

---

BRENDA BREWER:

Good day, everyone, and welcome to the SSR2 Plenary call on the 25<sup>th</sup> of March 2020 at 1400 UTC. Attending the call today are Boban, Danko, Kaveh, Ram Krishna, Laurin, Russ, and Norm. Apologies from Alain, and Eric, and Kerry-Ann. From ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda. Technical writer Heather is on the call and today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Hi. I'm sure we have more on the agenda than we can accomplish in an hour. So, the first thing on the agenda is that Laurin and Heather got together as they promised at the end of the last call and are proposing a different outline for the report. Instead of reporting on things in the workstream order they're just taking the exact same recommendations and laying them out in an order that's more cohesive.

I remember when we were first getting started after the pause, we had a discussion that said that this is the way we're going to gather the information. The way we report it out might be in a different order. What I'd like to do is see whether people like this.

The intent is not to rewrite it at this time but rather to deal with the public comment against the old report and then move to this if we like it. The thing to find out is whether you like it or not so that we can revise it or make another go at it if this doesn't make sense.

---

*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, the first link in the agenda has a Google Doc that just has an outline, no meat, because we didn't think it was worth the effort to move the content into this outline just to see whether this outline meets the group's needs. So, Heather or Laurin, anything further to add?

HEATHER FORREST: I think you've covered it pretty completely.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. I think I would only add one or two sentences, which is essentially when Heather and I went through this we both felt that changing the structure would be really helpful because we're jumping around topics a lot, which makes it difficult to read and which requires us to essentially say some stuff over and over again. By putting this along issue lines, if you want, really helps talk about one thing, giving everything we have to say, and then moving on, just as a quick point on how it felt when we did this in detail.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, you've had the outline for a couple of days and I wonder what people's reactions are. Is this an improvement or is there more improvement needed?

---

NORM RITCHIE:

Definitely an improvement. I like it.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not hearing any concerns. Okay, then I think what we will do is proceed. Basically, put that to the side until after we have dealt with the public comments.

And the next item on the agenda is the public comments. If you open up the second link in the agenda you will see that Heather has spent a huge amount of time gathering all of the comments from the public comments that we have received; all 224 of them so far.

We know that GAC and the ICANN staff also plan to give us comments so this is not a full list, but you can see ... What I am thinking about for this is that each of the team members should sign up for the ones that they think they can quickly handle.

We have the "assigned to," if you just put your initials there. And then, we should have the rest of the comments by the call next week and we can assign any that are blank even if we resort to round-robin. We'll get that done so that we can all work in parallel to get this done. Does anybody have a better proposal on how to tackle the massive number of public comments we have?

HEATHER FORREST:

Russ, I don't have a better proposal but I did want to add two things. One, what I put in the comment column is often extracted from a larger text. So, it's worthwhile for whichever comments you take to also perhaps look at the original source. All of that is in the same folder as

---

the spreadsheet, in case there was more context that you might find useful. I was trying to get to the meat of the recommendation but there was often more text as people liked to say words.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's hard to say pictures.

HEATHER FORREST: Sometimes I think it might have been better if they had tried that, but it's all right. Words are good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anyone have a better approach to this? Okay, then the action between now and next week is to go through these and put your initials in the "assigned to" column for the ones that you can tackle. Anything else on this while we're awaiting the rest of the public comment? Okay.

That brings us to the document where we still have comments from the team itself to resolve, and that's the third link in the agenda. My memory is that we need to deal with Recommendation 3 next.

HEATHER FORREST: When last we left our humble explorers on the last call we had gone through recs four through seven. The five, six, and seven is, in a way, what turned into the alternate-structure exercise as there were a lot of thoughts to rejig, revise, reorganize and those were assigned to Laurin.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I remember that but I also remember that we got some text from Denise right after the call.

HEATHER FORREST: For Recommendation 3?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's where I thought it landed.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. You had asked Scott and I to take a shot at the rewrite.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if people can just scan the revised text there?

HEATHER FORREST: It's at the bottom of page 26.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh sorry. Thank you. Well, it's pink in mine but purple on the Zoom screen.

HEATHER FORREST: And it's green on mine. There's just no telling what Google's going to do.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any concerns with the new text? Okay, then I believe we are at Recommendation 8, which is on page 35. And this is a comment from KC in 8.3 where she says, “Is there any evidence that has ever been a problem? If so, we should point to it.”

