
BRENDA BREWER:

Thank you, Russ, and good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the SSR2 plenary call number 107 on the 8th of April 2020 at 1400 UTC. Attending the call today are Russ, Ram, Zarko, Norm, Danko, Laurin, Ram, and Eric. Apologies from Boban and Kaveh. Observer Dennis Tan is on the call. And attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda. Technical Writer Heather Flanagan. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Russ, I'll turn the meeting over to you. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Hi. We've been exchanging email on the list for the review team and we've gotten a whole bunch of public comments, over 320 of them. And another set just arrived that Heather is yet to be able to put into the spreadsheet. She'll get that done in the next couple of days. But we need to take a divide and conquer approach to getting this done. So, we put together a spreadsheet to sign up for which of the recommendations which is really the findings and the recommendations the sub-team will tackle.

Today I'd like to complete that. I guess we should start with the people who are not on the call and have not signed up which I think Scott is the only one of those. And I would argue that Scott is going to be able to make the biggest contribution to the ISMS and related things like that. So, I think we should put him in subgroup 2. Is there anywhere else we should put him? My memory is he would probably have a lot to say about the ISO standards related to risk management. Does that 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.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. That makes sense. We can just kind of see and maybe once other people also say, "This is more important to me than that." Whatever.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, Okay. So, I'll send him a note. Tell him that I made those assignments. I just had to since he wasn't here. Now we need to get—I think Noorul is also not here. Is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Are there any suggestions for his background which [inaudible] he ought to join? We need somebody working name collisions and we need somebody working budget. How about we put him in there?

[LAURIN WEISSINGER:] [Okay.]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Next on my list of members is Norm. Norm, where would you like to be? I don't see you on here anywhere.

NORM RITCHIE: Are we looking at the same sheet?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You added yourself. Sorry. When I looked earlier today you weren't there.

NORM RITCHIE: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Ram, you're on the call. You said in chat that you would add your name but I don't see it yet. Ram, are you able to speak? Okay. He has said in chat that he's going to add his name to the spreadsheet but his connection is not stable. Well, if you tell us which of the recommendations, one through 31. If you pick two or three then you'll be able to help the team. In fact, if we could get you to do four, 22 and 26 then we would have most of the waterfront covered.

Would that work for you, Ram? I'm not hearing anything and I'm not seeing anything in the chat. So how about I add your name there and you come along later and change it if you need to. Okay. I think we have the sub-teams established at this point. And we can start working on the public comments as soon as Heather has the last set installed there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I plan to have that done as soon as we hang up the phone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Thank you for the prod. Naveed is missing. I think number three has only one person. Add him to 28 as well.

ZARKO KECIC: To be honest I don't understand what is number three.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Number three is Recommendation number three.

ZARKO KECIC: SSR1 Recommendation number three.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No. It's the numbers two through five are follow-ons to recommendations that were made as part of SSR1. Some of them are related to more than one SSR1 recommendation. That's essentially one through five are Work Stream 1.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah, but I don't understand what is SSR1 Frameworks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If you look at the document it tells you that it's a follow-on to some SSR1 recommendations. Heather made up these short term, short phrases instead of just having the number there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right, this was just supposed to jog your memory a little bit as apposed to me copying again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Putting the whole recommendation in there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah. This gives you what section to target.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is mainly about a variety of best practices and security frameworks, etc. etc. So, it would probably make sense to actually link this to the people who deal with ICANN Org in internal and risk. Although there is something on contracted parties in there as well. But probably still would make sense to [move this down].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, this is the order they're in in the draft report that went out for public comment. That's why it's in this order even though we have the proposed rewrite order that you and Heather put together.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry. What I wanted to say is this is logically linked to five, six, seven, eight, nine. That's what I was trying to say. So, we would probably see to this being included there. And Kerry-Ann is in both so I think that's fine anyway.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I hear you saying is that Laurin should be there.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Well, if I can use the KC approach to things.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're always welcome to propose that to the sub-team. Okay. I think we have our teams established. What I would like to do next is designate a rapporteur for each of the groups. That way somebody is responsible for bringing to team any issues that [the team sorts] out regarding consensus and can give us a status report on future calls.

