BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 plenary call number 117 on the 8th of July, 2020, at 14:00 UTC. Review team members attending the call include Naveed, Danko, Matogoro, Russ, Scott, Ram Krishna, Kerry-Ann, Žarko, and Kaveh. Observer: Dennis Tan. Apologies from Alain and Denise.
	Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda, and our technical writer, Heather. 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:	Thank you. The first thing I would like to do is go through the sub-stream status because a couple of teams had a few small actions, and I'd like to just see where we are on those. And then, we'll go through, hopefully, the read-outs from some teams.
	So, the first one. Naveed, you took an action to look at the merged Recommendation 4 that got moved into Recommendation 6 and confirmed that the wording that you had originally had, there, carried forward. Can you tell me whether that happened?
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	Okay. Hi, Russ. Hi, everyone. Can you hear me?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Yes.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. Actually, this is kind of an interesting something that was not in my perspective. And when I started to have a look at that … Actually, there are two things, here. One is the report that we put for the public comment in January. But then, we kept working on the draft itself and, in March, I made the change to this recommendation.

So, actually, my change is … And I put some rationale of one-and-a-half pages or two pages, which is currently available in that latest version of the draft that we have. So, I think it is on this link. That is available here, that I shared on that chat.

So there, we can see that there is one-and-a-half pages of rationale and findings. Previously, there was none of that in the draft report that we put for public comment. So, that was the change after we shared with the public that report.

And also, we made three recommendations, rather than one. So, in the draft report that we put for the public comment, it was four and 4.1 only, and this is where we get the comments from the public. But now, in the current version that is available on this link, there is 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

And there, those are almost entirely changed from what we put. Actually, I also see that the risk team has integrated the previous version of the Recommendation 4 in their own current set of modified recommendations. This is what, actually, Laurin mentioned last week.

And I had a look at that, but I saw that, there, they incorporated 4.1. But actually, it would be better if we have a look at this latest modification to the recommendation.

And then, the risk team can consider whether they would like to still keep it under those risk groups, or we keep it as a standalone. And we also need to see … Since this is not under my direct list of work that was assigned to me, I did not really have a look at the public comments that we get. But it is possible that the public comments that we get have already been resolved …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed, are you still there?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can now but you went silent for a second. Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Oh. I'm not sure what part you missed, actually, is all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, you were saying the risk team needs to take a look at 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 when you faded.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Actually, I was saying that, since this was not under my list of tasks that I had to do for this public comment, I did not have a look at the public comments that we received for Recommendation 4.

So, it is possible that the public comments were already resolved with the modification that we did with 4.1 to 4.3, and the rationale that we put with that. So, somebody has to look at the modified version of the Recommendation 4 and public comments, and the risk team has to see whether it still can be applied under the risk group that they integrated. So, this is what I was actually trying to say.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Good. When Laurin gets here to talk about the risk stuff, we'll make sure that happens. So, I have captured that in the spreadsheet so that we don't lose track of that. Thank you for doing that homework.

The next thing for Recommendation 25: during this week, we did get the implementation status on SSAC 97. So, that was previously blocking that sub-team. So, I hope KC, Denise, and Eric can now resume that work, or start that work, and report back to the team in a week or so.

And on Recommendation 28, Naveed, you said you needed an extra week, and that ends today. So, where are we on that one? Have you at least got the sub-team started?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. Actually, I did some work on that. So, what I did, I put, actually, some responses to the public comments, the other Excel sheet. If you can

have a look at Recommendation 28 in the other Excel sheet, that is, I think, open at your PC, right now.

I don't know if it is Brenda's screen or your screen. But if you see the other, where we have consolidated public comments, I put some response to those public comments. Can we have that open somehow, also? Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Brenda, can you open the public comment sheet—

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, the other Excel sheet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, that sheet.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, there. Yeah, the other one.

BRENDA BREWER: Okay. And where do I need to scroll to?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I put some—

RUSS HOUSLEY: And if you do it, go to the second sheet so that it's organized by section.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, exactly. Exactly.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, the other. That one, yeah.

