
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. Welcome to the SSR2 plenary #130 on the 3rd of December 2020 at 15:00 UTC.

Members attending the call today are Alain, Danko, Kaveh, Laurin, Norm, Ram Krishna, Russ, and Scott. Observer Dennis Tan.

Apologies from Jennifer.

Attending from ICANN Org we have Brenda, Jean-Baptiste, Larissa, Pamela, and Steve, 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. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi. Thank you. We have three things that I'm hoping we will accomplish today in the hour. The first is we were having several threads between Heather and the people who did the SSR1 review to see whether the intended effect was accomplished. Basically, we had a rewrite of that section to move recommendations out of it and push all of the findings into an appendix, and the result of that is some of the sections didn't wrap up cleanly because of the recommendation being moved. So each of the threads was to resolve issues with that rewrite. All of them have been resolved except two. We want to discuss those two to hopefully finish that.

Next, we want to review a few things regarding the SMART criteria on a couple of the sections where we think we need dates, just to get a feel for what's reasonable. And third, when we were together last, which

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.

was two weeks ago, Laurin and KC had an action to, over that following weekend, do some changes to what we thought was two paragraphs. And if you take a look at the links in the agenda, you'll see that far more than two paragraphs got changed. So we wanted to make sure that the whole team was up and aware of what was going on and why. And mostly, that's to avoid a bunch of discussion when we do get the final report back from Heather or the edited report back from Heather.

So those are the three things we're hoping to deal with. I hope we could deal with them in the hour. So I'm going to turn over number two, the SSR1 appendix, over to Heather to talk about the two recommendations she needs help on.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

Thank you, Russ. We're basically going to bracket the remaining items in the appendix, because the first question is in recommendation one on page two where we make the statement that despite the existence of this statement, which was the SSR role and remit, despite the existence of this statement and its clear definition of security, stability and resiliency, the use of these definitions remain inconsistent, and we provide an example referencing some discussions that were had.

As far as I've been able to tell from talking to others, this is very much an anecdotal statement and there's nothing to point to. We don't have access to the text of the contracts themselves, and the discussion with the individuals were off record. So this statement is very difficult to substantiate, and I was hoping that the review team would have some suggestions for what to do with it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So one of the things we could do is replace “for example” with “in side discussions with team members” or something liker that. But if someone has something that is posted somewhere that we could point to, that would be far preferable. Does anybody on the call have a suggestion?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So Lauren says, what if the stated the facts that we cannot find anything written but we can say how we got the information? I think that’s what Russ’s recommendation touches on when we say in side conversations. And that may be what we have to do, but it is a very weak argument.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It’s also the case, I believe, that these discussions with individuals took place before the shutdown, so it was a while ago.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I would just delete it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Do we delete the whole bullet?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: No, just the “for example” sentence.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Then you still have the problem of you're making an assertion, which is despite the existence of the statement, the use of these definitions remains inconsistent. There's nothing supporting that to be true or false.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Everybody knows they're inconsistent.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It sounds ... We could just delete it. I don't recommend that. I think perhaps the in side conversations—

RUSS HOUSLEY: With team members.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Thank you. I think that's probably the best we can do. The second question actually now goes down to—

RUSS HOUSLEY: A comma needs to go somewhere.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'll fix it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: This is just a working document right now. It will get sorted out before we're actually done. So if we go to page 21 in recommendation 23 ... Is KC on the call? No. That's unfortunate. The bullet that starts with the lack of metrics and monitoring of success or failure of the new gTLD program indicates that the multi-stakeholder process is not free of external pressures. That's fine. The next sentence, the CCTRT report on DNS abuse and the new gTLDs has found metrics to rigorously apply through which it is impossible to conclude that the gTLD program has been successful from a CCT perspective.