So, for the first one, I will be willing to do that. What I'm going to do is just bold one of the names to be the lead. On SSR2 I'd like to appoint Boban, on Recommendation 2. On Recommendation 3, I'll appoint Kerry-Ann. On Recommendation 4, neither one of them is here. I'll pick the first name. Recommendation 5, Laurin, I haven't tagged you yet. Will you do it?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yep, that's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: C-Suite. Norm, will you take lead on that one?

NORM RITCHIE: Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is a group that was together and is related to number two. So, I'm tempted to [get] Boban to lead all of them. Does that make sense? It's the workstream he was leading anyway. In the next section, 10 through 14, I'll ask Denise to lead those.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: To be essentially the same people. So, on the next [three] KC or Laurin, which one of you wants to lead this? Is KC on the call?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I can take it. I don't think she is. But I can take it.

JENNIFER BRYCE: She's on the call.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I'm on the call. Sorry, I came a bit late. What number is this we're on? 14? Yeah. Whatever Laurin decides.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, I can take it. It's fine.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Compliance audit, is that in the same group do you think, or separate?
Kerry-Ann can lead that one. Abusive naming. KC, will you take that
one?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric, will you do the next two, DNS test suite and key rollover?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, I'll ask you to take baseline security practices.

KC CLAFFY: Yep.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Cool. Will you be the rapporteur for RCS? [Probably no.] KC or Eric, which one of you wants this?

KC CLAFFY: I'll take it. I have the benefit of not remembering exactly what it is.

RUSS HOUSLEY: CDS, KC, Denise, or Eric? You all have other groups.

KC CLAFFY: I can take it too. I think Eric and I are actually working with the data and I'm listening to SSAC. So yeah, I can take that one too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. EBERO. Zarko, can I ask you to do that one?

ZARKO KECIC: I think Boban is better but I can work with him. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Good. Thank you. Algorithm rollover, Alain, can you take the rapporteur of that one? [Name collision,] I'll ask Naveed to do that one. Privacy is clearly Kerry-Ann. Eric, will you take the Academic Research one?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Zarko, you want DOH, I'm sure, right?

ZARKO KECIC Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you all. I sent an email on Monday that outlined the three tasks that the subgroup needs to do, which is formulate an answer to the public comment, update the findings and recommendations text, and deal with whatever comments are in the draft from the team itself. So those are the three tasks that the subgroup has for each of these. Okay. So that's done. The next thing on the agenda is to look at ...

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Russ, I had my hand up for what you were saying [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I can't see the hands. Go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I had sent a reply email to everyone to consider just for tracking. When we started to clean up the document, we had a lot of issues with trying to remember why we did what we did.

So, I had requested if maybe all the sub-teams, I guess we'll have a template or whatever it is to start fixing the text. I don't know if we'll do the text in an Excel sheet or we'll do it in a Word document. But I believe we need additional subtitles to cover logic. And maybe if there were different views on the team to be able to start tracking the discussion so when other team members read the document it will help to finalize the acceptance of whatever proposed changes each sub-team comes with.

