EN

JENNIFER BRYCE:	Good morning, everyone. Welcome to day two face-to-face meeting of the SSR2 review team. It's the 2nd of November today. Already losing track of the days.
	I'm Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Org. Let's do a quick roll call around the table. To my left, please.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Russ Housley.
DENISE MICHEL:	Denise Michel.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Heather Flanagan.
STEVE CONTE:	I'm going to proxy Eric who's getting coffee, and then Steve Conte, ICANN.
ALAIN AINA:	Alain Aina.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

BOBAN KRSIC: Boban Krsic.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Kerry Ann Barrett.

NORM RITCHIE: Norm Ritchie.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Laurin Weissinger.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Negar Farzinnia, ICANN Org.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Zarko's here.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Zarko's here. And in the room, we have Francisco Cabrera who is an observer to the team, and with that, I'll hand the meeting over to you, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we had some homework last night. The first question is to figure out whether everyone was able to get dinner and get their

homework done. Heather sent out some e-mail at the end of the meeting yesterday, and the body of that is on the screen.

The first homework item was come back to the abuse definitions, Denise to work on, and then we prevented Denise from working on it by making sure she stayed with us when we talked about the next topic, I remember. So, did you have a chance –

DENISE MICHEL: We fixed compliance. We can do that [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I want to find out which ones are done. This isn't the order I want to go through them.

DENISE MICHEL: I see.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, did that end up happening?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so I think we updated the compliance –

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, the abuse definitions, the one above it.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I'm finishing it right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, you're still working then. Thank you. And compliance, there was a significant rewrite or rearrangement needed there. Did that happen?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I saw an e-mail that made me believe that happened. Okay.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: There were three recommendations that we looked at: the one that's specifically on compliance, we edited together, and the other two are …

RUSS HOUSLEY: In works?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: In works, probably to be finished soon. One of them is actually the abuse. I think that ,we also looked at.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, there was the definitions part and then there was the recommendations part.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Yeah, there is the abuse definition recommendation, then there is the one on compliance itself, and then there is one that has to do with changing the contracts accordingly. So those are related, that's why the other two are kind of …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. DNS testbed –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Before you move on, as a part of the contracts, there's a section that was called policies agreements with contracted parties that for some reason we had coursed completely over. We didn't do anything with it yesterday. So Norm and I looked back at it and shortened it to two paragraphs, and the rest we're going to recommend that Heather include it in findings. So we're making a note of that now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great. Thank you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: You want that in abuse?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: As a separate.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. DNS testbed. Eric, did you have a chance to look at that?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry, I wasn't here most of yesterday, so I didn't realize –

RUSS HOUSLEY: I know. I thought we made clear to you which your homework was, but did we not?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I must have missed it, sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so to be done. Got it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think this is the thing Laurin and I spoke with Paul Hoffman about in –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: IANA portal, Zarko and Laurin were going to revisit that text.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, we didn't, but we –

RUSS HOUSLEY: But you will. Okay. Root zone data, Heather to pull out into findings, Zarko has concern about whether CZDS has any reason to be prioritized. So the prioritization question, the other one looks mechanical.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: And the mechanical part was done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, I had a talk with Eric in regard of entire part, and we agree that we should make more clear what we are asking ICANN to do later on.

So it is not about exact measurements but set of measurements and how to proceed with them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think I tried to bring this up yesterday, but I had a feeling it was not articulate enough, so just to try and raise it again to the team, I'm putting something out there that I think I'd like to know what the team thinks of. This was, I think, part of the subtext in the conversation Zarko and I had today.

We want to make a bunch of recommendations but we don't want to be directive and t ell how they have to be implemented, but we want to make it clear what we're saying and offer advice on implementation. And I don't know whether we should try and weave this into recommendations that might then be diffused or misunderstood, or make a separate section or separate sections that say "Candidate implementation suggestions" or something, because when Zarko and I talked this through, I think we were in violent agreement the whole time, and it wasn't until we had a strawman of like for example "You could do X, Y and Z, and that would accomplish this," but we don't want to tell people how they have to do it.

It feels like we may need some writing like that throughout the text or in the recommendation document itself.

RUSS HOUSLEY: My reaction is that kind of thing, "Ways to approach this include A, B, C, D" can go in the findings. They don't have to be in the recommendation. But Heather?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: And you can find an example of us doing exactly that where we pulled stuff out and put it into findings saying as an example, ICANN may find it useful to develop a roadmap, the roadmap would contain the following, blab la. So there's precedents in text that you can see as a [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Surprised you didn't find it the day before.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just one note, I just went outside and closed the door. If you do that, you can't get back in without someone with a badge. So I don't know what we'll do, if the door would stay open. They say we'd have to ask security to make sure we could open it and shut from outside ourselves.

Once I closed it …

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, just leave it open? Okay, just making a note if anyone leaves the room, don't do like me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: As long as there's not a rowdy party out there, we can leave it open.

STEVE CONTE: I can chase that in the background, see if we can get that unlocked.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, the last one is we wanted to make a possible recommendation regarding DOT and DOH.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just realized that my personal note was still in there about the fraught with peril, [inaudible] explicitly said that that was a note to myself.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you read the authors on the DOH document, you know [that ICANN's involved.] It's not a secret, right? Did anyone put any time overnight into that?

Okay, so what this tells me is going back down the list, the abuse definitions, Denise just finished while we we're talking. Compliance was done last night and sent out in e-mail. The contracts, it says the detail recommendations will differ between ccTLD and gTLD. Did I skip that one when I did the pass?

JENNIFER BRYCE: [No, you talked about it.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so it's still in works. It's now fixed. Okay. Testbed was not done yet, IANA portal was not done yet, root zone data was not done yet, DOH was not done yet.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, the root zone data, it's a part I think that was partially done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The first half before the semicolon, was done, after the semi colon, it was not. Right. So that leaves us four things that I would like to get done before we go back to the document. Go ahead, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: When you say not done, we haver some text for some of these, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: We have text, we're just not ready to make a consensus call because the text isn't in final form. Okay, so what I would like to do is pick four subgroups, four topics, recess the meeting, turn off the recording, get those four done and then reconvene in, say, 45 minutes or something. Does that work?

So I'd like to go around the room, and of those four, please pick which one you're going to work on, starting with Norm.

NORM RITCHIE: Sorry, I was working. What are the four topics?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The last four on the list.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, we'll start with you then, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Since my name's by DNS testbed, I'll do DNS testbed, CZDS and DOH. [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, but we're not going to get done in 45 minutes if we do that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I know. My point is that those are three things that I feel like I have an important obligation to participate in, and not sure how else to do it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I will see how else it goes. Maybe somebody will take a pen and then you do an edit instead of – start with – anyway. Norm, are you ready?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, root zone data.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Alain.

ALAIN AINA: I'll work on the future section on the DOH and DOT.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think Jennifer got what you said.

ALAIN AINA: I said I'm going to contribute to the future section on DOH and DOT.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: IANA [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thanks. Kerry Ann?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Wherever you need a second eye. I don't have specific knowledge, so I wouldn't want to be a penholder, but wherever there's a need for any edits, I'll [sit in.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: So whichever gets the fewest names, put her on. Laurin.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Start with IANA portal, and then I think when we're done, we can spread out.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm actually finishing some language for Zarko on ccTLDs and abuse, so I'm going to finish that up and then I'm happy to … And talk to Zarko, then I'm happy to help wherever.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: I'll be working with Laurin on IANA portal, and I'd like to be involved in DOH stuff.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I guess that I will work with Eric on the DNS testbed. So Heather, is there one of these you feel you can help with?

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	I'm going to be working on figuring out how we can do a mind map for the dependencies later.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. Perfect. That's for when we get back together. Alright, so let's see if we can break this up. Kerry Ann, you're going to be in root zone data.
	Alright, let's see if we can do this fairly quickly. Could you strategic plan the recording while we work in the small groups, please?
	Naveed, I understand you're online. Is there one of these groups that you want to participate in? If so, we'll do that on mic.
STEVE CONTE:	KC, your mic is on still. The group has broken up into subgroups right now to work on a couple items, and we'll be returning back to conversations in about 30 minutes at this point. No one's nodding, so 30 minutes.
KC CLAFFY:	Okay. [inaudible].
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. Let's put that list back up. Yeah, that one, thank you. Alright, abuse definition, Denise says you finished that. Can we go to that in the Google doc?

Is KC still with us?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We're on the abuse definition and reporting, page 24. Somebody is editing already, the Anonymous Dolphin is. Okay, please take a moment, read it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Russ, Denise, just checking, the other bullet points are suggestions or standalones? The ones in bullets, because they're all relevant, I'm just wondering if they were like a follow-on to what's above.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I'm not following you. So under abuse definitions and reporting, there's a paragraph. I think the intention there is it summarizes high-level what the bullets contain in more detail, and then there's the bullets that relate to that.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So the bullets are being moved to findings, or the bullets are part of the recommendation? That's all I was trying to understand.

DENISE MICHEL: You mean like the bullet 1 starts with implement? Yeah, they're part of the paragraph. That's the intention, but frankly, there's been a lot of writing and moving, and this doesn to flow particularly well. I think it would be good to at least get agreement of the general ideas, and the bullets too.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm going back to this emotion thing again. Would it be better to actually make the second point first and say like evolve the definitions, and in parallel use existing ones to get on with your job?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Switch one and two?

NORM RITCHIE: Yes. I'm looking for what other people think.

KC CLAFFY: I worry that if you put the "do definitions" first, it'll be perceived as that that's a higher priority than "work with what you have now."

DENISE MICHEL: So we have am ore pressing problem ICANN not implementing its current obligations and the CCT review using the community-vetted definitions. So that's now, that actually needs to occur now. The evolving a DNS abuse definition is a much more longer-term

undertaking, so that's just so you know the rationale I think behind the order of this.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, I stand down.

KC CLAFFY: But we do need to cite or footnote or something these community-vetted definitions. Maybe elsewhere in the document, but I think if we say it in here, we should just cite to where exactly they are.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. Footnotes definitely are needed throughout, and citations for sure. We have that information. Thanks. Yeah, KC, we'll make a note.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I'm wondering if we just kind of change the language very slightly so that we underline kind of the temporal issue here. So essentially, do one thing, and while you do that, do the other one. Kind of make that more clear. Would that work for everybody?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Isn't that what the "two in parallel," does?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I thought so, but from the discussion I felt maybe not enough.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Now you honed it, after you've outed her.] Okay.

KC CLAFFY: There's something weird in the second one, "Involve experts such as SSAC, [inaudible] and BC and external such as international cybercrime conventions." So you went from experts to an adjective, external, with no noun, and then conventions, which isn't … You mean experts from the conventions? I'm not sure if you mean go to the conventions.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Did that help?

KC CLAFFY: Such as from … I still don't know where the conventions come in.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I'm happy KC brought our attention there, because there's no international cybersecurity convention, so I think it would be even erroneous for us to state it that way.

DENISE MICHEL: KC, I get your point, I'm just trying to – how about experts involved in? And then Kerry Ann, I was just looking of a shorthand way of referring to the convention that we cited, the cybercrime treaty, convention on cybercrime treaty that we cite below.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I can fix it.

DENISE MICHEL: That'd be great. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: Are there others, or is it mainly that EU one?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: There's only the EU one, but the other conventions are international dialog on cybersecurity aren't addressing definitions and DNS right now, they're more specific and broad to policy norms and international law and stuff. So I wouldn't necessarily cite the rest of them, but we could use general terms. I'll try to use general terms now to make sure that if something comes up between now and next year – god knows, anything could happen – it captures it as well.

KC CLAFFY: Again, I just want a footnote when we say "Such as experts involved in X," we should cite a footnote to X. I guess you mentioned X below. Convention on cybercrime. Yeah, [we'll put notes in to say it.] What year was that convention?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: 2001.

KC CLAFFY: And is the US a signatory to that?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yes, it is. With reservations.

KC CLAFFY: On the content side, no doubt.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, because you can't involve a convention or a treaty but you can involve experts that are –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, what I was going to write was "And reference or incorporate," not involve. I know you can't involve the treaty, but you can reference or utilize the definitions that have already been there.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry if this is a digression, but how close are those definitions to the current thing that we talk about in item one, the community-vetted definition of DNS abuse?

DENISE MICHEL: The idea behind getting ICANN just as it relies on the UN list, like external expertise in defining what is a country or territory, the idea here is to acknowledge that DNS abuse and security threats are ever evolving and that ICANN should tap into international expertise that

focuses on security threats and DNS abuse, and find a way to incorporate that in an evolving way in its work to mitigate abuse and security threats. So that's the idea behind it.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, it makes sense from one side, but I'm trying to play it out in the context of all the dialog or posting about DNS abuse in the last couple of weeks that we've seen that are presumably going to come to a head or at least have some interesting conversations in Montréal, which is going to come down to, okay, that definition's been around for 20 years now, or this convention's been around for 20 years, but obviously not all stakeholders agree about what should be defined as abuse.

So we are representing one set of stakeholders here, but the elephant in the room seems to be that this conversation's been going on for a long time, and the equilibrium seems to be that this set of stakeholders does not prevail in the contracts.

DENISE MICHEL: That's always the case at ICANN, but I think that doesn't mitigate our responsibility to try and improve this space. But I take your point.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, definition of insanity is doing the same thing and expecting ad different outcome.

DENISE MICHEL: We are truly insane.

KC CLAFFY: I wonder if we shouldn't acknowledge all of that and say, yes, this is – I don't know how, and I'll think about adding some text here, what I can add. But especially, again, if we inject this document into a conversation where the threads are – I won't say contradicting, but orthogonal to this document about what the definition of abuse, and you get the big five who came out last week, GoDaddy, Amazon and those guys came out and said, "These are the things we're going to focus on," how do we want this report received in the context of that activity that is now very recently underway?

I don't want it to be perceived as, "Okay, these guys are kind of behind the times because we're already doing this." I want this report to somehow be cognizant of what's happening even right now as we're writing it. I know that might be a tough call, I just wonder if anybody has thought of that, because it seems an active area.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, good point, KC. I would suggest – this conversation on DNS abuse in the community and the board and staff is going to continue for quite some time, so it's going to be a bit challenging for us to be definitive about reacting to what's happening in the community, but I would suggest perhaps that we put in a placeholder note that our draft report should acknowledge this ongoing conversation and when we finish the writing on our draft report, we should insert language that we're

comfortable with that acknowledges at that point in time what has occurred. Does that work for you?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, and I'm happy to help write text there.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just to close off on Denise and the convention, the persons that worked the most on anything, not specific to DNS but like [cloud evidence] and investigation [inaudible] this convention is called a TCY working group, so it's a very specific group that meets every year. So I just referenced the proper name of the convention. We can put in bracket, "Example, the TCY working group." While they do do protocols and anything related to the implementation of the convent ion related to investigations, so I think probably if you want to put for example like as an example, because they can be consulted and they can accept topics on their agenda every year.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're typing really loud, KC.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. I'm not typing that loud, but your audio is just incredibly good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, it's really loud coming out of the speakers on this end.

KC CLAFFY: But wait, my kid's about to show me a YouTube video so that's about to get even louder. Let me mute.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, are we done with this?

KC CLAFFY: I think we're done. I'm done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So let's put the list back up. Thank you. So the compliance portion was Laurin, do you want to take us through that?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Yes. Let me scroll and try to find it. What we did yesterday, you can see that we deleted a considerable amount of stuff. We tried to make it tighter.

                             Content-wise, we agreed on one approach, which is to have internal compliance being audited by a neutral, arm's length third-party entity as it says on the top, and then we give some descriptions below. It's much shorter than it was, so I hope everyone is happy with this new version.

DENISE MICHEL: In the first paragraph, instead of "are conducted," it should be, "are audited." Right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any concerns? We were of two minds on this yesterday, the subteam came to this agreement that the compliance office will be audited by a neutral third party. Are we comfortable?

KC CLAFFY: I missed what was uncomfortable yesterday or confusing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yesterday, there were two minds, one was as it's written here, the other was that the whole function should be outsourced to an audit firm.

KC CLAFFY: I'm not sure I understand the difference between those.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The difference is that the compliance actual work is done inhouse and then an audit firm goes and looks at the work and reports, and the other one is the audit firm does the entire compliance function.

KC CLAFFY: Got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I'm hearing no objections.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just wondering what and how do we define the word "neutral" in this case, like the third party is supposed to be neutral? Is this something we are emphasizing?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I'm happy you picked it up because that's what we wanted. We don't want any third party that's directly affiliated with ICANN. We want them to ensure that it's neutral and removed, so when we had used the language "Arm's length," it's to ensure it's not an auditing firm that even has a current tightly woven relationship. We want to ensure the neutrality is when we speak about a transparent RFP that goes out every time. So that's what the neutral was to emphasize, to ensure it's nobody that could –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, so I'm just wondering if we need to explain it further in a pretext kind of thing of what we mean by that, just as an example or something.

KC CLAFFY: I think that's a good idea, because we use three words here, neutral, arm's length and third-party, and they all mean the same thing. but we need to have the metric for how SSR3 knows that it was neutral. If we mean no previous financial relationship with ICANN or a contracted party, we should write that down.

DENISE MICHEL:	Could you guys look at the top of page 30? And then just suggest additional text there in writing to that part, because it says to help ensure neutral and effective compliance with contracts, ICANN should engage and internationally reputable auditing firm to annually audit its compliance activities. The resulting audit should be publicly posted for comment and ICANN should develop and implement an improvement plan as needed following each audit.
	If you want to add more description to the internationally reputable auditing firm, why don't you just add text right there?
KERRY ANN BARRETT:	And I think, KC, how you said it a while ago in terms of the financial, probably that language, you said it exactly how we probably want to say it. But we weren't able to articulate it last night as succinct as you said it.
KC CLAFFY:	Okay. I think [I said] no previous relationship with ICANN or a contracted party.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Well, the five big audit firms, every one of them has an audit relationship with any one of those. Go ahead, Laurin.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I think what we should do, I feel we explain in the bottom point what we mean, so engage an internationally reputable auditing firm [inaudible] audit. I think we should just make clearer that we're talking about not just get one of these audit firms and then have them do it for 30 years, but that they should be changed around. So at the top, we could maybe put something in like engage based on regular tender processes or something like that. Kerry Ann probably has the better legal language for that.

