BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call #124 on the 8th of October, 2020 at 14:00 UTC. The Review Team members attending today include Russ, Norm, Laurin, Kerry-Ann, Ram Krishna, Naveed, Eric, KC, and I do… Yep, that's it. We have observers Alice and Dennis. Apologies from Michelle… Sorry, Denise and Danko. And attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer, Steve, and Brenda. Technical writer, Heather, is here and the meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. Thank you so much, and Russ, I'll turn it over to you.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay. Let's start by looking at the bar chart. It looks like we have a big block in the middle, numbers 10 through 19, which are the Abuse Team, which Laurin's going to talk about in a minute. And we have 25 which I think KC has prepared for based on a couple e-mails. Anyway, she said she would be.
KC CLAFFY:	Can you make the spreadsheet show what the columns mean? Can you lock the column headers? So what is F? I forgot. Yeah, okay. Yeah, I'm prepared to talk about 25. Go on, Russ. Sorry.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Okay, good. 28, Naveed had some e-mail on the list so I'm hoping that got sorted, although I'm not sure that we came to closure. I'll turn that over to Naveed when we get there. And 29 was folded in on the call last

week into the abuse one so we'll figure out whether that should be Xes or arrows when we get there.

So the goal is to have a draft report ready to give to Heather very shortly. It'd be awesome if that was an hour from now but let's see how far we get. Laurin, over to you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So good morning, everyone. Again, as I mentioned, this was a long effort and took me some last-minute work yesterday. So the document you have got was looked at by [the sub-team.] Thank you for that. And before I…

KC CLAFFY: Laurin, can I interrupt and ask people to raise their hands in the chat if they've actually read this text?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah.

KC CLAFFY: Because I'm not sure everyone on the sub-team even read it.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thanks KC. I don't think people will have had time so that's why I'm kind of giving a run-through in addition.

KC CLAFFY:	Okay.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	But I will note that a good third of the team is on this abuse sub-team. So I hope all of those have seen it.
KC CLAFFY:	I don't think so.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Or at least the earlier pass of it. Yeah.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	So essentially, I wanted to kind of go over all of that. So I did a pass yesterday kind of for clarity and to remove edits. I did not make any kind of changes that would go to the core of the document, as we usually do it. So what you see here from kind of the last abuse document that you will have seen, had the following changes.
	Heather restructured the document with Heather and myself having a pretty long call to kind of deal with open questions and then it kind of went back to the sub-team. So that's the first big change. The structure, it is completely different and it's all rearranged. So that's number one.
	Number two, having read through it yesterday with a cool head and also previously, it is very clear that this is not the final iteration of this document. There needs to be quite a bit of rearrangement of material in there, a lot of clarification, etc. However, we do need to get this report

done and it's important for the whole team to look at it, add their opinions, see what direction we want to go in because there are a lot of open questions. I will not talk about my personal criticisms and points right now because I don't think that it's a good point in time to do so because I'm right now trying to give kind of an overview of what happened and where we are instead of kind of tainting this with my own opinion.

So in terms of where this document is [pushing,] I don't think we have made that many changes. We now have, essentially, a new title which is "Contracts, Compliance, and Transparency". We're starting with definitions because various types of abuse, whatever, are being mentioned in this text so it makes sense to have this in the beginning, right? So then there's, essentially, an introduction, if you want, which is all about kind of different types of cybercrime. Then we're going into contracts. We're going then with its affiliated recommendation. Again, there is a section on compliance which includes the SLA. Transparency is the next section, also touches on DAAR. And then privacy and data considerations essentially contains general privacy considerations plus the specific problem of registrant data.

And as I said, this was a kind of effort last night to get this done. So in addition to issues in whatever style, content, etc. you might find, I cannot guarantee that there are not some weird editing glitches in there as well because I really had to push it through.

So this was the quick overview. I have my own points to make about it, which I will make at a later point in time. I hope that helped. If anyone

has kind of basic admin technical questions, I'm happy to help and I guess then we can go into a discussion.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Laurin, I just wanted to add I think what's important to point out with the restructuring as well is the attempt to make it have a more cohesive and logical flow, so some text was deleted as well. Just to ensure, I think you had done some cleaning up with duplicity where some points were made several places. We tried to ensure that anything related to compliance was in the same section and anything related to the EPDP was in the same section. So we tried just to ensure that everything as we had before where it was kind of spread in different sections, that everything is now kind of consolidated under the same headings where they should be.