I have no idea what that sentence means.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Since we talked on Monday, I've been thinking about it, and what I think it is saying is it's impossible to conclude using the CCT metrics that the program has been successful.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I came up with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It's successful from a CCT perspective, but yeah. Does anyone else read it differently? Not seeing any hands and not hearing anything, so I think we accomplished item one.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I will take care of that, tidy it up a little bit, and get it into the draft final report.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Just one thing on that one. I've read this like six times now. I think it probably should say the CCTRT report on DNS abuse and new gTLDs has found metrics, blah-blah, and then later on it says the gTLD program, it should be new gTLD program, because if I understand, [that's all that we've] looked at.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Good point. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So let's go to the SMART topic. Laurin, I think you're the one who's going to lead this discussion.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No, tag, I'm it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, it's you again. Okay.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

It's me again. So just to give folks a sense of where I was coming from with this, it's not the formal full spell out of the acronym. Where this came from was if you look at the abuse subteam text, after every recommendation, they tried to give just a short summary to help the next review team with what to do, what to expect.

As you may recall, when we were evaluating SSR1, you had three questions to answer. Is it still relevant? Was it implemented? And did it achieve its intended effect? And so we liked that in the abuse subteam text. Laurin has been working on something along those lines in a SMART chart for the risk subteam text, but that left the rest of the document, which was sort of the global DNS section, and so for that, I took a stab at answering those questions.

And it went reasonably well. I reviewed it with the leadership team on Monday. But there were several areas where I was unable, based on the text that we had, to answer a question about when, what's the timing of this thing—whatever the recommendation was. For example, in the recommendation on the DNS regression test suite, based on the text we could say the recommendation can be considered effective. When there is a test suite available, it helps ensure the DNS's integrity and availability. And I'll fix the rest of that text. You can tell I'm still in the middle of editing a lot of this. We know when it's going to be implemented, we know who's going to be doing it, but we don't actually have anything that says when we think it needs to be done by, or how often or there's no time bounding. Does anyone have any suggestions?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So my understanding is work has continued on this, and we could probably say something like six months after the board is finished with the report ... The thing is there's an evergreen aspect to this, so then revisit it each year or something to that effect.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Even yearly might be too much, but I don't think it's something that's going to change a lot.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, okay, I think the only thing is when new releases of the software come out, right?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And so that's kind of what I was thinking for a year.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Right, it's more like a trigger event rather than ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, exactly. "Hey, did any new releases come out? Did we bring them in?" Yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. The next one without a date is ... It's currently labeled recommendation 21. Those numbers will certainly change. Establishing baseline security practices for root server operators and operations. Based on the text, the recommendation can be considered effective when ICANN Org helps develop and then follows strong SSR best practices for root server operators. We say we know it's going to be implemented when ICANN has shown that it's followed RSSAC 37. And for its own root server, which is currently listed as L-root which turned into a massive editing conversation earlier. But we don't have a date. When does this need to be done by?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does anyone think this is going to be quick?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So it's probably a multi-year process. Two or three years would be my guess. Anyone have a better guess?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hi. I don't know how well my backup connection works. Two things. [inaudible] ICANN Org might not be able to ensure that, so I would just—

RUSS HOUSLEY: So you would just kind of ... and then your audio stopped.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I was muted by the host. I'm not sure why. My apologies. So that's number one. I would go ICANN Org to ICANN, and then we might want to focus on the next round of the gTLDs here. I'm not sure if that is realistic in terms of time, but it could make sense maybe to kind of say, you know, when the next expansion happens, try to get it better.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Oh, before another round of gTLD.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. That's reasonable.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay. What Heather just deleted was exactly what I was going to comment on.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: The ensures part?

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah. It's not a precise measurement.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, keep in mind this is just sort of the summary of the recommendation. The recommendations themselves have much more detail.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Okay, because I think it's just that when it says known to be implemented, I really like how that's phrased, and it's just that some persons would probably just read this, especially when they go back to check. But it's deleted, right?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Well, the problem is I may have pulled that from what text is already there, and so I've just highlighted it, so it's a note to me to go double check it, make sure that we're not using that term elsewhere in that recommendation.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Good. Perfect. Thank you so much, Heather.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Quick comment. One is a bit cosmetic, and then I think it's also in the ... it's not much a big thing, but maybe helps. ICANN has made an announcement that they called their root service IMRS, so they don't call it L-root anymore. That's just a point. But that aside, I just wanted to make it clear because ... and it is in the recommendation. I'm sure it will come back. It was referred in the last public comment round, but I think it will come back later on again. The root server system governance process that's ongoing, ICANN and ICANN Org and ICANN is just facilitating it.

