BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking and welcome to the SSR2 Plenary Call #125 on the 15th of October 2020. Review team members attending the call today include Russ, Kerry-Ann, Ram Krishna, Zarko, Laurin, and KC. Observer Dennis Tan has joined. We have apologies from Danko, Denise, Eric, and Steve. Attending from ICANN Org is Jennifer and Brenda, and our technical writer, Heather.
	Today's meeting is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the record. And Russ, I'll turn the call over to you. Thanks.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. Wow, it really struck me when you said call number 125.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Me, too. I was like, "Oh, my God. I hope that's not a record." But again I hope that is a record because this is too many calls.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	I realize that includes the calls before the pause, but still, wow. So, let's focus on getting her done.
	So, the first thing is to share with you where we are and the process that we are going to go through to get finished. Yesterday or last week we had a discussion from the abuse team and the approach they were taking and it was pretty clear that more details were needed in order for the team to buy into that, and KC and Laurin each took time to go through it and highlight places where that was needed and the abuse

---

team is working that and they intend to report that out next week. So, the goal for this week is to finish all of the other recommendations, other than those that are caught up in that.

Once we have agreement to an approach for each of the subteams, we're going to pass over that collection of work to Heather. Heather will probably take a week or two to put it into a form. She told me that I couldn't hold her to a week—that would make it ready for a full front to back read by the team to determine whether we actually had consensus or caught little errors. So the expectation is that coming out of next week's call, we'll be able to give a document to Heather, and a week or two later back to the team for complete front to back to read to make sure we've captured everything and we have consensus on it. So, my expectation is that we will need to have a fairly long call when we go through that document.

Then we'll have a confirmation that we have achieved consensus, and if so we'll pass it over to the Board and the Communications Team. The Communications Team will translate it and then post it on the ICANN website. Any questions about any of that?

So, let's move to the recommendations that are going to report out today. The first one is recommendation 25 and that's KC. It takes a little while for that document to load if you haven't already loaded it. So, once you do get it, it's down on page 54. Over to you, KC.

KC CLAFFY: I'm trying to find this myself in my thing. All right. So, this one is sort of caught up also in the big chunk of abuse recommendations because I

EN

feel that this access to data is … Well, overlaps with some of the ones that are currently in the abuse batch. But never mind that. Maybe this text moves or gets folded into the abuse batch, let's call it, over the next week. Let's focus on the content.

Then I put a bunch of stuff under what is now a relatively short findings in recommendation that don't specifically relate to CZDS but I feel like all this data access—registration data zone data access—kind of belongs together because it's in the context of needing it for the purposes of SSR.

So, I'll talk about that extra text that didn't fit into 25 because it was not CZDS specific and we'll figure out where to put it later.

So, first I tried to do the rationale and findings, which is where? Great. So, it starts with this SSR2 … Yeah. So, here's the text. I don't know if I should assume people have read the text or if I should read it. Who's on the call?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we could read it but give the highlights that are enough to show the logic you're trying to give.

KC CLAFFY: Right. So, the logic is CZDS is one type of data that folks interested in security, be they law enforcement, attorneys or security researchers are interested in getting. It exists because in the process of the gTLD—the 2012 gTLD program—there was multi-stakeholder negotiations that sort of led to this being a compromise of how to get access to data or one

EN

type of data that would help keep track including all of the security commitments that were made by ICANN in the wake of the new gTLD program.

Now, there are still issues with that data, although that data has proven quite valuable—useful—for SSR2 analysis [processes]. At least from … I can speak as an academic, from research standpoint. There definitely have been issues with access to data and complaints about it for years, so that's the reason the recommendation is in this report is that not only is there a large set of complaints visible on the ICANN website about access to this data, but SSAC who I guess includes folks that try to use it and folks that represent folks who try to use it [inaudible] advisory on this topic three years ago pretty much pinpointing specific issues that were problematic and I quote—do I quote one? I quote two, it looks like, even though there's more than that. I feel like the first two really got at the crux of the problem.