And there's also a new heading, instead of having it as privacy and SSR considerations, there is now a broader title that we believe should capture all the different concerns that was under that and then you had various subtitles under that larger title. So I think that's important to point out as well that our attempt was to try and make it more cohesive and clear and taking into account the comments from the Review Team members in terms of wanting to ensure that it captures some of the current discussions and issues that are being raised on the same topic.

And there is also a comment that I left in the document yesterday for the Review Team to consider as a part of one of the recommendations we just amended, one of them just to highlight because it was stated before, but just to clarify that our goal is, and as I had undertook to KC

EN

to include that our goal is to ensure that instead of giving specific recommendations on privacy, it's just that ICANN needs to consolidate where they actually hold this information because it's still a bit sporadic.

And then I copied all the links, where it's found on all the different pages that haven't been updated from 2017, no notation as to the fact that it has been either replaced by these current discussions by these current working groups. So just a general comment was included to highlight the need to ensure that where persons from the public-facing point of view would be googling this for ICANN, there is no cohesive or coherent way to track or monitor what is happening. So that was included as a comment and Laurin tried to incorporate that in text in like two sentences just to make sure that we were able to point that out.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. Thank you, Kerry-Ann. I also add in terms of making things more consistent while kind of cleaning up the document and reading the kind of—how can I put it?—cleaned up text, I noticed that we need to make another pass on that one too. But in general, things have been moved around quite a bit.

DENISE MICHEL: I think this has gone through many, many iterations and I think one of the things that we'll need to continue to review and edit for is, of course, I think a number of additional references can also be added but making some revisions for clarity. In scaling things down, more specific explanations that followed each recommendation were not carried over

EN

and it may be that we'll need to add some additional context for some of these recommendations and make sure that particularly where public comments indicated additional clarification was needed, that that has been carried through in this draft.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So my only real high-level concern with this is that it's really hard to see if we have consensus when there's talk of more changes.

DENISE MICHEL: So I don't… I think the discussion here is not about, or I think at this point in the Abuse Sub-group, has not been about… Well, there… Yeah, I guess then one of the things we need to clarify is the recommendations have been… Yeah, the recommendations need to be set and then I think the additional changes would focus on ensuring there's clarity and context.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think…

DENISE MICHEL: So yeah, [inaudible] approval but rather [inaudible]

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, and I think Laurin should jump in as well, Denise, because what I thought we had—and Laurin, you can correct me—about what we had, the sub-team had agreed to in terms of the additional revisions needed

EN

is more in terms of referencing and more in terms of once Heather has gone through and made it clear that we would need to just double-check to make sure that the points that are made can be sourced and that the points that were made if it can't be sourced, that's the discussion we had yesterday that we could refer.

We highlighted that some of the security information we got came from interviews, etc. and where they could be sourced, we'd source it. And Denise undertook that she would do that once we have a more updated text. So I think—if I'm incorrect, you guys can correct me, but I thought that was the only place that the sub-team had some further concerns. It's not so much in terms of the recommendations that are there but in terms of just ensuring that everything that's there is coherent and has sourcing. And where there's no sourcing, that we state that it came from interviews or confidential information or whatever it might be.

That's what I understood from the conversation yesterday so if I'm mistaken, I think it's probably all agreed that it could go to the wider team, Russ, unless I'm mistaken.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I was just going to say the intention is certainly to get any full team input that there is, particularly on recommendations.

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: As I said, I did an edit after our call and many things do not deal with what the rec-, many things that I have seen and that I was referring to in terms of we need to kind of look at this again, it's not about specifically recommendation content. It is much more about, does this all flow logically as we try to make it flow, are there still things we have to deal with, as Kerry-Ann said, like a lot of referencing homework-type work needs to be done, lots of things like style, some sections were written by different people where we have to kind of look at that and so on, and so on, and so on. So the main thing, really, I was referring to so far is this type of more editorial work. And as I said, I have my own more kind of in-depth points that I didn't want to put into this kind of presentation because I didn't think it made sense to have it there.

