
BRENDA BREWER:

Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call Number 123 on the 23rd of September, 2020 at 14:00 UTC. Review team members attending the call today include Eric, Kaveh, Kerry-Ann, Matogoro, Denise just joined, Naveed, Norm, Ram Krishna, Russ, and Scott. We have an observer, Dennis Tan. Apologies from Laurin. And attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve, Brenda, and our technical writer, Heather. Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name, before speaking, for the record. And Russ, I'm turning the meeting over to you. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you. Could we start by putting up the Doodle poll results? So, here's the problem that we're facing, is that ... Basically, a new semester started and that affected Laurin. And he is now teaching during this slot. And the situation is that if we keep this slot, we lose two people. And if we move to Thursday at the same time, we lose two people. And we're kind of stuck. The other slots that we included in the Doodle, I had Brenda remove because they were even worse. We lost even more than two.

So, this is a struggle for me. I'd like the people who can't make these slots to see if something could be done. And we'll return to this later in the agenda because we're now getting close to the home stretch. The hope is that we'll be done in six weeks. So, if you look at your calendar and the issues are ones that would come up in November-December but you could do something between now and then, please edit the

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.

Doodle. So, let's go on with the rest of the agenda but we'll return to this at the end.

Okay. I think the next agenda item is the bar chart. So, this tells us where the subteams are. There's a block that we call the abuse set of subteams, which cover recommendations 10 through 19. Those, we're going to hear about today. They're almost done with the work on this big block. And so, we'll talk about that today. So, I'm fairly confident that by next week, we will have text from that team.

I am a little bit concerned about 21 but we're going to talk about that later today, as well. I saw a note earlier today about 23. So, looking forward to Zarko and Alain reaching consensus on that.

I have not seen anything recently on 25. I know that this one was stalled in terms of starting because we were waiting for a question to be answered regarding the implementation of some SSAC recommendations. We got that information. I think KC is working on it but I haven't heard from her in a couple weeks. When you did the roll call, KC was not on. Do Denise or Eric know where we are on 25?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I do not.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. Can I ask you to ping KC and see if we can have text in a week?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. I'll do it now. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you very much. Okay. On 26, I exchanged a couple emails with Boban and Zarko this week. But I didn't get the warm fuzzy that we are close to text. Is either Zarko or Boban on the call?

ZARKO KECIC: Sorry. I just joined.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Can you tell me where we are on EBERO?

ZARKO KECIC: I have something written and I have to get in touch with Boban to clarify a few things. And I will be able to send this, this weekend.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh. Great. Thank you. Okay. And then, that brings us to 29—I'm sorry, 28. I haven't seen anything on 28 in a really long time. So, is ... Naveed, can you tell me where we are on that?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. The problem is I made the initial work and then there were a few things that—because I was not expert of the concerns raised in that. So, we decided, in the call, to involve Eric. But I think Eric got busy somewhere else. So, I sent him a couple of emails, requesting to put a

response, maybe, or a comment, or an understanding of those which are not addressed by me earlier. So, if ... He should have that email or I can forward it again, if it's okay.

So, once we have that, then we can start writing something about that. So, I can do that. I can draft the text of what we understand from that. But there are a few things that I'm not expert at and I was not the one who wrote this recommendation. So, I'm not clear on those things. So, hence, I sent that email. I think I also sent it to—maybe copied that to you, Russ, as well, a long time ago, I think.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Could you resend it so it's at the top of Eric's inbox. And, Eric, would you be able to get to that this week?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I'll definitely take a look. I don't want to promise a turnaround this week. It's kind of a crazy week. But I'll definitely take a look.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. I'll just do that now.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Thank you. Okay. Kerry-Ann, we're going to talk about 29. And on 31, we got a note, early this morning for me, basically saying that 31, the team is recommending we drop. But they want to add a couple sentences to 29 in order to cover the aspects of DoH that they're worried about that fall ... But basically, the original one, they've decided, is outside ICANN's remit. So, I asked Heather to send Zarko the Google Doc that contains 29 so those sentences can be added.

And I think that tells us where we are. All I can say is, team, we're close to having a report. Please, please find the time to get her—so that coming out of the call next week we have a set of inputs to Heather that she can massage into something for the whole team to review and that we can bring this to closure.