We have gone to a lot of trouble trying to remember why we did this, why we didn't do it, and I think recording it for this purpose especially since it's now the public comment that we're going to be making amendments in response to. I just think that we need an extra title to cover—either logic, comments, discussion, thinking, whatever title we call it but something to capture the sub-team's logic.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, that makes sense. I was thinking that the rapporteur person would, when they bring this back to the team, share that information. It's important that that information is captured on one of our recorded minuted meetings and anyway for transparency reasons. So, I think whatever way the sub-team wants to work is okay with me as long as the final text comes back to the team with some kind of a report out.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does that make sense?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. It makes sense. I just want to make sure we're all on the same page with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Absolutely. We all need to be working in the same direction.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Perhaps what I was thinking would go in the response and change columns for the public feedback form. That's where I thought we would actually capture quite a bit of that. What exactly changed and why and how are we responding to someone about that material.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So, should we use that column then to capture the discussion? Because I think no matter how long it is if we have the raw capture then we can reduce it or redact it for the public once it's accepted by all team members.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Depending on how long the conversation is. I don't know if you'll want to capture the whole thing in the there or if you'll want to point to another document saying here are our notes as to why we proposed the changes that we did.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: But this would at least serve as an index.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or your rationale for rejecting. Right?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes. One or the other.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ. You have Laurin and Eric in the queue as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin, go ahead, then Eric.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: If I have my hand up, that's some kind of bug. My apologies.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: So, for the subgroups that are planning to try and conduct their joint editing over email—which I suppose will be maybe the rapporteur role suggested—if that documentation exists,. Then can we skip putting it into a spreadsheet addition since it’s recorded?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, I think that we need to put it in the spreadsheet in order to build the public comment response document. So, I think it would save Heather a huge amount of work if it was there instead of having to go to the email and find it. If there’s a clean place that you could put a URL to the archive there, that would be fine. But she shouldn’t have to search the whole mail list.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Eric, maybe whoever is the rapporteur as well, once the email discussion has been completed, could just copy the main points from the email trail and then capture that in the excel maybe.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. That’s fine. That’s the clarification I was asking for. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Anything else? So, if you go to the public comment spreadsheet which is the third agenda item. There’s a link to it. If you go to the bottom of it which is ...

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Starting at line 310.

RUSS HOUSLEY: 310. Yes. 309, right? At the bottom of the spreadsheet are the comments that Heather felt didn't tag to any particular recommendation. So, we need to discuss them as a team to either tag them to a particular recommendation so that a sub-team can deal with them or figure out what we want to do as a team.

So, the first one being 309. Oh, that one's about the further suggestions appendix. Sorry. So, you were right, Heather, 310. So maybe KC can provide some context for this one. It [comes from] SSAC and says that, "We should consider adding an environmental assessment inventory, strengths, and weaknesses assessment to the final report. Think that this would help readers make the report more actionable and easier to prioritize." KC, can you give us some color to this comment?

KC CLAFFY: Oh yeah. There was color. [inaudible]

RUSS HOUSLEY: That wasn't what I meant. I didn't mean flaming angry red.

KC CLAFFY: Multicolor. Well, okay, look. I think that part of this was—and I'm sure this will come up a lot in these comments. At least in my interpretation of the SSAC's responses was the report did lack some context. It sort of

hits you like a ton of bricks with all of these recommendations and all of these criticisms of ICANN and in SSAC's view—and some of the people who read the SSAC's report view—I would say it didn't come across as having stepped back and look at things holistically.

How has the environment changed? I frankly disagreed with this comment and argued with it on the call because I think there is plenty of places on the report where we talk about, for example, the increase in the abuse, at least that big factor in the environment that made a lot of these things more important. But I think that SSAC looks at a lot of other dimensions of what they call the environment. And I think they would have liked to see a bit about maybe what ICANN was doing well or what various pieces of the ecosystem were doing well and what might have changed in the environment that would have made some of the recommendations of SSR1 be maybe less applicable or less easy to interpret in today's environment about what they might have meant back then.

So, it was a pretty general comment but I ended up accepting that there was some truth—or I should say some justification for the need for a bit more contextualization of the recommendations that we provided. Now, I would also say that my own view which isn't in the SSAC comment is that the contextualization—well, it's kind of an SSAC comment because they do complain here obliquely that all of these recommendations are effectively all of them are high priority. In which case, well, again how do you really think about that in a moving environment where things are dynamic? And it can't be that everything is the same high priority. I think again that's where they just felt like

there was not as rich of an assessment of the environment as there could have been. Does that help?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

It helps me understand the comment. And it sounds like it's something that all groups need to think about as they're making changes to both the findings and the recommendations to, if there is anything, they can change this to that help the reader to understand where we're coming from and ...

