JENNIFER BRYCE: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to SSR-2 face-to-face meeting on the 16th of January in Washington, DC. This is Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Org, and I'll pass it to Steve to my left and we can just do a quick roll call. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks. Steve Conte, ICANN Org.

KC CLAFFY: KC Claffy, UCSD.

DAVID CLARK: This is David Clark from MIT. I'm attending as an observer.

ALAIN AINA: Alain Aina.

RAM KRISHNA: Hello. Ram Krishna.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley.

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.

BOBAN KRISC: Boban Krsic.

ZARKO KECIC: Zarko Kecic.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Heather Flanagan.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Naveed Bin Rais.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Scott McCormick.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinna, ICANN Org.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. And Eric Osterweil just walked in.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Late.

JENNIFER BRYCE:	And at the moment, we've got no online participants. So, over to you, Russ.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Good morning and welcome. Hope everyone's travel was uneventful. The goal of this two-day session is to get to a point where we have a very near complete draft report, so that we can get it out for the 40-day public comment and get the comments back before Cancun. So, there's the goal. Let's see if we can get there. We have a lot of us of these two days to do that.
	The first thing we want to do is wrap up the discussion we started on Wednesday last week with the ICANN SMEs. We got most of their comments but we have a few more, so we're going to start with that. I think you said that we're down to two or three left.
STEVE CONTE:	Yeah. There's two left.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Let's start with that. Over to you, Steve.
STEVE CONTE:	Great. Thanks. And just to reiterate, the intention and the tone of these comments from last week is that this was meant as an informal pass from ICANN staff's SMEs to take a look at the draft as of December 9th,

so we're also quite cognizant that there have been changes. There was a snapshot. So, some of the comments may or may not apply.

It's also, like I said, informal. This was just a first reading from staff and was meant to just give some informal feedback to the staff's impression of the documents and things like that.

Russ, also on the leadership call on Monday, you had asked that we create a list of high-level reminders of what was spoken about. So, once I'm done with these last two items, we'll throw that up. It's on the share.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just send it to the email. It's probably easiest.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. So, we're going to pick up—I think we left off at the IANA root zone data and IANA registries measurements. I have just a few more that I wanted to capture and then either capture any dialogue that needs to be reflected back to the SMEs or just move on from there.

So, the next one that we had some comments on was the research and briefings, staying informed and informing policy debates, which is on page 66 of the document.

This was ICANN Org should track developments and peer-reviewed research community focusing on networking and security research conferences, etc. SMEs reflected back that they'd like to get clarification of what the review team has in mind in terms of scope, level of

attention, and effort surrounding that. So, 66. Okay. Let me pause so we can [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible]?

STEVE CONTE: Get good clarification of what they had in mind in terms of scope, level of attention, and effort. So, this one was proposed in the draft that ICANN paid attention to groups that we normally don't participate in, such as ACM and CCS, ACM Internet measurement, conference, USENIX, SIGCOM, IEEE, things like that. The thought—I think, Eric, this was your proposal—was that we have more eyes on those groups. So, the SMEs were just asking for more clarification on the terms of scope, level of attention, and effort around that. If you want a dialogue, I'm absolutely open to it. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, yeah. I think it was basically there's occasion for there to be peer review research that is relevant. And I guess an interesting case point is that one of the [inaudible] papers, one of those at IMC this year was about the root KSK roll and findings from that and where researchers and operators and stuff come together and talk about that stuff. So, that might be a good case point, not that it's the only canonical example but it sort of points at once in a while it's worth looking at what's going on there because there's some relevance.

Then, just some summary output to maybe the community. This community might be sort of like, "Hey, look what these guys are saying." That was kind of he spirit of it.

STEVE CONTE:
Okay. And as I said last week, too, that these comments are neither offensive or defensive, not meant to be more of a clarification as we start understanding the impact of implementation on them. KC?

KC CLAFFY:
I'm reading this paragraph and I probably wrote part of it. It looks pretty concrete to me what we're asking for. So, I hate to say it, but I need clarification of what they mean by clarification. I mean, we say summarize implication of publications that are relevant to ICANN or contracted party behavior. So, anything with the word registrar or registry in the abstract of the paper, I would think. And that if there's recommendations in the back of the paper that talk about what registries and registrars should be doing to improve security. Recommendations for action and changes, contracts that could mitigate SSR harms, recommendations for additional study, description of what data would be required. That looks so concrete to me.

STEVE CONTE:
So, this is only my impression back to you on this and not reflective of the SMEs that might have commented on it but I think the key on that is the scope of—

KC CLAFFY: The scope, how much … So, what do you mean by scope, in terms of how many months of time [inaudible]?

STEVE CONTE: How much full time … It sounded like at a first read that this was a lot of work to put somebody to watch all this stuff.

KC CLAFFY: Right.

STEVE CONTE: And again, my impression, not reflective of anyone who made the comment, is to maybe suggest being a little bit more clear of what you're looking to achieve by having this recommendation in there, the scope of it. But we'll capture what you said. We have it on recording. We'll capture that and we'll turn that into an action item and we'll try to get clarify on the clarify.

KC CLAFFY: So, what you're trying to achieve is a different piece of feedback than scope, level of attention, and effort. So, there's two separate issues I'm hearing there. What's that goal … Which for me is again at the top. It's staying informed and using what's being done in the peer review research community to inform policy. And then there's level of effort which we can think about whether we can put in quarter FTE or something. I don't know how to scope that but that's part of what the

new operating procedures were about is help scope the cost of the recommendation.

STEVE CONTE: Yeah. And actually that's a good point because some of the global comments was that it was too engineered.

KC CLAFFY: Right.

STEVE CONTE: So we're trying to find that balance of … I guess it's more of what we're trying to achieve through that recommendation, then the Org can figure out how to engineer the implementation of that.

KC CLAFFY: Right. So, I think Eric gave a good example with the KSK is we're trying to achieve, make sure the process is smoother next time, take advantage of all the work that's being done in the community because ICANN doesn't have the resources or doesn't spend the resources on doing peer reviewed research generally.

I've watched research happen for 15 years at least that has recommendations in it that could improve security of registrars and registries and they're not taken up. So, that's the question. There's a gap between what we know in the scientific community and what ICANN uses operationally and we're trying to close that gap.

EN

STEVE CONTE: Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I don't know if this is piling on or getting in line, hopefully it's not [inaudible] of what we're talking about here. But just to make sure it's on the record, we talked about this last time as well. I think you could reach out to the leadership of the organizing committees, the steering committees, of these venues. And I mentioned as an example, like SIGCOM basically does "here's what you're going to see this week" and a little brief presentation where they sort of summarize all the papers that are coming up.

I mean, if there was some outreach to the leadership, they would probably be able to do those sorts of things for us, too, whether we as a community summarize and read the work—some of us stay abreast of it, some of us don't—or whether we bring in the organizers of those other things and say, "Why don't you come and brief us on what happened this year?" or something in between.

My point is just some people do some summary already. That would make the lift lighter. And this goes right to our conversation about what's the best way for us to put recommendations out that are meant to be helpful but aren't implied as directive.

I could say do what I just said. That will accomplish this goal. But someone could read that as, "Why are you telling me what to do?" But

if we say there's interesting stuff, there's gold in those hills, good luck," that's not as helpful.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Finding that middle ground.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right. Yeah. So, this might be a good strawman for us to feel that out or it might just be a one-off but this is a good example.

STEVE CONTE: Great. Thank you, Eric. And again, we have this recorded. We'll capture that as action items and we'll take any concerns back to the organization to try to get clarity as you guys move into final draft mode on that.

I want to pause and welcome Kerry-Ann and Denise on the record on that, too. So, hello, you two.

Next one would be on page 26 and 67. I think 26 is probably what you have there. This is under DNS over HTTPS, implications [DoH]. What I have here is ICANN Org thinks it's a good recommendation but asks the review team to consider wording it such that the commission report be non-biased.

So, in the recommendation, it says ICANN Org should commission investigations into these increasing trends and focus particular intention on the reduced resilience. And they felt that that might have been a

little too focused on the commission report, and so the SMEs are requesting to maybe consider just asking for a non-biased commission report. There's no one thinking it's a bad idea or stopping—

KC CLAFFY: We could just take the word reduced out.

STEVE CONTE: Yeah. And again, these comments are in good faith and meant to be an informal dialogue and just helping move forward on this. So, no comments on that? Okay.

The next one that we had was under privacy. Privacy and SSR measurements, page 25 and 65. This is about ICANN's DPO should be responsible for external DNS PII. DPO should provide guidance to managers and stakeholders regarding responsibilities and procedures and monitor and report on relevant technical developments.

Our SME reflected back that they'd like to see definitions and rationale, and I want to pause there and recognize that, as of the December 9th version of the report, there were many places where there was no rationale yet inserted into the report. So, that could clear up a lot of some of these comments as well.

They would like to see definitions and rationale so they can better understand what exactly this recommendation is asking for. It was a little confusing to the SMEs.

All right. So, there's the big elephant in the room. This is page 14. This is abuse and compliance. Abuse definitions and reporting. ICANN Org and Board should undertake the following short-term and long-term actions regarding the application of DNS abuse. And there's a couple of paragraphs around that.

The general comments from SMEs and from the Org was that ICANN Org is concerned about this item as it feels the community needs to come to consensus on the definition of DNS abuse.

As you're all well aware, there's still a lot of talk going on within the CCT recs, and I believe in Montreal there were a couple of sessions that were launched, run by various constituencies about starting the conversation about DNS abuse.

So, ICANN Org is concerned that this might get caught up in a cycle on that. Denise, I see your card up.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey. Well, speaking of getting caught up in a cycle, I think a great way to get caught up in a cycle is to declare that we're not going to take any action on something because there's conversation in the community. I think the reality on this point is that the CCT Review was very diligent and very specific in noting that there had been a fully vetted and re-vetted definition and action and implementation on a DNS abuse definition.

