
RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Heather, what page are we on? Heather [has said] she's going to make it right, but she will make a pass and when she doesn't know what the team wanted, she will put a comment in and we will come back.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But does it build a case on [inaudible] justify whether the recommendations [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I hope so. She will let us know if it doesn't.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Part of the challenge for the work stream 3 section is that I recognize the material, particularly the findings were put together by a subcommittee. My perhaps incorrect assumption is that the subcommittee had come to consensus that this is what they wanted to have said. If that's not correct, someone needs to let me know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Plus one.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: If it is correct, then no, I probably won't make a whole lot of substantive changes in here.

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.

[NORM RITCHIE]: I think as far as I'm concerned, the recommendations are ... I support the recommendations. It's the tone that needs to be addressed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think you've been told it's okay to make it like one person wrote it, address the tone so that it's all boring instead of some of it being on fire with anger. Okay. I believe we are at the top of page 45.

[NORM RITCHIE]: Heather, it's not just the tone. Also, you don't have to beat the reader over the head on some of these points, like you assume that there is some intelligence of the people reading it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I agree with you, but I think we've heard several examples today where Denise in particular was emphatic that there be emphasis and didn't like anything that deluded that emphasis. It's going to be a bit of a struggle to get to where it would probably be healthier to be. All right. I'll do what I can.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Well, just for the record, I think there's a middle ground because I think some of the cases there were just things that were about to not be said, and yeah, the way things were said certainly can be attenuated. Just we need to say things sometimes. I think there's a middle ground. I don't think that will be a problem. That would be my guess.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Then the next thing on our list to talk about was, as Russ noted, at the top of page 45, the last sentence in that first paragraph that starts with ICANN also failed to act on additional SSAC recommendations. KC had a question. Denise did ask that to be assigned to her to follow up. So we'll see where that goes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And that's been assigned?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That has been assigned.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because it looks to me like there's a whole bunch of text in the side to answer that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: You mean for bullet two where it says additional information insights to be added? Is that what you're talking about?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. If you click on it, then you get this big thing in the side that jumps up from another page and it says, "This GAC Communique, this GAC thing, this contractual compliance safeguard, blah-blah-blah."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right. She added that fairly recently.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yesterday.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I haven't had a chance to put it in the document so I wasn't going to talk about that one yet. I was scrolling down to figure out where the next one was.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My question is do you know whether additional information is needed?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: As far as I know, that's what was needed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The next thing, which I suspect Denise would say assign to her was an open question that hasn't been assigned, for bullet number three on page 45 where it says, "The ICANN Board has not adopted similar recommendations." KC suggested we be very specific on which recommendations because not all CCT recommendations are relevant here.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Can I add something, though? How relevant is this paragraph? Norm, you can probably help me. We've said it throughout the document, that there's been [inaudible] of ICANN general to implement a lot of recommendations from previous team reviews. So, I'm just wondering, based on the [thread] of the logic here and what it's specifically related to, I'm not sure how relevant this paragraph is. And to go to KC, [inaudible] as much as we can, even if it's just a sentence. I'm just saying that this paragraph, to me, doesn't take the—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It doesn't add anything.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It doesn't add substance to the point that's being made in this entire section. To me, it has restated what has been said throughout the [thread] of our report. So, to me, this entire paragraph, I would recommend that it could go.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, number three. Paragraph three. This one that we're looking at. I think that whole thing, instead of trying to fix it, add more work, I just think it could be taken out.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I marked it as seems redundant because I'm reluctant to completely get rid of it without some buy-in.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I have deleted it, but in suggest mode and with a comment to say deleted as probably redundant and ask Denise to review.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Next.

KC CLAFFY: That sentence actually has ... It's kind of a run-off sentence. It has a bunch of things running together. It has been reviewed by external experts. I don't know that external experts have explicitly said they need to publish more impactful reports that associate security registrars/ registries. So, if indeed those reports have said that, we should quote them explicitly and cite them. But I read those external reviews. Marcus ran them and those other guys. They had some criticism of it but I don't know that it was exactly that criticism. So, somebody has to go back and do that research.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, I see this was assigned, right? It just hasn't been done yet.

KC CLAFFY: Who owns it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It says Heather assigned it to Michel.

KC CLAFFY: Michel?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise Michel.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Russ, the thing I assigned to Michel was reviewing the deletion of bullet three.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, that one says you did it yesterday at 10:52.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I see. Okay. Can you assign the other ones here? Confusing. Too many little boxes on the right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Here's another one [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Thank you. I'm going to assume that everything else, the other comments in this paragraph should all fall under Denise to consider KC's questions and comments and offer material.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That sounds right to me.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: KC makes a point about merging the material. I'm going to assign that to Denise. I'm really worried about how much I'm assigning to Denise if we want to get this done in a week.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Plus one.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, so given that, can anyone else look at this?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I can't find it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: At the bottom of page 45.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] registries.

KC CLAFFY: You see that yellow thing right there?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The comment associated with that, that says, "Can we merge these above two paragraphs and streamline?"

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Started with the paragraph starting "ICANN Org" and the paragraph starting identifying [registrars] needs to be merged.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's my understanding.

KC CLAFFY; [off mic].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No, you just made the comment.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, it hasn't been assigned. We're trying to assign it. You'll merge it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It looks like the ones at the top of page 46 have all been addressed in the little sidebar things. Is that correct?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes. I'm trying to find the next thing that actually requires discussion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. I think that would be the top of 45.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. The material that's in blue was added by Denise yesterday as part of her homework.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But I think the end of the previous one, the thing that's at the top of 47 has a big block of yellow. That one just says, "I'm working on it."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, but it's not actually assigned.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I'll do the little @ thing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, she tried to rewrite it to make things more clear. I'm going to see if I can channel KC for just a second. When it says in that very first sentence "establish a performance metrics framework to guide the level of compliance by registrars and registries" but also other elements that affect abuse, security, and resilience, do we need to be specific about what other elements are or is that going to be understood?

NORM RITCHIE: One of the things we're struggling with, with compliance and abuse, is that there's a lot of truisms in here and everyone knows they're true, but have we done a study? Do we have the metrics? No. If we were to get those, you're going to set things back two years again.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have the CCT report which actually has [a lot of this].

NORM RITCHIE: That's true. Good point.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And they have a study—

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: I think Heather channeled me quite well. If I'm SSR-3 or even the implementation shepherd and ICANN came to me and said, "Okay, what did you guys mean by other elements?" I'm not sure I'd know what to say there. I'd have to make something up.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, I have a meta question and I don't know what we want to do with it. A lot of the compliance section really seems to boil down to you need to do what CCT told you to do. Do we need to repeat all of those things or can we just have that comment, no really, our recommendations is that you have to do that.

[ERIC OSTERWEIL]: So, I think it's important to actually say we think that, and then I think it's okay to say that, too. But I think if we just say, "Yeah, what they said," it's real easy to not give us the credence that it's due when we actually came to these conclusions for rational reasons. So, I kind of think it's important to say both kind of things. We have to say why we think that. And I think it's very important to say, "And CCT also said that."

KC CLAFFY: But again, I don't think we can just say, "Do what CCT said," because in many places CCT's recommendations were actually not as clear as they could be and they weren't written like SSR-2 would write them. So, I actually think we need to be really specific about which recommendations in CCT we think are important. Again, I'm reading the CCT report, so I'll take that action to highlight that and send some text to the list.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you need to make assignments before we move on?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I agree with Laurin that the whole ICANN actions to WHOIS for GDPR, that's finding. It doesn't need to be in the recommendation itself.

As a general comment, whenever I see just this random "this" in the document, I will be attempting to make that "this thing" specific because people can get confused what exactly does "this" refer to.

STEVE CONTE: Looking at the bottom of that paragraph that's highlighted up there with Laurin's comment, you're talking the very last [line] text about bringing closure and passing and implementing a WHOIS policy in 2020, I just want to ask the review team to consider the timing on when your final report is going to be submitted to the Board and is that still going to be relevant? I don't know what the timeframe is, but if you're

submitting the final draft at the last quarter of 2020 calendar year, is that still going to be a relevant comment to have in the report?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Are we ready to go to the next one or is there still ...?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I think we have a lot of new text in the next one.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. There's an old note from Denise at the bottom of 47 where it says, "ICANN Org and Board should undertake the following." She says that in the draft report will acknowledge ongoing Board, staff, community discussion on defining DNS abuse. Did we do that? Has that been done already? I'm trying to remember if we did it anywhere in this report. We kept talking about it today and now my head is full of what we said versus what we wrote.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think this is a reference to the Board has a bunch of things going on that are trying to help define abuse, but none of them are final, right?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I don't think we've done it yet. I think it's one of the things Denise undertook to write under the section that we have about DNS. And then we had a whole thing about DAAR and that whole section yesterday we discussed. We said that it needed to be updated. I don't think we did it.

KC CLAFFY: But it's supposed to go on the section on DAAR.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I don't think it was here that it was discussed because we discussed it yesterday as well, so I don't think it was done.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, that was my next question. Does that need ... Do I have to assign it to Denise?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Do we need the comment, do we need [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: This says "should undertake the following actions".

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, we've mentioned several times that some of these recommendations ... In our prioritization exercises, we said that some of these are underway and that should be acknowledged somewhere.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is one of those examples.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Does that mean the wording therefore needs to change, perhaps say should undertake or should continue their actions?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, something to that effect.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Should continue and complete.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Mm-hmm. But the last part of this is about the Board not handling the CCT recommendations in a way that the bylaws require. That should be a separate something. And it's a finding.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: You mean what starts with simply passing a recommendation? Should it be in here at all? K

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's a finding, not a recommendation.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: But it should be in the findings section. We should keep it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It was more than just an opinion. It's not ... The tone of the report should be neutral and it's not neutral. So, it's more written in the first person capacity rather than a third person capacity. That's the [inaudible] for me.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But it is passive?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Really, Eric?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Russ, are you adding a comment? All right. I'm going to assign that comment to me. Or you can assign that to me as you like. So many Heathers. Oh, gee, thanks. All right, next.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What is "this"?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I mean, keep in mind, Denise also checked this and says that the convention's explanatory notes do go into more detail threats as identified in the discussion on computer and data security.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It sounds like you want to assign that to Laurin. I'm sorry, I didn't see it. Go ahead Kerry, then KC, unless yours is old.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just below this, these are two recommendations that are intended. Are they supposed to be here? Like everything that we've been reading seems to be fine. These two bullet points are recommendations. So, are they supposed to be here or we're moving them somewhere? The question isn't for you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No, it kind of is because there's a whole lot—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Because say you have two intended bullet points and then you have there's a sentence below, so everything says "should implement the review team recommendations" which we said before. I know we have the specific references now. In parallel, should encourage community attention to evolve in the DNS abuse definition. Keep in mind that we have a recommendation about definitions, research, etc. So I don't know if this could be moved there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, this is the abuse definitions and reporting section.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This is where we had the discussion about language yesterday with Eric about research and sharing, where we had these three bullet points that I tried to fix. Do you remember? When it had ... And the pricing

section. It was tied up in a section that KC was supposed to take the pricing out of that data.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That was DAAR.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, I'm just saying that I'm just trying to remember where does it fit, then? Where does this go? Is it a recommendation? Just go down in the recommendations under this section?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is the recommendation section for abuse domains and reporting.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No but everything above it read like finance and rationale.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right and that needs to be fixed.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Sorry. It didn't feel like a ... Sorry.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm sorry, Heather, is this the recommendation section? Because if we scroll down, there is a section that's labeled recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's crossed out.

NORM RITCHIE: No, it's not.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, because what I understood is we said yesterday that the section had a grouping of rationale.

NORM RITCHIE: Oh. My apologies, you're right.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, we're both wrong?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. We're talking about abuse definition versus DAAR, which is below that. So, our signals parallelally got lost.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]. Okay, because there's just a lot of findings mixed with recommendations. Okay.

Sorry, Russ, I'm keeping it open. So, this section has a lot of good content. I love it. It goes to ...