So I went through my understanding of a bit of the timeline of trying to get at those problems which was the Board reading the SSAC advisory, making recommendations based on it. And then we even had a meeting with ICANN folks that were responsible for this and got some statements from them which I've tried to incorporate into this text about why these recommendations from SSAC which represent requirements for changes to CZDS data to make it more accessible have not yet been implemented, which I'll just say, speaking as an SSAC member and an academic researcher and an SSR2 member are frustrating for me that it's been so long and this remains a huge category of complaints for people.

EN

But what I say is—and I say that also … Okay. One of the things that ICANN did with one of the recommendations—at least one of the recommendations—in SSAC 97 which is the one I'm talking about here, I'm quoting, is they punted it to the SubPro Working Group as "this is a problem for new gTLDs".

Now, the reason of that is the recommendation was phrased in a way of recommendation number one, we'd like you to fix all these set of problems with CZDS access. And then recommendation two is, to make sure they stay fixed, go put it in the contracts that this is what we mean by access to zone data. To participation in CZDS let's call it.

ICANN Board or ICANN Org, I forget which—I should fix it because it feels like that would be a Board thing but I wrote Org in here—punted this to SubPro Working Group which basically implies that it's a new contract, new gTLD issue, which it is as it says in the recommendation. But this is not even mentioned in the SubPro's final report here on new gTLDs—a 360-page report. So it gives us concern that it's not being taken seriously, that it keeps getting finger-pointed around to resolve these problems and it's still not been done by ICANN. And they say that it's on the roadmap per the written communication that we had with them, which is also a matter of public record. It's in the email. It's on the call transcript stuff. But it's on the roadmap, it's just not a higher priority enough to have been done by now. And that's pretty much it.

Now, the recommendation 25, the actual words, the bold font on page 55 is short and sweet and may not be smart as in that whole measurable stuff, such that SSR3 would know what's been done.

EN

I have one specific example of the auto-renewal because that got mentioned a lot in the report and I personally know what a pain in the butt that is to deal with. But that's not the only thing. So I would be very interested in feedback on other specific measurable things that folks think should be mentioned in the CZDS recommendation.

Also, there is going to be a shepherd involved in these recommendations, so maybe some of that can get taken care of through that process, the more specifics and how this is available in a timely manner without unnecessary hurdles.

I will say that one of the public comments we got was please be specific about what unnecessary hurdles you're talking about. So that's why I added the lack of auto-renewal which was mentioned in 97.

Another unnecessary hurdle that was mentioned in 97 actually refers to not CZDS data, like getting access to registration data which is covered in the text below the yellow highlight line here and wasn't here before. It was in the abuse section, I think, which is why I've left text down here but I don't know if it's appropriate to review it now because it's probably part of the abuse stuff. But I would love it if people could read it and say, "Is there anything in here that you object to me folding into the abuse section when I take a whack at that?" Which will happen this weekend.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know if others have questions but I have one for you. Let's see if we have any hands. I don't see any hands. Okay. So, can we be more

EN

granular than timely manner is really my only … More measurable than timely manner?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, fair enough. Okay. I mean, I could take that phrase out entirely because … Okay, yes, that helps actually because there's two aspects to that which I should tease out apart.

One is the data is supposed to be there every 24 hours, the domain data, the new zone data. I think what this "timely manner" is/was referring to in the public draft is people's approval to get access to it because some registries apparently were taking a long time—many times, months—in order to give an individual requestor access and others were very prompt and I don't know the current status of that. So I'll fix that.

I mean, how long should it take to get approval for the domains?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, you're talking about something that's undetermined now and you want to put it within two weeks or something, right?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. I would even need to consult with somebody at ICANN to say is there a current time [inaudible] how long it will take? I think there's not and I think that's what recommendation two is getting at, is it really needs to be … Or recommendation one. It really needs to be some SLA, some commitment to say, "Okay, within [inaudible]."

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. Even if it was to be worded to say, "Pick an SLA and then stick to it," would be fine with me.