DENISE MICHEL: So I think to answer your question more explicitly, Russ, I think if the full team focused on the recommendations themselves, that would be the most useful review at this point.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Why don't we go through them one at a time just to make sure?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: KC has her hand.

KC CLAFFY: Never mind. I think what Russ said is probably a better idea than listening to whatever I was going to say.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin or Denise, which one of you is going to walk us through the recommendations and the [inaudible] from the restructure?

DENISE MICHEL: Why don't we trade off? I'll start with…

RUSS HOUSLEY: All right, every other, go for it.

DENISE MICHEL: How about that, Laurin?

KC CLAFFY: By the way, do we also have the spreadsheet where we explained how we responded to the public comments for each of these? Is that available? Could someone put the URL for that in the chat?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's at the bottom of the agenda, just to help you find it quickly.

KC CLAFFY: Oh, okay so that was in the e-mail. Okay thanks, never mind.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. So on page seven, SSR2 Recommendation X, community defined public interest negotiating mandates for ICANN Org. ICANN Org should commission a negotiating team that includes abuse and security experts not affiliated or paid by contracted parties to represent the interests of non-contracted entities and work with ICANN Org to renegotiate contracted party contracts in good faith with public transparency and with the following objectives. And then five, six objectives are laid out here. Do you want me to read through each one, Russ? What would be most useful?

RUSS HOUSLEY: At least summarize where we're going so that—right.

DENISE MICHEL: Right. Yeah. Of course, contracts are the primary vehicle ICANN has to effect change and actions by contracted parties. So this details specific objectives for contract negotiation updates.

So SSR, the first one, is about making SSR requirements mandatory in the agreement. The second is provisions that establish a threshold of abuse that would trigger compliance inquiries, and presumably, actions. This also was an issue that was raised, particularly by the CCT Review and the SADAG Abuse Report and picks up on Compliance's discussion with the Review Team that they don't have the appropriate language in the contract and ability to address contracted parties that have high percentages of abuse in their portfolios.

Three clarifies ICANN's power to terminate contracts based on a pattern and practice of abuse by contracted parties, again, following up on all of the work the team has done in conversations with Compliance and additional research and this also picks up on SADAG report and the work they have been doing, that they did on more systemic abuse.

Four is the recommendation on considering financial incentives. [There are] many contracted parties that invest a significant amount of resources and effort in mitigating or blocking abuse and this recommendation proposes to look at incentives for contracted parties that keep abuse as a percentage of their portfolio below a certain level.

Five is making it easier or less expensive for registries to add abuse mitigation, security stability measures to their contracts. At times, it can cost upward of $100,000 simply to amend, go through the RSEP or RSTEP process. We're suggesting that this should be waived, again, to provide further incentive for registries to incorporate more security and stability-related measures.

Six, future contracts should include obligations for, explicitly for contracted parties not to aid and abet systemic abuse. Those are the six sort of synthesized recommendations that relate to updating the registrar accreditation agreement that all registrars adhere to and the base agreements and individual agreements, registry agreements that ICANN holds with the gTLD registries.

And the next set of recommendations are on compliance. I'll let Laurin walk you through those.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Let's just pause a second here.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	Sorry.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Let's just pause a second here. Does anyone… Does anything Denise just went over raise concerns with anyone?
KC CLAFFY:	I don't see that they're very amenable to SSR3 figuring out that they've been done. When we say SSR in X1 here, when we say "make SSR requirements mandatory", It's not clear to me what SSR requirements we're talking about there, as an example.
DENISE MICHEL:	Yeah, so I think we need to add some… This is… We need to add some, certainly some footnotes. I think an open question is we're… There has been a lot of effort to make this a lot shorter and a lot more streamlined. Some of that additional information has not been picked up from previous drafts so you will be… So as I indicated, I think adding additional footnotes and perhaps some additional clarification will be needed in making sure in the recommendations that to the extent we can make clear in the deliverables so they can be measured would be good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so we need to either have a pointer to text in the findings, the list above or something, right?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Okay.