BRENDA BREWER: I don't know where sheet two came from. Does anyone mind if I delete that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, please delete it. It's confusing. And if you would scroll down to ones at section … Has to do with Recommendation 28. So, the column B should say 28.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. It should be, really, down in 100-something, or 200 line. Yeah, somewhere here. Okay. So here, I put some comments in front of all the public comments that we received. Maybe there is another one on top. I don't know. We need to check. Can you go to line 255 and line 254? Yeah. No. Up, up. Yeah, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, there you go.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, just need to see where is the …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Down one row.

BRENDA BREWER: Sorry, my scroller is not working. Okay. I probably went …

RUSS HOUSLEY: There you go. [cross talk] all of 256 on the screen, that would be good.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: It is row number 256. So we had, I think, five or six comments. The first one was just that they agree with the recommendation. But the other ones, most of them from SSAC, I tried to put a thorough response, here. I did not touch anywhere else.

So, I did not try to modify the recommendation yet. But I put my thorough response, here. So, we can read here, or we'll have a look at that, or see if it is the right way to go about it, and then I can continue working on that.

So, the first one, we can read the comment and the response, and we'll see if we are on the right track. So, just to make sure, let me read from my sheet. Right. So the comment was, actually, 344. If you can go one

EN

row down so everyone will be able to see the comment as well as the response? Yeah. No, we lost it. Yeah, here. Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There we go! We can see the whole thing. Thank you.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: The first comment says that it is unclear why the topic of name collision in Work Stream 4 falls under the future challenges and not under the DNS SSR. And they also see that we have to see whether there is currently an old NCAP study and how it is relating to that. So, this is one of the major comments.

So, what I observed is that, in the start … Because I started investigation from the start of the review team of how we approached that, what I found it is that there were no future challenges with the name of "name collision" from the start, with the review team. It was added later.

But I also see that there was no response in the question/answers that were put to ICANN for investigation. There was no question asked related to name collision, but that does not mean that it is not a future work. Still, we have some challenges related to the future of name collision, and that, I tried to put here.

So here, I say, "The challenges related to the name collision and the analysis remain something that need to be investigated further with innovative and aggressive strategies. More specifically, there is a need to devise a mechanism that allows detection of malicious name collisions that remain unreported as of now."

So, recently concluded NCAP study, and I had a look at that study, does not address these concerns. On the contrary, it concluded that there is no recent research work on name collisions, and it took that as an indicator that name collision is no longer and interesting work to be resolved, and everything is going well, which is not the case, actually.

We are just basing ourselves on the controlled interruption mechanism under that Collision Occurrence Management Framework that ICANN has, and that has a specific approach. So, it might be possible that that approach is not working well, and we are not able to identify those name collisions.

So, that's why I just made the response that it is something that still needs to be resolved, and that is why we are putting it under future challenges. So, this was my response one. Anybody has any question regarding this one?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you for digging through that. I know KC was involved in reviewing these SSAC comments. Did she join?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Naveed, I agree with everything you said. I think it's what I've heard from others. And of course, this report, or this process, is in a weird state because SSAC was sort of pulled out of the loop, or sort of pulled themselves out of the loop, and this is all inside ICANN/OCTO right now.

But I don't think even OCTO has issued their own report. They issued the consultant report, which I think you characterized reasonably well. At

least, that's my understanding. I didn't read the whole report, but I certainly read the conclusion. I found it a very odd conclusion.

It was sort of a, "Well, there is all this research that has been done, although none of it in the last three years, and nobody has reported problems in the last three years, and these other studies would be hard to do. It's not clear how to do them, and so we should go on."

And yet, there was a recognition in that report for the need for additional studies, that the problem hasn't been solved. So, there's a bit of cognitive dissonance I got from just reading that report.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Another thing that was confusing, there, is that that study actually recommends not to continue studies two and three of NCAP.

KC CLAFFY: Right. That's right.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, that is kind of strange, why to stop that mechanism. And there was no proper rationale put for what is the reasoning of coming to that conclusion. So that … I didn't get it, actually.

KC CLAFFY: And I think it is important that we characterize that because, again, ICANN has not issued its own opinion on that report. And my interpretation is that they're going to let that report, essentially,

represent their opinion, since they paid for consultants to do it. I don't know if they plan to do their own criticism of that report, the way they're expecting from the public comment.