So it's larger than ICANN. ICANN is one of the players there, but it's not under full control of ICANN. So in general, ICANN doesn't have control over root server operators and operations. So the new GWG process which ICANN also has a role in basically is trying to address that, but I just want to say this is not fully within remit of ICANN as it is designed and then run by now. So I just wanted to make that clear. I know it is in the full recommendation as well like this. Just a heads up, basically.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Understood. The comments about L-root, so Monday morning at about 6:30—because I had been editing all weekend—I reached out to ICANN Comms and the ICANN OCTO office and said I'm seeing different ways that L-root is capitalized. Can you tell me what the right way is? Which as you might expect turned up quite the storm of, "Wait, we don't talk

about that in the style guide? No, you don't talk about that in ICANN's style guide."

And then a bit of the internal battle between the CTO office and the CIO office and how L-root is still very commonly used throughout ICANN's website, but it's not what's currently recommended, but it's what everybody seems to know it's called. And I've gotten very conflicting guidance as to ...

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Fair enough. And either way is clear to me. I will leave that to your capable hand and either way is clear. I think it will be clear to people as well. I just wanted to point out because at least in the interactions we have, it is consistently called IMRS. But I'm all with you and I'll leave it with you. I just wanted to point it out. Thank you.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

Fair enough. Thank you, Kaveh. It was a great way to start the week, let me tell you. All right, so I will sort that one out. I've got a date for that. But now for the next one, also does not have a date, and that is improve the security of communications with TLD operators. When do we want them to be using multi-factor authentication and whatnot? How soon?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Well, the real answer is the sooner the better.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: All right, let me rephrase. What can I put in the document?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right, exactly. I think a year after board approval for that recommendation should be doable.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. All right. So the next one, it sort of weasel worded the question of dates, and that was the recommendation on the CZFD, the centralized zone file data access. For this, we said this can be considered effective when ICANN reports a decrease in the number of zone file access complaints, which is fine. The timing we gave was “in a timely manner,” which is not measurable. I was hoping we could come up with some better guidance regarding timing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Alain, do you have a thought here? Is it going to take longer than a year?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: What is it that we’re trying to legislate here about the timing? Because the CZDS is ...

RUSS HOUSLEY: It’s update the ... yeah.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: If you think to the future of SSR3 or more likely SSR4, when they are evaluating this, “in a timely manner” isn't something that’s really measureable. We can leave it that way if that’s what the review team wants, but if there was any hope for a bit more specificity, that’s what I was asking about.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah, I understand totally. I guess I was picking at, what timing ... I'm sorry, I'm not familiar with the current status of this piece of text. So if it feels sort of like, “Why don’t you know what you're talking about,” then my apologies. But are we asking for a change in a timely fashion, or are we talking about some timeliness in the CZDS itself?

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, we’re talking about when should the recommendation be implemented by.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Right. The recommendation itself says something along the lines of complaints are not handled in a timely fashion, they're left for months. So if we want that fixed, we want them to reduce the number of zone file access complaints at all, and when do we want them to have resolved that by?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, if we can—I know I'm sort of opening my mouth and getting in trouble, but if we can find other timing, we should just

point at that and say just like the timing for something else. Because everything is going to be arbitrary, so if there's something else that's codified, I think we should just seek to have parity in the timing with other aspects. But I don't know if there are any timing aspects built into CZDS. Is there? Any SLAs or anything like that?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I'm not sure. Danko has his hand raised. Perhaps, Danko, you know more?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: It's more of a general comment. So maybe I don't want to drop into the middle of this discussion. After you finish this.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I don't know the answer to your question, Eric.