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's, yeah, a matter of pulling some more information back from previous drafts. But yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Anything else from any other Review Team member? Okay. On to Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. So compliance, this should be… I'll just put this under…

KC CLAFFY: Hold on, Russ. I've got to say I don't think we're done with the previous one. I don't see where in the spreadsheet we've addressed the public comments to this recommendation. The one that Jennifer just put up, it looks blank on this recommendation. Or what recommendation should I be looking at? Because it says X in the document. Is it 16?

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, the whole… The abuse sub-team was going to do all of them for 10 through 19.

KC CLAFFY: Again, I just don't see how we've addressed public comments on this recommendation.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Let's take an action to go back to that because the whole block, we need to make sure that spreadsheet's been filled in.

KC CLAFFY: Fine. All right. Keep going.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. And I think you may have missed it. We noted earlier that in addition to editing for additional reference, we also need to do a run-through to make sure that our proposed actions with respect to public comments on these recommendations have been fulfilled. There are many, for example, areas where we indicated that we would clarify items and so we need to go back through and make sure that that clarification has been brought forward in this draft.

KC CLAFFY: All right. Sorry, Russ. Keep going.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: No, that's a good point, KC.

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, it does need to get done.

KC CLAFFY: Well, I'll just say that my, I have a concern about calling it a run-through because I think in a lot of cases, the public comments merit changes to the actual text and it doesn't look like we've done that in the right order. But I'll shut up for now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Next recommendation is page ten so you can follow along. So this whole section is about compliance. It also involves the SLAs. It's a very long recommendation and you can see a comment of mine on restructuring there that I will, as before, not talk about right now. So essentially, this is about establishing a kind of metrics framework. What's important is that it should have timeframes and give guidance to, sorry, and these should be based on the guidance of interested community groups, and obviously, consumer protections, cybersecurity, law enforcement and so on should be involved.

So this is really to set a benchmark of the expected level of compliance when it comes to SSR issues. So 10.1.1, again, this is mainly about setting timeframes for registries and registrars with excessive rates of DNS security abuse. And we're taking the CCT final reports definition here in a footnote and kind of mentioned that, yeah, this probably needs to be updated. Right? But excessive also needs to be defined as well.

Number two, ICANN should proactively monitor and enforce this framework and then the 1.3 to 1.5, I essentially adapted from a CCT review recommendation. So cross-reference existing data from incoming complaints is number three. Number four is collating and publishing reports of these actions undertaken, etc.

Number five should, so that ICANN Org should take enforcement action per this framework against those who kind of fail to publish points of contact for reporting abuse. Then 10.2, not 1.something, so 10.2, thank you Heather, should allocate and publish a specific budget line for a team of compliance officers. Right? So again, it's about proactively undertaking the work of checking out the performance and react to it.

10.3, compliance activities should be audited externally and reports of those should be published. Last but not least, the ICANN Compliance office should, by default, involve SLAs on enforcement and reporting, again, efficient processes and informed complainant. So this is essentially about clarifying what is happening and having data to see what is going on and providing that information.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Any concerns with what Laurin just reported out? Okay, Denise.

DENISE MICHEL: All right. We're on page 12.

JENNIFER BRYCE: If I may, I just see that Zarko has his hand up.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, great. I have my headphones I'm not sure does my microphone work or not. I just have one suggestion in regard of contact data. There may be contact data but no one responds to abuse compliance. So can we add a line to have accurate and valid contact data that will respond to compliance?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Zarko, where would you like to add it specifically, or you don't mind?

ZARKO KECIC: That's 10.1. Can you all… Where is contact?

EN

LAURIN WEISSINGER: It's higher up, I think.

ZARKO KECIC: I am not sure. Why not this line? So I'll find out and send the e-mail to you in regard of that because we had a hard time at RIPE with same issue that people had contact but no one reads that and no one responds to abuse compliance.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I just noted it.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: That takes us to page 12, SSR2 Recommendation 11, improve name abuse metrics, reporting and actions. So the first recommendation underscores a recommendation contained in the CCT Review also referenced in the RDS WHOIS 2 review of moving forward with recommendations based on the current community vetted abuse definition as referenced in our footnote and also referenced in the CCT Review.

This recommendation is aimed at ensuring that there is timely and ongoing action related to SSR2 and ICANN, that necessary efforts are not suspended while there's an unending, unbounded, ongoing public

conversation about hypothetically what DNS abuse could or could not be.