Okay. I think that ... If there's no questions, other than that, from the team, I think I would like to move to 21. Eric, you had discussed this with the team last week. Got a little bit of feedback and you got a couple changes, mostly to move things out of the recommendation, into findings, as I recall.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. Hey. So, I'll just ... Russ, stop me if you need to stop me. But otherwise, I'll just roll forward. So, I moved the text that was there from the recommendation to the findings and I buffed it up a little bit. And I filled in the public comment ... I forget which on that's called—whatever the document is—the public comment feedback, blah, blah, blah, to say what was done to address it. I think this addresses the outstanding

concerns from the team, though I'm happy to be corrected if that's not the case.

And just for completeness, unless anyone objects, I'll just go ahead and read what's currently in the document that's called SSR2 Draft Report Recs and Findings, Subteam 20, 21, 24, and 30. I think everyone has it. I think Jennifer sent it out. So, while I'd be happy to let people read it on their own, Russ, correct me if I'm wrong but I'm assuming that it's just better to read it so it's on the record and anyone can jump up and down now.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Make sure that we have consensus. So, let's do that.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. No. Exactly. Read it for the point of reaching consensus. And then, I think ... Nominally, I hope this vaults its status forward on the public comment subteams grid to all arrows. That's my hope. So, but yeah. Definitely [anybody else that] ...

So, rational findings for key rollover. And this starts on page 46 of the document I mentioned, "The DNSSEC Root rolled over its key signing key (KSK) on 11 October 2018 for the first time since the Deliberately Unvalidatable Root Zone (DURZ) key. During this process, there was much debate and many calls for analyses on the details of this role." Two citations.

"One aspect of this rollover illustrated the need—" Oops. I'm going to do a typo correction— "illustrated the necessity for properly-

functioning exception-legs in the procedure. Specifically, the rollover was delayed for a year while measurements were taken to allay concerns. Discussions have already begun about the timing and procedure for future rollovers, including additional complexities, e.g. algorithm rollovers. ICANN subsequently held an open call for comments on the process for the next scheduled KSK rollover process.” And citation added.

So, that’s mostly unmodified text that was there for some time. Now, the new text follows this, saying, “Due to the criticality of security protections that are and will be derived from the DNSSEC Root zone—” citation added— “formally verifiable process analyses are critical to ensuring the security, stability, and resilience of the process by which DNSSEC protections are maintained during the Root zone Key Signing Key (KSK) protections during rollovers.” “Protection” is probably redundant. Let me take that out.

“Formal process modeling involve ...” Involves. Sorry. I’m going to do typo modification— “involves employing a methodology and/or programming environment to specify each task in the process, how to evaluate its execution (success, fail, other, etc.), and to specify the follow-on actions under different results.

“Process specifications like this have shown utility in complex, interhuman processes that include election security—” citation added— “medical process safety—” citation added— “and more. In these cases, the tasks undertaken by people in human space are complex and modeled in formal process specification languages and critical (and critical to life) choices and the consequences are symbolically modeled

and formally tracked. This modeling allows for quantitative prescriptions and predictions of what should be done and what can be expected to result from choices, exceptions, and successful executions.

“When compared to elections and medical processes, the DNS Root KSK rollover presents itself as a tractable venue, whose security and correctness are globally critical. For example ...” And then, that’s the end of the new text.

Then, the previous text follows it, saying, “For example, the global DNS Root is served by 13 instances of name server letters (a through m), most of which are operated by numerous servers. As a result, when changes are made by the Root Zone Maintainer (RZM)—” They. Sorry. Got to make this modification now— “they are propagated to them all.” Heather, apologies. You’ve got some work to do here—“to them all—to all of the instances.

“In 2014, RSSAC published RSSAC002, an advisory on the measurement of the root server system. But it is not clear if or how much of this advisory ICANN Org has implemented. The review team found no evidence that the propagation delay between the publication to each of the letters, and then to each of the letters’ instances, is well understood.”

So, here’s the last bit of new text. “Provisions to measure and report on the effects of propagation delay are missing in current reporting. And their incorporation could allay any existing and future concerns.” And then, the final sentence, which was objected to by SSAC is stricken.

