CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the OFB Working Group Recommendation Prioritization Sub-Group Call on Wednesday, the 14th of February, 2021 at 18:30 UTC. On the call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Laurin Weissinger, Alan Greenberg, Judith Hellerstein, and Sébastien Bachollet. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. And Nadira Alaraj is joining us.

And a kind reminder to please state your name when taking the floor and to keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Claudia. And welcome to a new group, as well as the stalwarts that have been harbinging this process through I think quite successfully at a reasonably good pace, so hopefully we can continue. We welcome today—thanks, we just noted Maureen as an apology for today. We welcome today the team, or at least the leadership, and I think one other so far of the team within the SSR2. That's the tab we're going to spend the lion's share of today on. Of course, first of all, introducing Laurin and co. to [inaudible] all of this and getting his and their sage-like wisdom on what we need to be doing with this particular tab on the recommendations from their excellent work.

But before we do that, we will now look at our action items from the previous meeting, so Claudia, If you could just [slide over to that.]

Terrific. And we're about to tick off the two action items from our running action item sheet which are the only ones outstanding on this list at the moment. At the top of the sheet, you'll see a couple for JZ to further edit item nine—19 sorry—on the CCTRT tab with status and comments and to review and edit any of the priorities because we had a lot to discuss and there was a few changes made forward and backward.

So with that, we will be ticking those off and that will mean, joy upon joy, that other than what we're going to put in today, our running tally of action items is up to date.

We're going to be dialing out, I believe, to Jonathan shortly but that matters not one iota because we know he has spoken to Heidi and that he is happy with the position he's in. What I might get you to do now Claudia, just so we can do a soft entry for Laurin and those of us who have joined today's call that may not be quite so used to what we do and how we do it, is to actually open up either the RDS or the CCTRT—make it the RDS one because Alan is here—and that will give them some idea of what happens when we do what we do, what it looks like.

So, as you can see, what we have is actually a pull-down menu in this middle section under ALAC here, which gives us our prioritization established by this group which goes along as a recommendation, not as a fait accompli for whomever gets to sit down in the wider ICANN process and argue for where these things should be in the queue and what resources they should be allocated with.

So, the first thing we do is under Column D—and like I said, this is the RDS example—is look at the overall level of prioritization from an AtLarge point of view and that is critical. It's the end user perspective. It may be incredibly valid recommendations, which are awfully important for other reasons, but when we do the test in this group that says is this of vital and incredible importance to the end user of the Internet [the answer is,] well, actually, no. ICANN cares or someone cares—or someone cares but not the rank and file of billions of Internet users and those yet to come. So, that is where a high, medium, or low will be established by this group.

If you just slide across a little bit, I'll come back to Column A, B, and C and bring Alan into the conversation. Just slide across to E and F. Thanks, Claudia. That would be great to [be central] on the screen.

The next thing we do is we look at other criteria, which we have been reliably informed that the Org is very, very interested in and that is, at least from our opinion, what the ranking should be in terms of specifically the priority ALAC. And you usually find that will match what is in the Column D that we then expect the group—sorry, the people are using the material in the future—to pretty much work out of Column B and F.

And we also add to our high, medium, or low ranking, a measure of our assessment of the level of effort we think this priority item will take and so we look to whether the recommendation will be of minimal, moderate, or significant effort. This is where the input from those involved in the Review Team is vital. Although it's vital across the board, it is particularly vital here. And also the sense of urgency, which again

goes back to a high, medium, or low measure. And so you can see here, that after our deliberations, we have made those assessments in that status Column E.

And then finally in F, and that is yet to be done and finalized for this one, which we only finished in our last meeting—we go back and we go through and look at an overall priority because obviously, we often have competing interests where everything is high or medium and that's not arguably a winning strategy to go to a negotiation table with.