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Which section is this section?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, the section that starts where we started talking this morning. It starts on page 40, right?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, it's abuse and compliance. It has rationale and findings in the second tier, and then after that, still under second tier of headers there is now unachieved. I don't know if that's now a third. Is that ahead of three?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Where are you?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, if you start off on page 40.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Abuse, rationale and findings. So, header one, header two, right? And then it goes down and we get into unachieved safeguards.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Uh-huh. That's header four.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And then we get into the sub-bullets, right? And it goes rationale and findings. ICANN compliance pops up.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's part of the rationale and findings.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And it goes into recommendations. And what I think I'm finding is that the headers that we have under recommendations aren't matching the headers in the logic above. So, me as a reader, if I look at it, it seems like it's a bunch of topics which are good and related, but the recommendations don't have the same headers. I'm just trying to ... If I was reading it, I'm getting confused as to what rationale is supporting what recommendation or does the recommendation need headers ... does the recommendations need headers if it's just addressing all the stuff above. Does that make sense?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Mm-hmm.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That last sentence may not have ...

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That makes sense, but [inaudible] above in the part that you're sayi9ng has to be clearly delineated and it's not [inaudible]. It totally makes sense.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, I'm just wondering, as I review this, if the review team for this section, what are we aiming to accomplish? I don't know if it makes logic to map the exact headers with a recommendation, but I'm just saying that there has to be a logic.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: [I have it].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, you have a feel for what to do.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Then tell us where you want to talk about the next issue.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Next up is the DAAR section, which was assigned to KC but looks like Denise made a bunch of changes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're at the bottom of 48.

[KC CLAFFY]: I thought ICANN had already published an announcement saying CCTs had been invited or encouraged to put CCT LD data into DAAR. Oh, was that CZDS? Maybe that was CZDS.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. I was there when it happened.

[KC CLAFFY]: Okay. So, can we remove the first bullet since they're doing it already? Okay. I want to take out the [Dave Piscatello]. I think they know where they can get this guidance if they want to do it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

[KC CLAFFY]: Okay. So, then, merge the two paragraphs above like this and then we can add detail below, so we can remove that.

Okay, now, ICANN should publish DAAR reports that identify registries ... Or it should say “DAAR reports should” or “published DAAR reports.” Published DAAR reports should identify registries and registrars whose domains [inaudible] abuse ... Should remove rate limiting for trusted parties. This is a different thing than DAAR, right?

NORM RITCHIE: No, it’s talking about—

RUSS HOUSLEY: It’s the DAAR data.

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible].

[KC CLAFFY]: Oh, it’s querying of DAAR, not DAAR querying the registrars. I thought the issue was—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, yeah, I think that’s [off mic].

[KC CLAFFY]: But DAAR is not actually provisioned by ICANN, right? DAAR is provisioned by some other ... Oh, I didn’t mean to do that. So, ICANN should effectively remove rate limiting for trusted parties when using the DAAR API. Is that what we mean?

NORM RITCHIE: I've never used DAAR.

[KC CLAFFY]: ICANN should identify entities with persistently high ... What is that, DAAR, or ICANN, or what, or the reports? I thought the reports ... That's already covered in the bullet two above.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

[KC CLAFFY]: But isn't that already covered in the DAAR reports thing—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We deleted that—

[KC CLAFFY]: Oh, sorry. Okay. Okay, ICANN Org. Is Heather going to add it? Okay, you do it. Okay, fine, ICANN Org.

Then, the next bullet, which is the third bullet that is not deleted, it looks redundant with the first bullet to me. Can we remove it? I'm out of it. My hands are—

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Someone give Russ a coffee.

[KC CLAFFY]: Not on the keyboard.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or a scotch, one of the two.

[KC CLAFFY]: Okay, I'm just going to put ICANN down here. But they're going to say they can't make this data available because it's not their data.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are you trying to type ICANN Board?

[KC CLAFFY]: ICANN Org, oh, sorry. ICANN Org should make the source data for DAAR available through the ICANN ... And line seven and eight, what is that? Of the [inaudible] data asset should be prioritized. Oh. And prioritized. What is line seven and eight? Does anybody know?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have no idea.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, it's part of the ODI data set, obviously.

[KC CLAFFY]: I don't even know what that is. I don't think there is such a thing as the ODI data set. Oh, data asset. I have no idea what that is. No one knows what that is? Can we just remove it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Need a second for the person who typed it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just checking. [off mic].

[KC CLAFFY]: You know they're just going to say we don't have the contractual—

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Data asset [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's fine. So, other than the noted action items, we're good with the rest of the text that's in the DAAR recommendation? I'd actually like to just remove the sentence on ICANN's former lead. I don't know why. That's not a finding.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What page are you on?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Someone crossed out the page numbers.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's why I'm confused.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: KC, somehow you deleted the page numbers.

KC CLAFFY: Google hates me.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay, hang on. Let me see if I can say, no, don't delete the page numbers.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible] keep on doing—

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I've just rejected your change. I'm at the top of page 49. I haven't left DAAR yet. I am at the top of 49. I have not left DAAR yet. I want to delete that sentence about ICANN's former lead.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I marked that as clearly not part of the recommendation. Is this a footnote or a commentary?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: In either case, I don't think it belongs here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's a resolution that I'm happy with.

STEVE CONTE: Can I pick a nit while we're up in that section?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

STEVE CONTE: It could be pedantic, but it says since 2018 the ICANN CTO has been publishing. In reality, it's been the ICANN office of the CTO been publishing. Does that matter? Am I too granular in that statement?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, I like that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No. I'm actually accepting some of these changes so that we don't go back and figure out what just happened there. I don't feel like ... KC, are

you happy with Denise's explanation about ICANN Org should publish DAAR reports that identify registries and registrars whose domain contribute to abuse? Because you said you worried about this since blacklist methodology is not open and transparent. Does that mean a change to the text?

KC KLAFFY: I'm thinking. I guess there is a way to have them reveal more granular information than they are already revealing in the reports without calling it proof that there is abuse or something like that. So, I think it's okay the way it is right now. I think it's the best we could do. We could say "whose domains most contribute to the abuse, according to the DAAR methodology." That would cover us with respect to the epistemology of it all.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Then I will mark that as resolved. Beauty.

NORM RITCHIE: Being careful with words. When we say someone is contributing to abuse, they're contributing to the volume of abuse. The registry or the registrar is not abusive, necessarily. But the wording, it makes it sound like it's the fault of the registry or registrar. No?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, Denise did a lot of rewriting in this section. She did have the action to, when saying as a measure of effectiveness, ICANN Board should

annually solicit and publish feedback. We talked about some revised language for that. Is that still needed? Middle of 49 in the paragraph “these actions would be an implementable, immediate way to address DAAR’s shortcomings. As a measure of effectiveness ...” She was assigned to revise the language there somewhat. Is that still needed based on the other changes?

KC CLAFFY: I would want to know what entities that are [inaudible], like M3AAWG or APWG. Actually, that is a useful sentence. It seems like it should be a bullet because above we have all the bullets we want them to do. By the way, I thought we were going to remove this text that I’m highlighting. Can we remove that text? Because I think it’s redundant with ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What are you highlighting?

KC CLAFFY: 49. Go up, go up, go up.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It’s in the bullet point.

KC CLAFFY: That one. Because the first bullet and the third bullet feel to me redundant. Can we get rid of the third? I thought that had already been done.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Going back to Norm's comment, though, "Should identify entities with persistent high abuse domain registrations." And the other one says "contribute" so we might want to merge them because then we get around this "are they themselves abusive" situation, because then, if they have a lot, they should be noted.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. But why don't we put the last sentence, what comes after "a measure of effectiveness" as a bullet? Okay. That's fine. Oh, Heather is going to do it. Look at this. I'm just going to wave my hands and it's going to happen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Wow!

KC CLAFFY: I know! The power! Talk about channeling. [off mic]. We've heard ICANN say, "We can't do this because of the nature of the contracts. We can't share the data to find [inaudible] without going back and renegotiating the contracts with the data source providers." Norm can tell me, "No, that's wrong. You misheard."

NORM RITCHIE: No, no. That's what they said.

KC CLAFFY: That's what they said, but we think there's maybe some multiple interpretations of the contracts or something. You know, we could preempt this because I do feel like this will happen again, like the DNS abuse conversation happens for decades. But we could say if ... To the extent that there are data feeds that prevent them from executing on these recommendations, what do we want to say? Do we want to say ICANN should stop buying those data feeds? ICANN should renegotiate and pay more for the version of those data feeds that they're allowed to release at a higher granularity? What? Just in the interest of this not getting stalled another several years, do we want to add something else to preempt what we have already heard in response to these suggestions?

NORM RITCHIE: But we're trying not to offer solutions.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, does that sentence that's now left at the end just ... It seems redundant with the intro to the list of bullets.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I am happy for it to go away.

[off mic conversation]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Wait, are we allowed to use that excuse? That's the same reason I didn't do my homework as of right now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm onto you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You [did] call first.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But she did. But Denise put good stuff here. I mean, I like what's here. I just would like [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: All right. Now I'm going to declare the DAAR section reasonably done. Reasonably done. We acknowledge Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, I still want to ask, "since January 2018" stays there? The sentence begins "since January 2018". Is that staying there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. The ask was to change it from ICANN CTO to OCTO.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I'm just re-challenging us. Do we want ... The sentence is not a recommendation. It's still a finding.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. But Heather is going to fix that. That's true all over this section.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, you'll flag that one as one we want to fix. I just want to make sure it doesn't stay as a legacy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Heather has 24 hours per day for the next seven days. That's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're going to work her. She's going to hate us.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: All right. Is there anything else on DAAR? Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: I believe we should clearly explain what rate limiting means here. So, that's probably WHOIS rate limiting registries.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, fine. I'll do it. I'll do it. But let me get clarification on what—

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Wait. If I may step in for a moment. When we assigned that question about rate limiting to KC, we were in the section on contracts and agreements.

KC CLAFFY: Thank you. [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes, we were.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But it looks like the exact section. Everybody [fixed] those bullets? Something is wrong with the reporting because it looked like a déjà vu. So, pretty much there's nothing in the world that you could have said to me that this was not the same.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, let's back up to what Zarko's issue is.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, but it would apply to the section below as well then.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes and no, because we deleted a bunch of things. I'm looking at it cross through right now. We deleted a bunch of that out of the contracts and agreements recommendation which was where—

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't think we deleted that part.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, we have. It wasn't—

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, we did. CL

Okay. So, we have resolved it by making it go away.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Which is what I was going to suggest.

KC CLAFFY: Well, it's elsewhere in the document.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right. It's going away here. Perfect.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's going to be a 10-page report [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. At this point, I want everyone to take a deep breath because the next section is going to be difficult.

KC CLAFFY: Wasn't this one I was supposed to merge and [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That's what I thought.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Do we want to have a coffee break, so that KC can actually make some of the changes that need to be done? That's up to you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, can you do it in ten minutes?

KC CLAFFY: I can [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Ten-minute break.

KC CLAFFY:

Okay. So, we're talking about the recommendations on contracts with registries and registrars to mitigate DNS abuse. I tried to merge two separate recommendations. One was called policies and contracts. One was called contracts agreements. I don't know the difference between these three terms: policies, contracts, and agreements. So, we are now on page 50. So, I'm just going to read it because it's such a mess. I reordered it also because the first recommendation talked about a PDP and the second one talked about a bunch of immediate changes, so I tried to put this all under one and say in the short term, do this. And then in the longer term, talk about changes to the policies. But I frankly don't know ... I would like to be more concrete about what we mean by the changes to the policy, so let's go.

"In agreements with contracted parties, including registry agreements based in individual [inaudible] RA, ICANN Org should make SSR requirements mandatory on contract or baseline agreement renewal. These changes should include ..."

And then we get pretty detailed immediately and I think maybe these sentences are in the wrong order but let me just read them.

"These changes should include provisions that establish thresholds of abuse. For example, three percent of all registrations that automatically trigger compliance inquiries with a higher threshold, like ten percent of all registrations, at which ICANN Org considers registrars and registries to be in default of their agreements."

Now, I have a sentence about the CCT did this. Denise has even added which recommendations do this in CCT, so that's great.

