
BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone, this is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call #98 on the 22th of January, 2020, at 1500 UTC. The members attending the call are Danko, Laurin, Ram, Russ, Eric, Alain, Steve, Norm, KC, Matogoro and from ICANN Org we have Jennifer, Negar, Steve, and Brenda. I have no apologies at this time. Technical writer Heather is on the call and the meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I'll turn the meeting over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSELY: Thank you. Thanks everyone for the hard work that happened at the end of last week and Heather, thank you so much for the work that you did over the weekend and early this week to get us a clean document in time for this call. We greatly appreciate it and shedding 20 pages, that's pretty impressive. Thank you. Maybe the first thing to do is for Heather to tell us how she shed those 20 pages to speed the review.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Sure, happy to do that. So, this is Heather Flanagan. What I did to the document was basically a couple of key things. First, you'll notice that the table that contains a summary of the recommendations is significantly shorter. One of the things I noticed during our meetings is that when people were presented with that table, the very first thing, no one reacted particularly well to that.

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.

So, I combined modifying that with KC's request that rather than treating each section as a short one or two word descriptive title, to actually turn it into the short sentence that summarizes the recommendation and that's now what's in that table, and all the gory details have been pulled out. That was the majority of the shortening of the document.

The next biggest chunk that was changed, it wasn't removed, but it was changed, as you will notice that the abuse and compliance section is within the body of the document significantly shorter. I took the research that had been done, which is actually quite excellent research, and moved it to an appendix.

My concern being people were again getting lost in that instead of actually looking at the recommendations in the document itself. The next substantive change that I made, this came out of the call with the ICANN subject matter experts and I thought they made a really sensible request, and that was to number each discrete recommendation. So, for example, the SSR2 Recommendation 6 is now creative position responsible for both strategic and tactical security and risk management.

This is the C suite recommendation, and it's broken down into 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, and each of those are specific line items of things that we want ICANN to do. One of the nice things about organizing it this way was actually, it helped me be very clear about what was a recommendation versus what was a finding.

Outside of that, I tried to be very cautious, since we talked about tone, I tried to be very cautious with how I saw particularly adverbs being used, because sometimes they were a little bit more passionate than I thought the review team was kind of after. We do have a couple of things still missing. I was able to pull the strategic objectives and goals from the previous documents and apply them to particularly where the abuse and compliance recommendations split apart a little bit further.

So those are there, but I don't have strategic goals and objectives for creating legal and appropriate access mechanisms to WHOIS data. And I also don't have one for the EBERO or the CCDS Recommendations. There are a lot more citations now in here. I do think the citations still need a lot of work, but this is work I don't think is critical for public comment.

In many cases, for example, we have the citation, but it's not necessarily specific, if we're quoting something it doesn't say what page can you find that on, where in the document is that thing. And that's something I would like to change for the final copy, I'm not going to worry about it for public comment.

Other than that, and that was quite a lot, I tried not to lose at all any of the intended meaning of the text and I did not make the changes to the abuse and compliance section without passing those changes by the eyes of the abuse and compliance team and I really want to give a shout out to Denise for all the work she did and helping me clean that up, it's really appreciated.

DENISE MICHEL: Right back at you, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Other than that, we can either make this, I mean, in my mind, and of course, Russ, you may have something different in mind, we can either make this a really long call or a really short call. If people have looked at the clean copy, is that good enough for public comment?

RUSS HOUSELY: Well, that is the question we're going to get to. What I want to make sure is we have consensus, as well. So the first question, I think, is does anything Heather just explained raise any concerns? If so, speak up. Awesome.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'll do a little victory dance on the side.

RUSS HOUSELY: Oh, that might have been worth a camera. In going through the changes, did anybody find anything that they want to raise now? Do we need to go through this section by section? Or are people comfortable just saying, we're done.

JABHERA MATOGORO: I think if we go section by section, could be very good, because this is Matagoro speaking. I've gone through the document, thanks to Heather for very good work that you have condensed together, but I appreciate

if we can go page by page and then we can also give input or comments. I know we also do the same through the emails. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSELY: Anyone have a different view?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Russ, this is Laurin. Also, first of all, thank you to, Heather, this is an amazing improvement from the very messy muck of copy to what I was able to read yesterday night. I have some like general observations bit maybe it makes sense to go through the sections and if anything is over from my general observations, I can input.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, let's use the clean copy, you were sent two Google Doc URLs. So let's all go into the clean copy. And I'm assuming we can skip the Table of Contents. And we can start on page 6. Page 6 is basically what our mandate is from the bylaws.

NORM RITCHIE: Could we just put a comment in there that it's actually a summary to be added, or something like that, because I read this as the overview as part of the executive summary.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay. Heather. Did you get a response, whether we're going to add an executive summary before or just to be supplied after public comment?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I didn't hear one way or the other what was required for this. I did in a side conversation with KC and Laurin - KC, should I bring that up here?

KC CLAFFY: Yes, absolutely fine. Bring it up now, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay, so KC raised a point, her homework assignment was to review the CCT report and figure out how much was relevant to SSR2 and what we should be quoting and citing and whatnot in there, and she found a quite a bit, enough that I'm a little anxious about trying to get all of that in this document before public comment.

My suggestion was to offer an alternative, which is to add something into the introduction that says, much of what SSR2 is recommending aligns closely with the CCT report and the SSR2 review team considers many of their recommendations in line with CCT's recommendations. So, put something there, and then say the rest of the executive summary will be forthcoming after public comment.

RUSS HOUSELY: That seems fine to me. Anyone else have a concern?

DENISE MICHEL: This is Denise, yeah, I do support that as well and I have sent the list of CCT recommendations that intersect with our report, as well as the

RDS2 recommendations that intersect with our report at least a few times. I can send it again, but I would agree with the general statement and then I'm happy to, again, work on providing additional detail.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

There are the citations in there that specifically state which recommendations that is absolutely in the document. I think KC had in mind something even more.

KC CLAFFY:

Well, that's right. I mean, look, I read the CCT report really carefully on the plane. At least I read the parts that were relevant to us because it is a 200 page document. There's a lot of things I think we should model after that document. Because, some of the reasons they modeled their document that way was because the feedback they got in public comment.

So, it would be weird for us to ignore that. In particular, they have a column in the beginning table that talks about to who the recommendation is directed because I think ICANN came back and said who do you think is going to do this, to some of the recommendations. Now, of course, the columns often says, pretty much everybody, this recommendation is directed to them.