KC CLAFFY: Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But that seemed very hand-wavy to me.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Fair enough. I hear you on that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Let's turn to anyone else on the team who has comments. Then we can talk about below the yellow if no one else does.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think Heather and I had our hands up. I think Heather was first.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yeah but my questions are for what's below the yellow, so I'll put it back down.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought the same. The only hand I see is Kerry-Ann, so go ahead, Kerry-Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: KC, I agree with you that it should probably go with the abuse section but I had wanted to suggest … Hold on. [inaudible] tried to reopen it.

What I had wanted to suggest is the sections on … Given how we proposed how you're going to go through and reorganize the section on … I was wondering about the title, if we should still keep the title. I think … Brenda, can you go down? I lost the Google Docs? Can you just go to the title—

BRENDA BREWER: The title … Recommendation [N], you mean?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. I was wondering if we should keep the title because if you fold it into where we have the Compliance and SLA stuff under the DNS abuse stuff that we're going to do, I think it would flow better because [inaudible] the more we've been speaking I think is that—and I don't know if it's something that when Heather goes through it, we could place again, Heather could look at it holistically.

But I remember when we were speaking about how do we combine the sections that deals with the things that we want from clients to improve on and we could take a long discussion about them not doing the SLA for the registrars and stuff, but at least just them improving, which is

EN

why the links I had sent the other day with how they handle complaints, how they handle different things. I think this would be one of them in terms of just their general processes.

So I don't know who to speak to in ICANN just to see if it's a matter of … It's no on their priority list. So their process is it's not a matter that they've taken months. It's just that, if they come in, these are the other things that come before that request. So, do we want to make that priority request? It's just if you get the process from that person you'll speak to, I think that would better help us to phrase if it should be an SLA matter or if we should actually be asking them to prioritize this request because [inaudible] persons might need the data because data will change. So that's my only comment, if you want to put it there instead.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Laurin, are you here to respond to that or are you just waiting until after KC responds to that?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I just want to make a quick note. This recommendation is in the abuse section as well as the findings text.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh.

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay because we [moved that]. Okay. It's because we were looking at it on a different doc. Okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, there are different docs, so thank you for highlighting that, Laurin.

[HEATHER FLANAGAN]: Okay because I admit I wasn't quite clear on what Kerry-Ann wants me to do.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, I think Laurin answered it. It was just to make this … You were asking if it should go in under where we had the DNS abuse stuff, and I was agreeing with you, yes. I was just saying that it should go closer to where we have [inaudible] compliance.

[KC CLAFFY]: Yes, absolutely. I was just hoping Heather would figure out where that was because I am in [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yes, that's probably a Heather thing and if it's already across there, which Laurin has said, I guess when Heather looks at it holistically it would get [inaudible].

[KC CLAFFY]: I didn't know that [inaudible] put there, but okay, let's [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, help. Tell us where we are.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, that's a fascinating question. I'm hearing that it goes into the abuse section but I also understand that the abuse section is about to go through some pretty significant rewriting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, for sure.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So, I actually have no idea where this is going to go in there because "there" effectively doesn't exist yet because it's being redone.

[KC CLAFFY]:   Right. Okay. So, what would help me, if I'm going to take the knife on that section, just put this in the same Google Doc as that section … Whatever the URL is that I'm supposed to work on—and maybe that's a Laurin question.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's a Laurin question.

[KC CLAFFY]:   I just want to make sure that I don't forget about this text and I filled it into the right place and then get Kerry-Ann to approve it, whatever I've done.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Question for me. Well, it is currently in the document with the recommendations that I'm going through.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: With these amendments, Laurin? Because I think these are the amendments … I think this is pretty clear how KC has it written here. So, this text is included in that doc? Or the old text?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: That doc currently only has recommendation text so …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. Does it have this, though? This, how she reworded the recommendations here.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I would have to check that because I pulled it from a previous section.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: From before.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. But KC and I will look at it on the weekend. That is already scheduled. So we'll make sure that is in.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

KC CLAFFY: All right. So, any other comments on rec 25 text? And as Kerry-Ann maybe is suggesting, the text below that I'm talking about is actually much longer than the rec 25 text, and if folks have time to read that before next Wednesday, you would be way ahead of the game on reading the abuse text that I'll hopefully be … Laurin and I will hopefully be done with early next week.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I think I'm not seeing any hands, not see anyone trying to get our attention on audio. So I think we're ready to move to recommendation 28.