And what we're asking for here is for you to continue to take action on that definition in addition to, in parallel with, looking at some specific recommendations on how to update that definition.

So, as I think is clearly laid out in this report, there is overwhelming, compelling evidence that not only has there been an unfortunate neglect of mitigating abuse that falls in some fashion within ICANN's purview and its contract … No. Anyway, I'll just leave it there.

So, I don't think we've got agreement with staff here, but perhaps staff was thinking that we were not in some way supporting discussions, revolutions of DNS abuse definitions. In my view, we are. But what we're saying is also what the CCT report said, that the Board actually— and perhaps staff didn't understand because they did not fully read it and look at the footnotes but there is a well-vetted and actionable DNS abuse definition that's been in place for several years. We're suggesting you use that, take action now, because of the overwhelming amount of abuse, in addition to updating your abuse definition. Thanks.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. Thank you for your response. We will capture that and send it back to the SMEs as well on that. Thank you. KC?

KC CLAFFY: I was just saying that we could do maybe a little better job of citing the definition that we mean, that our understanding is that there has been some consensus, at least in big chunks of the community on this. But it's

not cited well in the report, I think, so we can improve that and see if it helps.

STEVE CONTE: Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I just wanted … Do you think … I know that you wouldn't have known what their intent was. Is it that the intention was for us to modify the recommendation or do you think the intention was to remove it, given that it may be duplicitous or it might be that it's not as relevant? What do you think … I was wondering what the intent was because we need to action it. So, I don't think it's sufficient just to restate what we probably have in the recommendation, but to actually know what we should do with the recommendation.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you for that. Again, this is going to be my impression of … We had a very large group discussion prior to this, so this is just my interpretation of that.

First, I think intent is a strong word and I don't want to us that. This was meant to be an informal dialogue and was meant to raise points. I don't even want to call them concerns. Points that ICANN staff had reflected or had noted within the December 9th snapshot of the draft.

I think some of the language that was used that caused some discussion around that was that ICANN Org and Board should implement CCT and

RTS review recommendations surrounding the definition of DNS abuse, so there's a clear link between those and there was some … Again, concern is too strong of a word but I don't have enough coffee in me to come up with good words. Concern about the direct linkage between that.

So, there's absolutely no … There was no conversation about stopping or trying to steer the review team to define it differently. It was just some concern about the direct linkage between the review team's—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It might be useful if the review team clarifies then what precisely between the two recommendations regarding the definition that we want to be implemented. It might be useful.

STEVE CONTE: I feel that would be helpful.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: To clarify and to be very precise.

STEVE CONTE: Speaking as myself, I feel that would be helpful.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Not to just be general.

EN

STEVE CONTE: Any other comments around that? I know that's kind of a big issue, so I want to leave plenty of space for discussion if there is any further comments that need to get brought back to staff on that. I'm seeing no cards, no hands, no eye contact, so …

The final items were kind of all grouped in together for DAAR and I think it was recommended that there was to be a separate call with John Crain from OCTO, SSR, and interested review team members to try to come to alignment on some of the DAAR questions. So, I don't necessarily feel I've got the proper scope to frame those questions and I would like to defer those to a separate call with DAAR—about DAAR rather—with John Crain and whoever wants to join that call. So, I know that there was some talk about trying to get something together.

That was it on the comments. Like I said, there was only a few left to do. Thanks to Jennifer. She captured high-level of the ones that we did speak about last Wednesday. We'll put that up in the room. It's also a Google Doc at this point that they have access to.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. I sent it [inaudible].

STEVE CONTE: Oh. So, she's way ahead of me. Again, coffee.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [off mic].

STEVE CONTE: That was per request of Russ that the review team has something to refer back to last week's meetings at a high level of the general feeling and sense of what last week's meeting resulted in.

So, with that, unless there's any other comments that would like to go on record to get reflected back to staff, I'm going to pass it back to Russ and the rest of the leaders to move forward on the meeting.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We just … I'm sure we have concluded survey that we had with prioritization and urgency. So, I'm not sure about its status. Maybe Russ and Laurin can update on that.

But I would like the results of that and the informal feedback from ICANN Org or SMEs to see how they synch up together. For example, there's a kind of urgency that the review team thinks that it is [inaudible] importance, and the Org and SMEs think otherwise or they are aligned together.

So, it would be nice at some stage to see independently how they correlate with each other.

STEVE CONTE: Thanks, Naveed. As of the December 9th snapshot that staff looked at, there was acknowledgement that there was no work on prioritization at

that time, so the comments that were made did not touch on priority or prioritization, and if you'd like to request staff to look once you guys go through the prioritization exercise, we'd be happy to take another informal look at it. Or if you'd like it to be more formal, however the review team would like us staff to—if even would staff to review and consider that, we'd be happy to take that in whatever form you want. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Can you confirm that staff will be providing written public comments when we post this for public comment? That's part one. And part two, I previously requested more information on the process or priorities that ICANN will apply to the $20 million in SSR funds it's getting from Verisign. Will we be receiving information on that this week? Thanks.

STEVE CONTE: So, to answer the first question, yes, ICANN staff does plan on having a formal response during the public comment period. Negar, is there anything beyond that I should say or that you want to say?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Steve. Yeah. I think that's the plan, definitely is the intent. Hopefully we'll have—

STEVE CONTE: As far as the funding from Verisign, I don't know the details of that and I don't think we'll be able to get you any kind of answer this week on that. I think it's still … Premature is the wrong word again. I need more coffee. More undeveloped as far as how that funding is going to be used and I don't know the details of the contribution at all, so I can't speak on that personally.

DENISE MICHEL: Who does? Who is leading this within ICANN?

STEVE CONTE: I can find out. I don't know.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That actually is interesting because I don't know, have any idea what the money is intended for but it could be that it's related highly to some of these recommendations. I don't know. It would be interesting to know if that is already the case. Go ahead.

STEVE CONTE: So, just to understand that, between your comments Russ and Denise's comments, the review team is asking for a plan or guidance on how that funding is going to be used, if it applies to any of the items within SSR review recommendations?

DENISE MICHEL: No. I'm asking for what process and priorities and any additional information that staff has or is thinking about in using the $5 million a year it will get from Verisign starting next year, irrespective of whether you think you can draw a line specifically to a recommendation. This applies obviously to ICANN's SSR. This is information that we should use and factor in as we finalize the report.

STEVE CONTE: Okay. And Scott, before I go to you, Russ, is that what you're asking, too, or do you want to add to the ask?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. That information would resolve what I was asking.

STEVE CONTE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Scott.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Also, on the $5 million and whatever priority is in mechanisms that it's used to fund, what—I haven't had enough coffee—checks and balances [inaudible], but what checks and balances are being conducted to verify that before being obviously funded by Verisign?

STEVE CONTE: Thank you, all, for that input and we'll capture that and get back.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's a new logo, right, Scott? That's a new logo? Funded by Verisign.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah, exactly. Is there a check there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Anything else on the SME read-out before we move to the next agenda item? All right. Good. Sorry, I'm pulling up the agenda. Okay, good. I remembered what was next.

So, the next thing we want to do is different people had some homework to put things into the report. My understanding Is Heather gets a little email note every time a change is made to the document. She must have a ton of stuff in her mailbox.

So, we had that little table that was in a Google spreadsheet of those assignments. I'm not sure that the order in that table is the best way to go through this. I suspect and would like input from Heather as to whether just going front to back would probably be the better way. Yeah? Okay. So, let's see if we can put the Google Doc up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The actual report?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yes, the actual report. So, I believe there's a whole bunch of boxes off on the right that indicate where the suggestions have been made. So if we could just scroll down to the first one.

Okay. So, this was actually my homework. Matagoro made a suggestion on the mail list after this that we break this into two parts, definitions and acronyms. I like that, too. I think it made a lot of sense. I just didn't want to unilaterally do it. But I think looking at this, I have to agree with him. Laurin, go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yes. Quick question regarding to how we want to do this. I read through this thing and there were some comments, for example, it was like, "Hmmm, should we add a bit more to these explanations, for example?" It's very specific. Maybe, Heather, what do you think? What's the best way …

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

Oh, [inaudible]. No problem.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Us to do it because you're in charge of the document. I'm happy to just suggest it in. I don't know.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	So, what I would like to do in terms of process is make a pass regarding the homework, then we have all day tomorrow to make the document better.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Excellent.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. KC?
KC CLAFFY:	This is where I first hit the DNS abuse definition issue because we sort of try to define it in here but we don't have a citation to what source we're using for the definition. I think the whole intentional misuse thing is going to not go over well.
	So, I think we need to—and again, maybe that doesn't belong in the definition section because it's so hairy. We have to pretty much at the beginning of where we talk about DNS abuse say we understand this is, in some spaces, perceived as controversial. Here's what we're using as a definition. Here is why. Cite, cite, cite. Cut and paste from the documents where we're getting [inaudible] communique and everything. And I'm not sure … Unless we do that in this glossary, we shouldn't have it in this glossary at all.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	That makes sense. Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: I will cite the hell out of that. It's coming.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I mean, I actually spent a fair amount of time on that one. But that took me as long as the rest of my—right. Because I went to the Cybercrime Convention. It's not in there. It is not in there. Despite the fact that our report says it is. It is not in there. So, I went to the CCT report and so on. Anyway … Right. Go ahead, Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I wanted to make a suggestion. So, once it is that we include it as a definition within our report, it now becomes a citable source. So, should we at all include it here or just deal with it under the DNS section that we have and then reference it, instead of trying to do a definition here? So for me, I would probably prefer that it not be a definition and keep it within the section that would deal with DNS and cite all the other sources because it becomes citable once we include it here. And that we become the third report [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. No, you need a pointer but—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, [inaudible], so pointed instead of trying to use text.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	See along discussion in "blah". That's fine. I'm totally fine with that.
KC CLAFFY:	By the way, I have the same problem later in this glossary with the phrase "security threat" and I'm a little nervous as I read through these that we're having words that really aren't related to SSR of the DNS. So, it wasn't clear to me that the word "ransomware" needs to be in this glossary. And I'm in the mode of cut anything you can cut because people aren't going to read a 100-page document.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	So, the reason I included that one is it's talked about later.
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	So, it's like where do you draw the line? I get that.
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah. On security threat, we have to be clear what the heck we mean by security threat. Do we mean DNS abuse related security threat? Because that's a very big word, security threat. Okay, I'm done.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. In the vein of a large document, a lot of this stuff, when we bisect it, probably we could put at the end for those readers that feel like they want to see it. But right now, it's front-loaded. Makes the document feel a lot heavier, especially if you want to just skim through it. But then you think you shouldn't. But the separating acronyms from definitions, I think maybe those both go at the end.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I agree. Can we hyperlink this—all of this—and put it at the end in an annex?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. Maybe this is for Heather. Under the definition of stability, we qualify it to the identifier system, but for security, we don't—or security threat at least. Sometimes we do and sometimes we don't and I think we should be consistent in the glossary.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, do you see a problem doing that? Do you need words from us or do you know how to do that is what I'm asking. Okay, thank you. There's a whole bunch of places where I'm sure the answer will be, "No, the review team needs to do that."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you.