But I think it behooves us to be very clear that we understand when we think ICANN do this thing alone or when we think this is going to be the beginning of a PDP, or whatever. Indeed, there are places in the document where we say that, not in the table, but in the document.

And I don't think I agree with what we say about whether ICANN can do it alone or not.

Like, they don't have to go back to a contract negotiation process. If we're going to claim that based on what's in the bylaws, or what's in the RA or the specific contract language, we need to quote exactly what we're talking about, because I cannot be joining a consensus that says ICANN can go ahead and do this on its own when I personally couldn't defend that if somebody asked me.

So that's throughout the whole, I think we should direct the recommendations the way the CCT does in their beginning table. They also have a table, they just have a column that says, instead of a strategic objective, I don't think they care that much about that, they say who is it that we think that can do this.

The other thing that I think we really need, maybe not in the table, but we have to make it super clear and CCT has a separate section after each recommendation that says what is the metric of success. Which is also more or less what is the problem that the recommendation is trying to solve. And they're really quite succinct about it. It's pretty impressive. And I feel like we should not be issuing this report for public comment until we can be pretty clear about what is that metric that SSR3 should be looking for to decide if the recommendation was effective, because that's what their charter is going to be, presumably.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Okay, KC, are you done? This is Laurin.

KC CLAFFY:

Yep, for now.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

So this is Laurin and I wanted to say this in the end, but I'm saying it now because KC kind of brought it up. Our recommendations as they're written right now, do not fulfill our own criteria. They are not always trackable, we do not always define what needs to be done, and that is something that worries me.

Because if we give this to public comment, the issue is that on the one hand we talk about ooh, this was not trackable, they couldn't do it, blah, blah, blah, blah, and then at the same time our own recommendations, at least some of them, do not comply to the stuff we go on about and this kind of ties into another point that I consider a bit of a worry and something we might want to consider before we make a call on this, and that that the recommendations are really kind of standard.

If you read it, some of them are very short, to the point, others are really long and what I feel we would need to do would be to go through these and make sure they're all kind of as similar as they can be and they all fulfil the criteria we want them to have. I'm not sure if this is something we can do, but I'm wondering if it wouldn't make for a better report if that was done.

As a side note, because this goes into the same direction, findings, text etc, etc is also pretty imbalanced. Heather did a did a great job pulling it

together, but it's also very visible. Some stuff I feel the findings, there is too little there. We do not explain what is going on, I can think about one example which CISO position, was like, we just jump in and I think, okay, but what do they want here? Like, where they're coming from? But going back to the recommendation I think I would support KC's point here, that this needs another review.

RUSS HOUSELY:

Okay, so what I'm hearing is that we're not quite ready, but what we need to do today, then, is figure out how we're going to get from where we are, which is close to the goal line and how we're going to get it across the goal line where the goal is ready for public comment.

DENISE MICHEL:

This is Denise. I think it would be worth taking a step back and discussing process. I think the group has a collection of really strong findings and recommendations, that it would be really useful at this point to get some public feedback on. I agree that the report can be tightened up, that we can be clear on who owns recommendations, rewrite some of the recommendation so we can build in metrics and accountability, I agree with that.

But I would suggest that, one way to approach this is to put a note at the top, saying in the interest of getting feedback on the direction we're heading and the general findings and recommendations, we're posting this for public comment. Note that we will be editing this to do the following and your input and suggestions in that vein, in particular, would be useful.

I think that's a reasonable approach to take, noting that we have additional things that we're doing here, but we also want your comments and feedback on some of these elements, is a course that has been taken in the past by other review teams, including the CTT review that posted such an incomplete draft the first time for public comment that they actually posted a whole new section for an additional public comment after the first one.

So, there's lots of ways to address this and I think I'm leaning towards putting a note about the additional work will be doing and soliciting feedback now, that would allow us then to continue to work up and through Cancun to finalize all of this. Alternatively, we would need to take more time, post this at a later date, move past Cancun, and then figure out how we're going to work collectively to finish the report. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSELY:

So reactions to Denise's suggestion that we make the executive summary that says we know this is rough, these are the areas we're looking for feedback on, but we're going out for public comment now, so that we can course correct based on that view.

KC CLAFFY:

I could be convinced, but my first question is didn't we do that in Montreal? Isn't that what the whole slide deck was? And we already got some feedback?

RUSS HOUSELY: I can tell you, especially the time slot that we had, we got very little visibility.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, and only through a formal public comment process will we get formal input from a number of the key constituencies, I think several of which are waiting for our public comment post in order to weigh in on a number of these things.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is Heather. I would also suggest that we've done some pretty major changes since Montreal, maybe not in terms of intent, but I think in terms of clarity and being able to see that in context and report versus in a slide deck is a pretty big difference.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin. So, Denise, I completely see your point. And I do like the idea of saying, okay, let's do an early public comment. Now, if we had, say, two weeks to do this from now, I would say amazing, let's make some of the additions, let's kind of fiddle around with this document see what we can do, and then put it out.

One of the things I think we would be missing is the kind of mapping. I know we have something graphic, which Heather had, so if we were to do this early public comment, then something like that would have to be in there, say, look, this is how this stuff fits together, this is kind of how we see these things as being connected, etc, etc.

And then also wondering, going the CCT route completely where we push this out for public comment this week, we get something back by Cancun. We make edits in Cancun, and then essentially do a second round of public comment.

If this were to be the plan, and we would already say, look, this is what we're planning to do, I would again see this differently. Because as we all kind of know, no one reads the final, final. If we had two rounds, we would probably have people actually look at the next iteration of the public comment. Just throwing some ideas out.

KC CLAFFY:

KC, I guess I might be in the queue, I agree with everything Laurin said. I agree with Denise's premise that it would be good to get feedback sooner than later on these things, and that we all want this thing to be over with. I also have an ART2, ART3, whatever the hell it is, perspective, which is, there's two sides to this perspective.

One, they issued a report for public comment because they were on the clock, where they have to be done by April. That was not only do I think it was not ready, it was 220 pages, so I don't think anybody's going to read it. It wasn't consensus, by far, of the team. And so they issued a report saying this is a consensus, and I don't even know if they're going to get consensus on the final report.

On the other hand, to the extent that some people have read that report, they're not happy with it. In particular, the group I know it's not happy is SSAC. SSAC is frustrated with this review process so much so

that nobody even wanted to be on the review teams and the ones who were have resigned, except for me.

So, one of my concerns is yes, as to Laurin's point, nobody's going to read this document more than once. Very few people will go back and read it in the second public comment if they read it in the first, unless we were just to issue literally the table, but probably that would be unprecedented for ICANN and not the point of public comment.