So, I think we are, basically, considered the objective party in assessment of that report. So, I would encourage other people who are even remotely interested in this to go at least read the conclusion of that report and make sure you agree with Naveed's take on it. And then there is, of course—

RUSS HOUSLEY: KC?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't want to interrupt your train of thought but I note that Eric sent regrets for today.

KC CLAFFY: Right.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And he was clearly one of the people highly involved in the discussions when we were able to have face-to-face meetings. So, I wonder if you could just ping him to get a discussion going on the list?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I suspect he's going to agree with what Naveed has said, too.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I suspect he might feel a little stronger, but otherwise …

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, fair enough. Fair enough. Okay. So, that brings me to my other question for Naveed, which is however this got put in future challenges. It's not obvious to me this is a "future challenges" versus "now challenges." At least, I know the SubPro next round of TLDs is underway and is issuing their report this summer, maybe. I'm not sure.

And I don't know if this issue is addressed in that report. It may be that they use this report to say—when I say "this report," I mean the consultant report on name collision—"Okay, well, we don't have to worry about this. We can move on, because they don't even think we need studies two and three." I don't know SSAC would agree with that, but I don't know how …

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, yeah. KC, one of the things that this report is kind of misleading is that they use the tool that the under-reports, or decreasing reports, is an indicator that it is no longer a challenge.

EN

But on the other hand, we also need to see that, for example, starting from the new gTLD first round, the number of TLD delegations are also decreasing quite dramatically in the past few years.

So, with the decrease in delegations, the name collision is also expected to be decreased. And I think we need to correlate the two together in order to better understand this mechanism. So, I don't think that it's the right conclusion that there is no longer an issue. What I found, I just put it. That's why I did not touch the report, as such. So, I just put my responses here.

KC CLAFFY: Now, I don't see your response on the spreadsheet that … Jennifer. I see it in the Zoom window, but is that some different URL? Because …

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Are you in the "organized by" section, KC?

KC CLAFFY: Oh, no, I'm not. Thank you. God, Heather can read my mind. That's scary, Heather. All right, fine. So, okay. I think we need to figure out how to contextualize this in terms of future versus now, versus how high a priority is with respect to new rounds of gTLDs.

And the other threat I want to mention is that there is an SSAC working group, now, on this issue they're calling … What are they calling? Private use TLDs. I won't go into detail on that. Russ can go talk to Rod and get more detail. I think it's worth it because I think it's relevant.

EN

But what's public is the IETF side of this. There was a draft—I think it started three years ago, also in the context of name collisions—for how to mitigate the risk of name collisions by, essentially, ICANN allocating, or IETF allocating, or somehow the powers that be making it be that something is allocated for internal use.

And they were nicknaming it ".internal," but that is very unlikely to be what it's called. But it's the equivalent of—if it happens, I'm not saying it's going to happen—RFC 1918 space for the naming space.

Because it is clear that, for many of the sources of name collisions, or potential name collisions, there is a need for some internal domain, TLD, or domain name, at least. Now, there is a lot of debate on the IETF public mailing list about whether this a good idea, or a terrible idea, or what kind of middle road could be taken that would cause less damage than it might mitigate.

But it's another big chunk of thinking that's happening, and debate that's happening, that is related to name collisions that may require ICANN to step in, or at least to have some serious research done on the cost and benefit of various future trajectories.

Again, IETF is … Well, the first time that this was taken to the IETF—I think it was three years ago, by Warren Kumari—it was basically thrown out. They said, "Warren, this is not IETF space. This is policy about whether to do this allocation of a new top-level domain."

Whether or not you agree with that position, I'm not sure that I do. I don't know whose problem this is. That's what happened. And so then, Warren is sort of has now helped to get this work party started inside SSAC,

because I'm not sure ICANN thinks it's ICANN's job, either. And I think ICANN would look toward the community, of which we are a part, here.

So, I think this is just, actually, a bigger issue than this name collision report that they got this consultant to work on, and I don't know how to capture all that. I will certainly add some sentences to whatever text ends up in the report, and references to the IETF documents. And hopefully, this SSAC document will be out in the next few months.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I worry that it's not going to come out in time to affect what we're doing. But this all started as a result of .home?

KC CLAFFY: Yep.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, that was the first tip of the iceberg.