The text for 28 was sent out in its own document. It's a small one-and-a-half pager, if we could bring that up, please. Thank you. And I turn it over to Naveed to take us through this.'

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Am I heard?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. Hi, everyone. So, this is a small document but an extension to what we had previously in the recommendation 28 that was just around the paragraph and we got around I think seven to eight comments about that. Most of them were coming from SSAC.

Here, I just tried to actually read the whole recommendation and read [inaudible] and finding by keeping [inaudible] the questions. One of the questions was why it is—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I stopped hearing Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Do you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: You're back now.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I think there was a problem. I'm seeing that one of the questions was whether there's well-placed as a future direction of SSR2 or not. So keeping [in view] that we have the NCAP and all that. So, based on that, I tried to answer that and keep that in perspective, like why there are—

EN

what are the issues that are still to be handled and why we believe that it is still an open issue and it is equally relevant in the future?

The findings or the comments that are coming from the public comment document were about the [inaudible] NCAP. They're working on that. So I tried to have a comparison between NCAP and what we do, and as we agreed upon on a call a couple of weeks ago, that we're not seeing that it is something that is in addition to what NCAP says. We're just trying to highlight what are the gaps still there in the NCAP study and how we can fill that gap. So this recommendation now revolves around that aspect.

I also redrafted the recommendations that you find at the end of the document. It's not a long one. If you want me to read that out, I can also do that, but otherwise as it is up, so if there is anything we can discuss about it, I'll be happy to do that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Does anyone have any comments for Naveed?

KC CLAFFY: I have a question.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Go ahead.

EN

KC CLAFFY: This is much-improved text. I really appreciate it. I still have a minor concern that might not be minor, which is … And I'm looking for it in the text and I don't see it. That there is this whole what ICANN would call and has called a framework, to characterize [inaudible] which is the—what do they call it? Controlled interruption thing. And they've gotten research on it, they've got reports on it, they put money into it. Some people, including many of the public commentors on the NCAP stuff, have said this is effective, this is sufficient, there's not much more that ICANN can do.

So, I feel like there are some, including ICANN Org itself, that are going to say, "Well, what do you want that we haven't done already?"

So, when you say framework, I'm worried its not that whole measurable thing because they're going to say, "Well, we already have a framework. Check."

Now, I know you say above that recent research is not sufficient but I think we haven't referred specifically to this—what do they call it? Controlled interruption thing. Have you any thoughts on that? Oh, here it is.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Controlled interruption is in 28.3.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah, yeah. Has never been tested against evolving name collision attack scenarios. I'm not quite sure what that means. I mean, controlled interruption is—

NAVID BIN RAIS:

KC, what I found … So, I had a deep review of the NCAP draft report and final report and these are the things that I found as being claimed by even their studies or they're even saying that …

For example, they are presenting things mostly in a rationale manner, so there are known measurements associated with how the name collisions are, data is collected, and if there is any data associated with that.

There is no evidence that, for example, whether this controlled interruption framework is working or not, so there is no evaluation of that framework itself.

So, this is what I tried to put there, so of course I'm not sure this is one man's effort. I'm not saying it's perfect. There might be some or a lot of margin of improvement, but this is the overall prescriptive of how I saw that, as compared to what you have as a controlled interruption framework and as the findings of the NCAP and the comments that we received on the report of NCAP. So, all of that I kept in perspective to update this recommendation, actually.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, I don't know that much about controlled interruption, but what I read this to say is, "We don't have any metrics in order to know whether controlled interruption is adequate." That's what I hear this calling for is those metrics and then measure whether it is.