So, go back to the front end, the A, B, and C view please. And Alan, if you're connected to audio, you'll note and I'd like you to just sort of mention what you did in preparation for your RDS priorities. For example, you added in a column and you added particular additional information into what we had originally in Column C. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The information I added in Column C was what, in the ATRT, you had in Column D, I think. It's the information that you included as a separate column. I didn't have a separate column, so I just added it there. It's simply what the Review Team rated this as, and I thought it was an interesting comparison to see whether either we viewed it differently because of our different position or simply time had passed. Two years later, things change. So I'm not quite sure what else you want from me at this point. Maybe I misunderstood the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	No, I just wanted to… No, no. That's fine. I wasn't going to… I was tired of speaking actually, Alan. So, if we now move across to … Actually, just have a quick peek in CCTRT as well. Let's go back once more, a little cameo visit in there. You'll see there, Laurin, that here Jonathan chose to list in his Column B whether or not the Board had opted or otherwise the recommendation that was relevant to his group's work. So you'll see there's flexibility. These are not all to be only treated the same way. And if we now move forward to ATRT…

ALAN GREENBERG:	It's Alan. If I could make a comment, I might have added that also if the Board had ever acted on our recommendations. But a year and a half into the six months, they still haven't so I didn't think adding that column was worthwhile.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Well, it would have been a very empty column. Or perhaps full, but not of what you want to see.

I also wanted to just note the sort of information that Sébastien has inputting into ATRT3 column. Now Sébastien, is it better to go to the VO_ column now just as a quick look? Or straight one? Can you advise?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	The straight one is okay, so [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay, thank you. Okay. If you'd like to speak to this as you've been preparing this for when we get to this one.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Yeah, just to say that I add the decision from the Board and I tried to put this information here. It's in the summary, each in Column B, and Column C is what was the priority for ATRT3. No, sorry, it was the recommendation in B and in D, I add comments from the Board in each and every … If you can go a little bit, scroll down just to have some text and you can see on the Column E, you have high for ATRT3 and I suggest that for ALAC it may be low and we will discuss that. But that's a different column. But the main work I have done is to add the Board decision in Column D. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you very much, Sébastien. Back to the job at hand, which is the SSR2. And Laurin, you've now seen that pretty much, each time we've dived into these recommendations, we've worked at the whim and made it work with the [leads] that we have for each and every one of them. So fear not. We recognize that this is just a very rough skeletal capturing of some aspects of the recommendations from your report, but now we get to make it work. And so, with you and yours, if we need to add things, now is where we get to do it but what we do need to speak to is that drop-down menu and the categorization aspects that we worked into Columns [D and E] later on. So Laurin, what would you like us to do to make this better? Thank you for having a look at it before we came to the meeting. I do appreciate that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, so this makes a little bit more sense to me now. So, my main thing is that I expected to see this alongside of kind of the numbering of the recommendations we had so I can kind of comment on that. However, it's upside down. So, I will start with I think line three is essentially a finding. It is not a recommendation that we made. I mean, there is no recommendation. Let's just get rid of that, unless you have a reason to have it there. Other than that…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not at all. What we'd like you to do then is we've got several of those may have occurred, if, Claudia, can we just capture, perhaps, in the drop-down menu because that might be… We can do it in there. It might just copy and paste. We can either make it not applicable or just not a recommendation and then we'll go back and edit this later. Thanks. So, if you can continue on down, you're doing the work beautifully.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, so the next one, again, I'm not sure how it is a recommendation, so I cannot say much. So, the budget transparency, I would essentially say, okay, this is from an ALAC perspective, right? There is something to be said about it; however, I think from an end user perspective, who will actually look at it? So, I would not say this is extremely important at this point in time. When it comes to…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's work with that. Can we just look at the drop-down menu on cell 5E?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. So, I will say this is a low for us, to be completely frank. And I really do think…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Completely frank, that's exactly what we want.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: The reason being I think there are other ones where I would say high or medium, so I'm happy to let that one go.

