every week. Anyway, Heather has a plan for that. She's going to send us some email before Montreal regarding a cleaner document, so that we have that to start the work in Montreal from.

KC CLAFFY: Great. Second – or whatever I'm on. What number am I on? This recommendation, part 3, looks to me that it's [inaudible] a CCT recommendation about [inaudible] related to consumer trust. So my concern is to the extent that we are repeating a variant on a CCT recommendation, I think we should acknowledge and put further – sort of put it under the CCT recommendation. Even the recommendations as CCT recommendation [acts] partly to just – well, primarily to make it clear that we're not the only people that think this is important, if it's true. And if it's slightly different from a CCT recommendation, I think we have to think about that because in this current world of too many recommendations going into ICANN's plate, it would be better if we could say this is the same as CCT recommendation 7. Just to make sure that you understand, we both think this is high priority, or something like that.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think, in this case, it's actually SSR-1 recommendation 11 and CCT thought it was important and didn't get done and was repeating it.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. It didn't—

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not saying we shouldn't highlight that, by the way, CCT also thought you should do this. But that's its origins.

KC CLAFFY: It didn't also end up in a CCT recommendation?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I didn't cross check that.

KC CLAFFY: I wonder if Heather could check for us because I'm pretty sure it did. Again, maybe it's a variant but I think we ought to know how they worded it and how we worded it. Or if not, then that's fine. We can drop my comment. I wanted someone to check. And then back to—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, will you take that action to see if this aligns with one of the CCT recommendations?

HEATHER: Well, should I be doing that for just this one or should I be doing it for all of them? I mean, if I'm doing it for one, I should do it for all of them, I think.

KC CLAFFY: I got a feeling there's overlap.

HEATHER: Yeah. I could do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sure there's overlap. Okay, thank you.

KC CLAFFY: And then back to the earlier thread with Denise. The other thing I'm wondering about is the most recent thing that Danko sent to the list about the big five registrars taking a stand on domain abuse – and by the way, they're willing to use the word abuse, although I haven't read the document enough to know how they define it, if it's different from all the other definitions that are floating around.

                             But I think we have to analyze what they actually have said, and if it's different from what we're proposing, we should make it very clear because what I would expect a response to be is this recommendation is already being handled by this announcement. So I think we need to … I understand things are moving fast and that's a reason that these

reviews should not take a year because we keep having new stuff come up and we don't have time to deal with it, but these guys have made a big enough splash and I think the timing is intentional. Everybody knows what's going on here.

So I think we just have to do the extra homework and I'm willing to go read those documents before Montreal, but it shouldn't just be me. And maybe somebody has already read it and knows exactly what the distinction is and how far these guys are already offering to go and what ICANN's role should or should not be in this space. But I think we can't just let it drop.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, KC. That's a good point. I don't know that we can do that before we have general recommendations to discuss with the community. I think we're looking at about a week and a half. But I agree this is something we should take a look at in Montreal and determine if we want to update the recommendation. I believe you're referring to the statement about voluntary best practices.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Voluntary best practices have been discussed and have been out there for – well, [inaudible] ever since almost registrars were created, which is very different than what's in our recommendations. And then of course there's also the very long and detailed GAC statement on DNS abuse

EN

that we should also be looking at. The Business Constituency just submitted a statement on DNS abuse.

So, I think it's a conversation that's going to go on for quite a while but if there is something particularly compelling that we should work into our report … It's a little bit hard to have a shelf life with an ongoing discussion occurring but I guess the bottom line for me is the Board hasn't passed anything new. There hasn't been anything new added to a contract but I certainly take your point that we should, in some appropriate way, acknowledge the ongoing discussion. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I want to avoid the outcome of this is how this one is being handled. I want to say if we think this is not what we mean, we should say this is not what we mean and cite it and make sure that we skip that conversation about this is a substitute for what you mean.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. That's a good point. Although, it would be good to find ourselves in a discussion – a real discussion – with community members about this space and what we mean and whether a recent proposal would suffice. I think that would be fruitful.