Then we have a sentence that says ICANN should put in a pattern and practice of abuse in something like section 552 of the RAA. That seems to be a more general sentence that should go above maybe the three percent, ten percent sentence. But maybe whoever wrote this means something different by that. So, that's one thing we need to talk about. But let me keep going.

And then we have a bunch of bullets and I think all of this needs to be turned into bullets. The three percent, ten percent sentence and maybe the pattern, practice of abuse sentence. Then these three remaining sentences are about data. Ensure access to registration data for parties with legitimate purposes via contractual obligations and rigorous compliance mechanisms. The second one is immediately instantiate a requirement to white list ICANN address space for all contracted parties. And then establish a process for vetting other entities that could be white listed. Then the third is the [RCCDS], establish and rigorously enforce uniform [CCDS] requirements. And there I think we should really cite the SSAC report and basically say—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [SSAC 47].

KC CLAFFY:

Yeah, ICANN should implement all the recommendations. And I had a sentence somewhere in this report that did that yesterday but it's not in this section right now. It should get moved to this section.

Okay. Then, more summary stuff. ICANN should [inaudible] and collaborate with ccTLDs and ccNSO to address DNS abuse. I feel like they've already invited ccTLDs to be in [a DAAR] and we should acknowledge that and give them credit for that. We should be more explicit about what else we want them to do, because if that doesn't happen, what else can happen?

The ICANN Board community and Org should work with the ccNSO to advance data tracking and reporting, address DNS abuse, security threats, and ccTLDs and develop a plan to support ccTLDs for the mitigating threat.

So, again, does it count that if [CCLT] goes into DAAR, is that done? Do we consider this one—should SSR-3 consider this one met?

Okay. So, we should be explicit about what else we want them to do.

Now, the last paragraph here is in the longer term, and here we say go do a PDP but we don't say ... We say including changes to RDAP and registry information ... Including changes to RDAP and registry information. I don't know what we mean by that. Changes to the actual protocol, changes to rate limiting, changes to what's actually in the fields and which changes we need to be more explicit about that. Incentives for contracted parties, that's in a later recommendation. Establishment and performance metric framework, I think we need to

be more explicit about that, unless it's in a later recommendation. And institutionalized training and certification for contracted parties.

So, it would be reasonable to break this up into two recommendations, a sort of "here's what we think you can do in the short term without a PDP and here's what we think you need a PDP for" which is how it was before. It was just in the wrong order and kind of confusing. But I haven't done that yet.

So, I want feedback before I go take the next pass of this which is probably bulletifying more.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

Thanks, KC. That's a lot to unpack. I think it's further complicated by, as we've discussed ... So, there's things you need a PDP to do and there's things you don't need a PDP to do. And in the bucket of things you don't need a policy development process to do, there are things that staff can just go do. There are things that staff can negotiate with contracted parties to put in contracts. There are different processes for that. If it's the registrar accreditation agreement (the RAA) that governs all the registrars, the process is different for that versus a base new gTLD registry agreement which forms the foundation for all new gTLD agreements versus specific unilateral contract changes and renewals for each new gTLD and separate rules for dot-com or net and a few other legacy ones.

So, it gets a little complicated when you get into the process of changing contracts and I think we need to be more specific there. I'm happy to take all your comments and look at them and propose a more

streamlined way of organizing this and perhaps by process, so it makes more sense.

Before you make any more changes, I'd like to take away all of your input and think about how to reply and streamline this whole section. Does that make sense?

KC CLAFFY: Yes, to the extent that we can be clear on what we believe does not require a PDP. I think we should be clear about that. But I'm now feeling that we may be getting into territory where ICANN is going to say, "Don't be that directive about what we do. Just tell us what you want the outcome to be." So, I think we try, but okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: On your ccTLD question, in addition to the DAAR data and [tracking stuff] we were discussing previously, there is also where appropriate and the ccTLD welcomes it, assess DNS abuse and security threats and ccTLDs help develop as appropriate a ccNSO plan to support ccTLDs and for the mitigating abuse and security threats. So, that's separate from DAAR.

KC CLAFFY: What about these two sentences, the three percent/ten percent sentence and then the next sentence says a pattern of abuse should be cause for termination. You can think about whether you want to switch the order of those, I guess, because Denise is going to take the next pass over this text.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just confirming that we're not adding new text because I think it would be easier for all of us to agree that pretty much if the text is being reordered, we'll be looking at reduction of text. So, pretty much ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's fine with me.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Because there's a lot of concepts here. I'm trying to make sure that in terms of the objective, because when we go back at it again, it wouldn't be introduce any new context or ideas.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Nothing new. No new ideas.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Because the streamlining I'm thinking of is that it's just moving paragraphs around.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. But in order to ... When you're rearranging things, you may need an additional bridge sentence or an introductory sentence, and if KC has a couple "this isn't clear" or "explain this more" we'll need to add a few more words. The intention here is not to introduce any new ideas but to

bring clarity and better organization to the ideas that we've already agreed to. Yeah? Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Then what I'm hearing is that we collectively in the next three hours can't further revise these recommendations in the compliance section. We can't accept the changes and we just have to wait for words to be finished.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm also not seeing any objection to the points that are being made here, which I think is the most important. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Those are both important points. My point was more in that hopes for the week from today deadline, were we going to be able to make it or not?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Next one, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: My next one, can we talk about the incentivization recommendation or does that fall under the category of it needs to go away for some—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Who owns it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Denise.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think I do. I welcome conversation about it. It would be good to hear what people think.

KC CLAFFY: We talked a little bit about this at lunch, too. I think the gold in the recommendation is the clear articulation of recognition that money matters. And I think we could tie this also to the recommendation I haven't expanded yet about pricing data being needed. But I think we also have to recognize that we're asking for somebody to give up money here, and it's either ICANN or the registrars unless you think the pot will continue to grow.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Right. Dot-com's pot will continue to grow. That's a safe prediction. Therein lies an important point because my view is that the whole fiscal structure here, it's unreasonable to expect a lot of this stuff to get fixed with the current fiscal structure.

So, I feel like there's a little bit of moving deck tiers around on the Titanic here, to move money from one corner to another. But I think the

higher level point is we understand that incentives matter here and money is the big incentive that is a lever that could be used. Passive voice intentional.

But I also think we need to find a contingency recommendation in case this one fails, as I predict it will, that someone will stop at either ICANN or the registries. I don't think it will make it through the process. And I understand Denise's point that they don't necessarily a process to try to pull this off. Indeed. But I think we need something in here that needs to say ICANN needs to report the results of this process, so that it can't just ... Like, even if it fails, it will succeed because we will get a report about how it failed. I think that's an important thing to add here and that's not here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Sure. Why don't you just drop that in there, that the public should receive a report on the efforts of this process. I think that's a good suggestion.

Backing up, though. Ultimately, it's anyone's guess whether the Board will accept any of these recommendations. And even if the Board accepts a recommendation, if any of them will be implemented. So, I don't think we should start out ...

So, I think our space is, after all of our work, here are the recommendations that we think are the most impactful and the most important and urgent. This is what we think you should do. We recommend that you do this. And then who knows what's going to happen?

So, while I take your point that, looking at this it's very uncertain to know what path it will take and what its chances of success are. You could say that about a lot of recommendations. And it's not our job to worry about ICANN's overall budget. We absolutely do not have insight into ICANN's budget and its abilities, either. Or its future abilities.

Again, I don't think that should be a limiting factor. What do you think about that? I see a [inaudible] over KC's head, so I don't think she's quite done.

KC CLAFFY:

With academic hat on, I really think some of this research needs to be done on what is happening to the economics of the ecosystem in general, which goes back to the pricing data recommendation. But that doesn't discount anything that Denise just said. So, I will go try to add a sentence about let's report the outcome either way. To the extent that ICANN wants us to focus on what we want the outcome to be rather than have to execute on the outcome and whether they raise the prices and give a discount or keep the prices the same and keep a discount, because I guarantee the problem is going to be the incentives of any of these players to do this.

I wonder if we could make the outcome more about what we say ... I guess we do at the top. What we say at the top is create pricing incentives for contracted parties to mitigate abuse and security threats. And at the end of the whatever time document how ICANN has executed this. I'm repeating myself. I'm going to shut up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: They're supposed to document how they execute every recommendation that's accepted by the Board, but sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't mean how they execute it. I mean the actual outcome of the recommendation. I have heard that some of these registries are already using these kinds of pricing incentives to mitigate abuse, but I don't see it in writing, so maybe somebody else knows.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Is this page 52 that we're on? It is, right? Because this is incentivization from fee reduction. So, a lot of the comments I think here are very general. I don't think they apply to that situation, where basically you just say, "We'll charge you less." A fee reduction. When you talk about where this money is coming from and who is getting what ...

When I read this, I liked what it said because it essentially says less money will change hands, and that's the incentive. So, it's not about where—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's just the registrars.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And [off mic].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right, which is why we're recommending it to the ICANN Org—why we recommendation to ICANN Org because everyone else is probably in line with it, which is part of the community. Nevertheless, they can still say no, etc., and so forth. But as far as the ... I guess I felt like some of your consternation was about maybe it was intractable. It seems very tractable to me, just when I read it. But I wanted to make sure I was looking at the same thing as you all because I don't understand the consternation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that it's not so ... Well, you worked at a registry. I didn't. Maybe you know more about ... It seems to me that one could look at this as the malicious domains are actually the ones that cost money to clean up and track and run after. So, why are those the ones that are stopping the money flow? There's just something ...

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right. That's what this is saying. It's basically saying the registry, not the domains that are malicious. The registry that hosts them. If you were to stop having so many of those, it would be in your financial interest, whatever that means.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Furthermore, there is an incentive for ICANN Org. They have theoretically less abuse, less compliance work. But I think we should take a queue because Norm has his up and Naveed as well.

NORM RITCHIE: Didn't the CCT recommend the same thing? I could have sworn.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Probably.

NORM RITCHIE: I know there is debate on it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it was you should look at doing something, too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, do we know what happened to that recommendation? Did that [inaudible] cutting room floor? Did it get to the Board?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's pending.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'll take a note to look at that, what they actually recommended, how close it was to this, and what happened to it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I know there was carrot and stick part of it. There's two parts to it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it was pretty high level and vague. "You should look at doing something eventually."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Drew wrote it.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. To me, it's more important and I think more practical to suggest, to recommend, to ICANN to come up with a process or framework to have incentivization rather than telling "this is what you have to do and this is what you have to do." I think we should keep this thing open to them to come up with a process and comply with that process, so at the end of this review process, when the next comes, it will be evaluated whether that process has been developed or not and whether it has been complied or not, rather than saying you have to do A, B, C, D, whatever, because that would allow ICANN to see what it can offer in the agreements or whatever and then stick to that. So, this is what I believe.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, we're giving examples of what they can do. We're not telling them, "You have to do it this way."

NAVEED BIN RAIS: For example, we say should [audio cuts] to say that "such as" kind of thing. That would be better. But I don't see a statement here asking ICANN to come up with a process. When you have a process, then you can streamline that process and you can review that process and come up and improve that. So, when you say you have to do A, B, C, you can just do that and stop it. So, framework would continue.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. So, you're suggesting that ICANN should create and implement a process or framework that achieves the following results.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Such as it can ... Exactly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think I heard agreement to that approach. Heather, did you assign who's going to make the changes.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: [I am].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Next.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I sort of have another meta question. This is aimed at KC. I had been creating titles for each of these sections that were just really ... They weren't ... To describe the recommendations. You're not cool with that?

KC CLAFFY: Ultimately, I think there is a large number of people that will read only the section headers of this report, so at least we need to have—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] only the tables.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Fair enough. I don't feel that strongly. If you want to keep it as labels instead of recommendations, it's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The thing is I agree that there's that risk of just skimming the table of contents, but I also feel like if we were able to get our recommendations down to one accurate line to describe all of it, we wouldn't be struggling with the report the way we are. There's so much packed in there. I'd rather just say this is about incentivization and then unpack the details.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I actually think we need to get our recommendations down to one succinct line and it probably should be about outcome. Then the text of the recommendation can have all these things that we are suggesting to help implement, to guide implementation. But I don't think the fact that we haven't articulated things concisely is a reason to just use labels and not put this [thing in]. But I should probably then take the pass at trying to make those titles and I don't know if anybody else even cares about this. Do you care?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, you care? You want me to take a pass or...?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I want you to take a pass. I don't care.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, thank you. I feel empowered and loved. And guess what? More email from me in just a moment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, my God. 36 emails.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, no. I'm going to summarize it in one. But I do now have corollary of ... Okay, so that seems like a reasonable action. Do we need to have that action done before we go out for draft?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are we done with that diversion? Okay, go ahead, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: All right. In the recommendation on abuse portals on page 53, that seems like ... I think we can just accept that. Never mind. Say yes, yes.