HEATHER FORREST: She also had a comment earlier on about merging eight and nine into one recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Well, let’s see if we’re going to keep 8.3 before we plan to do a merge. So, why are we calling out the IANA functions? Is it just that we haven’t seen a plan or is it that there’s been an issue? Boban, you’re on the call. Do you remember?

BOBAN KRSIC: Not really. As I can remember, PTI and IANA functions were in the scope then it was out of the scope. And a former member of the team, I think it was James Gannon, he also always touched this recommendation. So, he always put it on the agenda but I don’t know and I don’t remember if there was evidence or not. So maybe Alain can clarify something here? If not, we will leave it out because, PTI, we have agreements.

So, there is everything defined what PTI and IANA had to do. So, I would leave it out here, but that’s my personal opinion. So, we should try to clarify it via Alain and I can try to reach out to James Gannon, and he’s an observer. Maybe he can also give, here, some relevant input.

DENISE MICHEL:                    Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    Go ahead.

DENISE MICHEL:                    Sounds like a reach out to James might be a good idea. Eric isn't on the call. I don't recall, but Eric might recall. I can send him a note and ask him to take a look at this section.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    That sounds good. Yeah. Okay. I will fire off that.

ZARKO KECIC:                    May I clarify?

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    Sure.

ZARKO KECIC:                    Okay, thanks. At one point this is not James and Kathy were doing [inaudible] and stuff. So, James doesn't have to do anything with this. At one point we're talking about our plans and right now we have a disaster which can lead to some undocumented approach by PTI and IANA function. We will see what will happen until June.

---

But before the end of June, they have to do key rollover action and if all key holders cannot go to the states that's something that they didn't have in any plans. We'll see how they are going to solve that. But also, we're talking about disaster recovery and a disaster recovery facility outside states on a different continent and a different country. So that was, I believe, a year ago.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's in 9.3.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. That should be there and that initiated that ICANN and, actually, PTI should think about disaster recovery and follow a standardized procedure for everything.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's a good point to pay attention to. I think Steve in chat said, "There is no key rollover planned," and I don't think that's what Zarko was talking about. I think he was talking about the next time that the Key Signing Key needs to be used.

STEVE CONTE: Yes. I was just clarifying that comment. I wasn't accusing at all.



---

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. I will fire off a note to Alain to see if he knows anything. Heather, can you insert a comment about seeing how the DNSSEC Key Custodians are able to get together?

HEATHER FORREST: Is that kind of thing assigned to anybody?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think what we want to see is whether anything happens that leads to a recommendation or anything [else] to happen that [needs a recommendation] that would replace what's here.

HEATHER FORREST: Okay.

STEVE CONTE: Russ, this is Steve. Can I jump in?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Please.

STEVE CONTE: I just want to clarify that the next Key Signing Ceremony has been identified as something that's out of the ordinary. I do know that IANA is working very hard to determine how to do that. I don't know honestly what their steps are but it has been identified. So, there are two paths on this and like you had mentioned, wait and see what happens.

---

Another path could be to send an e-mail or query IANA on what their plan is, but as Zarko mentioned we are in the midst of a crisis right now so there might not be available cycles to give you an answer until after it happens, anyway. But I just mostly wanted to float that it is identified internally and we are aware, and those in the capacity to take action are looking at the options to do so.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I'm glad to hear that they're working on it. I don't think we need to add an additional task to their list. I think we just look at what happens and see whether we want to add a recommendation. It will of course be something they already figured out they need to do. At any rate, it would be bad for things to start expiring at the root.

Okay. There was a recommendation from KC that we merge eight and nine. I don't know. I see the Business Continuity Plan and the Disaster Recovery Plan as somewhat different. In fact, we point to different ISO documents that they should be audited against, so I would like to push back against merging.

KC CLAFFY:

That's fine. I don't disagree. I don't have an issue with that. I think the bigger issue is identifying what problem we're trying to solve here, and we should probably look at the comments that we got in the public comment on these.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

And indeed, we will. We talked about that earlier on the call.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just as a note, we have as a public comment exactly this idea. Plus, the reasoning that if ICANN was to go for these ISO standards they would have to do and document this anyway. So, I would say let's put that one off and work it in with the public comment. That's what I [would do].

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, the next one I think is 9.3 and 9.4 where KC says, "We go into too much detail. Can't we leave some of these decisions to the implementor?" So, KC, are you talking about the "outside North America," or are you talking about the timeline, or both?

KC CLAFFY: All right. Somebody's going to have to remind me. Is this the highlighted text we're looking at?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. In 9.3 and 9.4.