KC CLAFFY: A great [inaudible] at Montreal would be for those folks that are in Montreal to ask others in the community, "How close is this to what you think is needed?" And then take some of that input.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. And then my last comment on all of the recommendations – and again, it would help if they're structured and organized to make this assessment. I know we're not operating under the new operating standards for the reviews but I happen to be on ATRT and they are operating under those standards where there is definitely cognizance about the number of recommendations and the overwhelming nature of them all. So I do think we should talk about – and maybe this is another thing to socialize at Montreal – how we plan to prioritize these. Which ones do we think should be prerequisite on what other ones or what other external triggers? But maybe that's after Montreal. That's my last comment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I've been thinking about that a lot and I'm worried that it's a trap. And yes I understand that that's what the new operating procedures require. But given that we have already eliminated everything that doesn't align with the strategic plan, how could any of them not be … How could any of them be reduced in priority? Just a thought. Maybe there's a good answer to that but I don't see it right off the top.

KC CLAFFY: It might bear us using exactly that sentence in the report.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, fine. That would be easy.

KC CLAFFY: To show that we thought about it and that this is the situation that we are now, and if ICANN's answer is, "Look, there's way too many things for us to do with the budget," that's important information for us to know and for the community to know."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I accept that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I feel that it would be useful to go through everything again when we're face-to-face. [inaudible] has always been a productive time for the team. But at the same time, in the end, I think [inaudible] Russ and KC [inaudible]. If we, after another pass, and after looking at it in person, etc., decided we don't see anything we can throw out, then that is that.

In a way, the ICANN Board and community will have to then decide what they believe is – what they should give priority to. I don't think this is what we, the team, should do to the extent, particularly because these new rules came very late in the process. We might have had a different approach if we had [inaudible] this over a year ago.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. If I heard KC properly, that was her last comment. Are there others who have something they want to share about 3 or 3b or any of the – or the document as a whole at this point?

HEATHER: So, regarding recommendation 3, it doesn't actually say anything other than implement SSR recommendation 11. That's really all it says. There's no embellishment to it. There's no further detail. So, I wonder if that just merges into the statement we're making, that ICANN should actually do what SSR-1 told them to do. Does this need to be called out and enhanced in any way other than what's there right now … Do what we told you to do?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I think the answer may lie in the research that's yet to be done regarding CCT alignment because my guess is that this actually is aligned and ultimately what we're saying is you've been told twice and you still haven't done it.

HEATHER: Okay, fair enough.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, I know I said I would shut up but now Heather just said something important.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: You wound her up!

HEATHER: Go me!

KC CLAFFY: She's right because, basically, we have to remember that ICANN said they already did this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly.

KC CLAFFY: So, the least we have to do is say, "You think you did this. We think this is what we mean by you doing this and here's the measurable outcome how SSR-3 would know that you have done this." So, I think she's right. It needs to have more to it, but maybe that's for future writing.

DENISE MICHEL: I thought Laurin wrote an intro text to SSR-1 implementation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: He did.

DENISE MICHEL: Did that not address this? Sorry, it's been quite a while.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It has been quite a while since we did that.

HEATHER: But that is kind of what I was asking and what I'm hearing, at least from KC, is there actually needs to be a little bit more here.

KC CLAFFY: It needs to be more explicit, yeah.

HEATHER: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if I remember the roll call properly, Eric is not on the call.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ah! Can you take a stab in the next couple of days at what an implementation of 3 would look like that SSR-3 could easily measure?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: There's a paper deadline that the abstract is due in two days and the paper is due seven days after that and I've got two submissions that are

being juggled by zero grad students, so I don't think I can. When I get off the plane in Montreal I'm going to submit hopefully two papers.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, your answer is no.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I wanted to give a little transparency so it doesn't just sound flippant, but I don't think I can. I can try. It would be easier to help somebody else or maybe do it in Montreal if that's okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I was hoping to get it before Montreal, but if we can't, we can't. Can anyone help Eric here?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, which number is this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're still on three.

DENISE MICHEL: I can't find three in the … I just got on one.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can you say, Russ, [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's on page two.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Where's page two?!

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] documents.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We are.

DENISE MICHEL: All right. I can help. I just have [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay. If you find the email from Jennifer with today's agenda in it, there's a link to the Google Doc and it's on page two.

DENISE MICHEL: Got it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. It's the page numbered two. If you use the slider bar, it's page three, which of course is a Google Doc thing.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. I think we've dealt with number three. We have two action items on the define abuse and the make measurable.

HEATHER: Quick chime in for defining abuse on three. The use of the word abuse there is part of a quote.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, it is.

HEATHER: So, I wouldn't change that word, though we may add sentences.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I think that was the plan.