KC CLAFFY: Fair enough but I think we need to cite the report on controlled interruption and make sure that it's consistent with that claim, which I'll go find the report. Is this it? Yeah, this is it. I'll put it in the chat. I want to make sure everybody read this because I feel like they did do measurements in this report but I haven't read it in a long time, so I might be …

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Naveed, could you take that action item?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. [I'll have a revisit] of that and keep this comment in mind and we'll see. Maybe we can specifically present what kind of metrics would be there or what is exactly missing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would be great if you could take that action item and hopefully wrap this up in the next week, that would be great. And if you can wrap it up on an email, even better.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Okay. As soon as possible, yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. Great. Thank you. Any other questions from the team for Naveed?

EN

KC CLAFFY: The other problem is that 28.2, the process of producing and implementing the solution should be independent of any party with financial interest [inaudible] possible because ICANN will be implementing it, unless you mean they need to contract this out to another party, in which case ICANN is paying the other part.

And ICANN, as has been noted many times, has a deep financial interest in expansion. So we need to fix that a little bit. I don't know how. I can try and take a whack at it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. I see the tension there.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: That's a trickier thing, you know. I'm not sure if we say that it has to be completely outsourced. That would be acceptable or accepted eventually because [inaudible] will also cut our cost and things like that. I'm not sure how to balance this [out]. Maybe you think about it and if you have any suggestions regarding that, that would be great.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. KC, was that a hand for what you just said?

KC CLAFFY: Yeah. Sorry, I'll take it down.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I just want to make sure that you weren't queueing up for something else. Okay, I see no other hands. Any other comments? Okay. Let's go to the next one, which are some updates to things we already talked about last week, which were some updates to recommendations 23 and 26. There's a separate Google doc for that. I turn it over to Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, thank you. Regarding recommendation 23, there are some updates in rationale and findings and I believe we didn't do any change to recommendation. We go back to that page there. I can look at … There were a couple of questions in regard of this recommendation and there are some misunderstanding between what was written—actually what was the intention of this recommendation and how people understood that.

First of all, we didn't recommend to speed up. It would be nice, but it is a security issue right now to speed up development of new [inaudible] management system.

But to [inaudible] security of existing and move on to new when it is established and implemented with exchange of encrypted emails and implementing a multi-factor [identification]. We believe it is not that difficult, that ICANN can do that because a lot of social media has already done that.

And talking to Kim Davies a couple of times, he defended their position in not implementing the stuff that not all TLD admin [inaudible] are capable of using multi-factor authentication and encrypted emails. And

we believe it would be really nice to implement that as optional functionality.

There are a lot of European ccTLDs. I talked to them in [inaudible] workshops. They would like to see that implemented in a [inaudible] management system.

This [inaudible] for rationale and findings and a comment on that? Is that clear or we missed something?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I'm not seeing any hands. I have none myself. Anyone else? Okay, let's move to 26 then.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, 26 was a tough one. Heather helped with both recommendations a lot, putting my thoughts into nice wording. We wrote this recommendation pretty much because I believe—and I would like to hear from somebody who originally wrote this recommendation—the intention was to have a [inaudible] process tested from end to end. So tested from escrow provider to the end of putting TLD into root zone. Sorry, my phone is ringing. So, we would like to see that.

There are also a couple of recommendations asking ICANN to write clear text about decision making, about entire process with flow charts and stuff like that. There is already documented. It is pretty hard to find it because it is embedded into agreements with [inaudible] providers but there is document which is pretty well-written and it is clear and clearly says when and how [inaudible] declared and what each party has to do.

EN

So, we ended up with those two recommendations saying that ICANN should coordinate end to end testing [inaudible] process and to make that test plan in accordance with … Actually, that's [inaudible] findings and rationale. That plan should be in accordance with ISO 22 300.

Another one is to make this transition process manual easy to find because it is mentioned a couple of times on [inaudible] page but it is hard to find because it is part of the agreement.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Zarko, I am the one who wrote some of this text. What happened was there was a review of this done before the pause and during one of the face-to-face meetings it was realized that it never made it into the report, so when we broke up into working sessions, I took the notes from the pre-pause work and put them into findings and recommendations in order for people to talk through. I think you've improved what I did, so I'm totally satisfied, as the person who wrote the original words.