And so, that's it. And that's all in this document. So, anyone should feel free to take a look at it. But that is what, representing the rapporteur role of the subteam on this recommendation, am proposing to the team as we incorporate.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any concerns with the finding text that Eric has just gone over? Okay. Then I'm going to call this done. Eric, were there any changes in the recommendations text?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Only to remove the text and move it up so, it's streamlined back to what it was before. I believe that that was still okay. So, no others.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's what I thought I read. So, we're back to the recommendations text. Let's quickly go over the public comment spreadsheet for 21. Okay. So, basically, the first one, you're saying that we disagree with SSAC's comment because this has shown, to be very successful in other fields.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yes. Which line are you on? Because I'm trying to track in on—

RUSS HOUSLEY: 208.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: 208? Sorry. I was in the wrong place. Yeah. And this one ... This was what I read. Like minds can disagree. But basically, that was the reason—the rationale behind a lot of the text that I just read to the team, is to explain and use citations from peer reviewed articles to explain that this is something ... The DNS Root zone, I think, is a subset of some of the other places this would be in play.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I think the change should say, "Citations added."

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. I'll do that now.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Just as a point of order, I guess, the public comments for recommendation 21 start at line 200.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ah! Okay. Could you back up? I was going by Brenda.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, it looks like there's some that aren't filled in, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. So, those are, “We support this.” So, I didn’t respond to, “We support this.”

RUSS HOUSLEY: What we’ve done in other places is either wrote, “Noted,” or, “Thanks.”

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Oh. Okay. I’m happy to do that, unless someone else wants to hold the pen for consistency. You tell me what you’d like.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Just fill that in after the call.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. So, let’s go back down to 209.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. So, this one, I’m not sure exactly how to ... I remember what we went through to call things high- and low-priority and medium-plus-plus and all that stuff. And so, my response was basically just if it doesn’t take much to do then it’s high return, low expenditure. But I’m happy to defer if the team has a different perspective.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That seems fine. You just might want to change “no op” to “thank you.”
210. 211.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Line 211 is recommendation 22.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. That was [on me].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sorry. That explains why I was confused.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right. Recommendation 21 was lines 200 through 209.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Anybody have further feedback for Eric?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry. I’m late. Can you summarize what the feedback has been so far?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. We moved the rationale for why doing this kind of formalism is ...
When we talked about it last week, it was embedded in the
recommendation. We moved it to the findings. And basically, line 209,

on the screen right now, talks about the prioritization, basically saying the review team felt that this requires low commitment but high return and that is the reason for including it.

Okay. So, let's see if we can move to recommendation 29. Kerry-Ann, we got pretty far on this last week. I think that we're at the point where the subteam has consensus and we need to know if the whole team supports where you are at.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. I think I'll probably turn it over to KC. I'm happy she joined in time. We had gotten to the point where KC was going to propose some final text, based on the sections that we agreed to delete, which was the point I made at the end of the call.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Ah! You're right. I forgot that. Thank you.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And so, I don't know if she was able to do anything else on it since then. KC?

KC CLAFFY: Hello. By the way, I'm noting that I have outstanding stuff on 21. So, maybe Eric and I need to go back to that because I never got a response to some of my comments there.

But let's focus on 29. I'm confused. I have a markup version of 29, where I deleted everything in there, and moved some of it elsewhere, and just decided this OBE. We talked about that last week. So, what am I ...? What are you—

RUSS HOUSLEY: And where is that text?

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Heather should know because—

JENNIFER BRYCE: I just posted a link in the chat. It should be in that document I just posted the link to. It looks like page 59 is where recommendation 29 begins.

KC CLAFFY: But that ... Okay. Maybe it's because I'm not signed in. I don't see my comments.

JENNIFER BRYCE: The one I'm looking at basically has all of recommendation 29 crossed out.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. That's right. So, what I said last week was we could go through this, sentence by sentence, if folks wanted to and I could explain why I

deleted every sentence. But that's already in the comments. So, people who cared were supposed to go look at this over the last week.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So, clearly there was a miscommunication. Jennifer, could you please send the pointer to this by email and ask everyone to review it for next week? Because I know I didn't. So, I'm sure that others got confused as well.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah. I can do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. Okay. The next thing is to talk about the abuse subteam. We don't have final text but I thought, since it's such a big block of recommendations, it would be important to bring the team up to speed on where the subteam is and the direction they're taking so that when we get text in the next week or so, that we we're able to quickly digest it. And so, I'm going to turn that over to Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Russ. So, for a month or so now, the team has had a spreadsheet with detailed information on all of the comments related to the abuse subteam recommendations, that starts with recommendation 10. 10 through 19 are the recommendations that the abuse subgroup has focused on. So, we haven't received any additional comments on that spreadsheet.