I will jump down to line seven in comparison because I think that is one where I would say this is a high priority because, essentially, there is no security Board position and there hasn't been one in a while. Obviously, there is whatever his official title is, John Crain, but he is not at that level. To me, it just seems like a good idea for a place like ICANN to have someone who is doing security and responsible for security at that level. And I also note the ALAC comment also said this was a very important recommendation. So there, I would say that's a high.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And just before we do, Alan's hand's up and I don't want to go too much further down because I'd also like to pick up the other aspects in the

Column D that we're after which is the degree of difficulty and the amount of time we're to fit in a timeframe. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm actually back on line number five. Line number five is interesting in that there is a reference to new gTLDs and that does go to something that the ALAC has discussed at various times. You know, we approve new gTLDs or we have approved gTLDs last time and this time, probably under the similar terms that the cost of applications is self-funding with the presumption that the income associated with the new gTLDs will offset the expenses associated with them on an ongoing basis. That last thing has never been factored in and never been calculated and we don't know to what extent that is actually true or not. And the security aspect is a particularly interesting one in that from an SSR point of view, do the new gTLDs cost us something? Is it just revenue into the organization and not SSR cost? Or is there a high SSR cost which somehow we have to put into the equation?

So, from that aspect, the actual funding is not the issue but the discussion of the funding I think is a critical issue that should be addressed in terms of new gTLDs and I don't know to what extent that was the intent of mentioning gTLDs in the wording of the recommendation or whatever it was.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I can respond to that if you want. Yeah. So, this wording, you will find in not just this recommendation but in multiple ones and the reasoning behind that in the team was that some of this stuff should be cleaned up

before we have another round. So the SSR cost of another round is one of these where it's really like, "Well, maybe we should have that discussion and think this through before we do the next round because how the next round is done and under what circumstances will have a huge effect on the SSR cost of that."

So as I said, my main reason for putting this at a lower priority is that I feel there are two or three more where I would argue for a really high priority and that's why I kind of tried to push the other things down. But I completely see your point and I was part of the team, so I still think it's a good idea.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I just wanted to note that in chat, Olivier makes a point. Olivier, did you want to speak to that as well?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, Cheryl. I think that one of the things, SSR cost is definitely important. When one even looks further at the policing of that TLD when it comes down to contractual compliance and some of those TLDs not being run in a way that maybe the major ones are, you can certainly see that there are additional costs and none of that has been taken into account unfortunately. And I don't think that there is any calculation that's ever been done on this. We don't even know whether more TLDs means more income for ICANN or more costs for ICANN, which is the concern that I sometimes have when there's a lot of application of small top-level domains with very few, small as in few registrations, but there are a lot of problems with them. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Alan, what I'm hearing then, is this a plea for us, as this team, this small team, to actually note Laurin's kindness and concern about the overall end user community being particularly concerned about this and flavoring it a little bit more with the At-Large—from an ICANN At-Large perspective and argue that this should be perhaps medium overall priority? Is that what I'm hearing?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I would tend to agree. For the record, I did have a discussion with a number of ICANN executives and Board members a while ago and the bottom line came out is nobody has even thought over from, at least as far as I can tell, from the period of 2012 onward of ever trying to figure out to what extent new gTLDs have cost us operationally or benefit us operationally. It's a very hard thing to do because the overall organization has grown so much during that period of time if you look at the period from 2012 to now, the size of compliance for instance, how much of that was natural growth that was simply needed and how much of it was due to the actual increase in numbers. And we have no idea but no one's even attempted to come up with identification of that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. Our job isn't to do the analysis of that either, but rather look at where, if this is a recommendation of a review team, it should fit in the overall priorities of getting done going forward. So, without going down all sorts of black holes because I heard a lot of them in the new gTLD marathon PDP process. So, let's agree if we can then to make that

a medium. But let's now look at what the degree of difficulty we think would be in actually implementing this. But Laurin, just to take you along that line now, we all have our own opinions on how hard or not such an exercise would be. But what was the SSR2's feeling on this?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, so I quickly want to say one sentence. I'm very happy with this being a medium and the important thing is that we have to come back to later is really the question of, again, under what circumstances are we getting this next round? So if, for example, contract changes were to be forthcoming, you could argue that at least when it comes to SSR, there would be at least something to deal with the fallout, should there be any. That said, the question here I feel from our discussion is how transparent are we talking? Right? So are we talking about everything above a certain dollar amount? Right? Are we talking about this by looking at specific parts of the organization? And so on and so on.