HEATHER: Okay, great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right. Turning to 3b. Denise, are you now no longer in transit so I don't have to read it or are you?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I am no longer in transit.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, since you asked about—

DENISE MICHEL: Which means I'm having trouble finding things. What is it that you want to address?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just wanted to know if I needed to read it.

DENISE MICHEL: Oh, okay. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, this one says recommendation 15 for SSR-1 needs to be implemented, which was ICANN should act as a facilitator in the responsible disclosure and dissemination of DNS security threats and mitigation techniques. It says ICANN implemented a vulnerability disclosure process but there are no public statistics or other information on how often such a process has been invoked or its impact, therefore it's not possible to assess if the process is functional and effective.

So, basically, then we go on and have text that says implement what you said you already did but provide regular and timely reporting.

EN

All right. Are we ready to move to 24? Is that what the silence means?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, I think so.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, 24 is a merge of a whole bunch of other recommendations that were originally that came out of the I think Los Angeles meeting. So, they're now all kind of put together with a couple of bullets. We did some editing on this last week. Are there any remaining concerns here?

So, I thought there was a question coming out of last week regarding whether we wanted to leave the IANA bullet or delete it. Basically, this is calling for the creation of publicly disclosed measure on the size and growth of the IANA registries. My personal view is I'm not sure that meets the same impact as the rest of the things that we have here.

I'm not hearing support and I'm not hearing pushback. I don't know how to take it. I need one or the other.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, why do you want to measure the growth of the IANA registries?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that this is—

EN

KC CLAFFY: I made your lunches already. Is it in your backpack?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: KC is not muted.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, guys.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I think the IANA registries, the major composition and the status of them are an SSR concern and I think, as a result, if it's important for security, you ought to measure it, period. I think that's my general starting perspective. So, since if someone wants me to explain why I think the IANA registries are a valid point for SSR, I'm happy to do that. If the question is, "Why are we measuring them?" it's based on the fact that there are SSR concerns and I believe SSR concerns demand measurement. So, I'm not sure if that's answering your question, Russ, or if I'm going sideways.

RUSS HOUSLEY: See, I think measuring availability of the IANA registries, that makes sense. The rest of the things that are being asked to be measured, I'm not seeing how they actually are SSR related.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I guess … Yeah. So, just subject to debate amongst the team, my perspective personally, no hats on, is that the ways in which … There's a security aspect to these are unfortunately usually better judged in retrospect after [Xplode or Vector] or something like that comes up. So, it isn't the case that – I can certainly make a really strong case that the larger the registries get, the more there is any kind of a security concern or that it's harder to serve them or it isn't harder to serve them or anything like that. It's just that if, later on, we say something was hiding in the noise and it was only after the registries got to be so-and-so big, having tracked that gives you some insight to do some measurement, sort of like looking at who's deployed DNSSEC. You can look and see who's done it now, but you can't say, "Oh, my gosh, lots of people deployed it when this event happened," if you aren't tracking.

So, I guess my data geek perspective is that if you're going to track the IANA registries, there's certain general natures about them that would be great to have longitudinally in the archive somewhere and one of them is how big are these registries. I don't know that that necessarily means that you have to rack them each independently, although being a data geek, I'd love that, or if it's just sort of like, "Yeah, the sum total, just as a low-pass filter, the total number of entries in these is blah." You can easily make the case that will never, ever be useful. I'd just say the companion case I'd make is you can't prove it will never be useful until you've done it. So, that's the origin of it. That's its back story.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY:	I don't think it's a lot of work to measure it but I also just wonder whether it's at the same level as the key performance indicator for the root zone, for example.
NORM RITCHIE:	I agree with Eric on this. At the very least, it needs some visibility into the other registries within IANA, because for the most part, there's none and that could be dangerous.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Last week, I think it was KC that raised do we really want to measure alternate root zones because of the [inaudible] that discussion is going to lead us into?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	It seemed like we covered that on the list, right?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Well, I just wanted to make sure, since there was a bunch of people who did not participate in that discussion.
KC CLAFFY:	Just jumping back to what Russ's question about the growth in the registry, the IANA registry, I also am reluctant to add recommendations there that are not tied to specific harm that is already occurring because I just think that there is too much here going on and measurement is expensive. So, I would side with Russ on … Unless we can point to a

specific harm, like all the DNS abuse that's triggering our request for DNS measurement. I'm reluctant. I'm not saying it's not a good idea. I totally agree with Eric. You can't secure what you can't measure. It's just a matter of how much we're putting on the plate and we already know that they're overloaded, so I don't want to have … I don't want there to be a perception that we're just living in a fantasy world here of infinite resources.