KC CLAFFY: Yep.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Then because that happened—

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But they actually … This is under the study three that was proposed. This is study one, I think. And as I said in the conclusion, they explicitly said that there is no need to investigate .com and .others. There are two other, I think, that—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, because they've been put in a place where they can't be allocated, at least for now.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's why they didn't see a reason to invest, because .site and .corp are in the same place.

KC CLAFFY: I mean, I think we could talk to the TLD operators, like Verisign. I mean the gTLD operator root … Not root server. GTLD name server operators to get some data or insight into the growth, the proliferation, really, of use of non-allocated TLDs. So, that problem is not going away, which makes the name collision problem sort of more relevant, not less.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. And whether they leak, right? Because the idea is that those will only be used in a VPN context, and then somebody's VPN falls down and, suddenly, they're making queries against the public DNS.

KC CLAFFY: Right. And there are big security risks, there. And so, one of the SSR responses could be to write a draft that says, "Please don't use these. Please go get your own real public domain name." You might advise people not to use RFC 1918 addresses because you don't want those leaking: "Go get your own addresses." Not that there are any left. Or go use—

RUSS HOUSLEY: As long as you want V6.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, right. Anyway, again, this report needs to be finished so the problem doesn't seem to keep getting bigger, and we have to write more report about it. But I just want to put that on the table. But that's also—

RUSS HOUSLEY: But I do think that the first order question that you raised is, does this belong in the future challenges, or does it belong in the DNS challenges? And I think you've made a pretty persuasive argument that this is now, not the future.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, this is now.

EN

NAVEED BIN RAIS: To be fair, if I can just follow up on that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I investigated this matter since the very start, when the review team started working on it. So, I looked at all the documents which were relevant and I found that the text to this recommendation, which is a very small text, and it specifically needs some kind of rationale. So, it needs to have more text before to justify why we are putting it there.

So, when we start doing it, we might conclude that this is not the proper place to put it, and we might change it there. Because I see that the text related to this recommendation remained the same throughout the lifetime of the review team.

So, since its inception, nobody tried to touch this text. There was no [update] related to that, which is very surprising. So, it is something that remains there and constant throughout. And once we start putting some kind of rationale over it, which it is missing, a kind of two-line rationale or findings that we put on top of this recommendation, which is certainly not enough. So, once we change that, maybe we conclude what is the right place of that.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Fair enough. Who is writing that text? Is that clear yet?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I believe that Naveed is leading the team that is writing that text.

KC CLAFFY: And then, Naveed, from reading the public comments on this study, do you know when OCTO will deliver its … I mean, is the idea that ICANN/OCTO will take all the public comments and then write its own report and issue that? Is that you're understanding?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, I have no idea, because I think I mentioned previously that I even did not know anything about NCAP. So, I had to investigate all this document to find out what it has and all that. So, I have limited information about the perspective of that in future.

But I don't think that it is going to be concluded in the next two or three months, actually, which also leads to the thing that, these public comments that were put by SSAC to our report, most of them are based on this NCAP report which currently stands as a draft report.

So, I'm not sure if we can do something about a report that is not even finalized and try to refer to that report, that it is doing something or not, because we don't know what the end-product would be.

KC CLAFFY:	Oh, geez. I wonder if we could get ICANN to give us a timeline of that. It seems like it shouldn't take another five months to get a final report and OCTO's thoughts on it out.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Steve, do you happen to know?
KC CLAFFY:	Yeah.
STEVE CONTE:	I don't. I can go and bring it back to the team that was working on it. I don't even have enough information to give a pretend answer, so I'm just going to sit here and flail.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Well, we don't want a pretend answer, but if you could send an e-mail that lets us know what their projection for something is? It's just so we know whether we need to take that into account or we could just say, "Well, we're going to have to publish before that comes out."
KC CLAFFY:	Yes. But to Naveed's point, do we want to say something as bold in the recommendation as, "ICANN should absolutely be collecting this data, or in a position to collect this data before new gTLDs are launched," or something that stark? Rather than, "ICANN should go study this," or, "go do studies two or three," even though the [cross talk] not to.

RUSS HOUSLEY: SSR1 said, "Start collecting this data before you do any more changes."

KC CLAFFY: Yes, I'm aware of that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I kind of think we'd be on pretty solid ground, right?