Compliance function.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Before we move to the next, I put a comment here in the last paragraph of DAAR. No, not of DAAR, of incentivization. Yeah, here. How does it fit here in the last paragraph in this complete section? Because we are talking about incentivization and then about trainings and stuff like that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We've already repeated all this training stuff from the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It looks similar to it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. We have all this training stuff as the recommendation above it. It's not incentivization. It belongs in the sentence, the paragraph before this recommendation about in the long term, ICANN should do blah-blah-blah and institutionalize training for contracted parties.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, just move it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no. The reason that's there is so that people know how to do the above. If you're going to say that there's a certain amount of abuse and blah-blah-blah or there isn't or how ... You have to be able to know that there's abuse and you can track it in order to have money change hands.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Then we need another wording.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Then there needs to be some transition.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Maybe there's a relation [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I don't know who to assign that to.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric is doing it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm suggesting it. I was about to do it and then I realized I was in the wrong mode and I—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But it's your homework is what I'm hearing.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Awesome.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm going to do it [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Eric is doing it in passive voice and you can fix it later. Is that what he said? Okay, Heather. Take charge.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: All right. Then moving down to compliance function, the bottom half of page 53. Norm, did you mean to strike through? Did you want to delete that first paragraph? Is that what you wanted to do?

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I see. You didn't suggest the [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah. I'm not good at this.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No. Well, I didn't like how he deleted it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm not sure who wrote that. I thought it was Laurin. But I think it's an important point that underpins a lot of problems that ICANN has had and some solutions that were advancing.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's not a recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Are you just moving it?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, but it's just a statement. We had the same kind of concept at other places already, that they're not doing and they need to be audited.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, my only comment is I like that idea, and before we delete it, I want to make sure that we have it up in the findings. How about that? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's also have recommendation.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. It's kind of a recommendation.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Since ICANN derives most of its funding from registries and registrars, it should have compliance activities [inaudible]. There's a shift.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That's not a smart.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It is not.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's not a very smart action. That's like saying, "Hey, Laurin, you should cut your hair tomorrow." It doesn't really say how you should cut it, what style, what's wrong. It doesn't really help. You should get—

LAURIN WEISGINGER: Yeah. It's more like an intro to the other "shoulds" in here.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Well, we have that concept higher up already.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm okay. Just [fine].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You can take an action to check to make sure that the ideas in this first paragraph are elsewhere. So, the first part needs to be in the findings and the second part needs to be in the audit section. So, I'll take an action to check to make sure they are and then we'll delete them. How about that?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: On this SSR-1 implementation [inaudible] recommendation 2 which speaks to recommendation 9 of SSR-1, we speak about audit ad nauseum. There's a whole thing. So, unless we put that point that we want to make there, because there may be a slight conflict of interest

with receiving money from registrars and auditing them. I would recommend that if we're moving it, it just goes there to support the point of implementing that recommendation. We spoke about audit like crazy yesterday. I remember.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'll take a look at it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So just stick it up there somewhere.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. We have an old comment in here and it comes back to this is now abusing naming top of page 54 saying that this recommendation must include defined and clearly distinguished abuses and misleading naming. This is key for this working. Laurin, this was your comment. Do you think this has been covered elsewhere at this point or is it sufficiently described in this first paragraph?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. I think we did put it in somewhere.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I think that first paragraph probably covers it. Okay. In the rationale and findings, do people really want to find a better example than whatever that word is in Danish?

[off mic conversation]

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, you're laughing. [inaudible] made it to the report.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I couldn't think of the name, but I kind of said, okay, if anyone has something better, put it in there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it's fine. K

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, just leave it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's better in this context.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't know. I'm not the one that put this comment there. I'm the one that said do you really want to just work on this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I [can offer] a better one.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do we need to?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't know, like not right now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I really don't like how much I'm assigning to you, Denise. It's too much work for you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do we have dates? Can we put dates on it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Not at this point. We're more than half way through and trying to add dates to all the things would be ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, I know what you meant. I think we're going to have that in a big conversation I suppose per item.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, you just want something that's a good homonym to insert there instead of [inaudible]. Is that what people are upset about?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No. I'll tell you later.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's an SSAC document about—[audio cut].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Next thing, still in the rationale and finding, is we have this detail on implementation and we really don't do that very much in this report. I think that the general consensus has been this is a little bit prescriptive and we wanted to avoid that where we could, sometimes. What about ... Do we keep this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: At the appropriate time—and I think for sure we should do this before we turn in our final report—we need to think strategically about the level of detail we're going to include. We were told specifically by the CCT Review Team members that ICANN told them not to be too

prescriptive. They needed a lot of latitude in how they were going to do something, and then in the Board report that failed to approve most of the CCT recommendations, there are several entries that say, "This is too vague," and, "We'll send it to the community to discuss, so we're going to put it on hold."

So, we need to have a more fulsome discussion about what level of direction and detail we want to include in the final report, and that might be better done after we received public comments.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

My comment goes beyond just being specific or not. The section implementation measure of success has nothing to do with rationale and findings. Absolutely nothing. Then it goes into a recommendation below, an update handling of abusive naming, which the rationale above has some of the other documents, sections in the document have done have actually justified why this recommendation is being done. I'm not seeing the correlation with implementation measure of success with the rationale and findings. At this point, I think it's not even about who wrote it but I don't know if it makes sense.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

No, no, I'm saying the expert, the person who helped craft this can probably help fix that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Or delete it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I mean, it could be part of the recommendation as to how to, in terms of how ... The thinking. The thinking is there as to how they see this being worked out to fix. It's just that it shouldn't be under rationale and findings. It should be probably under the recommendation and tied to a part of the recommendation as a thought [through] as to how to implement, as an example.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I don't disagree. I can't remember if I wrote it. If I did write it, I'm okay with removing it. As I said, if I wrote it, which is quite possible, I'm happy to just delete it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, but there's value in the first three bullets. The last bit, maybe not, but there's value in the ... It's just move it. It just doesn't fit there.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We can say the process might work as well or something.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, like as part of [inaudible]. It's just to kind of make it ... There's no flow.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, you delete [implementation].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'll do some rewriting.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just to make the thought process flow.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think Heather has it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. That's fine, too.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: After Naveed's suggestion.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, next in the recommendations update handling of abusive naming, KC, you and I are having a conversation in the dialogue about who decides this level and I thought that that was discussed in the rationale but perhaps it was not clear. I did offer some alternative text but I want to make sure that that meets the intended meaning.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Isn't that one [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, immediately under abusive naming at the top of page 53, we describe what misleading naming is and we describe what abusive naming is. Is that not what you're looking for?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This highlighted text is not a recommendation. It's like more of an explanation of the recommendation, so it should move to findings. So, because here we're defining what is misleading naming, actually.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, you mean the detail [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Isn't this where we were talking about a portal for people to complain and stuff? So, basically, someone would self-report or someone report—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: A registrant?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think nominally anyone. I guess probably there's different ways to report, however that portal gets implemented.

So, I read this as maybe ... So, I didn't write any of it, so I'm not trying to be proprietary. It's not mine. But I read this as basically saying there are a lot of ways to get telemetry on strings and identifiers that shouldn't be

used in registration. And it doesn't say how you get those. It gives a couple of ways you might imagine getting them but it essentially says there are certain things that should not get registered because they could basically be ... The words that come in my head are homoglyph attack.

And it even points at guidelines for implementing of IDNs, presuming that IDNs is going to be one place in which a lot of homoglyph attacks will be effectuated.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Why didn't you just cite these guidelines [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's in quotes, so it's not cited, per se, but yeah, you're right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But those guidelines are for who, registries or registrars?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Right. But this basically saying you can't register names that look like "blah". The guidelines are there for very proactive, very antiseptic reasons, but this is saying more generally there will be lots of strings that you shouldn't allow registration of. It doesn't say why you would know that or where you would get it from. It just gives some intuition, which [maybe is to diffused]. But I think this generally says there are certain parts of the namespace you shouldn't allow registration into.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And they've got like a block list at the registry level.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm just saying making clear of who [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And I support KC. You guys just explained a whole bunch of stuff that makes sense but it's not in the document.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It doesn't mean that it should be deleted. It just means that somebody who understands it. Just like how you explained it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You understand it and you would delete it?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So it doesn't help anything?

NORM RITCHIE: I think this is trying to be a bit too prescriptive and the prescription is not correct. I agree that this area should be addressed but this might not be the best way of addressing it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What is the best way to address it?

NORM RITCHIE: That's what I was saying. I'm not sure we should actually say how to do it. We're trying to say how to do it again.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How does SSR-3 know it's done?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is one of the recommendations that has less text in the rationale and findings and more text in the recommendation itself. It should be [inaudible] actually. So there is plenty of information in the recommendation which has no rationale behind and no findings behind that. So, I think we'll have to expand the findings section more and that would then allow us to better understand what the recommendation is about.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's a good suggestion.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Naveed just suggested while you were out I think that the findings need to be longer and the recommendation needs to be shorter and less detailed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure. [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

[ERIC OSTERWEIL]: Yeah. I'll accept homework on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Heather?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I also want to point out that this process should function as follows. Again, that's a level of specificity that perhaps we don't want. We could say this process could function as follows, to be a little less prescriptive.

Okay. Then the next big area to work in is page 56, which is key rollovers. There's a lot of new material there. I think this was much of Eric's homework from yesterday.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I did it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Would you like to say anything about it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think I effectuated my homework. I think it's on the bottom of page 56 as new text, based on what I'm looking here. The rest I think is ... You can see all the edits but I didn't really feel like I needed to modify that I think.

I think that covered everything that I had in notes that people asked me to look into, but if I missed something, let me know.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. In that first paragraph on rationale and findings, KC deleted the sentence "one aspect of this rollover illustrated the necessity for proper functioning of [exception legs] and the procedure." Are we okay with deleting those sentences?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Why did we remove that? That's like the main reason that I think doing this as a formal process is that we had a problem we didn't foresee and we were deadlocked for a year. The problem was we weren't getting the new key uploaded into—

HEATHER FLANAGAN: [It's not on there].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's what this is talking about.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Where?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The part you deleted. One aspect of this rollover illustrated necessity of properly functioning of [exception legs]. The [exception leg] was, hey, half of these guys aren't getting the new key.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It says specifically the rollover was delayed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Or I don't think it's needed really, but if you want to put it in—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The rollover was delayed for a year while measurements were blah-blah-blah. I mean, it's deleted now but that's ... If nothing bad happened in the first rollover, someone could say, "Why do we need formal modeling? Everything went fine." I know. And I know for a fact that that was not true.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can I suggest we un-delete that sentence that's deleted? The two sentences that are deleted and reword them and add a little more specifics I think to meet your needs, KC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. If you could highlight those two sentences and assign them to Eric.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, I thought you were going to add a cite to the what happened to that sentence and then everything I think would be okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I didn't realize that we wanted a citation to that but that's totally fine and I can go and I'll try to find exactly what ... I think the [IMC] paper at this point is probably the canonical citation for something bad happening but I'll dig up something that I can point directly at that says, "See? We waited a year and that wasn't because everything was going well."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. I think that's what's needed, although I'm not sure what [inaudible] is about.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nothing. They just—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is the [inaudible] link the [IMC] report?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, there's a set of comments there and that was where I thought maybe we would put the [IMC] but we had this conversation yesterday and it didn't seem like it necessarily was. But in view of the conversation we just had, then maybe if not there, then down below right below it. Wherever it makes sense, I'll find a place to point at something very specifically that says there were dragons that ate our ship.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And word it in a way that's not released last week which ...