KC CLAFFY: By the way, on footnote 5, is that the most recent framework document we have from ICANN? It's now going to be four years old by the time—

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is correct. And they told us last week they don't intend to update it ever again.

                          Okay. So, what I'm hearing is Heather knows what to do here and move it to the end. Okay. Can we scroll down to the next homework-related comments?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Are we going to link to the strategic plan that when we mention—okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh yeah. You did this? All right. Well, then, you can tell us what you did.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I did not drop the text in here. This was Heather. I just left it as a comment. I wasn't sure where it would go. Essentially, I went for the whole table and kind of added as before kind of which goals [inaudible] recommendations. Obviously, if you look at number one, [inaudible] security of domain name system, DNS root server system, that

essentially is linked to everything we do. And sometimes there are additional ones, like number two, if we could scroll down. I'm not sure if it's three or four, which also comes up from time to time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's also quoted text, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. So, this is quoted. This is all a quote. So, four sometimes comes in, three sometimes comes in, and I think even five. But obviously the one that always matters in some way is number one with some objectives.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: There we go. So, I believe I put this in for someone else. I personally don't like having this text here at all because it is all quoted material and reiterating so much of the strategic plan doesn't seem to add value.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It has to be in the report.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I feel the problem is if we don't have this in there somewhere … We all say, "Oh, this really matters for strategic objective number one," but no

EN

one knows what strategic objective number one is. So, that's why I left it in there, to be put somewhere.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Based on the decision to move all the definitions to the end, this probably should go to the end as well. Does that make sense, Heather? Is your card still up? How about you? Okay. Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just a quick question. When we move it down to the end of the appendix, are we doing a statement somewhere in the preamble to state that the recommendations have been aligned to strategic objectives which could be found in annex blah-blah-blah?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Is Heather expected to do that or us? Just to be clear. You can do that? Okay. Just to make sure. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. I think it's important that we move that stuff to the back, so that you get to the meat, right? All right. Scroll down to the next one. We can skip the [toll] table.

Okay. So, that is why the survey for priority only started at 50 instead of zero.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's 55, [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. That was the thought.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] is a low priority.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I'm sure you didn't put anything that was below 75 on your answers. Okay. Go ahead, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Another reason I think for the survey and for this is this was what we really hoped for by saying everything aligns to a strategic objective. It is therefore a high priority. The feedback we got from the Board, not just us but in general, how a review team should work is that they really, really, really wanted more clarity on priority, and if everything—if all 20-something, nearly 30 recommendations—are high priority, then they're going to cherry pick. So, that's where the whole, all right, well, if we're going to really, really say something is incredibly important, then the survey comes in so we can figure what that is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I don't think so. Probably not. Unless we cannot come to consensus on priority, which I hope won't be the case.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Which from the one discussion we've had on priority is quite possible. Okay. End of the table. Go ahead, Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, it's just to clarify. KC sent [inaudible] just to make sure. So, when we say that the sentence won't be there, it's just a matter that the words "high priority" won't be there. It's not—

KC CLAFFY: Right.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Because the statement … I mean, I think the whole purpose of us writing that it aligns the strategic objectives is to show that we didn't just randomly go off on a tangent. So, the sentence will still remain, but just the words "high priority" will be removed. I just wanted to make sure because it's critical. Okay.

KC CLAFFY: Are the words in the orange box locked? Have we decided we're done with [the wording]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. But you wanted to skip over the box—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Those words come later.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The words in those boxes are direct quotes from the recommendation text. So, if you don't like them, you have to change the recommendation text.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't want to talk about them twice. All right. End of the table, please.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: For what it's worth, I tried to just accept where I could all the grammatical and other little bitty changes, so that you didn't see

EN

everything that changed. These are more the substantive comments, at least as of a week ago. If anyone has added new stuff, I haven't had a chance to go through it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. At this point, I don't think we need to spend time on the intro paragraph, so then let's go into work stream 1. Heather didn't have homework I know this weekend.

Okay, Boban, was that just fixing a cite? So, it looks like … I can't tell what change you made, other than you just inserted that paragraph or what did you do?

BOBAN KRSIC: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right. Anybody have concerns with that? I think we should accept it, then. Okay, Laurin, Denise, and Kerry-Ann were going to update this part? I don't know. I'm asking.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm just wondering if the last bit, hire an appropriately qualified individual, do we want to be that specific? It could be someone that is moved into that position.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Okay. I'm going to wave my tiny little card around again. Could you go back up to findings? Because I did something here. What I did—and I did that earlier. That second paragraph, the ICANN Org has a critical need for—I moved that up out of the recommendation into findings. Are we okay with that? Yes?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Actually, it makes sense to me.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, accept. Okay, scroll down. And stop there. Laurin, you were saying something about this. At this point, I think that's [inaudible]. But go ahead, Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: Thank you, Russ. I wonder if or when we [inaudible] discuss this issue because this was one of the topics that you or Dave addressed in the conference call last week and there was also new information [from me]. There is still some at ICANN responsible for security. Maybe it's new information. We don't have that information [into 18]. You can't hear me? Okay. So, I will talk to this one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's very directional. You have to speak right into it.

BOBAN KRSIC: I was wondering if this recommendation is still relevant because we heard the information or [inaudible] information last week from Dave that there is someone at ICANN who is responsible for information security. So, the question is, is this the right position? Do we need to amend here something? Should we recommend it and say, okay, it's the recommendation and then ICANN should decide if it's the right position or not? So, only to clarify a little bit and to talk about that because [inaudible]. What do you think about it?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just referring quickly to the survey that is not yet complete. I sent out another email. If you haven't done it, do it during the next break, please.

Just to say it is one of the highest rated and important to have the CISO, CSO position.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry, then Denise. Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: She had to go first.

DENISE MICHEL:

Yes. So, I take your point that we should specifically cite the current CTO and CIO and relationship to the new position that Kerry-Ann has proposed.

Also, I think make it clear that you look across the expanse of all the security and stability issues and recommendations in this report, it is really clear that the CIO and the CTO only have slices of it and I think part of the point—not to speak for Kerry-Ann—she was making was that in looking in totality about the challenges in SSR that ICANN has, it's I think clear to me and others that a C-suite executive whose job it is to look across these issues, interact with the Board and the community, and manage some of these priority areas is very important.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Thanks for saying it so eloquently. To Boban's specific point, I think there is value in probably maybe rephrasing it, but I think it should not be removed because I think what is still absent is we don't have any control over the roles and functions that will be assigned to this role or this new person. The person could just be responsible for buying security tools. Full stop.

So, what we are looking at, the kind of person we're hoping that they would hire as a result of this recommendation is someone who has complete responsibility for coordination, strategic planning, response in terms of making sure that the organizational changes that need to happen, happens, and someone who is high enough that they can speak to the Board.

So, I haven't seen the full function and role of this new person. Maybe we could look at it and then amend. But the whole point is if that person has a very limited scope in their job function, we would still need someone with that high enough authority to do the coordination that we're seeing as absent.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry, could you put those four things into the findings?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Which four things?

RUSS HOUSLEY: The four you just named.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I don't know what I said. It's on the recording. Where is Jennifer?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Kerry-Ann said, "I don't know what I just said." Okay. Naveed, Laurin, then KC.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. So, I'm just wondering again if this recommendation has to stay, we might need to work more on its rationale. At this point, I'm not sure which part we are asking the ICANN Org to have it as it is and which part

we are giving leverage to ICANN Org to play with it, so there has to be a clear distinction between the two.

So, having a C-suite kind of executive at that role is okay but how it would work with CTO and CIO or are we explicitly mentioning that it is up to ICANN Org to manage that or keeping in view that this is what you have to do but this is what you deal with it as it is. So, I would like to have more text related to that. Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, that's one of the struggles, I think, because Denise and I had [off script] email and I kept promising her that I'd add more text to the rationale.

The challenge I find is that ICANN, and even the persons on the team here, we're all security oriented. So, it's difficult to write text that says what this person should do because we all know what this person should do. The community as well, whoever reads it and is interested in this, it's difficult to give you a textbook explanation as to the role of this person or the function of this person because it kind of goes without saying, [inaudible] security for security.

The challenge I would have is that we can't be prescriptive because we are not going to sit with the Board to actually write the job description of this individual.

What I think we could work on the text is to refine what we expect as the end result of having this person, so the end result is really that coordination, strategic objective. It's coming back.