KC CLAFFY: Right. I mean, all of this, I feel like, is this not something that we should be recommending to outsource to a professional that deals with disaster recovery and they can parameterize the solution? It does sound like we're trying to parameterize 12 months, the third site, and where it is, da da da da. Why are we being so microscopic, micromanaging it?

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well part of it is what Zarko just said about making sure that one of the sites is under a different government.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I don't feel too strongly about this. If everyone else is happy let's move on.

ZARKO KECIC: May I say something? I understand what KC is talking about. We should just address the problem and leave that for IANA and actually PTI and ICANN to solve that.

KC CLAFFY: Right. If we're going to micromanage, we have to say, what is the problem we're trying to solve that with these parameterizations? If we've already decided not to talk about then I'll shut up.

DENISE MICHEL: Unfortunately, as I recall, because this was before the Board suspended the team—it's been a while—I believe the people who worked on this section aren't on the call. So, it would be good to ping a list to ask about this.

Part of the challenge that I think we have had in several sections is that previous recommendations were not implemented so the authors felt of the text that you're seeing, they felt that a more detailed

---

recommendation was needed in order to help ensure that it was actually implemented.

And I think that's a balance that is challenging to strike throughout the report where we've seen general recommendations, be it SSR1 or other reports or other documents not being implemented. So, I think the response on that is to make the recommendations much more explicit to provide a more detailed path to implementation. I'll take an action item to ping a few people on the original team to see if I can get more background on 9.3 and 9.4.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

That would be good. So, at the same time I think this is falling in that balance that Steve Conte shared early, right after the report was put out for public comment, which is the balance between being smart and doing all the engineering ourselves.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Apologies, Denise, for interrupting you. The audio cut out so I thought you were done. And we discussed this, actually, in L.A., not before the pause but after the pause and essentially the idea behind this is just to say "jurisdiction plus geography."

And to some extent, I think this is defensible. It's a quick sentence. It doesn't say where things have to go. We're more going into the direction of "address this issue somehow and then you can choose how to do it." And I think there was good reasoning behind this in that

---

particular case. So, I'm all for culling this a little bit but I'm not sure if we should remove this particular one outright.

KC CLAFFY: Is that reasoning that you're talking about going in the report because it's not in there now?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: That's essentially what we should talk about, I guess. I mean, the reasoning we had in L.A., and I think this was one of the small group exercises, was exactly to talk about what we're seeing right now. Like where, if all sites are in the United States and for some reason you cannot travel to or inside the United States, you have a problem. If there is a natural disaster kind of situation, we have the same issue. And I think that if we have to add that we should do so, you're right.

KC CLAFFY: If you're using this, today's scenario, as an example of the disaster that they cannot recover from you need to explain how having something outside the United States would help them with this disaster. Like I don't get it, the problem that you're trying to solve. Yeah. I mean, no, don't take me wrong, I think it would be great to have a site outside the United States but I think ... Okay. Think about SSR3. They have to say, "Was this implemented and was it effective?" Effective for what? Whether it was effective. There would have to be a disaster listed. You have to explain the disaster that would require this.

---

ZARKO KECIC: May I say, what disaster? Okay, this one that we have right now is of them but there can be a much bigger disaster when both facilities may be destroyed in a war, or turmoil in the States, or whatever; the natural disaster. So, it would be wise to have another facility, one or two outside and on different continents.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, I am happy to take the following action item. I will write a [present on this or may before] on the findings and I would also say we have to probably move this issue from just the DR to Business Continuity NDR. It's an overarching issue and that might make more sense. If everyone's happy with that approach I'm happy to take it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, if you take that approach then you have to clarify how the two different ISO standards apply to the two different things, to ISO 22301 for business continuity and ISO 27031 to disaster recovery.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, Russ. I would check on this. I'm just reading it. I'm not quite sure. Yeah, I see what you're saying. Yes. Yeah, I'll definitely look at that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Because the overarching point of this section was to have someone in the C-Suite responsible for these tasks and to do them in a way that followed these ISO guidelines and to have it audited. Okay. So, Jennifer, capture Laurin's action item, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I have done, and Boban has got his hand up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Boban?

BOBAN KRSIC: All this information on these standards, when they are talking about ISO 22301 there is a standard related to management systems. So, we are talking about implementing a management system like it is a quality management or information security management or [financial] management.

And 22301 is business continuity management systems. 27031 sets a specific guideline. It's only a guideline, it's not a standard. It's a guideline for ICT to be ready for business continuity. So, it's only a small part of the overall standard.