So, I'm worried that we're in a situation where there's a group of people in the community that are ready to say, you know, these reviews aren't working, look at the garbage that's coming out of these reviews, and we add fuel to the fire. It's just a prospective, I'm not saying it should override the other concerns. I see both sides of this. I don't feel strongly, I'm not going to die on my sword either way here, but I just want to add that.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, does anyone else have their hand up?

JENNIFER BRYCE: There aren't any hands raised in Zoom. But yeah, please speak up if you if you want to join.

RUSS HOUSELY: So I guess we have 90 minutes to spend on this document and see how close we can get. I wonder if we can get to the point where for each recommendation we know whether it's in good shape, or we can assign

a person to fix it and then see how close we are to make the decision as to whether we're going to go now or shortly for public comment. Does that process make sense to people?

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, sorry, this is Norm. We aren't contemplating adding any additional sections or anything, are we?

RUSS HOUSELY: I don't think that's the intent.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay, so we're really just trying to assess whether we think it's good enough for draft.

KC CLAFFY: Here's another thing I'm trying to see. The Board/Org came out with these new operating procedures in the middle of all this. And part of the reason they came up with the new operating procedure is they realize that there's a crisis here, which is that they have over 300 recommendations outstanding and even if they put all of ICANN's resources into doing them, they're not going to be able to.

So, part of the operating procedure is this new rule that the review teams, not us, because we chose not to accept them, the review teams have to go prioritize and cost out the recommendations and basically give more ability to the Board or inform the Board about how we would

recommend picking and choosing over the recommendations when some are clearly not going to get done.

Okay, so in the ATRT report, and I encourage people to read it as much as they can, this team in particular, one of the ways that the report talks about things that haven't been done is, this will be solved by the new operating procedures.

Another similarly related concern is that this report goes out, the public comment goes out, and the reaction is, oh, these people are asking for way too much, they didn't cost them, they don't understand that we can't do everything, this will all be solved by the new operating procedures and it'll give us a reason to disregard or reduce the severity with which we treat these recommendations.

I understand that's not our problem, that that perception will happen or that trajectory may happen, but it is a reality, I predict, on the ground. So, I think the more that we can harden these recommendations and say this is the goal that we're trying to achieve with the recommendation and how SSR3 would measure its effectiveness, the less likely that outcome and the better it is, the more effective this whole review process is for the community.

DENISE MICHEL:

This is Denise, can I get in the queue?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Laurin also wants in the queue.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, Denise, then Laurin.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think with all due respect, I think the comments you're going to get are very strong and supportive comments to our priorities by business constituency, I suspect by SSAC, certainly by ALAC who just issued a long statement on DNS abuse that is quite in line with our recommendations. We'll get support from GAC and the public safety working group, from the electoral property constituency, from who have I left out, and a number of external parties.

They have seen some of our initial recommendations. They're supportive of the ALAC letter that just went to the Board few a weeks ago, I can send that to the list if you don't have it. So, I don't agree that the comments we're going to get is, oh, this is too much, we should just wait for a bylaw change. I think what we're going to get is additional groundswell for ICANN to finally take on these critical security issues as a priority. So, I think the time to move forward is now.

Another approach on this could be taking another week to tighten things up and then posting it. I don't know that we're actually required to post for exactly 45 days, I'm checking the bylaws, but if Staff actually knows, it would be great to hear about that, as well.

RUSS HOUSELY: I think it just says public comment period and public comment has always been 40 days, plus whatever, if you cross a meeting start.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that's not the case, actually. Public comment is whatever Staff and Board decide it needs to be. They've had much shorter public comment for much more important items and longer public comment for less important items. So it's fluid, unless the bylaws demand that we post this for 45 days then we have some flexibility.

RUSS HOUSELY: Just so you know, 40 is the number of days we use to compute that it's got to be up by Friday.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I'm just saying, unless someone has a bylaw to cite, then we've got some flexibility on the public comment timing and another approach could be to pick another week make some additional changes and then post.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Negar has her hand raised.

RUSS HOUSELY: Go ahead, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, I just wanted to clarify the requirements for public comment. As you noted the standard public comment per the policy

that has been established with the community is a 40-day public comment process. There are some nuances noted in the policy for public comment which is to elaborate, but some of the details that would be relevant to this review team is for example if public comment happens to fall over an ICANN meeting then the duration would be extended by the number of days for the ICANN meeting because community members won't be able to take that time to review anything, etc, etc.

The public comment could always be longer, not only because community may ask for an extension, the review team may decide they want to post it for a longer timeframe or the review team, for example, decided to post their draft report for public comment. For a long period, I want to say around 50 or 60 days, if I'm not mistaken, right from the get go. So a minimum of 40 days is required, longer could always be accepted and approved.

I don't think there's any problems with that. There has been one or two instances that I'm aware of where there was public consultation sought on documents and that duration was for 30 days. That wasn't an official public comment, it was just a consultation period on the document. So, the standard process is 40 days with any additional days that either the review team or per the request of the community, we'd want to add to it. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, if there's no hands, I'm back to my question, should we be going through this and figuring out which recommendations need more work or something else.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: This is Eric. Apologies if I've missed this, I suspect I probably did, does anybody comments that they're waiting to get to, like if we go page by page and I'm waiting until Page X to say why. Does anybody have anything that they've seen that they would like to go over?

RUSS HOUSELY: So, Laurin and Matogoro asked to go through this, at least Laurin admitted to having some he was waiting to get to.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Maybe should we just jump to those and Mr. Matogoro, if you have some, I couldn't tell from your email whether that was the case or not, we could just jump to those?

KC CLAFFY: KC has one too, mark up the document or we can walk through.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay, it was just a suggestion.

RUSS HOUSELY: Alright, does anyone have anything else to say about page 6?

KC CLAFFY: Recommendation #2 on my copy reads, do I have the right copy? Because it just reads SSR Recommendation #9, information security management systems and security certifications. I don't see a recommendation in there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: KC where are you? What page are you on?

KC CLAFFY: Oh, sorry, you're on a different page 6, because I have the one that's showing – so you're just in the executive summary, nevermind.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah, we're on the clean copy.

RUSS HOUSELY: Good, I was very confused. Okay.

KC CLAFFY: I like how Heather said where are you, rather than, where the hell are you.

RUSS HOUSELY: She is an editor.

KC CLAFFY: Fair enough.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Laurin, comment on page 7. We have something called priority. We should change the terminology I think because it's weird to read. So if it would just be, I don't know, plus, minus that would be easier than high plus or high minus, that's my opinion, I'm not sure what other people think.