KC CLAFFY: Aren't there some standard rules in the industry about change every N years or something?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: [I think there are even laws] for some industries.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Folks, we're at the point where we need a redline text rather than discussion, so if people could suggest additional words, KC and [inaudible] that fit your needs, that would be great.

KC CLAFFY: Yeas, I will do that. You pointed me at page 30, and I'm finding [inaudible] document isn't page numbered. Can someone add page numbers?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You use the scrollbar, the numbers pop up while you're scrolling.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It's just top of the next page, I think.

KC CLAFFY: I will add text.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I did include a bit of redline text just under the heading. Let me know if this makes sense to everybody. Yeah, so it just says engage based on regular tender processes. And I would say we should then add similar words under point two if we were to go with that.

KC CLAFFY: I don't know what regular tender process [inaudible]. That doesn't work for me unless somebody defines it.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Kerry Ann as someone who knows this type of stuff has volunteered to change that addition to be more functional in context.

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible] no financial engagements in the last three years or something, and that takes care of Russ' concern that they've all had relationships with ICANN or a contracted party at some point in time.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Should we add something like rotating?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Competitive tendering process?

KC CLAFFY: Kerry Ann has a sense of what to write, let's let her write it.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I just wanted to think about if we should put that specifically in, that these firms have to change.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: I think we're getting way too deep on this.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: It's very possible.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: I agree. So we'll clarify the tender process at the top and then in the intro, and then in the bullet on top of the page 30, but in parentheses, "In a fully independent manner." And I would suggest –

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. So I think we have agreement that we want an effective and independent auditor of these activities. How we describe that in detail or provide additional guidance I think are details that can wait for the draft report. I think what we're doing here is agreeing on draft recommendations we'll discuss with the community. I think the actual details of how you effectuate a fully independent and effective audit are details that can wait for the draft report. That's how I'm thinking about this thing.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Just asking for clarification, if we are saying that the ICANN Compliance team has nothing to do or would have nothing to do with all this process or only the audit should be done by an external party?

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Naveed raised a point that made me read back the text, because we have not stated that we want – I think we need to move the paragraph that speaks to the strengthening of the compliance services first and then speak to the auditing after, because right now it's in the reverse because we went back and forth so much on it. So I think I'll probably just move the paragraph that starts with "As with other sectors" above, and then it'll continue with the auditing of that process after. So I'll move it now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Kerry Ann's going to come up with some words there, but I think we all agree in principle. Is that right?

KC CLAFFY: KC does.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're just looking for a phrase, right? Alright.

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Another thing, when we say that something should lead to the termination of the contract, but we are not asking to make some guidelines that allow the meeting those criteria and not to violate those, so are we making it generic enough and leaving it to ICANN to see whether those violations are persistent and the other word that is used here, repeated? So should they come up with a code of conduct about these contracts or use the existing one? How that would actually be realized. I'm talking about the first bullet point, by the way.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I'm slightly lost in the text as well. Didn't we have a point on how we want this to be introduced somewhere?

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you did, it was only among the four of you.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Okay. Then we have to look for this. I specifically remember we had a bullet on how these changes would be introduced over time.

KC CLAFFY: Over time, I'm not sure, but you do talk about move its compliance activities to a third party. [inaudible] several times here.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: There is stuff on it in the description text, so that is page 27, roughly in the middle.

KC CLAFFY: Somebody [added] page numbers. Thank you so much. [inaudible] lot of stuff here.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I think it literally just changed page numbers. I have to find it again. Sorry. I'll find the text again and then we can look at it and think about if some of it should be moved to the recommendation to clarify the procedure.

KC CLAFFY: Is all this red text new from page 25 to 28? Above the recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's going to go in the findings part eventually.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Is it final-ish?

DENISE MICHEL: It's not new, it's the old language that the abuse and compliance subgroup came up with and shared [two ago.]

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I look at that, and in the section that we used to call contracts, the contracted parties section, we do have recommendations, and there were findings. And I see that the word "findings" was crossed out,

resulting in two and a half pages of material. Do you consider those now recommendations, or are they still findings?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm not sure why it says findings, because I crossed out findings because all of the bullets below are recommendations, they're not findings. I think we had substantial findings texts in the abuse compliance subgroup, but that's not it.

Page 33 is the beginning of the findings that relate to the [texts that were] above prior to page 33.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So yes, a point I made yesterday was in earlier iteration, there were a lot of shoulds that were otherwise marked as findings. That was bit confusing to me. So that would mean that these are all – that's two and a half pages of recommendation. That's a lot.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: If you go back, there's a lot of text that we somehow glossed over yesterday. I don't know how or what happens. We're going to the recommendations, so we kind of probably missed this, but I think it was a decision when we said that all of this would just go into findings. So I just skipped it and so we'd fix the recommendations and move all of this into findings. I think that's why everyone seems like we didn't see it, but all of that was there yesterday.

But just to go back to the compliance section, I'm oved the paragraphs around now. It should read much clearer. So if you could just read the compliance recommendation itself, it should read a little bit better now?

KC CLAFFY: What page?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It would be now on page 29 according to mine. The compliance recommendation. Just read it now and see if it captures – it flows with all the thoughts we just discussed, without trying to add new text, I just rearranged it a little bit better. "As with other sectors that have inherent conflicts." There's some duplication. That cut and pasting doesn't work.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: As an aside, that's something we should experiment with offline, because when I was working on the document yesterday, I was able to keep all of that in the [inaudible].

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think because we're still in suggestion mode, it keeps everything that was suggested and pastes what exists. In editing mode which you're in, it accepts it and then pastes it without all the other suggestions. No? Oh, it was doing that. That's what I noticed. The paragraph after the compliance does not –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But that's what we typed last night, because the discussions we had last night –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Be that as it may, I think [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Fix it? So the idea was that just like with other institutions that have fiduciary duties, there's a need to ensure that there is some amount of transparency with transactions such as this. I remember that was the discussions we had. So we could fix it.

DENISE MICHEL: I think the problem was, as you described the problems with editing, I think it makes more sense now. [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: We have a verb, "Enforce," here but there's no what's being enforced. Contracts? Again, I think we have to recognize that ICANN believes it's enforcing its contracts, so if you say ICANN needs to enforce its contracts, they're going to say, "Okay, good, check, we've done that."

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and Kerry Ann, in the first paragraph under compliance it says that ICANN should separate its registrar, registry compliance activities. What does that mean?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: I mean this has been changed so much that it doesn't really reflect …

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, I didn't change it, I just moved it. I didn't change text, all I did was to reorder the flow to make sure that it flows well. I didn't touch text because I didn't wan to do that. All I did was reorder the logic of the paragraphs to make it make sense. So we can now look at it with fresh eyes and make it make sense, but all I did was just reorder the point that, one, we want transparency with this, we think that compliance needs to be strengthened, third, it needs to be audited once compliance has done their work. That's the logic flow now. So we can fix the text however, I didn't touch text.

But that's the flow pattern, we want transparency, we want compliance strengthened, we want their work to be audited. Full stop, the three points.

KC CLAFFY: So again, what are they enforcing?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: The terms of the contract, for example we've found that every time there was a breach in one of the contract terms, they would give warnings, they would give time for remedying, and the time for remedying would pass any they would continue. But they would never get to the point of termination if the contract says that. there will always be an extension on the remedying.

So even though it has various tiers that the contract itself does speak to different tiers, for them to be given time to correct, time to remedy, time to remedy, but it just never seems to be an expiration on the remedying.

KC CLAFFY: And we're going to cite an example of that?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Example of them not adhering to it?

KC CLAFFY: Yes. We're making an accusation that ICANN is allowing violation of the contracts to continue, so we need a citation to that.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [In the writeup to this in the findings] that I had done for this, it speaks to the contract term sufficiency, so the findings will address that.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. And there's an "As defined by …"

KERRY ANN BARRETT: SLA.

KC CLAFFY: Do we delete "as defined by" or is there something we're going to … As defined by the contracts?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: As defined, but we could just put in, "As defined by the SLA" since you're typing. I don't want to type while you … "The SLA."

KC CLAFFY: In the contracts?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: N, the SLA is the contract. The service-level agreements.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. But we say enforce contractual obligations against those aiding and abetting systemic abuse as defined by the SLAs, so now it's nowt clear to me reading this that the SLA is the same thing as the contractual obligations.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It is. So pretty much ,the term is called service-level agreement, but it is a contractual obligation. So the SLA is an agreement. How it's worded now, the references would be correct.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Denise, I don't know, [inaudible] haven't seen the edits to the first line, what you said. I know you said you didn't like how it started off.

DENISE MICHEL: It's okay now.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: The reason why I'm asking is that entire sentence could be deleted and just starts off with "ICANN needs to ensure [to substantial insurance] compliance activities are neutral." I think the first part could be deleted.

KC CLAFFY: The only concern I have, again, is that I assume that ICANN believes its compliance activities are neutral and effective.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Qualifying sentence after though is what we're hitting, so we're not saying that they're not, it's like a statement of fact that they need to ensure that it happens, and then the continuing sentence highlights the

potential problem that we see that could happen, which is why we'd make the recommendation, to bolster their compliance office.

KC CLAFFY: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: are you suggesting that we say explicitly that they are currently not neutral or effective?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I don't think we need to say that.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] understand what KC is – her point.

KC CLAFFY: No, again, I'm just putting myself in the mind of somebody reading this and wanting to know what we mean by that they're not. I mean, [we imply] they're not.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But we didn't say that they're not. It's like you say that that chair needs to be stable. It doesn't mean that it's a statement of fact that the condition of the chair is not stable, but we continue to say because they have that need to ensure their transparency and neutrality, we recognize that they need to ensure that they have these things in place.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I guess I was reacting more to the second paragraph. [inaudible] we imply that they're not escalating their enforcement measures, but we don't cite examples of where they're not. So this doesn't have to be in the recommendation, but somewhere else in the report I guess.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, KC, I see your point and we can make a note under the findings section which is like page 37, 38. I think it would be appropriate to insert some additional background there on compliance activity since we did so much due diligence and questions on their activities. So we'll make a note of that. And just for the sake of this work today, I think Heather's put the findings that relate to all these recommendations we're discussing after the recommendations, because as we've asked her to really just focus our work today on the draft recommendations that we're going to be discussing with the community, but your point's well taken. In the draft report, the findings, the recommendations need to flow from the findings and the findings should support the recommendations.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, that'd be great. Let's keep going here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is now three paragraphs, and then there's repeat stuff. Any concerns with these three paragraphs?

KC CLAFFY:	I have a concern with passive voice in the sentence, "If any complaint is found to be specious," by who? And how would the public record reflect that? I think recommendations need to say we recommend X do Y, and not have it be vague. [inaudible] the same thing. That's more of a finding. We can't just say "Needs to ensure," we have to say X needs to do Y, and how SSR3 would measure that it has been done.
	I don't mean to make someone else do it. Do we know who we're thinking about finding a complaint specious? Like if anybody sends in mail and says, "I think this complaint is specious," then ICANN should add that to the public record for it, or only ICANN can make such a judgment? Or what?
KERRY ANN BARRETT:	KC, agreed. We could delete it because there's a specific – I'm trying to go back to when I looked at SLAs, just the complaints, I don't think specious would be the best word for it.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	And I'm wondering why we are using this compliance function as not being transparent in the past as part of recommendation. So this is something, kind of a context of the thing, but should not be put in the recommendation itself, specially without a reference to it or something like that.

DENISE MICHEL: There's a lot of discussion about this in the findings that are lower down in the document, around page 33, 34.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: One of the things that we found when we looked at it is the neutrality – and every time one from just paper records, even looking at blogs and everything, looking at the agreements, every time we spoke to Compliance, they said they were [inept] to enforce, but looking at the things they could enforce.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: What I mean is that maybe we need to change this to start this paragraph and say that the review team observers that this has not been as transparent as it needed to be because of maybe one, two things, followed by what we recommend, kind of a reverse …

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, it's a bit confusing, but over the last … Couple months ago, the subgroup on abuse and compliance shared the significant findings followed by the recommendations. For the purposes of agreeing on just the draft recommendations today, they've been separated.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correct.

DENISE MICHEL: So there is findings and there is discussion about all of this, but it's separate from recommendations. So if you look down further in the document, I think you'll see relevant text and –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just saying that the last sentence, we can just remove it because it is not well placed.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, the one about –

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Only that the compliance function has not been transparent in the past. This thing, only this sentence or part of the sentence, it might not be here.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think we could take it all the way from if any complaint is found specious all the way to the end, I think that entire last two sentences could be deleted, to be honest, just to avoid that whole emotiveness that we've been trying to … I think the one above as well, as KC pointed out, "If any complaint is found specious." I didn't notice it before, I think we could delete it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That seems to be more related to the part of a different recommendation where we talk about how we're going to make abuse reporting more open and transparent.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But above it would be corrected, if we have an auditor looking back at what compliance has done, they would flag that as well. So anything that stands out that is not within the parameters or the metrics that would have been developed, that would come out in the public audit report that we've asked for. So an additional public record is not needed if we ask for the auditing report to be published.

KC CLAFFY: But again, I don't think an auditor is going to make sure the public record reflects any complaints that are found to be specious. I don't think we know who is the one who adjudicates whether a complaint is specious, I don't think we know what specious is defined to be. So we can delete this sentence, but I don't think we can say the sentence is covered elsewhere and the auditor's going to take care of it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But if you think about the recommendations as a whole though, KC, if it is that we are highlighting [that, one,] we want the DNS stuff to be published, so anyone who's an abuser will come out in that forum and anyone who's noncompliant with contract terms, there are public reports that auditors can actually produce, that would be [inaudible] as the agreements are rolled out. I don't know what the agreement

between the auditor and ICANN would look like. It's something that if it's public, the whole idea is to make sure that anything that is of public interest is disclosed, which is covered above. And maximum public disclosure, we have that in a sentence above already.

KC CLAFFY: Yes. Okay. So now I would like some way for SSR3 to know this has been done, this has been effective. And I would like a sentence that involves review of this whole implementation of this recommendation by a stakeholder that we think is most likely to represent the public interest. So, is that PSWG? We could recommend that ICANN solicit explicit comment from the PSWG on the audit results every year.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I'm not sure if that would be possible considering the agreements and the role of GAC.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I just threw that out there, but I would like to have there be something that's measurable, unless – I guess we can handle this another way, of having implementation follow-up team.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [Yes, we can.] We probably think about – because I think [the point here is we] would cover all the recommendations, I think maybe before we finalize the report, we begin to read them back with that lens to see how would this actually be measurable. And we can think through all the

different mechanisms for each of the recommendations so that SSR3 could possibly have an easier role than we did.

I think we could think about this holistically, not just for this recommendation.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Great.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And [the point here is it] goes beyond even this one.

KC CLAFFY: I hear you. Okay, so I'm okay with this.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, if time allows later, we can also have a discussion on KPIs of each of the recommendations and put them in a table. So these are the KPIs that can be used to evaluate.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And I think the mapping exercise that Heather will be doing will help as well, because when we start to see the interdependent recommendations, then we can structure it as well to make sure that it's not like – it could be dragged out for 20 years kind of thing.

KC CLAFFY: So this third paragraph is now one sentence. Should it be merged with the first paragraph above that looks very similar in spirit? I'm not sure why these three – Kerry Ann said earlier what the three meta themes were with these paragraphs. Maybe she wants them in this order for a reason even though it's just one sentence. It could all be one paragraph for that matter, we could just merge them all, given that it's one recommendation.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We just deleted the other two, so yeah. That'd be covered in editing, no?

DENISE MICHEL: We've got lots of text through pages 30, 31, 32, 33 that have just been completely crossed out.

KC CLAFFY: I believe they've been moved up.

DENISE MICHEL: No, they haven't. They've just been completely crossed out, which is not something that we had agreed to. I think there's just been an error in some of the editing. So things like …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, that was all done yesterday.

DENISE MICHEL: We haven't discussed it. Empowering Compliance to react to complaints and requiring them to initiate investigations and enforce against aiding and abetting of systemic abuse, is that …

KERRY ANN BARRETT: The policies, agreements and contracted parties bit?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and [before that] as well.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I thought it was up above …

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think it's somewhere else, Denise, because that's the text that Norm and I were looking at and said that it should be moved to findings. So I don't know who would have crossed it out.

KC CLAFFY: Well, a bunch of it is above, Denise, I just verified. The bullets that start with update key policies and practice is moved up.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We moved it up. Yes, that's where it is. Thanks, KC, because I was like I know I saw it yesterday. It was moved, it wasn't removed. It just got moved up because we had separated it. [inaudible] said that wasn't looked at for some reason last night, and then Norm and I looked at it

and created two paragraphs, and the rest of it, we think that it could be moved. [See, we said] Kerry Ann and Norm recommend moving the text below to findings.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, but it's not findings, they're actually actions. So findings is we find that this is the problem that needs fixing. These are actions, so they are recommendation.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But if you look above, recommendation, it says policies, agreement activities with registrar. We pulled out the ones that were actionable. You have six bullet points, almost seven bullet points where they're all so long, so we pulled out the ones that were actionable, and then the rest we thought could have been repurposed into findings and some of the suggestions because there were so many. So we pulled out some at the top and then we separated – so where you see the sentence, "Kerry Ann and Norm thinks …" We think the rest could have been moved.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: There's some confusion here because I see some text being crossed but moved up, but the cross is not removed after moving up. So all the text that we see is deleted is not actually deleted, it's part of the –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, but when we add it to some part above, it's not uncrossed after that. It is still crossed. So something I saw duplicated.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Can we accept that move?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Maybe we need to accept that. I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It's the confusion between editing and suggesting, I think, [it's the same thing.]