But to the alternate routes, again, I personally – we discussed it on the list. I think we should drop this one.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. So, I think I own both of those, the origin stories for both of those. So, I'm [not at all] proprietary here, so if I sound defensive, I hope someone will just put a [inaudible] on top of that in the amount of hours I've spent doing some other stuff. So, stop me. There's no personal whatever here.

But just for clarity and perspective, just as long as I don't lose my train of thought. Okay. Going to the IANA registries. So, we have the SSNR in our charter, so the security I think is the motivation. There could potentially be a security concern. There's also stability. So, the idea that these registries are part of the ongoing management responsibility of ICANN I think is critical. So, we could say there could generally be a security concern, so we ought to be prepared in case it comes. That's sort of like … That sort of doesn't stand up against the comments that KC just made, which is like, hey, they've got a lot to do. Do we really

want to put this on their shoulder? I'd flip it around and say this is foundational.

Some of the stuff we could argue as, well, maybe of all the things you have to do, do you really have to do that one, too? But since this one is part of the foundation, there's a remit of ICANN to manage, among other things, the IANA registry. There also is a remit for them to manage the root zone and to manage the global address space, etc. I think all those things basically point to you should at least do proper care and feeding in due diligence at the very foundation of your organization's remit. That's why I think the registries are important. They're less flashy and they're less subject to headline exploits than other things in cybersecurity or even in ICANN's purview.

But it's sort of like, yeah, but of all the jobs that there are for this organization to do, managing these critical resources of the unique identifier space is kind of like one of the headliners. So, then it's like, well, then you always need to be watching, period. That would be my perspective. It's sort of like, yeah, the DNS abuse is very clear. There's clear and present danger there and we're spending a lot of time on that which I think is appropriate and it's also very easy for people to understand because it makes press headlines.

But, at the same time, it's like just because my tires haven't blown out doesn't mean I didn't mean I didn't just go to Valvoline and have the tire pressure checked. Yeah, of course I checked the tire pressure but I didn't go and check all the gaskets all throughout the engine. That would have taken too long. So, I feel like this is the tire. We know we need to do it.

So, that's kind of like my last pitch. This is an obvious thing that you always should have been watching, period. And I know measurement is expensive and I don't think we're giving ICANN the roadmap of how they must implement. I think they could commission a university researcher to do it or something like that. I think that would be total fine. They just have to be sure it's being done somewhere. It doesn't have to be them. And if someone out there was doing it drops the ball, then they should go find someone else to do it or something like that.

The second thing was the alternate route. The alternate route, I think we covered that on the list, so I'm sort of happy to let it go. I think it's important. I also think that this one does fall into the hole of in every day there's only 24 hours, and in every budget, there's only so many dollars. So, is it ICANN's job to do this, considering all the other things? That one I think totally is like, yeah, I could easily be convinced that while I think it's important, it may not be appropriate to do it here. That would be my view, is that that advice applies better to the DNS route than it does to [inaudible] registry.

Just for clarity. Sorry if that sounded like I was ranting. I'm just super jacked up on coffee.

KC CLAFFY: Again, Eric makes a good point. I'm not opposed to leaving this recommendation in if the group wants that. I'm not going to die on my sword on it. Yeah. Reasonable people can disagree on this.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Are there any hands?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think what Eric just said, if we kind of make this a bit more clear for the IANA registry data, that this could be simply an external research project that is linked, then I think this would be less of a problem. I completely agree on the roots. I also feel this is probably more than we should put in, particularly under current situation.

The other one is something I think we should definitely consider, particularly because it is, as Eric said, a specific function that is there and that's totally within the clear things that have to be done.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, just one follow-up to that. Earlier, I think it was last call – I don't know. Somewhere I feel like I might have said – and maybe I said it in my head and not out loud. At some point, we could potentially think about adding some text somewhere that says there's a lot of recommendations here, and while we don't presume to tell ICANN how to implement it, we can provide suggestions for implementation either in general or specifically about recommendations.