ZARKO KECIC: Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Anyone else? Maybe somebody who's been involved [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I wasn't involved but I was going to give that background in terms of the pre-pause as well and what happened because I remember following this one, while it wasn't something that I specialize in or I wrote, and I agree with you that the text has improved it. And Zarko, I remember the intent pre-pause was that ability to hold them to standards for this, and if you're able to include the reference to ISO even as a footnote because I'm not seeing it in the text and I know you mentioned it when you were explaining. I think it was ISO 2300 you were suggesting.

ZARKO KECIC: It is somewhere in the text.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, it's not in the text on the screen.

ZARKO KECIC: No, it is up

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Oh, okay. I don't know if we should put it in the recommendation as a footnote because it's in the findings but not in the recommendation.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay.

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And I think that would read it differently in terms of that just [inaudible]. If we could probably reference in the specific recommendations somewhere as a footnote, at least it would be tied to it. That was my only suggestion.

ZARKO KECIC: Anyone else?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, I see hands from Heather and KC.

KC CLAFFY: I was having trouble getting the commented version here. I think I have an old hand. I'll take it down.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, Heather?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: With regards to tying in the ISO standard into the recommendation itself, is that what you … Do we want them to follow exactly that? The way it was phrased was this is a best practice, as indicated by things such as … But that gives ICANN at least some room to make its own decisions as to how exactly are they going to do this. I'm not sure what should actually go in the recommendation itself.

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: It was just when he was explaining it, Heather. He had mentioned it in the text when he was reading 26.1. I was just checking if it was something that we wanted to reference there as well or just have it in the background. If it's just like a recommendation as a reference. But what Zarko explained to us, it sounded as if he was suggesting that it could have been one that they used. So, if not, I guess it's fine with it being in the background text.

KC CLAFFY: I think putting citations, like the footnotes—

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: [inaudible]

KC CLAFFY: Well, I think putting footnotes in the recommendations is probably not a great idea.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. We'll [inaudible]. No, [inaudible]. I'm saying it's just a suggestion at the end of the day. It's just to make all the text flow the same. So, it's fine.

ZARKO KECIC: I can agree with Kerry-Ann if we have recommendation period saying that ICANN should implement ISO standard. But if we don't have that, in

that case we have to leave it up to ICANN to decide what standard we'll use for this.

KC CLAFFY: I have absolutely no opinion as to whether they should do that or not, so that's your decision.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, I mean it's putting it out to the group. How it's worded now, it just says that they should coordinate end-to-end testing of the processes and [determinant on intervals]. It's not saying they should follow standard in the recommendation. So it's just for us to decide do we want them to follow standard in the recommendation or it's a matter that do your end-to-end testing with no reference or guidance to what you should consider.

So, my only recommendation was, at the top, we have it as something for them to consider, but here we're not mentioning it in 26.1 for them to implement any standard. It's just to see what we wanted.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But I think the flow chart actually is pretty good in terms of what the steps are. So I don't …

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: But that's in the findings, though. I'm just trying to say I don't know what the logic of the [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: That's correct. It is.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: So I just wanted to see, if it's not in the recommendation, it's just like background talk, like, "Hey, this is really nice but just test when you can." That's different from saying, "Hey, this is really nice. We recommend you look into this as one of the methods you use for testing." It's kind of different for me.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think so because I don't think we're asking them to change the EBERO process because we don't have enough testing data to know whether to recommend any changes. But by testing it, people will know whether it's working or not is the way I interpreted it or what I had in mind when I wrote it the first time, based on the notes from pre-pause. That's my interpretation. Go ahead, Zarko.

ZARKO KECIC: In findings, we said that we are looking at EBERO as specific disaster recovery for [failing] TLDs. We should follow testing for disaster recovery to test: is process okay? Is our plan okay? And also are all actors ready to fulfill their tasks if disaster is activated? We should check—actually ICANN should check—everything and [inaudible] end-to-end testing process [inaudible] everything.