So for several, several years, ICANN has had an abuse definition and our proposal on one is to use it. At the same time, 11.2 recommends that recognizing that abuse evolves, the board should also in a time-bounded, structured way, seek to work with the community to evolve the definition to keep pace with how abuse on the Internet evolves.

So that's the gist of Recommendation 2, is creating a process the structure to continue to evolve the definition of abuse.

Three focuses on DAAR, the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting project, recommending explicitly that it be guided by the GAC's Beijing Communique for Spec 11 and international cybercrime conventions.

Recommendation 11.4 recommends that OCTO team at ICANN identify and incorporate feeds for DAAR that expand the range of abusive name reporting based on research conducted and noted in Recommendation 11.2 above. 11.5, based on definitions agreed on, again, coming out of the work noted in 11.2, ICANN should coordinate with the DAAR Project and publish the number of abusive naming complaints in more explicit actionable ways as outlined in five.

And we seem to have two 11.5s. "ICANN Org should update the current guidelines for implement ..." I think this should be 11.6, ICANN should update the current guidelines for the implementation of IDN site, IDNs to include a section on names containing trademarks, chaining, and use of hard-to-spot typos.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Again, any concerns from anybody on the team?

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, Russ, did you ask for comments?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes.

KC CLAFFY: Again, I think we're in a situation where we were before where we would need consensus on the text that leads to these recommendations before we get consensus on that, and that is still blocked on references to some of the sentences in the text, which we've been asking for since before this went for public comment. So I really feel like this is the reverse order of deciding on the recommendations and then retroactively substantiating the need for those recommendations and then retroactively seeing if we now address the public comment. It just makes me uncomfortable that we're going in this direction. So I don't know if I agree with these recommendations because they're not substantiated. And when I go and look at the text that tries to substantiate them, I see sentences that I don't think are correct but if they had a citation, I could go study and see if they were correct or not. So I don't know how, Russ, you want me to handle my perspective on whether I agree with this text given all of that is not done yet.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, that is somewhat concerning, what you're saying. Do you… Can you highlight the ones that are making you uncomfortable so we can talk them through?

KC CLAFFY: We can go through an example which is 11.5, the first 11.5, publish a form that allows third parties to analyze. I think that's a great idea but it goes up to the text in the justification which says DAAR is not fulfilling its original intent and it doesn't say what the original intent was. And when we, when I had a call that everybody was invited to be on and I forget who was actually on it, with ICANN about DAAR—the most recent one because I know there have been many of these calls—but they said very clearly DAAR was never intended to be that kind of data source. So we seem to have a disconnect here on what the point of DAAR was and if it was never intended to be that, why could it be turned into that now?

Maybe what we need to be saying is scrap DAAR. We don't know why it was put in place but you need a new project that is going to do X, Y and Z. And no more money should be put into DAAR. Rather, you should put something into X. I'm not saying that should be a recommendation. I'm saying we have to start from the principles that are leading to the recommendation and that is one example of I don't know how we got there.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anybody remember how we got there?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I think, KC, you're highlighting the challenge of draft text that has gone through many iterations and has been carried over in different places over the last couple of years. But we do have citations and additional information from the work that the team has done over the last couple of years on the intent of DAAR and the original scope and ICANN Org's response to constituencies asking for this type of system and what it would help achieve. So that, yeah, definitely needs to be added back in a way that is streamlined.

KC CLAFFY: So I'll just say I don't think it's fair to ask this team to get consensus on these recommendations until all that work is done and I think we need a timeline for getting that work done.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. I think this is of the opportunity for the team to walk through the recommendations, understand them, give people an opportunity to comment, make suggestions. This isn't sort of the last call, but rather, an important opportunity to raise items, as you have, about areas where more justification is needed, more clarity is needed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree with you, KC, that we're not at a point where we can call for consensus. However, I think we are at a point where course correction or disagreement can be [inaudible]. You've asked for some completeness. Now we need to make that happen in the abuse

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, Laurin has his hand up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. So essentially, I just want to kind of say the same thing. So when I tried to edit this for clarity, my hope was that now this is a text people can look at. Speaking without any hats as myself, I see quite a few issues in this text that need resolving. We had the same issue, by the way, with the risk section as well where we kind of edited for clarity so that it can be read in the first place. And again, in my personal capacity, I have some stuff. I feel it is too long. I mentioned on the sub-team call yesterday kind of the same direction that KC was going in where it was like the points we're making in this need to be kind of well-referenced and dealt with so that it is clear where we're coming from. The sub-team agreed this is something everyone is happy with and that we should do.