KC CLAFFY:

I'll say one more thing, which is I think ...

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I don't think we should turn this into a, "We made these 14 changes." [You could say] something more once we see the changes that are made, we can summarize the approach we took to adding this kind of material.

KC CLAFFY:

I think that this is really a symptom of the more fundamental problem with the report which is the lack of what they call the smart versions of the recommendations. And we really point out what is the problem that each recommendation is trying to solve, how do we know that it's a problem. Make it as quantitative or at least as concrete as possible. And that again, it comes in the next comment about prioritization

consolidation, it comes in the comment after that about context and reasoning for each of the recommendations.

So, I really think that these are all repeating, the SSAC is repeating the same things in a bunch of different ways which we already knew to be the case and was part of the reason I was really uncomfortable going to public comment. I just felt the report wasn't ready. So no, I don't think we have to say in response to this, "We made these 14 changes." I think we can say that we acknowledge that part of the issue here that we think inspired this comment was the lack of smartness in the recommendation. We've tried to address that throughout the report.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

I have been banging on about this smartness thing for a while. So now I'm wondering as we have broken this up, will every sub-team define the smart criteria for the recommendations they work on? Is this something we'll add to their work? None of this seems to be very ...

RUSS HOUSLEY:

That's a good point. Make it a fourth point that each sub-team should do, is take a look at making the recommendations more smart.

KC CLAFFY:

Technically it's worse than that. It's that we should be going back and doing that for the SSR1 recommendations because we say they aren't implemented but we don't say in a smart way what we would count as implemented.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, we kind of do. But let's see what that sub-team comes up with and see if we can agree with it. Okay.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, agreed. We've done some of that. Eric has his hand raised.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Sorry. Going back past this smart. Not talking about that. I'm confused about the SSAC comment. And it could be totally me, but haven't we been spending a lot of time over the many years we've been together talking about how we're not supposed to get too down in the weeds, get too specific in implementation details, certainly not to be directive, etc.? But isn't that suggestion saying we should go out and do a deep analysis of deployment for example? I mean, someone could do that but I thought we had sort of gotten our hand slapped a bunch of times for not even getting that close.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Actually, we've been on a teeter-totter about this. You will recall right before we went out Steve brought back comments from ICANN saying in some places, we were overengineering and not leaving enough flexibility. So the balance we are trying to find is one that provides

ICANN the appropriate flexibility in implementing but yet is smart enough to be measurable and everything else. So, I don't know the exact balance point and I don't think we will find it to be a razor edge kind of thing. But [attempting] to get that balance correct is the best we're going to be able to do.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Cool. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. I mean you're right. But there is no formula for that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Maybe then that gives us a lot more leeway in whatever response we'll end up crafting to it, I guess, is maybe the meta point of this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. So, 311 seems to be a call for greater granularity in our prioritization. Maybe we can get another look at that after each of the sub-teams is done. But I'm not sure that this would be fruitful. But I think we have to see what the sub-teams do before we take a [inaudible] spend a lot of time on that. Does anyone have a different perspective? Heather, any suggestions on we should mark ones we have to come back to?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I would simply say, "Come back to it." Maybe in the response or our assign to.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right, 312. "It'd be helpful for SSR2 to provide context and reasoning to substantiate each of the recommendations within the body of the report. It'd be helpful to fully describe the intention of the recommendation in terms of resulting benefit and cost to ICANN Org and the community if particular recommendations were implemented."

So, I recall a phone call where the SSAC has said that they thought each recommendation should say, what harm would come if it was not implemented and what benefit would come if it were implemented. That is what they're trying to say here. It must be how it got wordsmithed as they went along. Is that right, KC?