So, I think over the course of today and tomorrow, I think I'll spend time because I know next week is ridiculous, so I'll spend time today and tomorrow working on this and then we'll refine it. But any information, Steve, you have on … This is a [news announcement] one, Boban, or just word of mouth?

RUSS HOUSLEY: My takeaway from what we heard last week was actually confirmation that this is needed. The fact that it's John Crain is responsible for external related things and Terry Manderson for internal related things and they report to two completely different branches of the organization is exactly the reason why we need this position.

KC CLAFFY: Well, maybe Kerry-Ann covered it. I just think that it's not clear, and when I just read this recommendation and I just read the recommendation without the rationale, it looks crazy to me to have there be the same person responsible for ICANN's internal security, like the normal, what we think of as a [inaudible] for a Fortune 500 company. And then also that same person be responsible for the security of the global identifier system, which is what ICANN is supposed to do. That to me is not the same person. It shouldn't be the same person.

You're trying to identify a problem which is those two chain of commands don't communicate. And what is the harm from that? We need to be clear about why that's a problem and why we think this position could fix it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry took the homework, I think. Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Thank you. We'll capture that and we'll reflect that back to staff. Can you let staff know I want my own microphone?

                       Yeah. So, that's one of the reasons why a CSO sometimes will have a lot of CSOs under them, and the CSOs will have things that they do. And that doesn't mean the CSO has to do everything but at least there's a point at which they all get together.

                       I think your comment is very, very good, KC. The global identifier system has a big blast radius. But at the same time, it is kind of coupled in that, like the IANA registry database resides inside of corporate ICANN.

                       So, it would make sense for somebody to just be able to be holistically, if not in charge, have visibility and all that. So, I think what we're saying is one step further is, yeah, there should be an organizational alignment, so that in the event that there needs to be a cohesive security posture, it can be effectuated. Does that make sense? I mean, I'm not trying to be argumentative.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My interpretation of what they said is what goal are you trying to accomplish by this suggestion. That's what I heard. So, during the break, Kerry-Ann is going to take care of that, right? Okay, moving on.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, can I make a meta comment?

RUSS HOUSLEY: A meta comment.

KC CLAFFY: When the text is a recommendation from SSR-1, can Heather make it in italics or something? Because I'm confused on whether we're rewriting the recommendation and this is what we're going to put in SSR-2 or it's really quoted text. So, I want quoted text to be indented or in italics. And it's not here. That's a meta comment for the whole report.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Sure. I can do that. That's exactly what we did, at least for making sure the SSR-1 recommendations were italicized in the appendix for that. So, I can do it in the body of the text, too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, moving down. Eric, what does signal mean? You did it two days ago and I'm not sure what you're trying to tell us. If you click on the comment, it will tell you what text you were commenting on.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This content was pulled from some very old material which I dug up. I'm not sure if it's what you want in here at all. So, this is some old history.

With that diagram, I know KC had a lot of questions in the original document this came from which is probably a couple years old. So, the whole section needs review.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. Right. Which is why I marked this as one of those things of we needed text here. I was trying to assist by saying here's where it came from. But you all need to look at it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I think this was really old and was done for a different context.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can this end of the table just take an action item to pull that and rewrite a small part as an intro and plug it back in later today or tomorrow?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Steve observed that signal is in the sentence before but signal starts in the first sentence. Okay, Eric. Thank you for highlighting this. This needs … Can one of you pick … I would like a designee who's responsible for doing the edit on this paragraph. Okay, Eric's got it. Thank you. Can we go back to page 36, then?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'll deal with you later.

STEVE CONTE: While we're navigating back to page 36, just as a reminder, we got so many hands in the pie, to remind everyone to make sure they're in suggesting mode today and not editing mode so we're not doing fell swoops of changes without notification.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That would make things faster.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It might make it faster but, at the end, we may not have consensus. That I worry about. Okay, back further down.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just because we scroll back up. Denise had inserted text here, so I was just wondering why it's not being seen.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]:   Because I moved it into findings.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Oh, okay, it's moved.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Can we scroll down? Boban moved a paragraph. That's fine. Keep going. Okay, Matogoro proposed … Basically, we had one set of findings to cover both the risk management and the disaster recovery. Matogoro put together the text. Please take a look. Can you scroll up a little bit? No, other way, so we can see more of his text. Okay, that's a little too far.
	Okay. Can we scroll up a little more? Scott, are these the right documents? [inaudible] citing the three [ISO] documents?
	Okay. I'm not hearing any concerns. Eric has made a few editorials. That's fine. So, what do we think that first sentence is supposed to say? I think we're saying we want the implementations of BC, [DR], and [IMS] to be audited. I think that's what the sentence says. Okay. Heather, can we just replace that? Thank you.
	Oh, I see. Thank you. I've been waiting and nothing is changing. Okay. Scroll down until we find the next homework. There it is. Laurin. Oh, okay. He added the which strategic objectives. Okay, moving on. You can accept his. Go ahead, Laurin.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Yeah. So, with the strategic objectives. I just want to make the note, as I already wrote to the list as well and kind of mentioned before, sometimes there are connections to strategic objectives that are not [one] which is security. Some of them are more [strenuous] than others. Let's just say I would be personally in favor of getting rid of those. I did put them in, so they're there, because there is a connection that could

be made but I would prefer personally to focus very specifically only if it's super obvious to put something in.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm a little confused. Perhaps, Laurin, you and I can talk about its separately. I'm not quite sure what you want … You want footnotes—

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, essentially, I added the links to the strategic objectives. We said all our recommendations will refer to strategic objectives and their [sub-goals]. More or less, it's always number one, which is literally security of the DNS. In some cases, there are links to other ones, like develop the ecosystem or improve the multi-stakeholder processes. And in some cases, those links are not as obvious. I put them in the text, but personally, if it's not really directly related, I would rather kill it but I didn't want to make that call. So, this is something we can kind of talk about at some point. I just wanted to make the comment because this was the one where [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I thought when we last spoke about this, we decided that we want to preserve that information, maybe move it to the table, the [colored] table that we zoomed past or something. But that inserting it in the middle of all these sentences made it harder to parse the sentence and get to the point.

So, we don't want to lose the information but we want to make the recommendations easier to read.

Okay. we have a break planned for 10:30 which is 15 minutes from now. But we're at a break between the work streams, so I'm going to suggest we take that break now and be back at 10:30. If you have not completed your survey, please do so during the break. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: If you have not completed the survey, you will have received an email from Qualtrics this morning. I know that nine people have not completed the survey. This is total tracking, people. I haven't checked who it is. I could.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Welcome back. We're going to begin on the work stream 3 part. My memory is Boban had some assignment here. No?

BOBAN KRSIC: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric made a suggestion. Oh, that's right. Yours was work stream 2. Sorry. I see. So, the comment related to the box at the upper right is actually the blue text. Where's Heather?

Eric, does it really have to be as illustration consider an example?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	It doesn't have to be anything. It can be whatever you want. I think there was something above it where it says example, so I don't want to say example again but—
RUSS HOUSLEY:	But then you did.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	No [inaudible] first engagement.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. That's minor but obviously … We can leave that to Heather to clean up. Okay. Does anyone have any concerns with the paragraph that was added by Eric? You're in the process and methodology section of work stream 3. Okay. Please assign this paragraph to KC to edit.
[DENISE MICHEL]:	What is a spoofed service to [inaudible]? Who is doing the spoofing? I don't understand this sentence. What is a spoofed service to [inaudible]?
[HEATHER FLANAGAN]:	So, this particular process and methodology section, we actually just talked about that with relation to signal, I think, which means we assigned it to Eric. We knew that this needed to be redone, so maybe KC and Eric can … So, skip to the next thing because we know this needs work and there's not much we can do about it right now.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can I ask a question? Is it just a matter that will be rephrasing it from describing methodology? Because it still needs the rationale and it has a lot of the rationale, which is the logic to how we came up with it. I'm just wondering because that's the only thing I think that needs to be changed with the … It's how it's written which the other sections are not written that way, by discovering the methodology, but I think it's important as a part of the rationale as to why we took this angle. So, is it like we're moving the subtitle process and methodology and just reworking the text? I don't think it's as hard as we think it is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, no, offline is fine. I don't think it's as difficult as we think it is. Just to kind of motivate you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, we've got our homework assignment. Scroll down. Should be pluralized.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Moving down. Yeah, it's all part of the part that's going to be rewritten. There's the signal. We're moving past that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, my initial question on this one was, with the text that was submitted, the areas of reviewing the section, that didn't seem to match what was actually done. That looked like what was done in work stream 2 or the previous work stream. I didn't understand what I was missing here. Something seemed strange.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Actually, if you start reading at the next paragraph, I'm not sure you lose anything.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. I know at some point [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I'm just wondering if delete isn't the right answer.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think at one point early on we were—

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's my … I just did the thought experiment and it seems to work in terms of communicating. Okay. All right, moving on to the next chunk of homework. So, this is a concern that we've mixed the findings and the recommendations. Is that the point?

[DENISE MICHEL]:   If you go to page 44 in the large paragraph that starts with ICANN's legal authority to address compliance, security or stability, you've got in there "and therefore it is recommended that …" and I thought that didn't sound very much like a finding. That sounded like a recommendation. Should it just be moved? Has it already been covered? What do you want to do with this?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. I'm happy to work on that, clarify it. We really don't need a summation of the areas that this recommendation touches on at this point, so I'll change it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. Norm, go ahead.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. Heather, I just want to clarify something. Are you suggesting that the recommendations be moved to other sections of the report, of the abuse section? I'm just reading your comment here.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. That's a good part of it. You have your findings. Here's the homework that we did and then you have your recommendations. In here, this is your findings section. That's including some recommendations. Not all of the recommendations seem to actually be covered elsewhere, so some should be deleted or maybe moved or something needs to happen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The summary, not the actual recommendations.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It needs to not say recommend.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay. So long as we don't lose the punch that it gives by clumping it under abuse. So, if you start to separate them out into different sections, you—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That's not what she's saying. In the text itself where we have rationale, we also say "and therefore it is recommended …" So, it's just to [lift] all the things that is a recommendation within the justification and either create a new recommendation under the right section or, if it's already covered with how we have it recommended to delete it altogether. So, it's pretty much we have a mix of both rationale and then we continue by "because we said this, it is now recommended" when all the other text is not written like that.