KC CLAFFY: Yep.

STEVE CONTE: Just to see if I can synthesize the conversation that took place, are you asking OCTO to give a timeline of any response to the public comments, or a report of the public comments, or are you looking for OCTO's or ICANN Org's position on the document? I'm sorry, it's not clear to me what you're asking.

RUSS HOUSLEY: A consultant was paid to do this report and that was published, but we haven't heard what ICANN plans to do next. That's what we're—

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, and that's not even the final report. So, we'd like to know when the NCAP work is completed, meaning ICANN has declared it as completed and is telling us what it's going to do based on that.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: But by the time we do it, because we have to finalize, we might need to finalize this report earlier than that. So, in that case—

KC CLAFFY: Correct.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: [cross talk] need to base ourselves on something that is not finalized, and refer to that, or we just do the way we are doing.

KC CLAFFY: Correct. Naveed—

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we have to proceed with what we have. But if something is going to drop in two weeks, I'd sure like to know that.

EN

KC CLAFFY: Right. Or even two months, and then we write something and it's out of date before it goes to press. We need to prepare so we can know not to spend time on this, to spend time on other things until we get OCTO's position on this, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Naveed, do you know what needs done?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. So far, I see that whatever I wrote is insufficient to provide an answer to that. But this NCAP would be very important, because the three or four comments relate to this NCAP study. And they are saying that we need to answer whether what we are doing is a parallel to NCAP or not. It is not, actually, as of now, as of the current report.

That's my answer to that. But we don't know what the actual report would be, so that's what I'm saying. So, as of now, we are just going to say that it is not something in parallel to anything, but it is just complimenting the NCAP study – kind of that as a response to that. So, what we are proposing can be just used as a complement to what is there in the NCAP.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not hearing anybody disagree but I do see a hand from Kerry-Ann.

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Hi, Russ. I just had one general thing. Because I think the discussion, and the points that KC raised, and even Naveed's response, is something that we could take forward for some of the other [ACs] and the future challenges. I think the community generally had an issue with how we titled that section.

And I wanted to raise, here, because the name collision thing is so … I support Naveed's position that it's something that, yes, other reports might be mentioned in it and they have more detailed studies, etc., and the approach that we've taken, that we're going to keep it in our report, keep our radar out.

But I was just wondering if the title, "Future Challenges," also could be problematic when it's finally published. I don't know if we could probably be more creative with that section, where it could be like risk considerations that we couldn't delve into deeply because it's not all of our remit. It involves several other community groups in topics that we've identified on the future challenges.

Because I got this sense when I read the "Future Challenges" comments that it seems as if persons don't think they are future challenges. Some persons think it's no. Some persons think that it's issues that have to be dealt with with groups that are already looking at it.

So, I just wanted to raise a more general thing for the plenary, given that the name collision discussion … I liked how it went in terms of where we've concluded and rested how we're going to address it.

But I just think that, maybe, we should just consider not just moving out of "Future Challenges," but actually changing and getting rid of the title

"Future Challenges" and calling it "Other Risk Considerations," and then put a preamble that these are other issues that we saw were necessary/we weren't able to delve into because it's a wider community discussion, and then kind of have this in other topics that we have. Now, I just wanted to raise that on the floor, if any of that made sense.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I understood it, I'm just trying to figure out how to turn it into action. And I don't think there is anything we can do with it at this phase until we see what the output of the sub-teams are, and we know how to, then, write the preamble text to each of the chunks of the report. Does that make sense?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It does.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead. I'm not sure who was trying to speak. Okay. KC, I don't think you were on the call yet when I observed that we got a status in from SSAC 97. So, if you could kick that sub-team off, now that we have it?

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Let me find this. Got it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Jennifer sent it out during the week.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's about three pages' worth of stuff that they sent.

KC CLAFFY: I haven't looked at it yet.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you. I'm glad I went back. So, if you could, in the next week, figure out which way is north, that would be good. Okay. Laurin, I think the risk team is next.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Russ, there are a few more points that I need to put related to this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, there are more than that but, pretty much, we discussed that. But one of the things which are unclear is that in the recommendation itself, because I was not the one who wrote these recommendations, in the Recommendation 28.2, I think, it was explicitly mentioned that ICANN

should need to initiate a process, or facilitate a process, of an independent study of name collisions. This is the point.