KC CLAFFY: I'm sorry. Say the last part of what you just said again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That as the SSAC comments got wordsmithed this is what, "If this is implemented, what benefit is expected? If it's not implemented, what harm is expected?"

KC CLAFFY:

Yeah. Absolutely, what's the risk, what's the risk if it's not. Just to comment on the prioritization thing before. If they are all high priority, we have not prioritized. That's not the meaning of prioritize.

I will also say however that ATRT has sort of cheated on this also because they did accept the new operating standards but realized that they actually couldn't implement them. So instead they dropped everything that isn't a high priority recommendation. They made it a suggestion so that they didn't have to follow the operating standards for those.

So, they have more or less done the same thing in my view. But either way, it's not really prioritization if we say they're all high priority. This one, line 312, is really about if you provide context it would be helpful for ICANN to prioritize them if you're not going to prioritize them. If we, SSR2, are not going to.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

I think from my perspective, we try to prioritize. We used a survey. So, we can definitely look at doing a similar exercise again after some of the recommendations have been rewritten. There were differences between the recommendations in both urgency and importance in the cluster that we said to be the important ones.

The problem I think is as well—and I guess this is probably the struggle of other review teams too, these things are all interrelated. There is a higher kind of benefit and then you have to do like four things to get to it. That's at least how I interpret a lot of that stuff. Like the C-suite is a very good example of this where it just kind of ties into a lot of other

things. But yeah, we can just repeat the previous exercise maybe and see if that helps.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Possibly, if KC's approach takes a hold in many sub-teams, we'll have fewer recommendations.

KC CLAFFY: Right. So, let's be realistic. And I see Eric and a bunch of other hands up. And Jennifer's hand is up. She may want to provide some clarification here. If it's going to fall to ICANN, the Board, and maybe they'll delegate some of this to the staff to prioritize. And we sort of see that.

I guess you could argue that we saw a little of that happening with CCT where it then came down to, well, what can ICANN actually do on its own or what does it think it can do on its own. And we don't need to go into that weeds. So, another way you could argue this is, look, we can't prioritize these. This is a risk analysis. It's up to the board. We don't have the resources. We could totally say that.

I do get the feeling it's not, that we would find things to be a higher priority. But that's again why I would say it's more important than a prioritization for us to identify clearly what the risk is. Now, that doesn't mean we're going to be able to quantify it. That's maybe not our job. We don't have the resources to do that, but that would give ICANN a hint on how they could go quantify it for them to figure out which of these to put resources in because they can't do them all, for example.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay. Eric, then Jennifer.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Okay. So, I guess I'll add my dissenting opinion. It's not surprising probably to anybody at this point but hopefully, this just makes some sense. And if not, I'm happy to go with the group. So not trying to make a big stand here. But I think we've tried prioritizing a couple of times and it sounds like we've come up with the same result that it sounds like ATRT3 has come up with which is basically it's not tractable.

So, I mean if the operating standards say, "You have to do it." It doesn't mean it's workable. This is like trying to do fairness in networking. You have to define what fairness is. This is like defining priority which is at least as hard. I think that was implicit in some of the things I think I heard KC just say.

I mean we basically have to know what the stakeholder's perspective is that's going to implement it and that's the Board and that's not us or ICANN Org and it's not us. We can't do it. But more than just as a strawman, we actually tried it and it was so intractable, the result, that we wound up prioritizing everything high like KC just said. And that basically means to me as a measurements person that we tried it, it failed. They tried it, it failed. We've got a couple of data points that this is way harder and not worth our time.

But if we do decide we want to go down this route I would like to suggest that we consider something like ranked [ballot] voting where you can say, "These are my relative priorities of things I think are important. This one is greater than that one, these things are all equal

to each other,” etc., and we can look for a Condorcet winner. And if we have Condorcet winners, that means that everyone agreed in a head to head run-off that these things were the winners. And if we don’t have a Condorcet winner, then we just say, “Yeah, we were at loggerheads so we can’t prioritize.”