DENISE MICHEL: I'll take the oar in tweaking this. But just to make sure we're all on the same page, I'm not changing the substance. I'm changing the style and organization. We don't want to put a high-level recommendation summary in a findings section. So, I'm just going to be really clear about separating findings from recommendations. I'm not touching any of the substance. Right? Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Maybe I missed this point earlier somewhere but I'm not sure why we are using the title heading as rationale and findings. To me, they might be different and mixing them together might be very confusing because we might have a [rationale] heading if required and findings heading because all of them might not have findings and some of them might not have that kind of rationale or logic. So, some recommendations are based on the findings. So, maybe, I don't know, currently it's very, very mixed if you read the pretext.

And secondly, I assume that for any recommendation of the document to conclude the findings saying that it is recommended. So, I don't have any problem putting it as recommended at the end of the findings. And then you have a formal statement of the recommendation itself which can go in the next paragraph or next heading.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Part of the challenge that we've been dealing with here is that the recommendations were written before any findings or rationale were put together. In many cases throughout here, that was the ordering. It wasn't, "All right, let's draft all the …" What research we did, what our

rationale are, and then come up with the recommendations. In many cases, it was the other way around.

What I was aiming for is since there is a little bit of a mix of the actual finding components of this is the result of the research and then rationale, here's how we interpreted what we found and then here's how the recommendations, I just wanted it to be reasonably consistent through the document to make it easier for the reader to figure out, okay, where should I look at, why you made this recommendation at all and then have the recommendation. I think having that structure is a lot easier for a reader in general.

DENISE MICHEL: Do you think it should just be findings and not rationale and findings? Does that make it—

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It depends on the recommendation, actually. Some of them … The point is sometimes I feel that one paragraph contains both of them, so we might have the same text but separating them in two different paragraphs, starting with the rationale and then finding before putting the recommendation itself. So, maybe the reorganizing might …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: On [inaudible], I would say sometimes we don't have findings but it's more rationale from just general knowledge that we had. Some of the findings we have is from specific investigations we did last year or the

year before. So, I think having both in the title I think would help because at least that way it covers both.

When we try to separate it, you'll have some with rationale and findings, some without rationale, some with just findings, and then it becomes … I think it would be more messy for the reader. So, the broad heading, rationale and findings, at least it just allows the reader to know that there's some [inaudible] before the recommendation, if that makes you more comfortable or it makes more sense. Just because I know when we were going through it, it's not all of them that have findings, which is why we started to write some rationales for them.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, I understand that, but the problem is, as I said, somewhere I believe that both of them are very much mixed with each other. One sentence for rationale and then one sentence for findings, that might need rephrasing or restructuring within the same, even if we maintain the same heading. But a paragraph for rationale or two paragraphs, followed by findings. In case there is no rationale and we have direct findings, we might start with the findings, by putting the same heading. That's not a problem, but putting them in more … When we have another pass of this document, maybe we can keep that in mind.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I think we have assigned homework here to fix this part. Thank you, Denise. Moving down. Why the question mark? I think we could just delete the question mark. Okay, moving on. I think you got an answer to that, so moving on. Okay, what's the requires follow-up part?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's on abuse.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ah! Denise, consider yourself reminded. Remind me if I forget. Okay. All right. Good. Moving on. Is it okay to remove that clause?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good. All right. Sorry. We were just discussing this on the break, but this needs, the bottom part especially where the yellow is. So, Denise, was this all part of the homework you took?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Most of this is citations to the material on the ICANN website, and unfortunately we don't have someone on staff to do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. The tech part I'm well aware of.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm absolutely, as soon as schedule permits, get this done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. What just happened? This one we just resolved. Next. What is the bright yellow text?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Probably—I don't exactly remember, but one of the … Are we okay with how that's phrased? I think this was something that I rephrased a couple of times to try and … We talked last time about tone and whether we were being too aggressive. Is the tone in this okay?

[DENISE MICHEL]:   I'm fine with it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anyone have a concern with this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is the color [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That now mauve part.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I think that's relating back to the contractual tools part. Go ahead.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Yeah. There is just an ocean of potential citations on this. But if you recall, not only in the documents that the subgroup reviewed but actual conversations we had with the compliance staff where they essentially stated again—and this has been identified in letters to ICANN, submissions, statements, hearings.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [off mic].

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Yeah. I can. I think it's—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: The citation. The challenge with the citation, a lot of it came from the question and answers that we sent to them and the phone calls.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: So, yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Like a lot of it, like every single time we sent a question, it came back. Every time you had a call, it was the same response.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Yes, because this is an issue that has arisen in many ways. More recently, we explicitly discussed this with the compliance staff and this is the response we got. That phone call was not transcribed but we have many other citations about compliance doesn't have the tools, compliance doesn't provide any requests for tools.

KC CLAFFY: But not having the tools is a really different problem than having a narrow interpretation and I'm worried that …. So, somebody made a comment about the tone, so if I could find a problem with the tone in the text, it would be that. We're asserting there's a narrow interpretation and we don't have any evidence to back it up—any written evidence, anything we can point to.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Yeah. I do. I'll provide citations. Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I think that would help. Kerry wants to say something.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, we came up with the word narrow interpretation. We could probably … I'm thinking if we could rephrase it. I think at one point it was limited interpretation. A real challenge that compliance kept saying is their role is specific to the terms off the agreement, full stop. So, to go beyond that scope, there is no room for them to go beyond the scope of what …

KC CLAFFY:　　　　　　But when we say narrow interpretation, do we mean they have a narrow interpretation of the term abuse, for example?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:　　That's what I'm saying. I think that's a—

KC CLAFFY:　　　　　　What do we mean? What is the narrow interpretation that they have?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:　　The role and function of compliance.

KC CLAFFY:　　　　　　Okay, we'll clarify it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:　　I will clarify that. It's a narrow interpretation of the contractual obligations that they are responsible for overseeing and—

KC CLAFFY:　　　　　　Because one could argue that they have a very broad interpretation of what the registries are responsible for doing.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:　　Yeah, [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: So, that's why just narrow interpretation doesn't cover.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think it's a narrow—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There is also correspondence that also lays out this is a very unusual narrow interpretation of this section of the contract. So, let me play with it and get you some language and see if you're comfortable with it.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Actually, I think the words you just said were really good. Is it like the last time? Okay, Kerry's card is still up. Are you trying to say something? Oh, but it was Kerry's card. Interesting. Okay, moving on, then. That's been sorted.

                        Laurin edited this one. What does that mean? Just you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It's just copied from original documents. My assumption is it's extremely old and probably can just be deleted.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, moving on. So, you're just going to add into the footnote that list. Is that the plan? On the CCT recommendations, which ones are we talking about, that part. Does that make sense?

DENISE MICHEL: I think a few more words would be in order here. An ongoing problem that I have observed is that instead of playing its leadership role in several areas, the ICANN Board is simply saying, "Oh, we're just going to pass these review items onto the community," or the community needs to work on this, which in the past, unless the Board actually takes ownership and drives community involvement and processes, it doesn't get done.

So, perhaps we should discuss this at a different time in our sessions here in DC. But we have a real problem with the Board not … Essentially parking and not acting on a majority of the CCT Review recommendations and the Board's responsibility in driving, both accepting or explaining why they're not accepting recommendations. Why don't I work on some additional language and run it by the team to make this more clear?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think what you're saying is the same thing we said at that Board caucus session.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thanks. I just wanted to make sure. Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Second bullet right after that discussion that speaks to [inaudible] convention on cybercrime. I would recommend to just ensure that our report is timely, that we probably added text that says addressed in international cybercrime treaties such as …

The reason for that is I don't know how many of you are familiar that the UN started a … There was a [Russian] resolution about four weeks ago, three to four weeks ago, that is now asking the UN to do a new convention. As a result, to make sure that the report is not outdated by the next SSR-3 report This may not be a priority convention anymore because they'll start the discussion in October this year on the development of a new UN convention or treaty on cybercrime. So, it's just to make sure that it's not time warped. So, I think it's just international conventions such as this one, but that's not going to be the only one in the near future. It may take the UN three years but [Russia] has determined it may be faster.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We will be done before that.

KERRY-ANN BARRET: No, we'll be done but it would be outdated as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, I see two things here in this. One is that some of these recommendations have a shared responsibility that we are putting in together without explicitly mentioning whether it is ICANN Board or ICANN Org or which part. We are just saying ICANN Board and Org or ICANN Org and Board should do this. So, which part to be done by what?