ERIC OSTERWEIL: You mean something archival [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. That's all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Oh yeah]. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: And later, on the text you added, can you ... Is there a canonical textbook on this branch of computer science that you could just add a cite to?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's kind of a sub-field in software engineering called processes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I can try to find ... Basically, everyone will claim it's their paper. "Oh yeah, that's my paper." So, it's hard to point at the canonical place. I'll find something. I'll see if I can find a workshop or something like that, something that looks a little—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. Great.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I'll look for that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Sorry. Naveed? Sorry, I'm reading.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The next ... I have just a question about top of the page 57, actually. So, just wondering why you explicitly mentioned that it is broken into two parts because all other recommendations are also broken into many parts. So, for the sake of consistency, either we specify it everywhere or we just don't specify, we can itemize this [inaudible]. I don't know. Or there might be some reason behind doing it like this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't have a preference. I broke it into two parts because it really felt to me like they were sort of separate [inaudible]. I think that's fine. We should certainly homogenize it. So, if Heather doesn't mind me just leaving it in her hands. KC's point yesterday was that SSAC 63 and 73 were basically being very directive. "Do these things." And what we had before about modeling is something new. So, it felt like they were a bit different. But yeah, you're spot on. It could be periods, dots, whatever Heather says.

ALAIN AIDA: Eric, for the second part, there is a call for comments going on currently on a proposal for future key rollover.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible] this to them?

ALAIN AIDA: No, no, no, because this seems to be ... The part two seems to be asking [inaudible] or something that maybe we should look at the document and the IANA people [inaudible], see how it affected this part.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. This part is not in that document. That document is sort of like a [rough shot] over what [inaudible] before, which is very high level. And what this is proposing is to do something systematic and formally verifiable, which means a computer could compile what you did and say it worked or didn't work, it's safe or it's not safe. That's the ideal formal verification is something will actually prove what you've just done is provably safe, for example. And right now what's in that document is a bunch of high level maybe it'll work, maybe it won't, try something, do the best you can.

So, I know the public comment is about to close and this kind of thinking I think really should be in that work, so it would be great to rewind the clock. But we can't do that.

Just as something for the team, sometimes we get too close to things. I guess maybe it would be helpful ... It sounds like maybe this isn't as clear—or maybe my head is in a different place than everyone else's. But it would be great if I am not way off in the weeds on this, if people could sort of help me see where the text isn't really clear.

The idea that is trying to be conveyed by the text—which I think is maybe getting lost, so if someone wants to help, that’s great—is saying that there’s a bunch of steps that have to happen for something important to work properly is part of formal process modeling.

It’s a process whereby you start to say if something bad happens here, this is what we’ll do. And if something else happens down there like this, then that’s what we do, such that you can essentially compile that as a program and you can prove if these things happen, I prove that everything is safe, or I can prove it’s not safe or I can explicitly say what the problems are and people are applying formal process modeling to medical procedures to make sure your doctors give you your medicine in the right order, and if there’s a problem, you don’t accidentally die. To elections—if these things happen, then you know the right candidate was elected to office, etc.

So, that’s why I was proposing we apply that same kind of rigor and methodology to the KSK rollover.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

So, Eric, I think your explanation ... Your recommendation says exactly what you just said, which is good. But what’s missing I think is that formal process analysis as a tool was introduced without a context before it.

So, just having an introductory sentence, you could just add that just to say as a result of the potential risk, if this is not done—or a potential benefit that could begin if a model that has been proven or is used in industry is blah-blah-blah. Formal process is blah-blah-blah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And you say up above, not in the recommendations.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No. Where you have the explanation and the findings just before, where it starts, “A formal process analysis is ...” It’s a good explanation but it just needs a preamble sentence to kind of contextualize why we are suggesting this as a recommended [formal] option or tool.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Also—and I know Eric already knows this—there’s already a proposal about the next KSK roll out for public comment. There’s already been a couple public comments. There’s already these two pending SSAC documents and SSAC has a working group on this. So, I just feel like this needs to acknowledge all this stuff. You already have this in here at the beginning, except for the public—the current IANA proposal. And basically I guess what you’re saying is that proposal is missing any of this. But I haven’t even read that proposal, so we should probably say we know there’s work going on in this area. We’re saying this is what is missing.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The recommendation itself, especially part two, explicitly details what needs to be done. The only thing is we are specifying here the details, and if we specify it like this, I feel that the rationale also must have something about those, for example, why do you need a group of

stakeholders to come up with or to be included in the process? So, if we can put something in the finding itself or in the—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The part two I'm talking about. For example, we are saying ICANN Org should create a group of stakeholders involving relevant [persons]. If we can ... All these three, four sentences that we have, it might be better to put the rationale accordingly so the importance of each of these, what we are proposing because what we find rationale in the previous paragraph is only to establish a formal procedure. We find rationale of that.

But the details which is put as three, four sub-recommendations, they don't have rationale or logic associated in that paragraph.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. So, I'm confused. What's in there ... You mean the part that says part two in front of it.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But that doesn't say some of those things. It basically is a roadmap for how to implement. It should be a formal process. It should have details of key rollovers, decision points. It's basically laying out these are the things you should do and it says you should use a [finite stated mission] and it should have empirically verifiable acceptance criteria. And then it should be periodically reconsidered so that it can grow. If I were tasked with doing this, that would be the roadmap I'd want.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. This is what exactly I wanted to point. Earlier, we also had a discussion that it is better not to explicitly specify what needs to be done rather than a formal procedure. Doing something and coming up with the task, the outcome, which is more important than how you follow it.

But if we are explicitly saying this is the procedure, then the rationale might be one paragraph, might be added accordingly in the rationale and findings that support this, that you have to do this, this, this, this to implement.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. See, the thing is I don't believe the text says that. What the text basically says is you can't know if you've succeeded unless you have things sort of like this. The closest it gets to what you're saying is that EG and FSM—and EG means examples, like you don't have to use [inaudible]. So, I want to [inaudible]. We also have to give [inaudible] that are S.M.A.R.T. So, it's trying to basically be—

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Maybe I'm unable to convey my point. My point is each of these, for example in part two, they are four different sentences. Each of them start with a "should" so that would be taken as four different sub-recommendations. So, each of them should have a rationale behind because you are asking ICANN to do this, this, this, this. So they are connected in a way by the follow-up process. So, do we have a rationale behind that one step is followed by another and the outcome of one is connected to another? This is what I mean, actually.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

I think that's an easy fix. So, for all the other recommendations, we wanted to avoid specificity. We included it in the rationale. For example, you could implement a process that takes into consideration these steps, and then in the recommendation a very specific "should establish a formal procedure." We've already explained it above.

So, the guiding tool for whoever has to implement it is already included. It's just not giving us a directive to do it this way, but they have the example and the process. So, when you put the sentence about what the formal analysis would be, at the end of that sentence, you could take the sentences up to verification of the key rollover process should include—no, that's the specific things you want then. The process should have empirically verifiable. So, from that sentence, put that as a part of your [explanatory] note about what the formal process looks like and I think that would fix the concern Naveed has, I hope. No? Because his justification is in the first two paragraphs about why we think that

something very specific about having verification and having an established formal process. But I think if that part of the sentence moves up, it would just go up to where you're doing explanation as to what the formal process is. I think that should help. Make sense?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I mean, do you want to take a whack at it or do you want me to do it?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, just do it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just move it up, yeah.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so just move that up.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think just move it up and then just make the thought process flow and it should be fine.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I just want to come back to the thing. I think at some point we have to make one sentence recommendation kind of title for each of these because it's not going to work having four or five should in one and we cannot put it [inaudible] as a title. So, our table in the start cannot be

like six, seven pages long just to provide a recommendation. The recommendation text can be longer but if we think about the title of a recommendation, when we have a four-sentence recommendation, it would be very hard to come up with something like that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Naveed, it's good that you're warmed up and talking because the next section, root server operations, you added a bunch of text yesterday that folks need to review.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, just to explain, yesterday we found that there is a gap between the findings and the recommendation itself, so I just tried to fill that gap and tried to highlight what is missing and why we have a recommendation like this. And I tried to dilute the recommendation itself because I see that there is a process ongoing. The implementation of RSSAC 037 is already started with a working group call as well. So, I cited that in the footnote that the process is started. We just want to make sure that the security aspects are included in that process. It's just to summarize.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any concerns here?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Just one question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think Naveed also did the next section.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I just had a question. What is a sanity check procedure? Is that a term that's [in industry], sanity check? You guys use that? Yeah? I see one nod.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I do.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Sanity check is a term that you guys use?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't know that it's a formal term [inaudible]. It's just a common—at least common American—colloquialism.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's a formal term.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is it? Okay. I actually don't see where it is.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible] sanity test. Are we ready for the next section?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm going to go ahead and accept Naveed's changes in the rationale then.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] thing about L-root. I think that would be a universal change.

[SCOTT MCCORMICK]: I'm just picking nits with that. I mean, anytime anyone talks about L-root, I'm obliged to say it's IMRS. I'm just putting notations in there so it's consistent throughout the whole document. That's all. In the section below, it's referred and then defined. IMRS, commonly known as L-root. I think the first IMRS maybe, or in the definitions, maybe we'll throw it there and then everyone is happy.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: All right, then. Looking at the recommendation for baseline security practices. Is everyone okay with Naveed's changes there?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We should do a similar thing that we did with recommendation—what was that? Key rollover, yeah, to shorten this part of recommendation and put somewhere else [as proposal].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, we've deleted KPIs to measure—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We just moved it up, actually.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, you moved it up. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, because [inaudible] there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, what's the recommended action?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's actually [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. Encouragement isn't really measurable, though. There's a big gap between we can't tell you what to do and we're going to everything we can to improve the whole system including [inaudible] of the system, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And we need to change this wording because [inaudible] KPIs to measure the best practices, how to measure best practice, implementation of best practice. [inaudible] some metrics.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Agree. And I think the [audit] in that same sentence, reporting to whom? Reporting to the community, reporting to the Board, reporting to whom? It's not saying [or report].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's [off mic].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But we need to say—because it says “and ensure yearly public reports are issued on how these KPIs—” That's not measurable because they won't know who they're reporting to.

STEVE CONTE: I'm down on the recommendation part. I don't know if you guys are still in rationale. Recommendation? Do we have public debates that ICANN launches or should that be public comment periods or something? I don't know. Denise, do you know if we have launch ICANN debates? Very top of page 61 in the rec section of RZMS.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We're not there yet.

STEVE CONTE: Oh. I thought we were in RZMS. I apologize. All right. I'll save that question for later.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: About metrics and measurements, I think this is a link to the best practices that are proposed in the SSAC or RSSAC document and I think ... I don't know the content of the document, but I think, when I read it, it's a reference to KPIs, metrics, because we are referencing [inaudible] these best practices and requirements. So, I think it's possible to define them when they are in the document. Where not, then we should use another wording.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't understand what—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You don't understand. We have a reference to the RSSAC document and that document includes [inaudible] security best practices for root server operators and operations. That's what is written there. And ICANN should develop KPIs to measure these best practices and requirements. So, I think that's a link to the document. Where's the problem [inaudible] why you can't define it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How you measure best practice.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You can measure requirements that are defined. You have to define KPIs, metrics, and then you can measure it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Then just add the word “implementation”.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I’m saying that we should change wording here. SSAC 037 is more directive than ... It has an exact best practices. It is tasked of that working group RSS GWG to develop [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, the RSSAC 037 does not ... It just provides the framework of how the governance should be. But it does not define any best practices. What we are saying is when they define the best practices, they also need to consider these because security is only their subpart in one of the streams. It’s not their focus, actually, if we see their governance framework. So, we’re just here mentioning that when you develop those best practices, you just consider having these as well and then you measure it.

So, we can just change “develop relevant KPI” to “measure the implementation of these best practices” for example. That would solve the—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic] implement best practices.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Or the outcome of these best practices or something like that. So, that I can just put it in.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I was hoping to get through this part of the work stream before the break but it's pretty clear that's not going to happen. So, I think we need to take the break now. We remind you that the leadership team needs to have a short meeting to set the agenda for Wednesday. So, we could do that. It shouldn't be more than 10 or 15 minutes. So, do we want to do that in here? Jennifer, where do you want to do the leadership meeting?