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Okay. No problem.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think there's two parts to this. There's one on the availability of the system itself, which is ICANN Org, and then there's also the data that goes into it in the approval of the request for access which goes to the registry service providers, registry operators. And both of them affect the consistency of the data being available. So I think we're actually

trying to address two different groups and timings in the same sentence.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah. That makes a lot of sense to me. So just to sort of channel my own personal frustrations with the process, I'll be routinely denied by some registries for no apparent reason. Like they'll state stakeholder that you didn't specify in the request, when I totally did. And you get the exact same text every time. So were I to seek remediation for those, I don't know that I'd ever hear back and who I would respond it to. So yeah, I think Norm's right, there are two different aspects of this.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

So it doesn't sound like something that's actually measurable. I can look to see if there are any SLAs that might apply. And otherwise, we may just have to leave it as it is.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Yeah, I don't want to kick this back open.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yeah, I think that the SLA you're looking for might be actually in the registry agreement. But I don't know how clearly that's stated.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

I'll go hunt it down. Okay, the last one that doesn't have a date is the algorithm rollover where we say that it's considered effective when

ICANN Org is prepared for more advanced algorithms to be used for key signing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Alain, do you have any experience with how long it takes to update the DPS?

ALAIN AINA: No experience.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you see any reason why a year is difficult to achieve

ALAIN AINA: Yes. Algorithm rollover is more complex than—

RUSS HOUSLEY: No, just the DPS.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. No.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Of course the whole process takes much longer.

ALAIN AINA: Okay. I got you wrong. Yeah, no, I think updating the DPS should follow the normal maintenance, update of the DPS. So it should be no problem. But I think the issue is people agreeing on the necessity to go for the algorithm rollover.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Sure. But the DPS just prepares them that when they decide it's time, they have a plan.

ALAIN AINA: Got it. Yeah. So the DPS should allow that these rollovers happen [inaudible].

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. So I think we're saying a year, or even two because the whole process will take much longer.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Okay. I will turn that into actual words. I think maybe now we come back to Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yes. Thank you. A bit of overarching comment on the timing issue. First of all, I really commend the team of working towards the SMART criteria, because it's important, but looking at current discussion on timing to see ... two kinds of timing targets. One is related to events like for the algorithm rollover and key changes and things that should

happen with for example next round of the new gTLDs. But another thing is ... Or annual events. And another type is actual deadline or planned timing when the recommendation should be implemented.

And I'd just like to remind you about the current general discussion about the prioritization that is coming both from the number of projects and recommendations we do have that have to be implemented, as you're well aware, for example also from the CCT that is often discussed in the group. But also there is ATRT3 recommendations that are currently discussed at the board level that are calling for the specific body that will be discussing prioritization issues. So some of those recommendations and recommendations by this team will not be able to directly be executed in the guaranteed time frame that is recommended by the team.

So in order to really hold the board and the Org accountable to some sort of exact timing, it'll be needed to be understood what's the implementation and what is its connection to the other processes and items of the work that are coming up. So of course, this is impossible to do on the review team level this time. So I don't have an exact solution, I just wanted to bring your attention to the recommendations from the ATRT3.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

Sure. There's also another consideration that we looked at and realized there was nothing we as a review team could do about it, and that is the fact that according to the current bylaws, SSR3 must convene five years after SSR2 first convened, which means there's no way any of the

recommendations that SSR2 is coming up with are going to be ... ICANN has no time to implement them before SSR3 starts. So that's also sort of a, well, then we can't do anything about that other than make what recommendations we can.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Yeah, but the ATRT3 team has done something about that and created a recommendation how the reviews should be rescheduled. And that of course implies the changes to the bylaws. And this is a process that is currently in the initial stages on the preparation how that can be executed as it's discussed in the board.

So I don't have on top of my head the proposal that should solve that, but it's a significant bylaw change in the way how the whole ICANN reviews and everything will work. So the best thing probably for the team is, just to be ... Well, a little bit more flexible and to try to connect the recommendations with the actual ... set the priorities and guidelines that will actually feed into the prioritization process. The challenge of course is we don't know how the process will actually look like. Even the board doesn't have the power to control those things at this point in time.

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

Kerry Ann.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Thanks, Heather. Danko, I really appreciate you highlighting that challenge. My question to you would probably be, is there value then

in ...? Two things. Early in our discussions when the review team had just started, I remember some of our team members—they not with us anymore though—had mentioned suggesting to ICANN that the board actually create a dashboard and create thematic areas that line up with the various review teams actually provide recommendations so that they find some way of mapping them to for ma part of a dashboard that can be easier managed by the board in terms of doing their prioritization.