JABHERA MATOGORO: Can you show the document moving to the page we are, because I'm using my phone and I'm not open it in my laptop. I was not with my laptop. So the one who's controlling the shared document, please go around with the arrows direction. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: On my screen it shows that, Mr. Matogoro, but I'm not sure. I just think the terminology there, this is a quick, quick change. And then I'm also noticing we don't have strategic objectives.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, two things. First, regarding the high plus states high minus, that was something that Russ had selected because they would be really easy to do a fast search and replace on. However you want to label those things, I'm fine with that.

Regarding the missing strategic objectives and goals, there are actually three that are missing and that's because those three, two of them were created during our discussions and editing process, well actually three of them essentially were created and filled out during our editing process. And so no strategic objectives were actually assigned.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

This is Eric. I had a response for Laurin and a response for Heather. My recollection, I think, and maybe it's right, maybe it's wrong, was the reason we have high plus and high minus was because we sort of had a spectrum where everything was clustered around like 80% and above. And we said, yeah, you know, the scale sort of starts at a high point so nothing is really low priority.

So, I think probably this was designed to impart everything that we thought was important, but maybe there was like some grade within that, but nevertheless, I think I sort of agree with what Laurin said, it's like what's a high plus and what's a high minus, it's not really clear to me what anyone will make of that.

I would normally say we should just yank the priority column because it will be really hard to say something, or go the other direction and be very granular and say above 80% where someone can wonder what a percent is, but at least most people think 80% is, you know, a B or higher. And then to Heather's point, maybe just can we fill in like TBD or something there, forthcoming or something, just so it doesn't look like there is no mapping.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is Heather. I think if we actually do nothing, we don't have a priority column, we will get pushback on that without question.

DENISE MICHEL: I agree with Eric, I think we should include the priority column but we should leave it blank. I don't find it helpful to put so many highs in there. And in addition, I think at the top with the notes. I think we should specifically ask people as part of their public comments to indicate there, to give us their feedback on what they consider a high and urgent priority.

So I would suggest leaving a blank priority column and putting TBD in there. I think it would be more impactful also, instead of having a strategic plan column, note in small text where in the recommendation column what strategic objective it relates to, or note in an annex, all the recommendations are connected to strategic objectives, see a complete list in Annex whatever, and instead of the strategic plan column I put owner, and then either put TBD or plug in here's the entity within ICANN that we think should drive this recommendation. I think that would be more powerful than a column on the strategic plan that no one really reads, look at, or knows what the references are for.

RUSS HOUSELY: I personally like the move to an end. KC?

KC CLAFFY: I just, I'm going to make a plea to please can we have one thing in these reviews because we use the same priority that CCT did, which is high,

medium, low prerequisite where prerequisite must be done before another round of gTLDs, now I know their mission was focused on the safeguards for new gTLD program, but I think they have very clear priorities and if all the review teams come out with a different way of prioritizing it just makes the problem even more intractable about ICANN is supposed to sort through them all.

RUSS HOUSELY: I think that would leave us with all highs. The prerequisites, we'd have to add, but it does leave it with all highs.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, fair enough, okay.

RUSS HOUSELY: We did that dependency chart in Montreal, we'd have to adjust it for the ones that were added last week, but that would be pretty straightforward. I like the owner idea. Right now it would have to be TBD, right?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Or I can just pull it from what it actually says in the document where it says ICANN org, or ICANN Org and Board.

RUSS HOUSELY: Right, but not part of the work which is ultimately we could ask whether it's part of public comment people to provide them.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, that could be again, we can be TBD on owner and priority and make that part of what we're still seeing public comments on.

NORM RITCHIE: This is Norm. I also like the idea of having the owner down there, that's a great suggestion. On the priorities, though, I was just scanning through them all, and this is high plus to high minus, that's the two priorities here. So that'd be high and medium, I assume. We want to translate those and looking at the high minus I actually think that most would be medium.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay. That's an easy search and replace.

NORM RITCHIE: If others could just scan there and see if any disagreement.

RUSS HOUSELY: What they are is when that cluster diagram we talked about last week, it's the upper right and the lower left, and I purposely picked phrases, character strings are easy to do a global replace so that it wouldn't impact other parts of the text. The was totally my reason for choosing these in the legend.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

This is Eric. I don't have any strong feelings on this. So my constant chatter is not because I'm trying to sort of push one way or the other, but one thing I just point out is that is that when there's a distinction that's within a very small range, sometimes the confidence you have in that distinction is reduced.

So we might have a high plus and high minus on a lot of these for people. And I think this was borne out by the discussion exercise we went through. So the distinction between a high plus and a high minus may be so small as to not be significant enough to be a distinction which is where we could wind up with a find and replace that would categorize them as high and medium but really the difference was so small that that wasn't a meaningful distinction.

So I think that's the concern we have to put our minds at ease about. So Norm went through and he's satisfied with that, we might all or a number of us may want to do that or just fall back to TBD. But just that's one of the concerns of taking what's there and mapping it over.

RUSS HOUSELY:

So, I will ask the team to look at that while we move on. So. if we're talking about a part you're not interested in, you can make that assessment and we'll come back to that. Anything else on the table which spans page 7 through page 10? Okay so the next thing is page 10.

KC CLAFFY:

This is KC, my earlier comment applies that some of these things in the box are not actually recommendations.

RUSS HOUSELY: They're more like pointers for the recommendations.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Again, that's not the way CCTs report, and I think if we're going to consolidate it in a table, the table should actually have the recommendations. That's my view.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So starting with the SSR2 Recommendation #2, would you put in that box everything that is listed on page 13? The 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5? IS that what you would want to see in the table?

RUSS HOUSELY: Or would you say complete implementation of SSR Recommendation #9?

KC CLAFFY: One, I don't know the answer to that question. I think that's partly why I think the document is not ready. But probably I would put in what we're going to count to the extent that we would boldface the text that we consider the recommendation in main body of the report, we should put all of that bold text in the table. But because this brings up another issue.

We already have Recommendation #1 that says implement all SSR1 stuff and then we have several recommendations that are specific about

which SSR1 recommendations to reimplement or finish implementing as if the rest of them don't matter. So when I just look at the table, and actually this happened when I looked at the text, I'm confused.

Why does it say complete the implementation of all relevant SSR1, and then it gives us 9, 12, 15, 16, which I can't discern what's 12, 15, or 16, I have to go back to the Appendix and then I get even more confused. I just don't know how we expect the reader to digest what we mean by, go do everything, but then here's four recommendations that are really specific.