That was the first deliverable. It includes any follow-up action that the abuse subgroup is recommending, and undertaking, and also includes the proposed response for each and every comment for those recommendations.

Then, the team shared its proposal to reorganize and synthesize some of the recommendations in recommendations 10 through 19. That has been done. A side-by-side showing how the current recommendation would be combined and synthesized ... So, the review team has the side-by-side. And Heather has used that side-by-side to reorganize the text of the report.

So, the broad categories we're reorganizing recommendations 10 through 19 into include doing measurement of Registrar/Registry compliance as it relates to abuse. Recommended contract changes would be a second grouping. WHOIS would be another group, abuse management. And then, the final grouping would be recommendations relating to reporting ... Just a second. Let me grab that subtitle. Yeah. Reporting data was the final category. So, regrouping those recommendations as reflected in the side-by-side that's been shared with the team quite a while ago.

So, we're at the point now where we're working on the ... Heather has updated the actual draft report text to reflect that organization and flow. So, we're now editing the findings as well as aspects of the recommendations to bring them in-line with the results of our spreadsheet response—the responses to the public comments and additional discussion on the subgroup. And also, trying to do a review for smart or smarter recommendations and ensuring that the findings

are clearly articulating the intent and our drivers for the recommendation. So, I'll pause there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Can I chime in?

DENISE MICHEL: Sure. Please do.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The abuse text was really fun to sort out. And I actually mean that. I enjoyed working on that. As I mentioned last week on the call, when I had worked on the risk text, I wanted to develop a logical argument. What I had noted is in every recommendation in risk section, it came down to transparency. Transparency was your biggest single concern. And you had several ways you wanted to resolve that—by creating a CSO position, by changing the reporting for budget—all these things. But it boiled down to the issue of transparency—that you did not have evidence that ICANN was organized well enough to do what you would have expected to see.

I took that same approach to abuse—the abuse subteam—to say, “Okay. Was there a core theme in here that can structure this argument?” And it wasn't quite as clear-cut to say there is one core theme. But there were three. And that was the issue with contracts, the issue with compliance and enforcement and, again, the issue with transparency, RDS being sort of a special snowflake case because it

touched on all of the above. So, that's being pulled out as a separate thing.

But the idea was to have this logical flow of, "We see an increase of abuse patterns on the internet. ICANN has a responsibility to do something about that. Here's the tools that you should be doing more with." So, that's how that's organized at the moment and pulled out into a document for the abuse team to say, "Okay. Does this make logical sense? Does this support our document?" I have not actually edited the text very much at all. I've been focused on logical structure first. And once I get the sign-off from the subteam that, "Yes. This makes sense," then I'll start actually working on words, phrases, and clauses.

So, that takes care of two thirds of the document. The last third is going to be very interesting because that's where all of the onesies and twosies recommendations start to tie in together and to see how they fit. What logical argument are we trying to make with those? That's going to be a lot harder. It doesn't have the same common themes that risk or abuse did. So, I want to reiterate what Russ has said. The sooner everyone closes out on those smaller recommendations, the easier it will be for me to sit down and bang my head against those particular walls to get them into a logical structure.

DENISE MICHEL:

Sounds great. Thank you, Heather. So, unless people have any additional comments on the material we've shared to-date with the team, as Russ said, the steps now are for the abuse subgroup to edit the

text that Heather has—review and edit the text that Heather has assembled for us and then bring that back to the full team for discussion.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Awesome. We're looking forward to that. I'm really anxious to pull together the final draft, I guess is what I would call it. KC wanted to return to 21. So, let's do that now.

KC CLAFFY:

I don't know if it's a good use ... I don't know if somebody can mute their phone while we're on here. I don't know if it's a good use of the whole team's time because it was really comments between me and Eric that I put in the email text. And he answered one of them but ...