The second thing is next paragraph it says ICANN should minimize ambiguous language. Here we need to be specific about whether we want ICANN Org or Board or community. Who will be doing that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you have proposed words that you could just type?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can propose specificity here and elsewhere where it lacks it for people to then review.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Being specific in what part of ICANN as been an ongoing challenge through the document and it's been fun because every time we go through and add text, the problem crops up again. This is also good for people who are going to be adding and revising text again in this document as a result of homework. Please be specific.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	But, actually, in that last sentence "ICANN should" we are actually talking to the whole community. We are not talking just to Org in that, interestingly. And then I think the second one should be ICANN Org because we're talking about definitions. Okay, moving on.
	DAAR. So, the DAAR call was never arranged. It was suggested Wednesday last week that we have a call on that. We were not able to make that happen in the eight days in between. So, I think we just have to proceed with what we have.
STEVE CONTE:	I think recognizing … My suggestion is the review team is not have that call but recognizing that you're going into public comment with another drafting phase after that. Then that might inform that second drafting phase. I still think there would be value to having that call about DAAR.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	I agree, and that portion of the staff will also I'm sure provide a comment to the draft report. So, we went backwards, right? Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There were some comments from Danko.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [I addressed them].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Is that all done?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think this is related to the definition question that we've already talked about and we need to put the forward pointer. We need to have that text clumped, so that it's easily referenced but basically says get going with the definition you have.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And I sent detailed citations to the list.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. All right, moving on. The pricing data I think is the question here, right? Zarko, please check. Is that the text we're talking about?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Zarko and I had a conversation a few meetings ago about a lot of the good work that was going on in the CCT [LD] community and tracking and collecting data and mitigating abuse. So, I think you had suggested that on a voluntary basis or something about, where available, ccTLD data should be included in this. So, that's why I had written a note that Zarko should check and weigh in on this, see if this language is acceptable to you and your ccTLD colleagues.

ZARKO KECIC: Not only that but ICANN announced around Montreal meeting that DAAR is now open for ccTLDs. I talked a long time ago with [Dave Piscatella] about having my ccTLD involved in DAAR and we got caught with ICANN Legal in producing [inaudible] that our zone file will be used exclusively for DAAR and not for something else. But now it is fixed with ICANN Legal and now ccTLDs can be involved. It is okay and I believe that ccTLDs will jump in and use that.

Another thing that I would like to add here is that there is one problem with ccTLDs because we have local laws involved in what ccTLDs can do. For example, we cannot suspend a domain name by our own. We need—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Depending on the ccTLD.

ZARKO KECIC: Exactly, yes. it depends of laws within the countries. Some European countries can do that but most of them cannot suspend or delete domain name just [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right. Although, yeah, I think that's separate from the high-level data aggregation and collection and reporting but probably should be footnoted by ICANN if it's including ccTLDs. So, if Heather could note, I'll update that ccTLD reference, to note that ccTLD data is now being included in DAAR and should continue to expand, can be included in DAAR and should be—[can and should be the text].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was talking about the part we just talked about. Okay, we're good. All right, thank you. Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: [inaudible] question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, so what's the answer?

STEVE CONTE: Sorry, I'm getting requests. Can we use the mics for the recording? Can we use the mics in conversation? Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Essentially, it's just a question. What do we want to do with this? Removing rate limiting for trusted parties, and it was struck and I commented on it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How did it get struck?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. This I don't get. I think my question is—and that's a relevant one—how does this make sense in context? This is referring to API access, yes or no? I'm not sure why it's also struck.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I don't understand why it's struck either. I would suggest that it be unstruck.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Everything that says, like comments above copied from original document, I would be weary about what's going on. But, yeah, essentially, if it's API, we should say it.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: So, we're keeping that line. Where do you want to specify that we're talking about the API? Something like ICANN should effectively remove rate limiting for trusted parties when using the API? What do you want to say?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would be fine. Kerry-Ann?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: For those of us on the team that really uses DAAR, like Zarko, Eric, Boban—no, you don't use it? Oh. For those of us on the team who do, is there any value in reordering this to make sure it has a sequential logic? Because when persons read it as a list here, to me it seems as if the first one is the most important one to you. So, I was just wondering, can we look at it and meaningfully—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can we make this an ordered list?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yes. Make it be structured because then it will be seen … Those of us who use it—I don't. Those of us who use it, it would seem like a logical flow, so it follows from the findings and stuff above. So, I was just wondering if you could just read it again to see if there is a flow or logic or if it's just really random unrelated points. Because some of them seem related to me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Steve?

STEVE CONTE:	Thank you. I'm looking at the second bullet there about the ccTLD data. I'm looking at it from a perspective of SSR-3. ccTLD data is going to be an opt-in from [that CC] and the way it's worded now could be a [fail] to implement because you're just talking about ccTLD data in general and not identifying that it's an opt-in option for CC's to contribute or not. Thank you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	How about encourage? Because you want ICANN Org to encourage them to include it. That's all. Okay. Naveed, then Kerry-Ann.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	[off mic].
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Let's have an on-mic discussion, please.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	I'm just wondering when we are having this recommendation on DAAR. Are we just limiting on reporting itself or recommending that it should also result into some actions with ICANN and some follow-up on those actions? Because to me, when I read this it is only about reporting and identifying.
	And the second point, I think it's all about recommendations from ICANN Org. So, again, the same point, that we should include ICANN Org with ICANN.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, this recommendation specifically addresses domain abuse data, registries, registrars and abuse data, not action on the data. This is intended to be a separate recommendation that really focuses on ICANN's role in gathering, facilitating, publishing, aggregated and actionable data in this area. There are some other recommendations that would have some connections and data would be useful for, but quite broadly, there's a really important need for this type of data, not only inside ICANN as the community struggles to create policies that help mitigate abuse and ICANN tries to implement its responsibilities, but more broadly with registrars and registries and users, etc. So, this is really just abuse data focused. Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: What confuses me is the sentence, the last sentence after the bullet point, where it says it should solicit feedback from SSAC on the utility of DAAR to reduce domain-related abuse. So, that is to reduce. When we say solicit, it might be we need to rephrase it, because when we say to reduce the domain-related abuse, it seems to include the actions implicitly. That's what's confusing me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It wasn't me who added that, so this isn't [inaudible]. Basically, I think what it's saying is this is all about access to data. I think what it's saying is we should have some way to measure whether this recommendation's implementation was effective. And one way to

measure whether access to data is effective is to see if it's been used, etc.

So, I get that that might be a bit of a [derived] result and it might be a bridge too far, but I think, as I read it, the last point is there to put some teeth on this recommendation. How do you know you've done it? You know you've done it well if people are actually making good utility out of it.

So, I don't know if we want to keep it or not, but it looks to me … That's how I read it. That's what the [intuition] looks like to me.

ALAIN AINA: I think I have the same comment as Naveed about the blue line [inaudible]. Then he said [inaudible] going to do some work on it, then we will see how [inaudible]. But I do have a concern about [inaudible] to SSAC because I think this could be … Not only—it shouldn't be only SSAC, asking feedback from SSAC on the [agility] of DAAR. So, if we want to do these kinds of things, I think we need to be maybe broader than just asking SSAC about the [utility] of the DAAR data. I don't know. Or maybe the one who used to this on SSAC will explain why specifically mention SSAC here so we can understand why are we targeting SSAC here.

DENISE MICHEL: Again, I don't know who put this in there. KC?

KC CLAFFY: No, that last—

DENISE MICHEL: Anyway, irrespective, I'll suggest some updated language. There is an SSAC report, more than one, that relates specifically to ICANN doing this, which probably is why SSAC is … And I can add a footnote on the SAC reports that are relevant here. I think that's why it was suggested but we can add an additional line and invite other interested ICANN stakeholder groups to weigh in as well. Yeah. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, you have a whole bunch of comments on this. Use the mic.

KC CLAFFY: I'm quoting. That was a long time ago. That was in November. God knows what I meant back then. I was probably on pain killers. No. But it's all going to be about … Well, you have to open that up to see. Oh, I added something. Oh, I see. That was me. I [inaudible] SSAC. No, I'm fine with whatever others want. I just feel like that all over this section citations are needed and quoted definitions. When we talk about the evolving definition of security threat, because we have adopted that new term, but we say in there a term used by DAAR, the GAC, [Beijing] Communique. I thought it was DNS abuse that the [Beijing] Communique used. So now I'm confused how we want to discern security threat from DNS abuse. But in either case, I want it to be quoted and cited. That's just my comments there.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	So, who's going to do the quoting and citing? Thank you. Okay, moving on.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	There's a comment on pricing data. Did we get to that yet? I haven't …
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Pricing data?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Okay. Maybe we're not there. Yeah. DAAR data and reports should include and integrate pricing data. I want to be real explicit about what pricing data we mean. Did this one get in front of the SMEs, this language?
STEVE CONTE:	It did and this goes back to the suggestion that there was a call between the DAAR folks and the review team.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Do we mean retail pricing? Frankly, I think the security research community means the whole money flow situation, where money flows up the chain and how they can correlate it with other security abuse factors. But do we just mean retail pricing? I know what we're going to get back. We're going to get back that's really hard because registrars can have sales and discount and free and $5000 for [inaudible]. So, I

think we need to be real explicit about what we mean and how SSR-3 knows that that was done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: Do you have a suggestion on how that should be framed? If you recall different conversations and threads from the abuse subgroup, there are reports that focus on the correlation between cheap prices and big spikes in abuse. I think that was a stepping off point for this reference but let me know how you think we should word this.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can take this as an action. My recollection is that CCT report talked about pricing data as well. So maybe we can … I'll take the action of going back to the CCT report and finding out what they said to make what we're doing as consistent as [inaudible]. Maybe if Drew comes to dinner tonight, we can poke him about it, too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm, use the mic. Zarko, then Eric.

ZARKO KECIC: I would just like to clarify this because the back of my mind that the pricing is connected to incentives for those who are fighting abuse. So, I

believe that's connected to incentives, not to domain pricing. I have to read the text about that.

KC CLAFFY: I think the issue of … I don't know how we phrase it later in the document but I remember reading it last night, the issue of let's encourage ICANN to use pricing as a way to incentivize registrars and registries to take abuse more seriously and demonstrate evidence that they've taken abuse more seriously. That's the incentives between … Well, yeah, for the registries and ICANN. That's a relationship between the registries and ICANN. I thought what this is getting at is the relationship between the incentive of the registrants who get domains for pennies or less, and therefore find it a very convenient vector to use [attacks]. And I thought that's what this is trying to show the relationship between … The relationship of pricing as in domains are effectively free and abuse using those domains.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think this conversation is suffering from … This conversation is perennial. It shows up in lots of places and it's been the subject of a lot of failed research studies.