One of the other recommendations, and that's where again, we have this interaction, is that we're saying, "Get yourself a Chief Security Officer and put all SSR-related expenses under this person." So, if that were to be done, right, things would be a bit easier, at least as far as SSR is concerned.

So, my answer is it depends.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, let's capture that just before you move on. Yeah, hang on. Let's capture that in the notes though that there is an interdependency with,

and if you can just identify the cell number and column, line and column number for that.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, I just marked it as well, it's AB7.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific, because we need to note, I think, those interdependencies because whoever is sitting at the table will need to make those points as well.

Okay, so assuming that that interdependency will be well recognized, we need to also recognize that Jonathan is with us on audio. Thank you, Jonathan, always a pleasure to have you. We're just going into the thrill-packed and exciting and exciting exercise of starting off SSR2 tab work. So Laurin, would you be looking at a level of effort here of being minimal, moderate, or significant for the organization? And also a concept of the sense of urgency, because that may not match the priority. And for there, the sense of urgency, we're looking at a high, medium, or low.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Cheryl, it looks like you dropped or you muted yourself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I stopped talking. I asked Laurin to throw his hat in the ring on the level or urgency and the degree of effort.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay. I wasn't sure if you were done. My apologies. So, I would say the effort is probably, again, if the recommendation—let me just see the number—if Recommendation 2, which is AB7, were implemented, I would say it is a low effort because then it's essentially the spending of that department. However, if it were not to be implemented, it's probably more of a moderate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, let's make that point. Let's make it medium, low, and am I assuming a high sense of urgency then?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Again, it would first require this position to be established in one case, but I think there is urgency to this. Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, if we look at a low, medium, high in this column and link it to the position creation, being that is arguably important information for our representative to know about. Okay. Are we all comfortable with that?

We have a number of guests, I guess we'll call you, observers in today's call. You're all welcome and your voice is welcome to be heard, so feel free to weigh in in chat or put your hand up and we'll recognize you. The rest of us tend to just elbow into each other's space with such a small and interactive group. And Laurin, believe me, if I just stop talking, it's probably because I finished. Okay, so let's move down.

Let's treat the next one, which was the high, the risk management framework one that is in Column 6C. Here, you would be talking about what type of effort level and what sense of urgency. Back to you, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. So, I did not put this as a high. I haven't talked about it yet, so I'm not sure what the reasoning is behind this being high.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's talk about it and decide.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I would actually—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll call that a gremlin, the gremlin got it. What would you like it to be if not high?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I would put this as a medium because, again, if someone is being in charge of strategic and tactical security at the Board level, and that is something that anyone worth their money would do anyway. So, it is important. The effort I assume would be moderate. The reason why I can't say exactly is that the team did not have very good insight or access to what is already there. So, we did see some documents. A lot of them were pretty old, let's just say, so we don't have full visibility of what is actually being done and what is available. This, by the way, also

applies to a variety of other internal measures which I'll now kind of mention that. So, I would say it's moderate even though I do not have sufficient insight to give you a kind of full assessment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for that. Would you then have a sense of urgency that was medium, so it would be medium, moderate, medium across the board or [inaudible] a sense of urgency?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Again, yes. I think that is an appropriate sense of urgency. Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. And I must say as someone who's delved deeply into this in the historical past, and did actually create with a few others and experts in the field, a risk management framework for the organization which was then not taken up by the Board and they did some other silly risk management thing which was little, if any, relevance to what we could call a security and stability of the system, rather more an organizational approach which is all very fine but not what we were meant to do. I support that absolutely, so I'm coming from a very biased point of view. We actually did a modified NIST system that would have worked right out to registrars and registries, but there you go. It's not impossible, but yes. I think moderate, medium across the way will go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Stop reminiscing on the good old days, Cheryl. The good old days.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I know. I can't help myself. When I was a little girl, we only played with pebbles. Anyway, enough frivolity.