RUSS HOUSELY:

I see, because what we're really doing here is we're saying finish 9, but we would like to see some things that SSR1 didn't talk about done, as well. These are ones we've expanded.

KC CLAFFY:

Okay, that's not clear.

RUSS HOUSELY:

Well, those four, we have taken something that was recommended, and then said, no, they didn't go far enough, and added to it. that's what's going on here.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

So I think I think what we did is okay, like in terms of, yes, take this and do these things. But then I think we need a column to essentially make

this clear. Most are like an extended followup, so we have to kind of somewhere put okay, this is where we took SSR1 and specified what they already said so that it meets the smart criteria and so that I don't talk all the time, page 11 is the next one and there I made the comment, our recommendations are not smart, and we're going on about that, which I think is a massive issue.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay. I wonder if to make the room for what you're suggesting, if we lose the workstream column, because that isn't going to really help somebody understand the recommendation. It's more like how we got there.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just to quickly answer, I think that makes sense because in the end, who cares what workstream it comes from.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay. I'm sorry, was Eric next, or Denise, I don't remember.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think it was me. Just to sort of jump over my point real quick. I agree, I think the first column doesn't add a lot and if we wanted to put a pointer to a section number, I think it should probably go on the other side anyway, since that's the last thing I'm going to look at. The comment I was going to make was just an answer to the high minus, high plus.

I think Recommendations 20, 21, 25, and 26 which are currently high minus should not fall below high, especially based on the discussions that we had about them. This is the key rollover with adopting SSAC 6373 Baseline Security Practices and Regression Testing For DNS, I think these things are part of SSR are in general, so I'd hate to see somebody say they're not that important compared to other things.

And then we talked a lot about CCDS and EBERO and so I know at least some of us feel like those are particularly high priority. So I'd hate to have those fall down. But other than that, I agree with Norm, the rest, if they turned into medium, I wouldn't lose a lot of sleep.

KC CLAFFY:

The first table, some people aren't going to read past it. I think it has to be the highest octane we can make it. I think which strategic plan column, this doesn't have to be done before public comment. I think nobody's going to look at it, nobody's going to go figure out how to map it back to wherever the heck the strategic plan is, which is apparently in a different document.

I think it should be an appendix. We've done the mapping, the mapping is in the appendix. The thing that should be in here is either who the recommendation is directed toward the way CCTD did it or some mechanism for assessing its success, like what is the outcome that we hope for.

NORM RITCHIE: I like that, I agree with that. I think that's a good approach and I also agree with Eric's comment on resolving the priority issue.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin, just a quick proposal. Let's just say at the top of that table all these recommendations are aligned with the strategic plan to make clear that we did it and details in appendix.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. And we can also say, if we want to say the priorities are all high or high plus, move that out of the table because it's just not signal.

RUSS HOUSELY: If people agree that they're all high then we can say that at the top and drop that and get the owner, get space for the owner or space for the intended outcome.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is Heather, but I'm hearing both everything high and some high and some medium.

RUSS HOUSELY: I know, I agree, we haven't sorted that.

NORM RITCHIE: Yeah, a long time of being in management one form or another. You can't have everything high priority.

KC CLAFFY: There's that and then also, if it's really just half high or half low, you just make two separate tables and the top table is these are high and the bottom table is these are low, so that you don't lose all that white space that you could use for how do we know what's being done.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay. I think there's a huge amount of work to be done on this table. But I think it'd be very valuable because I think KC's right. Some people will read the recommendation table summary and not read any further. Or based on what they read there, they will decide which sections they're going to read. Okay, are we ready to move past the table? We're going to come back to the priority question, Heather. Okay. Is there anything in the introduction to Workstream 1 that anyone wants to comment on?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is just my old comment, this is Laurin. We talk about smart and it's not smart. this can both be seen as relating to the table or to this.

RUSS HOUSELY: Are you talking about the table on page 11?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, I'm talking about the intro text, what I'm trying to say is this obviously relates to the table as well because this is where all the

recommendations are. So here it says, most importantly, having provide recommendations or metric based on measurable performance indicators. So this is definitely something we need to do. And this is something that I don't think is necessarily a public comment issue. This is something where we could actually put in a public comment if you have good ideas of how this might be done, let us know.

RUSS HOUSELY: I'm not sure where you would say that other than the executive summary.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, this would fall for a comment period.

RUSS HOUSELY: Okay, we've been through the text related to each of these recommendations, a whole bunch of times, but I'll just go page by page as requested. Anything on page 12?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is Laurin, I just saw a little kind of lack of clarity, first paragraph, you could just write implemented SSR1's recommendations. Where I really struggle is the whole section assessment of SSR1 recommendation. To me, at least, having read it, it lacks context, we don't have intro sentences and if I struggled reading through it, maybe I was just stupid yesterday night, but that was my feeling and I was involved in writing this.

RUSS HOUSELY: Do you think this is a public comment issue or one we can deal with afterwards?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Considering this impacts on understanding this might be strange not to do, but this is something we can discuss. It's just something I think we should flag up and we make the final call. And then there is a specific one SSR2 Recommendation 1.

The results of this paper offer direction where the original guidelines are not sufficiently measurable presentation or recommendations below. What is the paper, it says this report. That's another editing. Okay. But yeah, so I feel we need some context in this. I know a lot of it is in the Appendix but I don't want to jump to the appendix, kind of mirroring what KC was saying before.

KC CLAFFY: So, I did jump to the appendix and then I got even more confused because pretty much the first one we say in the appendix is part of the reason that so many of these recommendations were only partially implemented is the way that they were written, where they're not really, it's very hard to figure out whether they're done or not, either if you're ICANN, or if you're review team.

So I just don't see how we can then say, Recommendation #1, go implement all these things that we just said weren't written well enough to figure out where they're implement and ICANN already

thinks it implemented. And then we've just got no context here, so I've come to hate this recommendation.

DENISE MICHEL:

While many of the SSR1 recommendations were not written in a way that were easy to measure and some lacked clarity, that really was not the main reason why they weren't implemented. There clearly was a lack of staff due diligence and will to actually create a meaningful implementation plan, check with the authors and the community, and then actually implement it, and that's the main reason that most of the SSR1 recommendations aren't implemented. I take your point though, whether we can be clear on this.

RUSS HOUSELY:

So, what I'm hearing is that it's not clear what yardstick SSR3 should use to determine whether the SSR1 recommendations are finished being implemented.

KC CLAFFY:

I agree with that statement.