So, the overall standard is 20301 and the second specific part is 27031 and these are only guidelines, nothing more. It's not a standard. You can't certify it, so that's also one big difference between them. So, if you would like to certify your management system then you can certify 22301 or 27001 but not 27031. These are only guidelines.

So, we're following guidelines implementing a business continuity management system and if ICANN would like to certify its management system then we have to do it related to 22301. That is the difference between these standards. [inaudible] 22301 or 27001.

---



RUSS HOUSLEY: So Boban, I want to make sure I understand what you're saying. You're saying that 9.4 is wrong?

BOBAN KRSIC: Sorry. Could you repeat it, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, 9.4 asks for an external auditor to verify compliance with these aspects of the implementation of the disaster recovery plan. So, the disaster recovery plans against 27031. So, you're saying that's a guideline that shouldn't be audited against?

BOBAN KRSIC: You can audit it but you can't certify it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

BOBAN KRSIC: So, if you would like to follow the guidelines then you have an audit, "Yes, you are following," then you will get a station or something like that, and if you would like to certify it with your processes and such things then you need a reference to 22301. So, you can audit both but you can't certify any guidelines. You can certify only standards in the ISO world.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. That was a subtlety I missed. Okay. I don't see any other hands. Laurin took an action item here. And I think we're ready to move to the next one. Is that right? The next one is the introduction to Work Stream 3. The last sentence of the introduction, KC says, "This is false." Are you just saying we should delete the sentence?

KC CLAFFY: I can't remember, Russ. But yeah, would it hurt to delete a sentence here and there randomly?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Randomly? Yes, probably. The bottom of page 36.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. But now I don't see the context. I have to go back and ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you click on the yellow it'll bring it up.

DENISE MICHEL: I don't think she has a problem with finding where it is. I think it's more finding the context and her own notes as to why she wrote it.

---

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I mean, I'm not sure I agree with this statement about the focus of this work but I would have to go back and read the section here. I'm not sure that I agree that it's just within ICANN Org's agreement all the things that we talk about in this section, so that is probably why I highlighted it. Let me go look. Why don't we put a pin in it and come back later when I have gone through this section?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Laurin wants to adjust the tone. I don't know what to do with that one right now. Is it fair we should wait until after public comment on that one?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Absolutely.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, I just remembered or I just realized. Because we're asking with all these things about enhancing contracts and creating pricing incentives and a lot of this stuff, and I think you see this in SSAC's comment, the counter is going to be, if it hasn't been already, that that's not up to ICANN Org to do. That's going to require PDPs, etc. So, strictly, this sentence is false.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see. So, we either delete this or change those recommendations is what you're saying?

KC CLAFFY: Well, or change the sentence to say these ... You say the focus of this work, I assume you mean the recommendations coming that are coming out of this workstream. And only those systems, I don't know what you mean by systems. If you mean the whole registries and registrars, which is what we talk about here, that's certainly not within ICANN Org's agreement only.

So, you have to be more clear about what that sentence means, which would require another paragraph, and I'm not sure you need it in this intro or if the documents even going to be structured with these workstreams. So, I would say the most expedient approach would be to delete this sentence at the moment, but that's why I wrote it.

DENISE MICHEL: I would suggest we keep it and come back to it. Again, I'm not sure we've got everyone on the phone who wrote this.

KC CLAFFY: That's fine.

---

DENISE MICHEL: I take your point. But you're not indicating though that we are recommending action that requires a PDP that that's somehow not appropriate?

KC CLAFFY: Correct. That's exactly what you just said. It's just that it's definitely not within ICANN Org's remit. It's maybe within ICANN Org's remit to, how do you say, encourage a PDP. I don't even know how the wording is.

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. It is. And they do have. And the Board, of course, has the authority to start a PDP. So, I would not say that it's not within ICANN's remit but the wording could be clearer. It's not always clear when a PDP is needed versus staff action or board action.

KC CLAFFY: And then we have to be clear what system do we mean.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Or we can say, "We're not clear which system is required to carry this out." Recommend that staff access this and come back with a proposed plan.

KC CLAFFY: So, we can come back to this. Leave my comment, Heather.

---

HEATHER FORREST:                   Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                    Okay. The next one is from Laurin, in the abuse and compliance paragraph at the top of page 37. "Both Org and non-Org," is what he says.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:            What is this specifically linked to? Because I'm at a loss what I wanted to say here. This is one copied from the original document. I assume this has been resolved. The only thing we're talking about, I guess this refers to is, is it just ICANN Org with Twitter support acting, or is it the community, or the space more generally where we believe this is lacking? I think this was the discussion if I remember correctly. I'm happy to just kill that one off and leave this as is but if other people think differently ...