If you've had a sip of water, perhaps Laurin, let's then dive into the next line which we agreed was—let me double-check—was going to be a fairly important one. At the moment, it's not applicable, but over to you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, so this one, I think, is one of the ones that I would really kind of underline as the highest priority. Having someone at that level to me, and to the team, seemed as something that's just very important and there is a lot to be said about having someone at that position that has to do, as the field already says, this is about strategy, this is about tactics. This is not to say that the current security team at ICANN is doing a bad job. It's more to say they should have a seat at the [big thought] table more clearly and that should be reflected.

In terms of the implementation, the question would be, is someone else being hired or is someone essentially—is one position that already exists being kind of just elevated up? In the latter case, we would see a small pay increase for an already existing staff member. In the latter case, we would have… Sorry, in the former case, we would have an additional salary at the kind of level we're talking about, so we're talking yearly cost of, let me just open the tax filings. What did we say? What do people make at this level? Oh yeah, let's just say like $600K a year additional. That is only if someone completely new gets hired. If staff are just moved around, we would have far less cost.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well noted, and with that, would you suggest that that would be a minimal level of effort? I mean, finding a bit of money for increase in an existing role salary seems to be hardly overly complicated. We're not saying it's going to be easy to get the funds, and thank you, Sébastien, for putting your hand up because I was actually going to deliberately come to you in a moment on this matter. And while Sébastien is making his intervention, if you could think about the sense of urgency I'm assuming that high and high will be what it is, but it may be a minimal effort.

Sébastien, you were around in the Board last time, I believe, we had this delving into the thrill-packed and exciting world of SSR and the risk group. Over to you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you, Cheryl, and thank you, Laurin. My first comment was this position used to exist within ICANN a long time ago maybe, but with the same title. My feeling is that, in fact, it was merged or split with two jobs in ICANN with office of the CTO and I guess the CIO even if it's not the title [of Ashwin]. But that's why I am always in trouble when we want to organize ICANN staff. We can say that this function needs to be taken into account and we need to have more visibility on that, but asking for a specific job, I feel it's not our task. I just want to give you one small example of what's happened when I have done that. When we past 100 staff—we are almost 400 now—I say it's already too much. We need to stop. The answer of the CEO at that time was to say it's not

your job, it's my job. And therefore, if we want to be listened, it's to tell that we need to be sure that this function or this, yes, these duties are taken into account within the organization.

I guess there is still a committee within the Board about security, yeah I am almost sure it's existing. I don't know who is the Chair by heart, but I know there are two people participating in it. I guess you have met with them or met with the Chair of the Risk Committee. But that was my input I wanted to give you. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. Laurin, did you want to respond to what opportunities your team did have working with the C-Suite?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah. So, we did have various meetings also touched on that. The reasoning behind why we said this should be an individual officer simply has to do with, essentially, the best practices and the current research on security handling. So, for example, by having security under the office of the CTO, it essentially becomes a sub-function of the CTO. What should happen if we look at security management approaches is that security looks at what the CTO is doing. So, there's an internal checking function, if you will.

And that, again, according to what is currently our best knowledge about how to do this, is best done when these functions are independent. That is one reason why we said get someone who is responsible for this only and not for security plus something that might

be conflicting with security at that level. That's number one and number two is, again, the kind of strategic thinking.