JENNIFER BRYCE: We have a [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, thank you.

Thank you. We have a couple more recommendations in this work stream which have significant edits. We have one more workstream to do. It has actually very light edits. My hope is we can push through this

and get the homework ... I'll get all the homework assigned and get that all done in time for review on Wednesday on our call, and then make a call at the end of the call on Wednesday as to whether the document is in good enough shape for public comment. So, that's the plan. Let's see if we can do it. Yes?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: This may be appropriate or not appropriate, but if that is the plan, which I agree with, would it be okay if we have two versions of the document for review on Wednesday? One that accepts all changes and looks clean, that we can actually see it in entirety and the mark-up which is the public one. So, have an internally circulated clean version of the same document that will be reviewed on Wednesday for sign-off with all homework done, etc. Only because I think on Wednesday, if we look back at the document that looks like this during the call, it will not get a sign-off at the end of the call. So, it's just a recommendation that a clean version be circulated prior to the call, trusting that all is well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, I don't know if the chair has agreed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That makes sense to me, so long as everyone is able to do their homework by like Tuesday morning. Okay. Back to you, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: All right. Next up is the root zone change management. This is on ... It starts on page 58, but what you're going to see is a whole lot of text has been proposed to be removed and a whole lot of new text added. The new text is on page 60. Thank you, Norm. Does anyone have any objections to this new text and the removal of the old text?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, I don't know if this is just moved text or what, but just one thing that popped out to me was the final bullet at the bottom of the colored text—the one that is talking about RFC 8078—where did that come from?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [off mic].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. So, does anybody remember advocating that we're basically saying people should use RFC 8078 which I think has some security [inaudible] problems. So, I have some concerns that aren't cover here but I'm happy to discuss.

So, I just wanted, before we get too deep into that, does somebody feel strongly about that bullet? Keep or not?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, what it's saying is consideration of that RFC, which would include SSAC and RSSAC assessment of it before you do that. That seems like a real good thing to lead to a way to fix the concerns you're raising.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. That looks good. The only other thing more I'd ask is can we just take it out? But if we can't just take it out, that's definitely good enough.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My feeling is if it leads to a fix of the RFC, that's a good thing, too. Any other concerns?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't think Eric is done yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry, I didn't see that. Go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This particular finding and rationale is kind of a mix of recommendations and findings. It more describes what needs to be done rather than why it needs to be done, so that's my concern about this two, three paragraphs that ... We have, for example, all these bullet points are what needs to be done rather than ... If we have a summary of that at the end in the recommendation itself, then it's okay. But if the recommendation itself, the next heading, it does not contain any of

these which we're proposing here, then we should rather move this or a summary of that to the next bullet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. The way I read the recommendation, we're just asking them to increase the priority and accelerate the implementation. Kerry and Zarko, you don't want to talk now?

ZARKO KECIC: You just answered.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, does that mean change text or no?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm, do you want to trim some of this to only the things that are related to that recommendation?

Yes. But do you want to focus it is the question? Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: In the recommendation part, this is where I was referring to earlier, in the wrong section earlier, about public debate versus public comment. I'm not sure what the proper intention and wording should be on that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm still confused about this paragraph which, for example, I highlight here. These ones. For example, authentication of change request should be more stringent or do we want to say that "are more stringent and involve ..." Because when we say "should" it means we are recommending something and we are not providing the rationale of it. So, again, as I said, if you look at the text above this one, this [inaudible] a recommendation rather than the logic behind that recommendation. So, I'm not sure how to present this in a better way.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I also thought we heard last Wednesday that they were concerned that we shouldn't push too hard for some of the TLD operators wouldn't be able to meet that requirement. That's what Steve reported, right? Did I misunderstand?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is this about the MFA part?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So that was what I read yesterday for Kim's response to our conversation is that he's concerned about the ... I'm going to paraphrase this because I don't have the me. About the potential gap between log-

ins between the customer that could impact their ability to retain their token or remember how to use their token which then could cause issues with false denials or rejections into the system.

So, I think they're open to a conversation about that. I know they're open to a conversation about that. But the concern that I got from IANA was that they don't necessarily ... I'm talking myself into a corner here. That having a recommendation around that, forcing an MFA when it's not fully vetted and discussed within their community could be problematic.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. We should add that part of sentence that we're discussing and you just said. Implement MFA in coordination with the community. So, that may solve the problem.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Add that text where "and by whom".

RUSS HOUSLEY: Add that text to the recommendation is what I think I heard. Norm, will you take that action? Thank you. Anything else on the RZMS? Okay, back to you, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Next is the root zone data and IANA registries. There's been a number of changes in here by KC. KC, do you want to talk about these?

KC CLAFFY: I'm sorry, what page are we on?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: We're on page 61.

KC CLAFFY: I'm live, okay. So, this is really streamline, streamline, streamline and get rid of passive where I could, put the outcome at the beginning where I could, put the intended outcome at the beginning. But I don't think I took any meaning out. Yeah. DNSSEC is where Naveed is. I mean, DNSSEC isn't really a metric. Maybe you want to put deployment of DNSSEC. Okay, he's not going to. Sorry, I don't know what really to say except that I tried to just shorten it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Does anyone have objections [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just one thing that I want to put in front of everyone and see what people's thoughts are is the IANA registries, we had a lot of back and forth whether they matter, what they are, where they live, etc. And one of the results that I think was the final paragraph that got stricken here, and so that means we're not talking about what they are. And just

amongst our own team, there was a lot of consternation and learning about them. So, do we want to keep an intro about why the registries—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Maybe it goes in the beginning, though. Sorry about that. Maybe I ...

NAVEED BIN RAIS: My question is a generic one. Why do we want to shorten the rationale and findings section? It should be as detailed as it would allow to understand something. Are we intentionally making an exercise [inaudible] throughout the document of keeping this section short as well?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I hope so.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The goal is to be clear and concise and I think what she's aiming for is just for that and that means taking the extraneous words out. All of the same meaning should be there. If some of the meaning was lost by her changes, then that's what we need to fix.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: For example, when we say that there is no such reporting exists and we are cutting it, it means that we don't have an evidence to support that. That's why we are removing those—

KC CLAFFY: I think we basically say at the beginning the SSR-2 team believes that various stakeholders need to be able to assess key SSR indicators of the root zone, and that ICANN should create formal KPIs to support this objective. I don't think we need to say first they don't do it. If we're putting the recommendation in, the implication is they're not doing it. So, I definitely don't think we need that sentence.

I take Eric's point about the sentence about the IANA registries, but it's so disconnected from the rest of the text, I think it needs to be ... I mean, these are root zone data ... I see.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's the point. That's where we [inaudible] this.

KC CLAFFY: And IANA registries data. Yeah. It's not clear to me what metrics you want captured about the IANA registries. Availability, integrity of the file that holds the parameters. That should be added.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was here.

KC CLAFFY: I know. It's at the bottom. But it should be integrated into the top text. So, let me take a pass. So, how about key performance indicators of the root zone and the IANA registries.

I'll admit, Eric, I don't find the two sentences in the last paragraph to really explain to me why the IANA registries are important. It just says they're important and it needs to be illustrated to the community. So, that's probably why I deleted it. I know we had a conversation about that more than once.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, the final paragraph ... I mean, yeah, I didn't write it. But the final paragraph I think is the result of a bunch of back and forths we've all had, so find it to be important. It says, "The IANA registries include many needed parameters that are specified by RFCs in the IETF." This is something that not everyone on our own team knew. The availability, integrity are paramount and need to be clearly illustrated to the community. Again---

KC CLAFFY: Even there is not clear what you mean. "Their" refers to parameters?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, the IANA registries.

KC CLAFFY: The registries. Okay. The registries—

ERIC OSTERWEIL: At the moment, no such reporting exists which is a red flag, denying stakeholders the possibility to assess key SSR indicators over time. I

mean, basically, we don't know if those things are available and we certainly don't know over time, which is why this is in the measurements.

I mean, we talked about this a bunch of times and it sort of led me to believe that it was maybe even a bigger problem than I thought because a lot of people on our own team didn't know it. So, outside of our team, I think less people know it.

KC CLAFFY: I'll take a pass at integrating that concept back into the text above.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, this is what I observed because we have a lot of recommendations and we tried to merge some of them, so the rationale behind many of them are lost, actually. So, I think some of the logic behind this is available in an archived document where the initial draft recommendations were there, which we worked on in Brussels, I think. So, if we go to the recommendation #24 there, it provides some kind of more information on the link between this root zone data and IANA registries.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Could I ask staff to provide us via email a complete list of Google direct links to the documents? The historic documents that have, I have a hard time finding previous drafts and work products that we had in Google Docs.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is the [inaudible]. I can share it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. Because I don't have it.

[off mic conversation]

Okay. So, I'm wondering if Eric is happier now. I'm going to still delete this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Eric is happier, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm going to try to add a sentence back in about IANA.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, some of the discussion about the availability and integrity kind of bleeds down into the recommendation two. My question to the review team to consider is available to whom? Are we looking for an ATLAS type project on this or ...? Just impressions on that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, this is exactly where we have this sort of ... We want to find the right level to speak to, because I'd be happy to brainstorm and I think it wouldn't be appropriate to be directive here of how you do that, but

certainly, some kind of best effort by smart people doing good work would be, "Here's how we've tracked it over time," just to show good stewardship of whatever.

Someone could say, "I would've done it better." That's not the point. What we really want is just some way to say this was good enough for us as engineers to say here's how it looked and it's available over time.

I think we could produce something that's a little bit more specific than that, but I'd just hate for it to seem like we were being directive on how we expected it had to be implemented.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thanks, Eric. I can fully appreciate that and I think the gap that I'm struggling with in my own head is available, like up time, like the servers that serve those are running or is the review team looking for some kind of accessibility availability to it? You know what I'm saying?

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. And I think either one would be fine. I think even just a sort of simple attempt at putting them both together, and even though it's like one point from one place on the Internet doesn't prove anything about the whole Internet but that's fine. Just as long as it's like, "Yeah, it was available. It was downloadable. We're not going to run SLA computations over it." But if you said, "No, no, that's just a kettle of fish. We just want to make sure it's up and running," something is better than nothing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I remember a discussion about this in Brussels. We observed that a bunch of build environments now, as part of the build process pull from the IANA registries then do the build. Time zone data, for example, is downloaded, then app is built, then it's shipped. And that's why we thought it was really important to put availability information.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks. I'm fine with that. The question I guess I'm really getting at is will SSR-3 consider that implemented if we have some subset of the statistics in which you both described? And that's where my concern is, that we're being definitive enough that SSR-3 has enough to go on.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. So, if there's some way for us to put some text in that would allow that ... So, if SSR-3 asked, "How do we know you did this?" you can say it says right here "blah". What would be helpful for us to say? We can work with you on this, I think. I'm not playing both ends against the middle or anything.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. And I think we're in pre-draft or pre-draft release and we've got a couple of iterations that we could get together with, put IANA with the review team and nail down that language. So, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic]. Oh, because that's the recommendation.

KC CLAFFY: Right. We've now got the recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're now on data access.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, shoot. [inaudible]. I wrote it as a recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Maybe it hasn't been [off mic].

KC CLAFFY: Well, because we do have the rationale and findings up there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: KC, don't get distracted by that. I'll fix that. I would rather focus on the recommendation and measurements.

KC CLAFFY: Well, the measurement section is a lot bigger, so I don't know ... I haven't had a chance to really sit down and try and parse it, whether anything is included in measurements that isn't included in the rationale and findings.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think the measurement section recommendation looks good.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Me, too. I did spend time on that. It's just that there's going to be some redundancy with the rationale and findings, which I think Heather can take care of.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I shall fix.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, fine. Moving on. The data access, that needs cleaning up. Who owns it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm worried about this one over here that says "needs discussion".

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Where?

RUSS HOUSLEY: On data access.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Where are you, 63? No. The [inaudible]?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You put a comment in on January 2nd “needs discussion. I do not know how SSR-3 will know this is done.”