And then, it has to make this study vetted by an independent panel who has no financial interest. So, this is a two-way or a two-step process that we are recommending. I think that it's too much. I don't know what is the rationale or the reasoning of putting it that way.

Because one independent kind of thing might be okay for me but it clearly says—and this is one of the comments from SSAC—again, that they did not understand why this vetting is needed when you are doing an independent study already.

So, I'm not sure if somebody on the call can explain that so that we go to the right direction. And I put that on line 262, actually, the row 62 of the same document. If you see my response, there, I put it there, my response to that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Brenda, could you scroll that down?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, here it is. So, you can see that. So I'm saying, here, "Are these referring to a two-step process? One is initiating an independent study, and second is vetting both NCAP work and this independent study from third parties who have no financial interest in TLD expansion." So, I think it's too much, and it won't be implementable, I think.

EN

KC CLAFFY:	Sorry, which part won't be implementable?
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	Like having it as a two-step process, both steps from independent kind of panels. So, it says that we need to have an independent study of name collisions—this is the first step—and then that independent study should be vetted from an independent or third party who has no interest in the TLD expansions.
KC CLAFFY:	So, the current one was independent, right? The current study that they did, the consultant that was hired.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	No, no. We're not referring to that. We are referring … If you can read the report section, there's the same row. But under the report section column is our comment that we put there. If you read that, it says—
KC CLAFFY:	I'm looking at it. I'm just wondering why you think it's not feasible because they just did it for the first part. So, the part that's missing is that the NCAP … The part that's missing is number two, you're saying? How to find third parties who can vet it?
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	No, no. I'm saying that this recommendation is saying that NCAP is a parallel process to the independent study that we are proposing.

KC CLAFFY: That is the case today though, right?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: You mean that there are two independent studies?

KC CLAFFY: No. Okay, I see what you mean. The question is this word, "NCAP work." And I think, in today's model, there is no "NCAP work," per se. NCAP's role is to sort of oversee—which is too strong a word, I think—to basically vet the study.

And I guess this recommendation was put in because people wanted to make sure that NCAP itself, who is responsible for vetting the study, wasn't having financial interest in TLD expansion and would just say, "Oh, the study says we don't need any more studies, so that's good. Let's go move on." That was my read of this when I read it. Maybe I'm wrong. Whoever wrote it has to clarify their intention. I guess it was Eric.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, that's what Naveed is asking, and Eric's not on the call.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: At the least, it is confusing to me.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, okay. Well, and to SSAC, also, apparently. So, my interpretation was that we didn't mean a new study independent of NCAP. We meant to make sure that whatever vets the study that NCAP … If NCAP is to be the body that vets that study, and approves it, and says, "Yes, this is a legitimate study and ICANN should go …"

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I see what you are saying. But if you just read the end of this recommendation it says that, "ICANN Org should ensure that the SSAC Name Collision Analysis Project," which is NCAP, "Work Party research and put evaluation team's results."

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, I agree. That's confusing.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Two different things, you know?

KC CLAFFY: I agree.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: And [work needs] to be vetted, it is saying. So, this is kind of …

KC CLAFFY: Well, I know that the thing I can add that went into this—at least my understanding is went into the writing of this recommendation—is that

NCAP itself, which is an SSAC work party, made the decision to not require any management of conflict of interest in NCAP. So, NCAP can be composed entirely of people that have a financial interest in TLD expansion. And my understanding was that this recommendation was trying to address that problem.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. So, maybe I contact Eric. But I'm not sure if he wrote that, so just to be …

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, you can e-mail to both of us and we can have a conversation. I don't know who else to consult besides Eric.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Let's keep it to the list, then.

KC CLAFFY: Yep. That's fine, too.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: Is that the last thing on this?

EN

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. I put a response to all of this but I leave it to the team to read it before the next week's call. And by that, I will see and assess the update on this.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I mean, the next one is about the smart thing, and we say, "Enable community reporting," and SSAC said, "What good is that going to do?"