The second part before I ask the question is, is there merit ... Two questions then. Is there merit in us not recommending that dashboard per se because I think it would be a difficult task, but supporting the recommendation of the review team you just mentioned in the board, finding a way to sync when the review teams start, recognizing that many of them are already in cycle, and figuring out or probably putting a recommendation that the board actually conduct some form of study as to how to sequence the studies going forward?

Because I remember one of the things like even when KC, when we were looking at some of the other recommendations for DNS and for some of the security stuff, the biggest challenge was timing, the fact that we have reports that are already out for public comment, reports that are already agreed to, and us trying to—as Heather pointed out—constantly edit ours to make sure that it's time sensitive. Is there any merit in us mentioning that dashboard format, us mentioning our support in the recommendation to sequence other reviews? Is there any merit in probably mentioning to the board in our general recommendation section something about thinking about organizing themselves more thematically so that recommendations that correlate

or duplicate from the various review teams can be slotted and managed together rather than you take one report, prioritize that one, take another, prioritize it, but actually have a team that actually does this cross-referencing for the board? Because it's really challenging.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Kerry Ann, that sounds like something that belongs in our suggestions section.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: That's what I was thinking, but I was just wondering from Danko if there would be merit in us just putting that in the suggestion section. And if I wasn't clear, tell me, it's just when we spoke, my mind started to run a little bit just trying to put it together.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. So I'll try to comment and we'll see how well I understood you. So of course, one of the challenges is to understand the whole work that is coming. Generally the process is that the board receives recommendations from the various community groups, including this review, and then the board needs to get understanding of the resources needed, how the implementation would be executed, and of course, the procedure, the global public interest before accepting those recommendations. And when the recommendations are accepted, they go to be implemented by the Org, and only then Org can fit them in their budgeting schedule and everything.

Of course, even before the board accept, Org knows what is coming up. For example, we have SSAD that is being discussed in the EPDP2 and already some understanding of what is needed to do that even before board has made any decision. So it's a complicated process. I believe there is some value in having such a mapping, but in my understanding, part of the operational considerations that ICANN Org has to do to understand. And we had quite recent changes in the process. Xavier is the CFO, but he's also heading the planning group that is now separate from the finance department, and Becky Nash is leading that effort under Xavier's overview. So this is something that is really now coming out of all this work that is coming to all of us so [it's new kind of the] planning structure.

So in that sense, I believe that will be helpful. As I said, I don't have any direct solution how to address the issue of how the review teams should structure the timings of the recommendations, but I'm s you're that any consideration about urgency would very much be valued by the board and by the prioritization process. I don't know if answered your question well enough.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Yes. Thanks, Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

And if I remember correctly, also, KC was on the ATRT3, so maybe she can comment on that, because my understanding, it was very much discussed during their deliberations.

KC CLAFFY: Sorry, which part was very much discussed? I lost that [inaudible].

DANKO JEVTOVIC: KC, about the prioritization and how the new reviews will be structured and how to prioritize the work that is coming up.

KC CLAFFY: Right. And the recommendation there was to create some new organization—not organization, team that’s composed of the SO and AC leadership and they were going to help work through that. Is that right? I don't know what the state is of that recommendation with respect to the board.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: I want to jump in for a sec. I think this is a good thing to have in the suggestions section, but it’s not core to our report. And we do have something on the agenda which is really significant to the report itself. I wonder if maybe we should hop over to that to talk about the abuse subteam stuff.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. Sorry for my intervention, but I just want to bring a bit of clarity how the process goes after your recommendations are done.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Understood and appreciated.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: And for me, sorry, just to close off, Heather, he did answer my question and yes, I support in the general—[when we spoke about] different things that we couldn't put as a specific recommendation, we would have this general section—I don't know what the title would be—I would support something being mentioned there. Maybe I could discuss it with KC and Denise, because it's come up for us before when we were trying to figure out what to include and what not to include. So maybe KC, if you don't mind, we could meet, when we get to that section, we could talk to Denise as well and see how we could put even two sentences.