RUSS HOUSELY:

Okay. So, boy, I hate to go back to SSR1 at this point, but if that is the situation we're finding ourselves in, then we need a couple sentences after each of the SSR1 recommendations where we claimed work is needed which is all but one of them, to say what yardstick to use to know you got there.

ŽARKO KECIC:

Yeah, hi, everybody. I had a few comments, long time ago about SSR1 review recommendations and implementation review. I'll just ask to fulfill statements that implementation didn't reach but intended impact. Because we are seeing that without knowing what expected impact is and we said in some part of the document that recommendations were written that way that we cannot see what impact is expected and also we didn't try what we expect to have. So I believe that we should add that to review of implementation of recommendations given by SSR1.

DENISE MICHEL:

We spent years on SSR1 recommendations. We need to stop going back to the start. It is not the most important part of our report. The most important part of our report and are the many items that we've identified as high priority and urgent, I think our time is best spent on those.

I'm happy to help craft a sort of blanket statement that indicates that the majority of SSR1 recommendations, although they were not clear, blah, blah, blah, they also were not fully implemented. Staff should go back create a meaningful implementation plan working with the community and propose how it will implement these in a measurable and impactful way. I do not think the team should spend any more time on the SSR1 recommendation. Thanks.

KC CLAFFY: So, I'm willing to take a pass over the appendix, because I agree the fewest number of people to spend any time on here at all. But I cannot abide by these accusations in there that you know ICANN has different definitions in different places for security threats or DNS abuse and then there's no citations to what they're talking about. I mean, there's some really strong accusations against ICANN in this appendix.

And it's okay if they're true and we can back them up, but right now, they're not linked to anything that I could, if somebody said, what do you mean, I would have no idea what to point people to, so I cannot put my name on something like that. So I'll just go to the appendix and remove everything I can't personally cite and then we won't have to spend any more time on this.

DENISE MICHEL: Or you could just highlight where you think more cites are need and you can have someone look on it?

KC CLAFFY: Okay, I'll do that. I can do that over the weekend.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, based on that, should we skip to the beginning of Workstream 2? Any objections to that? So, KC took homework to indicated where cites are needed.

ZARKO KECIC: May I add something to comments?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You may.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, thank you. Recommendations, actually review of implementation is done really fast. I personally agree with Denise, that we are doing that one year but nobody really looked at and tried to figure out why Recommendation is not implemented or is it implemented the way it is understood? So, we have to clarify why and what we really expect. Let's jump to Recommendation 1 for example.

It is backed up by statement that there are definitions of security and stability and I didn't see any mention of security and stability in actual recommendation of SSR1. They were asking about limited ICANN remit and they were asking to give a statement, what ICANN can do and what ICANN cannot do and it is written in framework. We should look at that again, otherwise I believe that people from ICANN Org and also the Community will shut is up because we didn't back that up.

DENISE MICHEL: We're really at the point of redlining not talking. At this point I think if some of the team wants additional changes to the report, I think it's incumbent upon them to make them rather suggestion them for everyone to consider.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I have to agree with, that we're to the point of proposing text changes. KC, the exact point that Zarko just made, would that have been a place where you were going to ask for a cite?

KC CLAFFY: Yup.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I guess we will see what kind of cite we can find to fill that. We have 45 minutes left and we haven't gotten to the workstreams yet. I'm getting pretty nervous about that. Can we turn to page 15?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Quick note. C Suite, it kind of starts with, I'll propose the text so we can continue.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, you're going to make a suggestion right now, here?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'll write it into the document, I just have get it done.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Laurin, what problem are you solving? For everyone else on the call, are you changing the rationale and findings or are you changing the recommendation?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Findings. It just says, “C Suite Security Position Rationale and Findings. This recommendation is also informed by several other recommendations.” I think this is not how this should start. Again, I’ll propose something.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, but this is one of the ones where we built on an RRS1 Recommendations.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, we’re kind of starting with, “This is informed by something.” What is informed? That should come first.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Look forward to seeing your suggestion. Alright, anything else on page 15? Page 16. Page 17.

KC CLAFFY: Again, are we going to add a section the way CCT has a section that says how this -- what’s the metric for success? How does ICANN know they’ve achieved this effect of this implementation?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we agreed that that was a good thing to do but we have not yet agreed whether we’re going to do that before Public Comment.

KC CLAFFY: I see, okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: KC, you had said earlier that you were not comfortable with this going out for Public Comment without those metrics in here.

KC CLAFFY: I mean, I would go read it all again. I haven't read this whole document. I pretty much read through the appendix and realized, "Oh god, there's so much stuff that needs to be changed I here." I wouldn't say that.

DENISE MICHEL: I think it also might be valuable to note, I mean there are approaches to note in Public Comment solicitations that, we'll be adding for each recommendation a metric for success and would like input on that. That would highlight something that I think would be useful to get some additional feedback on to continue our work on it, what do you think?

KC CLAFFY: I totally agree with that. The reason I'm asking right now is because Russ says, "Is there any comments on the text?" And I feel like if sometimes we add a good metric of success, we can take out some of the detailed text about how they should go implementing it and let them decide how they implement as long as that metric is achieved.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I take your point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That makes a lot of sense. I worry about how we get from here to there quickly.

KC CLAFFY: We can even say that. We can say, “We understand in some of these recommendations there’s detail. We solicit input on if there’s a metric that could substitute for some of this detail or if we’re along the right granularity of description.”

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, we had that discussion with Steve, balancing, you’re being too -- I think the words were, “Your recommendations are over engineered, tell us what you were trying to achieve instead of how to achieve it.” And I think that’s really a continuation of the same discussion.

KC CLAFFY: But I would submit that we haven’t actually done that in a lot of the recommendations.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, we’re struggling to find the balance, to know where, how to keep it measurable and also thinking of SSR3, as you have said over and over and yet provide enough that someone reading it knows what we’re after.

KC CLAFFY: If we were struggling to find a balance, we would have a metric and we would have the details and then we could decide where to put the words in between that spectrum but we don't have the metrics, so I don't know if we're struggling to find a balance yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, that's where I am but fair enough.

KC CLAFFY: Maybe we should take a poll of how many people have read through these things because Heather just sent it out? I have not read it so I'm not in a position to go through and read it in real time. I've read the appendix, I've started reading, I read through the table.

If you go through a few more pages and nobody says anything, to me that's a sign that we should use the next 40 minutes or whatever is left of this to go read it and do the markup of whatever concerns we have that would prevent us from being comfortable with it going for Public Comment and then we take it to the mailing list. What's our drop dead to make a decision here?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Friday.