DENISE MICHEL:                   Are you referring to the ICANN Org highlight?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:            Yes.

DENISE MICHEL:                   Yeah. I would suggest that it just read ICANN's record because it involves staff and board and the gTLD community as well as the contracted parties.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY:                   Okay.

HEATHER FORREST:               If we just say ICANN it will be questioned because folks will want to understand which part of ICANN we're talking about. If we're talking about all parts then is there a way to specify that?

DENISE MICHEL:                   Yeah. I think we should come back in the course of processing the public comments. There is a lot more detail in terms of actions below that I think probably support this overarching statement.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                   How about we say for now the "ICANN community's record"?

DENISE MICHEL:                   Because it's not just the community, it's ICANN staff, ICANN compliance, it's board action or inaction, it's the GNSO Council, it's the contracted parties, so it's really the ecosystem of ICANN.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                   So, the whole ICANN ecosystem's record.

---

DENISE MICHEL: I think adding “ecosystem” would be confusing for people. So, I’m suggesting if you just want to leave it highlighted and we can come back to that if it’s an issue for people.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Given that it’s really in the introduction to this whole flow of things we’re about to talk about I think by the time we get to the recommendations, it’s clearer.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Moving to the next comment. “Suggest a causal link,” from KC.

KC CLAFFY: Am I being asked to say something?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I’m trying to understand whether you’re just thinking that the words need to be different so as to not suggest a causal link or you’re saying that we should be more blunt about the causal link. I’m not sure which you meant.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. Which of the two yellow comments is this on?



RUSS HOUSLEY: We're on adopted SSR1 recommendations in 2012.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Again, I don't know what I meant. It's not clear why that's in there.

DENISE MICHEL: Well our job starts as a review team. The period we're assessing starts with the board adopting and ordering up the implementation of SSR1 recommendations.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. The way it's written, if you don't have all the context it does suggest that there is a causal link between these trends that have been noteworthy since as if something about the SSR1 recommendations made them more noteworthy. It's not what we mean. I think we mean that it's the last review team looked at it or something. But we should clarify that to avoid this—

DENISE MICHEL: How about in parentheses after 2012, put the period for our assessment period of [inaudible].

---

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I mean, I think the point we're trying to make here is that whatever SSR1 recommended didn't help. In fact, things seem to have gotten worse.

DENISE MICHEL: I think I get your point, KC. And Heather, if you would like to assign this little comment to me, I'll take a look at it again and see if I can satisfy KC's point.

KC CLAFFY: And even Heather can probably handle the response, if she wants to take it on, if she understands what I mean.

DENISE MICHEL: That's fine. I'm sure there are others in here that I will need to look at.

HEATHER FORREST: All right. How about I take this?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, thank you, Heather. Okay. Next paragraph, the word "action." "We're missing a side of the take action now. What action?" is what KC asks.

DENISE MICHEL: I can find the citation on that. I think I have it in one of my files. I just forgot to drop it in.

KC CLAFFY: Well there's a citation issue and there's the action issue. Those are two problems here, because what action do we intend them to take? I think this is more of an abstract sentence. Yeah. I think, what action? And of course, you know at least what I saw in the public comments is that there is not a consensus on DNS abuse terms that we believe there is on this work team. So, we're going to get that back.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, you think we should just ... Because what we're saying is, don't wait for the community to refine the definitions but act concurrently with that going on.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Again, I mean I even looked at some of the transcripts from the DNS Abuse Work Groups, and ALAC stuff, the wholistic compliance that we had last weekend. I see the same back and forth about ICANN says that it's taking all the action it can take under the current letter of the contract.

So, this sentence is just going to get thrown out unless we're more explicit in addressing exactly the back and forth that we see happening as recently as seven days ago on this exact topic. It just looks a little bit like we are pretending that whole conversation isn't continuing to happen. Not that I have a good substitute for ...

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I was about to say, “KC, do you have words to put here?”

KC CLAFFY: Well okay. So, the first thing is, what citations? So yes, we need the citation. And the second thing is, what action do we explicitly need them to take? Now presumably this is sort of an introduction and you're going to say later and so you might want to forward pointer two [EG] recommendation and plus one or something.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm happy to take a shot at clarifying the highlights in this section Heather, if you want to assign this to me. I can come back with some language for everyone to look at.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does that include the next sentence?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. The part about impact ICANN's operation is just too abstract. I don't impact how obviously part of what ICANN is supposed to do is handle this, so that is ICANN's operations. This sentence, I would kill. I mean, it sort of doesn't say anything that I think is helpful in this space.