KC CLAFFY: Yeah.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We already have four suggestions back at the end of ... about how to improve process for future review teams. So I suggest we just either augment one of those suggestions or add a fifth one, but I think we do need to go to the next agenda item and maybe we can just propose some text on the mailing list and sort that out before the next call. Is that okay, Kerry Ann?

KC CLAFFY: I can help Kerry Ann with that, so we can move on.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Yeah, I'm okay with that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Heather, maybe you could start that thread by sending a pointer to where that text is with the four suggestions now so that people can [inaudible] see how to edit.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Happy to do it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. Let's go to the next agenda item, which is KC and Laurin were going to edit two paragraphs and ended up editing a lot more. We didn't want to surprise anyone. Laurin, do you want the clean one up or the one with all the redlines?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I think let's go for the clean. I also have to say, as mentioned in chat, I'm on potato Internet. My fiber line is not working. So I might drop off or whatever else. In that case, [KC] should take over, which I hope she will kind of make some comments herself anyway.

So if you look at the initial document, it looks like a total bloodbath. However, you will find, if you compared them, that a lot of text is still there. It has just moved. For example, quite a few things were just really long but relevant enough, so we extended some of the footnotes a little

bit so it kind of makes more sense and it's easier to read the argumentation.

One change is specific, and I think we need to probably also take this to the mailing list to some extent, and that is the one I'll pick up, and I think KC can speak a little bit more to some other points. But the one I want to talk to is we're talking about SLAs based on DAAR data in the context of the temporary specification.

At the same time, we are saying that DAAR is not functioning in a way that would essentially allow for using DAAR as is in some form of temporary specification to kind of deal with abuse. So that's not quite logical.

I think what we tried to do—and having reread and kind of reworked the text, we—so this is KC and myself—are unsure if it makes sense to focus the temporary specification recommendation on DAAR that much, considering the fact that we say at another point objective's not really clear, it's not set up in a way that allows to use it in the way we propose it should be used. Data are not public. So essentially, how do you deal with this if you're on the receiving end? So there are a lot of issues with that kind of on a very ...

HEATHER FLANAGAN:

If I can jump in for a minute, Brenda, I think you're looking for page 15, because the table of contents has not been refreshed. So it's hard to find what you're actually talking about, but that's what's highlighted. So I think that's what we want to talk about.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Apologies. Yes, there we are. So essentially, summing up my slightly jetlagged rambling, the problem is it just doesn't parse. We can't do our analysis and say it doesn't work, and then say use it as a temp spec. So we were wondering kind of what would be a better approach to focus the temporary specification on. What I was thinking about as just an example would be something along the lines of maybe give some SLAs and how quickly abuse complaints have to be answered, or something that is more tangible, more measurable and doesn't rely on a tool that we ourselves say doesn't really serve the purpose.

That's I think my key point that I feel needs discussion. Other than that, I think if you've read it or will read it, you will see that not much else kind of has really changed in substance. It's just a bit cleaner, hopefully. And yeah, KC should also weigh in if ...

KC CLAFFY: Right. Thank you, Laurin. That was great. And I see Danko's hand is raised. I wonder if he ...

HEATHER FLANAGAN: That's a historic artifact, I think.

KC CLAFFY: Okay. So as Laurin said, I found myself really trying not to change the meaning until I found things that contradicted each other or I couldn't substantiate with footnotes which I've been whining about for a month,

and then just flow and logic and things, and when I tried to have a coherent narrative, something that I could for example actually submit to someone for a peer review, I found it much cleaner for me to put all the narrative in one place. Like here's our view of the landscape, here's all the things that are wrong with it, and then we put all our recommendations after that because many of them tie together. In particular, as Laurin is suggesting, we're trying to get to a place where behavior is more evidence-based.

I think everybody agrees with that, and I spent many hours reading public comments about the DAAR system which at least initially the slide decks were saying we—ICANN—want to have things be more reproducible and fact based. And there was lots of pushback, including by the Registries Stakeholder Group, about, well, it's not. DAAR is not currently reproducible unless the registry or whoever is getting called out. And that's why ICANN is not calling them out, which makes the data not actionable. But if they were going to call somebody out, then some of the data fees are proprietary so it creates a requirement that whoever is getting called out has to go pay for the proprietary data, figure out what the methodology is, go do their own work. I don't think that's going to fly.