I do completely take your point on the other hand, Sébastien, that the question always is kind of where do we put this kind of stuff and how do you, where do you kind of have to cut? To say, "Okay, we have enough people." So that's the reasoning of the team. I still stand behind that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that, Laurin. What I'd like to do then is—and can I, just from my own personal point of view, say I've worked on both sides of the team here in other organizations and that is within close support of CEOs who absolutely have the right and responsibility of the hiring, firing, and what their employee pool is and it ain't our business. So, what you were told, Sébastien, you'd hear in most organizations.

This is my personal opinion. I believe we need the right staff in the right numbers to do the job to support the community work that's done and I don't care whether it's 500 or 600 as long as it's effective. And I mean that literally. So, I'm not concerned that, "Oh gee, we've got 0.3 more of a person." Far from it. I'm the opposite. As long as the people are the right people for the job and it works for the end game, then I'm okay with it. No problem at all, provided you can resource it.

That being said, Laurin, what you gave as additional information on the best practice modeling which was the rationale behind this recommendation, I think is vital for us to note because I have made my daily bread in the area of ISO worlds and until you get the position properly managed in the entity, you do not get the attention to getting

programs run properly. I couldn't agree with you more. So, could I ask you, if we go with a medium, minimal, medium—sorry, was it medium or high? Which were we going? Medium, minimal, high, weren't we? Yes. Medium, minimal, medium—I'm getting myself confused now—in Column C, Laurin, could I prevail upon you as an action item—or you can do it now if you're in the document—to just write those very important words of wisdom regarding current best practice and the ordinance, the reason that a subordinance is not a positive thing, a co- or peer ordinance does work and that will be important information for our people to be able to draw upon so that they can argue the point effectively. Is everyone happy with that? Great. I'm just going to take that as a yes, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we're going to move onto the next block.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. So, we already had risk management before, so I think we can essentially copy over what we have for line six.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Line seven, cell 7C, which you established earlier on, that would be a high. It's certainly not going to be much of a problem with the business continuity plan. If you have that entity organized and that position done,

then that ISO work should perhaps be easy to do. What would you be giving that as a moderate or a...? The framework, sorry, the ISO plan?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: The business continuity. Again, so these all hang together. If you do the risk management accordingly, you would automatically get into business continuity. So, I think, again, it's one of those where it's deleting line eight because we already discussed what is now line nine. I would just say, again, this is medium priority. I would say on the low side actually if I have more than three options.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, we can make it low. That's not a problem. If we do low, it's actually, it could be a low or moderate depending on how the other ISO activities are in the entity. My tendency would be to say low, low, and high as a sense of urgency but it could be low, low, medium. What's your response to this?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yeah, I think urgency is maybe more. Yeah. I would say it's more urgent than for C, so yes, I would agree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So low or medium on that one. Great. Okay. Moving down?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, next line is the disaster recovery plan. This is essentially part of above line. So, same thing applies.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We also should note that it is an interdependency with the line above, with C—whatever it is now, C9. I think it would be C8 or 6 later on, but we'll sort that out, the line above.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. So, the next one is more interesting and that's essentially where I kind of started to be unsure where to put things. So, in the ALAC comment, it says right there is support for recommendations 14 and 15, and those are the two recommendations that touch on DNS abuse. Number 14 is the temporary specification that's recommended and the second one is to launch a PDP. Is this what line 11 [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Laurin, your audio just faded briefly. Could you just restate what you…?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. My apologies. Yes, so this is where I became kind of unclear on what is where. So, is line 11 speaking to recommendations 14 and 15, which is to establish a temp spec for security improvements and then the PDP on DNS abuse? Is this what this line is referencing?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's a darn good question. This was populated by staff, and what, it seems to me, would be valuable, Laurin, if we could prevail upon you between this meeting and the next, is if we also put in an additional column so that like Alan, you could link each one of these things, the ones we keep, to the recommendation number out of your report. That would be very valuable, I think, going forward.