I also think that shortening and tightening the recommendations is necessary, kind of more clearly link things. I feel further rearrangement is possible. Our observer, Dennis, for example, just noted something I missed which is 11.5 which actually belongs to abusive naming which is at the bottom and where I, in my own read, said, "Let's add a really

short section because there are two or three things that do not fit but they do fit in proactive kind of anti-abuse measures." And yes, we have to check against the public comment as well.

So I do have these points and I can make these points now because the text I looked at was pretty clear because I did these edits. So I just feel this is exactly the point. We need to now go and see what of this text is fine and what needs work. And before this iteration, it would have been very hard to do. So that's what I tried to achieve, essentially, when I edited it. So now I kind of spoke about kind of myself plus my editing which I tried to avoid. But I think that's really the point. By reading it now, you can see the issues much more clearly than you could before and that also means we now have the opportunity to change it.

So I think, KC, what Russ is saying is exactly that. You, as well as everyone else, we need to go now and look at this and make our comments and see how we can kind of edit this, change it, so that it meets all our standards.

KC CLAFFY: So Laurin, you guys are the leaders, does that include going through this and just crossing out everything that doesn't have a reference? Because I don't think anybody here is volunteering—and we've had two years to do it—to go do the homework to make this substantiable. And then we should rewrite the recommendations based on what we can actually substantiate in the text before them.

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah KC, I think in most cases, it's a matter of bringing the substantiation back. I think the challenge, in particular, with these recommendations is they, in the effort to make the report much smaller and much more streamlined, there was a lot of material left behind.

KC CLAFFY: That's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about material that was never there because I'm seeing the same issues that I saw before it went for public comment of unsubstantiated claims. And those are complained about in the public comments too.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah. No, I think there's a wealth of material that was not put in the document that was up for public comment. So just because it's not here doesn't mean it doesn't, that it's not in prior versions and in other material that the Review Team has. But your point is taken and there are absolutely parts of this, of these recommendations, that need more substantiation and it's useful to get more eyes on the text to make sure that's done.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Because KC kind of named me in her comment, I will also respond. So I think, yes, essentially, if there is a claim that needs referencing, we might not cross it out but we can just kind of put "needs reference". Or what I did is just to indicate that, I just put a [ref] in brackets to kind of indicate this is where we need to say something.

The next problem is there is more text, as Denise says, and I think we need to think about what has to be in this section and what is essentially information to back it up. So Heather and I had this kind of idea when we looked at this text together, to add an appendix to kind of deal with the factuals, so where we can refer back to but not overwhelm the reader with what, for most people, likely is not relevant. I'm not sure if this is the solution, but essentially, just to say these discussions exist and we really need to kind of look at this because if that substantiating bumps this up to, I don't know, 30-50 pages that might be, for example, something we should [inaudible].

KC CLAFFY: So again, as another example, I have trouble with the whole couple first pages of this text where we just talk about random statistics or lack of statistics about cybercrime. I don't think any of that should be in here. I think it's not well-connected to the recommendations and it sort of dilutes the point of the report. But never mind that.

On the issue of where Laurin says, "Okay, well, we could put the word "ref" in," I would like the leadership to give a deadline by which if the references are not in, we get to cross out the sentence and move on and figure out what we have left and write recommendations based on that because we cannot keep doing this, guys. We have to have a timeline to finish this report and we have to put in, "If this isn't done, we move on and we see what we have so that we're not still having these calls next year."

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh my God.

KC CLAFFY: [Inaudible] for the leadership. How are we going to make progress
                       here?

DENISE MICHEL: I support that, KC, creating a deadline for both comments and
                       references on this that are resolved by a certain date.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Is next week a reasonable deadline?

KC CLAFFY: It is for me, but that means that if they're not there by next week, we
                       get to just remove the text.