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: That's why I'm wondering, can we accept this specific move of the text so that we don't get confused?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We're on page 25, right? That's where the text got moved to?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: We absolutely can do that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I see some of that at page 33 as well, some part from page 33 is moved to page 32 or somewhere, or 31, and one of that is in addition, ICANN should publish a list of enforcement tools. And I see it's being pasted up but not uncrossed after that.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Everything I've seen that's crossed out is moved.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes, that's it. You're both correct. The stuff that has been crossed out, much of it has been moved or rephrased. When we move it, the artifact is left there since that was a suggestion to do as opposed to something we accepted. Can we accept that to clear it up? Absolutely. Am I willing to hit that button given how many different pages we're talking about? No, because I'm not exactly clear on which ones we're certain about and which ones we're not.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: To address Denise's, yesterday when Norm and I looked at the document, this was moved prior. We weren't the ones who moved it. So what had happened is when we were speaking of compliance and contracts and stuff yesterday, when Norm and I looked at it, we realized that entire section was not reviewed, nor flagged for review. So we just looked at it, we didn't try to edit a lot, we just made sure that what was recommendation that was actionable was in one section, and all the

other text, we just put a note to say we think this should be moved to findings because of how long it was.

DENISE MICHEL: Right, and so we can discuss making it a shorter recommendation, but for example, use of pricing to incentivize contracted parties to mitigate abuse has some very specific actions recommended. You're suggesting it be moved to findings, but there's no corresponding –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: There's a bullet that says adopt new policies and agreements with contracted parties for incentives. That's above where we said should be moved. That's in the recommendation section.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: What I would suggest is first we have to agree upon this moment of text and just accept it before we move on, because otherwise, it would create confusion and we might skip some discussion on the topics, because it's very difficult to read the crossed text otherwise and we might think that it is deleted.

So let's first agree upon that, accept it, and then see how we go about this.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think I'm uncomfortable with moving so much recommended specific actions to findings. I'm certainly open to – appreciate the need

to further synthesize and summarize the recommendations, but too much – I wouldn't support for example simply recommending that we use incentives with contracted parties. That really doesn't provide enough recommended action that is measurable and that ICANN can be held accountable to.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So, do you want us to tackle this probably during lunch?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so if we could [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm very uncomfortable with two and a half pages of a recommendation. If we're going to do something like that ,we need to break it into several recommendations or summarize it and move the thing to findings. But we can't have that kind of ... Imagine being the guy who's got to say, was that recommendation implemented? It's like, well, that piece was and that piece was, and that one wasn't. So we've got to do that triage now.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And I think it goes back to Naveed's point. I think we can accept probably the move of all the text. When we looked at it, it seemed as if all of it was moved. Norm and I didn't cut and paste it, we saw it there. So we just worked from what was there and then just moved – put what we thought was recommendation and what was findings. So I think we

can accept the move and then I'll work with Denise during lunch and we'll summarize that section.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we now have an action. During lunch, we're going to revisit this part again.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Stretch break?]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, I think we really need one. Can we keep it to ten minutes, please? It seems like when we do a break, it never stays as short, but I'd like –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So Heather, you're the one highlighting the blue? Because it's going down all the way to compliance.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But I don't think the compliance text was included in there, the compliance text we just agreed to.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay, can we get started again, please? Okay, the first thing we have is an announcement from Jennifer.

JENNIFER BRYCE:	Hi, everyone. We made a reservation for dinner tonight. I have sent a calendar invite, hopefully you've had a chance to add that to your timetable. If you haven't ,please look at it. The restaurant is 15 minutes from the hotel. I believe you're all staying at the DoubleTree. It's called Verses Bistro, and the booking is at 7:15 PM. Unfortunately Negar and I have a prior commitment, but you guys should all have a good time. Everything is prepaid in terms of the food, so you shouldn't have to worry about that. Russ is informed. But yeah, if you have any questions, let me know, and enjoy your dinner.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	And who's the reservation in?

JENNIFER BRYCE:	[It should be my name.]

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. Okay, so as we decided that we're going to make a pass at this again during lunch, I'd like to move to the next topic. Can you put that list back up? Thank you. Eric, [inaudible]? Thanks. The next section was on contracts. I believe this was sorted already, but I'm not sure the team has looked at it. Zarko to write that part, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [We're having our separate meeting, remember.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, exactly. Zarko to write the part where ccTLDs and gTLDs are going to be different in the contracts part.

ZARKO KECIC: That's written by Denise, and I believe we'll put contractual part with ccTLDs.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, where are we? What are we talking about?

RUSS HOUSLEY: The contracts section. See if we can find the page.

ZARKO KECIC: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Right.

ALAIN AINA: I think we need to make this thing more general, because even yesterday when we were talking about disclosure of [inaudible], the issue of contracted parties also came up. So we should maybe try as

much as possible avoid using the contracted parties and maybe – I think yesterday, we said responsible party or find different expressions, because not all the parties who are relevant [in some of the things we do] has contract, like the ccTLDs or some of the DNS operators may have interest of some of the things we're doing here, but may not be contracted parties in ICANN from the ICANN perspective.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Alain. If you could look at the bottom of page 25 which addresses the ccTLD issue, could you add another bullet or additional text to make it relevant to entities other than registrars and registries? If that's what you're proposing. Would that be okay?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Basically, it calls for best practices for the people who don't have contracts, the current text, that's how I read it.

DENISE MICHEL: So it's data tracking and reporting, assessment of abuse and security threats, and a plan to support further efforts from the ccNSO, ccTLDs. So Alain, do you want to just add some proposed text to cover other entities?

ALAIN AINA: I think yesterday, we had the [inaudible] contracted parties, and this word is the problem [inaudible]. But no, I think [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, I think so, make it clear.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so that's it?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think when we look at the entire thing as a whole, it will be – I won't be editing that part, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. DNS testbed. Eric and I substantially rewrote this part, so you'll see lots of crossed out … I hope this resolves the concern that Zarko raised yesterday. Not hearing any concerns. Okay. Back to the list, please.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Do you mind if I go and accept those changes?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Please do. Okay, so the IANA portal is on the next page down. Okay, any concerns with the IANA portal part?

NORM RITCHIE: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's the part about unencrypted e-mails on the next page. Can you scroll it down? There you go.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I remember we had a discussion on the minimum amount of time required to respond to the emergency responses. So here, we now modify it to say as soon as reasonably possible. So again, the world "reasonably," like how reasonable it should be, it's hard to decide, so I think that we should leave it to ICANN to develop a criteria about the response time that they would like to see in this situation and to comply with that later. So then comes the compliance of those standard operating procedures that they make. Because the word itself, as soon as reasonably possible, it's not enough to …

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're saying you want ICANN to establish a response time?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, so like how do we decide what is reasonable enough? Before, I see that we have said one hour or something like that, but again, due to time zones and all that … So we can just leave it to ICANN and suggest them or recommend them to come up with an SoP in case of these emergency changes, and then comply with it.

ALAIN AINA: I think the IANA has some SLA on the root changes, so we already have something, have SLA. Are we saying that we should do something extra? Because we already have SLA for the root zone changes.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, you're right, they have SLA, but what Naveed is trying to say is to change that reasonable time into community agreed SLA or something like that.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I just added a little bit of text. Naveed, do you think that's better?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: In the same IANA [inaudible]?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Yeah, if you go up, it's there. There we go. Why is it not … Okay, [it killed] some of it.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, the following sentence already provides a baseline to what I was suggesting. Like we are suggesting ICANN to have a clear process for [emergency] changes, so when we say just come up with a clear process of making changes, then we should just leave it to them to define what should be the reasonable response time in case of

emergency changes. And in that case, the first sentence has lesser effect than the sentence that comes after that, or we just swap the two sentences.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: So then I would recommend we cut out what I just put in and we just communicate this, "Establish a clear process including a reasonable response time," and that's it. No, that is not there right now.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It's like merging the two sentences to make it one and start with the second one rather than the first one.

BOBAN KRSIC: Just to add, there is a clear process, actually, also, so we have at the moment clear process. it's defined how changes are made. And we have also SLAs.

So what we saw in the past is maybe the process is too long because there [inaudible] questions, there are approvals, it's a manual process. And I would suppose, just to add that part that Laurin added the response time maybe, or defined response time, and that's it.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: [inaudible]

BOBAN KRSIC: But we have a process at the moment. There is a process in place and we know how to do such changes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What got lost overnight is the near real time.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yes, there was a proposal to delete it because real-time is from the phrasing end, from the language.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, but the point was real prompt, and that the current SLA isn't.

ZARKO KECIC: That's part of agreement between community and IANA, so IANA should work with community and find out what is acceptable response time for emergency.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I made a small change which now reads [emergency] changes should be actionable as soon as reasonably possible, IANA should establish a clear process, including a reasonable time frame for emergency changes, and then obviously we delete the "for emergency changes," then communicate this process to relevant stakeholders. Would everyone be happy with that?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [Actually also require the first sentence to be crossed?]

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I would not say so because that is slightly different. The first sentence kind of says you should make these changes actionable as soon as you reasonably can and next one is to define the process and include that time frame that they think is as fast as reasonably possible in that process. It's two different steps.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I see it as when we have a process, the process includes both things at the same time. So even for both, we need to have a process, so that's why I was suggesting to start with like ICANN should establish a process to do the actionable emergency response as well as to undergo those changes. So it can be merged into one sentence which is concise.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Alright, guys, these statements are too diffuse. There's a process in place. We have registry operators in the room right now and I have some experience with that as well, and there is a process in place, and it is being managed, and these diffuse statements cover what it currently being done.

That's the problem with being too concise and making general statements, is you're saying you should do things that make sense that are reasonable. I guarantee you that's what people involved in the IANA process say they're doing now. That already is done. So there's no point

in having a recommendation that says you should do what's already done.

If there's something specific that we want to recommend, we need to be specific. But saying – what does it say? "Should be actionable as soon as reasonably possible," that's already the case. They already make these changes. There's an SLA in place. There's a 24/7 operation center staffed by the root zone maintainer that actually does that.

So if you have a general statement, then I would say we don't need this recommendation. But if we have something specific to recommend that could actually then be tested later on by SSR3, to KC's point which she may be teeing up right now, then I think we should put it in. But I don't think we're doing ourselves any favor by making these statements more general.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: It is pretty obvious what our problem is here, and that's the following. We, when we looked at this, considered that emergency changes are not rolled out quickly enough in our opinion. We did have the hours in there to kind of speak to that, and then we said, okay, we probably shouldn't put a specific time frame in there, which his why we're at this point.

So we might be able to approach this to say emergency changes currently take too long and it should be possible to roll them out more quickly.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:	I don't think you can say that. I think without data, I could easily produce data that refutes that if I were in a position to – there are people that can produce data and easily refute that because you're saying they aren't rolled out rolled out fast enough. I'll just show one counterexample.
	If there's something specific we want to say, like all of them must be bla, I don't know that I'm saying we should put hours in because I'm not sure it's our place to say what the operation should be, but if we don't have something specific to say, we shouldn't say anything at all. But I'm not saying that we don't have something specific to say, I'm saying we should be specific.
	So what is it we are trying to convey with this recommendation? We don't care about hours? Then we shouldn't say it. But what do we care about? Why is it there?
LAUREEN WEISSINGER:	So again, as I described, there was a process to why we ended up with the text we currently have. Essentially, what you're saying is that at least to me it seems we cannot become much more specific considering our limitations, so we should probably just cut that point.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	I think we need to quantify things, because otherwise, this'll never be measurable later. So if we're just saying to have reasonable, somebody might say it's already reasonable, or we didn't prove that it is not reasonable. But there's no way to measure that.

So we need to either say that it should be finished within this time period, like within a day or two days or whatever. The other way of putting things is to suggest ICANN to recommend to have a process that involves less number of stakeholder or offices so that you don't have to go here and here, you need to have a kind of one-window operation where you just go and have your things done.

So here we are talking about making the process improved rather than improvement of time itself, because time improvement can never be guaranteed when you are in the same process, when you have multiple offices involved, you can never guarantee what time it would have. But if we have one umbrella under which the whole operation must be done, then somebody can be made responsible of ensuring a minimum number of time like a day or something.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that there be dragons there. There's a number of motivations to various aspects of this process that I'm not sure how clearly understood they are amongst different groups of people, but for example, do you really want one person able to yank a ccTLD out of the root in the middle of the night without any oversight? No.

That's one of the reasons why there are multiple stakeholder involved in a very difficult process to making changes. Nevertheless, there are emergency circumstances in which changes have to be made, and those exception paths do exist. And like I said, there's 24/7 operations around the RZM function.

So again, I'm not saying that this process is perfect. I don't think anybody thinks that it is. But if we have a recommendation, I'd like maybe for us to take a step back and say, what is it that we're recommending here?

Are we saying that once upon a time, we know of a problem that happened? Are we saying there's always a problem that happens? In either case, what is that problem? Because right now, I would err on the side of I don't see what the problem that is motivating a recommendation here is. I'm tempted to yank it.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I essentially see two options here. Either we go back to saying you need to be able to roll this within X hours, because that is something that's measurable, or we yank. That's where I stand.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: That's not what I said. I said, what's the problem?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Oh, no, that's my opinion.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I know, but I'd like to say I don't remember the origin of this recommendation, so I'm not sure who to look at or if that person's still on the team. But what is the origin of this recommendation? What are we worried about? Maybe we should go back to that, because we've got

	text that has evolved. It may very well have evolved a life of its own, but we're not doing ourselves any favor if we've lost track of what we're trying to recommend.
NORM RITCHIE:	Yeah, I think only the people that are involved in the process should be commenting on this. So if you're a registry operator or a registry, you have a voice in this, but it doesn't really matter if people outside of that group know what the process is. So it doesn't need to be common knowledge, it just needs to be known by the registry operators and the IANA. So I'm saying delete it.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	The [assertion] in the first sentence is that ICANN has already committed to increasing the level of security and increasing the level of responsiveness. So either we have something to say about the level of security or the level of responsiveness, or both.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	But then it goes on to talk about the portal, so maybe the portal was the rub –
RUSS HOUSLEY:	The portal is the way that they're implementing the [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm aware of that. But my observation is that whatever motivated the recommendation, it may have been about the former statements or the latter statement, and I'm casting around – we have people involved in this process in the room, to Norm's point. I think it would be useful to hear if anybody has any concerns or thoughts, whether they're up there on the screen or not, around the IANA portal or the management of changes and whether we feel like we should have a comment, and then maybe a recommendation.

NORM RITCHIE: I was involved with this ten years ago and I was happy with it then. I can't imagine it's gotten any worse.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so I'm hearing the proposal that we delete the whole IANA portal recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So what do you want?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: We're talking, at least to my understanding, specifically about a subpoint emergency changes should bla bla. The rest is unaffected.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we have changed the first sentence as well.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm wondering if we can recommend ICANN to review the process of emergency changes and to see if it is reasonable enough, investigating into the matter rather than suggesting or recommending directly that you need to make it shorter or something, like do they have done this exercise of the self-review process of seeing retrospectively how the previous changes requests were handled? Something like that, rather than recommending that it should be changed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think if we don't have any findings to point to the fact of a problem, we shouldn't say anything.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: My feeling is that we're moving to deleting subpoint on emergency changes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Only that specific subpoint, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Is everyone happy with that? Okay, yank. Steve.

STEVE CONTE: Two things. One is we're talking about emergency changes and everyone's acknowledging that there's a process already, and I apologize I don't have this information, but do we know what the time frame is right now? Who's been on the IANA subcommittee? Do we have anyone in the room or online who's been in the IANA subcommittee?

The team is basing a suggested recommendation on a data point that I don't know if we have in this room anymore. And maybe we should chase that to find out what that data point is to see if there is actually an actionable recommendation.

The second point is maybe the review team should consider exercising these emergency changes. I know IANA has done this in the past with tabletop exercises to make sure that the process is working. Maybe this specific recommendation should be around the exercise of ensuring the process and the policies that are in place working and doing a lessons learned off of that. Thank you.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: To Steve's point, as you guys consider, we have a similar recommendation for the key rollover, so we could consider a consistent approach.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's my point ,rather than deleting it or something, keeping it, we should first see why this was put together here. Maybe we have data or record that suggests that we need to have this. So I'm not for or against deleting it unless we know why in first place we put it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I don't know either the technical reasons, but as it's written now, it's not measurable. it says changes should be actionable, so to Steve's point when he mentioned making it that recognizing the importance of it, implementing a tabletop for example would be useful because that way, we'll be able to exercise how fast they respond to a real threat when it needs to be corrected.

So I think right now, it's not measurable, so whatever we do to it, delete or keep, it has to be amended anyway. And a specific action such as implementing or institutionalizing exercises around it would help.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But Steve just told us they do them. So I think I would not like to have a recommendation that says keep doing it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, he said they did it in the past. He didn't say that it's currently being done. So it's something that we could reemphasize.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We don't know how often they do it, is what you're saying.

NORM RITCHIE: I feel like we're really struggling to have a recommendation around this, and maybe that's indicative that we should just nuke the entire thing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Plus one from my point of view.

BOBAN KRSIC: I propose let's talk to people from IANA and discuss it with them, and when they have defined processes and time frames within this emergency change process, then we can maybe recommend something or not, but I would like to talk with them before we delete it. Just comment it and give me today and I'll [inaudible] tomorrow [inaudible].

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This might be in the questions and answers that we prepared for ICANN and got response back, so maybe we need to have a look at that as well if they already responded and we have …

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, so I tried to pay attention to a lot of the cross chatter, so maybe I missed something. Apologies if I did. I think rather than try to mandate a change or a perspective on this process, one thing we could do is – so my understanding is that there's some amount of disagreement about

whether this emergency process should or shouldn't be public and how well-known it is or it isn't. But regardless, it might be reasonable to say we should come up with a set of well understood types of emergencies, and we should have community input on to what an SLA for that type of emergency change should be, and just start that discussion.