Can I ask, Heidi, are you or Claudia in a position to respond to that question? If not, we can make it whatever we like, I guess.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I am not in a position currently because I was not the staff who did this. So, we can add that extra line, yes, that extra column.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, let's add the column and make it whatever works best. Laurin, how's that work for you?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Okay, excellent. So, I will just assume, then, this is recommendation 14 and 15. So, essentially, what 14 and 15 say is the Board create a temp spec that kind of deals with DNS abuse. And how the team recommended to do this is to say keep stuff that is considered abusive below a certain threshold and then kind of give contracted parties an appropriate amount of time to essentially clean this up again and then nothing's going to happen, but if people continue, if contracted parties continue to kind of have very high numbers of abusive domains, then we

need to step in and act. And the policy development is obviously a bit more open, but the idea is the same.

So, I know that the contracted parties were not very happy with this. On a call, I remember I was on, I tried to tell them, "Look, this is not really meant to be something that is weighing on everyone. But it should be a tool to deal with the alt names and similar where it's like, okay, if you show a pattern of enabling this type of behavior, these types of crimes, then something should happen to you and this doesn't mean that the SSR2 team wants essentially ICANN Compliance go around with a whip and whip all the contracted parties."

That said, I think from an end user perspective, dealing with DNS abuse is obviously a very high priority, and again, it's also in line with, again, the ALAC response as well as kind of all the work that has gone into DNS abuse. So to me, dealing with that aspect is very high priority.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, coming off mute each time, if I've typed in chat, I have to move my cursor, otherwise it just progresses as if I'm doing a space bar on the chat. It's very annoying. It's, well, one of the annoying things about Zoom.

So, let me see what others would like to say about that, whether we look at that as a high or medium. I suspect I know the answer, but let's ask everybody as well. But just on that, can I ask, which may help us frame our reaction here, what was the feedback from Jamie and his team on this particular aspect of Rec 14 and 15?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, the responses I was alluding to are not from Jamie and his team, but they are the public comments that came back from…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I heard that was the industry. That's why I wondered what Compliance actually may have said.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, Compliance has not given an official comment after. What Compliance did tell us is that they do not have the tools, and this is not a quote but this is essentially what it is and it's all recorded so you can look up the specifics if you want. They essentially told us they do not have the tools to deal with the DNS abuse issue.

If you look at the contract, there is also not really much there that would give ICANN leeway at this point in time to actually act on it. So, yeah, that is essentially where, what Compliance told us, which is essentially like, "Look, we cannot really do much about this."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a song we have heard before. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and yes, you have heard this before. It won't help us here, but I think it's important to know that Compliance says they don't have the tools, registrars say they do have the tools and we can't get them to

talk together to actually come to a final conclusion. That's in terms of the tools to take action against it. Whether they use analytical methodology to identify the offenders that they then may or may not have the tools for is not at all clear either.

ICANN Compliance and their various representatives at different times had said, "No, we absolutely do not do that," and "Yes, we absolutely do do that." And I personally, although I've spent significant time one-on-one and in groups trying to figure out to what extent they do this, I still don't know. Although, something like eight years, seven years ago, Maguy demonstrated one of their tools of how they recognize patterns. So, God knows.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fortunately, there's no gods or goddesses, other than me of course, on the call. Never mind. Anyone else want to weigh in on this before we have a go at allocating priority levels?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, it's Jonathan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, I can't imagine. Oh, Jonathan. I knew you were on audio but I wasn't aware that you'd be able to talk and do what's happening at the same time. Over to you, my friend.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	So yeah, just to follow-up on what Alan said. The most recent discussion of this was actually with our meeting with the Contracted Party House DNS Abuse Working Group. And in the chat, Reg Levy said that the Compliance tried to turn everything into a pattern. And so, it's certainly her position that Compliance was always trying to look at things holistically even when it was inappropriate to do so. I don't have any other specific evidence, but that was Reg's reaction to me raising this point on that particular call.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, Jonathan. Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much. I think that in such situations, we still are without much of the needed data and understanding of how Compliance works. On the one hand, we see that when you look at the compliance reports, it looks as though the only, well, the only contracted parties that have terminated contracts are the ones that end up not paying fees and then 99% of the rest, it's the matters are either ongoing or are dropped.
	At the same time, we also hear from contracted parties that they get hassled by Compliance for small, little, silly things, which in some way, I could say, "Yeah, well it could be seen as a pattern and so on," but is not. And I have difficulty reconciling the two. Either Compliance is doing its job and going after every problem, but of course, evaluating correctly which ones are the really important ones, the ones where we see a pattern of abuse or they don't, in which case they do bother contracted parties for commas and semicolons and things like this in an address line