It undermines, also, the previous sentence because we first say, “Just go ahead and use the existing definitions that ICANN presumably has on its website,” and we're going to cite it. Snd then we're going to say,

---

“Defining it is an ongoing challenge.” Well, we can’t have it both ways. Either they have a definition they can use or they don’t.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well we could say refining these definitions has proven to be a challenge because that’s certainly true.

DENISE MICHEL: So the fundamental point that we were making in the report ... And yes, KC, I think it’s difficult to parse this a sentence at a time or paragraph at a time because you’re right, I think this was intended as a sort of intro overarching sections that are supported by the sections below.

But fundamentally the review team was recommending that noting that there has been a standing and well-used definition of DNS abuse that should continue to be used. In addition, and in parallel, cybercriminals and abuse continues to evolve and that supports the recommendation of, in parallel, an update of the DNS abuse.

KC CLAFFY: So again we have to take into account that ICANN compliance on whatever these are, work party ICANN meeting things that happened last week that I sometimes scan the transcripts of and pull my hair out, already say that compliance is doing everything they can to take action with respect to DNS abuse.

So, this sentence does not acknowledge that that conversation is happening. We have to say exactly what it is that ICANN says publicly

---

that it's doing that is somehow not taking action according to what's in the contracts.

We say that we have a different interpretation of the contracts but are we lawyers? Where do we expect this to go? Might they get an objective third party who doesn't have a financial stake at this to look at it who has a legal background? But I don't know how this can go any further if compliance is already publicly saying in the last few days, "We're doing everything we can here. What else do you want us to do?"

DENISE MICHEL:

Yeah. And I think again it might be useful to sort of flag this paragraph for further discussion and then also circle back after we've gone through their comments in this section.

KC CLAFFY:

Yeah. I would agree.

DENISE MICHEL:

Because we have a couple of issues here. One, there is disagreement about compliance doing everything it currently can under the contracts and its responsibilities in DNS abuse, and that's pretty well documented through comments we've seen from the business constituency and the ISP constituency and others.

KC CLAFFY:

So, we need it documented. Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: And citations can be added for that. And then separately, there's the issue of compliance telling the SSR2 Review Team that it needs more tools. It needs more language and direction to do more to combat DNS abuse and that's the other issue that we have to try to address.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think it might make sense and I'll send around the document that KC was referring to which is from the ALAC session on "wholistic compliance" I think they call it, so that we have the most up to date on what Org or the parts of Org responsible have said about this.

I consider it pretty enlightening and I would say before we discuss let's try to have everyone read it. It's not new but it's up to date, so I think that would help. I'll send it around.

KC CLAFFY: Just, Laurin, there's no way everyone's going to read it, I'm telling you now. So, somebody should read it and summarize the important points and even cut and paste the sentences that we should be quoting here.

DENISE MICHEL: Why don't you just assign it to me? I'll do that and email more information around as well as propose that it's in this. How's that?

---

KC CLAFFY: Or assign it to a couple of people. Not everybody will read it but it would be good if a few people read it. I read it but I scanned it and I'd have to go back and try to cut and paste it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I have a mocked-up summary, KC. So, I will pull this out and I can see what I can do with it.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: So Laurin, do you want to work with me on this?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Absolutely. I'm already looking for the document.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We've exhausted the hour. So, I think we stop here now that we have at least two people willing to work on this text. Heather, if you'll note that this part was assigned, I'd appreciate that. And over to Jennifer for the action items and decisions.



---

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thank you, Russ. So, I captured the decision that the team is going to use the proposed revised outline going forward when developing the final report.

Then a couple of action items for team members to put their initials in the public comment analysis spreadsheet ahead of next week's call to volunteer to help address the comments.

Russ is going to send a note to Alain to seek clarification on Recommendation 8.3. Laurin is going to propose additional text for the findings sections of Recommendation 9 as it relates to 9.3 and 9.4. Heather is going to address KC's comment on page 37 regarding board action on SSR1 in 2012 as discussed today.

Denise is going to propose edits to the abuse and compliance findings and rationale section on page 37 to address the highlighted comments. And then finally, Denise and Laurin are going to work together in—I'm sorry, I didn't catch the name of the ALAC document that was referenced—proposing text based on their review. Let me know if I missed anything there. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I think that's it. Okay, we're out of time. Thank you very much and we'll talk soon.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**