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, there are two parts to that. One is that they are objecting why we need a reporting tool or a reporting mechanism. That, I answered already. But the second half of that comment is about the smartness of that recommendation, which I said that I agree we need to make sure that it is smart.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, okay. I agree with the comment, at least. I think that the counter from ICANN, or from SSAC, for that matter, will be there is no way to measure the effectiveness of the controlled interruption framework beyond what the consultant did. I'm speculating, here, but that's my … And we could reach out.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Maybe a way to assess the reporting mechanism itself – not to its outcome, but at least a way to keep track of the results.

EN

KC CLAFFY: I should note that the SSAC members of NCAP, or anybody else on SSAC, would be happy to have a conversation with SSR2 about specifically this comment and what SSAC thinks could be constructive in a recommendation. Naveed, if you wanted to have such a conversation, or Eric, or anybody.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay, yeah.

KC CLAFFY: Keep it in mind. Okay. I think we're done with that one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Last time I thought that Naveed said, "Wait, I have one more point!"

KC CLAFFY: Okay, let's let Naveed declare that we're done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, Naveed, could you send a note to Eric to make sure that he's happy with the way forward, since I know he had a lot to do with this text?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I will do that, but with the assumption that we are saying that he actually wrote this. So, he might say, "I don't know."

RUSS HOUSLEY:　　　　　Yeah. I know he was involved in the discussion, even if he didn't take it down.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:　　　　Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY:　　　　　Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:　　　　Sure.

RUSS HOUSLEY:　　　　　Thank you. All right. Over to Laurin. We only have ten minutes on the call, so at this point, I think, Laurin, the best we could get is the broad-brushstroke agreement that the direction you took is acceptable.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:　　Okay. Hello, everyone. Ten minutes is optimistic even for that, I fear, but let's try. So, essentially, yesterday I sent to everyone a mark-up version of the [inaudible] risk section. Everything in there is fresh, and new, and already in the new structure.

Not much has changed since I talked about it last time or the time before. The sub-team is happy to go ahead. We had no requests internally to

make changes. I'll point everyone to the budget recommendation, which is number four.

And in the document I sent, it's right under the CSO/CISO recommendation, and the response is at the bottom of the document we're seeing, I believe. I hope. If this is the risk one, at least. Yes, this is this comment.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Laurin, we had a discussion on this before you joined, actually. Actually, I just wanted to point out that this Recommendation 4 has been changed since this report was put on public comment. So, if you can just have a look at the latest version of Recommendation 4 and see if you can incorporate, still, that one, here, or not, then decide whether we need a separate stand-alone or it can be merged, here, for example.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It might be mergeable. So, this is the only text I changed. I was not aware there was any change to it. So, I took what was in the latest document and copied that over into the risk section. So, I'm not sure if this is the version you're talking about or if there is yet another one.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, this is the version that we put for the public comment. But after that, in March, actually in the start of March, we actually changed this recommendation.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Oh, okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, I shared that link, as well, in the start of the call. I can share again.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: So, if you could go to this? Yeah. This is the link. If you go to this link … Yeah, this one. You see, here? So, it now becomes Recommendation 20, 21, 22, and there was some rationale for that that we added, and it became 4.1, 4.2, 4.3. Earlier, it was just 4.1.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. So, yes. That means this is a change that I need to look at, because I wrote the rationale above the recommendation, now. So, we have two rationales and two recommendations. So, this is an action for me for next week. So, let's jump over that one. I will copy the link and save it somewhere so I can look at it. Okay.

So, with that out of the way and unresolved, the rest I said, then, completely applies to everything, minus that recommendation and its rationale that, essentially, this has been presented twice. Subgroup is happy. Only change outstanding is this merging the two edits, and I'll do that by next week.

I think it's too late to do a full run-through and consensus call on it, though, because, here, we have five minutes left. I'm not sure if this makes sense because it's quite a lot of recommendations. I can only say everything you need is in the two documents and the sub-team is ready to be done with this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, that made me chuckle. I'm sorry. What do you expect Heather do with $CIO/CISO$?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, this is something that I wanted to bring to the full team's attention. That's why it has these lovely variable marks. But I think we should do that next week, simply because I have to look at that specific recommendation/rationale again to include the changes that were made that I wasn't aware of. So, maybe it won't be a problem by next week.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: I have a question, in general. In the latest one, Heather sent out documents for us to read. She sent out a markup one, and then a clean one. But I would like one that just has the text in color. Does this green color that Laurin is using for the text mean that's what's changed?