when they basically are just wasting their time on these things, which seems to be inflating numbers because you can certainly inflate a lot of numbers with columns and semicolons and dots and things. But at the same time, not going for the really tricky ones.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, yee of little faith.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, go after the really, the real tricky ones. And we know that there are some out there that requires significant work to go after. But I don't know. For some reason… This is why I say I don't think we have enough information on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, we're back to analyzing the issue that was already identified by the RT. And I'm very aware that we've only got a couple of minutes left in this call, so two things. I'm going to come to you next, Laurin, and basically, right now I'm hearing that we will probably be looking at this as a high, low, high, or a medium, low, high but you can tell me that when I hand it to you. But what I want staff to do is to highlight what is currently line, row 12, and highlight it in a color so we know this is where we come back to, this is where we'll be starting off in our following call which will be… Normally, it would be in two weeks' time, but to be honest, if we can do it this time—or not this time, a little bit later would be nice for me, but anyway, next week, perhaps half an hour later would be a little bit easier. But I'm sure Claudia will sort that out.

So, Laurin, you'll get the almost last word on this. I'm sorry, go ahead, Claudia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Sorry about that. So, next week, CPWG is from 19:00 UTC to 20:30 UTC for the…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can we not run 18:00 to 19:00?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We can do that if you'd like. Yes, we can book that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [All right, that sounds human.] All right, let's make that the case. Now, Laurin, where are we going to sit—and we can come back to this, of course, if we don't complete it—in terms of priorities here? Is this going to be medium, minimal, medium, mid-high, minimal? What's your feel?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, my feel really remains that this is high and for the following reason, and that is that the language in the contract. The discussions about is Compliance doing too much or too little or whatever else, that is something else. What we know for a fact is that they do not have the possibility to actually act on this because there is no provision. That means we need a provision. So, I really feel this is a high. In terms of the effort required, I just have to kind of ask that quickly and say, how have

you rated it, the effort of doing a PDP in the past? Because that is what the effort would be for this one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, a properly scoped PDP should be no more than of moderate effort. It certainly should not be significant, but it could in fact, be minimal depending on the scoping. I think this one might be more like moderate, but we'll see.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: That sounds good to me then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, high, moderate, and would you suggest the sense of urgency is medium or high?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Considering the current ALAC talking points, my tendency would be take this into the direction of high, also considering kind of that a lot of stuff is now going on in that space. But that is a researcher talking about security.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. [inaudible] A lot is going on and that's a good thing. Now, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for the additional couple of minutes today, although we did start a little bit later than usual. We would very much appreciate if we could meet next week as Claudia

indicated at 18:00 UTC. Laurin, if you and any of yours that you can drag along with you can join us—it's essential that you do. We will get the extra column put in if you could do a little bit of preparation homework and work with staff if need be to get those rec numbers in that column. That's an action item on you, and I believe we'll be in good stead to power through hopefully even the rest of the recommendations if all the stars align.

Thank you, one and all, and do remember that we have the ALAC and Board meeting starting in about 25 minutes and I hope you're all going to be there as well. Bye for now.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Bye, everyone. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining the call. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]