So the first thing we had to address—and again, many of the public commenters on the DAAR system when it first came out two years ago were saying the same thing, that you can't be using data that is not reproducible or validated in order to do anything, really, and that's why ICANN Org backpedaled and said, well, this data was never meant to be actionable, validation isn't one of our goals, and there's a little bit of subtlety between reproducible and validation because I think by

reproducible, ICANN means, well, you can go pay for the data too if you want and figure out why they said this domain was blacklisted. You can't really figure out why, because those are black box, proprietary methodologies, but you can figure out that or who said it was blacklisted. But then the validation means that somebody has to go do more than write down what somebody else reported was a phishing domain, for example, and do a lot of legwork, a lot of validation work. And that's really the big problem with using this ecosystem as, let's say, against some evidentiary standards.

So we're back to the same old story here of, what is the evidentiary standard for deciding that something counts as a malicious domain and therefore should count toward some threshold, that I think where we got to two weeks ago was, well, what should the threshold be? And we put in a threshold that we thought was sufficiently high that it would take care of all the false positives and attempts to manipulate the blacklist by putting your competitors on it, by just reporting that your competitors have malicious domains or whatnot. The system is Swiss cheese from that regard, although as ICANN Org says in its documents, it's trusted. The sources they use are trusted, meaning they went and talked to people in industry who are presumably paying for this data and they said, yeah, it's okay data.

But that's not going to make anybody accused, or much worse than accused, deaccredited, make them happy. So we have these two prongs. We're trying to say we need to get whatever data analysis activity that ICANN pursues and puts community money into at a place where it's got integrity and it's considered to have integrity from different stakeholders, especially the ones that are being accused of ...

because indeed, part of the next recommendation is we think it should be used in that way. We think it should be used in that way. We think it should be used to actually move things forward and not just come up with some aggregated statistic that shows, okay, there's more abusive domains than there were last month, which is sort of where you get right now from the aggregated reports, and that's even less than Spamhaus will put on their public website for free.

So we have to move past this sort of not scientific approach to doing this. But that isn't not a small problem. As Danko has mentioned in previous calls, some of the data feeds, you won't get if the contract terms say this has to be shared for the purposes of reproducibility. I think that's the nut that needs to get cracked. I think there are plenty of data feed providers—I work with some of them—who are perfectly willing to share data for noncommercial use, for the purposes of reproducibility in a way that doesn't interfere with their revenue model and that that should be the basis of anything that ICANN's going to use to change its relationship or threaten its relationship with its contracted parties.

So that's where we tried to get. We still haven't solved the problem. We still don't say what's the published threshold. We still don't say what's the level of validation. Obviously, we're not going to solve all these problems. But we state that the objectives are the kind of reproducibility and validation that would allow the data to be used in an actionable way.

And our bottom line is if the data cannot be used in an actual way, ICANN should not invest in it, because it's community money and we're

trying to move the ball forward here. and just putting up aggregated numbers is not moving the ball forward. And from what I could glean from the public comments on that system, everybody agrees with that.

So that's where we're trying to head, and then of course, we still have a problem of, okay, what do you do with it? And we got to the point where EPDP might work. And I know Danko has said several times that a lot of these things would constitute policy changes and would require an EPDP. It would be fine with me if an EPDP actually worked. There's reason to believe, based on recent experience that an EPDP would take years and maybe not work. And there's also evidence from recent events that there's other avenues that the board could take if it decided this was a serious problem. And ICANN Org's own reporting shows that it is a serious security problem.

So I think it's well within—not being a lawyer, so obviously this has to go to a lawyer, but I think it's well within ICANN Board's purview to do something like a temporary specification and we try to give them evidence that they can do that by forming a recommendation in this way. Of course, it's out of our hands how ICANN actually deals with this, but that's the line of reasoning that went into this recommendation 12, create a temporary specification and it needs to be based on data if it's going to be having an SLA for, okay, if you're above this many ... it needs to be based on reproducible, validated data where there's some level of independent validation of the work that goes in, not just, here's a black box that we've been told people trust.