DENISE MICHEL: I think we need to sort of touch base with other abuse team members.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm not hearing anybody's support but I'm not hearing anybody scream
                       no.

DENISE MICHEL: I'd like to… Yeah, I think we should check with some other, the other abuse sub-team members and come back with a date tomorrow perhaps.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Russ, I had my hand up.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think I wanted to probably ask KC just a quick question because I think one of the things I'm not hearing is because the report has been going on for almost four years, I think by now, a lot of the recommendations would have come from text at some point. They weren't pulled out of the air, I think, when we started to draft them. And I think it's just over the time, some of the information would either have become obsolete or needing updating or may not be relevant again.

And the fact that the recommendations got in there means that the abuse team or whoever were the original drafters, because I think it's all muddled now as to who drafted, who amended as we went on, is a matter that there was enough information at the time for these recommendations to have been developed the way they were because they're very specific based on findings that would have happened from the research interviews, etc.

But what I'm not hearing… I think what I was hoping to hear is value on whether or not these recommendations still stand. Are the information we have still there to substantiate it? Rather than the substantiating information isn't there so scratch the recommendation. The recommendations would have come from some place of need or some identification of something that someone in the Review Team over the years would have thought was relevant.

So I was just trying to figure out, understand the exercise as a matter that there is consensus because all of us have been part of this process all this time. It hasn't been a group developing. All of us have been in the discussions at different points and different phases. So is it a matter that there is no consensus on the general direction of the recommendations here? And then saying, "Okay, the information you have here is no longer valid or can't validate this." Can you just validate this information first and if you can't validate it, is it that the recommendation still is relevant and you find the information?

I think it just sounds as if, for me, if we do the process that you're suggesting, the entire report would probably be deleted and makes no sense and then we'd have wasted four years. So I'm just trying to figure where we're going in terms of if that is the process of elimination, because I think you have a lot of value you could add as well in terms of information you have. And what I was hoping is persons such as yourself who is probably more connected in more groups than probably some of us here would be able to say, "Hey guys, the information you have here is incorrect. Use this instead." "Hey guys, this information, I think I have more current data on this. Substitute this instead," rather than, "It's not there. You guys delete it." I think it still sounds to me like you versus the

team and I haven't said this before and I can't [inaudible]. I believe you have a lot of value to add and I want to hear more team rather than you guys didn't do this, the abuse didn't do that. [It's a matter that] this is all our work. We just broke it up to ensure that it was more manageable.

And as I said, I haven't said this before on record. I'm saying it now only because we're at a critical point and I think now the value added is to be able to work together to figure out where the nuances are, what needs to be removed, and where we can substantiate. All of us have some data somewhere and if it's a matter that we're scrambling to find that data, I agree, it should be deleted. It's not relevant anymore, but I'm not too clear on the elimination of the recommendation process. I'm sorry. Like I said, I've never said it but I'm listening, again, it's the third meeting I'm hearing this approach and it's a bit exhausting for me now.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I understand where you're coming from, Kerry-Ann. But I also need to remind everybody that these were the same comments that KC offered right before public comment and we kind of said, "Yeah, we'll deal with it later. Let's let the community tell us whether we're going in the right direction." So it's not like it's new is my point.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I get that, Russ. But at the same time, there is so much value that we could get as well in terms of, I think for me it's more the analysis of is this really a substantiated issue or not. And if it is, okay, you guys have worded it wrongly or you're not addressing it from the right angle. And then I think there has been substantial work put in and it's just a matter

of… And KC, it's nothing personal. It just feels it's a matter of, I think, persons have been trying and it feels as if it's justifying it. And justifying it is a good reason because when it goes out, it's going to get brutally criticized which it has in the public comment, but I just feel like at this stage, I would want to hear us more coming together as a team, as a whole rather than, yeah. I know, Laurin, you did mention it as well. And as I said, we've all said that it has to be grounded, defensible, everything. But as I said, right now, I think it's the team, all of us as a team have to be going towards this and putting this, and putting that substantiation because we've all been part of this process. And if that substantiation is to figure out, okay guys, why were we not substantiated? I think, for me, it's just a matter of how do we pull it now together as a team?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes. So I think…

KC CLAFFY: I have no objection to that. Then somebody needs to go assign, "Okay, you do this, you do this, you do this, you do this, and it has to be back by this deadline." That has not been how it has moved forward for the last nine months.