For example, a broken signer in a registry will almost necessitate removal of the DS record from the root immediately, because while a DS record's in the root, if the signing zone is not signing correctly, then that zone is not resolvable when in fact it might actually be online and resolvable otherwise. So you might want to take your DS record out and you might want to do it in minutes instead of hours, days, or whatever.

We could decide that a recommendation makes sense to say come up with those types of emergencies so we can start to understand what the SLAs for them should be, but I don't think we should propose text about how to interface with the process and how things actually work. That would be my two cents.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we're to the point we have to have text or move along, so Boban took the action to, by morning, have a conversation with somebody and propose text. And one proposal might be delete, right? Okay, does anyone have a problem leaving this in Boban's hands?

NORM RITCHIE: I do not, but I just want to let you know that Zarko and I talked to Kim at the last ICANN meeting and we covered a lot of things off. Just so you know that that conversation was held.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, root zone. In particular, we're going to talk about the CZDS.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Norm and I worked on it. The approach we took was to make the items very specific and actionable on the more broader framework, so we're hoping it makes more sense. I don't know if Norm wants to add something.

NORM RITCHIE: No. As usual, I just try to remove words rather than adding them.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: And then what we thought was findings, we pushed down to findings. There was a lot of duplication in the texts, so what we did was try to avoid some of the actions were actually described as findings as well, so we tried to separate that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Still pretty long, but if people are happy with it …

NORM RITCHIE: I agree, it is still long.

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

KERRY ANN BARRETT: The conversation Laurin just asked, Norm and I discussed it, is the whole issue with the CZDS. We recognize that the issue that was identified with it, we found that sticking it under this recommendation as a fix wasn't the best place because that's not what this recommendation was trying to do, but if the team that has an issue with the responsiveness and how that is being managed needs – I think a new recommendation specific to it would have to be written.

How it was written here, it wasn't addressing the problem. We spoke to Eric about it as well, and we just [inaudible] a new recommendation addressing the specific issue that we have about it, but sticking it here wasn't fixing it either.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought the previous one was about collecting metrics, and that's still here.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, that is still there because we thought that what was needed from the CZDS, the metrics [inaudible] was helpful, so it's as a part of one of the many other metrics they could look at or data sets. But the issue they had with it was the CZDS, there was a specific issue that I think Eric and Laurin had raised, and I think it would have to be a new recommendation, not tied under metrics. When they were mixed in with metrics, it got confusing because the issue they had was how it was being managed and the responsiveness for it, that it wasn't being

corrected in time. So that was a whole different problem. I discussed it with Eric before we did this.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I think what we talked about was the problem we were worried about with CZDS was its ability to function in the role that it needed to function in, and it was less about the fact that the people had or had not measured its uptime and whatnot. Yeah, we thought those were separate, and I think speaking for myself – and I don't know the extent to which others agree – it provides an important service when it's providing it, and we want to provide it more often, more reliably.

DENISE MICHEL: Absolutely.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think Laurin, we also discussed it. There are systemic problems with access, and this is a very critical source for security research, mitigation, a whole host of uses. So it's really a matter of ICANN following through on its obligations and compliance, and really ensuring that we have a 24/7 robust system for CZDS access.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Completely agree. What Norm and I looked at is where it was stuck in as an example in this particular recommendation, that whole point that you guys just made was lost. So what we wanted to suggest to the group is that a recommendation be written specific to the issue you've identified, because it got lost completely in being subsumed under this one.

So we thought that if you write a specific recommendation to address that issue, it will stand out a little bit more clearer, because it wasn't clear.

STEVE CONTE: Bottom of page 45, I guess the page above the one that's displayed, the last bullet, I know we talked about this on the calls, but does that actually fit into this recommendation category for root zone data? I know that there is a registry for root zone data, but we're talking about the IANA registries under that. So I'd just ask the team if it's in the right spot.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think this is talking about metrics on the size and availability.

STEVE CONTE: Yeah, of IANA registries inside of the recommendation for root zone data. I'm not asking whether that should be a thing that – we already had that conversation, I'm just asking if it's in the right spot.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: If I understand Steve's concern, it starts off saying each root zone related service, and then it winds up talking about IANA registries. So maybe we just say something more general at the beginning lead in.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, just change the title from root zone data to root zone data in IANA registries.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Somebody fixing it? I think it's the first sentence as well, Heather, if you can. I was just pointing out that we've had several conversations yesterday how important the CZDS is, but no one has taken the responsibility to just write text on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I've noticed that.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So I'm just pointing it out because it's been coming up over and over, but there's no penholder for it. And if we do put it in, it wasn't clear to me when – because as I said, it's not something I'm familiar with, but when it was explained, I still couldn't see based on all the recommendations that we have where it would fit. Is it standalone, or subsumed under another header that we have? It wasn't clear. When you guys described it, it still wasn't clear what it is.

DENISE MICHEL: I think – so we can reference it in a couple of places because there's many connections.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: But I don't know, Laurin I think is writing it, so he should weigh in here. Perhaps under compliance and contractual obligations, because at the heart of it, the registry contracts, the registry agreements for gTLDs require daily deposits to the CZDS, and then there are regulations promulgated based on that guidance, if you will, on how that needs to be carried out and there's been lots of documentation of failure. So that's what we're trying to get at. What do you think, Laurin?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I would say let me write this three-liner. I hope it will be around that. And then let's see if we're okay with it and then think about where we put it, because I'm not sure if we want to necessarily put it in contracts because this is a more general point, particularly if this one was to accept – must be accepted process would also matter to those data.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, so we'll probably need to iterate to make sure we include a number of the known failure modes that exist in CZDS, like for example I've been routinely denied based on data that was actually in my request being absent, the fact that people get their access revoked

aperiodic with no periodicity, so at any given time I don't even know which of the registries I have access to anymore even though I applied to all of them at the same time. It's like a low-level DDoS, it's a resource starvation attack.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can we go back to the list? Okay, and did Eric, Alain and Zarko come up with text on DOH? And if so, where did you put it?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Zarko was very much interested in talking about this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Where did you put the text?

ZARKO KECIC: We come up with some text. It is not in. Eric, we didn't put –

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [I can put it somewhere. Want me to?]

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but we need to discuss with entire team because we still do not have an exact recommendation proposal for that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree we need to talk about it with the team. I was hoping you guys would share a strawman position.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, we have that, but we went through a couple of iterations, and what we would like to have is a clear statement why it is dangerous and why this big security and stability issue. So we'll have to change that a little bit more.

ALAIN AINA: Okay, I think we need to look at it, but I want to call up on my friend, Zarko, that we have to –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

ALAIN AINA: Yeah, okay, so I think for me, the text we have [copes] very well with the issue, and then of the impact of the consolidation of the DNS resolutions of the new trend of the DOH and the DOT, but we also emphasize the issue with DOH which is more problematic than DOT, and also emphasize the fact that the end users are losing control of

DNS, etc. But I think we have to – then we'll have kind of recommendations and ICANN Org who commission investigation to the – is increasing trend and with particular focus on the DOH, and I think we have to – for me personally, I'm happy with these things and I don't think we need to go into the detail of why this is dangerous or why etc. [inaudible] this is what Zarko wants, but I think Zarko [inaudible] as SSR2 team which is more on the stability and the resiliency than more on how the protocol works or the impact of the end user. So we need to compromise somehow.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay. Just to [inaudible], I don't want to go deep into why it is danger, but there are two approaches, and one is broadly spread out. This is dangerous because it will aggregate DNS queries to small number of resolvers, and that's what we already have. But real danger is if we have applications doing DNS and going to resolvers which are embedded into software, and especially with HTTPS encrypted traffic, you cannot track and you cannot know what kind of responses you're getting.

So this is totally different DNS ecosystem than what we have right now, and don't giving ability to users to choose what DNS resolver they're going to use, it is really dangerous. So we have to explain why is that important.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I've done a bunch of thinking about DNS over HTTPS for a while, but even that being the case, once I spoke to Zarko, I eventually realized he

was actually trying to open my eyes a little bit, which I think they opened a bit after talking to him.

What I gleaned from the conversation with Zarko was that in addition to the other concerns that I felt I was aware of with DNS over HTTPS was that you could wind up with per application resolutions. In other words, different applications [inaudible] resolve the same name differently because they're being trafficked to different HTTPS resolvers.

And whether that's a problem for SSR2 or for ICANN is hard to grapple with until you realize that the way I got to this was those that are invested in the namespace community are also invested in the proper resolution of their names, which means if there's a technology that's going to propose to make that subject to debate, subject to democratized values, then that means that undercuts the value in domain names, and that seems like that would be an ICANN concern.

So maybe that would be – we were dancing around these thoughts when we were talking about name collisions, alternate roots, alternate namespace protocols, and at various points in this review team, we talked about these problems.

This sort of feels like it maybe actually calls them all out in a much more real near-term way that could be happening right now. if DNS over HTTPS were to allow applications to decide how names were going to be resolved and DNSSEC was no longer going to be able to protect the proper resolution because it wasn't being used anymore, then it would be a really big problem.

So there could be a really important SSR issue for us to look at here because at the end of the day, the way I think this relates potentially to ICANN is anyone who has any sense that the name that they are curating has value needs to be invested in that name being resolved properly and DNS over HTTPS means that applications can point at providers that users are unaware of and names may not be resolved properly afterwards.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I think one of the key issues we have to think about when we do this is implementation differences. If we look at two big browsers that do this at the moment, one points you to something they choose, the other tries to upgrade the connection to whatever is set in your system.

And that is already a very different approach and has different consequences. So I think we have to be extremely careful with how we word this and how we divide the technical aspect from the potential – I'm not sure how to call them, economic/political consequences of how the technology could be used.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I wasn't trying to come in, but just that last bit threw me a little bit because how it's written now, I was happy that it starts off with stability and resiliency because that's the focus and not necessarily security, and I think the stability and resiliency that Eric explained is pretty clear. It's a matter that if it's unreliable, at some point it's going to come to a head if every single time it's trying to be resolved, it's being redirected.

So I think how it starts off – Eric may have explained it in an economic sense, but how it starts off I think is pretty direct to – we're thinking of more stability and resiliency in the long term. So I don't think this paragraph itself reflects that. I think it was just in the – [inaudible] so we could understand the economic impact as well.

ZARKO KECIC: There is security as well. If a domain name is not resolved correctly –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So the other point I was going to make, that would go to me for the potential of abuse as a result, which is a security concern.

ZARKO KECIC: Exactly.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So that, I think, is missing. But I like the fact that we start off first on if there's no reliance on stability and resiliency component of it, that's when you open the door for potential abuse which would be the security concern. But not mixing it but having it flow I think is just a matter of taking out the security potential, the risks. So it's more risk factor at that point of potential abuse.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So this also seems to make the assumption that DNSSEC is not used with DOH and they can both be used. They don't have to be, but they could be.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I missed the last round, so I don't remermber if they finally put DNSSEC in, but I know that they haven't had it for a while, they've just had it on their roadmap to add in. But that still doesn't mean that relying parties are actually checking DNSSEC, they're counting on the resolver for that. So the DNSSEC protocol would make it the DOH resolver's job anyway, so just like I can use the [CD] bit to allow my stub resolver to see DNSSEC queries, or data, but I don't actually do that because my resolver's a validator. So it still pushes the validation out to someone that then might not tell you the truth.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There are applications that do the DNSSEC validation themselves as well. Go ahead, Steve, and then Zarko.

STEVE CONTE: Zarko and Eric, thanks for writing this. I personally think it's a really good recommendation. I do ask that the team consider which proposed outcome is – you're asking for an investigation. But arguably, ICANN can come and say "We've investigated it already," as you guys well know.

So if the review team can consider being more precise in what you're expecting to get out of this recommendation from ICANN, I think it would help move this recommendation forward and become a more measurable, more impactful – I really do like this recommendation.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, thank you, Steve. That's one of the questions that we are trying to resolve, and just to shortly answer to Russ and others who have that question, whether HTTPS overwrites DNSSEC or not. There is no problem with HTTPS if it resolves normally, goes through root zone, then TLDs, then to authoritative servers. But we talk about alternative root, tweaking TLD zones. So if I have application which points to my resolver, I don't have to resolve whole domain names and [in the way] they are resolving normally.

So that's the biggest threat with HTTPS, because you have DNS resolver embedded into software, you cannot change that. You have HTTPS traffic, you cannot track what's going on, and you've got some response that you cannot be sure is that trustable or not.

So that's the biggest problem with HTTPS.

NORM RITCHIE: I'm going to concur with what Steve said, I think this is really well written, by the way. Getting back to the actual recommendation though, would it not be something that should go to SSAC and have them do a report for the board? Just my guess.

ZARKO KECIC: What I believe is SSAC will or would do that before we end up our report.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

ZARKO KECIC: And we need some community and ICANN action on this because it is really dangerous and important.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, do you want to say something in the last sentence about sharing a report or something?

ZARKO KECIC: I would rather see some action, and let's think about that as a team to come up with some recommendation to ICANN what ICANN and ICANN community really can act upon and do something soon as possible.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The folks who first developed DOH had an idea where they were trying to protect an application from a hostile ISP environment, which is not the environment that everybody lives in, right? Laurin.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I just wanted to say I put some comments in because I didn't write this and I don't want to edit someone else's text. I mean, text that has been

written just now. So as I said before, I think we should address specifically and be clear with, okay, what is the tech side, what is implementation side, and what are potential ramifications.

So I kind of marked it wherever I think we should make a few little changes to reflect that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so I think the place we're at is where we all agree that something needs said here. I think we agree that there are many actions we would like to see taken that are outside ICANN's remit, so we won't make those recommendations, but this one seems to be within the remit. I would like to see the two things that we said we would do during lunch done, plus this, if we can come up with some more stuff for that last paragraph. I'm not sure there's anything else to say, because I've seen no hands. So if we could take 45 minutes, have something to eat, lunch is here and then we'll discuss hopefully what gets sorted out during lunch when we return.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I was just looking at the same IANA portal and trying to investigate why that emergency response was there. So I saw in the questions and answer document that there was some question related to that, and there was response first that it's a 24/7 process maintained by Verisign and IANA, but there is also a paragraph written that there is no provision of emergency rollback.

So that's in the response. So I would assume that this might be coming from there, that they are handling that, but there is no notion of having the emergency response as such. So I think this needs further clarification coming from who's maintaining the process before we decided to drop just that one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you for doing that research. Okay, 45 minutes, please do your lunch homework.

Okay, what page in the Google doc are we starting at? Top of page 24. Okay, so let's each take a minute to read what the subteam has put together, and we'll discuss it shortly.

So how many recommendations is this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Less than there needs to be, but] I can count them.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Russ, I think the issue that we're facing is that from a security perspective, there were a lot of issues with the contract process, and I think this is [inaudible] that in order to hit some of the core components, which is ensuring that the contracts are renegotiated smartly to incorporate current threats and enforcement tools, to ensure that, one, there is communication with the community on the gaps, and three, to ensure that there's some incentive for compliance as a new tool to be able to have are as comply with the contract terms.

That's what we tried to hit [inaudible] as well as include it, because we realized that it could be that there's no continuous training and we're okay with accepting that as a possible gap. But we've cut a lot just to try and group them so it makes more sense. So whether we call it that big, broad header or to have now just individual headers so they become [instead of part of one block,] they're now standalones under those subcategories. I think the team could decide.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just don't even know how to wrap my head around it the way it is, because it looks like a four-page recommendation. Starting on page 24, right? That's what you said.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: 24 has the DNS abuse stuff, and [we realized that persons in] Compliance were asking about DNS abuse, so we [said to read from] DNS abuse all the way down so you see the entire picture.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Now I understand. Let me start again.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, the idea was to read from DNS abuse all the way down so it's now a seamless flow of thoughts from fixing the reporting and analytics, ensuring that it fits into the contract procedure and compliance, and then incentivization is at the end.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The way I'm reading it is, yeah, you've got your set of recommendations associated with abuse definitions and reporting, then you have a set of recommendations for policy agreements, activities with registrars and registries, which includes contracts and agreements, incentivization, abuse report portal, DAAR.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay, and then I see you got another section with recommendations on compliance, and then that's the end of recommendations on abuse and compliance overall.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Because compliance would come at the end of all of that restructure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So even if we just look at page 24, the first recommendation talks about doing two things in parallel to set the definition. Then a recommendation regarding CT and RDS review recommendations, and then another one about abuse definitions.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Could you turn the mic on?

DENISE MICHEL: Sorry. Yeah, Kerry Ann and I were just talking about removing that duplication because the bottom two paragraphs on that page are duplicative of the one and two up above. So we'll combine those two. they are essentially the same recommendation. Yeah.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yeah, delete it, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you guys need more time? Because every time I start reading, the words I'm reading keep changing. Laurin, Denise and Kerry Ann.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so it's Laurin. Okay, I've read this at least twice. Can you guys walk us through it? Because I'm confused.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. It'd be good for Laurin, Kerry Ann and Norm to jump in. I'll start this. Just to make sure we're all in the same place, I'm on page 24 starting with abuse definitions and reporting. Correct? Okay.

ICANN ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

So this is the short and long-term actions to address the definition and application of DNS abuse. So the first recommendation is to implement the CCT review and the RDS WHOIS review recommendations and related actions based on the community-vetted abuse definitions without delay. We're going to add a footnote that gives citations for those community-vetted definitions.

The next one is that ICANN should use the current definition, again with footnotes. I'm not sure why it says that. And take into account he convention on cybercrime to evolve the definitions of abuse.

Have SSAC work with e-crime and abuse experts to evolve – I think we need to clean up this language a little bit, but essentially, this is the recommendation [to] in addition to using your current definition to meet your obligations and implement reviews, evolve the definition to keep pace with Internet abuse and threats. Do this by involving experts involved in the convention on cybercrime, SSAC, and other entities.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Why we need to do this mention ICANN board and ICANN Org separately in first point, while at other points we just keep mentioning ICANN Org and throughout the document?