And then two, when there is a temporary specification put in play, if—and/or when—you still want to launch an EPDP in parallel, which sort of

teases out what's in the temporary specification and creates something permanent. Laurin, does that cover what you wanted me to cover?

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Absolutely. I think, yes. I feel that people on the call can see we're kind of pushing in the same direction. And that's kind of ... I feel you should have discussed this first and then I should have talked about the problem of the SLAs, because this is essentially now will just go full circle.

So the problem is ... and this is not just KC and—

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Laurin, I'd like to do a checkpoint with the team and have an opportunity for people to comment on the direction at this point.

KC CLAFFY:

I'm watching for hands. I don't see hands, but I too would like to hear something from the team, because I do understand how irritated Russ is with me for rewriting this section after it went for consensus. But I really read it very carefully, so that's where my rewrite came from.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

It's clear you've read it carefully. But at the same time, I don't want to lose anyone in this transition.

KC CLAFFY: Yes, I agree.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. So that's why I wanted to come in quickly, Russ, to kind of give an observation which ... for people who haven't read it, the points that were made by KC and also by myself are not something that we came up with last week. They were in the text, they are in the text. So essentially, at least this is my feel. We're essentially taking what we have said to the endpoint with what we have been talking about. Our intent was not to kind of significantly change the meaning and the thrust of the text. I just wanted to add that before ... hopefully people will comment.

KC CLAFFY: Kerry Ann's got her hand up.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: I think it still keeps the—it's what's on the screen, correct? Just want to make sure it's the highlighted thing on the screen.

KC CLAFFY: What's on the screen is the temporary specification piece. Before that, there's a DNS data analysis piece which I'm carefully not calling DAAR because I actually believe that whatever ... the thing that is needed for this temporary specification piece to work is something that is so different from what DAAR currently is and the way that people think about it and the way that ICANN Org talks about it, that it doesn't make

sense for us to call it DAAR. If ICANN wants to call it DAAR, fine, but we need to make clear that it does not look like DAAR except superficially in order for it to support recommendation 12 and 13 in my view.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT:

Okay, so the DAAR piece,, I'll probably sit back on, but in terms of what's in front of us on the temporary specification piece of it, I think it still reflects the essence of what was trying to be convened in the previous draft. But I'm okay with how it's written now because I also had issues with some of the content, some of how we had specified what should be done was too specific. So I think I'm fine with how it's written now.

Russ, I know that Denise had some interest in this. I don't know if Denise has gotten to see this part of it yet, but I think personally, based on the comment I made last week, I'm fine with how it's written now, especially with the reword of the last number five. But how it was brought back into this section, I'm fine with it.

KC CLAFFY:

Great. Anybody else? And I know it might be a lot to read right now, although if you just read the recommendation text, that would be great.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Okay, so at this point we're already past the top of the hour. It's important that people give this a read and make sure that they are in line with it. And please raise any issues on the mailing list. We had originally scheduled next week for a two-hour call because we had hoped Heather was going to have the first full version of the document

together. Given these late breaking inputs, Heather, is that still going to happen?

HEATHER FLANAGAN: It's pretty unlikely, to be frank. I like the changes that were made, with the exception of the footnotes. I think they need an intervention. There's one page where there's four lines of actual text and then the rest of the page is footnotes. This is not readable. This won't do.

KC CLAFFY: I'll work with you on that.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: So I think it's going to take me probably at least an additional week to beat this into shape and also to get the public comment spreadsheet sorted out. I don't have any mappings of the original recommendations to what's been changed now most recently, particularly in the abuse area. So yeah, it won't be done.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, so what I suggest we do then is change next week back to a one-hour call and make the 17th the two-hour call, and then next week, what we'll be doing is dealing with any issues that you find in doing the work of creating the report, whatever you have gotten to by then. And hopefully you can get the report to us well in advance of the call on the 17th so that we can have all read it.

HEATHER FLANAGAN: Yes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So Brenda, would you make that so?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, I will. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. All right. Thank you, everybody, for hanging into the end. I think we're beginning to see light at the end of this tunnel, and I'm looking forward to being done, as I'm sure you all are too.

KERRY-ANN BARRETT: Thanks, everybody. I think it's been really good.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Bye to all.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
