BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to SSR2 Plenary 94 on the 11th of December, 2019 at 15:00 UTC. The members attending the call today include Alain, Kerry-Ann, Laurin, Naveed, and Russ. We have apologies from Danko, Eric, and Heather.
	The ICANN Org participants today include Jennifer, Negar, Steve, and Brenda. 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 for today. Thank you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay, thank you. The idea today was to finish filling the gaps. I see that not everyone who had writing assignments is with us today. Hopefully, we can get this finished before too long.
	The first thing I think we need to look at is, Kerry-Ann, you put a bunch of stuff in the document. That was good. Thank you. Maybe you can walk us through what you were thinking.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	If we're going to start there first, I could understand why [Heather], the background document that we had for this, it wasn't … I guess it's probably my fault, it wasn't as good as it could have been in terms of being able to pull a summary as a justification. So what I tried to do, I went through all of the information we had in a document that was titled "DNS SSR Outline Version 2" because that's the one that has a compilation of some of the background data, of some of the

recommendations. But I realize what's missing is that section now, the recommendations we have was a combination of some points that Denise had made. Remember that long text she had at the end of the document before?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So it was merged with that. So the justification for some of the auditing thing, we don't have any background document that I could find online. I went through all the documents we had on our archives and there's no background data on it. So what I think we'll have to do is do some further research. I know we had a [inaudible]. We discussed it at length. But we don't have text that supports the research behind it.

So what I had tried to do yesterday was go through the question and answer which I had compiled in this DNS SSR2 Outline Version 2 document. I went through the notes that I had regarding the GDPR. Some of it is irrelevant now so I think it has to be updated because a lot of this would have been done in 2018 before the updated discussions that they're now having on the temporary document that they use. So I would like to propose that there's text there. I don't think it's smart text meaning that the depth of conclusions we've drawn for the recommendation needs more support background information.

So what I would want to propose is the text is there. It gives kind of a logic that we wanted to address both privacy and security and what

EN

they're doing to pretty much be proactive. That was the logic we had when we did the research, that while they're doing something—because they have documents on data privacy, data protection—it's not comprehensive nor specific.

So I tried to flow what data we do have into a logic to show that one, we want to address the fact that they say they're doing something but we don't think it's enough, which is why we have all the auditing provisions in the recommendations. But I would want to say that if this is published as-is, we would look a little bit uninformed and I want to take an opportunity to refresh the research.

I have time next week and this week because I'm not traveling. I want to take the time to do some further research to see what is the latest they've got on the temporary document because there has been discussions between GAC and other community groups. And while there are no updated documents, I think there has been a substantive comment on the temporary specifications to date. So I would want to do something that … I want to just check all the press releases that ICANN has had since we did the research last year just to make sure that we're up to date with current discussions because right now the research doesn't reflect current discussions and I think it would be erroneous for us to try and publish something that looks a bit ignorant, to say the least.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Fair enough. Okay. So do you think you can have that by the call next week?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. I can. I'm not traveling, so I'm grounded , and all I'm doing for the rest of this week is research and reviewing documents for our internal stuff. So this is on my list as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So text is there. The logic is there. But I am not comfortable that this should be a text that we sign off on or even … I think we need … The research is too old.

RUSS HOUSLEY: so basically, what I hear is you put some stuff in there. It's placeholders. It needs to be updated before the teams talks about it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think so. That's my recommendation. The research is too old to justify us including this in the report as-is.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, you're more expert in—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: The thing is I would agree to the logic that I'm going. The angle I'm taking is that we acknowledge that ICANN staff and the compliance unit says they're doing things. We are not saying that they're not. But we believe that it's not sufficient. That's my logic. And because of the insufficiencies and no documented process outside of them saying that when there is noncompliance with DNS issues or WHOIS complaints, they follow through on the agreement, and while they say that for the GDPR recommendations for privacy, they are following the temporary specification document.

What we're not seeing … What I'm not seeing based on all the things that they have released, they have something that they released in February this year, and they went to the GDPR European Union Commission Board on it and asked for an opinion. But there is nothing on the website after that as to what happened after they got their opinion. It's pretty high-level.

So that's my logic is that while we acknowledge that they are doing something, we don't think it's sufficient and we need more stricter or more clearly articulated processes to deal with WHOIS and to deal with privacy considerations, which is a bit mashed with it because of what WHOIS requires.

I also included the … There was a question posed by, I think it was Danko, regarding while we had included []DARP, so I just put exactly what [DARP] is and I need to do some research to see what has happened to it since. So once you're okay with that logic, I think that's when I would need a team to agree on. Then I can do the research to support that logic, just to verify more updated data. Makes sense?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Makes sense to me. Anyone else on the team want to react?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Alain, I don't know if you had any thoughts on it. I know, t some point, you had some views on the WHOIS aspect. I'm just checking if … I know Alain is on the call, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, he was on at the beginning.