KC CLAFFY: You mean places in this document or places in literature?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: No, in the literature, or lack thereof, because of failed studies, like I said. And the thing is pricing is not pricing is not pricing. Pricing for whom? For resellers? For registrars? For registrants? For registries? Every level of those has a different pricing model that [all fit together]. To Denise's point, we have to follow the money because it changes as you go through that chain. And a lot of that is either opaque or it's not standardized and it can change.

Resellers will have a sale that's only visible in images, like they'll put an image on their website, not text, that's not easy to scrape [inaudible]. So it's really hard to stay abreast of what prices are because they change incredibly fast in places that are non-standard all over the place because resellers could do something different than registrars can do something different than the registries are expecting. At no point is there any way for anyone to know what's happening because various pieces can do whatever they want.

So, I think if we're going to say something about pricing, we need to be very specific knowing full well that that word is extremely complex here.

KC CLAFFY: In that case, I think we have to [say that] quite a bit and we have to expect that it will be ignored. To the extent that pricing is really correlated, what we see correlated is when prices are low, abuse is high. The implication of that is you can't sell cheap domains if you want to clean up the Internet.

I had a conversation … No? Okay. Denise will correct me.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's partially correct. Or you sell cheap domains but you have the right safety and security controls in place, so they aren't used by criminals and abusers.

KC CLAFFY: Right. Or you're very transparent about who you're selling. We could make a case, and we sort of allude to it here, but I think we could be a lot more explicit in this space about if you're selling bulk domains, those are not anonymous anymore and we have to agree that those are just not going to be sold to anonymous folks or you need some other additional controls.

But back to Eric's comment about the money flows. That's a much bigger ask and I'm prepared to try to make it, because as a researcher, I want to see research happening in that area. I think it's really important for larger issues, even beyond ICANN, with understanding the ecosystem. But some of that I think is beyond ICANN's ability to do. And I think the most that we could expect is to draw out the importance of that, so that other people reading the document that might have more ability to regulate the registrars and registries and their jurisdictions could get us a little closer.

I mean, we could say ICANN just needs to make it as transparent as possible, and I think CCT went in this direction, so again I'll go back and look at what exactly they wrote in the report. But if it were me, I would probably go further. And I wonder how much consensus there is around the room for me to go write such text before I waste my time doing it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm, then Eric.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. To KC's comments, just given the discussion here, I think that putting this recommendation in with DAAR might not get accepted. But the study is required, so you can do [empirical] studies, just a subset of domains and actually do the money flows and see the results you get from it. I think this is a very, very important point but it might be in the wrong spot. Yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I think one of the things that could be really helpful is some writing that clearly makes a strawman for this because I think lots of people I know, and personally I've run into it before, where you want to correlate abuse with price, you kind of have to be watching at the right time and you have to have the telemetry to be watching and that's the tricky part. It's sort of like I don't get to see when there's a flash sale unless I happen to be watching in the right place at the right time, and if I want to correlate a flash sale with abuse, I have to had correlated the events, [inaudible] measured them.

So, it winds up being really tricky, but if there was a nice strawman to say here are the various elements of pricing and here's why you need to see certain things, to correlate certain things. I mean, if I get lucky, I can always make a correlation, if I happen to have the right data and happen to have been watching at the right time. That's really tough

because you can scrape pricing data. I mean, the registrant, what they pay, that's what drives the abuse correlation here. I mean, they're the ones …

Some registries, they never change their price, so it's clearly not … They're not a party of that. But I can get the registry pricing information. It's just, at that point, diluted.

So, a nice strawman to say here are the moving pieces, that might be really helpful because even if someone wants to say, "We're not going to do that," it would be a nice canonical citation for "here is the pricing model, where you do need the instrument?"

KC CLAFFY:　　　　　　　Let me see if I can understand it. Let's play this out a little bit. If we were to say that—and Eric, when you say telemetry, what you want is for the registrar to report up the chain somehow every domain they sold what the price was of that domain?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:　　　　That's unfortunately not good enough. You also need the resellers. Resellers can do some different pricing than the registrars can.

KC CLAFFY:　　　　　　　Does ICANN have any relationship with the reseller? That's not going to happen. Let's stay on this planet.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, until we write out that there's this dynamic, it doesn't exist.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. To [inaudible] dynamic. Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right. So, if you explain that there are these hierarchies, there are these places at which things could be different and maybe even then … Let's sort of use examples for how it's actually being implemented today, knowing full well it could change tomorrow. Certainly, if some element takes payment through Bitcoin or something like that, that's a separate piece of telemetry. It's got nothing to do with pricing. It's got to do with payment. But they do tie together.

                         But if we could break this out and just show these are the current moving pieces, then that's a better starting point than we have today, in my opinion.

KC CLAFFY: I need a diagram. Does anybody know of a diagram that does a little bit of that? Because I'm not even sure I would draw it right. Let's put it in the report. Or maybe Dave is the closest—Dave [Piscatella] is the closest that might have one.

                         But again, let me finish this thought experiment. Let's stick with who ICANN has a contract with. If we get the registrar to report the price of every domain it sells—forget about what the reseller did—that would be way better than we are today, right? Eric is not sure. Would it violate

any contractual or bylaws or anything or would it just be that the registrar would say, "No, we're not going to do that," and ICANN would say, "Okay, fine." That's what would happen.

No, it doesn't violate anything. In fact, the new gTLD base registry agreement has price reporting in it. Staff watered it down last time the base registry agreement was renewed, but pricing data reporting from new gTLD registries is still part of the contractual obligations but it's kind of vaguely defined … It's not like, "Give me the price of every domain [as telemetry] as you sell it." It's just sort of, "Give me pricing data."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: At the registries?

KC CLAFFY: At the registry level.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But the registrars are the ones that are—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There is no—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, the registry you're saying.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: New gTLD … Just the new gTLD registry base agreement. I'm not aware of any pricing data in the RAA.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Even now, per domain that would be something.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You could have a registrar decide to actually lose money on a flash sale, paying for the registration fee for every element that goes into the registry just to get a whole bunch of registrants in there and then try and make your money back on renewals or something like that. I mean, I'm not saying that's a great idea and I'm not advocating it. I'm saying that would be one way in which seeing the pricing at the registry would hide that flash sale. You'd see no evidence of that. So, once you start doing measurements, you can sort of figure out how to sort of … But I think just having an illustration of the model …

Like you said a second ago, is there some place where I can see a picture? If there is one, I've never seen it. I had to figure this out myself, so it would be nice canonically say "here's a picture" and then of course if it's wrong, we can fix it. But I don't think there is a picture.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just listening to the discussion, it carries me back to my earlier point. I think a recommendation is still a bit sporadic and disjoined because all the different elements that we just spoke about with just the pricing is completely different from some of the other bullet points that are there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In DAAR for sure.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So it's like you have a complete listing that is correlated but unrelated at the same time because it requires separate actions for each of them.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So it can't be bulleted and I think—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, we pull this out. It's its own [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But not as its own thing. If you read each of them … For example, you start off by saying ICANN Org should work with GNSO to improve DAAR. That's one. Then it goes on to say DAAR doesn't have any indicators in data. Specifically, ICANN should remove [written].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But that's not even an indicator. That's orthogonal.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's not an indicator. It's—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I did make a comment about that.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yes. It's asking for something specific to indicators and the listing below has nothing [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Fair enough.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It needs to be restructured a little bit and at least some of the explanation, like the rationale that you just explained, it needs to be something more specific because it's not actionable as it is. It's just like a discussion for the bullets. It needs to be rewritten.

KC CLAFFY: I can take this one if everyone else has too much.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you. So, you're going to do two things as I summarize [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Oh, I forgot about the other one already.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're going to clean this up so that it's DAAR focused and you're going to put a separate thing together for pricing.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's what I thought I heard.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And then still have the logic related to how are we recommending that they get better indicators for DAAR because that's what the recommended [inaudible] by trying to make but it never made it because it got mixed up with everything else in between. So, that point still needs to be stated clearly because the first conversation that Eric had was about having reliable research information and indicators to be able to do blah-blah-blah. Then the rating and everything else is

[probably] the supporting information for it but it's not … The thought and discussion we had, [inaudible] recommendation [inaudible] no clue.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Okay. But none of that text … You're not saying fix any text that's in there right now with respect to that point. It's not there at all. Because I don't see anything right before this section that talks about rationale.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, no. It's just here. It's just here. The recommendation is [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Fine. I see my charge.

[DENISE MICHEL]: I'll help you, KC.

KC CLAFFY: And look, Heather has written out there exactly [when I needed it]. Thanks, Heather!

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm here for you, KC.

[DENISE MICHEL]: And I'll help you [inaudible]. I think it's going to be [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible].

[DENISE MICHEL]: No. I mean, it's written in other places and different ways and then it was [inaudible] and summarized.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Marinated and blah-blah-blah. Really? Okay. Kerry-Ann, do you still have something?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I think we're now moving on to the policies and agreements, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. This is one of the ones that needed to be clarified. ICANN Board should request the GNSO initiate a process. It further needs to be clarified. There are some things that can be addressed in contract negotiations without any policy changes and there are things that require policy changes. So, I'll take an action to make this more clear and specific.

For example, as we speak, staff is negotiating change to the RDAP language in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. They've specifically been asked to addressed some abuse-related contract issues and I think crickets was the response that the Business Constituency got when they asked about that.