If we wanted to do it systematically that’s what I would suggest we do. It’s simple. It’s empirical. We can get it done really quickly and be done with it. And I suspect it will tell us really quick we can’t prioritize. And I think that might actually be something we put in our write up as well.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Jennifer, then Kerry.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks. I just wanted to read out some of the comments that Naveed had asked me to read that he’s posted in the chat. And he’s just saying that he disagrees with the prioritization issue. He has disagreed with the prioritization issue on many occasions. “If we’re supposed to do all priority stuff then what’s the implementation team supposed to do? Proper prioritization varies with time an also needs details on resources and environment and all of that we might not have.” Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Kerry.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Hi Russ. I completely agree with Naveed because every single time we've met in person we've spent at least the first half of our time meeting discussing this. As Eric said, unless it's empirical, which is hard to do unless we're actually the person having received it, they then see what are the current resources as Naveed said. They see what are the current circumstances. They look at the recommendations. They then do a ranking on their end and then put that to the public. I think that's the only way it can be done.

For us to prioritize without inner knowledge and inner working of what's happening in ICANN every single day as the environment is changing. It's kind of hard for us to prioritize. Again, as Laurin did say, we had gone through the whole exercise. And maybe we need to document that process that we undertook and to indicate our logic that we believe that is implementation team when they do see it, they have to then advise the community why they've prioritized, what they've prioritized, and how they've prioritized.

It's really difficult for us we think as I completely agree with what Eric said. We have ranked and said that everything is important to us now because of what we know and the knowledge that we have. The longer we sit trying to prioritize, we don't have enough information to do it. So, we've been prioritizing based on what we think is important from our different constituents and what we hear and what we know. But at the end of the day when it gets to ICANN and the implementation team is implemented and stood up, then they could do it. But we've all stated in our recommendations that this has to be done.

So maybe we need to emphasize that we've gone through the exercise in that section and having gone through that exercise we believe that once implementation is done, they need to publicly put out their implementation plan and their process and why they've done that logic. I think time would be better spent making that section stronger than us going to back to reprioritize again.

KC CLAFFY:

I totally agree with Kerry-Ann's comment that we should put the explanation in here. Okay. We had this conversation a dozen times. I agree with Naveed, Eric. What everybody said here.

Indeed I think it really bears calling out—and I'm having this argument over in ATRT because there are many times in ATRT's report where whenever they come up with an accountability issue, their out—I should say their conclusion—is that, "Well, the new operating standards should take care of this because prioritization is going to happen." And prioritization drives at one of the big accountability issues which ICANN isn't. So, people, review teams think ICANN isn't implementing all the recommendations or they're not taking things in the right priority.

Now CCT I will say did prioritize. And I think they did a decent job at prioritizing. But I also think that they had a fairly narrow mission. And our mission has expanded where security can mean a lot of different things. So, I more or less don't disagree with the prioritization they choose. And I appreciate that they did it.

I'll observe that I don't think it made much of a difference to how those recommendations were treated which gets back to what Kerry-Ann is

saying. If you asked me, I could prioritize all of the SSR2 recommendations. And I would feel pretty strongly, I could definitely put them in three or four different buckets where one bucket is a trash bucket. But I don't think there would be consensus on that.

And I think that fact that we can't get a consensus even in this group explains why it's not something that we can take on. And of course, neither can the community get consensus which is why you end up with sort of the multi-stakeholder physics taking over and what can be done easily or what you can get incentive alignment ends up happening. And the other ones just don't happen for 25 years. So, we should say all that because that's an important piece here of why some of these security problems persist for decades. And we can't solve them. In fact, this architecture can't solve them. But that's my view.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, would you be able to write part of that down in an email note?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I'll just cut and paste the transcript of this call, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You may.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I'll try.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you. Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. Sorry. Just one quick thing. Maybe this is color commentary, maybe it's humorous or maybe it's serious. KC, one of the things that you just said—or to everyone, one of the things I just heard KC said really kind of hits it home for me as sort of an empirical justification.