DENISE MICHEL: I don't know. There's lots of pens on this page, I'm not sure who did that and I'm happy to just make it ICANN. I think this is the type of wordsmithing that Heather's going to help us take care of. There wasn't any particular reason.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think that's legacy.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, both are mentioned.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just delete it now.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, then third paragraph, again, I think there's still repetition here. And I'm sorry, we're getting different edits here. I'm highlighting this if you're looking at the document. These two need to be merged, because they're essentially saying the same thing. It needs to be streamlined. So this needs to be one succinct little paragraph here that says evolve the definition, consult using the convention on cybercrime, and experts.

Moving on then, the DAAR recommendation, this is the recommendation to improve DAAR, and incorporate ccTLD data tracking and reporting. It notes that DAAR is not serving the intended function, should not be rate limited, reports should identify registrars and registries, illustrate high systemic abuse, provide data in accessible form. I think that's the DAAR recommendation, to really focus on improving DAAR.

The next set of recommendations involved the policies, agreements and activities with registrars and registries. That's a little intro

paragraph after that red-lettered heading. The summary is – okay, I think someone is highlighting it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So this paragraph is actually not a recommendation but an into to what's coming.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Do you want to just delete it, highlight it, hold it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm just trying to digest it. You don't need yet another pen at the moment.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, so moving on then, the first recommendation under this section is ICANN should incorporate measures to mitigate DNS abuse and security threats in agreements with contracted parties, including registry agreements, the base agreements, and the RAA. Changes should be [demonstrably] informed by both ICANN security function and the compliance team, particularly when it comes to enforcement gaps.

This should include as a priority provisions that establish thresholds of abuse, for example 3% of all registrations, at which compliance inquiries are automatically triggered with a higher threshold, for example 10% of all registration, at which point registrars and registries

are presumed to be in default of their agreement. This approach was also underscored by the CCT review.

The next recommendation is, as current contracts cannot be changed except during negotiation periods, ICANN Org should make SSR requirements mandatory on contract or baseline agreement renewal. A pattern or practice of abuse cause for contract termination is to be introduced on renewal of contracted parties' contracts and agreements.

Although ICANN Org does not have contracts with – and then separately, the next recommendation is – ccTLDs, DNS abuse and security threats require more action in this area, and it is recommending that ICANN should work with the ccNSO to advance data tracking and reporting and assessment of DNS abuse and security threats in ccTLDs, and ccNSO plan to support ccTLDs in further mitigating abuse and threats.

And then we still, I think, Laurin, have some duplication here. If you look at the top of page 26, yeah. So this renegotiation of the contracts needs to be folded into what I read above. It adds a little bit more specificity here calling for ensuring access for parties with legitimate purposes via contractual obligations with rigorous compliance rather than voluntary implementation.

RDAP and registrant information access, rate limiting practices are impediments and should be prohibited. Establish and rigorously enforcing the uniform centralized zone data service requirements to ensure continuous access.

So this needs to be added to the above, and then deleted here. It just adds additional specificity to what should be in the contracts. Okay, the next section is in –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Wait a minute, so another alternative would be this highlighted text, the blue, showing blue on the screen, could move down below the bullet and be a separate recommendation.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure, somehow compress those. And I think Laurin is in the best position to do that. So the sentence isn't going to change, it's just going to remove the duplication.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Yeah, I'm totally fixing that, I guess. I will try.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thank you. I know this is a moving target. We keep fixing things and they kind of pop up again. But incentivization, so now we've [grouped] the recommendations that have to do with incentivizing action. So the first – and if you're having trouble tracking, this is on page 26, the subheading is incentivization.

The first recommendation under that is that ICANN should require the use of pricing to incentivize contracted parties to mitigate abuse and security threats, and specifically, the recommendation is that ICANN

should, number one, the contracted parties with portfolios that have less than 1% abusive domain names as identified by commercial providers – okay. Some of the text has disappeared here.

Contracted parties with portfolios of less than [8% domains] get a reduction from current fees, or ICANN could increase the current per domain transaction fee and provide a registrar with a discount down to 18 cents per domain.

So the recommendation here is that ICANN give contracted parties that have les than 1% of domain abuse in their portfolio a fee reduction. The second recommendation –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Why do we not just say that and stop the sentence there?

DENISE MICHEL: Again, lots of penholders, lots of details. Happy to make that change.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because all the rest is just ways they can go about achieving a fee reduction.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, okay. This part, I will reword this and take out – make it shorter. And then this continues at the registrars receive a fee reduction for each domain name registered to a verified registrant, and that any [RSEP] fees be waived when in connection with RSEP filings that will

demonstrably mitigate DNS abuse and that any registry RSEP receives preapproval if it permits an EPP field at the registry level to designate – there's a lot of details here.

A verified registrant. So we're trying to incentivize changes at the registry level to include verified registrants, which is also a way of cutting down on abuse. And that part you just highlighted is additional background or rationale, which –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, and then the next element of this under incentivization is that abuse and security threats could further be mitigated by incentivized by ICANN refunding fees it collects from registrars and registries on domains that are identified as abuse and security threats and are taken down within an appropriate period after registration.

We give as an example 30 days after the domain is registered. Right now, ICANN makes a substantial amount of money on domains that are abusive or security threats. Initial incentive would be giving the contracted parties back that fee, a refund when they do a more expeditious takedown of these domains.

The next recommendation relates to the abuse report portal, and the recommendation is that ICANN establish or maintain a single complaint

portal for all complaints that automatically directs reports to relevant parties.

And then there's detail that's highlighted with specifics on how to carry that out, which you may wan tot move to another part, or not.

Okay, the next section of recommendations –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Has agreement already.

DENISE MICHEL: Has agreement already. This is what we went through.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: This morning.

DENISE MICHEL: Auditing, empowering Compliance office SLAs. Is that it? That's it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

DENISE MICHEL: It's not that many.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: From four pages to –

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think it would help at least Heather if there were "recommendation:" after each new one so that it's not stream of consciousness. But just to make sure things get separated as you intend. But at least now I understand it. I hope the rest of the team is in the same place.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Russ, could you just repeat? Right now, we tried to subcategorize, and each paragraph stands on its own. So just trying to see what additional clarification Heather would need to go forward so we could do it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that as you just went through it, there was one place where there were three paragraphs that were a recommendation. For example, under the contracts/agreements, those next three paragraphs are a recommendation and then the next one is a separate recommendation, as I understood it. If that's not what you meant –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: What's the coding she needs? For all the other recommendations that have multiple, we didn't do like numbering. So just to make sure that you want it numbered, you want a dash, just say what you need.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just something like what – I don't know who did that just now. Laurin, of course. Just like –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Heather was trying to tell us what she needs.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What does Heather need?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. In some cases, you have "recommendation:" and then a thing. Sometimes you don't. Where it says for example recommendation: policies, agreements, activities and registrars, I understand that first paragraph was actually introductory text and not a recommendation? Which, if that's the case, then I'm not sure where the recommendation starts. Presumably –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Where it says "ICANN Org should." So each paragraph starts with, "ICANN Org should. ..."

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So that first one under policies, agreements, activities with registrars and registries is a recommendation?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay. Whether or not it needs a sub-header, I'm not sure, but a whole section, then you have under contracts and agreements –

HEATHER FLANAGAN: And that's a recommendation?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: That's a recommendation.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: A recommendation? It has sections. [That's fine.]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: What we could try to do, everywhere it's actionable, "ICANN Org should …"

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, I like "ICANN Org should …"

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think that's what we tried to do. And then the other paragraphs that would follow would be elaborations of above, and if it 's a new one, we could start "ICANN Org should …" Would that help?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Skimming through it right now, I think you've pretty much done what I needed, which was just you've now triggered the start of each recommendation.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So one of the things, like we didn't have it for DAAR, so I asked Laurin to make sure he puts that text, "ICANN Org should …" as the first line.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Under incentivization , you've got "ICANN Org should require the use of pricing to incentivize contracts," etc., which is cool, and then the second paragraph is another one, and then the third paragraph is a follow-on and the fourth paragraph is – okay. Those are all just sort of sub-bullets to incentivization. Okay.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We'll need agreement on the highlighted paragraph at the end of that, after abuse report portal, if we get rid of that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The yellow highlighted paragraph, Denise said she was going to reword.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm doing it right now.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: This is another highlighted paragraph. Forget it. I thought Kerry Ann was referring to the process specification under the abuse report. Sorry. Different paragraph. All good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are you saying disregard? Okay.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Just accept all my edits.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Of course. Alright, so let's now make a pass of – does anybody have concerns? Starting on page 24 – go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: The same concern I had a month ago and I have now, and we should think about that on all recommendations, not only compliance stuff. When we write something, ICANN Org should adopt new policies, is this possible? It can be initiated process of adopting new policies, but they cannot do by themselves.

So we should think about wording where PDP and community consensus should be taken into consideration.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's a good point, I think.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just one clarification, the community, the policies, the recommendation is related to contracted parties when they're actually going to the negotiation for the new SLA terms. So should we say – instead of "Should adopt," "Should negotiate?"

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought he said "Begin the process to adopt."

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But I was just wondering what Zarko – because he was saying that because of how the process that's involved in that happening, ICANN just can't automatically adopt. So, is it that we should say "negotiate?" No?

ZARKO KECIC: It is not negotiation with contracted parties, it is community involved into that process.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: What was the language you proposed, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just repeated his language, which was begin the process to adopt. Any other concerns? If not, I'd like to go through them quickly one by one to see if we have agreement. Okay, starting on page 24, the recommendation on definitions and reporting.

Laurin, did you remove the duplication already?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: As indicated by my comment that is not on screen, I did.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you so much. Okay.

BOBAN KRSIC: Just one question. Why are we referencing short- and long-term actions, Do we need this?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We don't. It got squeezed in when we were editing a while ago, because someone had asked that we distinguish – I'm trying to find – the fact that the second half of the third paragraph that speaks about incorporating the comments of the community, [at large] external community, and it had just gotten squeezed in to try and address the concerns someone had, because they were saying it's something that couldn't be done immediately, because it was an evolving process.

                        So that's why it was – but I don't know if that's fixed, I don't know if you remember that's why it got thrown in.

BOBAN KRSIC: Okay, I understand, but that's the process itself and it's not an action. So I would –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just strike it.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I would say for that one also based on Zarko's comment, strike what I've marked right now, and then add that the board should ask the community, because some of it does involve the community. For example, point [to] and trust SSAC. Would that be okay with everyone?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This reminds me of a point that we made yesterday a few times in that because of some of the tricky politics, you need to be explicit for me when you say ICANN, what part of ICANN are you talking about? Whether it's community, Org, etc.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: This is exactly what I'm trying to do right now.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but sometimes it is hard for me, probably somebody can help here, who initiate process? So we should look into bylaws and policies who is starting the process. And my comment before ICANN Org should initiate, maybe it is not ICANN Org, maybe somebody else should initiate that, board or …

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm sorry, I was working on another page, but if you're talking about a policy development process, the board, it would be the ICANN board. It would be that the ICANN board would be requesting that the relevant stakeholder group launch a policy development process.

KC CLAFFY: But we don't say PDP in here yet. If that's what we mean, it should be explicit. I'm not convinced that's what we mean though.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: KC, check the one that's marked right now in the Google doc. What we're currently saying is SSAC to lead.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Zarko, are you referring to some specific recommendation?

KC CLAFFY: No, I just generally said that we should go to entire document and find out what we are recommending. If we say ICANN Org should initiate something, to be sure that that's ICANN Org, not board or community members, or whatever.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Are you doing that?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I don't think he wants to do it, no. What I understand is that generally, we have to make sure that whatever we assign as a task for ICANN Org, they have the authority and power to do it. And if not, we need to just ensure that when we look through all the recommendations, we identify who, they would probably have to [inaudible] who should have the responsibility.

I think we could probably make a mental note, like how we were making the note about metrics.

KC CLAFFY: Well, when Zarko spoke up, the cursor was up on "engage the ICANN community accordingly," at the top of the paragraph, and not what Norm was talking about. So I want to make sure you guys are on the same page. It is the case when you say engage the ICANN community, some people are going to read that as PDP, and some people are not.

So we should probably be clear on what we mean by that. And of course, down below, you just mean SSAC. It's clear you don't mean PDP. But engage the ICANN community, some people are going to insist that means a PDP.

DENISE MICHEL: I don't think so. There's a lot of community engagement in a lot of different ways. You can say the community is engaged on discussing what the definition of DNS abuse should be, or the community is engaged on discussing how reviews should be changed. that's really different than the specific language of "Launch PDP." In my view.

KC CLAFFY:	Well, you know more about the dynamics than I. I'm imagining somebody saying, "Well, we have to have a PDP to ratify that definition of abuse." But if you don't think there's a risk there, I'm fine.
DENISE MICHEL:	To be clear, if we think that a policy development process should be launched, we should specifically say we recommend the board request that GNSO and ccNSO, launch policy development process.
KC CLAFFY:	Right, but I'm more thinking of if we think a PDP is the wrong approach at this time because they've already had PDPs on this or something, then we could say that. So [inaudible] to come up with this.
DENISE MICHEL:	Yeah, fair point. Again, if there's specific places that people are referring to …
LAUREEN WEISSINGER:	I just change it to elicit feedback from the ICANN community. Would that solve this? We could add "elicit feedback and support from the ICANN community." That would not really point to PDP, I believe.
ZARKO KECIC:	What does it mean to address a definition?

DENISE MICHEL: I'd prefer to just go back to "Should undertake short- and long-term actions," because then we provide the specific actions right below. That's just a lead in, because people thought it was important to delineate between actions now and longer-term actions.

So if I could suggest that we go back to simply undertaking short- and long-term actions, and then maybe put a colon after that, and then you've got three specific things. One, ICANN implementing the CCT and WHOIS reviews. Two, use the current definition –

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But do you need the short-term or long-term to make that point?

DENISE MICHEL: I think it's obvious which is short-term or long-term. It's evolved the definition using the convention on cybercrime and other experts, and …

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But Denise, do we still need the words short-term or long-term then? I don't think we need it.

DENISE MICHEL: It was a response to someone else's suggestion. The person who suggested that should indicate.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I think it made sense in a previous iteration. I would also say let's just cut it out. "Should undertake the following actions" instead.

KC CLAFFY: Me too.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Are we happy with "eliciting feedback from the ICANN community," or do we have to rephrase that? if not, I think we can move on.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, let's go to the next one. What are you doing?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I think that we need to be careful about when we use these again, board and Org without really putting a thought of who should be responsible of what. if we say both are responsible, then it might never be implemented between them. So how do the resolve who has what responsibility? So either we particularly assign a particular entity of ICANN to do something, or we just put nothing and say that it is recommended to do this and leave it to them to do that task. But when we involve more than one entity, then it might be a problem later in the implementation phase.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think he was suggesting that in the first bullet, we drop the Org. Not that one, the one above.

ZARKO KECIC:	Yeah, but Russ, we already discussed that we should go through the entire document, not only this part of the document, and check who is responsible, and fix that.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay, are we ready to move to DAAR? Okay, hearing no one, let's look at the bottom of page 24.
ZARKO KECIC:	Yeah, I have comment on this. We have to check what are legal responsibilities of DAAR, because they're collecting a lot of data from different sources, and I believe they have contracts with them about confidentiality and what can be publicly reported and what not. So we should take into consideration that limitations.
NORM RITCHIE:	They can collect data from other sources. Those aren't the only sources of data they can use, and there's also a variable timeliness of the data. Once the data is a bit older, I'm sure they could disclose it if they talk to the vendors. But that's not a step they've taken.
ZARKO KECIC:	That's exactly what I'm saying, we should take into consideration what they can publish and what they cannot, and when. So just to ask ICANN,

Steve, can you help us with this to have some meeting with the DAAR people?

STEVE CONTE: Yeah, and just as a note, there's a session this Wednesday on DAAR improvements that might help inform this part of the recommendation. So I know John and Samaneh from the OCTO SSR team are here on site this week, and maybe we can get them with some members of this team to discuss this piece and tighten it up a little bit with you guys.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Question for Zarko. What specifically in the recommendation text do you think – like really impacts on what you were talking about? Because most of what we're saying is the reports, and the reports are posted after the fact. So there's probably lead time, and that information that is proprietary is not up to date anymore at that point. Or Steve, I can see you [want to press] so you can also respond to that.

STEVE CONTE: No, I'm sorry, you were looking at me so I thought you were asking me specially. But if it's not for me, then I will turn my mic off.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: If you have the answer, you can answer to it.

STEVE CONTE: I don't have an answer for that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm not comfortable putting again something like this entity or this thing is not serving its intended function without providing the proof. It can be moved to findings, but if this is a recommendation, then I would just say to remove this line, because otherwise, we are just providing the recommendations in terms of what should be done, so this line is redundant, the line number two which says DAAR is not serving its intended function at the moment.

So this should be put in the findings and not in the recommendation.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: We have more specifics on why it is not serving that function in the findings. I would also like to note that we did agree to have a very short status description in the recommendations so that it's clear where we are and where we believe we should go, and I think we can't get much shorter than that for a straight description that we agreed to put into the recommendations.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, but putting a line only without providing at least one reason, like as, or because, or something like that, would be just a confusing thing. it can always be put in the findings, and I believe this will be, as you said, but just putting one line without any justification would be misleading eventually.

So when we are saying that it should be –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I think we can put that in. I get what you're saying now.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We have it for some other recommendations too, so I think –

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: So we will add a little bit more so it's clear what we're trying to say.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: How about just a reference?