ALAIN AINA: Yes, I am on the call.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And Denise is on by phone as well. Denise, I don't know if you had any feedback because of the auditing section. I couldn't find any document with the background for it. I know we all agreed on the recommendations but if you have anywhere that I could go to, to do the research, I'm more than happy to do that as well.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi, Kerry-Ann. I'm in the car so I don't have access to my laptop at the moment. If you could send me a link to the section of the report you are referring to. I'll check some previous Google docs and see what I can come up with.

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay, I will.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin, do you want to talk about the additions you made?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sure thing. Just so you all know, I am not on laptop right now, so this will be high-level talking points.

For the misleading and abusive naming, we discussed it and mentioned we would want to define what these things are and this is something I have done now. This is just at the beginning of the findings and it essentially just says while misleading naming or what we say misleading naming is, is something along the lines of a reasonable person based on the name would think it leads to A or is provided by A, but it's in fact B, or provided by B. And this can obviously be both kind of accidental, right? So if it's, say, an IDN that just looks similar, we had an example or two for that in the text as well, or it can be purposefully misleading which can now be used for abusive purposes like leading people to phishing sites, etc. So that was that addition.

The other thing that had my name on it was business continuity and disaster recovery. Boban will have a look at it later today, he told me, but he has been so busy that he couldn't do it before. I hoped he could do it before his call.

EN

Essentially, if we could scroll there, I might be able to use my small phone screen to run you through what I've written. It should be in the document under findings, business continuity management, disaster recovery. I'm not sure whose screen is being shared.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I believe that's on page 24. It says "Laurin's Proposed Solution:"

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm not sure that's the correct one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. That's page 25.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, this is not where I put it. Oh, damn. I'm sorry. It is in there. Essentially, it's we're kind of saying, "Okay. I hope I can remember everything I wrote." Essentially, it is about, "Look, ICANN Org in particular has specific functions or specific functions under their purview/control that are really critical, obviously IANA. That is used as an example. And then, obviously, beyond these key things that really shouldn't go down other. There are other things like dealing with interactions between various players and there's obviously the policymaking aspect of ICANN. But generally, which I'm mentioning but I'm kind of saying this is something you might want to think about but it's not as urgent as, obviously, IANA.

We're then saying these things need to have a proper risk assessment attached. This is something I did not write because it didn't have my name on it. So I'm just saying in brackets there, "Please refer to this section, which should reference the risk section." And then it follows with essentially saying, "This stuff is important." There are ISOs in the world that tell you what to do in these cases. We do recognize that ICANN is not your normal kind of company, but that the standards are very flexible and that they can be used. So I'm done giving for various reasons for why this is useful.

So essentially saying, "Yes, it helps to have a standard. It helps to have a baseline to go against, particularly if you want to be audited which is something we recommend ICANN does, again, for a variety of reasons. On the one hand, obviously, another pair of eyes but also to kind of show to the community and the world, whatever you want to use as the audience, that they're doing what needs to be done, that they're dealing with the things they need to deal with. And that's, essentially, the text.

What I can see on my phone screen, it's not the thing I have written. So I'm not sure where it ended up. It is in the Google Doc. I just wasn't sure where to dump it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I'm having a hard time finding it as well. But I'm sure that Heather, who gets these notifications about each addition, will be able to find it and put it in the right place.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think I didn't put it in the right place to be honest. I'm not sure if Heather is on the call who may be able to.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, she's not. Okay, the other text that was added was just a comment from Matogoro. He suggested that we have one introduction to the security risk and business continuity parts because they basically took the same approach to establish, so one set of findings with two recommendations is what he's proposing and it's reasonable to me.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So I think this is fine. I would recommend the following. We need the risk text and essentially the business continuity and disaster recovery can just be appended to that at the bottom. So if we had the risk text, I don't think it would take more than 15 minutes to kind of link this up properly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I think that's what he's proposing.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. I agree.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. So, when you connect with Boban, can you float that idea and make sure that it's at least considered?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So I think Boban had the same approach, or thought the same approach would be useful. So I think that works. As I said, he wanted to have a loo at this but couldn't do it yet. And somehow, [inaudible] also disappeared in the document, so I'm sorry about that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So those were the three contributions that I was aware of. Did I miss any?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just so you know that Denise and I spoke offline last week and we're going to try and work together to do the C-suite text. I don't know, Denise, if you have any updates or if you had any comments so at least I know.

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry, I had trouble getting off mute. I have draft text. I'll send it directly to you, Kerry-Ann, so you can edit it and then be able to [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Thank you. Just so you guys all know, we did try to coordinate last week on that.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: We did, but [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right. Let's see if we can come to closure here soon before the holidays, please. Okay, not hearing any other hands for contributions that I missed. Let's turn to the survey. Laurin, you're going to walk us through this. The idea is to gather information using a survey of the Review Team members regarding prioritization which is both urgency and importance so that we have that raw data in front of us when we get together face-to-face in January. The idea is to not spend the time in the room gathering the data, but discussing the data that the survey yields. Go ahead, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, Russ. As you can see on screen, this is something I made which my dear employer being nicely on top. Essentially, two questions. We might want to tweak the wording slightly, etc. But what you can see is essentially we will have the recommendations and under each recommendation, you will have a slider to rank them from important to extremely important. As you can see, the scale starts at 50. This has to do with the next question, that when Brenda scrolls down, you will see the difference.