Well, the one was he didn't think we needed to update the text that looks to me to be, really, too old to have in the report because so much has happened since then and we should acknowledge it. But maybe I need just to take that up with Eric. Does anybody else have a voice or thought about this recommendation? Wonder if Jennifer can go back to the text. Actually, if you ... Well, maybe I didn't mark it up.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

I'll just jump on the grenade here, real quick. So, KC, you should definitely take a look at the text that's there. And I think if there's changes to it that we need to make, we can make it. And certainly, I know this is being recorded. So, it's certainly reviewable post facto.

But the comment about moving the goalposts, I think, is a general one that might be worth airing out. Maybe we can actually put it to bed. A lot's happened in three years and there's a point at which we wind up in a scope creep situation. We'll never be done if we need to have the text that goes through a protracted review and publication process. We need to be instantaneously correct.

So, I think we need, at some point, draw a line and say, "We're not going to keep this up-to-date." I think a lot of the text is defensive, in the sense that it says "at the time of" or something. So, certainly, if there's something glaring, it should be corrected. But generally speaking, I think it needs to be something that we can put to bed with ... We wrote ... We did a bunch of investigations. It was over a protracted period. And clearly, the world didn't stop spinning during that time, right?

So, some of the things, I think saying like, "Yeah. This talks about a public comment period that's now over." I think the text hopefully says something about, "Subsequently, there was a public comment period." We don't necessarily have to refresh citations. But I think that's fine, if you want to update citations to point to the current. But I don't think that's ... That's certainly something. I think you have the editing capacity on the document as well.

But I just have to push back. I have addressed, I believe, all of your comments. So, a couple times you've mentioned that you think that I was remiss in addressing your thoughts. But I think if you take a look, they're all—I believe they're all addressed. And certainly, if they aren't it's an omission—accidental, not intentional.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Thanks. Whoa. Am I muted? Okay. Sorry. I might have over-spoken there. Let me back off a little bit. But my issue was that we now have a recommendation that, in my mind, is so off from what the public comment period yielded that we should at least acknowledge why we think this is more important than anything that's in the public comments, where there were a dozen recommendations on how this exact same event should be handled. That was my—

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I don't believe that's the case. I read all the public comments, I believe carefully, and with the possibility I missed something or I misunderstood. That notwithstanding, I don't believe anyone actually was talking about the things that we're talking about here.

And I think if there was some overlap ... And I saw your note saying some of this is overlapping with public comments. I don't believe that means we shouldn't comment on the perspective. The comments align with what other people are saying. I believe that's a good thing. I don't know that it obviates our need to actually state our perspectives. And so, certainly, someone looking back would say, "Wow! Nine out of ten dentists agree," is better than saying, "Well, eight dentists didn't say anything because the first dentist covered it."

KC CLAFFY: Okay. Sorry. I think we're going to agree to disagree on this one. And so, unless somebody else has the comment here, we should just take it to

the next level of review of this document, which I would like to get to. And I can put in a comment there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well all agree with that sentiment.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. KC, we talked about 22 last week, which is the baseline security practices. And you were waiting for some information from staff on the SSAC recommendations. You got that. You proposed some text. But for some reason, I didn't mark it as achieving consensus during that discussion. Do you feel that we're done with 22 or do you think there's more to do?

KC CLAFFY: I think you must ... I'm hoping you're talking about something different than 22 because that's root server stuff. Or, wait. Am I looking at the wrong document now? Can you bring up the 22 you're talking about, Jennifer? Because my 22 ... No. It says "baseline security practices" but this is about hardening strategies for ... Or are you talking about that I went talked to Duane and Wes about the GWG and such?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I just remember we were waiting for some information. And you got it. And then, we talked about some text and I don't remember when.

KC CLAFFY: The conversation I had with Wes and Duane was not very ... It was all sort of, "We don't know what's happening yet. A lot of this stuff should be covered under what's planned." But that was also six months ago. But I think what ... I'm looking at the recommendation for 22 right now—the text, at least. Who knows if I'm looking at the current one because that's a URL that doesn't have any markup for this section. And it looks fine to me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Then, I will mark it as done. It probably was me not tracking it properly when we talked about it.

KC CLAFFY: No. I think it was probably me. But where ... I think I might have added some markup to this text. And it's not on this version.

RUSS HOUSLEY: There's so many Google Docs. So, that could be.