KC CLAFFY: While I agree with Naveed, I would go further. We can't say intended function without saying whose intention, because I believe that ICANN thinks that it's serving at least some of the intended function, or it would change it. They declare success of DAAR quite a bit. So I really want to take Steve up on his offer, because I think there's a whole bunch of stuff in here that we need to be really careful what we say. We say the system should not be rate limited, but then we say reports should identify …

So the system isn't even – well, I don't know what aspects of the system we're talking about, and which trusted parties we mean, and we may say the way that they're vetting trusted parties is not okay. So this whole thing is a bit, I think, too packed now. We have to unpack what is it about the system that should not be rate limited. You can't just say a system should not be rate limited, or it's going to get DDoS attacks.

So that sentence needs to be unpacked. And then there shouldn't be a semicolon between that and something that talks about reports, which are obviously not rate limited.

And then the next part of this sentence looks to me to be redundant about illustrate entities with high abuse rates. So I think we need to be real precise here about what we want, or punt this to another group that we think needs to be set up to evaluate DAAR on a more ongoing basis.

DENISE MICHEL: We're in a bit of a ping pong game, KC and Naveed, because a couple months ago, the subgroup shared extensive findings and the detailed recommendations with the team. It's been out there and discussed for a while. And then there's concern that there is too much detail and it's too long, so different people have gone through editing and synthesizing and summarizing, so you've got a separate section on findings that expands on the problems and challenges that the subgroup spent a fair amount of time doing due diligence on and discussing, and previously, there was much more detail in the recommendations.

So for the purposes of raising a draft recommendation with the community that we then need to follow on before we put final pen to paper to add specificity, perhaps – so I'm raising this as a challenge. We keep kind of coming back to, well, there should be findings here. No, the practice that we're going through and we've all agreed to is simply focusing on a synthesized draft recommendation.

So there's extensive background and findings, but that's not what we're looking at right now. So I think we need to decide how much – perhaps you could look at the findings and the earlier draft of the specifics of this recommendation, and then kind of come back with some specific suggestions of where to draw this line between short and detailed.

KC CLAFFY: I agree. I will go look at the findings and I would even take a [crack at] trying to match this more tighter to the findings. But I think the sentence that it's not [inaudible] intended function in the recommendation, I would object to – like Naveed, I would object to having just that sentence in the recommendation. I think it's too loaded, because again, I believe that it is serving some intended functions and I think what Laurin just offered is putting this 365-day threat count thing in there. Now we're leaking into what I feel is too much detail for a finding to be in a recommendation. So I understand that there was consensus to put some finding, but I think that – and again, I'll volunteer to take a pass at this. [inaudible].

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

66

NAVEED BIN RAISE: To me, a recommendation should only be talking about the recommendation. That's what I say, recommendation has always a pretext, a context where you put your findings and all that, and when you put your recommendation, it should not be more than a few sentences. And just to suggest what should be done rather than just putting details, or commenting on the existing functionality, like it is not functioning well or something like that, should never be put in a recommendation. So we should just [inaudible] what should be done.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So how about [inaudible] in the interest of forward motion here, the way that SSAC does this by the way is, often in a document they will number the findings and then the recommendations can refer to in the interest of addressing the issue in finding number six, we recommend X, Y, Z. We could try that. I don't know [inaudible]

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But KC, what we have agreed to, I wanted to address the latter point you make, and then the point that we're discussing. What we've agreed to is that Heather is going to be doing a mapping, and that mapping will tie the recommendations that correlate with the findings as well. so that mapping is what will guide the final draft of the document.

in relation to this one specifically, yesterday we were careful with some of them to actually correct words that are emotive, and I think this is one of them.

So what we could probably do is just for those that require the preamble in order to make the recommendation, it had a concluding statement such as this one, so we probably just have to find the best way to make that concluding statement that it's not emotive, because [inaudible] brought emotions from both Naveed and KC from two perspectives, it means that it would do that to the community.

So we'll just need to find language to say that, concluding point in order to give context to the recommendation. That's what I would recommend, laurin.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Yeah. We might have suggested language here. For example, I just proposed to say DAAR lacks key indicators and data, for example [inaudible].

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: And that's less emotive. However, I think in general, we have to – if this is coming up again and again with the status, it depends what we want to do. So if it comes up again, we have to consider that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I really think what we ought to do is, these recommendations are going to get excised and kicked around. they're going to be walking around

atomically no matter how we write this up. These recommendations have to have motivation in them in some form, and just like a number of people have said in different ways, I'll say it now in my own way just in case this gets purchase.

You put findings in your introductory statements, and then you backwards reference or forwards reference. You cite where to go and get the details. So you would put in here DAAR's not working because it's got a bunch of problems with rate limiting, see our detailed discussion in section whatever. And that way, if it gets put in a PowerPoint somewhere and someone doesn't like what we said, they know exactly where to go to look it up, which I think is what a couple people said we're going to kick around. But I'm jumping up and down because I'm worried we're going to go and dilute the text again, and I don't think we should. I think the text needs to not be diluted, it needs to be clear, concise, even if it winds up being long, because when we try to shorten it for whatever reason, I think we lose signal, and then later on we come back and we're not sure what it means or where it came from.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: So we are happy with the level of current status along the lines of what's written right now in the DAAR recommendation. A sentence that says, "Okay, indicators data missing, for example, these specific ones." This is a level that we're all happy with, and then we make a reference later on where the rest is to be found. Just so we all know how we're dealing with this.

KC CLAFFY: Alright, so I see a recommendation of no rate limiting. I see a recommendation of published report should identify the registrars. And then I see a recommendation for tabular format, so machine readable form. And then I see a recommendation for pricing data. So what is that, four, five recommendations? Six, CCT related abuse and security threat data, which might be ten recommendations in that one sentence.

So let's say there are five recommendations in here. And then I think we need a recommendation about if the – because they've stated this even though ICANN stated a few different things, and I again want to repeat that I want to take Steve up on his offer to get John and David [inaudible] to talk to us.

But I know this has been another game of ping pong, but I think it's worth one more update there. If the current contracts do not allow this kind of granularity, I think to Norm's point, we should say ICANN should move away from those contracts and move towards contracts where it can actually make this data available to the community that is requesting it in the first place, even if it costs more. And we don't have to say that, but I think that recommendation needs to be in there, because this game of ping pong will go on for a few more years, and we want to cut that round short, and say if it's an issue or that the contracts are not allowing to share, don't have those contracts.

DENISE MICHEL: The contracts don't come into play with DAAR. This is – Right?

KC CLAFFY: [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: So in the interest of moving forward, I can write a sentence to the spirit of what I just said, and then ask for feedback from you guys, and Steve can make sure that it's not totally wrong.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, so to Laurin's point, it's five recommendations inside of this recommendation. Is everybody okay with those recommendations and the one that I'm going to add and you can give feedback on in the next couple of days, so that we can move forward?

DENISE MICHEL: So we're providing an overview of first draft recommendations tomorrow. If there's something specific that you think should be reflected in how we talk about this at a high level with the community, we'd need it by tomorrow morning, our time.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I'll add it right now and Steve can make sure it's not totally off.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, I have one question. Why the last sentence in this paragraph is highlighted? DAAR also should include ccTLD related abuse and security threat data.

DENISE MICHEL: It's highlighted because it says "Zarko please check."

ZARKO KECIC: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It worked.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, it is nice to have, but I don't think that we can recommend something like this. We could put some sentence that ccTLDs should be attracted to use DAAR, and it is also related to amount and clarity of data I'm getting back, because I wouldn't submit my –

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, this is language I sent you because you asked me to create language that included ccTLDs, so we should just delete this. Yeah?

STEVE CONTE: I just want to acknowledge KC's request and I've been working with MSSI, we will work on getting John to join the call or the review team somehow to have this discussion further to nail it down.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I don't know about the rest of you, but I need about five minutes, so let's take a break. And please let's keep it to five minutes. We have a lot to do and we are quite bogged down.

Alright, let's get started. I believe we just wrapped the DAAR part. Is that correct? Or while we were gone, did KC rewrite it? So in the next one, we have the policies, agreements, activities, so on. This one's one paragraph here.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's no what?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] one paragraph.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's got all of the words, initiate, adopt, and …

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's got all the best words.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's got all the hot words. Stakeholders. It's even got metrics.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I love it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Are there any concerns here? This was the one that was hanging for a while. Alright, contracts and agreements. The recommendation is two full paragraphs and three bullets, and then a little paragraph at the end, right? Okay.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: But it's one "ICANN should." So it's one recommendation, right?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No? That's what you said.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It has ICANN should in the third paragraph and the second paragraph as well.

ICANN66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought we had this discussion, if it begins "ICANN should."

DENISE MICHEL: We're not arguing that it doesn't have them, we're arguing that you said there was like one "ICANN should" per recommendation. This recommendation has three, so is it three recommendations?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It's three different recommendations. "ICANN should," the preamble we spoke about to make sure that it's contextualized, "ICANN should make," preamble, "As renegotiations are imminent, ICANN should …" So for some of the recommendations, we had to have a preamble statement before the "ICANN should," but it all has the ICANN should.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: We're going to treat this, for the sake of the cloud thing, as one recommendation.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It is the contracts agreement recommendation.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so let's start with the first one. This is a recommendation, the highlighted part, right?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yes. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I now understand. I did not before. Are there any concerns here about incorporating measures to mitigate DNS abuse and security threats in the agreements with contracted parties? Seeing none, moving to the next one, which is this paragraph and the three bullets, correct?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No. [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So it's only to here?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Specifically "Should" is the ... I see. I'm not hearing any concerns. Next. And here is this ... In this one, are these ICANN Org, or what are they?

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

KERRY ANN BARRETT: ICANN Org.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we're now on this recommendation. Does it include this or not?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So it's some intro text, three bullets and some closing text. The bottom is really just saying –

DENISE MICHEL: No, it's not closing text, although ICANN Org does not have contracts with ccTLDs. Let me change that to start with "ICANN Org should" so it's identifiable as a recommendation. This is the language that was added at Zarko's suggestion. On page 26, Zarko.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, so that would be helpful. Thank you. Okay, so right now we're going to look at this part while Denise is working on this part. So it's the intro text and three bullets regarding RDAP and EPDP phase one [causing] the imminent renegotiation, so while we're in the renegotiations, do these three things.

Okay, I'm pausing because she's still typing and I don't want to go faster than she's typing.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm not changing any substance, I'm just starting this little paragraph with "ICANN Org should" so it's easily identifiable as a recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, basically, it's even though they're not contracted parties, bring ccTLDs into the fold. Zarko, go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: This is okay. I would just add the word "attract" ccTLDs to use that.

DENISE MICHEL: Where do you want "attract?"

ZARKO KECIC: At the beginning, "ICANN Org should attract and collaborate with ccTLDs."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ask those guys. Okay. Any other concerns here? Okay, now we're moving to incentivization.

DENISE MICHEL: So there's a short intro.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Then recommendation here.

DENISE MICHEL: Followed by three recommendations, three "Shoulds."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any concerns with the first one? Go ahead, Boban, then Steve.

BOBAN KRSIC: I would like to address the 1% abusive domain names. Can we maybe say something like an example as 1% and define it as a ...

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [It has a specific percentage.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we're addressing the "Such as 1%" comment. Okay, then the next one, further incentivize abuse. Do we want to say that? Somehow, I think not.

DENISE MICHEL: There is no comma after that, you're not supposed to pause. You're supposed to say ICANN Org should further incentivize abuse and security threat mitigation.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Probably remove the "further." Continue to.

RUSS HOUSLEY: How about incentivize mitigation of abuse and security …

KC CLAFFY: I think Heather would automatically make that change when she does her pass.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, but sometimes it's fun to just giggle for a few minutes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Any other comments?

NAVEED BIN RAISE: This text suggests that ICANN already has rewarded previously to incentivize the contracted parties. So I'm wondering if we have justification of what extra would make sure to happen in terms of security, because we need to keep it related to the SSR thing, so how doing this would actually improve the SSR-related matters in terms of threat mitigation and abuse, and this particular text is somewhat not clear to me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry, the prompt takedown I think is what they're trying to incentivize. That's how I read it. So you're questioning how that's SSR-related?

NAVEED BIN RAISE: I'm actually wondering, if they're doing something, how that is not enough to incentivize more on this aspect. So if they're not doing it all, then it has a different meaning as compared to if it is being done right now and we are asking for more.

DENISE MICHEL: It's not being done right now. So it's worded in a confusing way, yeah, that paragraph.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, sorry, I'm just looking at two, a fee reduction for domain names, that's on a per domain name basis. I just wonder if that should be axed out somehow, because one registrant could have hundreds of thousands of domain names. Number two in the first paragraphs up there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry. We [inaudible].

NORM RITCHIE: I know, but that won't fly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That won't what?

DENISE MICHEL: After verified registrant?

NORM RITCHIE: It says registrars receive a fee reduction for each domain name registered to a verified registrant. That has to be capped somehow.

DENISE MICHEL: Up to an appropriate threshold.

NORM RITCHIE: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. You'd be so lucky as to have that problem. So Russ, we're down to the third paragraph there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm making sure that Naveed's happy. Okay, thank you. Alright. Now we're down to the last one on page 26. So this is just calling for shaming, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Just want to make sure I got it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm going to introduce you all to the Oxford comma at some point. Features should include as a starting point automatic tracking of complaint numbers and treatment of complaints, quarterly, yearly public reports on complaints, actions, etc., and third is analysis. Three, analysis of the complaints? Analysis of what?

DENISE MICHEL: This was compressed from half a page, so let me go back and look at the original and then come back and clarify that analysis for you, add a couple words.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anything else?

NAVEED BIN RAISE: Just wondering, what do we mean by features? Like how do we define these? Because it's not clear reading the first sentence, like what we mean by features. Again, perhaps because we summarized it, so we might have disconnected something here.

DENISE MICHEL: Features of training.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So could we just say "Training should include ...?" Is that what you're saying?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anything else? Moving to the abuse portal then.

NAVEED BIN RAISE: It is clear by reading the heading that it has to be an abuse report portal, but reading the text, it's not clear if it is an abuse report portal. So we're just saying the complaint portal, but about abuse, it should be, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Should we delete "For all complaints?" It just seems a complaint portal for all complaints seems pretty complaining.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: We might want to reword it, but the idea really we want to push here is that it's for all complaints so that as little as possible is excluded from this. We cut down the text so it did mention this more specifically in the past.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does that improve it for comprehensive DNS [– that way?] It's in suggest mode, it's easy to take back.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I would just say that automatically directs all abuse reports so it's clear what reports and what number of reports, and then I think it's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: We could get rid of comprehensive then, yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That works. So Laurin, explain why you made the next text yellow.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: So essentially, we always have these discussions about how specific we want to get versus how can we explain what we mean? So essentially, the second paragraph is pretty specific, kind of giving an outline of how this is supposed to work, and the language right now is pretty collegial as well, probably to keep it short.

So I'm wondering, do we just want to push this somewhere else, like the analysis section where we in more detail explain, "Okay, this is what we want to do and this is what the process could look like?" Maybe need some tweaking. And get rid of it here in the recommendation because

it's very specific and might need far more words to be completely clear and make this recommendation as long as our compliance recommendations.

DENISE MICHEL: I think for the purposes of what we're doing today, just grabbing that, just noting details provided in annex or elsewhere, and then make sure that we save that language and bring it back to the draft report.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, can you make a note or something?

DENISE MICHEL: Do you want me to repeat that, Heather? So it's not findings per se, it's a lot more detail on implementation. So the suggestion here is to note in the recommendation details provided in annex, or wherever we decide to park it, and then take out the process paragraph that's highlighted. But we want to save that because we want it to be somewhere appropriate in the report when we write the draft report.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, something like the implementation should include bla bla. Right. And I believe the last of this, we have already visited twice.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. It's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And agreed twice. Okay, so we're now where I thought we would be by morning break. So [let me] pick up the pace indeed. I've asked Jennifer to see if it's possible to do some meeting time tomorrow in the morning since we're briefing in the afternoon. I don't know if she's been successful.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes, I booked a room from 9:00 until 12:00. I haven't sent the invite to the team. I didn't realize it was for everyone, but I will do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the next thing that I think we need to do, give you a little roadmap of the things that we need to still do are look at dependencies among our recommendations, then prioritize to see which ones are high, medium, low, then put together the slides for tomorrow.

So to do the dependencies, Heather has made a chart that will help us. It's a start. It has got a few arrows and boxes and stuff on it. What we're trying to capture at a very high level is which recommendations depend on other recommendations. that way, we don't mark something high that depends on a low and vice versa.

Okay, so yesterday, the gray ones in the middle, I'll explain why we put the arrows in already. We decided that the C-suite position was in charge of risk management. We decided that the risk management was therefore as a dependency on the C-suite.

The contingency has a dependency on the risk assessment, and then the disaster recovery has a dependency on that. So that's what that ladder in the middle is all about. It's not at all clear to me that we know how some of these ones we just talked through a few minutes ago are going to line up, but the other ones that we figured out was in the SSR1 follow-on stuff, there were some that depended on the C-suite, put those arrows in, and in the cryptography, there's no way to transition to a new algorithm unless you do a DNSSEC key rollover, so we put that dependency in.

Please point out other dependencies we have.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Does the abuse report portal depend on abuse definition and reporting?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I looked at that carefully and it looked to me like what they were saying is start doing the portal now even though the definitions are going to evolve over time. It was like in parallel. But go ahead, Laurin.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: It is not, because the only thing the portal does is to move it to central locations, so you can already submit these reports right now. [inaudible] will be impacted, if and when these definitions would change. But it's not necessary.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: We had a couple of links here that I took out because we changed the abuse compliance subteam section so much, I believe the contracts probably do depend on definition and reporting though?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: My proposal here would be abuse definition reporting is first [inaudible] contracts agreements, that's required for compliance to step in in some cases, but not all of them. And then the incentivization that is also contract related. I'm not sure if I want to put something there. Denise, Kerry Ann, Norm?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we have to, because the incentives have to be based on the contracts.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: In the contract, yes. I think this is okay.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But the incentivization is related to the contract. It may not be embedded. It could be our program implemented as a separate thing.

you can have incentive programs that's not embedded. It's related to it though. It may not just be embedded in it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, remove it or not? The arrow. [How could it be are not] the fee structures in the contracts?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, then we're saying reduce the fees if you do these good things?