KC CLAFFY: I can markup tonight of the Appendix for sure.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Friday is when it would have to go out. I'm good but I'm not that good, in terms of doing any editing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I wonder if we complying a list of the things we want to ask the Community in the Public Comment would be a valuable use of the time, to make sure that we get all of our questions answered, saying we know the report is rough and needs more work buy I think you can tell where we're going from where we are at this point?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Can I get in cue please?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'd like to make a suggestion and Russ; this is a suggestion of whether you think this is a good idea or not. Maybe right now, considering the time, after we get done saying whatever comments any of us have to say, we just identify them, Heather would have to sort of incorporate them etc., does it make sense to do a go, no go and maybe at this end of this call, maybe going back to an earlier suggestion, maybe just those that know they have comments, we can go through those and before or

after that just go around and see whether we have a go, no go from the people on the call now, of would you be comfortable putting this out?

Again, this is just first round Public Comment, it's not the Final Report. Just find out where we are because if a lot of people are already at no go, then we're not going to do joint drafting on the call in time for Heather to take comments.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

How many rounds of Public Comments are there, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

There is at least one, we have a precedent from CCT where there was two. The reason Eric I'm very much in a place where you are but I thought that some people might say, "Oh, we have an adequate question to the Community, they might be willing to go now but without that question they would not."

That's where I was going. But I'm certainly willing to go where you are. Jennifer, I'm going to ask you to do roll call. So, the question is, if we have a note to the Community that asks questions about where we are, is the document in good enough shape for Public Comment, yes or no? Can you go down the roll please?

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Sure. First on my screen is Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise, yes or no, is it ready for Public Comment with an adequate cover note?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Eric?

ERIC OSETERWEIL: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Alain?

ALAIN AINA: I have not read the document, so prefer to not answer.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, you're abstaining?

ALAIN AINA: Yes.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, Danko?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Sorry, my mic was off. Can you repeat?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is the document ready for Public Comment given an adequate cover note?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Well, it is not for me to say, I was following your discussion and I think you went through everything, so I would absolutely propose it but I think it's for team to decide, I'm just in supporting roll.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, you're abstaining?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yes, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: KC?

KC CLAFFY: No, I don't think it's ready but I don't want to be the reason it doesn't go out.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's a no asterisk.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Similar as KC, I have a lot of doubts here but I don't want to be the reason, essentially like KC. Noting, I do have a lot of adds.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is that a yes or a no?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Again, more a no.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Norm?

NORM RITCHIE: Yup.

JENNIFER BRUCE: Ram?

RAM KRISHNA PARIYAR: Sorry, I have not gone through the document. Take some time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, is this yes, no or abstain?

RAM KRISHNA PARIYAR: Abstain.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Zarko?

ZARKO KECIC: It depends what's the question. If we ask what Russ proposed, I'm okay but I don't believe document is ready for Public Comment.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Okay, I think I got everyone and I see Laurin's hand is raised.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Kind of a comment, jumping on what Zarko said and I think this is one of the key issues, which is why I had such a wordy response. It is a question of what we put as our question as what we put as high community, this is what we want from you. The more we push this into, this is early, please give us your thoughts, the happier I am with this going out.

USS HOUSLEY: Okay, so...

DENISE MICHEL: I agree Eric. I think a reasonable compromise here is to highlight that this is an early draft, that we have the following things that we're going to add or iterate upon and we in particular would like Public Comment on priorities owners and metrics, things that we want to cite that would give us more time and also afford us I think important input form the Community on our key recommendations. That's a long way of agreeing with Laurin.

I think we can have our cake and eat it too here. I think with the right notes of acceptations and things we're going to add and requests for input, that we can continue to work on elements that people think we need to work on, at the same time we get some really important input from the Community to use when we get together in Cancun. That's a key thing here, we're going to be missing, potentially missing a window of opportunity to hear from the Community in a much more formal and substantive way before we get together in Cancun.

RUSS HOUSELY:

I think, my reading of the vote that we just had is that we have more yes's than no's by one, that means we're going to add some text that says, "We know that this is a rough draft but we want Community comment on the recommendations. How to balance the not over engineering it but yet making it measurable for SSR3. How to set the priorities and how to assign the owners." Is there anything else we want to ask about?

DENISE MICHEL:

I agree with that statement. I think that's really useful. As a side note, I'd like to also suggest that for everyone who feels like more work is needed and particularly for everyone who voted no, I think it's incumbent upon them to put in writing on the email list, exactly what item they feel needs to be changed or added to and what they're volunteering to write. Thanks.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

I guess I'm second on the list. I have all my comments in the web document that I'll send to Heather so she can include them as I've agreed with her. I think one thing we might want to consider and this should be pretty quick is, if there are really issue laden areas, like KC noted, if we have one discussion where there's really zero cites, zero evidence, that we remove these from the Public Comment, not present stuff that appears have baked.

Again, I noted in a lot of places we know these things should be correct. We know that the sources exist but throwing this out as a Public Comment with zero cites and a half a page, that is -- this is one of the key reasons why I expressed doubts, not because it's rough.

I'm thinking maybe we can agree on which are where are the fenders where we can say, "This is coming but we're not making this stuff right now." I'm not sure what other people think about that. That would kind of save us from a lot of the issues that KC and I have right now.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Laurin, my concern is, that almost guarantees a second Public Comment period because then we've got new recommendations that appear.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Russ, that's a quick response. I don't think this would relate to recommendations. This would relate to Staff for example, in the appendix SSR1 where the cites are simply missing right now. I don't see a problem with the recommendations even if they're half baked, it's more about the background.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, I misunderstood your comment. I'm glad I pushed back because now I understand what you're saying.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'm not talking about throwing everything out that has no cite, I'm talking about egregious ones where it's like, we have a page of zero cites, then there's the question, do we want to put that to Public Comment because that looks like we're rambling on.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We need to put some kind of place holder if there's...

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah maybe just push out some of the findings and just say, "We're still working on that text. This is what we found." Very basic, a list of bullet points and then say, "Full text incoming." And then we don't have the issues that we don't have the cites which we do really need.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anyone else?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Two things. I don't think recommendations require citations, it's focus on the finding and rationale. Second, if we're saying this an early draft or rough draft or however, we phrase it, we're pretty much begging for a second review period. I don't think it would be reasonable to put out something where we say, "We have a whole lot where we're not sure about. A whole lot of things that we haven't necessarily proven. A whole lot of material in here that you won't see, we're just getting your input now."