If we really feel like we need to have N recommendations, and N is determined to be too large by some people's metric, we could then say, "For example, recommendation N (or recommendation M) could be implemented by simply doing blah," or something like that. I know we've talked about and maybe even woven that into some of the recommendations but maybe if we had some structure in the document

that said, "Here's our strawman implementation section," and we basically said, "It may sound like a jagged [inaudible], but all we're really saying is you have to do blah, but your mileage may vary," then they can sort of take it or leave it. But that way, our recommendation can e focused and they can be concise and we don't have to feel like, "Oh man, I hope they don't take this the wrong way," and feel like we're telling them they have to do it all.

That's just a suggestion. I know it's extra writing and we may not want to get into it, but it would be one way to sort of disambiguate that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's an interesting thought. If we get the report done enough that we have resources to actually do that, I think it would be an interesting task. But I do worry that the amount of energy that I see people having at this point is diminishing.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Steve's hand is raised.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

STEVE: Hi, thank you, this is Steve. Mostly just for clarity, looking at the IANA registry bullet, one clarity question and one comment for the review team to consider.

The question is what your expected outcome on measurements on these are, because even as specified in the beginning of this bullet is that many of these registries are entirely – with the exception of a very few, are entirely dictated by outcomes of RFCs that are published. So, the registries aren't necessarily being changed except for when an RFC published. So, I'm curious of what you're looking for to get out of the measurements on this, because like I said, with the exception of very few – maybe port parameters and ASNs and things like that – IANA doesn't change the registries without a document to tell them to change the registries.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I can think of a whole bunch where the document creates a registration procedure. Pen numbers, for example.

STEVE: Oh, okay. So, maybe some specificity around what you're looking for to measure around that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Now I'm taking the opposite. But if we were to do this, I think those are the places we would find out what the wildly successful registries are. Media types are another where if a media type takes off on the Internet, it does ultimately get registered, otherwise the browsers don't render it.

STEVE:　　　　　　　　　Okay, fair enough. Then, another point for consideration for the review team is that the IANA functions review is just about to kick off. So, just keeping that in mind as you're writing this recommendation. I'm not sure what the scope of the IFR is and maybe that's something that they could or should look at as well. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:　　　　　Okay. Anything else on recommendation 24? Okay, 25 was deleted last week. Hoping that means we spend zero time on it now. Okay, no objections.

　　　　　　　　　　　　26 got edited fairly heavily last week, at least the first part of it, but the bottom line is now it's being … It says adopt – establish. I'm sorry, we dropped adopt. Establish a formal procedure. And this is where Eric made a big pitch regarding modeling tools. Any concerns here? All right, I'm not hearing any.

　　　　　　　　　　　　So, I think we had two action items for this, both regarding recommendation 3, in terms of defining abuse and making the recommendation measurable. Other than that, we are done with the recommendations in terms of we've reached the consensus part and now we need to turn them over to rack, stack, and organize and hopefully we'll have a researcher to help us align them with the policy development process before Montreal.

　　　　　　　　　　　　Is there any other business today? Okay, hearing none—

DENISE MICHEL:　　　　I'm sorry, this is Denise.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL: Just wanted to clarify. Is our intention to use the slides as the written material that we make available for our discussion in Montreal? We're not going to be distributing any rewrites of the recommendations. I just wanted to clarify that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so yes and no. We will be using slides to talk to the community. We will be now restacking, organizing, renumbering the recommendations for our own internal use to get to the report. Does that make sense? I'm assuming the slides will be aligned with the new numbering.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. So, we'll refer people to the slides that we're going to—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

DENISE MICHEL: Shortly be creating if they want to see a summary of the recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, great. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What I've asked Heather to do is put together a slide that kind of has bullets of what the recommendation is about because I hate talking to full paragraphs. But then the following paragraph will be the actual text, so that people will have, as a takeaway, to look at later, both.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Okay, thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Kerry-Ann's hand is raised.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Kerry-Ann, go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just a light note. I actually got my visa, so I'll see you guys in Montreal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Awesome! Good news.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. It was easier than I thought. I should always do official visas. I got it in a day. So, that's good news.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ram, have you had any change in that? I guess he doesn't have audio. Okay. Jennifer, do you want to … Well, I just did summarize the two action items, so …

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. I was going to say I think [inaudible]. Ram actually just typed in the chat. He said he is waiting.

RUSS HOUSLEY: He is still waiting. Okay. Well, we hope we see you. All right. I think we're done then. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, Russ. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]