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So how does abusive naming fit into all of that? Are there any other dependencies? The rest of these are all totally floating and independent? Yes.

BOBAN KRSIC: No, they aren't. I see dependence between abuse report portal and maybe the abuse definition and reporting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: They said, no, we can move the current reporting system to a central portal and then continue to argue about the naming. Or the definitions, sorry.

BOBAN KRSIC: Okay. But I still see the dependency.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I suspect that what we have is a methodology issue.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [No, don't go there.]

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, does an arrow mean that something has to happen first or that something has input into something else? Because those are both forms of dependencies.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, I think it means that you can't implement the thing that's being pointed to.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I think I'm calling out that we should explicitly state that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's no point doing the disaster recovery if you haven't done the three boxes above it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So Russ, I think looking at this list then, that would be a very extreme sort of dependency graph which I think is fair. But I think we wind up with this where a lot of these things can really be done independent.

If you really want to build some structure – I think it's fine to say that you can do these things in parallel with each other or choose your own adventure, but if you really want to start to build a connected graph, I think you have to have a looser relationship and something that says which of these inform the other one, then you can start building extra edges in, if that's what you want. Or you could just simply say not everything has to point somewhere?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Not everything has to point somewhere is what I think.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: And for the sake of the discussion, which is really how I primarily see this graph, we don't have to have solid lines. If we have a dotted line to something, that just implies a different connection, and I think that's probably okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is to inform the prioritization discussion. It's not a deliverable [in its own right.]

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right, so if we have solid lines, then that implies a much stronger relationship and would inform the prioritization.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Just noting there seem to be comments in chat. Are they old?

RUSS HOUSLEY: What are you talking about?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: In Zoom, I can see chat.

NORM RITCHIE: Laurin, I looked, they're all old.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Thanks.

NAVEED BIN RAISE: Do we need to have a differentiation between a weak dependency versus a strong dependency, kind of a must or a should? So some modules might be implemented but better to implement the

dependent one first to get that. And the others might never be there once you don't do the prereq of it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you find that helpful to the prioritization discussion, then we can put it in. I don't have an opinion one way or the other.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: you can see where I did add a dotted line instead of a solid line. That's probably the easiest way to differentiate some of that. I'm guessing that policies, agreements and activities with registrars and registries links to contracts.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You mean dotted?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I don't know.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know, I'm asking too.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: It links to all the things [that kind of had flowed] after it, because we spoke about policies generally that would affect the relationship. So it links to a few of the others. They're all connected.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [Will you] also recommend that the contract require participation in DAAR? So, is that a solid line or a dotted line? Tell me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Dotted.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. From DAAR to contracts.

STEVE CONTE: I'm sorry, you're saying that DAAR can't happen unless the contracts and agreements are in place? Because DAAR's happening now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, that's why we made it dotted, because the contracts and agreements are going to require them to participate in DAAR as we just went through one of these things.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, so when you say contracts in the ICANN context, people are thinking of ICANN's contracts with registrars and registries. ICANN's contract with registrars and registries by and large have nothing to do with the data that's collected. ICANN collects that data from a variety of security and other related vendors.

                       So the rate limiting issue – the way that DAAR was structured, they get data from the vendors, a number of vendors, aggregate that, report on

it, but they're publicly reporting on much less data than they actually have, and have made a strategic, legal decision, not to provide any further level of detail in that data, which is part of the due diligence that the subgroup did on all of this.

So there was quite a big disconnect between the detailed briefing we received from Dave Piscitello when the SSR2 group started and what the intent and what the numerous stated intentions of DAAR were and what ICANN Org has told the various constituencies about the data that would be provided and the data that's actually being provided. It is really of no utility to entities in the ICANN community that are interested in being informed for policy setting purposes, for security, cybersecurity decisions, other things like that. So that's the heart of that recommendation, and perhaps it needs to be clarified.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we don't need the dotted line?

DENISE MICHEL: Well, I could og on for another 15 minutes about it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That is the conclusion.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, if it's a dotted line to ICANN contracts with registrars and registries, then no.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you.

ZARKO KECIC: DAAR is a tool, and it is independent collection of abuse data, but maybe it is related just partially, not fully, compliance doesn't rely on DAAR, but having DAAR into compliance part is really important. So somehow, maybe [test line.]

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's a good point, Zarko. And in fact, it's somewhere in our recommendations, we note that compliance should incorporate DAAR data in its work. So there should be a dotted line to ICANN Compliance. Good catch.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: Just asking for the technical persons, should there be a dotted line between the abusive name and the abusive definition and reporting?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Russ, we wrote that, and it's one of those where –

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Yes. So it's one of those where there could be an impact, but they're not related in the way that one needs to be done for the other. So that would be the appropriate relationship here.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: At the end of the day, they're all sort of related. That's why they fit in this group. So I don't want us to get so wrapped up in having to put a line somewhere. They're all SSR, we've got that part.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alright, so now assuming that this is good enough for us to do the next exercise, which is trying to figure out which of these are high priority to implement and which are medium and which are low. None are low? I would argue otherwise, but we'll see. The easiest ones are probably low, which his sadly the realization I had the other day.

KC CLAFFY: When was say high, medium, low, are we using the same definitions as CCT? Or if not, can we clarify what we're using this as?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, that's what I was thinking we would do, because that's what's coming out in the guidelines. But we can, since we're not bound to those guidelines, to do our own thing. But that's what I had in mind.

ZARKO KECIC: What's in the guidelines? To use CCT's definition?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, got it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: If we don't have to reinvent that wheel, then let's not.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would argue that the C-suite thing is extremely urgent, and a whole bunch of things that we are recommending depend upon it. And we should make it a highest priority, and then we'll see what else. I don't know how you want to do this, mark them bold or something?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I was just pondering how I can display and take notes at the same time. I was going to go back to the recording.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you find the colors that we currently have important?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: They have to do with the Work Stream.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, they just have to do with the Work Streams, and it helps with how the human brain – if I'd made them all the same thing, you wouldn't have been able to read it. It's just how brains work.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so what else needs to be high? I assume some of this compliance stuff is pretty high. Okay, contracts and agreements? Let's make that one green. And anything that it has a dependency on.

BOBAN KRSIC: I propose the security C-suite should also be a high priority.

RUSS HOUSLEY: C-suite is the high priority, that's why it's green.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I apologize in advance if anyone's colorblind, because I didn't check these colors against that.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Could we define the color scheme? And then we do the rest.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, right now the color scheme says what Work Stream produced that.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: [inaudible] importance then.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's unimportant of this exercise, but that's what it was. Now we've made three high priority ones green.

                        The three green boxes we have just decided are high priority.

KC CLAFFY: I think high priority should be red.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I agree with KC. Red, yellow, green would work.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Not yellow because one of them's starting yellow.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Okay, make it red.

KC CLAFFY: Presumably we're not going to keep two [inaudible] we're going to get rid of the Work Stream –

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're not going to use this figure at all as far as I can tell. We're just trying to use it as a tool.

KC CLAFFY: Fine. I apparently went to take a break at the wrong time so I have no idea what we're doing right now, but I'm trying to hang on.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're trying to decide which of these are high, medium and low priority for our implementation guidance.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yesterday, we heard Zarko argue that the DNS test could be deleted, so I would argue that means it's low. [inaudible] Okay, let's make it low. I was about to say we had the same discussion about the IANA portal. Does that mean it goes to green? No? Why? I'm asking you.

KC CLAFFY: Is that the complaint portal?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, the complaints portal is something else. This is the one that says do [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: Okay, got it.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can I ask that we please don't use that shade of red? It may sound – seriously, it hurts.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can we make the IANA portal green and make the abuse portal – Is that medium or high? Medium? Okay. Green. I had Boban.

BOBAN KRSIC: I have a question for the methodology of this work that we do at the moment. So we tried to put them in three clusters? The first one is high priority to implement it, or to review it, or what to do with it?

RUSS HOUSLEY: To implement.

BOBAN KRSIC: And what does it mean from a timeline?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that depends on the recommendation.

BOBAN KRSIC: Yeah, but –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead, Laurin.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: As much as I hate to say this, I think we should think about what this means in some terms, because Boban was just saying, what does it mean if this abuse report portal is medium?

BOBAN KRSIC: Is it critical to SSR? That's what I think when I prioritize something.

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

BOBAN KRSIC: When I say, okay, there's a high priority, we have to implement it because it's critical to the function of – and when you ask me, abuse portal, it's slow. So there's no criticality if we don't implement it, and [I really don't need it.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so you're arguing it should be high?

BOBAN KRSIC: No, low, because from the risk perspective, [inaudible] criticality. What does it mean for the criticality and the functionality for the SSR or for the DNS and such stuff?

ZARKO KECIC: Doesn't that depend what you think the use of that portal will be? If that portal is used by white hat operation security folks to help negate or prevent DNS abuse, then it will have an impact on harm.

BOBAN KRSIC: I thought it's only a reporting mechanism, nothing else.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can I propose that priority is always going to be subjective? And that one thing we could do is we could prioritize level of effort. We could simply say lower level of data, like what do we think would be a bigger job, a smaller job? And then we could let people decide for example shortest job for scheduling would be the fastest way to implement. But we could let people decide for themselves what they think is important. [Give them some data.]

BOBAN KRSIC: From the budget point of view, I'm with you, but only from the budget and the invest point. So we need resource to implement it, and then we can decide, okay, is it high or low with the priority or with the time, or

with resources? But when we take a look at the criticality, that's the main issue or the main point how I would like to prioritize it or how I prioritize such things.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I just think that would be very subjective.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, it's true. It would be good if each of these could be tied to whatever harm it is we think that we're trying to prevent by having the recommendation implemented, and then you have to figure out harm to whom, and then somehow quantify the expected harm if the recommendation is not done. We're not doing any of that.

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: I'm just thinking, can we at least in the discussion think about something like four security ratings, critical, important, moderate, low? Something like that. There are definitions attached to that which we might be able to adapt for our use. So [inaudible] flaws that could be easily exploited, that kind of stuff, and base it around something like that so there is language that clarifies what we're doing here.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: But then what would you do if DNS testbed – that could just be like nominally everything's low until you justify that it's higher, but I think what we might wind up with is that's a scheme that may not be an appropriate scheme for some of these recommendations, and then the

mapping might then also not survive. It might not be very rigorous. Look at compliance function. Well, maybe that's a bad example. Like policies, agreements, activities with registrars and registries. It might be hard to map that to a severity rating. It might be very important, and I guess what I was trying to say before is it might have a different level of importance to some people depending on where they sit in the organization than to others.

We've covered a lot of ground, which I think is a good thing, but it means a canonical taxonomy for all of our stuff is going to be very difficult.

NAVEED BIN RAISE: I'm just thinking about the rationale behind using these high, medium, like is it a binding on us or specifying, or this is because what's happened with CCT review team? Or because high depends on from which perspective you're looking at in terms of resources you need, in terms of the time that it requires to implement, in terms of its criticality, in terms of the risk associated with doing that, it depends on a lot of things, and when we say high, medium and low, we need to clearly define what they mean. And then somebody could argue on our definition and it's a kind of vicious circle we can enter into.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand that. The board is asking which of your recommendations is most important that we implement, and that's what the high, medium, low is supposed to be. Laurin?

LAUREEN WEISSINGER: Eric, exactly that is – what you're saying, I think this is exactly why we have to have a conversation. And this is also what I take away from Naveed's comments. We do have to have some way of categorizing this if we want to have a categorization.

So this is the point, we agreed to have categories. If we have categories, there has to be more behind them than us just shouting, okay, this is super important.

One of the things we could do is not to think about impact severity or something like that, but to think about something like how much harm could be caused if this was not to be done.

Obviously, this depends on where you stand [in the system,]I don't disagree, but we can have as a group a discussion about, okay, what do we think how much harm there is, and what's [inaudible]? This can then be criticized, but at least we can say, look, this is the approach we took, this is what we discussed, and these are the four categories we use, and that's what it's based on.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think that the more we stretch on this, the less utility it has. I also think it could be less helpful than doing nothing, for example, if we put a mapping together that doesn't actually give us some advantages. So like you said, if it doesn't stand up to scrutiny, then we really should be sure we want to do it. I remember early on, we started prioritizing low, medium, high, in recommendations when they were still forming, and [I think] it made sense then, but now that they formed, I guess I just

want to have a clear understanding of why we're doing it. A couple people have said we're clearly not going to be the ones implementing this, so we either need to think through the would-be implementations, but we're not going to be doing the implementations, to think through what the level of effort would be, or the ultimate form that they'll take if implemented to know how good they'll be.

I'm just saying there's a lot of question marks here, and so for us to decide to categorize them, we should just have a really good reason we want to do that. And I think cases where there are clear dependencies, those are good places to say, yeah, you probably should prioritize this one over the other because it has to come first. Other than that, I really think there's going to be a big set of motivations that the implementers are going to have in front of them that we're not going to be aware of right here. So sometimes, prioritizing early just makes it more difficult later.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, I wanted to say something that Laurin mentioned, because we're doing SSR review, and all the recommendations should be leaning towards SSR and how important are into SSR – getting to better security, stability and resiliency of the systems, and I fully agree with Laurin how and what impact will have some recommendation and what impact will have if we don't that or – actually, if ICANN don't do that. So that's priority over here. In terms of resources and time frame, I don't see why some recommendation that needs less resources and time

should have higher priority than some other which will take substantial time and resources.

NAVEED BIN RAISE: I just want to go back to the fact that considering the board asked us to tell them what should be implemented first, but again, as I said before, it depends on many factors, like the criticality, the time it requires. For example, we say something to them but they say that, okay, we started but it took us or it will take us three years just to implement that, and they would not do anything else it means, or things like that. Something that requires more cost, and we say that this is critical, and again we will enter into the same thing.

So to me, it is better not to prioritize them as high, medium or low, rather to give an order of the implementation, like this has to be done first and second and third, or there's some recommendations that could be implemented in parallel. So we can provide a table like this that already implicitly prioritized things, like this has to be done first and second and third, irrespective of how much time it takes or how many resources we should never think about while proposing something.

BOBAN KRSIC: [I hear in the] report of the CCT review and they have only [inaudible] priority level, so they say high priority must be implemented within 18 months of the issuance of final report, medium must be implemented in 36 months, and low priority must be implemented prior to the start

of the next CCT review. So it's only a timebound and nothing else, and when we are talking about critical, we have to define it or when we have another methodology that we would like to follow.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: When Russ and I first started talking about prioritization exercise, because I know there was definitely some pushback against doing it, my point – since I want this to be a successfully received report – is if you give them an unordered list, then they will cherry pick what they want to do. This is your only opportunity to influence the board in making the decisions that they do. I don't think you can make them – but at least you can influence. To have that influence, you have to set that priority.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, so let's remember what this is coming out of. It's coming out of 100+ Work Stream 2 accountability recommendations that haven't been touched yet, it's coming out of 30, 40 CCT recommendations, six of which were accepted, 17 pending, 14 pushed over to other community groups. ICANN's got a DDoS attack of recommendations against them, so they need a way out of this mess.

So they put in these new operating standards, which we're the last review group that will not use them because apparently, the community ratified them. I'm not sure if they read them, but they ratified them. I find them a little scary, because I think they're asking – ICANN's essentially pushing [the] responsibility for figuring out the

relative cost of implementing these – the recommendations [like in other] review teams – on the review teams [or there'll] be a joint meeting between the review team and the board.

So I don't actually think that the new operating standards are going to work, but we haven't seen them yet. I'm also on the first review team that's going to use them, the ATRT3 agreed to use them. So in lieu of us not using them – and I'm anticipating, because we're not using them, one way that ICANN will handle our recommendations is they'll say, well, these are not under the new operating standards, so we need to find a way to navigate them since we're all operating under the new operating standards now. Because this is going to be six months out. By that time, the operating standards will have been in place for a year. So I think we need to worry about that.

Second, part of the same concern is that really, these are board-level risk assessments on deciding which of these things to do first, and I'm uncomfortable doing that job for them. In any event, the world could change in six months by the time they actually get this report, and a different fire could be burning brighter at that time. So I really think all we can do is attach the risk to the recommendation.

And we can't even quantify that risk. We don't have the data, we don't have the expertise, we don't have the time. If ICANN's future is relying on a volunteer committee to do risk assessments for it and we're three years late already with our report, we're doomed anyway.

So I agree with Eric, we can't really prioritize these. And I think it's not appropriate for us to take that responsibility for prioritizing them,

although I agree with Heather; to the extent that we want to influence what happens, we can be articulate about the risks that we see, and acknowledge to what extent they could be quantified or not, assuming that we cannot do the quantification in any case, but ICANN could. Done.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I did what I usually do, I prepared some text. For example – and this is not something we have to follow, but this is just an idea of what I can see.

If we choose to prioritize, which we're now putting into question, at least some people, we can do something like, okay, we do critical, important, moderate impact and lower impact recommendations. And the critical is something like that is given to recommendations that have to be implemented immediately, as quickly as possible, and thoroughly to avoid something like a severe compromise with security, stability and resiliency.

Important would only be you have to do it quickly and thoroughly, because this could lead to a compromise. Moderate would go down, so this should be implemented to ensure that the provision of SSR and anti-abuse going forward is taken care of, and then lower impact would be something – there's an issue that has an impact on SSR, and that's it. So we have something that we can go by.

And for example, we can say that C-suite is critical because we really think if there's no one to oversee this whole security stuff, this can have

severe consequences and can lead to massive issues. Just as an example. I really think if we do it, we have to have a definition.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Laurin. Yes, I agree. KC, just to address a few points that you made, I wouldn't say at all that these operating standards were ratified by the community, the staff put out various iterations, some community groups commented on them, an d as is the usual process at ICANN, the comments were not really addressed, and on the process, moved and then the board declared them final. So if it makes a difference to ATRT3, I think that workflow is important to note.