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What happened for this review team, or sub-team, and some of the others, is Heather made a clean "all comments accepted," gave it to the sub-team to put their edits in as suggestions. That way, when it comes to the full team for review, you can tell what's what. And so, like for the work you're about to do for 25, if you want a clean document like that, Heather can make you one.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right. Clarification point: I made a clean copy but, based on the conversations we had had during the face-to-face meetings and the phone calls, many of those comments were still a, "Well, we don't know. It's going to depend on public comment."

They hadn't received consensus or discussion, so they're not necessarily included. That's why I kept telling people that they need to go back and make sure they have received the review team's comments, as well as the public comments. Yeah. It's complicated.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, which is exactly how we got the problem that Naveed just highlighted.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: For risk, we did that, and they are in the same spreadsheet as the public comment ones, and I think the only three that were not just error corrections were all from KC. We did discuss them and they are marked down. So, KC, if you scroll down, at the bottom you will see the comments you made after public comment, and we hope we addressed those, as well.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. I'm just wondering, when people have new text, I would like a convention of how to read it, like how to know. Can someone paste the URL that we're looking at on the screen? Is it the one that Naveed just pasted? No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, it's the one that Laurin sent in e-mail yesterday.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. And then, when he says "review it," it's just the green text we should review?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. That is very helpful. And then, that one—

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. So—

KC CLAFFY: Go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry. There might be different colors because different people drafted it. But you can see it says "Risk Section," and that's the heading where our changes start. And you can also, obviously, see where there is all the colored text, so that is where to go.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And Laurin, I think what would be useful, KC, is that the table that has the list of recommendations that the sub-team worked on … Just follow all the numbers there because it pretty much still have the numbering, for the most part. And I think, as Laurin said, it will be different colors for different people, depending on what your Google has.

So, it won't just be green. On my screen, it shows orange and blue sometimes, not green. So, it all depends on … So, you can't use just the green as the marker. But I think the table would help you to kind of see the title of the recommendations, if not the number, and if it's different.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. There are a bunch of different colors. Okay. So, does it start on page … Where does it start?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anywhere it's not black, it's text they added.

KC CLAFFY: But there is also crossed-out stuff back on page 25. So, it's not assessment of SSR1, so it has to be starting on what's currently page 27, key stability issues. Is that all new?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: If we can scroll up?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Scroll up and tell me what page … And it would be good to have this in the text like, "Hello. Start reviewing here, SSR2." Is that the page, right there?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Key stability, yes.

KC CLAFFY: So, start there and go to the end of the different colored, not necessarily green.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, go to the end of this section. The next section is probably abuse. I'm not sure what I did.

KC CLAFFY: So, it includes business continuity? Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. Yes.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. And then, Work Stream 3 on page 40, it stops there? Yeah.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Correct.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, got it. Got my assignment. Thank you. Page 27 looks like …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: KC, I just want to make sure of something, as well. Last night, I added the text for the CDO. I sent two links, and [it's in] both links because [just if you confuse] the links. Heather, I don't know if I did the right thing. I've pasted it in two documents, exact text.

So, whichever one it will be, it's in both, whichever version is floating around. But I sent an e-mail to the group last night with both links. But the exact amendments to the section related to the CDO, I've put it at the end of the rationale for the CISO as another consideration, like a note. So, let me know.

KC CLAFFY: And you want the edits in this document, right, in this URL that you just—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. It's supposed to be wherever the risk document is that's tracking all of our amendments. It's supposed to be whichever one the team is working through. It's supposed to be there. But I had used a link that Laurin sent, and then I saw that Jennifer had a link to. I opened both and it got confused. So, I did the edits to both versions, just in case.

KC CLAFFY: I see a bunch of comments in this document that are from a month ago, so that's not consistent with Heather saying she accepted them all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, it reads it's for teams when working for more than a month.

KC CLAFFY: Okay, sorry. Right. I mean, sorry on a number of levels. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We are out of time, so we'll pick up next week with the risk team, and then we'll do Kerry-Ann's comments. And then, hopefully, the abuse team will be done. All right? Have a good week, and stay safe.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]