I would think we would need a second Public Comment period to say, “Okay, we’ve taken in all this feedback, this is our proposed final draft.” And see where we go.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just to say that this is exactly what I’m thinking about, what Heather just said. Just to clarify again, nothing about the recommendations, this is only about rationale and finding in these appendices that people are not that interested in anyway but would make us look really bad. I agree with Heather as well that we’re begging for the second review period if we’re doing what we decided to do.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anyone else? Okay, so Heather, can you post in email what you think will go in the Executive Summary, which is, “This report is being released now to get these kinds of feedback from the Community.”

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yup, I had been taking notes on that, so I have a couple of sentences already.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Great, if we could send those to email, I’d like to get that wordsmith by Thursday, so that Staff can do the rest of what they need to do to get it out for Public Comment. That’s tomorrow, just to be clear. Is there anything else we need to talk about, we have a few more minutes if anyone wants to drill down on any part of the document?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I do want to ask some clarifying questions. I heard some pretty actionable things with regards to the table, should I implement those now or wait?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, I think you should. I think we're moving which workstream produced it, adding which. I do want to return to the high minus, high plus but other than that, I think you know what to do.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Two tables was a good idea, to eliminate that column, here's the high ones, here's the medium ones.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Absolutely. You know the appendix is going to be bigger than the body of the document.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It already is.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's like academic history books.

RUSS HOUSELY: The footnotes are bigger than the rest of the book.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right now, there's 160 of them and we don't have enough but CCT had 364.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think which rich citations add merit.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, then you have another 100 to produce. Sorry, couldn't help that. Okay, do we break the table into high and medium and do we follow Eric's suggestion about which ones we move from high minus to high?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Eric, can you remind me which ones?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The ones that jumped out to me where 20 21, I thought those are important, that's my opinion but also my recollection from the discussions, that could be wrong. Then also, 25 and 26, which is CCDS EBRO.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought EBRO -- I remember we said it's in the middle and that was the problem but since the bulk of that investigation was done before the pause, I will defer to anyone who was actually involved in that the priority.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: My recollection, that's when we spent the lion's share of the discussion time on it, you know my perspective.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I hear no one pushing back on Eric's suggestion. Someone just unmuted, I assume you wanted to say something, it sounds like you're on a treadmill. Alright, so I think we got through. Heather is going to give us an executive summary, we just did the prioritization and we're going to go to Public Comment on Friday. Anything else we need to talk about?

NORM RITCHIE: Just to tell everyone that I pasted as a comment my suggestion for text, page 15. Since we just turned it around, saying, "Currently, SSR's concern [inaudible] across the ICANN Organization recognizes rolls, blah, blah, blah." Then goes through the roles, then our findings, why this interacts with these other recommendations. Essentially, it's the same text, just reorganized.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay. I'm going to ask now Negar or Jennifer, what do you need from us, that you don't have in order to go to Public Comment on Friday?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, Russ. We need to have the final document to the Public Comment Team by the end of the day tomorrow, Thursday at Pacific time at latest. I would just ask that when Heather sends the new text or any changes that we have a clear final document by the end of the day tomorrow that we know is going to be the document that's published. Aside of that, we don't need anything from you at this time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Like I said, settle email tomorrow. Heather is going to put the text out for the executive summary, we need the wordsmithing done tomorrow.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'll put it in the document but lunchtime pacific today and I'll drop a note to the list both with the text and with a pointer to the document so folks can either comment to email if that's easier for them on the document and I'll make sure everything is sent.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Is there any other business today?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I was wondering, regarding what I said about coming some of these findings and rationale paths, is this something other people are happy with it us doing and if yes, how will we decide what to kill off and get it out of the document by tomorrow?

RUSS HOUSLEY: My view is, it's not as embarrassing as you think it is but that's because I'm not an academic I suspect. I don't know, what do others think.

KC CLAFFY: I am academic so maybe it doesn't count. I would say all we can do Laurin is make suggestions in the document. If nobody complains then Heather can whack them.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'm sorry, Laurin could you repeat that, I missed what your comment was.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: The first one or this one now, Eric?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: The one Russ and KC just responded to.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I said before that it might behove us to get rid of some of the text for Public Comment, not for the final report, so essentially if we have a

page of findings and rationale that have very bad sighting for example and look like we're saying something and we have absolutely nothing to stand on, doesn't mean we don't know these things to be true, correct, whatever else, it's just right now in the text, that it might make sense to just not put these to Public Comment, particularly if it's stuff like SRR1 that's in an appendix anyway, we don't want people to get hung up about because it's not the important and we know we have to work on it, to instead have people focus on our key work, on the stuff we have done, the stuff that is usually well cited.

Just trying to avoid that kind of weird area where we know it's weak and work needs to be done and we know we have to find it. Just to not distract essentially from the key stuff that is well sighted and well worked out and to not open ourselves up to getting a lot of comments about how it's crap, even though we already know it's crap, so this one won't help anyone. This was just my proposal to deal with some of the issues.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

My response to that personally would just be that, I personally don't think that all of the things that are in here are things we haven't unfortunately or fortunately deliberated over for a long time, to your point and KC's point about the need for additional citations.

I think putting in citation forthcoming, whatever citation needed, we can say citation forthcoming is important but I think one of the liabilities we would have in redacting it ahead of time is that if we take something out now that we plan to put in later, then someone could easily cry fowl

and say, “Hey this extra stuff wasn’t in your Public Comment, I would have had something to say about it.”

That I feel personally is a bigger risk, somebody being surprised by additions that we had in mind, that we thought we would pull out and putting in we feel strongly blah, citation forthcoming, someone could say, “Without that citation, this is my opinion.” But at least understand the team is intending to support it. The general case where we can’t find the citation for something, we said then we’ll yank it out. That would be my opinion.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I think that KC already agreed to highlight the places where additional cite was needed. Do you think you can highlight those tomorrow, by the tomorrow deadline or do you -- because you originally said over the weekend, that’s why I’m asking?

KC CLAFFY:

I’ll try and work on it today. It’s not all just citations, it’s also -- there’s rationale stuck inside conclusions and we don’t actually say whether we thing a recommendation is implemented in the text. There’s a whole bunch of editing work that needs to be done but maybe one, it doesn’t have to be done before Public Comment and two, having [inaudible] do some of it tomorrow if she can figure out what we meant.

RUSS HOUSELY:

Okay, focus on the cites, even if we’re just going to put a TBD for there, to be supplied. Thank you. Any other points someone wants to raise?

Alright, thank you. I think this is an important milestone for the team. I look forward to the Public Comments. Bye, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]