Essentially, we dropped everything that we don't think is important already. So there is no "not important" recommendation because that is

a cut we already made. And then essentially, you can kind of slide up and down to kind of say how important is it.

Now we go to urgency. This is slightly different. We haven't really discussed urgency so the idea here in terms of the concept is, one is how important is it for ICANN to have this. And the next one would be kind of how quickly should this be established considering some stuff takes more time than other stuff, etc.

And so there we have the "not at all urgent". That's zero to extremely urgent. At 100, and through the magic of this pretty well-developed survey tool, we will be able to do this the way we want so we can do this completely anonymously where everyone gets a specific link, so they have, the link links it to them but we wouldn't be able to see who said what. In case we want that. We can also put our names in so that we can call on specific comments. That is, I think, something where we might want to decide on. I'm just saying this is possible. And the idea would essentially be that we would have some form of data that is pretty granular or that can be granular.

So if you don't have that much time, you can just push it to "moderately urgent" which is 50. Or if you think there is a level of granularity you want to go to, you can also give something a 66 if you think that is the specific number that should be attached to it. And then we can take all that. We can tabulate it. We can plot it, whatever else, and we kind of went with this design because we said just a few click boxes, takes longer to do. It's not as granular and it's kind of–how can I say? I don't want to say it's less fun but essentially, this seems more natural.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thanks. I think this is straight-forward. I don't see the need for anonymous prioritization input. Does anyone disagree?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think persons identifying, it will help with the discussion as well because then we'll start to get a feel of each person's views on the recommendations as well. I'm okay with it not being anonymous.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So I will ask that Laurin connect with Heather because I think we currently don't have numbers but have little phrases for each of the recommendations to figure out what the best way is to reference each recommendation and then put the survey together. Does that work?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, Russ. This works and Rec 1, 2, 3 was just to show how it would look like. We can maybe do a combination as well where we give them a temporary numbers again. The question is how temporary these numbers would be considering that we're very close to wrapping up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, exactly. That's why I want you to connect with her so you're not working at cross purposes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Makes sense.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there anything else that we need to do today? I note that just yesterday, I got an invite from ICANN Travel for the Cancun meeting. So the planning for that is beginning. If anybody on the team did not get their welcome, please reach out to staff and find out what's going on.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. Just to check in, did we want to have a pre-meeting again? I don't think we discussed this yet. If the dates reflect that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, the dates reflected a pre-meeting, which I assume if we actually achieve our goal in January by producing a draft report for public comment, that we will need to resolve the public comments. So whether we're really going to have such a meeting will depend on the outcome of the January meeting. That's the plan.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: The dates seemed a bit long. So I think for me, I won't be able to confirm until I have probably an idea as to which date specifically we would want to have our face-to-face.

I know for certain that we have a UNGG session the week of March 9th and we have some EU meetings that week as well. So I just want to be certain which dates we would do the face-to-face of our team.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would be the 5th and 6th. The way the invite was worded, Kerry-Ann, that would be the 5th and 6th.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay, because it had official dates approved so I got kind of confused as to which dates were for us, the one that I received.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Like I said, we'll know coming out of the January meeting for sure what we will be spending that time doing. My hope is that we'll be resolving public comments.

ALAIN AINA: So that means we should not get the ticket issued until January, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know whether you have to answer ICANN Travel before that and then just not … I don't know the process on that, so I will let someone from staff answer your question.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. Just to clarify, we had requested the two days pre-meeting which I believe we had discussed before, as Russ said, the 5th and 6th, which is why I haven't seen the travel e-mail but I think it probably says arrival date on the 4th.

And I don't know from … I didn't realize those e-mails had gone out so I'll confirm with our colleagues as to the last day which we would be able to cancel that meeting. I'm not clear as to what—it sounds as if for us, the decision of whether or not to have that two-day meeting will be determined at the face-to-face in January.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So I think we need to plan for success, but be realistic and know that we're going to talk about it at the meeting in January.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay. So we'll get some dates from the travel team in terms of the last dates for cancellation or for booking travel because ideally, obviously, if you're not going to use those two days, it wouldn't be ideal for people to travel two days before the meeting. So we can get back to you on that one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Also, just while we're talking about face-to-face meetings, I think Brenda is waiting for some dinner selections from some people for the D.C. meeting. So if you haven't sent those to her, please do that. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Is there any other business? Then I think we're done. Thank you very much.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Have a good one, guys.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]