I don't know where to contribute now. Someone tell me what to do. I can't do this whole report. I could look for the record. I could go look for substantiation on one set of sentences and if I can't find them, come back to the team and say, "I can't find any substantiation for this," and then seven other people are going to take the other ones or what?

Somebody has to set goals here. Somebody has to manage this process. It's not being managed. I'm sorry to be harsh here, but…

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

So I'm sorry. Can I just jump in real quick? Because I have to drop and I hope I'm not stepping on KC, you or anybody who's hand is up or anything like that. Just one thought. And I [hate to do seagull management] because I'm late to another meeting.

But one thing we could do is we could also draft something that would essentially be sort of like objection text, basically let's pretend—which I'm not saying we should do—but let's pretend, for example, text that not everyone agrees with is gilded and it's going to stay. I'm not saying we do it that way. But what would you write to say, "Not everyone agreed with the above because we didn't see…"? That would be a roadmap for someone to say, "Oh, if those are the objections, I'll go ferret them out."

And the deadline thing would be if you don't address these comments, then that new text will supplement what's there or some version of what's there. In other words, instead of saying, "If you don't fix the problems, we're going to yank it out," and then that sort of runs afoul of what I hear Kerry say, you could say, "If you don't fix what I'm going to detail in a writing that's actually going to go in the report as essentially a sort of objection, then if you don't address it, then my text will go in too." On the other hand, we could say, "Oh, well that's a great roadmap to address your concerns." So that's just a suggestion. I don't know if

EN

that was clear. I really apologize because someone's waiting for me for five minutes now and I have to jump off.

KC CLAFFY: Bye, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Hey, how's it going? I have been listening. I have been here. I've just been triaging multiple things. But yeah, unless somebody wants to beat me over the head real quick, I could stick around for one more minute because I'm already four minutes late. What's the difference between four and five?

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Eric. I think that's helpful as well. Can I suggest that, and part of the challenge to state the obvious is that we're relying on volunteers with very busy day jobs and have not, in several cases, seen the ability to follow through on assignments and deadlines that have been made in the past. But I think it's a good suggestion to touch base with the various people on the sub-team who need to hold the pen on some of these and come up with the appropriate assignments and timeline so we can bring this to closure. So I'm happy to take that action item and then come back to the team with the proposed steps and schedule.

KC CLAFFY: I think Zarko's waiting.

ZARKO KECIC: Yeah. I just wanted to add I complained about same issue some two years ago and I said that they cannot complain and be sure that I will support the [end] recommendation of which I don't understand and cannot be backed up by either our opinion or a document which says that. So whoever wrote this recommendation and all other recommendations which says "not reached intended result" without explaining what result is or putting a document where this is written, it is very difficult to support something like that because I know as well, as KC mentioned, that DAAR wasn't intended to provide more information than it is now.

And from the beginning, when Dave Piscitello was in charge of DAAR, he mentioned a couple of times that because of contractual obligations toward other institutions which DAAR is relying on, they cannot share data. And I really don't know what is intended result from DAAR and without writing that down, I'm not sure that we can put that in the document. And the same thing applies to other recommendations which say "not reached intended result".

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, Zarko. I think it's clear more references and context is needed in the DAAR section.

Since we're over time, and I know many of us have another call, shall I take an action item to connect with the sub-team members and agree to assignments and a timeline to come back with additional, well, the additions that we've discussed here today? Does that make sense?

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know what else to do.

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So yeah, and we'll definitely be talking about this on the next leadership call which I don't recall when is because Monday was a holiday. But I'll have to look that up. Okay.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Russ, it's on Monday, the 12th, I believe, of October.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, it is going to be Monday at the normal time?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yeah, the normal time.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. All right. Obviously, we need to figure out some things going forward, but I appreciate people staying late so that we could get as many views on this as possible. We will get back to you on e-mail probably on Monday. All right, thank you all. And this is an awkward place to leave it, but we're well over time so thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Thanks, everybody.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thanks, everyone.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thanks, everyone, particularly staff for staying longer with us. Good night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]