I agree with you, it attempts to move a significant and unrealistic burden on volunteers to do detailed analysis and implementations and budgets and risks and other things that are really not appropriate, that are more appropriate for the board to turn around and direct the staff to do that work and come back to the board, and if appropriate, to the review team as well. I can't remember what other points –

KC CLAFFY: Can I respond to that? I'm not going to talk about ATRT3 right now, but I think we can achieve our goals and move forward here by focusing on attaching the recommendation to the finding, which we need to do anyway, and we can have a sentence in there about what is the risk that we think this recommendation is trying to address.

And I believe if we do that, I think we should do that first and then come back and have this conversation again, because I think it'll be a lot

easier once we look at the risks that we're trying to mitigate to sort them in priority order. Like if one of them is an existential risk for ICANN, we can go ahead and put it at the top.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and do that – the next steps when we actually draft the report. I agree with that. And also, I wanted to note that this team is meeting with the board SSR review caucus in a couple of days, and so KC, I think that point you raised about us moving towards the end of our cycle while the board's proposing new ways of doing these reviews is an uncomfortable fit. We should raise this issue with the board, because personally, I think there's some clarity we can bring to be responsive to some of the issues, but to wholesale change the approach three quarters of the way through our work.

I don't find it reasonable, and especially not if it in any way extends the life of this group at all. so I think we need to have just a really upfront conversation about you've got new protocols, new templates and we are three quarters of the way through our work. So that's a conversation I think we need to have with the board caucus.

KC CLAFFY: Wait, hold on, [inaudible] I don't think we should be changing the way we do our work. I was just trying to get underneath what these guidelines that Russ mentioned earlier are coming from, and will try to keep our eye on that.

And back to what Boban said, CCT uses three categories, high, medium, low, and they're really time bounded categories, 18 months, six months. I thought one was prerequisite to a new round of gTLDs or something like that. So again, I think we can do two things. We can have one risk sentence in each recommendation or each finding, wherever we want to put it, maybe that's what ties them together, and then we have the category that CCT is using, the high, medium, low.

And then we come back and see if prioritization falls out of that, but I think all we're obligated is those three categories. And whether it's short, medium, long may not be a function of priority, it may be that something just has a timebound on it.

So the testbed may be needed really mostly when we do the next key roll or something. I'm making that up. But it's less important than if the RAA contracts expire in six months and there's an opportunity there to fix some of that. That's a short-term thing just because of the nature of the environment. But again, I think we could have this conversation much more efficiently after we wrote all the recommendations down and tied them to findings and risks.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: KC, I agree with the approach and I agree that it should be done at the end, but I think it's still critical that we – I know it's still tossed up as to whether prioritization should be done at the end or not once we've done the findings correlation, but I think it's important at some point we should say what we think, having done all of this review, is important to be done, [something] at the end. Even if it's risk-based or

based on the definitions that Laurin suggested or what Boban suggested, I think it would be remiss of us not to – at the end of all of our analysis to say, hey, this is critical. And for me, I don't think any of what we've done should be saying, "Okay, this is less critical, but at least the ones that are really important to us, we should highlight somewhere, however it's done."

KC CLAFFY: I agree.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I just wanted to say I put what I had in a Google doc. Don't worry about specific text –

RUSS HOUSLEY: Why?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Why?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Because I didn't want to do it in the one that already existed. But I just feel, if we have something like that, we can kind of say yes, this applies or not, because we will get asked why is this a critical recommendation, and then what do we say if we don't have a way to define it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] to what KC said, once we've done the analysis, tying the findings with the recommendations and the risk associated, then this becomes more relevant.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I completely agree. And if you read the text, I think this also comes out – has to be implemented immediately because there's a risk of severe compromise for example.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, but I think what KC's pointed out is a big difference between what is that – like you have to be able to explain it and define it. KC, if I understood what she was saying correctly, was basically saying let's go and understand and be able to explain why we've done that, why we've rated it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, we have to get our data first, so going down the list and looking at the names and saying this was probably a severe criticality and this is how we define [severe], is not the same thing as saying "This is severe because …" That's what we're going to be called on, and that's what we have to start with. That's basically getting the data first.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: What Eric just explained, we already have the findings, so when we go through and attach the findings to the recommendations – and we've flagged it then – the prioritization as to what is critical, important, moderate, so you define the risk, is there a risk or not? You look at the recommendation, you look at the findings, is there a risk or not? Checked.

Then when it comes to whether or not that risk is critical or whether it's tolerable or not, that has to be done after. So I think we're all in agreement.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think this is orthogonal.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible].

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Absolutely not. If you want to, go ahead.

KC CLAFFY: I guess maybe this started from that flowchart-y picture thing where we tried to sort those bubbles into priority, but those bubbles are – it would be easier to sort the bubbles if they were risks and there was actual fire coming out them. No, I'm kidding. Because I think that they're too abstract as labels on those ovals to figure out how to prioritize them,

for me anyway. So I'm wondering if we have to do that now, or can we postpone that part?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm just wondering that the notion of criticality and importance or impact changes with time and priorities might be different. So we can just provide a rationale behind a recommendation of why we think it's important, but maybe by the time the report is published, that might not be the main priority of how it should be implemented. So that's why I repeat what I said earlier, that that might be orthogonal with this effort, but we need to provide an order in which the recommendations should be implemented so that implicitly, as I said before, provides the nature of criticality and importance of the recommendation because the others might be dependent on them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So can we put the figure back up for a second? Maybe not.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So I note that we very quickly came to the top three without any argument about definitions, and then we started looking for what's low, and that's where we got bogged down.

We already have gone through [past] that said if we can't map it to the strategic objectives of the organization, it doesn't even get on the list. So maybe we have three highs and the rest are medium. Is it that simple?

BOBAN KRISC: It's super simple, but I think at the end when the board will come up with a question, okay, and what about priorities? Because they requested it and they say we need something, and [I don't want to discuss this] [inaudible] with them.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understand why they want it, and I think that we very quickly came to the top three, which I find very assuring in some way.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think it makes a lot of sense that we did this immediately, because we have conducted this review and we've been talking about this. At the same time, we have to provide a reasoning, because they will ask us why, and then we have to be able to say these are super important because they mitigate this really important risk, or whatever approach we choose. So this is my problem with just saying those matter, because this is [intelligible] to us but not to someone outside of this team. To those people, we have to be able to explain our prioritization, our choice. That's also why I'm not sure we want to put everything else as medium. This will be harder to do, but I think we do have to make some choices here as well. Otherwise, let's say we have more than two

categories, [then it's like,] why do you have more than two categories if there are no lows or no moderates or whatever?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I think we are looking from different perspective to me why board might be interested in something like this is because they would like to invest in resources and the time of the ICANN Org, but we are looking at it from the perspective of criticality to the SSR system, so that I think before we decide anything related to that, both we and the board should look at it with the same eyes so as to reach to the same thing, because we might say that something is critical because of its importance or medium because of its importance, but they might see it as they did with CCT review, that because something is too costly, they say we cannot do it, for example.

So they don't see it from that perspective as they understood when we met them before. So I think we need to be on the same page in terms of why they need it.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I would like to make a suggestion. Is this critical for tomorrow? Because I would suggest that the fact that we have so much discussion around it, I don't think we'll come to an agreement in time for tomorrow. Tomorrow, it's about presenting high-level, and just getting a feel from the community on our recommendations. And I think the exe3rcise would be best served, as KC probably suggested, closer to when we see the full document.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If we get to the question from the community that says, have you prioritized these, we simply say not yet.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: We could say not yet because we want to ensure we get community feedback in order to see what the community feels about recommendations as they are, and then determine based on that, or analysis of our own findings, because it can't just be on [what they say, because] we have research to support it. We'll take their considerations in order to do that exercise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: anyone have a problem with that approach?

KC CLAFFY: I don't have a problem with that approach, although I find Russ' comment compelling that we came to the top three quickly. I don't know if we really did, because I don't know how many other ones would end up in the top if we actually processed them all. I think we only processed a few and then we got into this meta conversation for a long time.

But one comment on Denise or what Kerry says, I really like that idea, but given what's happening with DNS abuse, we might also think about mentioning that it is a high priority recommendation for us just to see what happens, because this week I think is going to be a lot of people saying, "Oh, we're doing this about DNS abuse."

And I want to make sure that our report isn't short circuited by that, that if we just say DNS abuse is somewhere in there, it may not get as much attention as if we say DNS abuse and reporting is near the top. If it's near the top, I think you might get – I don't know. it's something to think about. I'm perfectly okay with either way, sort of listing all the recommendations and saying here's the three that seem to have drifted to the top thus far, and we're looking for feedback on that.

But I definitely hope we get feedback on whether there's going to be enough talk about what different stakeholders are planning to do about DNS abuse in the next six months so that we can make sure the report isn't obsolete by the time it gets published. That's all.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: [inaudible] understand where KC is coming from, I think the DNS subjects are a different conversation, which I think as we get closer to finalizing the report, those on the team that are closer to that discussion can ensure that it's relevant when we finally click "print." That makes sense.

KC CLAFFY: Fair enough.

DENISE MICHEL: I don't agree that those are the three top priorities. Just personally, there are more discussions needed than I really agree that part of our discussion with the community should be quizzing them on what they think the priorities are, because I think that would be really useful to factor in.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: In violent agreement with all of that, I would just like to suggest that we pay close attention to what people use to explain what their high priorities are, because I think rather than hearing what their actual priorities are, we should start to build an understanding of how people in the community are going to prioritize things in general, the extent to which we can then use that as a guide when we do our prioritization will be critical instead f coming up with something all on our own.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we've decided not to prioritize now but to listen to the community and do that toward the end of the meeting or on the calls starting thereafter. Okay, Heather, you have some slides.

KC CLAFFY: Can I make a request or a comment?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You may. Sure, go ahead.

KC CLAFFY: In SSAC when we get to this point when we've got a bunch of bubbles on the slide and we need to prioritize them, we do a survey of the group , ICANN staff sets it up for us and we all go off and prioritize them overnight and we come back the next day and talk about the sorting that happened. I wonder if we could do that, because I feel like we spent more time in meta land than actually talking about why one bubble should be above another one.

So before we go into the calls post-ICANN meeting, maybe we could all do a survey and then look at the results and start there.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Just to follow on that, if we do that, I'd like to put a bid in that we do ranked ballot voting so that we don't literally have to put things at – we can compare them to each other, but if we do that.

DENISE MICHEL: But not now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think we're going to do that after this week. But it would be interesting, Jennifer and Negar, if you could find out how SSAC does that, whether there's a tool we can take advantage of. Okay, over to Heather for a quick look at the slides so you can think about this, talk about it through dinner, and at 9:00 tomorrow morning in 515A, we can start working on these slides for tomorrow afternoon.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Happy to walk you through it. I just want to make sure you all understand I'm not doing the presentation tomorrow.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We can fix that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Moving on, so we have I think what are fairly usual intro slides. I want to give a shoutout to Jennifer for helping put these in the ICANN template as opposed to one that I made up. Review team names, where we are in the review process. I think we're supposed to have a checkmark on "conduct review."

RUSS HOUSLEY: We're still doing …

HEATHER FLANAGAN: We're still planning? Okay. Leaving it.

DENISE MICHEL: [It's really misleading.]

HEATHER FLANAGAN: You know, I don't care about that so much as I care about –

DENISE MICHEL: We're not planning, we're actually doing review. We have been for quite some time. So if we could just change that slide, please.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is also so much misleading in terms of the time that it requires to do something. It appears as if we are in the start of the process.

KC CLAFFY: Guys, the box right there does mean you're in the middle of conducting the review. If you check it, it means you're done.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Fair enough.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's why it's green.

KC CLAFFY:	That's what all the other webpages are doing now. And the timing, again, all the other ICANN webpages that do reviews use this template. Let's not muck with that right now, let's move on.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	It's demoralizing.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	"You've had three years and you're still not even on box three yet, what's wrong with you people?"
KC CLAFFY:	Let's make it red and put fire coming out of that box.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	A spinning wheel of fire. That'll be good.
ERIC OSTERWEIL:	Yes, and this is from someone in California.
DENISE MICHEL:	The fires are over.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	We'll have a Johnny Cash moment. Okay, ICANN's strategic plan, this is something that you all did where you tied most but not all of the recommendations back to strategic plan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We will by the time we're done.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm just saying you hadn't done it yet. You have your Work Stream areas as defined at the start of the project, I think. We have a table that highlights that there were 28 SSR1 recommendations that were evaluated. 27 were considered still relevant, none were considered fully implemented, 26 are partial, two were not.

We have a summary for – this is really for the SSR1 stuff, so we'll want to change the title on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We also did some merging.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, I haven't fixed this slide yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, just the merging we did yesterday.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes, we did that yesterday. That is reflected farther down, implementation. So the very first one, of course, is finish what SSR1 told you to do. Then recommendation 9, which is the summary of the revised text. I took out all of the "ICANN shoulds" because I thought that

was rather implicit in the fact that these are slides about what ICANN should do. And with that, I also went ahead and removed the full text because given how much we've expanded some of these things, you wouldn't be able to read it.

We had merged SSR1 recommendation 15 into the 12 and 16 text, so that has been done here. We have the budget transparency. We kind of ate recommendation 22, sort of combined in here and sort of [made to] go away. It was a little unclear to that which was more accurate.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you're going to add 22 up there?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I can. And we'll fix this tomorrow, and then 27, risk management. So these slides were, from here down, the slides were based on the text that was in place on Friday morning before we started touching things, so there's a lot of updating that I need to do here around what's in Work Stream 2, what we changed about the C-suite. I'm not sure I finished that one yet. Security risk management, and so on.

That's what we're looking at in terms of a deck. Disaster recovery, we still need to put in business continuity information, that still needs to come in here. Work Stream 3, that's going to have the most work done in the slides tomorrow because of the sheer amount of work that the subteam did today. So good job on getting that done, but you can just see from the original outline how much is going to have to change in here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And then futures.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, scrolling down we've got futures, there's going to be a few changes in here as well since we want to add the DOH stuff. One point of interest, it doesn't really matter to anything. I don't know if you noticed, but I alphabetized it all because I'm kind of OCD that way. That's not going to stand in the future set of recommendations because I think especially with the abuse and compliance subteam, your stuff has a logical flow that's more important than alphabetization. So if anyone else gets anxious about seeing things alphabetized and then suddenly not in a section, that's why that's happening.

I do not have the suggestions in here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's fine.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: We do have a wrap up where we can perhaps use that as an opportunity to ask about what the community thinks of the work done and the highest priority thing that they think they heard. Questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How long is the session?

RUSS HOUSLEY: 90 minutes. Yeah, it'll take 90 minutes to go through the slides.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm afraid so.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: We've got to spend a lot of time tomorrow getting this message to the point where we can actually get feedback in the hall. I don't know, you two are racing for the same tent.

DENISE MICHEL: I have another meeting to go to. If you want to e-mail those around, I'm happy to give you some additional comments. I'm also booked tomorrow morning, but will be joining you a little bit later.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I'll resend the link. I think I had sent it out before, but I more than happy to send that again. I'm a little hesitant to say dive in and make changes, because there's so many changes that we already know just have to happen just from a mechanical perspective.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I want to say thanks for doing the slides how you've done it, succinctly. I'd want to caution the group not to make too many edits in the slides but to make notes for the comments during the meeting, because it would substantially change the recommendation in the document. So I would caution us against trying to do that because if we change – I think it's to look at the slides, make mental notes, and we do it together here, because if we start messing with the slides, it means that we're messing with the recommendations, and I don't want it to be a mismatch. That's my fear.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, absolutely. Just because I'm leaving now, I have other things going on tomorrow morning, I would like to just send notes on the slides. But they're already on the e-mail list.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: No, they're not.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Did we not send these out?

DENISE MICHEL: Anyway, I'm happy to share notes tonight for you to use tomorrow morning if you give me the slides. Thanks.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: I think that probably [refers to the] slide number, comments on the slide based on that's referring to the slide number, but I'd really not want to be dealing with …

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, the slide numbers are absolutely going to change.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: You're changing that tonight?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, it depends on how long dinner is, but quite probably. I'm going to work on this until dinner.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: But the slides have headers.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The slides have headers, yes.

KERRY ANN BARRETT: So probably comments based on the headers, so we all have a universal way to comment on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that we're down to like ten minutes anyway.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: 144.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right, as of this minute, there are 54, but again, that's going to change significantly. I think I'm going to go ahead and take out the full text components because right now, [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we have to.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Those are coming out, but then all of the new recommendations that were added today will be added in.

NORM RITCHIE: If we had the time, I'd suggest full text and a backup deck [in point form] to present, but I don't know if we have time to do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That was the intent, to have a bullet form and then the full text so that someone who read it after the briefing would have it, but I don't know, we can just stick a URL to a Google doc in there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: My original deck actually did that by hiding all of the full text slides, but that doesn't translate well into a Google slide deck and at this point – you will end up with things worse than that, and I don't think that …

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: But we will.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, please think about this. Looking forward to dinner. I understand at least one of you can't make it. So thank you for the time, we'll be meeting again tomorrow. We have a lot to do yet this week. Thank you so much. I know I'm exhausted. I'm sure you are too. Thank you.

STEVE CONTE: Just as a reminder, everyone, tonight is daylight savings time and we're going to fall back one hour. So most phones will probably catch that, but you get an extra hour tonight for sleep.

KC CLAFFY: Laurin, text me whatever you want me to do.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So I shall be jetlagged by one more hour so it will be nine hours.

STEVE CONTE: Brought to you by ICANN.

NORM RITCHIE: It happens at 2:00 so 2:00 goes back to 1:00, so you just keep going.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: KC, I heard my name. I think it's easier you write to me.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I was just saying you text me whatever you want me to do for tomorrow.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Will do.

KC CLAFFY: Thanks. Bye, guys.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019