EN

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Right because my memory was that the one time they did run a test, it did not start at the beginning.
ZARKO KECIC:	No. And also, as part of the agreement, there is [inaudible] of pages saying how testing is done and it is just [fragmented] and not from end-to-end full EBERO process testing.
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Laurin, I see your hand.
LAURIN WEISSINGER:	So, just want to make a note. When we referred to international standards, stuff like that, in the risk section, we kind of put it along the lines of you can use this standard but you're also free to choose another accepted one. So I just wanted to make a note this is how we've handled it there which might be an option to mention it like that here but I think that discussion kind of went away from that anyway.
ZARKO KECIC:	That's what I thought. We just referenced ISO standard over there and we'll leave that up to ICANN. Maybe we can add some wording saying that following acceptable standards or whatever in recommendation, not referring only to [inaudible].

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I agree with that, Zarko. I understand what you're saying, Russ. Like I said, this is not my area of specialty, so I can't offer a technical opinion. It's just in terms of how it … Just in terms of specific instructions to them. I think what Zarko said, we could probably [inaudible] could probably go … You probably know where best to place [inaudible] acceptable standards in testing, [inaudible] the standards. Maybe [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm going to channel KC for just a second. Acceptable—what does that actually mean? Acceptable to whom? I can't turn that into an actionable item because acceptable is just entirely open to interpretation.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I guess [inaudible], if end-to-end testing covers them utilizing all the standards then available, testing processes that would be applicable to this.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I guess it should be fine then.

RUSS HOUSLEY: The point of those words were that the last test they did only tested part of the process and end-to-end [inaudible] test the entire process and if you would prefer to replace end to end with the entire process, that would be fine.

EN

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: No, no, no. That's fine, Russ. I was saying it was just a reference to the standard. I just wanted to know if we wanted to recommend them using it or not. But that was it. Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. We have some minor edits proposed. Any other comments on other parts? Laurin, I saw your hand come and go.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I wrote it in the chat. Why don't we mention what you just discussed specifically to kind of say, "This was the specific issue." It might be just a footnote, so then everyone is clear, "Okay, this is what they didn't like."

RUSS HOUSLEY: We do point to the report of the exercise which was a Tech Day at ICANN 55 but we could add [inaudible].

HEATHER FLANAGAN: If I may, if you go up to the third paragraph in the rationale and findings, what we said was ICANN appears to have participated in only minimal testing where pieces of the process were tested.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, exactly.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So we have mentioned that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry, this is the problem with this, because you can't see the whole text, so I didn't realize it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. It points to the report. It says which actual TLD was tested. I think it's there.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: As a sort of general aside, one of the challenges I think we've been having in working on the recommendations themselves, without looking at the findings, is those two things—the findings and the recommendations—must tie together fairly closely and that doesn't mean repeating the findings and the recommendations or the recommendations and the findings. It means you say what you found and then you say [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, you have no way to know this, but you're sounding like Naveed.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yay!

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Because Naveed, when we were reading the SSR1 recommendations to see whether they were fully implemented, about 1,000 times he said what you just said. You can't read the recommendation without reading the findings to know what they really meant to be done.
HEATHER FLANAGAN:	Naveed, you are my people!
RUSS HOUSLEY:	Sorry, a moment of deja vu there. Long before you were involved in this. But you're both right. All right, I'm seeing no hands. I think that means we're good. All right. Thank you. If you could make the final little edits so that we'll pass this to Heather, that would be great. Just send her an email when you've put them into the documents. This means that we're going to wrap up about five minutes early today, and the abuse sub-team will report out next week and hopefully that will get us to a place where all of the public comments have been addressed. Is there any other business for the review team today? Okay, I'm not hearing any, so thank you and, please, especially the folks on the abuse team, have a productive week. Thank you.
KERRY-ANN BARRETT:	Bye, everybody.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	Take care, all. Bye.

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]