You know in physics, it's sort of a known thing, you can't solve beyond the two-body problem. You can't solve a three-body problem. And in fact, the multi-stakeholder environment where people have different views, they have different perspectives that motivate their relative prioritizes kind of suggests that if you have more than two types of stakeholders, empirically maybe you can't solve this.

You know KC said she would categorize these into three buckets and plus her follow-on comment was that she knows other people in the team would probably disagree with her. And that could very well be from different perspectives. So maybe that really undermines the idea that anyone could really prioritize this set of recommendations across a broad space with multi-stakeholders.

KC CLAFFY:

However, in SSAC's defense now, that's kind of why they want this where our line is. 312 does not talk about prioritization. 311 did. But 312 is like, and the way I think about it is, yeah, if you can prioritize you at least need to provide substantiation for your recommendations. What problem are you trying to solve? What's the intent? How do you

know it's going to be successful? So, then ICANN will go prioritize that. We at least have to help them out with that prioritization, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Hi. Can I get in the queue?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. You're in the queue. Go ahead. You're next.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I think it's important to keep in mind that the Board as I noted in the chat despite all the prioritization and other efforts of the CCT review and the WHOIS RDS Review, the Board failed to act on a large majority of the recommendations of those review teams. I think we should move onto the work at hand. Try to wrap it up as quickly as possible and then circle back to this discussion.

There are different ways we can prioritize things. We could point out the prioritization of a category of recommendations or we could prioritize recommendations within the categories. Frankly at the end of the day it seems given the Board's actions in the past that it's not going to make much difference. And ultimately the responsibility of the ICANN Board of Directors is to make the final decision on prioritization and act accordingly. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC, I see a hand.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. Old Hand.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We have four minutes left. It's clear we don't agree on the prioritization.

KC CLAFFY: Hey, but I can get rid of the next comment entirely by recommending we delete the sentence that SSAC is talking about and then we could say we got one more done, Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anyone have a concern with deleting that sentence?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I have a question. If we delete that, do you want me to delete the table in the appendix?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: How would that work?

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. I'm not in the document so I can't support a deletion but I'm happy to look at it.

KC CLAFFY: SSAC sort of choked on a sentence that said, "The SSR2 removed any recommendations from this report that did not clearly align with the strategic plan." And I hate that sentence because it raises all sorts of flags in my head going, "Wait, wait, wait. What did you remove? What did you remove?" And indeed, SSAC said that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: How about we reword it to say, "SSR2 RT did not make any recommendations that are not aligned with the strategic plan."

KC CLAFFY: You could say that.

[KERRY-ANN BARRETT:] [inaudible] disagree with that.

DENISE MICHEL: Or we could say our recommendations are aligned with the strategic plan. I mean goodness gracious, we went through [inaudible]

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I agree with that.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, that's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree with that comment from Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: [inaudible] every single place that it connects with the strategic plan.

RUSS HOUSLEY: If we tried really hard, right?

KC CLAFFY: I support that.

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry. I'm going to have to drop off to jump on another call. Please ping me if there is anything else I can do.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yes. Reading the comments, it seemed that some of the comments were ready before even the report was out and had to be in the public comments. So, you're not like mapping to what the report says. So, I wonder what that is.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, I think the agreement was the SSR2 RT recommendations align with the strategic plan. Okay. We now have one minute left, so I'm sure we cannot get through another recommendation or comment.

We will pick this up next week in addition to getting readouts from any sub-teams that have anything to share. Thank you all. Please, rapporteurs, start organizing your subgroups. As Eric suggests, hopefully, a good bit of this can be done by email. Thank you so much and stay well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]