But, nevertheless, there are some things that can be done between staff and registrars to update the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and then some things require a new gTLD policy—a GNSO policy, where GNSO policy has requested the Board has the ability to specifically request that a policy development activity be undertaken by the GNSO. I'll add some more clarification in this paragraph.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, given that Russ has ran away, the next thing that was marked as unclear is in the recommendations, contracts/agreements. Laurin, you had a question about the example of—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You've lost Laurin, too.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll wait for Laurin to not talk to Zarko.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry. [inaudible] specific problem. Sorry. We just had to fix the survey, so I can find [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: All right. So, Heather, go ahead.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's okay. I want to make sure that Laurin remembers what his question was when he said that the example of 3% of all registrations is unclear in some manner. Laurin, what's wrong with it? What needs to be changed?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think it is good like that. The question is simply how do we underline that this is something that has to be set, that we're not saying it should be 3%? I mean, it says "for example" but still this might be considered too specific. I don't know. Steve, what would you think from staff perspective?

STEVE CONTE: I don't have a gut reaction either way on that one.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. Then, just leave it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Denise, do we need to discuss anything in that commentary between you and Danko on "as current contracts cannot be changed"?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I'm sort of restating what I said previously. There are elements that were … Depending on how the contracts are changed and what's being addressed, some things can be addressed simply between negotiations between staff and registrars to change the RAA. And then as each registrar renews its RAA contract, the new contract language comes into place. That's one process.

Under certain items that fall under the picket fence, if they're changed, it requires a GNSO policy development process and consensus policy. So, there's two separate things. And once the GNSO passes a consensus policy, [inaudible] addresses picket fence language and the RAA contract, then the contract is updated by staff and applies to each registrar as it renews the contract. And this probably way more information than you guys wanted but I'll take an action item to clarify that statement.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Can't we just say something along the lines of not all aspects or not all relevant aspects can be changed or something like that, and then we're done, not going into these details?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you. I think that resolves Danko's comment, right? Does it resolve his next one as well?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I mean, [inaudible] my commitment to clarify [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I think we're—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just a point of clarification for me. Denise, when you did a strike through, were you suggesting to delete that? You're using different formatting suddenly for how things are changed and I wasn't sure what you were trying to do.

DENISE MICHEL: No, if I'm responsible for that strike through, it was completely unintentional because—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, we should keep that there?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. And it's actually renegotiations are underway for RDAP and are imminent for EPDP phase one. They're underway for RDAP and imminent [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're not going to talk about imminent [are we]?

DENISE MICHEL:　　　　　Well, that's part of the moving target that is this [inaudible].　I was trying to read that sentence … In trying to read the sentence "RDAP and registrant information access, rate limiting practices by …" I couldn't parse it. I think it may require a certain expert level of understanding about how that all works. It almost needed punctuation or something somewhere. I didn't know what to do with it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:　　　I think Eric could probably clarify that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:　　　　I just took a look at it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:　　　Awesome.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:　　　[Heather is worried about punctuation].

HEATHER FLANAGAN:　　　No but the basic issue is that—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:　　　I just threw a bunch of commas in [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Rate limiting prevents even ICANN staff itself from getting fundamental information it needs to do its job. That is insane. And that's what we're trying to get to in addition to certify cybersecurity and academic researchers, etc.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're going to have to help me word this [totally fantasy] recommendation about getting [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I think we're done with this page. Is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No because Eric thought I was talking about the sentence before the bullets, so now we're looking at the sentence that I'm actually confused on, the second bullet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That you're actually confused on, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: We could just take a whack at it. We don't have to sit here and wait for me to do it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Eric is taking homework on that one. So, Eric is getting homework. He might do it before he scrolls his screen but it's still homework. Okay, Alain?

ALAIN AIDA: Yes. I want to ask about the rate limiting because anytime you see people putting rate limiting on [inaudible] has some issue maybe because of capacity in terms of [inaudible] requests or they are trying to [protect] something. So, do we know exactly why some of the registries or the registrars implement the rate limiting before we said that [inaudible]? Do we know the rationale behind the implementation of the rate limiting behind the registry and the registrar? That's my question.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, Alain. Yeah. It's ill conceived. It's a holdover from WHOIS rate limiting, which is in fact because it's used for abuse, and so for a long time people were spamming WHOIS. You probably are very familiar with the fact that people [inaudible].

                       So, RDAP is the successor to WHOIS, so it inherited a whole bunch of baggage that was just there from before. So now RDAP is rate limited as well. Does that make sense?

ALAIN AIDA: Yes. But my point is are we saying that ICANN should not allow people to implement rate limiting? No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: ICANN itself. So, ICANN security staff or ICANN compliance staff needs data from a registry/registry. ICANN staff should not be rate limited. In other words, they have either in the past and currently are being prevented by rate limiting ICANN staff from getting data they need.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, the beauty of this situation is if anyone is exposing a service and there's justification for rate limiting, you would expect them to put rate limiting in because lots of people have lots of different data, then they've all rate limited everything which means the end result is that it's very hard for anybody to get anything.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. My personal two cents would be that there should be trusted parties that are white listed. If that trusted party list is just ICANN at the beginning, so be it. But yeah, something whereby—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] as trusted, ICANN?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Starting off, I think having the ability to create a trusted list would be a good thing. And then, yeah, you're right. Clearly, that's an important thing to sort out. But if we don't have the ability to make a trusted list, then we don't have any white list.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But I think we need to be explicit and say immediately every single registrar and registry should white list ICANN staff and then work on a trusted notifier. My only point here was—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] because what if they say we can't do it without [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's not true.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm just saying don't allow the implementation, should we even get that far, with ICANN. Don't allow the implementation to say … No one can be white listed until we spend the next three years doing a study and vetting it and having public comments and blah-blah-blah. White list ICANN staff. They need it to fulfill their objectives.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, are you able to put the white list sentence in?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Because I'm not looking [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, I was trying to move the assignment.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I can't edit it in there, especially while we're talking about it because [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: TMI. Okay, we're ready for the incentivization part.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think Danko suggested that ICANN legal verify … I don't think we want to spend another couple of years waiting for a response from ICANN Legal, so …

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. I think we need to make our recommendation and if part of the implementation is that happening, fine. Go ahead, Kerry.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just scroll back up a sec, Jen. I just saw a word I wanted … It just struck me a while ago when I reread it. Historically, ICANN Org has rewarded contracted parties. Rewarded is the correct word?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Rewarded?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: How are they rewarded? I just want to know. It could be … Like, what is rewarded?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If you immediately implement this change, stop domain [tasting], you will get a reduction—an immediate reduction—in ICANN fees. That's a

reward for an abuse mitigation measure. They literally did that to stop domain [tasting]. It's all on the record. Make sense?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, it does. It's just reward sounded …

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, it is a reward but it's also an incentivization or an encouragement, so whatever. It's a "Wanted" poster, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, for clarification, we're not making any changes regarding Danko's question or suggestion?

RUSS HOUSLEY: The Legal one, I don't think we should. If that's part of implementation, that's part of implementation. Naveed?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What, the sentence or his comment?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, give Naveed the mic.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm sorry.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I think if we are changing it to incentivize, then the whole phrase needs to be rephrased because it's saying now ICANN Org has incentivized contracted parties with fee reductions to incentivize again. So, incentivize is appearing twice. So, [reward] with incentivize was okay, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: To implement the changes, [inaudible] incentivize to implement [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, something like that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Incentivize to incentivize.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Come on, let's get through this by lunch.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What's the difference between agreement and contract? Why are we having two separate recommendations? [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, it's called the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and it's a contract.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But we have the recommendation about the agreements with registrars and registries and then a recommendation about the contracts.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, it should be the same.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, then we need to [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just fix it. Okay, can we move on to the next one? Noon, as in three minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: First, I just have a quick comment on Laurin's comment. The abuse report portal. I think he provides a very concise guidance and I wouldn't move it to a footnote. I would just leave it the way it is, for sure. I think this type of guidance is exactly what staff needs on this recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, you're talking about the part where it says likely too specific.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Was Laurin recommending deleting it or moving it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: He's recommending moving it up into the findings, like this would be one way to do it and then the recommendation be broader is how I interpreted his comment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, it doesn't really … I don't think it belongs in findings. I think it belongs in "this is the recommendation and this is how the process flow would work." So, I wouldn't touch that section. I like it the way it is, personally.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I admit this actually bothered me quite a bit because it did seem to get into that level of specificity on "we are telling you exactly what to do" as opposed to what problem we want you to solve.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, we can add more text about the problem to solve but I think the deep knowledge and experience represented on this review team in this area is a benefit to creating a more effective abuse complaint report portal. I think it's useful.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed, can you—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is Laurin and Norm's recommendation, so I will let them talk to this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm had his hand almost on his tend card.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, I agree that it's too specific. I think that just changing the words [of process] might work as follows.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Wouldn't it be [off mic].

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, exactly. But the last sentence there is important. So, regardless of how it's implemented, the fact that the response isn't publicly searchable I think is important.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, maybe you should add that phrase.

NAVID BIN RAIS: I would actually recommend the last phrase to move up in the first paragraph, rather than the second.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe the other comment on reports to non-participating ccTLDs to be forwarded via email should also go up because, otherwise, we again have a split system. If the emails are not sent to some, then the portal is, again, not central. So, I would also say let's pull that one up because that's an important [feature]. So, that sentence in addition [inaudible] also go up. Yeah. So what is red now I think should also go up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How do you prevent a [DOS] attack on that portal?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You don't.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't mean [inaudible] DOS attack of [inaudible]. I mean fake abuse reports. Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, we had a discussion about that a little while ago where we said that right now abuse isn't getting reported, so we're trying to flip the problem.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] the problem I'm describing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes because then we can figure—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was the outcome of the previous lap around this track. Am I misremembering? I see a lot of people shaking their heads. Okay. All right. Next one, please.

Okay, so we'll stop here at the compliance function. Lunch is outside where the coffee was this morning, so we'll stop the recording, take a break, and if we can stay close, so maybe take less time on the agenda for lunch, then … Can we do … How about 12:45?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]