KC CLAFFY: It might have been on the same one where I did 29. I'll go look. Go to the next thing while I look, here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. The last thing, I think, on today's agenda is to circle back to the Doodle poll.

KC CLAFFY: Is somebody going to show it or what's ...?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. I'm waiting for Brenda to put it up.

BRENDA BREWER: Okay. I was just looking to see if we had any new input and we don't. So, one second here and I'll show you. There we go.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm struggling with this because we lose two people, no matter what we do, which, to me, I'm quite reluctant to lose Laurin. He's been so active, being one of the vice chairs. To me, that gives me a slight preference for Thursdays. What do other people think here?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I can move my 7:00 AM Thursday obligation to 7:00 AM Wednesday. So, it seems like, perhaps, another quick Doodle poll. Thursday ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think you did, “Okay for either one.”

DENISE MICHEL: Oh. I did? Okay. Thanks for reminding me. Yeah. But I agree, Russ. I think doing whatever we can to ensure that people who are holding the pens and doing a lot of work ... If we at all can have them on the calls, that would be great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any other thoughts? I’d especially like to hear from Alain and Zarko because if we moved the call, you’re the two that we would lose. And we would gain Matogoro and Laurin.

KC CLAFFY: I have a slight concern because Zarko’s name is next to a bunch of recommendations that are not very far.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. We talked about them before you joined. He’s on it, is basically the short summary.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Looking at the subteams spreadsheet, I don’t see Alain as rapporteur for anything that hasn’t been resolved.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's true. Zarko or Alain, are you on? You were on earlier. Any comments?

ZARKO KECIC: I can comment that Thursday is not best time for me. But it doesn't mean that sometimes I cannot join.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. And again, we're aiming to be done with this in October. So, we're looking at the next six weeks.

KC CLAFFY: All right. So, I motion to move it whenever Laurin can make it.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Just to be clear, saying yes to Thursday means saying no to Wednesdays for me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's correct.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. Okay. Just making sure that ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Unless someone's going to scream right now, we're going to move this to Thursdays. Same time in your local time zone but instead of meeting on September 30th, we'll be meeting next week on October 1.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: As another motivation to wrapping up the text before the end of October is we won't have to deal with the song and dance of Daylight Saving Time changes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, which happens on November 1st in the US.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right!

RUSS HOUSLEY: I believe it happens at a different time in Europe.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Exactly. There's that one week of being ... Actually, it might be two weeks, now. I forget.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I can't remember.

KC CLAFFY: So, Russ, is there any text we can review before next week? And because I'm also a deadbeat on one of these 26, I'll make sure that there's text this weekend so that folks can review it before the call because I don't think I finalized that text yet, 26. But is there any other texts that folks should be reviewing so we can make this more efficient next Thursday, I guess.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, let me just go down the spreadsheet. The abuse team, we just went over. They're going to have text for the team in time for the call next week. 23, Zarko and Alain are talking. And Zarko said he'd have it sent out prior to the call. 25, I think, is the one you're talking about—the CZDS.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, yeah. I'm reading the spreadsheet wrong. Okay. 25.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right?

KC CLAFFY: Yep.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Good. Okay. 26, Zarko and Boban have agreed to push this one forward and get us text. And 28, Naveed is waiting for Eric to answer some questions. And when he gets those answers, he will have text.

And on 29, Zarko wants to add a couple sentences to 29 because we're dropping 31. And so, he wants to say something about it there. And you said you wanted to look at 29 as well. So, we're close on 29 but that's ... That's how we're going to land this guy. Does that make sense?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Brenda, you're going to send us a bunch of invites to move this to Thursday?

BRENDA BREWER: I sure will! Today.

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right. Thank you very much. And I think we are done with a couple minutes to spare. Is there any other business we should be covering?

JENNIFER BRYCE: I just wanted to quickly mention ... I think everybody has it in their calendar, anyway. But on the 7th of October, the review team webinar is part of the ICANN 69 prep week. I believe it's at 15:00 UTC. So, if you don't have that on your calendar, let us know and we can resend the invite. But just please keep that in mind. Thanks.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Does that require slides?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. It does. We're going to talk about that on Monday.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You knew that, didn't you?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I had a sneaking suspicion.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Thank you, everybody. Stay safe.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

ZARKO KECIC: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]