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, okay. Right. That’s correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is that resolved by the changes you made?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Russ, I’m not sure where you are. I don’t know [inaudible] but I agree with—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Aha! Oh. You are in a different spot.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, that’s where your comment points to.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, but that’s not data access.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right. And we didn't to data—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, I'm sorry, right before data access. Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. I'm not even clear on the definitions. What are they measuring? Who do we expect to do the tracking of SSR aspects? Let's see if I still care about that. I mean, because we have this up ... What exactly do you want them to measure? Especially on the abuse. Abuse of the root zone.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, here's a proposal for the team. These are things that could be defined by different people in different ways, rightfully so. Like a measurements person could just find what availability means in one way and another measurements person could do it another way. But we have left it here, just generally open.

I think what SSR-3 could do is they could come around and they can say how did ICANN define availability and measure it and decide they don't like, but they would say at least you defined availability and measured it. And I think I would trust the ICANN Org folks to do a good job on something and someone who wants to do a better job could do that.

But I think then this is maybe part of the discussion, Steve, that I've been sort of alluding to a bunch of times, where this was put there I

think probably so that ICANN Org had some flexibility on how they would do it. And I think that's good, personally.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that's okay except for the word abuse. What does abuse of the DNS root zone mean?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] on the root servers.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That [inaudible] root zone, though, does it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No. I don't know what was meant by that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Other than availability.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I took a piece out up in the rationale and findings because I didn't know what it meant.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, this is just an example of things we mentioned, even in the findings as an example. We can just cut the abuse if that is bothering

us. You can just say “including”, so including can be anything that they want to measure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What is DNSSEC and what does it mean to measure DNSSEC root zone?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I have a whole database of that stuff, so it could mean a lot of different things in a lot of different ways, and one thing would just be is the [DAAR DS] record for the top-level domains. It could be how often is the DS correct? It could be are the DS records all signed? It could be lots of things.

But if someone said, “Oh, you guys did an incomplete job of tracking DNSSEC deployment of the root. I did a better one,” I’m sure everyone would be really happy with both sets of measurements.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can we have him fix the weird not-parallel structure of all these bullets? In the first bullet, it’s actually—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, hang on. Don’t even talk about it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, fine. I’m going to not talk about it.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, just to get to the point that we've been making throughout the document, if this is a recommendation and we don't want to be prescriptive, are we going to say, "For example, these KPI services ..."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But it says not limited to.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, you're being prescriptive. So it has to be that we're just to go to the point that Eric just made, that different people interpret it. It will get the same end result, but I think it should start off with a preamble that, as an example, you [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: I don't know about that. I agree with you in principle, but in this case, the four bullets are almost outcomes we want and they're different outcomes. They're so different. Like the CZDS responsiveness, it's metrics that reflect the responsiveness to the service to the community's needs. So, I don't think we get to say that's an example. That has to be done.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But those who are technical [inaudible], then if it is that you have a KPI, you want the KPI to measure the delay at the root zone changes to instances. You want the KPI to measure root zone, SSR aspects, and you want limited to measures that demonstrate the size, growth, and composition of IANA doesn't flow.

KC CLAFFY: Well, that's correct. That's what I was talking about, the parallel structure, but I think all these are—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That's not beyond structure. That's specific. Is it that you want it but not limited to the size, growth, and composition of the IANA registries, which everything—

KC CLAFFY: I don't care for the words "but are not limited to" in there. It could just say, "These KPI services include ..." But I don't want it to say "for example" as if they could choose other things.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, no, I get that, KC. But I'm saying since your mind is on it, the third bullet doesn't flow with ... The third bullet seems to summarize as well everything above, like it's still [coming to a result].

KC CLAFFY: No, no, no, no. IANA registries are totally different.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, should it say ... So, we need for her to fix it. It has to be specific. So, is it that it should state—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Everyone [is getting specific].

KC CLAFFY: Heather told me I wasn't allowed to worry about that.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, measure the time?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Not worry about the bullets.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: The bullets.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Just making the format of the bullets the same as format of other [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It's content. I'm just wondering. It doesn't flow with the other two.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The one that starts with "measures that demonstrate"?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. It doesn't flow with the other two.

KC CLAFFY: How does it not flow?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: It's more specific than the others.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yes. I'm just saying that—

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is the most prescriptive one. This is sort of like ... Someone could implement this and know exactly what we wanted because it says the size, the [off mic].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Isn't all the KPI measurements?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I mean, composition is a little bit of a—

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I don't think size and growth were that much more concrete than availability and integrity, except that you can say size and megabytes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I mean, availability would be like how many points you—

KC CLAFFY: So, I still don't understand her point. Hold on.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, take yourself off of it and read it as someone who has never seen it before. So, if I read it, it says, "KPI services should measure ..." We'll [inaudible]. "Should measure propagation delay, DNS root zone, so that third parties can track SSR aspects. KPI services should measure ..." Measure is that demonstrate size. "KPI services should measure metrics that reflect." It is a metric.

KC CLAFFY: Right, right, right. I want Heather to edit out all the metric and measure and all that crap and just say what are the metrics. Delay, availability, integrity, size?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. So, we're on the same page. I think Heather now understands the formatting to be done.

KC CLAFFY: Responsiveness.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Measures are different than metrics.

KC CLAFFY: Heather thinks she can—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I call that all parallel structure of the words. That's what I call it and Heather said don't go there. She'll handle it. So ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, are you comfortable? And if so, let's move on.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Can I say something here?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, why don't we refer this to RSSAC 002 document which also specifies the measurement that is related to RZM? It includes availability in a way because they get the size and the response and the latency. Everything they define. Not from the security aspect, but availability and stability aspect are covered by that. So, maybe we can just point to that document and say that we need to make sure that we follow what is recommended there, for example.

KC CLAFFY: There's a whole paragraph about RSSAC 002. It's just in the wrong place. It's up in key rollover because the metric about delay—the first bullet in here about delay of propagation matters a lot for key rollover.

I totally agree with Naveed that we should have that referenced in here but I don't know how. I just want Heather to be aware that there's a whole paragraph. So, here it could be a footnote, a reference to that paragraph. You can move the paragraph here. I don't care. Just don't have it twice.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We talked about it yesterday. RSSAC 002 talks about a set of things that you would measure. This is talking about the actual measurements and making sure you do them. They're related but different. So, we can point at 002 and that's fine and that's what we were talking about yesterday. There's no derogatory comment about 002. It's just something different. And I think what we said somewhere else is we should say that the RSOs should implement 002 and we should check—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Which is what we say elsewhere.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. Exactly. So, we can say here that's a really good framework and you should use it but this is saying someone is responsible for actually doing the measurements. These measurements. Maybe not all of them in 002.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just saying that we can take the metrics that are defined there to measure, for example.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic] there's too many.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And so what we're saying is the RSO, separately, somewhere else ... We're saying the RSO should do 002 and that's good. This is saying someone needs to be on the hook for doing a subset of those measurements because that's specifying a huge amount of data and I don't think we want to pile that on to ICANN to have to be responsible for all RSOs. So, they're just a little bit different. They're just related.

STEVE CONTE: I would actually agree with that. The recommendations for RSSAC 002 are pointing at the RSOs and I think the way—my feeling and my reading of the way that it's in the review team is that it's actually speaking to IANA. And I think if you introduce 002, it's going to confuse the recommendation more and we're actually at a point where the recommendation isn't as confusing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry? Heather?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm going to take a stab at this mostly because we've been talking past each other too much and I think need to move on to a different thing. I don't know that I will get it right but I'll see what I can do.

All right. Zone file data access. This turned into something very different, I think. I can't tell if another recommendation was added.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: What is—

RUSS HOUSLEY: We [inaudible] that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. So, that EBERO is a separate thing?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. For then the zone file data access, it's just sort of some open questions that KC had. I'm not sure what we want to do with this.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Trying to just drop in the SSAC 097 for recommendations and I think that's a good start for this. I'm just having trouble formatting it properly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Drop it and Heather can format it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Where are you?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm on the top of page 64.

RUSS HOUSLEY: 64?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I tried to put it right at the bottom of 62 and it kept adding it as striked out.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: There's a page [made] here on page 62. I just added a page [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Heather needs to fix it. I can't because I'm in suggested edits. It's not working. I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Please pause for a moment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It was marked as a header and not [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you know how to fix it or should we—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: She's fixing it right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm concerned that we have very little time left.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, all I've done here is to make it clear that right now we're talking about zone file data access, not broader data access, and we're recommending that ICANN implement SSAC 097 which has been out there for quite a while, has four major recommendations, and the recommendations themselves have been dropped in here. So, that's all we've done in this section. It's straightforward.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. So, let me talk to this one. What happened yesterday was we went back and looked at this document from the first LA meeting, which was before the pause, and we scanned it and said was there anything in here that we were supposed to include in the report and we did not include? And we found this text.

So, I pulled it in. Basically, what it says is one paragraph or two paragraph description of EBERO, pulling a picture from a slide deck, and then at that meeting it was concluded that the process needed to be publicly documented and tested and that the smoke testing needed to be done periodically and those tests where they showed that exceptions were exercised needed to be documented.

So, that's what I did. This is all completely new text. You haven't seen it before, so please take a minute and read it. Two tests have previously been done, both with TLDs that were abandoned by the people that got them in the previous process.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I read through it. I think it looks pretty good. Thanks for doing that. One just quick question, request sort of thing. Do you think it makes sense to point it back at the process discussion we did with the rollover text, as opposed to copy and paste and saying where we're talking about decision process modeling, to say "as discussed earlier" or something like that?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Totally fine with that. That didn't exist yet when I wrote this. Denise?

DENISE MICHEL: The whole fairly serious problems with EBERO came to the review team's attention at our meeting, like our second meeting that coincided with an OARC session that reported what was going on. It was quite, quite concerning.

Do you think it's clear that regular reporting on EBERO results are publicly provided? Do you think that comes through in this recommendation? In other words, I think that level of transparency for what was clearly has been a weak point in this process seems to me an important aspect of this, too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [off mic]

DENISE MICHEL: Which is different than the results of that testing being made public.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. We should publicly document the process.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I think public documentation should be added.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's the first sentence in the recommendation. Publicly document the process, including decision points, actions, and exceptions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, that's the process, but I think Denise is saying the results.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But there are no results because there are no frequent hits. There was only one initial [inaudible]. They published the results?

RUSS HOUSLEY: They did a blog post of the results. That is all they did.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But look at the last sentence. The last sentence says, "In addition, ICANN Org should publicly conduct the EBERO [smoke] testing at pre-determined intervals using a test plan that is coordinated with the ICANN community." Then I think just "and publish results."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ZARKO KECIC: We should look at this as a disaster recovery procedure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, why isn't it in disaster recovery?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you want to put it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no, no, a different thing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, on that point, I had a discussion with Boban because he was at the meeting where this came out and that was my initial reaction, too. The difference is the [DR] section is about ICANN systems and this is about DNS systems. So, I think it goes in this work stream. Just sharing the reasoning.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What I was trying to say is we should look at and apply same things that we are applying to [any DR]. If you have [DR] and you are not doing regular testing, there is no [DR].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And ISO standards will help with this, too.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I do notice that Naveed and Boban have added some comments to this. Naveed asks about creating a citation for the tests conducted. Do we happen to know where those might be?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's a blog post.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Blog post. Can you add a link to those?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'll see if I can find [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Found them yesterday.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So then they're somewhere. Okay. The next comment is from Boban about the process can be improved by allowing the gTLD data escrow agent to send the data escrow deposit directly to the EBERO server. Is that a recommendation?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would say yes because—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic] cannot be—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: At the moment, the process looked like that ICANN request the deposit from the escrow agent and then ICANN push the data to the EBERO. You can't improve the process if you said, okay, ICANN requested it then the escrow agent can send data directed to the EBERO because you will

Yeah. You need ... At the moment, you want to look more. So, for me, it looks like a process improvement but I'm hoping for any discussion here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Would it say ICANN Org should improve the process?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Does the process exist and they need to improve it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's the process.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The picture is the process itself.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The picture is the process as best we can tell.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. So, that was the idea, to move it to the recommendations section because it's a recommendation. Improve your process in terms of efficiency because it's time-consuming and it's a critical procedure and we saw in a test there was one TLD and one EBERO, an escrow agent, and from the beginning of the request to the delegation at the EBERO, it took five days. Yes, it's a little bit long. In these five days, we can—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. That's fine. I've rephrased it and moved it down to recommendations. Does that now capture what you're after?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Perfect.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: We need to rephrase this because it, again, ends with "once ICANN Org initiates the process" so it's not going well with the overall ... I don't know. We might need to divide it into two phrases or whatever. But that [doesn't go well].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I cannot find ICANN publications about the two tests. I can only find other people writing articles about the test. Not good.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I got three of them. I'm posting them [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Naveed's comment about where we changed the recommendation that ends with "once ICANN Org initiates the process." That's too open-ended. Is that what I'm hearing Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: One of the ways to do it is that ICANN Org should initiate the process in order to improve ... We can rephrase it like this: by allowing ... Then it becomes complete.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] should improve the process by [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, the end actually confuses the whole sentence.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's just weird. Yeah. I was just testing it out, though.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Where it says "is coordinated with the ICANN community" you ask if there should be additional parties? Community and contracted parties or just contracted parties?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would say they're [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And then we need it to clarify that [inaudible] recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So put it in the middle.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a quick question [inaudible], as long as we're taking a walk down memory lane. A couple of other things came up in previous LA meetings that I'm actually just asking if you feel like we've captured it appropriately in this report. One was the really important IANA impacting problem that we don't want to talk about, big security problem that we don't want to talk about publicly on the record. Do you feel like we've addressed that adequately?

Then the second thing that we had identified was that they were not following a consistent breach notification and process at the time. I think those are two things that I recall I wanted to ask you about.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [off mic], the team?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [The assembled] from LA meetings.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, my memory of those two issues is that we believe that if IANA were to be included in implementing the whole C-suite through disaster recovery through disclosure of vulnerabilities that it would be sucked up into that. But I also recall that Scott, in his previous job, was involved in mitigating that. Do we feel it is mitigated by the time you changed jobs?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's ... Okay. just to summarize the non-sensitive part of the previous discussion. An action was taken by Scott to craft some text around the discussion of the sensitive thing that was found in the LA meeting.

The next section that we need to talk about is name collisions. Heather?
Page 67.

I see. All right. Does anyone have any concerns with the new text? It's only one paragraph.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, Naveed?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: KC, I thought there was something in place for reporting and alerting about—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed, go ahead.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. I think some of the text from the recommendation can be moved to the findings or the findings need to be more elaborate if maybe ... For example, among the findings of [MIM] attack by a name collision, this can be used as a rationale or the finding behind this recommendation. So some of the text I think can be moved there.

KC CLAFFY: Can I go?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Let's see. First of all, to say there is no reporting and alerting mechanism, allowing the community to file reports, I'm not clear that that is the case. There certainly was a whole bunch of—in fact, there's a whole IP address range allocated toward this experiment they had on

testing out TLDs before they were actually allocated to see what traffic would go to them.

So, I agree with Naveed that there's some text—there's at least a sentence there that is findings. "Among the findings"—that should probably go in findings.

"Should facilitate by initiating an independent study." That sentence is sort of behind because they have initiated. They've assigned it to SSAC. I'm not on the work party that is reviewing it. SSAC decided that this was a big enough job they couldn't do it in-house, so they outsourced it. They hired that person, they outsourced it. They sub-divided into three—I think three tasks. They outsourced the first task because they're doing it one at a time because it may not even get to task two, depending on what comes out of task one. And I believe task one was a literature review of what's been done thus far.

The biggest problem I see is the last sentence, the independent means that ICANN Org should ensure that the NCAP work party research and evaluation is free of any participants with a financial ... That didn't happen. And I fought for it and lost on the SSAC. So, I believe that both the person who does the work and the review team are allowed to have financial interests in TLD expansion.

So, I agree with what's in here but it's not happening.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, just because it didn't happen doesn't mean we shouldn't say that's how it should have been done.

KC CLAFFY: But have it be in the past tense? Because this is too late for this to be implemented.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We could say that the findings need to be vetted in that way if we want.

KC CLAFFY: And you need to know that but this paragraph should be aware that it's already underway and they already accepted COIs as part of the game.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It should be vetted by people who don't have a financial interest. The NCAP's report should be vetted by ... Just change that to vetted.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. That's great. We could put it exactly that way. Say results from NCAP should be vetted by conflict-free.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I believe the next changes were the ones that Zarko made but I think you put them in instead of ... I think you did edits instead of suggests.

ZARKO KECIC: Probably because everything—

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, could you point me to the right text?

ZARKO KECIC: [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Your DoH text that you typed as homework.

ZARKO KECIC: 71.

RUSS HOUSLEY: 71, okay. There we go. So, Zarko made changes to this as homework but they're in as edits instead of suggestions.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. I already reported that to Heather and she said she can—

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, I know Heather can fix it. I want to make sure the team has had a chance to look at it. Those are two very different concerns.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is on?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Page 71 and 72. Heather, you're back.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I am.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can you help indicate which parts were changed?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Do you want [off mic]? Just a sec.

KC CLAFFY: The recommendation on DoH is a bit sparse and it is likely that ICANN would say SSAC is already doing it. So, we need to know what is the outcome of that study, the investigation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [off ic].

KC CLAFFY: Well, let me rephrase that. They have a DoH Working Party. It's not like they're doing a peer-reviewed research but it's not clear that's what's being commissioned here. I'm sure the word "resilience" is in the report that SSAC is going to write. So, again, what is the outcome you want of this study? Honestly, I'm not convinced this recommendation should be

in this report at all because I don't think there's much ICANN can do about this. But if you do want it in the report, if I were at ICANN, I'd be thinking, "What do they want the outcome to be?"

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we want to see the trends because it's—

KC CLAFFY: The trends of what? Resilience? Measured how, from where?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's a very good question but one I don't know the answer to off the top of my head. But what I do know is when we talked about this in Montreal, we were concerned that each app could pick up their own backend infrastructure via DoH and we needed to know whether that's happening, because if it is happening, then ICANN may want to do something on a policy side.

KC CLAFFY: Like what would they do?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know but we might when we know what they're doing. And I worry about saying "nothing".

KC CLAFFY: All right, all right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] voice in this matter.

KC CLAFFY: But ... Okay. So, investigation, you mean you want them to do measurement versus going and doing analysis? Because we don't need to measure to know what DoH is going to do for a lot of these metrics. You can just make an argument on a whiteboard. You don't even need a whiteboard. You can have a beer. I mean, that's the only tool you need. So, if you want a measurement-based investigation, that's a different thing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So it's analysis [we're] recommending?

KC CLAFFY: I wouldn't recommend this at all but you guys want a recommendation. I just want to know what do you want the outcome to be? You want to understand what apps are doing? You want to understand if apps are stopping using the DNS at all and to avoid having to deal with DoH if they're using DoT? There's already peer-reviewed research and there's like six papers published on this this year about trends in DoH and whether it impacts on privacy and resilience and performance. So, I really think you need to be pretty explicit about what you want to come out of this research.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Then maybe ... Yeah. Unfortunately, that's beyond ICANN's control. And therefore, it worries me that you're going to direct resources into this rather than things that are within ICANN's control and responsibility.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC just made a pretty bold statement and I'm surprised no one is offering a counter.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's 5:00, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Who wrote it, Eric, Zarko?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric wrote part of it. Zarko wrote part of it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Zarko was the one wanted [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: What dimensions do we want this commissioned investigation to—

KC CLAFFY: What is the hypothesis you want them to investigate? What is the thing that you want that to inform? What sort of policy could ICANN make anyway that would have any impact here?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Use the mic.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, but I think to KC's—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was right there at this event, so—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, but I'm just saying, to KC's point, it just needs an additional sentence. Having done the research, what do they do with the results? That's it needs. That's all she's asking for.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: KC has a very good point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree that's the main problem with this recommendation because we don't know how to put recommendation up and maybe Steve can help us. But this is a big issue and there is possibility that in a few years we'll have DNS totally different than we have today and there will be no need for IANA and root zone and anything else.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, there was a session where it was actually said that with DoH you don't need DNSSEC anymore which is completely untrue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not at all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Exactly. It's not at all true, but it was said amongst a bunch of people that were hearing about DoH for the first time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] remove DNSSEC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, the truth is, yeah, you could basically ... You can downgrade. You can have downgrade attack if someone is using a DoH server and they don't know it because you're trusting that server to do the validation and the client is not supposed to see the validation anyway. So, there's a lot of really bad stuff there, but the comment about we should have a briefing about DoH, we've had it and in there was a comment, "You

don't even need DNSSEC with DoH because it gives you this privacy and security guarantee," which it doesn't.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it does, of the communication between [DHAP] and the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] security, that's true.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, maybe that's a key here is we say investigation determine whether DNSSEC is being used in conjunction with DoH.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, I think that's good. I think we may have to go into that sort of thing. I think also, to Zarko's point about whether there's a long-term degrade in fidelity or use of the DNS, we may need to sort of craft something if we go that direction to say start tracking trends of ... I mean, the dangerous part there is that you might have a fractured root, you might have people doing downgrade attacks on DNSSEC. So, you would nominally, if you're worried about that, try and figure out ways to instrument and measure it. So, maybe that's what we need to say because we think DoH will make this easier. I mean, maybe that ... Because I've been trying to figure out how to make this relevant to our report since Zarko brought it up in Montreal.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, this conversation helped a lot because I think what you want is for the stakeholders and the community to be aware of the SSR-related implications of what's happening, what seems to be likely to happen here. That includes the actual existence of ICANN and IANA going forward. That is a very good outcome. That would be a very good outcome because we certainly don't want it to be the case that all of this happens and ICANN never notified the community that it was happening and ICANN knows quite well that it's happening.

So, I think then that we just need to add some text to the—and I'll take a pass at it. Add some text to the recommendation that more or less explains at the beginning what the intended outcome is of this, which is making sure the community is aware of the SSR-2 related implications of DoH and the implications for the future of IANA. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wow, we got through—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic]. Steve is waiting for [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I speak [inaudible] off mic, please?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Off mic? Go ahead.

Okay. So, if we're going to get to public comment next week, that means everybody needs to do all of their homework by Tuesday morning so that we have time to read it and ensure that we have achieved a good enough report for going out for public comment on the call on Wednesday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The call is planned to last for five minutes?

RUSS HOUSLEY: The call is planned ... We are planning to extend it to double our normal time.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, but [off mic].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was the next point I was going to make. Yes, Kerry?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I just have one thing. I am traveling [on mission] to Belize on Monday. I'll be in executive meetings with the government with the Prime Minister level on Tuesday and Wednesday. I'll look at the schedule just to see if they set any meetings for the time of the call. If I can't make the call, I will send an email.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We hope you can be there. Heather, I know you have a boatload of work ahead of you. We greatly appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just want to remind everyone, too, that our goal here is an interim goal. It is to get enough information out to be able to give the community that's interested an opportunity to comment. So, we're not finalizing everything. We're simply getting it to a point where it enables people to have insight into what we're doing and provide some comments that we can then take back and incorporate it into our final report.

Also, there's a lot of citations missing from just ICANN material. And if staff has any time to provide us with links—suggested links—to ICANN material on the ICANN website that Heather hasn't been able to find, given our aggressive deadline, it would be really helpful if you provided that, too.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The last thing I would add is I think you all have a reasonably good sense of what our critical comments and material to cover in order to get a

public review—things like the citations, a certain amount of the passive voice stuff. That’s important but not as critical as everything else. Before you feel overwhelmed, prioritize what you’re trying to do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Norm, I, thinking back, heard you provide like a one-paragraph intro to our whole report. It primarily has these two points. Could you write that up and send that to Heather as a starting point for the executive summary?

NORM RITCHIE: Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Anything else?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It’s been a great week.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, it’s been brutal. I know I am mentally exhausted. Thank you very much. Safe travels. We used every bit of this meeting time, plus eleven minutes. Stop the recording, please.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]